

**Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte**

Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris

(Institut historique allemand)

Band 51 (2024)

**Rowan Watson**

**Bishops, Canons, Counts, and the Writing of History in Angoulême. Part 1: c.1040 to 1130.**

**From the Angoulême Chronicle and the Advent of Reform to the Career of Gerard, Bishop and**

**Papal Legate**

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2024.1.113903

---

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

ROWAN WATSON

BISHOPS, CANONS, COUNTS, AND THE WRITING OF  
HISTORY IN ANGOULÊME, c. 1040–1160

Part 1: From the Angoulême Chronicle and  
the Advent of Reform to the Career of Gerard, Bishop and Papal Legate\*

At some moment towards the middle years of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, a chronicle was put together by cathedral canons in Angoulême. The intention was to record the *Nomina et gesta pontificum et comitum Engolismensium*. Surviving only in a 14<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript but much copied by antiquarians from the 16<sup>th</sup> century onwards, the resulting text, known today as the »Historia Pontificum et Comitum Engolismensium« (henceforth HPCE), has provided historians with a significant source for the history of Aquitaine in the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries<sup>1</sup>. The work begins with an original account of the earliest bishops, the basis of which was a list in a 9<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript, annotated in the 12<sup>th</sup> century when it was in the Angoulême cathedral library<sup>2</sup>; thereafter, details of bishops and counts are taken from the chronicle of Ademar of Chabannes († 1034), with some original insertions; from the time of count Geoffrey, 1031–1047, the text is original, though created, as argued below, by more than one personality at different times in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. The latest events recorded are of 1159.

The HPCE was a panegyric<sup>3</sup>. The aim of this article is to show the agenda of the chronicle by examining the milieu from which it emerged, and to consider the factors that governed the historical narrative it created. For an area not rich in chronicle sources, information from the HPCE has been used in an uncritical fashion. From the mid-11<sup>th</sup> century to 1159, the canons had lived through a number of major changes which impacted significantly on the environment and mental world in which they operated. Quite apart from relations with their bishop, they had had to cope with adjusting to ideas of reform, with problems of managing the cathedral's property, and with supporting the legal and judicial work of a bishop who was a papal legate for

\* Part 2 of this article, Bishops, Canons, Counts, and the Writing of History in Angoulême. From the Anacletian Schism in the Province of Bordeaux to the Advent of the Plantagenet Dukes of Aquitaine, will be published in *Francia* 52 (2025).

1 The modern edition is by Jacques BOUSSARD, *Historia Pontificum et Comitum Engolismensium*. Édition critique, Paris 1957, with the MS Reg. lat. 2113 of the Vatican Library as the chief textual source. This is a relatively short text to browse, and reference to it will be kept to a minimum in the following notes.

2 GUY DE PUYBAUDET, Une liste épiscopale d'Angoulême, in: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome* 17 (1897), p. 279–284.

3 For Alfred RICHARD, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou, 778–1204*, 2 vols., Paris 1903, vol. 1, p. 412, the HPCE »n'est qu'un panégyrique«.

over 20 years; they had also had to live through the Anacletian schism and its aftermath, and on the death of the last independent duke, William X, to establish relations with a Capetian monarch who, from 1137 to 1152, were dukes of Aquitaine. From 1152, the advent of the Plantagenet dukes, with unprecedented resources and ambitions, signalled a new regime in the duchy.

Against this background, the HPCE appears as a carefully constructed literary creation which sought to provide a reassuring view of the past, one that celebrated the independence and honour of the rulers of the diocese and county of Angoulême. A great deal can be said about the Angoumois and Aquitaine in the period covered by the chronicle – especially from c. 1040 to 1159 – which is often only hinted at or positively overlooked in the work. It is only by relating the HPCE to these developments that its tendentious nature and the culture from which it emerged can be properly assessed.

### The composition and nature of the HPCE

The work begins with a declaration by a putative author that he has rescued the names and acts of the bishops and counts from oblivion, bringing the work *usque ad nostra tempora*; beyond this comes the statement that the author has added nothing of his own but only what was found *in veteribus libris vel in scripto felicitis memoriae Hugonis Engolismensis episcopi* and what was relayed by *celebris fama*. The cathedral's cartulary was certainly not used as a source – this was being drawn up in the years around 1160<sup>4</sup>. A number of features belie the idea of a single authorship. The structure suggests a text that was gradually updated, with material added without effective editorial control. The Hugh mentioned was very probably the cathedral cantor who was elected bishop in 1149 and who died in 1159, rather than the 10<sup>th</sup>-century bishop of this name (about whom the HPCE was not complimentary). The 12<sup>th</sup>-century Hugh evidently had historical interests: he was concerned to identify the bodies of an early bishop, Mererius, and of his follower Innocent, discovered in graves near the altar of St Peter as work on the cathedral progressed – since there was no *titulus* attached to the bodies, he refrained from making public statements. He may well have been the author of the lives of the earliest bishops of Angoulême with which the HPCE begins, and perhaps even of some of the small emendations to the text of Ademar of Chabannes' chronicle incorporated in the HPCE to cover the period from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the early 11<sup>th</sup> century. Added to the narrative of Ademar of Chabannes are original accounts of bishops Hugh (973–990) and Grimoard (991–1018); both show interest in their tombs, the former at Saint-Cybard and the latter in the cathedral, so that we may not be wrong in seeing here the archaeological and historical interests of the 12<sup>th</sup>-century bishop Hugh. Until the account of bishop Ademar (1075–1101) and count William (1087–1120), a section of text is devoted either to a

4 The cartulary, G 330 in the Archives départementales de la Charente, was published by Jean NANGLARD (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'Église d'Angoulême*, Angoulême 1900 [henceforth *Cart.Égl. Ang.*], who gave it a late-12<sup>th</sup> century date. The dating of c. 1130–1140 for the first part of the cartulary, proposed by Michael François WEBB, *Interwoven Texts. The Cartularies of the Angoumois*, University of Toronto PhD 2018, is not convincing.

bishop or a count. The pattern changes thereafter, so that the deeds of Vulgrin, count in 1120–1140, are mixed in with texts devoted to bishops Gerard (after 1101–1136) and Lambert (1136–1149); the section on count William (1140–1179), *De Guillelmo Taillefer*, is confined to deeds of that count though with details of the death of bishop Lambert; the final section, *De Hugone episcopo*, includes material both on count William and bishop Hugh. This mixing of subject matter may not be a compelling argument to indicate a text made up of cumulative additions, but there are details that suggest that a basic text was being constantly expanded. The death of bishop Ademar in 1101 is mentioned on two separate occasions with two separate calculations of the length of his episcopate; the second account thus appears as an addition to an existing text. There are two complete accounts of the life of bishop Gerard, each complete in itself and listing his benefactions. The first gives his date of death as 1135 and celebrates his burial in the cathedral; the second, correctly dating his death to 1 March 1136<sup>5</sup>, ends with a reference to the removal of his grave from the cathedral – pope Innocent II at the second Lateral Council of 1139 ordered the removal of relics of the schismatic bishop, so that we are likely to be dealing with an added text. In the first life of bishop Gerard, an account of count Vulgrin’s wars was inserted between the description of bishop Gerard’s work as papal legate and the same Gerard’s building of the new cathedral; following a reference to the count’s building of a tower in the *castellum* of Montignac, the text continues that ›he‹ built the new cathedral (*Ecclesiam Engolismensem a primo lapide aedificavit*): grammatically the subject here is the count, though without doubt the ›he‹ intended was bishop Gerard. Perhaps the surest indication that we are dealing with an amalgam of separately composed texts comes from the discussion about a dispute regarding the *castrum* of Blaye. Vulgrin had recovered and refortified the castle of Blaye against duke William IX – that is to say before 1126 – and was able to hold it against ducal wishes *usque in hodiernum*. This *hodie* could not have been 1159 since Henry II was securely in control of the place in 1158 and very probably earlier – and, as discussed in part 2, it seems inconceivable that any duke, particularly a Plantagenet one, could afford not to control Blaye at any date since it guarded the major route between the ducal city of Saintes and Bordeaux, the latter central to ducal authority in Gascony. These details suggest that in the HPCE we are looking at a composite text, one that gives a collective view of Angoulême’s past that was rooted in the circle of the cathedral’s canons. The author who introduces himself at the beginning of the work is best seen as a final editor of texts that had been accumulated over a period. Given the archaeological interests of bishop Hugh, it may be that the impulse to compile or complete the work was nurtured when he was bishop, that is to say between 1149 and 1159.

### Angoulême within the 11<sup>th</sup>-century duchy of Aquitaine

Until the advent of the Plantagenet dukes in 1152, Angoulême was an impregnable city, where bishops and counts enjoyed protection from outside intervention. This physical independence was doubtless a factor in the choice of Gerard, bishop of

5 The second account runs from p. 36–38 of the HPCE (as in n. 1). For the date of Gerard’s death, see RICHARD, *Comtes de Poitou* (as in n. 3), vol. 2, p. 42 n. 2–43.

Angoulême, as papal legate after c. 1107. The city was safe from the kind of controls that the ruler of Poitiers, duke William IX, could inflict on his bishops – William had imprisoned Amatus, archbishop of Bordeaux and papal legate, in 1097 and was to do the same for the bishop of Poitiers in 1113 and 1115. Angoulême was chosen as the place where Geoffrey, archbishop of Bordeaux, could ordain in 1141 Grimoard as bishop of Poitiers against the wishes of Louis VII, then in control of Poitiers as duke of Aquitaine. It was just this independence which the HPCE wished to assert in its account of the deeds of Angoulême's bishops and counts, compiled as it was at a time when the new Plantagenet regime looked set to threaten it. In the early 11<sup>th</sup> century, the authority of count William of Angoulême († 1028) had relied in part on his close relationship with the more powerful duke William the Great († 1030); through this alliance, count William married the sister of count Fulk of Anjou, so that his son and grandson acquired Angevin names, Geoffrey and Fulk. An affirmation of independence of a totally secular nature can be seen when count William, shortly before 1090<sup>6</sup>, revived the name Vulgrin for his eldest son to signal a link with the Carolingian 9<sup>th</sup>-century founder of the dynasty; the 10<sup>th</sup>-century name William Taillefer was similarly resurrected for the elder sons of the count until the late 12<sup>th</sup> century<sup>7</sup>. These names, reminiscent of a period when independent counts battled heroically against the Vikings, replaced names associated with a foreign dynasty<sup>8</sup>. Troubadour writers of the years around 1100 certainly saw the inhabitants of the Angoumois as a distinct entity and not as subjects of any exterior potentate – the »Canso d'Antioca« refers to *le Enguometzi* and the lament for duke William X († 1137) by Cercamon talks of men *d'Engolmes*. In a similar vein, the HPCE celebrates the singularity of Angoulême as it systematically refers to the ethnicity of its bishops: William (1043–1075), Ademar (1075–1101), Lambert (1136–1149) and Hugh (1149–1159) were all *natione Engolismensis*<sup>9</sup>. This was a far cry from Anglo-Norman historians of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, for whom there were no divisions other than Poitevins, Aquitanians or Gascons<sup>10</sup>.

The HPCE gives a negative view of the relations of the 11<sup>th</sup>-century counts with the dukes of Aquitaine, referring to the success of count Fulk in 1047/1087 in driving Poitevins from his lands and liberating Mortagne from a siege by duke Guy-Geoffrey. What weight we should give to references to wars of this kind – *guerras* – will be discussed in part 2 of this study, but they were probably not characteristic of relations

6 The HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 42, refers to Vulgrin as being *quinquagesimum et ultra annum perficiens* when he died in 1140.

7 Pascal BOURGAIN Richard LANDES, Georges PON (eds.), *Ademari Cabanensis Chronicon*, Turnhout 1999 (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 129), p. 161, 148–149.

8 Count William (988–1028) was never given the name Taillefer in charters, whereas his great-grandson, count William (1087–1120) was frequently termed Taillefer, *Sector ferri* or *Incisor ferri* in such documents.

9 Carol SWEETENHAM, Linda M. PATERSON (eds.), *The Canso d'Antioca. An Occitan Epic Chronicle of the First Crusade*, Aldershot 2003, p. 193, listing lists parties from the Saintonge, Bordeaux, Gascony, the viscount of Thouars and Poitevins, and Angoulême; Valeria TORTORETO (ed.), *Il trovatore Cercamon*, Modena 1981, no. VII, p. 184; HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 27, 38, 44. For the HPCE, the »nations« surrounding Angoulême were those of Saintes, Poitiers and Périgueux.

10 John GILLINGHAM, *Events and Opinions. Norman and English Views of Aquitaine c. 1152–c. 1204*, in: Marcus BULL, Catherine LÉGLU (eds.), *The World of Eleanor of Aquitaine*, Woodbridge 2005, p. 57–81.

between count and duke. Charters show that count Fulk, like his father Geoffrey, was at the ducal court on several occasions between the 1050s and the 1070s<sup>11</sup>. From the time of duke William the Great († 1030), part of the resources of the Angoulême counts derived from lands held from the dukes. As part of his re-ordering of the feudal geography of Aquitaine, duke William the Great had bestowed honours on count William († 1028). The HPCE included passages from the chronicle of Ademar of Chabannes describing what had been given to count William *in beneficio*, a reward for the count's role as a ducal *consiliarius*<sup>12</sup>. Of the lands in question, the viscounties of Melle, Aulnay and Rochechouart were clearly not held on a hereditary basis, but other places were: these included the *castrum* of Blaye, as well as the honours of Chabannais and Confolens, which passed to the descendants of count William. Pons and a share of the island of Oléron were very probably among the benefices not identified by name. Both count and duke witnessed alienations from Pons and from Chabannais before c. 1100, making it likely that both had rights over these honours, while in 1131 we learn that Vulgrin was among the lords who held rights in Oléron of the duke<sup>13</sup>.

These tenurial links with the dukes doubtless explain why counts and dukes can be shown to be together shortly after the accession of a new duke or a new count: homage had to be performed, though we do not know what specific obligations this created. Count Fulk's attendance on duke Guy-Geoffrey in 1059, and indeed his accompanying the duke, along with his uncle, bishop William, to the coronation of Philip I at Reims in 1060, is best explained by the need to perform some kind of homage to the new duke for benefices held outside the county<sup>14</sup>. The same can be said for count William's sojourn at Maillezais with duke William IX in 1088, this being shortly after William acceded to the duchy in 1086 and after William Taillefer had become count in 1087<sup>15</sup>. A similar rationale can be seen in the presence at the ducal court of count

- 11 My PhD thesis, Rowan Charles WATSON, *The Counts of Angoulême from the 9<sup>th</sup> to the mid-13<sup>th</sup> Century*, with a Catalogue of Comital Documents from 882/883 to 1246, University of East Anglia 1979, contains a catalogue of documents that refer to the exercise of comital authority (nos. 1–208), texts given in full when not then published, and including only documents drawn up in the name of Isabel and Hugh of Lusignan after 1218 (nos. 209–272) – this catalogue is currently being expanded and includes nearly 300 documents. The thesis is available on the British Library EThOS website, ref: uk.bl.ethos.476652. Charters mentioning count Fulk (catalogue nos. 66–91) mostly concern minor affairs within the diocese and county of Angoulême; seven charters record the presence of the duke (nos. 66, 67, 69–71, 73, 78).
- 12 Ademari Cabanensis Chronicon (as in n. 7), p. 163 (III 41).
- 13 Paul MARCHEGAY (ed.), *Chartes saintongeaises de l'abbaye de Saint-Florent près Saumur*, Paris, Saintes 1877 (*Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis*, 4), no. V; Pierre DE MONSAMBERT (ed.), *Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'abbaye de Charroux*, Poitiers 1910 (*Archives historiques du Poitou*, 39), p. 117–118; Charles MÉTAIS, *Cartulaire Saintongeais de l'abbaye de La Trinité de Vendôme*, Paris, Saintes 1893 (*Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis*, 22), no. LV.
- 14 Alfred RICHARD (ed.), *Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'abbaye de Saint-Maixent*, vol. 1, Poitiers 1886 (*Archives historiques du Poitou*, 16), no. CXVI; *Coronatio Philippi I*, in: Martin BOUQUET, Léopold DELISLE (eds.), *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules [henceforth RHG]*, vol. 11, Paris 1876, p. 32–33.
- 15 L'abbé LACURIE, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Maillezais*, Fontenay-le-Comte, Saintes 1852, no. XXVII. RICHARD, *Comtes de Poitou* (as in n. 3), vol. 1, p. 391, suggested that count William was among

Vulgrin in 1126, as William X acceded to the duchy<sup>16</sup>. The performance of homage in no way compromised the independence of the Angoulême counts, and had no repercussions for the status of Angoulême itself. The HPCE assumed that the count of Angoulême was an equal of the dukes, an independent ruler and not a vassal, not beholden to them for their authority. Duke and count clearly shared a religious culture. Guy-Geoffrey, duke in 1058–1086, was a notable supporter of reforming clerics, discussed below. When count Fulk confirmed the gift by the lords of Jarnac, of whom he was the *senior*, of land near Jarnac to Hugh, abbot of Cluny, and the Cluniac priory of Marcigny-sur-Loire in 1073, and when he later, in c. 1077, entrusted the comital abbey of Saint-Cybard in Angoulême to the same abbot, he was following a pattern set out by duke Guy-Geoffrey. In 1097, count William was prepared to countenance subjecting Baigne to Hugh of Cluny<sup>17</sup>.

The HPCE's treatment of bishops of the late 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> century is extremely brief. For bishop Hugh (973–990), the chronicle avoided inclusion of Ademar of Chabannes' remarks about his career, perhaps since they described the appointment of a bishop of Limoges, consecrated in Angoulême, by the duke directly though acting with Hugh and other bishops. Instead, the HPCE composed an original text accusing Hugh of engaging in *maximas guerras* against count Arnald and his alienation of church lands: as discussed below, this represents a 12<sup>th</sup>-century concern. Roho, bishop from 1018 to 1032/1036 was described as a Poitevin, though the HPCE avoided the impropriety of concluding, as modern historians would, that he was appointed by count William or even the duke<sup>18</sup>. Nothing is known of the background of Roho's successor, Gerald, bishop from c. 1037 to 1043, but his successor, William, was the son of count Geoffrey (1031–1047). Sources other than the HPCE indicate that he was destined for an ecclesiastical career by his father Geoffrey, since he was brought up by his *consanguineus*, bishop Arnald of Périgueux, scion of family which ran the lordship of Villebois and was regularly in attendance on the count<sup>19</sup>. On William's death on 20 September 1075, his brother Ademar was promptly made bishop – *promotus est in episcopatum* – and ran the diocese until his death in 1101<sup>20</sup>.

those influencing the young duke, though the next recorded association of count and duke came in 1102 (Chartes et documents [as in n. 13], p. 117–118).

- 16 François VILLARD (ed.), Recueil des documents relatifs à l'abbaye de Montierneuf de Poitiers (1076–1319), Poitiers 1973 (Archives historiques du Poitou, 59), nos. 76, 76bis.
- 17 Jean RICHARD (ed.), Le cartulaire de Marcigny-sur-Loire (1045–1144), Dijon 1957, no. 65, p. 49–50; Count Fulk's gift is mentioned in a document of 1087/1091: Georges MUSSET (ed.), Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Jean d'Angély, 2 vols., Paris, Saintes 1901–1903 (Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis, 30, 33) [henceforth Cart.St.J.A.], vol. 1, no. CCCXXXIII; Alexandre BRUEL (ed.), Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny, vol. 5, Paris 1894, no. 3725.
- 18 For 11<sup>th</sup>- and 12<sup>th</sup>-century bishops of Angoulême, see Robert FAVREAU, *Évêques d'Angoulême et Saintes (avant 1200)*, in: *Revue historique du Centre-Ouest* 9/1 (2010), p. 7–142, 19–40; p. 40–78 provides a »Regeste des actes« of the bishops, some 133 documents. On Ademar of Chabannes's treatment of Hugh, see Ademari Cabanensis Chronicon (as in n. 7), p. 159.
- 19 André DEBORD, *La société laïque dans les pays de la Charente, x<sup>e</sup>–xii<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Paris 1984, p. 485–486; ID. (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Amant-de-Boixe*, Poitiers 1982 [henceforth Cart. St.A.B.], nos. 3, 5, 90, 257; Édith BRAYER, *Le cartulaire de l'abbaye de Cellefrouin*, in: *Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1610) 1940–1941/1 (1942)*; *Cart.Égl.Ang.* (as in n. 4), no. XXVIII, signed by count William in 1020, is taken to have concerned the Villebois family.
- 20 FAVREAU, *Évêques* (as in n. 18), p. 26, suggested that Ademar was ordained on 15 May 1075 be-

Given that the HPCE was put together after the experience of the Gregorian reform, we could hardly expect it to see the careers and government of count and bishop as anything but independent concerns. On the basis of charters, however, it is clear that the sons of count Geoffrey († 1047), that is to say bishops William and Ademar, participated with the count in running the resources, ecclesiastical and secular, of the county. Bishop Gerald was regularly found with count Geoffrey in charters regarding property and rights of Saint-Amant-de-Boixe, a 10<sup>th</sup>-century comital foundation, and the cathedral in Angoulême. From the time of bishop William, custody of comital lands and rights appears as a family matter, with alienations and grants often needing consent of family members. Thus, when the canons of Cellefrouin in 1043/1076 sought exemption from the tax known as *sinodum*, the request was granted jointly by the bishop and count; when William Fredelandus of Blaye, cousin of count William, made a grant to Charroux in 1100 of rights of taxation in the *curtis* of Vouhart, land owned by the comital family since at least the 10<sup>th</sup> century, he needed the consent of both count William and William's uncle, bishop Ademar<sup>21</sup>. Charters here provide a surer guide than the remarks of the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century HPCE, which talked dramatically of *maximas guerras* between count and bishop, discussed in part 2.

The 11<sup>th</sup>-century bishops of Angoulême were regularly at the ducal court. Bishop Gerald was with duke William le Gros in 1036 after a ransom had bought the duke's release from the prisons of Geoffrey Martel, the ambitious son of count Fulk of Anjou and husband since 1032 of Agnes, widow of duke William the Great († 1030)<sup>22</sup>. Gerald's presence at the dedication and endowment by count Geoffrey and Agnes of La Trinité in Vendôme in 1040 (which included land in the Saintonge) suggests service to the Angevin regime for matters beyond the area around Angoulême and the archdiocese in which he operated<sup>23</sup>.

Gerald's successor, bishop William, similarly frequented the ducal court<sup>24</sup>. He can be found with his cousin Geoffrey Martel, who perhaps even before becoming count of Anjou in 1040 was also the ruler of Saintes<sup>25</sup>. Bishop William was also a close associate of Agnes when she governed through her sons by duke William the Great, that is to say William Aigret, declared of age in 1044, and Guy-Geoffrey, duke from 1058

fore William's death in September 1075; three charters indicate that he was acting as bishop in 1075, which would allow a date up to Easter 1076 if the year changed at Easter (Gustave BABINET DE RENCOGNE, *Du commencement de l'année en Angoumois au Moyen Âge et dans les temps modernes*, in: *Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente*. Ser. 4, 5 [1867], p. 21–46).

21 *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Cellefrouin* (as in n. 19), no. 1; *Chartes et documents* (as in n. 13), no. XXII. For the 10<sup>th</sup> century, see *Ademari Cabanensis Chronicon* (as in n. 7), p. 142.

22 Louis HALPHEN, *Le comté d'Anjou au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris 1906, p. 56–57.

23 *Cart.St.J.A.* (as in n. 17), no. CCCXXXIX (1037); *Cart.St.A.B.* (as in n. 19), nos. 5 (1040), 90 and 257 (1041–1043); *Cart.Égl.Ang.* (as in n. 4), nos. VI (1031/1043), LXIX (1037/1043); Charles MÉTAIS (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye cardinale de la Trinité de Vendôme*, vol. 1, Paris 1893, no. 40.

24 See FAVREAU, *Évêques* (as in n. 18), p. 23–24.

25 See *Ademari Cabanensis Chronicon* (as in n. 7), p. 161, 292. The family of the counts of Angoulême was linked to that of the counts of Anjou when count William of Angoulême († 1028) married Girberge, sister of count Fulk – both families were vassals of the duke of Aquitaine who doubtless sanctioned the alliance.

to 1086. Until his death in 1075, bishop William operated closely with Guy-Geoffrey, joining him for business in areas beyond the duke's heartlands in the role of a councillor both before and after 1061 when Poitevin authority was re-established in the Saintonge as Geoffrey Martel was finally expelled from Saintes. The appointment of bishop William, probably in 1066/1072, to govern the diocese of Saintes during a vacancy can only reflect a ducal appointment<sup>26</sup>. The HPCE does not comment on this link other than remarking that bishop William was a *familiarissimus* of the duke, and indeed claiming that he was treasurer of the abbey of Saint-Hilaire in Poitiers, a house firmly under the control of the duke; the bishop held from the duke part of the proceeds of an altar in Saint-Jean d'Angély, remitted by the bishop as duke William visited him on his deathbed in Angoulême, an indication of the kind of material benefit to be had from links with the ruler of Aquitaine<sup>27</sup>.

William's brother Ademar, bishop from 1075 to 1101, was evidently born late in the life of his father count Geoffrey († 1047), since he does not appear in any of that count's charters. The HPCE, with its admiration for military prowess shown always where the counts were concerned, reported that Ademar had campaigned with duke Guy-Geoffrey against *Saracenos* in Spain, very possibly the campaign in which the duke famously took Barbastro in 1064. This military activity may have ante-dated Ademar's becoming a cleric; it does not suggest a clerical vocation, though war against the infidel was allowable despite the ruling at the Council of Poitiers in 1078 that clerics were not to bear arms<sup>28</sup>. It is from charters that we see Ademar as bishop frequenting the court of duke Guy-Geoffrey and his successor, duke William IX (1086–1126). Unfortunately there appears to be no corroborating evidence for the statement of the HPCE that he had been abbot of Lesterps, a house of canons in the Limousin: it may be that the story was devised to satisfy the requirement of the reform agenda, taken for granted by the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century but forcefully stated at the Council of Poitiers in 1078, that bishops and abbots had to proceed through ecclesiastical orders rather than be catapulted into high office from junior levels or from the secular world<sup>29</sup>. There are, however, indications that Ademar had some education

26 Mentioned in a charter of Saint-Jean d'Angély – see Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 17), no. CXLVII.

27 See FAVREAU, *Évêques* (as in n. 18), p. 25 and references. There is no sign in the charters of Saint-Hilaire that bishop William was its treasurer.

28 Édmond-René LABANDE, *Situation de l'Aquitaine en 1066*, in: *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest*. Ser. 4, 8 (1966), p. 356–359. Contemporary with the taking of Barbastro was the duke's attack on Toulouse, in which Ademar may conceivably have taken part: Gérard PRADALIÉ, *Les comtes de Toulouse et l'Aquitaine (IX<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, in: *Annales du Midi* 117 (2005), p. 10–11. On the Council of Poitiers, see Kriston R. RENNIE, *Law and Practice in the Age of Reform. The Legatine Work of Hugh of Die (1073–1106)*, Turnhout 2010 (*Medieval Church Studies*, 17), p. 118.

29 In 1078, the bishop of Rennes was judged for simony and for having become bishop without passing through the orders of the church hierarchy: Jean-Claude TILLIER, *Les conciles provinciaux de la province ecclésiastique de Bordeaux au temps de la grégorienne (1073–1100)*, in: *Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1610)* 1968/2 (1971), p. 561–581, 564–565; Odette PONTAL, *Les conciles de la France capétienne jusqu'en 1215*, Paris 1995, p. 181–182. The much-repeated statement that Ademar, as abbot of Lesterps, commissioned a life of his predecessor, Gualterius, from Marbod when archdeacon of Angers seems to stem from an unsubstantiated suggestion by Dom Jean BECQUET, *Les chanoines réguliers en Limousin aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, in: *Analecta Praemonstratensia* 36 (1960), p. 202. Surviving charters for Lesterps of this date do not mention

that would make him fit to be a bishop: a treatise by one Aimeric on Latin oratory was dedicated to him, while an interest in classical culture also reflected in Ademar's use of an antique gem as a seal<sup>30</sup>.

### The Advent of Reform in Angoulême

It was under bishop Ademar that severe tensions emerged about relations between bishop and canons. This was made clear by the HPCE, as will be seen, but the chronicle is less than explicit about the nature of their disagreements, which concerned reform and the independence of the body of canons from episcopal control. At the outset, it is worth asking what kind of exposure the 11<sup>th</sup>-century clergy of Angoulême, and indeed the counts, had to ideas of emancipation of the church from lay control, of the rejection of what was called simony, and of the imposition of new codes that made poverty and collective living the basis of clerical life. Given their association with duke Guy-Geoffrey, it is unlikely that the rulers of Angoulême were not familiar with reforming initiatives. Guy-Geoffrey was sufficiently trusted by Gregory VII to be entrusted with the exercise justice within the bishopric of Poitiers when Isembart was deposed in 1074<sup>31</sup>; this was a duke who allowed Cluniacs to become abbots of Maillezais and Saint-Jean d'Angély, and who brought Hugh, abbot of Cluny, to his lands; in 1076 Hugh took on direction of the duke's foundation of Montierneuf<sup>32</sup>. The passing of Saint-Eutrope near Saintes to Hugh of Cluny was the result of a ducal initiative, acting on the advice of the papal legates Amatus of Oloron and Hugh of Die<sup>33</sup>. Bishops William and Ademar were regularly present at the ecclesiastical councils

Ademar: see Gustave BABINET DE RENCOGNE, Notice et dissertation sur un fragment du cartulaire de L'Esterps, in: Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente. Ser. 3, 4 (1862), p. 47–63; no reference to an abbot Ademar appears in the historical account of the foundation and reform of Lesterps by Jordan of Chabannais in the charter of 1093 witnessed by count William: Gallia Christiana, vol. 2, Paris 1873, Instr., cols. 196–198 – the document refers to Augustinian canons as ›newly installed‹.

- 30 See FAVREAU, *Évêques* (as in n. 18), p. 27 and references. For Aimeric, see Max MANITIUS, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. 3, Munich 1933, p. 180–182; David THOMAS, Alex MALLETT (eds.), *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History*, vol. 3 (1050–1200), Leiden 2011, p. 204. I saw in the Archives départementales de la Charente, in 1973–1974, a cast of the gem seal, part of a collection of seal casts made by the artist Eugène Sadoux (1841–1906), acquired by the Archives in 1906; the collection is currently being catalogued and in 2019 the gem seal could not be found – see Rowan WATSON, *Scribes and Writing Offices: the Charters of the Counts of Angoulême before the Late 13<sup>th</sup> Century*, in: Gabriel SILAGI (ed.), *Landesherrliche Kanzleien im Spätmittelalter*, vol. 2, Munich 1984 (*Münchener Beiträge zur Mediävistik und Renaissance-Forschung*, 35), p. 664.
- 31 See Erich CASPAR (ed.), *Das Register Gregors VII.*, vol. 1, Berlin 1920, reprint 1955 (MGH Epp. sel. 2,1), no. II, 24, p. 155–156.
- 32 *Recueil des documents relatifs à l'abbaye de Montierneuf* (as in n. 16), p. 428, *De constructione monasterii novi Pictavis (a Martino monacho)*; RICHARD, *Comtes de Poitou* (as in n. 3), vol. 1, p. 281–282; Herbert E. J. COWDREY, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*, Oxford 1970, p. 103–104.
- 33 BRUEL (ed.), *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny* (as in n. 17), vol. 4, no. 3580. Further documentation on this affair is published in John McNEILL, *Extra-Mural Developments: the Eleventh-Century Reconstruction of St-Eutrope at Saintes*, in: ID., Richard PLANT (eds.), *Romanesque Saints*,

held in the province of Bordeaux at this time<sup>34</sup>. Bishop William was at the Council of Bordeaux in 1068 held by the Cardinal-Legate Steven, with archbishop Joscelin (a creature of duke Guy-Geoffrey and a systematic supporter of reform), where it is unlikely that the reforming agenda presented at Tours in 1060 was not repeated, with its attack on simony and insistence on due process in the election and installation of bishops<sup>35</sup>. It is not known who precisely attended the councils in the province of Bordeaux of Gregory VII's legate, Hugh of Die; whether bishop Ademar was present or not at the Council of Poitiers in 1078, he could not have been unaware of the strict application of the Gregorian programme that was being implemented, with the support of the duke<sup>36</sup>. Ademar's presence with Hugh of Cluny at duke Guy-Geoffrey's establishment of Montierneuf in 1076 must have involved personal contact; Ademar was as well among bishops who followed the duke in 1080 in agreeing that La Sauve-Majeure near Bordeaux should be subject directly to the pope<sup>37</sup>. And yet Ademar's support of reform in Angoulême itself was minimal, and it was count Fulk rather than bishop Ademar who first established contact with Hugh abbot of Cluny.

The HPCE reported a very telling anecdote which illustrates disagreement between canons and bishop regarding reform. The cathedral sacristan, Hubert, accused Ademar of undermining the authority of the canons by passing to monks duties which rightly belonged to the cathedral staff. Ademar, it was claimed, sought to make every church in the bishopric a *prioratum monachorum* – monastic status would allow the bishop to run the diocese without recourse to his canons. This went against the tenor of the reformers' agenda, whereby monastic communities were discouraged from engaging in pastoral matters, as was made clear at the Council of Poitiers in 1100 and stressed at the Lateran Council of 1123; indeed, it was at this council that we have the clearest formulation of the Gregorian idea that bishops could act legally only in conjunction with their canons. The canons had begun to operate as a collective body independent of the bishop at an earlier date. In 1063, bishop William was obliged to return to the canons a benefice intended to feed the poor. Significant is the vocabulary used in the charter that recorded the matter, typical of that used by Gregorian reformers: present corruption had destroyed the purity of the primitive church; the bishop declared – or more probably was made to declare – that he himself had seized the benefice (*eripui*) against the constitution set up by the church fathers (*a patribus primis institutum*) before returning it *iusto ordine canonicis*. Bishop William can hardly have rejoiced that this renunciation, with its

Shrines, and Pilgrimage, London, New York 2020 (British Archaeological Association), p. 137–156.

- 34 The D.Phil thesis of Jane MARTINDALE, *The Origins of the Duchy of Aquitaine and the Government of the Counts of Poitou*, Oxford 1965 (available from Oxford University via the British Library EThOS website, ref: uk.bl.ethos.671286), p. 166–188 gives an useful review of Guy-Geoffrey's engagement with reform, including evidence for a direct link with Peter Damian.
- 35 Gian Domenico MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 19, Venice 1774, 1961 reprint, col. 1067; PONTAL, *Conciles* (as in n. 29), p. 172.
- 36 See RENNIE, Hugh of Die (as in n. 28), p. 111–120 for ducal promotion of reform and support of legate Hugh's reform agenda.
- 37 Charles HIGOUNET, Arlette HIGOUNET-NADAL (eds.), *Grand cartulaire de La Sauve Majeure*, 2 vols., Bordeaux 1996 (*Études et Documents d'Aquitaine*, 8), vol. 1, p. 34–35, no. 2, 43–44, no. 13.

admission that he had siphoned off cathedral resources for his own purposes or those of the comital family, was made at an ecclesiastical gathering of some importance: present were the archbishop Joscelin of Bordeaux with the bishops of Agen, Saintes, Limoges and Périgueux, a forum doubtless chosen by the canons so that a principle valid for the province of Bordeaux as a whole could be established<sup>38</sup>. The character of the gathering suggests strongly that the canons were fully engaged with the ideas brought up at the councils in the province.

The Angoulême canons became yet more assertive under bishop Ademar. In 1089 they recorded in very forthright language their right to control the appointment of the cathedral's sacristan, a right they argued they had obtained since the time of bishop Grimoard (991–1018). Ademar had usurped the canons' right in defiance of the constitution of the church (*temptavit sibi usurpare sacrorum custodis constitutionem*). In imposing their view, the canons appealed to the canons of the cathedrals in Périgueux and Saintes to support their case, a sign of the seriousness of their intent and of an intellectual solidarity among canons of the province of Bordeaux doubtless reinforced by the deliberations at the many reforming councils held there. The canons' rights were recorded before an assembly led by the abbot of Saint-Amant-de-Boixe and other senior clerics of the diocese, along with two canons from Saintes; these manoeuvres suggest the cathedral clergy were perfectly aware of papal ambitions to promote the status of canons in church government<sup>39</sup>.

### The dispute of 1095 and the language of reform

A dispute of 1095 between bishop and canons was of sufficient importance to be given some prominence two generations later in the HPCE. In a list of gifts made by bishop Ademar to the cathedral, the HPCE recorded that he had left to the cathedral a *prepositura*, and commented that he had previously usurped almost all the dividends for his own purposes. A charter of 1095 from the canons' cartulary described the case more fully and gave it a very different gloss<sup>40</sup>. The bone of contention was control of rights at Juillac-le-Coq known as *prepositura*. The rights were said to be abusively held as hereditary property by lay *prévôts*, who were driven by the desire for financial gain (*ambitione hereditativa successione pecunia promovebatur*). This was contrary to divine law (*divinis institutionibus adversum*). The *communes canonicorum possessiones* were being appropriated and dispersed, many granted to lay people as fiefs (*multi fevi de rebus sanctuarii laicis dati erant*). This *simoniaca heresis* had to be extirpated. The property was said to be *iuris pontificalis*, but managed by the canons, whose view was that bishop Ademar was allowing alienation of the cathedral's resources. Ademar ceded to the demand of the canons that it be transferred to their *communitas* – as in 1063, the implication is that the bishop was not managing church property in a correct manner and that the canons had to step in to correct matters.

38 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. XIV. Such a meeting should surely be called a council, but it does not appear in the list of events in PONTAL, Conciles (as in n. 29).

39 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. CLXXXIX; Charles DEREINE, L'élaboration du statut canonique des chanoines réguliers, spécialement sous Urbain II, in: Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique 46 (1951), p. 534–564.

40 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. XVII; HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 28.

Quite exceptionally, Urban II himself was asked to sanction the agreement, thus being called to intervene in a dispute between canons and bishop about property. Count William and his nephew, William Fredelandus of Blaye, were called in to witness and thus confirm the transaction, together with another of the count's nephews, Jordan of Chabannais, the latter a figure who had instituted a reformed regime at Lesterps<sup>41</sup>. Most significant however was the appearance in Angoulême as witnesses of two notable reforming personalities, Marbod, archdeacon of Angers (and about to become bishop of Rennes)<sup>42</sup>, and Baudry, abbot of Bourgueil. The latter, famous as both a poet, biographer and reformer, had known bishop William sufficiently well to compose an elegant obituary on his death in 1075<sup>43</sup>. It is difficult not to think that this aggressive Gregorian phraseology, and the provision, totally new in Angoulême, that the pope, Urban II, should sanction punitive action against those breaking the agreement, did not come from these seasoned reformers from the Loire valley, brought in by the canons, distrustful of their bishop, for support. That the 1095 charter was drawn up under the guidance of Baudry and Marbod is also indicated by the fact that bishop Ademar in the suscription describes himself as *pontifex humillimus*, something quite new in Angoulême and very much a sign of the spirit of Gregorian reform – an echo of the papal suscription *servus servorum Dei*. Baudry of Bourgueil was in Clermont on 21 November 1095, when Urban II instructed bishop Ademar to respect the provisions of the arrangement, and he may even have pressed the canons' case<sup>44</sup>.

The emotive language of Gregorian reform, with its appeals to a history whereby a corrupt laity had stolen church property, crops up elsewhere in charters of around 1100 drawn up by the Angoulême canons and recorded in their cartulary. This language appears more as a rhetorical devise, though one which had legal implications, than as evidence of an ideologically inspired programme. Itier of Cognac was accused in 1075/1101 of owning land and tithes which were by ancient right (*antiquitus iuris*) part of the cathedral's domain but which was said to have been alienated *quorumdam pravorum subtractione*; in fact, his rights, and those of people to whom he had sub-infeodated the property were recognised, and some 30 *solidi* of compensation was paid to them as they made a gift of it to the cathedral<sup>45</sup>. The same phrase was used to justify the canons' claim to tithes at Lavallade (com. Saint-Fort-sur-le-Né) in 1119, and to a church at Ladiville in the Saintonge in 1122<sup>46</sup>. In a charter of 1111 witnessed by archdeacon Achard and the cantor Mainard, it was stressed that the church of Haimps had been an allod of the cathedral *ex antiquo tempore*, the lay owners

41 Gallia Christiana (as in n. 29), vol. 2, Instr., cols. 196–198.

42 See the Lexikon des Mittelalters, vol. 6, Munich 1993, cols. 217–218.

43 For a full account of Baudry's life, see Steven BIDDLECOMBE (ed.), *The Historia Ierosolimitana* of Baldric of Bourgueil, Woodbridge 2014, p. xi–xxiv.

44 Philipp JAFFÉ et al. (eds.), *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII*, vol. 1, Leipzig 1885, no. 5589; *Cart.Égl.Ang.* (as in n. 4), no. XIX; Jean-Hervé FOULON, *Les relations entre la papauté réformatrice et les pays de la Loire jusqu'à la fondation de Fontevraud*, in: Jacques DALARUN (ed.), *Robert d'Arbrissel et la vie religieuse dans l'Ouest de la France*, Turnhout 2004, p. 25–56; Robert SOMERVILLE, *The Council of Clermont (1095)*, and *Latin Christian Society*, in: *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 12, Rome 1974, p. 55–90, 75.

45 *Cart.Égl.Ang.* (as in n. 4), no. XXXVIII.

46 *Ibid.*, nos. CXXVI, CLIII.

ceding their rights admitting that their ownership had been a sacrilege; in 1113 again, the cathedral's claim to Haimps against Boso, brother of the viscount of Châtellerault, was based on the argument that it had always been *antiquitus iuris Engolismorum episcoporum* – in return for the lifting of excommunication and receipt of 300 *solidi*, Boso renounced his claim<sup>47</sup>. The canons who compiled these documents were well versed in the arguments of Gregorian reform: the notion of cynical confiscation by lay parties of property that historically belonged to the church was a rhetorical device applied to situations where there was ambiguity about the status of property rather than illegitimate seizure. The task of the canons was to resolve this ambiguity by a process of negotiation and force, and to record settlements reached in written instruments. It is with this in mind that we should consider the passage in the HPCE that accused the 10<sup>th</sup>-century bishop Hugh of alienating church land to barons (not a 10<sup>th</sup>-century word) as part of a plot to seize control of the county itself: this was very likely part of a 12<sup>th</sup>-century argument to support claims to rights and land where these were not precisely defined<sup>48</sup>. This Gregorian phraseology disappears by the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century when the clerical position was secure. The clear separation of church property from that of secular society, and the precise formulation of the terms by which land was held from the church, was an integral part of the Gregorian aim to emancipate the church from lay control: in the elegant formulation of Pierre Chastang, the need to record title to property in written documents turned reforming clerics into lawyers and historians<sup>49</sup>.

The links of the Angoulême cathedral with the reformers from the Loire valley, Baudry and Marbod, ante-dated the dispute of 1095. Baudry's links with Gregory VII and Urban II dated from at least 1073 and 1093 when Bourgueil received papal privileges<sup>50</sup>. Count Fulk and duke Guy-Geoffrey had agreed to Jordan of Chabannais's gift to Baudry's abbey of Bourgueil of the church of Pérouse in 1058/1073, and bishop Ademar witnessed, with Baudry, Jordan's subsequent confirmation of the gift in 1079<sup>51</sup>. A further case of links with the reforming milieu of the Loire valley

47 Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 17), vol. 2, pièces annexes nos. X, XII.

48 HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 14. Richard LANDES, *Relics, Apocalypse, and the Deceits of History*. Ademar of Chabannes, 989–1034, Cambridge Mass., London 1995 (Harvard Historical Studies, 117), p. 31, 81, is among historians who accept the veracity of the HPCE's statement, though it was unknown to Ademar of Chabannes.

49 Pierre CHASTANG, *Lire, écrire, transcrire. Le travail des rédacteurs de cartulaires en Bas Languedoc (XI<sup>e</sup>–XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles)*, Paris 2001, p. 22: «c'est la Réforme grégorienne qui, contraignant les moines à lire, trier, voire à réécrire partiellement leurs chartes pour justifier de la reconstruction de leur temporel, les transforme en historiens». The theme is developed in ID., *Réforme grégorienne et administration par l'écrit des patrimoines ecclésiastiques dans le Midi de la France (X<sup>e</sup>–XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, in: Michelle FOURNIÉ et al. (eds.), *La réforme grégorienne dans le Midi (milieu XI<sup>e</sup>–début XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, Toulouse 2013 (Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 48). See also Florian MAZEL, *Monachisme et aristocratie aux X<sup>e</sup>–XI<sup>e</sup> siècles. Un regard sur l'historiographie récente*, in: Steven VANDERPUTTEN, Brigitte MEIJNS (eds.), *Ecclesia in medio nationis*. Reflections on the Study of Monasticism in the Central Middle Ages, Leuven 2011, p. 68–69.

50 Jean-Hervé FOULON, *Église et réforme au Moyen Âge. Papauté, milieux réformateurs et ecclésiologie dans les Pays de la Loire au tournant des XI<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Brussels 2008, p. 153, 175.

51 The best texts are Tours, Archives départementales d'Indre-et-Loire, H 990, p. 97–98 and 98–100, a copy of c. 1719 of the 1481 transcript of the 12<sup>th</sup>-century cartulary of Bourgueil. The edition of Jean BESLY, *Histoire des comtes de Poitou et ducs de Guyenne*, Paris 1647, p. 407–408,

was the gift of a church near Chateaufort-sur-Charente to Saint-Florent de Saumur in 1090, the charters in which it was recorded having as first witnesses the archdeacon of the Angoulême cathedral, Achard, and other canons<sup>52</sup>. Two charters in the name of bishop Ademar, dated 1097 and all subscribed by a large body of canons headed by archdeacon Achard and the cantor Mainard Cramal, record the gift to Bourgueil and abbot Baudry of churches in and near Angoulême. That transferring Saint-Martial by the city gates outside the walls of Angoulême, the church of Beaulieu within its walls, with the churches of Saint-Cybard *de Souett* and Raix was drawn up with fiery reformist rhetoric<sup>53</sup>. In the suscription, Ademar was termed *episcopus licet indignus* (a sure sign of fundamentalist sympathies and a further indication that the document was drawn up by reformers and not Ademar), and the Angoulême canons were to be *testes* and *tutores* of the agreement and to receive an annual payment of ten *solidi*. The church of Saint-Martial was *ab antiquis temporibus ab ecclesia nostra alienata et a laicalibus personis diutius possessa et iam quasi in proprium redacta* – the tyrannical hands were those of Peter Baudraud who handed over his rights apparently without objection – this was stereotypical characterisation of a landowner who was reported elsewhere as supporting the development of the estates of both Saint-Amant-de-Boixe and the cathedral, in 1112 giving up his rights in the church of Haimps to bishop Gerard, promising the bishop *auxilium et defensionem*, known in the vernacular as *chaptenz*, against any of his feudatories (*de conductu meo*) who should contest the transfer<sup>54</sup>. In an associated document of the same date, 1097, where Ademar was simply *gratia Dei Engolisme sedis episcopus*, the churches of Sainte-Marie de Beaulieu and Grassac were transferred to Bourgueil, which was licensed to make further acquisitions in their parishes; the Angoulême canons were to receive an annual payment of five *solidi*<sup>55</sup>. Among the subscribers was a canon who had recently been moved from Angers to the cathedral in Angoulême (*Signum Guerrici Andegavensis canonici noviter facti Engolisme*), doubtless to develop ideas of reform among the canons. The way that the list of subscribers ends – *Et alii canonici simul omnes una voce collaudaverunt et confirmaverunt* – appears like a declaration of solidarity among the canons in face of a reluctant bishop. This activity in the last years of Ademar's time as bishop shows the Angoulême canons seeking allies from outside their diocese as they sought to consolidate control of the process of reform in the diocese.

The charter of 1095 gave a triumphalist account of the application of the principles of Gregorian reform and its historical justification, but use of Gregorian terminology overlay ambitions that were more material than theological or spiritual in nature,

was taken *Ex Tabulario S. Petri Burguliens.*, mistakenly calling Fulk bishop rather than count, accepting the date of 1089 which evidently was a mis-reading for 1079. The documents are mentioned in Pierre LEVEEL, *Chartes de Bourgueil concernant la Charente*, in: *Mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente* (1961–1962), p. 219–220.

52 Paul MARCHEGAY, *Chartes de Saint-Florent près Saumur concernant l'Angoumois*, in: *Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente*. Ser. 5, 1 (1877), nos. IV, V.

53 *Gallia Christiana* (as in n. 29), vol. 14, Instr., cols. 151–152; FAVREAU, *Évêques* (as in n. 18), p. 48, no. 25.

54 *Cart.St.A.B.* (as in n. 19), nos. 57, 59, 70; *Cart.St.J.A.* (as in n. 17), vol. 2, pièces annexes no. XI; Paul LEFRANÇOIS, (ed.), *Le cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Cybard* [henceforth *Cart.St.Cybard*], Angoulême 1930, nos. 65a, 151.

55 Paris, BnF, lat. 17127, fol. 369r; FAVREAU, *Évêques* (as in n. 18), p. 49, no. 26.

control of church resources being the priority. The HPCE explained the dispute regarding the *prepositura* in very different terms. For those compiling the chronicle, the dispute was not one of ideology or even of corruption, as suggested by the charter, but of one of practical estate management. The dispute had nothing to do with simony, but concerned only the amount of the *acaptamentum* demanded by the bishop. The lay feoffees of Juillac-le-Coq had rejected the demand for 1000 *solidi*; the canon Itier Archambaud, famously rich, stepped in to negotiate, and both paid the relief and gave the feoffees the same sum to buy out their rights; the property could thus be handed from the bishop to the canons by this account, the claim of the lay *prévôts* was accepted as valid. In at least one other case, Itier Archambaud stepped in to buy rights of lay parties who were presented as owning them illegally<sup>56</sup>. Other instances where emotive Gregorian vocabulary was used for what was an argument about the status of property were mentioned above.

We can read the comment of the HPCE that Ademar was a man of great simplicity (*homo mirae simplicitatis*) as a recognition that he was not fit for office. This ›simplicity‹ was not a compliment and might best be translated as naivety: a contemporary writer such as Suger, abbot of Saint-Denis, certainly used the word in a derogatory sense<sup>57</sup>. Bishop Ademar's lack of energy in supporting reform is clearly demonstrated by his inaction as regarded the abbey of Saint-Cybard. In 1087/1091, count William had confirmed his father's gift of the comital abbey of Saint-Cybard to Odo, the Cluniac abbot of Saint-Jean d'Angély<sup>58</sup>. Subjection to Cluniac rules provoked long resistance by the monks of Saint-Cybard, as they had for monks in Baigne in the diocese of Saintes and in Saint-Martial in Limoges<sup>59</sup>. In Angoulême, bishop Ademar failed to use his authority as bishop to enforce compliance. The disobedience of Saint-Cybard after 1087/1091 had been considered at a number of councils held by Amatus, archbishop of Bordeaux and legate of Urban II, at which the monks of Saint-Cybard had been excommunicated – this was undoubtedly a *cause célèbre*, bringing dishonour upon the Angoulême church. An effort to avoid the case was very likely why Ademar, in the autumn of 1095, wrote to Urban II, then assembling prelates for a council at Clermont, to apologise for his inability to attend on account of infirmity of body and unsettled conditions in his diocese – *circa nos sunt quotidiana bellorum incommoda*<sup>60</sup>. The excuse appears rather lame. Urban himself had just undertaken a prolonged journey in the east of what is now France. After his stay at Clermont, which lasted from 18 November to 1 December 1095, he travelled very close to Angoulême itself<sup>61</sup>. Ademar's neighbours, the bishop of Périgueux and the

56 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. XXXVIII (a tithe said to be held of Itier was gifted to the cathedral in return for 10 *solidi* paid by Itier himself).

57 HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 27–28; Henri WAQUET (ed.), Suger. Vie de Louis le Gros, Paris 1929, e. g. p. 88. Negative connotations of ›simplicity‹ are discussed in Michel ZINK, Parler aux »simples gens«. Un art médiéval, Paris 2023. e. g. p. 40–43.

58 Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 17), vol. 1, no. CCCXXXIII.

59 COWDREY, Cluniacs (as in n. 32); L'abbé Hubert CLAUDE, Le légat Gérard d'Angoulême et la résistance de l'abbaye de Baigne à la centralisation clunisienne, in: Pierre GALLAIS, Yves-Jean RIOU (eds.), Mélanges offerts à René Crozet, 2 vols., Poitiers 1966, vol. 1, p. 515–521.

60 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. XVIII.

61 FOULON, Église et réforme (as in n. 50), p. 5–6, and references given. On the Council of Clermont, see the references in PONTAL, Conciles (as in n. 29), p. 224–233.

abbot of Saint-Jean d'Angély, as well as the abbess of Notre-Dame de Saintes or her representatives, had all seen no problem in getting to the Clermont council or meeting Urban II in Limoges immediately after<sup>62</sup>. In a letter of 29 December 1095 dispatched from Limoges, Urban II had to warn bishop Ademar that the monks of Saint-Cybard should not be released from excommunication until they recognised the authority of Saint-Jean d'Angély<sup>63</sup>. Bishop Ademar finally agreed to the nomination by Ansculph, abbot of Saint-Jean d'Angély, of one of his monks, Hugh, as abbot of Saint-Cybard at a ceremony at which the whole body of canons was present<sup>64</sup>.

### Reformers as landowners

The canons faced a situation where there was ambiguity about the nature of their rights over lands they claimed to own. This was a position faced by other ecclesiastical institutions. The abbey of Fleury on the Loire, for instance, undertook in the first part of the 11<sup>th</sup> century a systematic campaign to bring under their direct control lands (termed *beneficia* or *praecaria*) and churches granted to laymen in the distant past where there was ambiguity about what rights the abbey retained<sup>65</sup>. Looking in detail at the sorts of problem the Angoulême canons faced as landowners makes the dispute of 1095 seem almost routine. Disputes about the bundle of rights known as *prepositura* – involving taxation of agricultural produce, liability to services and sometimes judicial rights<sup>66</sup> – and the entry fine or relief known as *achaptamentum* were common among landowners. Many charters show them being resolved by *ad hoc* solutions – as, according to the HPCE, the dispute of 1095 had been. The clergy might argue that lay people were abusively commandeering ecclesiastical property, but ambiguity, not uncommon in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, about the nature of charges upon land and rights associated with it were at the root of the problem. Other examples of disputes about *achaptamentum* and *prepositura* on land in which the church had an interest made no reference to simony or corruption. For example, when one Aimery Bernard of Saint-Front finally recognised that he, his sons, uncle and wife held property near Mansle as a fief from the canons, for whom it was allodial property, it was established that his exercise of rights as *prévôt* over the land should be free of *achaptamentum* during his life-time, owing the canons only homage, but that after his (Aimery's) death, *prepositura* and *achaptamentum* should be paid direct to the canons. The matter was solved by negotiation. It was common for the charges to be owned

62 SOMERVILLE, The Council of Clermont (as in n. 44), p. 74–75, brings together evidence of who attended.

63 Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 17), vol. 1, no. CCCXXXV; JAFFÉ (as in n. 44), no. 5605.

64 Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 17), vol. 1, no. CCCXXXVI. Seguinus was last recorded as abbot of Saint-Cybard in a document that can only be dated to after 1087 (Cart.St.Cybard [as in n. 54], no. 102 – Estiennot knew this document from an original which included reference to count William in the dating clause, allowing the date to be put after 1087: Paris, BnF, lat. 12753, p. 213–214). The first documents of Hugh as abbot are dated only by reference to William, count from 1087, and king Philip († 1108).

65 The biography of Gauzlin, abbot of Fleury, by the monk Andreas, written before 1056, gives details of how lands were recovered; see Robert-Henri BAUTIER (ed.), André de Fleury. Vie de Gauzlin, abbé de Fleury, Paris 1969 (Sources d'histoire médiévale, 2), p. 38–48.

66 See, for instance, Cart.Egl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. CXLVIII, dated 1120/1160.

by several people, as if an initial gift had been dispersed by succession through the generations, creating ambiguity about where responsibility lay – fear of dispersion led landowners to demand that land held of them should be inherited by just one member of any family. As late as 1144/1149, by which time bishop and canons had worked to regularise taxes of this kind and bring them under the immediate control of the cathedral, disagreements could arise, as when the heirs of one Marron, who through his wife held half of the tithe at Mansle, protested at the amount the canons demanded, and arrived at a complicated concord where a procedure was agreed to resolve disagreements about what was owed by way of *achaptamentum*<sup>67</sup>. In 1151, the abbot of Saint-Cybard used emotive language to complain *de iniuriis et exactionibus et rapinis* imposed on the abbey's land at Chavanac by Itier de Chavanac *occasione prepositura et feodii*, but after negotiation, an agreement was arrived at by which Itier received a third of the land *feodaliter*, paying homage (*litgium hominum*), an entry fine of 100 *solidi Engolismensis monete* and agreeing that all of the property should be inherited only by his eldest son – tenants in the parts belonging to Saint-Cybard who claimed that they held their land from Itier were to regularise their position before the abbot<sup>68</sup>.

The way the HPCE noted meticulously the properties and buildings added by each bishop to the cathedral's resources testifies to the canons' interest in estate management. Bishop Ademar, it was noted, gave the *manse* of Le Gond; the gift of the *prepositura* in 1095 was mentioned, with the comment, that he had usurped its rights for himself. The bishop appears absent from the process whereby the canons sought to impose proper management of the cathedral's resources, ensuring that their rights were recognised and, if operated by secular parties, held from them on clear terms. In the business-like notices that replaced lengthy charters, the bishop played little part, so that he does not appear in the multiple documents which sought to see that all possible people who could claim rights or ownership of any piece of property resigned their interest to the cathedral. At Saint-Cybard, concern for effective estate management paralleled that of the cathedral canons. The arrival of Hugh as the reforming abbot sent from Saint-Jean d'Angély after 1095 was marked by torrent of charters drawn up with a new standardised phraseology and with, for instance, standardised rituals where documents were placed on the abbey's altar in front of witnesses. The transactions were almost always couched in terms of gifts, though there are sufficient cases where the gift was rewarded with a sum of money or some ecclesiastical benefit (burial, remembrance at mass) to allow us to think recognition of title rather than outright acquisition of new property often lay behind them. An unusually explicit transaction of 1106 from Saint-Cybard suggests what might lie behind a ›gift<sup>69</sup>. Lambert and his family had given the manse of *Bota* (near Montignac-Charente) to the abbey, his sister later transferring her share for burial in the abbey; but Lambert had retained the *prepositura* over the property supposedly without the abbey's consent (*sine ullo consilio capituli [sancti Eparchii]*). The solution was for Lambert to be given the *prepositura* as a fief (*factus est homo abbatis Hugonis et dedit*

67 Ibid., no. CLXXII.

68 Cart.St.Cybard (as in n. 54), no. 245.

69 Ibid., no. 146.

*ei Hugo abbas ipsam preposituram feodaliter*), with a detailed list of what taxes Lambert could enjoy, that is to say a third part of the judicial rights, including *destrictius*, extracted in agreement with the abbey's *obedienciarius*. Lambert could only leave this property to one of his sons – evidently to prevent fragmentation – who would be liable to an *achaptamentum* of five *solidi*. What appears initially as a gift turns out to be a definition of the legal categories by which Lambert held the property: his right to it was not questioned, only the terms by which it was held. It should be said finally that disputes of this kind were not confined to ecclesiastical landholders; they were common to landowning classes at all levels. The matter of the entry fine (*achaptamentum*) provoked regular disputes. In 1157, count William's demand for 200 *solidi* as the *achaptamentum* for a fief held of him led to a compromise, as did another case of the same count in 1178 when 1000 *solidi* were demanded<sup>70</sup>. In the rather less ambiguous conditions about tenure in the Plantagenet lands, disagreements about entry fines were an abiding source of conflict between the king and the baronial classes from even before 1100<sup>71</sup>. The emergence of a recognised and binding custom came only in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, in the wake of powerful secular government associated with Plantagenet rule and then that of Isabel and Hugh of Lusignan, where conditions of tenure and associated tariffs could be imposed to form a *consuetudo Engolismensis*, with payments for entry fines and other matters made *ad usus et consuetudines comitatus*; from even before 1200, managers of the episcopal estates specified the amount of the *achaptamentum* wherever fiefs were involved<sup>72</sup>.

The essence of reform in Angoulême, that is to say the clarification of the property rights of the church, shows the canons as a practical and even conservative body. Even as late as c. 1140, they were prepared to accept traditional arrangements. When one Odelinus, parish priest at Charmant had given the tithe of his church to his son, Aimery Picher, an alienation which the canons called illegal, an arrangement was agreed whereby Aimery with his son Helie returned the tithe to the canons, who then returned half of the tithe to Helie *hereditarie*, such that Helie and his heirs would do homage to the canons and pay six *denarii* as a relief *in mutacione heredum*; the interest of the secular party was thus respected and regularised<sup>73</sup>. There is evidence elsewhere of this kind of conservatism. There is no sign in Angoulême that the bishop or canons encouraged the transfer of ownership and rights over churches from lay to clerical hands, a phenomenon driven by the theology of Gregorian reform that has been noticed in the dioceses of Angers and Tours in the last quarter of

70 Paris, Archives nationales, K 1144, no. 17; for the text, see WATSON, *The Counts of Angoulême* (as in n. 11), cat. no. 161, p. 345; Georges THOMAS (ed.), *Cartulaire des comtes de La Marche et d'Angoulême*, Angoulême 1934, no. 35.

71 Austin Lane POOLE, *The Obligations of Society in the XII and XIII Centuries*, Oxford 1960, p. 94–96.

72 On the government of Isabel, see Robert FAVREAU, *Le comté d'Angoulême au début du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: Isabelle d'Angoulême, comtesse-reine et son temps (1186–1246), Poitiers 1999 (*Civilisation Médiévale*, 5), p. 9–16. The discussion in WATSON, *The Counts of Angoulême* (as in n. 11), p. 147–148, used a wider range of primary sources for this theme. For episcopal lands, see Jean NANGLARD (ed.), *Livre des fiefs de Guillaume de Blaye, évêque d'Angoulême*, in: *Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente*. Ser. 7, 5 (1904–1905) [Angoulême 1906].

73 *Cart.Égl.Ang.* (as in n. 4), no. CXCIV (datable by the reference to the canon, Arnaldus Ponchat).

the 11<sup>th</sup> century<sup>74</sup>. The climate in the diocese of Saintes, for instance, was very different, perhaps on account of the attitude of the dukes: the cartulary of the abbey of Baigne shows that between 1075 and 1109 some 36 churches or parts of churches were made over to the abbey, almost all under the auspices of the bishops in conjunction with his archdeacon and canons and many (some 17) apparently initiated or authorised by secular landowners<sup>75</sup>. The cartulary of Saint-Jean d'Angély demonstrates the same pattern, the role of the Cluniac abbot Oddo more prominent than that of the bishop of Saintes<sup>76</sup>.

### The life and business activities of the canons

Discussion of problems facing the canons as property owners takes us some way from the HPCE, though they certainly conditioned the culture from which the chronicle emerged. From what kind of educational background and from what classes were the canons recruited? There is precious little direct evidence, but activities cited above indicate a legal training, and a familiarity with developments in canon law. The Angoulême canons appear not to have subscribed to any rule. Urban II, in his decretal of 1095, assumed diplomatically that they lived *communiter in Engolismensi aeclesia* and *in communi vita*, but there is no sign that they had ambitions to follow the kind of strict rule then being adopted and developed for canons regular elsewhere under papal encouragement<sup>77</sup>. Some canons can be shown to have had private property apart from their prebends, and they were probably typical. The extraordinary wealth of Itier Archambaud, one of a small group of canons that managed cathedral property, can hardly have been derived from his work as a canon. His resources were legendary (the HPCE commented admiringly that he was *ditissimus super omnes coetaneos suos*), enabling him to be a major sponsor of the building of the new Romanesque cathedral; he was rewarded on his death in 1125 with a funerary monument within the church<sup>78</sup>. In so far as his wealth can be traced, it was both urban and landed in character, probably characteristic of the canons as a whole.

74 Jean-Marc BIENVENU, Les caractères originaux de la réforme grégorienne dans le diocèse d'Angers, in: Bulletin philologique et historique (jusqu'à 1610) 1968/2 (1971), p. 545–560, 548–549; Bernard CHEVALIER, Les restitutions d'églises dans le diocèse de Tours, du x<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècles, in: Études de civilisation médiévale, IX<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècles. Mélanges offerts à Edmond-René Labande, Poitiers 1974, p. 129–143.

75 See the Table Chronologique in l'abbé CHOLET (ed.), Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Étienne de Baigne (en Saintonge), Niort 1868, p. 290–291. Robert FAVREAU, Histoire de l'Aunis et de la Saintonge, vol. 2: Le Moyen Âge, La Crèche 2014, p. 75, comments that monastic sources record episcopal support for monastic acquisition of churches while sources are lacking to show how the secular church gained control of churches from secular owners; tithes and other dues attached to churches were liable to remain in secular hands.

76 See the Table Chronologique in the Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 17), vol. 2, p. 264–265.

77 DEREINE, Statut canonique (as in n. 39), passim, especially p. 550–553. For rules by which canons regular were to live, see Yannick VEYRENCHÉ, *Quia vos estis qui sanctorum patrum vitam probabilem renovatis...* Naissance de chanoines réguliers, jusqu'à Urbain II, in: Michel PARISSÉ (ed.), Les chanoines réguliers. Emergence et expansion (XI<sup>e</sup>–XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles), Saint-Étienne 2009, p. 29–69.

78 Robert FAVREAU, Jean MICHAUD, Corpus des inscriptions de la France médiévale, vol. 1,3: Charente, Charente-Maritime, Deux-Sèvres, Poitiers 1977, no. 6, p. 10–11.

When families made gifts to the cathedral so that their sons or brothers could become canons (an action not classed as simony by the cathedral authorities), they had property outside the city; indications are that these gifts could be substantial<sup>79</sup>.

The canons were able to act as a bank from an early date, providing a source of liquidity and accepting property as security for loans. By the mid-12<sup>th</sup> century, this was a regular and extended business, recorded in the cathedral cartulary maintained by the canons as well as in a specialised register kept by the bishop<sup>80</sup>. Count Vulgrin in 1120/1136 and his son count William in 1147 (the year of his departure on the second crusade) each borrowed 1000 *solidi* secured on comital rights in Juillac-le-Coq from the cathedral chapter<sup>81</sup>. Such activities doubtless strengthened the bonds of the clergy with the counts and the seigneurial classes. In 1150, the troubadour Rigaud of Barbezieux, a knight of considerable wealth, could raise 1100 *solidi* by mortgaging vicarial rights in Juillac to the canons<sup>82</sup>. At an earlier date, in 1048/1089, Alduin Ostend, had obtained 900 *solidi* from the canons which he needed to buy himself out of captivity in the ducal castle of Couhé, but in this instance he had to sell half of the *curtis* of Mansle to obtain the sum<sup>83</sup>. The reformed Saint-Cybard likewise was a source of ready cash, allowing count William in 1106, for instance, to borrow 1000 *solidi* on the security of comital land<sup>84</sup>. These business skills were not matched by literary ones: the uneven Latinity of the HPCE suggests that some of the canons, at least, gained little from the study of the patristic texts and works of Julius Caesar and Cicero, works left to the cathedral by bishop Gerard before 1136. The only indication of any kind of intellectual life relates to the cathedral cantor, Hugh: before he became bishop in 1149, he had studied theology and the liberal arts under Gilbert de la Porrée in *Galliis* (and therefore presumably in Chartres or Paris before Gilbert became bishop of Poitiers in 1142)<sup>85</sup>. This point may be of some significance: he undoubtedly had archaeological interests, and thus an interest in the historical mission of the HPCE, but the language of the chronicle is not that of someone trained in the cathedral schools.

79 In 1075, one Aenor and his sons gave to the cathedral a farm (*borderia*) near Malaville, in return for which one of the sons was made a canon (Cart.Égl.Ang. [as in n. 4], no. XCVIII); at about the same date, a complete church with its village (*burgum*), cemetery and other revenues was given for the son of Hugh Gototges to become a canon (*ibid.*, no. CLXXXVIII). For other rather later examples, see *ibid.*, nos. CLXXIX, CXLII, both c. 1120.

80 Lucien AUVRAY, *Notices sur quelques cartulaires et obituaires français conservés à la Bibliothèque du Vatican*, in: *Mélanges Julien Havet*, Paris 1895, p. 389–394, published fragments of a cartulary of the 1150s from the Angoulême cathedral, now MS Ott. lat. 687 in the Vatican Library, recording property handed to the cathedral in return for cash loans.

81 WATSON, *The Counts of Angoulême* (as in n. 11), acta nos. 133 (Angoulême, Archives départementales de la Charente, G 424/2, copy of 1566) and 155 (Cart.Égl.Ang. [as in n. 4], no. CLXI).

82 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. CLXXXIV. Rita LEJEUNE, *Le Troubadour Rigaut de Barbezieux*, in: *Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature romanes à la mémoire d'István Frank*, Saarbrücken 1957 (*Annales Universitatis Saraviensis*, 6), p. 269–295, 278–285, brings together archival references to Rigaud and family.

83 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. C.

84 Cart.St.Cybard (as in n. 54), no. 129.

85 HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 44.

### The election of Gerard, bishop of Angoulême in 1101/1104

Bishop Gerard was the bishop for whom the HPCE had the greatest affection. This is hardly surprising since his career changed Angoulême from what can fairly be called a provincial city in Aquitaine to one of the most important centres in Christendom. The HPCE was proud to report that Gerard had organised eight church councils, of which at least two are known to have been held in Angoulême itself<sup>86</sup>. As the first bishop for a century not to have been recruited from the comital family and entourage, and the first to have appeared when Gregorian reform was well embedded in Aquitaine, how Gerard was elected is of some significance. The HPCE's account of how Gerard became bishop after 1101 is uninformative and bland in the extreme, seeking to show only that due canonical procedure had been followed: election was by *petitione populi, electione cleri* (that is to say the canons), *honoratorum assensu*<sup>87</sup>. This was perhaps a rebuttal to Arnulf of Lisieux's vituperative diatribe against Gerard for his support of the anti-pope Anacletus<sup>88</sup>. Arnulf mentioned several rival candidates, leading Gerard to organise a riot which he alone could subdue (canon law stated that a 'popular tumult' in itself made any election invalid<sup>89</sup>).

The leading role of the canons in episcopal elections was to be confirmed in Pascal's bull of 1110 for the cathedral (the canons of Périgueux had a similar confirmation in 1119), but circumstantial evidence suggests that the canons were the leading force in selecting Gerard after the death of bishop Ademar in 1101. He suited the reforming, legalistic and administrative ambitions of the canons so well that it is difficult not to see him as their candidate. According to the HPCE, Gerard had been responsible for the *regimina scholarum* in Angoulême, Périgueux and *in quibusdam castellis circum adiacentibus*, so we can see in him the choice of a capable academic lawyer<sup>90</sup>. Beyond this, he was a canon at the cathedral of Périgueux at the time of his election, so that he emerged from a body of clerics where ideas of reform had flourished. Canons in other dioceses in Aquitaine had begun to elect bishops committed to Gregorian reform before 1100. In 1087, the Poitiers canons elected Peter, a cleric fiercely committed to freeing the church of lay control, and his relations with duke William IX were predictably stormy. The Angoulême canons must have been aware of this. We can assume that Gerard had attended the very regular reforming councils and ecclesiastical gatherings in Aquitaine, that in Poitiers in 1078 laying out Gregorian precepts against lay investiture and secular control of church resources, precepts that were repeated at the Council of Bordeaux in 1080. These councils were called by papal legates (Gerald d'Ostie, Hugh de Die, Amatus of Oloron) who could identify and evaluate, one imagines, promising local scholars and lawyers<sup>91</sup>. Records from these councils

86 Ibid., p. 32; PONTAL, Conciles (as in n. 29), p. 265, 294, 406.

87 HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 30.

88 For Arnulf's text, see Julius DIETERICH (ed.), *Invectiva in Girardum Engolismensem episcopum*, in: MGH Ldl 3, Hanover 1897, p. 87–88.

89 Robert Louis BENSON, *The Bishop-Elect. A Study in Medieval Ecclesiastical Office*, Princeton 1968, p. 25.

90 HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 30.

91 TILLIER, *Les conciles provinciaux* (as in n. 29); fourteen councils between 1075 and 1100, in Poitiers, Saintes and Bordeaux, are listed in PONTAL, Conciles (as in n. 29). The scale and inten-

are of course very patchy, but it is clear that compendia of canon law texts were being assembled within Aquitaine; this work of codifying ecclesiastical law on Gregorian principles was begun as papal legates became active in the province: it was a reforming initiative generated locally and not by papal direction; it would be very strange if Gerard, as an academic teacher, noted for his *insignem scientiam*, was unaware of these developments<sup>92</sup>.

Growing confidence of those ruling the church in the archdiocese of Bordeaux allowed the papal legate Amatus, bishop of Oloron, to be elected archbishop at the Council of Saintes in 1089  *nolente comite*, that is to say against the wishes of the count of Poitiers, duke William IX. This potent phrase,  *nolente comite*, appeared in the dating clause of a charter endowing the abbey of Saint-Maixent with churches in the Angoulême diocese dated at the council itself; the charter was drawn up in the name of Ademar, bishop of Angoulême, and made with the permission of two of Ademar's most senior canons, Mainard Cramail and Arnald de Porta<sup>93</sup>. That it was issued in such a public forum indicates that Gregory VII's rulings on the independence of the church from lay interference had been taken to heart among the clergy within the province. As with the Poitiers canons in 1087, those present in Saintes were doubtless emboldened by the advent of a duke, William IX in 1086, who was a minor – he was still being called  *infans* in 1088. Ducal advisers were more inclined to seek supporters than impose ducal authority. These cases show in action the kind of solidarity among canons that was seen as well when the Angoulême canons appealed to the canons of Saintes and Périgueux cathedrals in their dispute with bishop Ademar in 1089<sup>94</sup>. The canons thus had just the right experience to allow them to take the leading part in electing bishop Ademar's successor. What part was played by count William in the election of Gerard does not emerge. His participation in the resolution of the 1095 dispute, as indeed his confirmation of the bestowal of Saint-Cybard

sity of conciliar activity in Aquitaine, led by Hugh of Die and Amatus of Oloron, is amply demonstrated in RENNIE, Hugh of Die (as in n. 28), p. 175–177.

- 92 Gabriel LE BRAS, *L'activité canonique à Poitiers pendant la réforme grégorienne (1049–1099)*, in: *Mélanges offerts à René Crozet* (as in n. 59), vol. 1, p. 237–239; Kriston R. RENNIE, *The Collectio Burdegalensis. A Study and Register of an Eleventh-Century Canon Law Collection*, Toronto 2013, shows that the earliest manuscript of this canon law treatise originated in Bordeaux itself; Uta-Renate BLUMENTHAL, *Poitevin Manuscripts, the Abbey of Saint-Ruf and Ecclesiastical Reform in the Eleventh Century*, in: Martin BRETT, Kathleen G. CUSHING (eds.), *Readers, Texts and Compilers in the Earlier Middle Ages. Studies in Medieval Canon Law in Honour of Linda Fowler-Magerl*, Farnham, Burlington VT 2009, p. 90.
- 93 *Chartes et documents de Saint-Maixent* (as in n. 14), vol. 1, no. CLXXII; for the original, see *Charte Artem/CMJS n°1279*: [telma.irht.cnrs.fr/outils/originaux/charte1279/](http://telma.irht.cnrs.fr/outils/originaux/charte1279/). In 1076/1099 Mainard was *praecantor* of the cathedral and took the lead of canons who allowed bishop Ademar to sanction the gift of the church of Ambérac to Saint-Amant (Cart.St.A.B. [as in n. 6], no. 81). Mainard *cantor* with Arnald de Porta were among the senior canons who subscribed a major gift by count William to the cathedral's alms house in 1097 (Cart.Égl.Ang. [as in n. 4], no. LXXXIII).
- 94 For duke William as  *infans* in 1088, see *Chartes et documents de Saint-Maixent* (as in n. 14), no. 169. MARTINDALE, *The Origins of the Duchy* (as in n. 34), p. 180–182, notes the church's growing independence during duke William IX's early years, where major ecclesiastical disputes were solved without recourse to the duke, a novel situation and quite different from that under duke Guy-Geoffrey and his predecessors. See RICHARD, *Comtes de Poitou* (as in n. 3), vol. 1, p. 383–385 on this theme.

on the Cluniac Saint-Jean d'Angély, suggests he would have no difficulty in supporting an election by the canons. A series of charters dating between 1101/1104 and 1109 shows count William co-operating with bishop Gerard in managing disputes about property, so that the inference must be that the count had seen no reason to oppose Gerard's election<sup>95</sup>.

### The career of bishop Gerard, 1101/1104–1136

The problem with Gerard's career is to account for the astonishing rapidity with which he joined the inner councils of papal government. The HPCE makes no reference to any delay in his elevation. Bishop Ademar died in September 1101, but the earliest reference to Gerard as bishop dates from 1104<sup>96</sup>. The fact that there was no archbishop of Bordeaux between 1101 and 1104 is likely to have delayed his installation<sup>97</sup>. It is surely possible that Gerard made the journey to Rome to be installed by Pascal II himself before 1104. No source suggests this, but it would have been a wise move and would help explain the extraordinary speed with which Gerard gained the trust of the pope – it might also explain Gerard's working methods as a judge, which were very close to those characterising the activity of Pascal himself and the papal curia<sup>98</sup>. There is no source either that would point to papal legates in Aquitaine identifying Gerard for an international career. The HPCE introduces Gerard into its narrative at the moment of his fullest glory, when he took the lead at the Lateran Council of 1112 in reversing the concessions on the matter of lay investiture forced on Pascal by the emperor Henry V. The HPCE's account is artfully dramatic: somewhat casually, Gerard heard that Pascal had convoked a council, and arriving late produced the formula that solved the impasse. He was delegated to bear the council's decision to the emperor himself; the gifts showered on Gerard by the emperor gave proof of his prestige, as did the presence of the archbishop of Cologne, a former pupil. The HPCE here is quite accurate<sup>99</sup>, as it is when, in the midst of a description of count William's activities, two sentences refer to Gerard's support for Pascal II, his work as legate in Brittany and then in the provinces of Tours, Bordeaux, Bourges and Auch<sup>100</sup>.

95 Cart.St.Cybard (as in n. 54), nos. 67, 210; Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 17), vol. 2, pièces annexes no. XI; Charles Ferdinand DE LASTEYRIE, *L'abbaye de Saint-Martial de Limoges*, Paris 1901, pièces justificatives no. X.

96 This emerges from a charter of William, bishop of Périgueux, dated 1104 in Jean-Baptiste CHAMPEVAL (ed.), *Cartulaire de l'abbaye d'Uzerche (Corrèze)*, Paris, Tulle 1901, no. 33, a gift confirmed in Périgueux in *praesentia domni Geraldii* [sic] *Engolismensis episcopi et nostrae ecclesiae canonici*; see FAVREAU, *Évêques* (as in n. 18), p. 28, n. 222.

97 The death of Amatus was recorded in Jean VERDON (ed.), *Chronique de Saint-Maixent*, Paris 1979, p. 174; charters of 1102 refer to the *sede vacante* situation in Bordeaux (Cart.St.J.A. [as in n. 17], vol. 2, no. CCCCLXVIII), while in 1104, Arnald was termed *nondum archiepiscopus sed ad archiepiscopatum electus* (ibid., vol. 1, no. CCCXXXVII).

98 See below n. 119.

99 The HPCE's account matches that of Charles Joseph HEFELE, Henri LECLERCQ (eds.), *Histoire des conciles*, vol. 5, part 1, Paris 1912, p. 532–535.

100 On Gerard's career, the account of Theodor SCHIEFFER, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Verträge von Meersen (870) bis zum Schisma von 1130*, Berlin 1935 (*Historische Studien*, 263), is still useful, as is L'abbé MARATU, Girard, évêque d'Angoulême, L'égat du Saint Siège (vers

Gerard was in fact an intimate of Pascal well before October 1106, when he was among clergy surrounding Pascal at the Council of Guastalla, and took the lead in drawing up the declaration known as the *Cassatio privilegii quid extorsit imperator a papa*. Here, lay investiture was roundly denounced – all this far removed from the problems of Gerard's diocese<sup>101</sup>. Gerard was also with Pascal at the Council of Troyes in 1107<sup>102</sup>. A charter from Marmoutiers drawn up in 1120/1123 described how Pascal II after the Council of Troyes commissioned Gerard to settle a dispute concerning a priory in Fougères, with Gerard supposedly convening a council in Nantes<sup>103</sup>, while in 1109 Pascal II sent Gerard to see to the enthronement of Baudry, formerly abbot of Bourgueil, as archbishop of Dol, and probably to deliver the *pallium* – here Pascal addressed him as *fratrem nostrum Girardum episcopum* and not legate, though Gerard was termed bishop and legate in other documents of 1109<sup>104</sup>. The full commission as legate for the provinces of Tours, Bourges, Bordeaux and Auch was issued on 14 April 1110<sup>105</sup>. By this date, Gerard was prominent among the inner councils of the papal curia. He was with pope Gelasius II at Cluny in the weeks before the latter's death in January 1119 and had to be brought round to supporting his successor, Calixtus II, at whose enthronement in Vienne he was present<sup>106</sup>.

The Angoulême canons certainly had the qualities to support Gerard's career. Gerard was clearly a consummate and flamboyant lawyer, not averse to profiting financially from his activities, and despite criticism and even revision of his judgments retaining the trust of successive popes<sup>107</sup>. Canons from Angoulême took part in Gerard's work as bishop and then as legate throughout the west of France. Figures such as

- 1060–1136), in: Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente. Ser. 4, 2 (1864), though the sources of the many texts provided are often not stated. See Wilhelm JANSSEN, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Schisma Anaklets II. bis zum Tode Coelestins III. (1130–1198)*, Cologne, Graz 1961 (Kölner historische Abhandlungen, 6), p. 5–15, for Gerard's later career.
- 101 Uta-Renate BLUMENTHAL, *The Early Councils of Pope Pascal II, 1100–1110*, Toronto 1978, p. 32–43; HEFELE, LECLERCQ, *Histoire des conciles* (as in n. 99), p. 496–498; the text in Edmond MARTÈNE, Ursin DURAND (eds.), *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum IV*, Paris 1717, cols. 127–128, ends *Haec carta dicta est a Gerardo Engolismensi* followed by the names of five cardinals.
- 102 PONTAL, *Conciles* (as in n. 29), p. 250–251.
- 103 The charter, much cited by antiquarian scholars, is now published from the original by Florian MAZEL, Armelle LE HUËROU, *Actes de l'abbaye de Marmoutier concernant le prieuré de la Trinité de Fougères, XI<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, in: *Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest* 113/3 (2006), p. 137–165, no. 5. The only other evidence for a council in Nantes at this time comes from an undated charter from Redon – see PONTAL, *Conciles* (as in n. 29), p. 253.
- 104 MIGNE PL 163, col. 253; LASTEYRIE, *L'abbaye de Saint-Martial* (as in n. 95), pièces justificatives no. X, p. 433–434; *Charte Artem/CMJS n°1433*: telma.irht.cnrs.fr/outils/originaux/charte1433/ and FAVREAU, *Évêques* (as in n. 18), p. 52, no. 35; MARATU, Girard (as in n. 100), p. 328–332, acta nos. III, IV.
- 105 *Ibid.*, cols. 240–241; JAFFÉ (as in n. 44), no. 6262.
- 106 Mary STROLL, *Calixtus II (1119–1124). A Pope Born to Rule*, Leiden, Boston 2004 (Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, 116), p. 58–59, 71.
- 107 See the accusations of Geoffrey of Vendôme in 1111 and, after 1130, of the prior of La Chartreuse: Geneviève GIORDANENGO (ed.), *Geoffroy de Vendôme. Œuvres*, Turnhout 1996, no. 136, p. 282–287; RHG (as in n. 14), vol. 12, p. 82n.–83n. See also Georges DE MANTEYER, *Six mandements de Calixte II renouvelant la légation de Girard d'Angoulême (21 novembre 1123)*, in: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'École française de Rome* 18 (1898), p. 17–36, no. 1. Ian Stuart ROBINSON, *The Papacy 1073–1198. Continuity and Innovation*, Cambridge 1990 (Cambridge

Achard the cathedral archdeacon, and Mainard, the cathedral *praecentor*, and his successor Peter, were among canons who made up Gerard's staff, joining him in settling disputes beyond the diocese of Angoulême; abbot Hugh of Saint-Cybard was often similarly in attendance<sup>108</sup>. Gerard termed his archdeacon Achard *dilectus filius noster* when he confirmed, at Achard's suggestion, the gift of churches near La Rochefoucauld and Châteauneuf-sur-Charente to Saint-Florent de Saumur<sup>109</sup>. Mainard accompanied Gerard on his visit to Toulouse in 1114, a visit that can be called a diplomatic mission to support the claim of William IX's wife Philippa to the county of Toulouse<sup>110</sup>. The enormous amount of business carried out under Gerard's direction, at councils and elsewhere, was evidently only possible with the support of his canons. A telling example of the burden of this work is seen in the voluminous correspondence that lay behind a single judgment, that dispensed at the Council of Angoulême in 1117 in favour of the abbey of Quimperlé in its dispute with the abbey of Redon concerning Belle Isle: five canons from Angoulême together with abbot Hugh of Saint-Cybard participated in the judgment, as well as Peter, the cathedral *cantor* very recently chosen as bishop of Saintes under Gerard's direction<sup>111</sup>. That cathedral officials should support the work of their bishops was of course natural enough, a sign of the increasing sophistication of episcopal government evident elsewhere in the province of Bordeaux. As bishop of Saintes in 1083–1106, Ramnulf worked closely with his two archdeacons, who could act in his stead, as well as other office holders of his diocese<sup>112</sup>; Peter, bishop of Poitiers in 1087–1115, similarly worked systematically with officials from the Poitiers cathedral chapter, officials who could act on his behalf<sup>113</sup>.

Medieval Textbooks), p. 156–158, notes that popes Pascal and Calixtus intervened on occasion to question Gerard's judgments and recommend he operate with more courtesy and care.

- 108 Mainard as *cantor* in 1108: Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. CXIX; Mainard *praecentor* in 1111: Jean-Baptiste PAYRARD, Chartes inédites concernant l'histoire du Velay. Quatrième série, in: Tablettes historiques de la Haute-Loire. Ser. 4 (1878), p. 195–226, no. XIX; Achard archdeacon in 1112: Georges THOMAS, Les comtes de La Marche de la Maison de Charroux (x<sup>e</sup> siècle–1177), in: Mémoires de la Société des sciences naturelles et archéologiques de la Creuse 23 (1925–1927), p. 561–700, no. LXVIII; Peter *praecentor* with three Angoulême canons in 1118: Cartulaire de l'abbaye d'Uzerche (as in n. 96), no. 369; Hugh abbot of Saint-Cybard in 1117: Jean-Baptiste CHAMPEVAL, Cartulaire des abbayes de Tulle et de Roc-Amadour, Brive 1903, no. 503, and L'abbé Théodore GRASLIER (ed.), Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Étienne de Vaux, Niort 1871 (Cartulaires inédits de la Saintonge, 1), no. X. Abbot Hugh was with bishop Gerard at the council he convoked at Loudun in 1109 (MANSI, Sacrorum conciliorum [as in n. 35], vol. 21, cols. 1–3; PONTAL, Conciles [as in n. 29], p. 254). A list of Gerard's *acta* would extend the theme.
- 109 Chartes de Saint-Florent (as in n. 52), no. VIII.
- 110 Claude DEVIC, Joseph VAISSETE (eds.), Histoire générale du Languedoc, vol. 5, Toulouse 1875, cols. 845–846, nos. 451–452. In c. 1112, Gerard heard the case of a contested election of the abbot of Saint-Aubin in Angers; Pascal II formed a commission to investigate the matter that included Robert d'Arbrissel, but Gerard at this stage was not involved: Bertrand DE BROUSSILLON (ed.), Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Aubin d'Angers, Angers 1903, vol. 2, nos. CCCCXXVIII–CCCCXXIX.
- 111 Léon MAÎTRE, Paul DE BERTHOU (eds.), Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Sainte-Croix de Quimperlé, Rennes, Paris 1904, no. CXXXIII being the 1117 judgment, nos. CXIII–CXXXIII all being related to the case. On Peter *cantor*, see FAVREAU, Évêques (as in n. 18), p. 102.
- 112 ID., Archidiacons et actes des évêques de Saintes au XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles, in: Michel PARISSÉ (ed.), A propos des actes d'évêques. Hommage à Lucie Fossier, Nancy 1991, p. 265–275.
- 113 George T. BEECH, Biography and the Study of Eleventh-Century Society. Bishop Peter II of Poitiers 1087–1115, in: Francia 7 (1980), p. 101–121, 110–111.

Both Ramnulf and Peter had experience of working closely with Amatus of Oloron and Hugh of Die when they were papal legates in Aquitaine. Peter had particularly intimate relations with both Urban II and Pascal II – a militant reformer, he was driven from his see when he was brave enough to excommunicate duke William in 1114 for adultery. With the advent of Gerard as bishop, the Angoulême canons fell easily into this supporting role, which says much for their skills, educational background and ambitions.

Surviving documentary sources produced by Gerard's work as legate indicate that he imposed new standards of legal procedure, and in this he was forwarding the work of earlier papal legates who had worked in the province of Bordeaux – and training the Angoulême canons as he did so. This aspect of Gerard's administration was to have a great impact on the nature of surviving documentation. Against a background where charters issued in the name of any bishop were acquiring diplomatic uniformity – though not yet the consistency which denotes the workings of episcopal chanceries – and where beneficiary institutions largely took the initiative in recording judgments in written form, the legate Gerard and his canons made clear what kind of written documents were necessary to be taken seriously as evidence in any dispute. If charters were ›expressions of power‹, aiming to contain ›une action juridique [d']une validité perpétuelle‹, it was not their inherent nature but the way they matched the requirements of lawyers in ecclesiastical courts that gave them authority<sup>114</sup>. The vocabulary associated with Gerard's pronouncements can be very striking. In 1111, as the abbeys of Saint-Maixent and La Chaise-Dieu searched around for witnesses and documents to support their respective claims of ownership of the church of Jazeneuil south-west of Poitiers, Gerard was able to state that the document produced by Saint-Maixent was of no value in that it had no diplomatic form: it did not have the *circumstancias que carta debet habere*; as simple narration (*pura narratio*), it had no validity – Mainard, *praecentor* of the Angoulême cathedral, was among senior clerics associated with the judgment<sup>115</sup>. Gerard went beyond this in a dispute between Saint-Florent de Saumur and the abbey of Tournus about the church of Saint-Nicolas in Loudun. The charter proffered by Tournus was rejected since it had suspect vocabulary and no reference to witnesses: *cartam non esse definitivam*; the document was also dismissed as a simple narration: *quandam narrationem ostenderunt que nec sigillo munita nec titulo alicuius persona titulata erat*<sup>116</sup>. In a dispute between the monks of Uzerche and the viscount of Comborn before bishop Gerard in 1116, the viscount produced a document which Gerard rejected: *Carta ... canonicam firmitatem non habebat*; the viscount was charged to produce two worthy

114 Marie-José GASSE-GRANDJEAN, Benoît-Michel TOCK (eds.), *Les actes comme expression du pouvoir au Haut Moyen Âge*. Actes de la Table Ronde de Nancy, 26–27 novembre 1999, Turnhout 2005 (Atelier de recherche sur les textes médiévaux, 5), p. 11.

115 Chartes inédites concernant l'histoire du Velay (as in n. 108), no. XVIII. On this charter, see Benoît-Michel TOCK (ed.), *Scribes, souscripteurs et témoins dans les actes privés en France (VII<sup>e</sup>–début du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, Turnhout 2005 (Atelier de recherche sur les textes médiévaux, 9), p. 259, n. 158.

116 Paul MARCHEGAY (ed.), *Chartes poitevines de l'abbaye de Saint-Florent près Saumur, Poitiers 1873* (Archives historiques du Poitou, 2), nos. XIV, XVI.

witnesses within 40 days instead<sup>117</sup>. Retrospectively we can see that mistakes could be made. Political advantage rather than legal analysis could still lead to fabrications being treated seriously. In a dispute brought before Gerard as legate, the canons of Le Dorat produced a charter that supposedly bore the seal of Hugh Capet, king of France, as well as the approval of the archbishop of Bourges and the bishop of Poitiers, to counter the claim of the countess of La Marche to tax ironware brought for sale at the canons' market in Le Dorat; the document survives from another source and is clearly a forgery, but Gerard accepted it as genuine. Gerard included the bishops of Poitiers and Saintes, along with the archdeacon Achard of Angoulême and a host of other *sapientes clerici* in his judgment; excommunication was threatened on any infringing party who ignored three summonses to redress their actions<sup>118</sup>. The presence of such figures with Gerard characterises very many of his judgments and must be accounted a factor in the growing uniformity of procedure and language in such documents. The concern to include careful accounts of legal procedure in charters drawn up in the name of bishops can be evidenced before Gerard became legate, but there is no question that he propagated standards of diplomatic form within the areas where he acted as legate. The description of the nature of evidence produced (often with variants of the phrase *auditis diligenter utriusque partis rationibus* with its Roman law connotations), the listing of participants and witnesses, together with clauses of date and time and seals, demonstrated the model to follow. Where originals of Gerard's charters survive, they usually bear his autograph subscription in the form *Ego Girardus Engolismensis episcopus sanctę romanę ecclesię legatus subscripsi*; other bishops and clerics can sometimes be seen to subscribe next to the legate. Doubt has been thrown on whether all of Gerard's ›autograph‹ subscriptions were actually by his hand; if this were the case, it suggests members of his team were delegated for the role. Subscriptions of this kind are among indications that suggest close contact with practices in the papal chancery<sup>119</sup>. In discussing these

117 Cartulaire de l'abbaye d'Uzerche (as in n. 96), no. 369; BRUEL (ed.), Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny (as in n. 17), vol. 5, no. 3921.

118 THOMAS, Les comtes de La Marche (as in n. 108), no. LXVIII and »Actes faux« no. 1; for the forgery see as well Jacques DE FONT-RÉAULX, Recueil de textes et d'analyses concernant le chapitre Saint-Pierre du Dorat, in: Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique du Limousin 72 (1927), p. 255–256, 347. The charter was *sigillo Henrici regis Francie munitam*, and would have claimed a date of 987/996.

119 TOCK (ed.), Scribes (as in n. 115), p. 219–321. Tock illustrates six subscriptions, and refers to a seventh, a charter of 1109 reproduced in full in FAVREAU, Évêques (as in n. 18), p. 52; Charte Artem/CMJS no. 1433 (as in n. 104). For a further example of Gerard's subscription, very close to Tock's ill. no. 63, p. 321 (a charter for Fontevraud of the 1120s), see the facsimile of a charter of 1121 for Font-Vive (i. e. Grosbot) belonging to Eusèbe Castaigne, in: Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente (1846), between p. 120 and 121, text on p. 198. Professor Anne Duggan tells me that Gerard's employment of his own autograph signature may well have been influenced by Paschal's own universal habit of writing his own signature in the final protocol of privileges, in the form *Ego Paschalis Ecclesie Catholice Episcopus ss. (subscripsi)*, which will be stressed in her forthcoming chapter for a new collection of studies on Paschal II to be published by Amsterdam University Press. She also points out that the careful examination of *privilegia*, *cartae*, and other documents produced in evidence was normal practice in cases heard or commissioned by Paschal. Some of Gerard's charters may indeed mirror aspects of papal documents: the lay-out of text, use of capital in the first line, signatures with that of Gerard placed

documents, Soline Kumaoka has shown how Saint-Maixent was driven to reconsider its muniments when what it presented to Gerard was rejected, and Saint-Maixent can hardly have been an isolated case<sup>120</sup>. The Gregorian reform put church government into a system governed by law and due legal process. In the past, beneficiary institutions might draw up charters and have them validated at meetings where great secular and ecclesiastical figures were present<sup>121</sup>; there was now a need to satisfy what church lawyers would accept as fiduciary documents.

Activity in managing the cathedral estates, in financial dealings, and association with the activities of the bishop and legate Gerard, gives us an idea of the essential character of the body of canons in Angoulême in the first half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century. This expertise as regards estate management, finance and legal process, to use a modern vocabulary, could hardly be commented upon in a panegyric like the HPCE. On the other hand, there is celebration of the negotiating skills of bishop Gerard who, before 1120 with count William's son Vulgrin, recovered the *castellum* of Archiac from Audouin of Barbezieux and Bardon of Cognac, themselves aided by duke William IX; Matha was linked to this *discordia* (i.e. the seizure of Archiac). It was through bishop Gerard as well that Vulgrin recovered this barony, which his father had lost to buy himself out of captivity. At a later date, in 1136, the HPCE's account of bishop Lambert's intervention with bishop William of Saintes to resolve a dispute between duke William X and count Vulgrin concerning the castle of Pons, shows a similar appreciation of legal expertise<sup>122</sup>.

### Another kind of reform: hermits and canons of strict observance

In praising the achievements of bishop Gerard, the HPCE refers to his support for the foundation of four new religious houses, La Couronne, Bournet, Grosbot and Lanville (*Aulavilla*). When the chronicle was put together, these were part of the institutional landscape, though they derived from a totally different current of reform from that espoused by the canons of Angoulême. It was one to which, it can be argued, the canons were not totally sympathetic. Engagement with worldly affairs, a concomitant of building a church that was free of lay control and run by its own system of law, drove a number of clerics to reject the complications of church government and to withdraw to what was conventionally termed 'the wilderness' to follow the apostles as the *pauperes Christi*. Such people can often be shown to have abandoned promising careers in the church for an austere life of penitence and poverty far from human habitation. The followers they attracted, both lay people and clerics,

centrally on its own, in Gerard's charter of 1109 for Saint-Martial de Limoges (Charte Artem/CMJS no. 695: [telma.irht.cnrs.fr/outils/originaux/charte695/](http://telma.irht.cnrs.fr/outils/originaux/charte695/), facsimile in: Musée des archives départementales, Paris 1878, no. 30) may reflect the influence of papal acta.

120 Soline KUMAOKA, Les jugements du légat Gérard d'Angoulême en Poitou au début du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle, in: Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes 155 (1997), p. 315–338.

121 A rare insight into the circumstances by which an abbot – that of Maillezais – gained a charter in 1003 is recounted in the account of the foundation of the abbey; see Georges PON, Yves CHAUVIN, La fondation de l'abbaye de Maillezais. Récit du moine Pierre, La Roche-sur-Yon 2001, p. 142–145.

122 HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 32–33, 39–40.

formed eremitical communities that might or might not be absorbed into the church. As is well known, by the end of the first quarter of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, some had developed into major monastic institutions, Fontevraud being a major example. Angoulême and surrounding areas were certainly touched by this phenomenon. Some initiatives were ephemeral, as, for example, the endeavour of Gerald d'Olérat who set up at l'Houmeau near Angoulême in c. 1100 as a *canonicus reclusus*. Rather more permanent was the project of one Guillaume, a monk from the Piedmont who attracted a community when living as an anchorite near Talmont; in due course, he and his followers had to be brought into the Cluniac abbey of Saint-Jean d'Angély in c. 1096<sup>123</sup>. The major and best endowed establishment to emerge from this current in the diocese of Angoulême was the church of La Couronne near Angoulême, discussed below, whose founder, Lambert, was certainly a follower of Robert d'Arbrissel.

The extraordinary influence of the eremitical reformer in western France, Robert d'Arbrissel († 1116), founder of Fontevraud, and of his follower Géraud de Sales, was certainly felt in the diocese of Angoulême, though the local historiographical tradition, as seen in the HPCE and the early-13<sup>th</sup> century chronicle of La Couronne, avoids mentioning him<sup>124</sup>. As is well known, Robert's success worried the church hierarchy until the way of life of the communities he attracted had been regularised and sanctioned by episcopal authority. Perhaps the Angoulême clergy shared the horror expressed in the first decade of the 12<sup>th</sup> century by figures such as Geoffrey of Vendôme and Marbod of Rennes about Robert's way of life and its disruption of church government, in particular attracting lower class men and women away from their parish priests into communities which initially lived under no rule other than devotion to Robert<sup>125</sup>. Posthumous accounts of the lives of hermits such as d'Arbrissel or Géraud de Sales, hid the revolutionary nature of their projects, always suggesting that the blessing of the church hierarchy had consistently been theirs from the outset. Lambert was said by the HPCE to have been ordained and made chaplain of Saint-Jean La Palud by bishop Ademar, thus before 1101. Given Ademar's lack of reforming zeal, Lambert can be seen better as a disaffected canon: by the time the HPCE was compiled, episcopal permission for a cleric to adopt an eremitical way of life would have been required, so that Ademar's consent was important to record. »The chronicle of La Couronne« described La Palud as a wilderness from which Lambert had to eject a dragon; here, Lambert was joined by others seeking a reformed life subject to the rule of Saint Augustine (this already differentiated them from the canons of Angoulême). This account fits the pattern, seen with Robert d'Arbrissel and Géraud de Sales, of the educated cleric who gave up a promising conventional clerical career for an eremitical life, success in attracting followers necessitating in due course the establishment of new monasteries – for Lambert, this was to be La Couronne.

123 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. CXI; Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 17), vol. 1, no. CCLXXXI.

124 Jean-François Eusèbe CASTAIGNE (ed.), *Chronique latine de l'abbaye de La Couronne*, Paris 1864, p. 19. The first part of the work was written in 1201/1233.

125 Jacques DALARUN et al. (eds.), *Les deux vies de Robert d'Arbrissel, fondateur de Fontevraud. Légendes, écrits et témoignages*, Turnhout 2006 (*Disciplina Monastica*, 4), brings together documentation regarding Robert; *id.*, *Dédalles de la création historique: Robert d'Arbrissel vu par Michelet*, in: *Romantisme* 48 (1985), p. 3–20, gives a history of the embarrassment felt about the »unsavory« elements of Robert's life.

Like Gérard de Sales, who *de paupere canonico factus [fuit] pauperior eremita*, Lambert chose a life of poverty. Those who joined his community gave themselves *in pauperem Christi*<sup>126</sup>. The radical nature of his project stood in contrast, not to say opposition, to what the cathedral canons represented. Thanks to his radical credentials, Lambert became bishop of Angoulême in 1136 (in circumstances discussed in part 2). The HPCE reassuringly described him as *natione Engolismensis*. His success in building the church of La Couronne *a primo lapide* and in developing its estates (with mills, woods, farms and meadows) gets rather more attention than his reputation as a *vir ... sapiens ... maxime religionis*. The biography of Gaucher d'Aureil gives a surer guide to Lambert's aims than the HPCE: Lambert sought out this reclusive hermit for instruction with the aim of withdrawing from society to follow an ascetic life following the rule of Saint Augustine in the wilderness<sup>127</sup>. Where Lambert may have differed from Robert d'Arbrissel was in his attitude to women; like Gérard de Sales, there appears an absence of communities set up for women, a fact which may underline the conservative nature of the church in Angoulême. Perhaps the revolutionary example of Fontevraud, where a woman, albeit aristocratic, presided as abbess over men and women, many of whom came from popular classes, was judged unacceptable<sup>128</sup>.

Lambert's position as a follower of Robert d'Arbrissel emerges from a dispute about land at Agudelle in the diocese of Saintes, mentioned in a document of 1116. The location is at once significant: Lambert was setting up communities in places some distance from his base in Saint-Jean La Palud and Saint-Michel d'Entre-Aigues, suggesting the oversight of more than one community in the same manner as Robert d'Arbrissel and Gérard de Sales. The document refers to a plethora of minor gifts that had been made earlier to Robert d'Arbrissel and to Lambert as his associate. After Robert's death in 1116, Lambert had to argue with the abbess of Fontevraud that the gifts were intended for him and his community at La Palud. A charter of 1116 drawn up in the name of Lambert, termed *indignus sacerdos*, described how, in 1115 and in 1116, gifts of lands, buildings and woods at *Agudella* had been made to Lambert *sub nomine domini Roberti*; these had been made in such quantities that to list donors was not possible (*simpliciter notare non possumus quia nimia multitudine donantium alia dona sunt facta*). All donors, including women, had properly subscribed their gifts *propriis manibus* or had others subscribe for them; however, only a selection of the multiple clerical and lay witnesses could be named (of the lay witnesses, only knights, *milites*, were included). After hesitation, the abbess of Fontevraud accepted Lambert's case. The fact that a multitude of small donations were described in these general terms suggests that they came from minor proprietors, and not the class of landowners usually found endowing monasteries; the abbreviated way in

126 The term was used in a charter of 1120/1127 when one Fulk *de Brolio* endowed La Couronne as he entered the community; see Angoulême, Archives départementales de la Charente, H 2, 160, notarial copy of 1644 of *deux placarts de parchemen* with the muniments of La Couronne – the text is given in WATSON, *The Counts of Angoulême* (as in n. 11), p. 320–324, cat. no. 130.

127 Michel AUBRUN, *Saints ermites en Limousin au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Turnhout 2009, p. 111.

128 Odile LENGLET, *Les fondations de Gérard de Sales et leur évolution*, in: Nicole BOUTER (ed.), *Naissance et fonctionnement des réseaux monastiques et canoniaux, Saint-Étienne 1991*, p. 140, removed the convent of Tusson from the list of communities that Gérard is known to have founded.

which the donations were recorded may reflect a distrust of the formal notices and charters usually associated with property transactions at established institutions such as Saint-Cybard or the cathedral. The document of 1116 shows a process identical to that for the foundation of the abbey of Cadouin in the Périgord by Géraud de Sales. Here, a large number of transactions gifting property in the forest of Cadouin to Robert d'Arbrissel and the Fontevraud nuns by minor property owners were listed in documents of 1115, but in this case, Robert specifically stated that the property was intended for Géraud – Robert's death may have prevented him from recording that the property at Agudelle was destined for Lambert and his community<sup>129</sup>.

How did the church in Angoulême react to the eremitical movement represented by Lambert's project? The absence of any reference in the HPCE to the kind of reform proposed by Robert d'Arbrissel marks the essential conservatism of the Angoulême canons. Gerard, bishop after the death of Ademar in 1101, is often claimed to have taken a proactive role in supporting the kind of communities set up in the wake of Robert d'Arbrissel's activities, or those of Géraud de Sales, by historians who attribute personal enthusiasms to administrative acts. Bishop Gerard's interventions, in fact, reflect more the standard duties of a bishop and legate than personal commitment, and in this he reflected the attitudes of his canons. When there were disputes between religious houses, his mediation was a natural part of his duties. The fact that bishop Gerard and Robert d'Arbrissel were both witnesses to an agreement between Philippa, wife of duke William IX, and the viscount of Béziers in 1114 in Toulouse, surely implies no engagement between them: Robert was certainly in Toulouse at the request of its bishop and not as a member of Gerard's train<sup>130</sup>. Actions like Gerard's validation in 1114, with the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Poitiers, of Robert's agreement with the abbot of Suilly about property near Fontevraud, or Gerard's confirmation of the resolution of a dispute between Fontevraud and the abbey of Nanteuil about the ownership of land and a ruined church at Tusson, reflects routine government and gives no indication of personal interest – certainly Gerard's engagement did not come close to that of the bishop of Poitiers<sup>131</sup>. Evidence for Gerard's support for the new houses mentioned in the HPCE is minimal<sup>132</sup>. The thorough review of churches and their resources found in Pascal II's papal

129 Paul DE FLEURY (ed.), *Chartes saintongeaises de l'abbaye de La Couronne, 1116–1473*, Paris, Saintes 1880 (Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis, 7), no. II; Jean MAUBOURGUET, *Le cartulaire de l'abbaye de Cadouin*, Cahors 1926, nos. I–IX, no. IV the transfer of all properties by Robert d'Arbrissel to Géraud de Sales.

130 *Histoire générale du Languedoc* (as in n. 110), vol. 5, cols. 845–846, nos. 451–452. In c. 1112, Gerard heard the case of a contested election of the abbot of Saint-Aubin in Angers; Pascal II formed a commission to investigate the matter that included Robert d'Arbrissel, but Gerard at this stage was not involved: *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Aubin* (as in n. 110), vol. 2, nos. CCCCXXVIII–CCCCXXIX.

131 Jean-Marc BIENVENU et al. (eds.), *Grand cartulaire de Fontevraud*, 2 vols., Poitiers 2000–2005, vol. 1, nos. 402, 572, 578; vol. 2, no. 637. Balthazar PAVILLON, *La vie du bienheureux Robert d'Arbrissel*, Paris 1666, p. 596, prints an undated letter from Gerard to bishops and archbishops within his province asking them to support Fontevraud, but it is difficult to argue that such circulars represent the kind of personal involvement that many older authorities assume.

132 HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 37. Lanville (*Aulavilla*), said to have been established in 1120 as a house of Augustinian canons, left no archival record until the 17<sup>th</sup> century.

bull of 1110 for Angoulême mentions La Palud as a church over which the bishop had rights, but not the nascent community there; the other houses get no mention, so that the communities from which they emerged had not acquired official status by then<sup>133</sup>. Bishop Gerard's charter of 1121 for Grosbot allowed an oratory to be built near Grosbot itself, freed it from tithes on land worked by the abbey's brothers, and allowed the abbey's dependents to be buried there; it ensured that all this was subject to the rights of the bishop and parish<sup>134</sup>. We know nothing of bishop Gerard's support for Bournet, founded in 1113 by Géraud de Sales<sup>135</sup>, beyond a 15<sup>th</sup>-century description of a charter of c. 1125 by which an annual tribute of incense was agreed to mark subjection to episcopal government<sup>136</sup>. In both these instances, recognition of subjection to the bishop was the prior aim. Géraud de Sales was a reformer rigorously opposed to a *superfluitatem vel gloriae ostentationem*, hardly a view espoused by the Angoulême canons who were then investing in an exuberantly decorated new cathedral to mark their new status in Christendom; a sculptural frieze that included a depiction of waring knights to greet the faithful as they entered the west end could hardly be what the followers of Lambert and Géraud admired<sup>137</sup>. When Gerard ruled in favour of another eremitical foundation, Fontdouce, as La Chaise-Dieu claimed ownership of one of its cells, when he consecrated the Fontdouce church with bishop William of Saintes in 1127, or when he confirmed the election of Lambert as abbot of La Couronne in 1122, we see effective administration and enforcement of control rather than personal commitment<sup>138</sup>.

The lack of any reference in the HPCE to the contingent from Angoulême that joined the first crusade shortly before 1100 might imply a distrust of popular religious enthusiasms on the part of the canons<sup>139</sup>. The visit of count William to Jerusalem in 1120 was mentioned only to record his death and honorable burial in the abbey of Deutz near Cologne as he returned home. A similar lack of interest in any crusading ideal is seen in the account of count William's journey to Jerusalem as part of the crusade of 1147, where the narrative is concerned entirely to stress that he went as an independent party, and not as a follower of Louis VII, then duke of Aquitaine: the HPCE's aim here was to show how much more successful their count was than either Louis VII or the German emperor, and how his princely qualities were recognised by the gifts he received from the Byzantine emperor in Constantinople, Manuel Comnenus, and by those he gave to *egentibus baronibus* on his return. There was no celebration of the religious dimension, and certainly no reference to the patriarch of Jerusalem, Fulk, a cleric from Angoulême who had emigrated to the Holy Land after

133 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 4), no. CV; JAFFÉ (as in n. 44), no. 6261.

134 For the charter of 1121, see n. 119.

135 Chronique de Saint-Maixent (as in n. 97), p. 182: *Anno MCXIII Giraudus de Sala monasteria duo Cadoini et Bornet incepit*.

136 NANGLARD (ed.), *Livre des fiefs* (as in n. 72), p. 21, 45.

137 Timothy J. HUNTER, *Quid milites pugnantes?* An Early Representation of Chanson de Geste on the Romanesque Frieze of Angoulême Cathedral Reexamined, in: *Studies in Iconography* 34 (2013), p. 133–174.

138 De origine monasterii Fontis Dulcis, in: RHG (as in n. 14), vol. 14, p. 525; *Chronique latine de l'abbaye de La Couronne* (as in n. 124), p. 25.

139 The *Canso d'Antioca* (as in n. 9); HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 43. The »Canso« lists parties from the Saintonge, Bordeaux, Gascony, the viscount of Thouars and Poitevins, and Angoulême.

1130 when bishop Gerard decided to support the anti-pope Anacletus II – it would be strange if count and patriarch did not meet during count William’s sojourn in Jerusalem<sup>140</sup>. But the HPCE avoided embarrassing episodes of this kind; where the bishops were concerned, the chronicle wanted evidence of good religious character, regular additions to the cathedral’s wealth, and unruffled government. Events after 1130 brought forth further problems of this kind with which the HPCE had to deal, discussed in part 2 of this study.

140 HPCE (as in n. 1), p. 43. Robert Burchard Constantijn HUYGENS (ed.), *Willelmi Tyrensis archiepiscopi Chronicon*, Turnhout 1986 (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 63), p. 643, where Fulk was said to have been abbot of Canons Regular at Cellefrouin.

