Bishops, Canons, Counts, and the Writing of History in Angoulême, c. 1040 to 1160

Part 2: From the Anacletian Schism in the Province of Bordeaux to the Advent of the Plantagenet Dukes of Aquitaine*

Rowan Watson
Independent scholar, London

The Anacletian schism in the province of Bordeaux, 1130–1136

On the death of Honorius II in February 1130, there was a contested election for his successor, with Pietro Pierleoni gaining support in Rome itself and Gregorio Papareschi forced to flee. There was no clear case for either candidate, but Pietro remained in Rome as Pope Anacletus II while Gregorio, as Innocent II, fled to France and was recognised as pope even before the Council of Étampes in August or early September 1130; the major political forces in Christendom followed thereafter. Anacletus was then characterised as the antipope but in control of Rome itself. In May 1130, Anacletus confirmed Gerard as his legate, and it says much for Gerard's relations with the duke of Aquitaine – and perhaps even for the count of Angoulême's relations with the ruler of Poitiers – that he brought Duke William to support Anacletus. By the end of 1130, the prov-

* For part 1 of this study, see Rowan Watson, Bishops, Canons, Counts, and the Writing of History in Angoulême, c. 1040–1160: From the Angoulême Chronicle and the Advent of Reform to the Career of Gerard, Bishop and Papal Legate, in: Francia 51 (2024), 143–175, DOI 10.11588/fr.2024.1.113903.1

Francia 52 (2025), 93–127 DOI 10.11588/fr.2025.1.115612
ISSN 1867-6448, e-ISSN 2569-5452
Bishops, Canons, Counts, and the Writing of History in Angoulême (Part 2)
© 2025 by Rowan Watson
(ORCID iD 0009-0000-4443-4554) is licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0.
Abstracts in German, French and English can be found at the end of this article.

ince of Bordeaux was alone in the kingdom of France in preferring Anacletus to Innocent II as pope. It was undoubtedly with ducal backing, and presumably with that of the cathedral canons, that Gerard became archbishop of Bordeaux on the death of Arnaud de Cabanac on 29 April 1131 – the only suggestion that the Bordeaux canons objected to this comes from bishops outside the archdiocese who had declared for Innocent II.[1] Gerard had the united support of both the Duke and Count Vulgrin of Angoulême: when he was detained as a prisoner by Ademar of Archiac, the brother-in-law of Bishop William of Saintes, both duke and count joined forces to have him released.[2]

The Angoulême chronicle, the *Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium* (henceforth HPCE),[3] made no reference to the schism apart from mentioning, in the second account of Bishop Gerard's life, his request for forgiveness if he had been wrong to recognise Anacletus. Indeed the account of Gerard must be seen as an effort to eradicate this episode of Angoulême's past from historical memory. At the time when the HPCE was put together, reference to Gerard's promotion to the archbishopric of Bordeaux would be inappropriate. The Angoulême canons clearly continued to support their bishop after he had declared for the Antipope Anacletus II, so that Gerard could eventually die undisturbed at Angoulême on 1 March 1136.[4] Loyalty was doubtless cemented by the economic benefits for the city and diocese consequent on Gerard's holding church councils in Angoulême, as indeed from

1 Delphine Boyer-Gardner, La réputation face à la rumeur. *Fama* épiscopale et mémoires ecclésiales aux xi^e^–xii^e^ siècles, in: Maïté Billoré, Myriam Soria (eds.), La rumeur au Moyen Âge. Du mépris à la manipulation, Rennes 2011, 63–82, DOI 10.4000/books.pur.11966, 77–78, follows the invective account of Gerard by Arnulf of Lisieux and the letters of Bishop William of Saintes to Vulgrin, archbishop of Bourges, which talk of the Bordeaux canons being obliged to elect Gerard *violentia comitis*: see Migne PL 179, cols. 42–43. The account given here differs from that of Ursula Vones-Liebenstein, From Aquitaine to Provence. The Struggle for Influence during the Schism of 1130, in: John Doran, Damian J. Smith (eds.), Pope Innocent II (1130–43). The World vs the City, London 2016, DOI 10.4324/9781315601342, 152–171, 159–165.

2 Migne PL 179, col. 43. In his appeal to Vulgrin, archbishop of Bourges, Bishop William, driven from Saintes itself, asked for money »ut se [i.e. Ademar of Archiac] defendere possit adversus principem nostrum et Engolismensem comitum qui pro deliberando Girardo ei miniatur«.

3 Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium, ed. by Jacques Boussard, Paris 1957; its nature and compilation was discussed in Watson, Bishops (as in n. *), 144–145.

4 See the careful calculations of Alfred Richard, Histoire des comtes de Poitou, 778–1204, 2 vols., Paris 1903, vol. 2, 42–43. The HPCE contains two accounts of Gerard's life, the first wrongly dating his death to 23 July 1135.

what appears to have been a prolonged visit by Calixtus II in 1119,[5] quite apart from launching Angoulême as a major centre of power within Christendom. Gerard's collective way of working, whereby archbishops, bishops and senior clergy regularly participated in his judgements as legate, perhaps made them hesitate to deviate from his adherence to Anacletus.

The precise chronology of events in Aquitaine between 1130 and 1136, and the date at which Duke William declared for Innocent II and abandoned Gerard's association with Anacletus, is unclear, so that it is difficult to trace the process by which Innocent gained support. The rarity of episcopal charters from the archdiocese of Bordeaux that are securely dated between these years gives the impression that the normal working of ecclesiastical governance was in abeyance – those issued under Anacletus perhaps not retained – and it is remarkable that only two documents, both undated, are known issued by Gerard as archbishop of Bordeaux.[6] Outside elevated circles of government, a »wait and see« attitude probably prevailed. Crucial of course was the attitude of Duke William X. The partisans of Innocent II were careful not to alienate him, maintaining relations in order to persuade him to change his mind. Gerard was their target, and he attracted the fury of figures like Arnulf of Lisieux, a zealous proponent of strict observance and author of an extremely virulent attack on Gerard circulated when he, Gerard, was bishop. If the experience of Fulcher, the abbot of Cellefrouin who fled to Jerusalem, was typical, Gerard did indeed drive from office those individuals in his diocese who declared for Innocent II.[7] Duke William surely knew that his position was at odds with that of King Louis VI, so he consciously ignored the king's position. Bishop William of Périgueux suggested to Archbishop Vulgrin of Bourges that Louis be asked to intervene, but there was apparently no response to this

5 Odette Pontal, Les conciles de la France capétienne jusqu'en 1215, Paris 1995, 265, 294, 406. Calixtus II was in Angoulême on 11 August 1119: Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab condita ecclesia ad annum post Christum natum MCXCVIII, ed. Philippus Jaffé, ed. secundam correctam et auctam curaverunt Samuel Loewenfeld, Ferdinand Kaltenbrunner, Paul Ewald, vol. 1, Leipzig 1885, JL 6729. That his next stop was in Poitiers on 27 August suggests that his stay was prolonged. Once back in Rome, in October 1120, Calixtus renewed Gerard's position as legate (JL 6865).

6 Gallia christiana in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa, vol. 2, Paris 1873, Instr., col. 279, no. XVIII, both for Sainte-Croix in Bordeaux.

7 William of Tyre, Chronicon, ed. by Robert Burchard Constantijn Huygens, 2 vols., Turnhout 1986, vol. 1, 643; Gustav Zamore, Arnulf of Lisieux and the Crisis at Grestain 1164–6: Brother Bishops, Inherited Policies and Failed Leadership, in: Journal of Medieval History 46/4 (2020), 419–448, DOI 10.1080/03044181.2020.1787210, 419–448.

suggestion.[8] Partisans of Innocent II were evidently uncertain how much support their party might get in the archdiocese of Bordeaux. They can hardly have been unaware that after Bernard of Clairvaux had celebrated mass in Poitiers, probably in January 1132 (during a visit to confer with Duke William), Gerard rushed to desecrate the altar, and he had the support of the senior clerics in Poitiers when he did this.[9]

Duke William benefitted from the schism in that he was able to drive from office bishops with whom he had difficulties once they had declared for Innocent II. These were William Adelemus in Poitiers and Eustorgius in Limoges, the latter closely linked to Ademar, viscount of Limoges, with whom the duke had hostile relations. Charters of Saint-Maixent seem to refer to the schism and to Bishop William in a non-partisan way and suggest that dismissal was not immediate. The dating clause of a charter of 1130 refers to Innocent II as pope and William as bishop; another document of 1130 which mentions confirmation of a gift by the papal legate Gerard, bishop of Angoulême, was drawn up »anno obitus Honorii papae certantibus de papatu Gregorio et Petro« (Honorius died on 13 February 1130), again with William as bishop. As late as 1131, William appeared as bishop in a charter »secundo anno obitus Honorii papae, quando seditio erat inter Gregorium et Petrum de Lege [*sic* for *Leone*]«, a formula repeated in a document of 1132 – the phraseology appears pointedly neutral.[10] In ridding himself of these bishops, the duke was certainly acting in concert with Bishop Gerard. In these cases, the canons obligingly elected new bishops favoured by the duke, Peter of Châtellerault, cathedral canon and uncle of the duke's wife, for Poitiers and Ramnulf of Le Dorat for Limoges, the later consecrated by Gerard of Angoulême as directed by the duke but dying soon after in an accident. In the negotiations with Bernard of Clairvaux that ended the schism in Aquitaine, a sticking point was the requirement that Duke William take back Bishop William of Poitiers; once an agreement had been reached and Bishop William readmitted (and one can dis-

8 Migne PL 179, cols. 43–44.

9 Vita prima sancti Bernardi Claraevallis abbatis, ed. by Paul Verdeyen, Turnhout 2011, 114; Elphège Vacandard, Vie de Saint Bernard, 2 vols., Paris 1920, vol. 1, 319. Vacandard's chronology of Bernard's interventions in Aquitaine is not substantially revised by Peter Dinzelbacher, Bernhard von Clairvaux, Darmstadt 1998, 146–148, 158–161. A generalised distrust of fundamentalist reform is revealed by a troubadour: Sébastien-Abel Laurent, Le troubadour Marcabru dans la tourmente du schisme de l'anti-pape Anaclet II (1130–1135), in: Medioevo Europeo 7/1 /2023), 43–61.

10 Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'abbaye de Saint-Maixent, ed. by Alfred Richard, 2 vols., Poitiers 1886, vol. 1, 316–321, nos. CCXC–CCXCIII. The 1132 charter refers to the »altercatio Gregorii et Petri Leonis de papatu«.

count the miraculous ducal conversion recounted by Saint Bernard's biographer[11]), Duke William could agree to side with the pope who had been accepted by Louis VI and other rulers within and beyond the kingdom of France. Bishop Eustorgius of Limoges similarly regained his diocese and was in post in Limoges when he died in 1137.[12] The chronicler Geoffroi de Breuil attributed the ejection of Bishops William and Eustorgius to personal difficulties between duke and bishop rather than to the schism, reinstallation taking place once these were resolved.[13] Other ecclesiastics merely kept out of sight. In an undated letter to Archbishop Vulgrin of Bourges we learn that Bishop William Gardradus of Saintes and his canons had abandoned the city »ob metum et minas principis«, though he was not dismissed; he was described as bishop in a charter dated after 15 October 1131 by which Duke William made amends for having sacked Saint-Jean d'Angély – Ramnulf, recently made bishop of Limoges after the expulsion of Eustorgius as a supporter of Innocent II, also subscribed.[14] Charters of 1133 and 1134 show William Gardradus acting as the current bishop.[15] By 1136, he was working with Geoffrey of Chartres, the legate of Innocent II who oversaw the church affairs in Aquitaine as the new post-schism ecclesiastical regime was imposed.[16]

---

11 Pierre Boglioni, André Picard, Miracles et thaumaturgie dans la vie de Saint Bernard, in: Patrick Arabeyre et al. (eds.), Vies et légendes de Saint Bernard, Cîteaux 1993, 36–59.

12 Richard, Comtes de Poitou (as in n. 4), vol. 2, 24–27.

13 La chronique de Geoffroi de Breuil [once known as Geoffroi de Vigeois], ed. by Pierre Botineau, Jean-Loup Lemaitre, Bernadette Barrière, Paris 2021, 45–46. By this account Anacletus gained the papal throne (the *sedem Urbanam*) »quia de nobilioribus erat«.

14 Migne PL 179, col. 42; Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Jean d'Angély, ed. by Georges Musset, 2 vols., Paris, Saintes 1901–1903 (Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis, 30 and 33) [henceforth Cart.St.J.A.], vol. 1, no. CCXVII – the dating clause included »sedente in sede apostolica Anacleto papa secundo«.

15 In 1133, Bishop William, surrounded by his officials (dean and archdeacon, chancellor, praecentor, *magister scolarum*, archpriest) transferred a church to Baigne (Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Etienne de Baigne en Saintonge, ed. by abbé Cholet, Niort 1868 [henceforth Cart.Baigne], no. VII). Charters of 1133 and 1134 refer similarly to William as bishop of Saintes (Cartulaire de l'abbaye royale de Notre-Dame de Saintes [henceforth Notre-Dame de Saintes], in: Cartulaires inédits de la Saintonge, ed. by Théodore Grasilier, vol. 2, Niort 1871, nos. CXXII, CCXVIII).

16 Georges Musset, L'abbaye de la Grâce-Dieu, Paris, Saintes 1898, no. 1, dated 25 March 1135 or 1136. The date 1136 is preferable in that it takes account of the political situation, when Innocent II's position was unchallenged in the Bordeaux province. For the interventions of Geoffrey of Chartres in the province before and after 1136, see Wilhelm Janssen, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich vom Schisma Anaklets II. bis zum Tode Coelestins III. (1130–1198), Cologne, Graz 1961, 18–30, and Lindy Grant, Geof-

The date of Duke William's conversion to the cause of Innocent II is generally taken as January 1135 – and this seems plausible given that the first recorded intervention of Innocent II in the archdiocese of Bordeaux was a privilege of 30 March 1135 for Saint-Romain de Blaye, which by then could not have raised the ire of the duke.[17] If this date is reliable, it would show that the process of cleansing the church of supporters of Anacletus was slow and that Gerard maintained some authority to the end. There is no sign, for instance, that Geoffrey of Loroux became archbishop of Bordeaux before the end of March 1136, so that he was made archbishop only after Gerard's death on 1 March 1136.[18] After this date, Gerard's nephews, promoted by him to the »highest honours« in the church and one of them, Richard, even considered as Gerard's successor as bishop, were driven from the region.[19] Innocent II's major attack on the schismatics came at the Second Lateran Council in April 1139, that is to say after the death of Anacletus in 1138, perhaps indicating an effort not to offend neutral or hesitant parties by advancing too quickly. Geoffrey of Chartres, the legate of Innocent II, had supported Saint Bernard's negotiations with Duke William at Parthenay in 1135; after 1136, he acted in conjunction with Geoffrey, archbishop of Bordeaux, to establish new principles within the province of Bordeaux, part of this being to erase the memory of the heretic bishop Gerard.[20]

---

frey of Lèves, Bishop of Chartres: »Famous Wheeler and Dealer in Secular Business«, in: Rolf Grosse (ed.), Suger en question. Regards croisés sur Saint-Denis, Munich 2004, DOI 10.1524/9783486835427, 45–56, 52–53.

17 Vacandard, Saint Bernard (as in n. 9), vol. 1, 355–357; JL 7678 (as in n. 5); Epistolae pontificum Romanorum ineditae, ed. by Samuel Loewenfeld, Leipzig 1885, no. 179, 89–90.

18 See the discussion of the date of the foundation in Musset, La Grâce-Dieu (as in n. 16), 134–135, where 1136 is favoured, this being the first reference to Geoffrey of Loroux as archbishop.

19 Vita prima sancti Bernardi (as in n. 9), 117 (II 39). Gerard's nephew Richard was archdeacon in Angoulême in 1121 and given a group of churches that were to return to the *communem mensam* of the canons after his death, Richard also receiving other properties that were to return »ad iura episcopi et archidiaconi« after his death; provision was made for the eventuality that Richard become the next bishop (Cartulaire de l'église d'Angoulême, ed. by Jean Nanglard, Angoulême 1900 [henceforth Cart.Égl.Ang.], no. CLXXXIII).

20 Vita prima sancti Bernardi (as in n. 9), 114–115 (II 36); Vacandard, Saint Bernard (as in n. 9), vol. 1, 355–356. See Janssen, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich (as in n. 16), 21–22.

The aftermath of the Anacletian schism

The most significant factor in the slow acceptance of Innocent II in the province of Bordeaux, apart from the influence of Bishop Gerard and the duke, was his association with the current of reform that sought to impose strict observance on cathedral clergy and enforce their status as canons regular. Fulcher of Cellefrouin, mentioned above, was certainly committed to strict observance: when he fled Angoulême as a supporter of Innocent II, he joined the canons regular at the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. In addressing the bishops of Limoges, Poitiers, Périgueux and Saintes (those of Poitiers, Périgueux and Saintes having already appealed to Archbishop Vulgrin of Bourges for support against Gerard and Duke William), Saint Bernard stressed the support for Innocent II of the new eremitical orders of canons, from those of Camaldolese and Vallombrosa to those of Tiron, Cadouin, Marmoutier and Savigny, as well as the monks of Cluny, by now brought to stricter observance by Peter the Venerable.[21] Bernard made clear that the party of Innocent II represented the radical tendencies within the church, with strict observance of the rule of Saint Augustine obligatory for cathedral canons. Resistance to this tendency has been noticed throughout the kingdom of France, the most celebrated case perhaps being that of Paris in 1133/1134, when the canons drove their bishop to find refuge in the Cistercian abbey of Clairvaux, the matter resolved only with a major church council at Jouarre.[22]

A substantial proportion of the clergy of Aquitaine appears to have hesitated to accept Innocent II on account of his association with fundamentalist reform. As with the canons of Tours, there was a reluctance to join the party of Innocent II.[23] The example of the neighbouring cathedral of Cahors, where

21 Bernard de Clairvaux, Lettres, ed. by Monique and Gaston Duchet-Suchaux, vol. 3, Paris 2012, epistola CXXVI, par. 10, 269–270. Peter the Venerable in 1132 convoked all those in charge of dependent monasteries to Cluny »ut precepta monasticae conversationis austeriora […] audirent«: The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, ed. by Marjorie Chibnall, vol. 6, Oxford 1978, 424 (XIII).

22 Pontal, Conciles (as in n. 5), 315–317. Imposition by bishops of strict observance on their canons, however, is barely mentioned as a source of dispute in Myriam Soria Audebert, La crosse brisée. Des évêques agressés dans une Église en conflits (royaume de France, fin x^e^–début xiii^e^ siècle), Turnhout 2005.

23 Jean-Hervé Foulon, Église et réforme au Moyen Âge. Papauté, milieux réformateurs et ecclésiologie dans les Pays de la Loire au tournant des xi^e^–xii^e^ siècles, Brussels 2008, 324; Myriam Soria, La trahison schismatique, un outil de propagande (début xii^e^ siècle), in: ead., Maïté Billoré (eds.), La trahison au Moyen Âge, Rennes 2009, DOI 10.4000/books.pur.125454, 103–123, 114–115, referring to the »schisme épiscopal à Tours« in 1133.

the bishop, Gerard, had introduced a stringent new regime on his canons before 1090, showed the brutal changes involved when a life of communal poverty, with total submission to the dictates of the bishop and rejection of links with families and secular society, was adopted.[24] The conservative inclinations of the Angoulême canons, and their lack of enthusiasm for radical elements of reform, have been mentioned above.

When Geoffrey of Loroux was nominated successor to Gerard as archbishop of Bordeaux in 1136, the canons of Bordeaux cathedral can hardly have welcomed the nomination of a reformer known for his dedication to fundamentalist reform. This was a cleric who had been *magister scholarum* at the cathedral in Angers but relinquished his position to seek a *vita arctior* and by the 1120s was founding groups of canons of strict observance.[25] The apprehensions of the Bordeaux canons were justified: Geoffrey's efforts to impose a new and stricter way of life on the canons as *pauperes Christi* resulted in his being thrown out of the city in 1140 for a period of over four years. From even before the dispute was resolved, Louis VI had, in mid-June 1137, acceded to Archbishop Geoffrey's request to have free canonical elections of bishops and abbots in the province of Bordeaux confirmed, in a privilege reissued by his son Louis VII on 1/8 August of the same year. These grants can only have gratified the clergy of reformist tendencies; the privilege stipulated that no bishop was to perform homage to any secular ruler, and that ecclesiastical revenues were not to be touched during vacancies – there is no evidence of these practices, but Geoffrey was clearly seizing the moment as the Capetian monarch became the duke of Aquitaine to establish the principle of the church's freedom from any lay interference.[26] By 1145, Louis VII was firmly on the

24 Guillaume Lacoste, Histoire générale de la province de Quercy, Paris 1883, vol. 1, 436–438. Reform in Cahors required firm support from the count of Toulouse and from Popes Urban II, Pascal II and Calixtus; canons unwilling to accept new conditions were deprived of their benefices.

25 Jean-Hervé Foulon, Un représentant de la spiritualité canoniale au XII^e siècle? Geoffroy du Loroux (†1158), in: Michel Parisse (ed.), Les chanoines réguliers: émergence et expansion (XI^e–XIII^e siècles), Saint-Étienne 2009; Frédéric Boutoulle, L'archevêque et les communautés canoniales en Bordelais pendant la réforme grégorienne (1079–1145), in: Michelle Fournié, Daniel Le Blévec, Florian Mazel (eds.), La réforme »grégorienne« dans le Midi (milieu XI–début XIII^e siècle, Toulouse 2013 (Cahiers de Fanjeaux, 48), 393–418, DOI 10.3406/cafan.2013.2176. On Geoffrey's views of ideal social order, see Peter Jones, Is Paradise a Democracy? The Heavenly City as a Political Paradigm, c. 1145–1155, in: Past & Present 263/1 (2024), 47–80, 69–71, 76, DOI 10.1093/pastj/gtad014.

26 Jean Dufour, Recueil des actes de Louis VI, roi de France, vol. 2, Paris 1992, no. 387, 312–319; Achille Luchaire, Études sur les actes de Louis VII, Paris 1885, no. 1, 97–98.

side of the reformers. A settlement in that year was brokered by Peter, abbot of Saint-Romain de Blaye (a house of reformed canons) acting with Saint Bernard and the papal legate Alberic of Ostia, and with the support of Louis VII. The terms were very advantageous to the canons then in office, in that those hostile to a new way of life were left undisturbed. In a separate document, Louis VII instructed his *prévôt*, *proceres* and the citizens of Bordeaux to support those canons who had chosen the »vita canonica […] secundum beati Augustini regulam« while allowing those unwilling to adopt the *regulam vitam* to retain their prebends (»stipendia sua et reditus suos«) for their lifetime.[27] Commitment to ideals of poverty and collective living were clearly minimal among the clergy of the province of Bordeaux when Geoffrey became archbishop.

The reputation and authority of Bishop Gerard did not disappear overnight after 1130, and it is a corrective to the diatribes of Saint Bernard and Arnulf of Lisieux against this schismatic bishop to find that a local historian like Geoffroi de Breuil attributed Innocent II's victory over Anacletus to the fact that Anacletus died before Innocent, or that an outsider like Ordericus Vitalis bore Gerard no particular grudge, commenting only on the extraordinary learning of this *vir eruditissimus* when he died in 1136. Geoffroi de Breuil may have been voicing a popular view when he reported, almost approvingly, Bishop Gerard's view that the candidate who controlled the city of Rome should be regarded as legitimate – and it was Anacletus, not Innocent II, who was established in Rome.[28]

The resolution of the schism in Aquitaine and the victory of the party of Innocent II brought with them a new regime to which the church had to adapt. Supporters of Anacletus had to make amends. Brought over to the side of Innocent II, Duke William X, by way of expiation, endowed Clairvaux with land to found a Cistercian abbey, La Grâce-Dieu, between Niort and La Rochelle.[29]

---

27 For the document in the name of Abbot Peter resolving the dispute, with its reference to the confirmation of Louis VII, see Gallia christiana (as in n. 6), cols. 814–815. For the order of Louis VII, see Luchaire, Études (as in n. 26), no. 165, 152, the text published in Jérôme Lopès, L'église métropolitaine et primatiale de Sainct André de Bourdeaux, où il est traité de la noblesse, droits, honneurs, prééminences de cette église avec l'histoire de ses archevesques et le pouillé des bénéfices du diocèze, Bordeaux 1668, revised edition by Jules Callen, Bordeaux 1884, vol. 2, 446.

28 Geoffroi de Breuil, Chronique (as in n. 13), 45; on Ordericus and the schism, see Myriam Soria Audebert, La propagande pontificale et sa réception au temps des schismes (xi^{e}–xii^{e} siècles). Innocent II, Anaclet II: la mémoire d'une guerre de libelles, lectures et débats, in: Rossana Castano, Fortunata Latella, Tania Sorrenti (eds.), Comunicazione e propaganda nei secoli XII et XIII, Rome 2007, 595–612, 603–605.

29 Musset, La Grâce-Dieu (as in n. 16), no. 1.

During the schism, Count Vulgrin was probably excommunicated by Archbishop Vulgrin of Bourges as one of the *fautores* of Bishop Gerard.[30] An endowment of Clairvaux itself by the count was surely an expiatory gesture. A charter of 1153 indicates that Bernard of Clairvaux had in the past been given land at Échoisy in the forest of La Boixe by a count of Angoulême, unnamed, as well as by the cathedral and Peter Ostend, the latter a powerful landowner closely associated with the count. The abbey monks of Saint-Amant-de-Boixe had resisted this gift, to the extent of impeding and destroying building works there and suffering excommunication. In 1153, Bernard renounced the gift he had received from the count, surrendering it to Saint-Amant; monetary compensation of 60 marks of silver was given to Clairvaux.[31] It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Vulgrin was the count in question, and that he was also the count to whom Saint Bernard had written earlier to complain about the high charges to which the gifted land was subject.[32] There are references to privileges bestowed on La Couronne, an abbey of canons regular and proponent of radical reform, by Count Vulgrin – in a bull of 1144 and in a comital charter of 1155/1179 – but there is no way of knowing if these were expiatory gestures made after 1136.[33] The same can be said of references in a bull of Lucius II of 1144/1145 to an exemption for Fontdouce from taxes by both Duke William X and Count Vulgrin with the »baronibus illius terre«: given that Fontdouce was an abbey of strict observance founded by Géraud de Sales, this may well have been another expiatory gesture to the post-Anacletian regime.[34]

The advent of Lambert, the abbot of La Couronne, as bishop of Angoulême

30 See the letter of Vulgrin, archbishop of Bourges, to the bishops of Agen, Poitiers, Périgueux and Saintes, and the clergy of the province of Bordeaux printed in Migne PL 179, cols. 44–45.

31 Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Amant-de-Boixe, ed. by André Debord, Poitiers 1982 [henceforth Cart.St.A.B.], nos. 231, 320.

32 S. Bernardi opera, vol. 8: Epistolae, ed. by Jean Leclercq, Henri Rochais, Rome 1977, 215, no. CCXCIX.

33 Vulgrin's exemption is mentioned in a papal bull of 1144 (JL 8544 [see n. 5]), printed in Chronique latine de l'abbaye de La Couronne, ed. by Jean-François Eusèbe Castaigne, Paris 1864, 119–123. Vulgrin's taking La Couronne *sub nostra defensione* is noted in a confirmation of the privilege by his son Count William in 1155/1179: Angoulême, Archives départementales de la Charente, H 2/29, original, mentioned in Chronique latine de l'abbaye de La Couronne, 126, n. 1; for the text see Rowan Watson, The Counts of Angoulême from the 9th to the mid-13th Century, with a Catalogue of Comital Documents from 882/883 to 1246, PhD, University of East Anglia 1979 (available on the British Library EThOS website, ref: uk.bl.ethos.476652), 357–360, cat. no. 176.

34 Papsturkunden in Frankreich, ed. by Wilhelm Wiederhold, vol. 6, Berlin 1911, 39–41, no. 14; JL 8694 (as in n. 5).

on 24 May 1136,[35] nearly three months after the death of Gerard, provides another sign of accommodation to a new ecclesiastical regime. Certainly, this was a cleric much respected by Saint Bernard, sufficient evidence of his support of strict observance.[36] According to the HPCE, Lambert »took up the government of the church«, with no mention of an election, as if appointed by an external force.[37] There is no sign that Count Vulgrin had any difficulty in accepting Lambert as bishop, as though detached from engagement with ecclesiastical politics. During the schism, Lambert can hardly have approved of Vulgrin's protection of the schismatic Bishop Gerard. At an earlier date, in 1122, Vulgrin was said to have participated in the consecration of Lambert's church of La Couronne, and the remark of the HPCE that, once bishop, Lambert was in 1140 called to Vulgrin's deathbed in Bouteville and given responsibility for his *testamentum* suggests good relations.[38] As bishop, Lambert adopted the epithet »inutilis et indignus minister Engolismensis ecclesie« in his charters, a formula unthinkable for his predecessor and abandoned by his successors: this identifies Lambert clearly as a radical reformer.[39] He at once is found with the group of reforming clergy that ran the church of Aquitaine after 1136. He was in Bordeaux for the marriage of Louis VII to Eleanor of Aquitaine in late July 1137, part of a clerical party made up of Geoffrey of Chartres, now Innocent II's legate for Aquitaine, and the new archbishop of Bordeaux, Geoffrey of Loroux, together with Bishop William, now reinstated in Saintes, and Bishop Raymond of Agen. Lambert's subsequent appearances with Geoffrey of Chartres and Archbishop Geoffrey in dealing with cases in Poitou and Brittany show him at the centre of the reforming party,[40] as does his role in sheltering Grimoard in Angoulême in 1140 when Louis VII refused

35 Robert Favreau, Évêques d'Angoulême et Saintes (avant 1200), in: Revue historique du Centre-Ouest 9 (2010), 5–142, 33.

36 On his death, Bernard referred to Lambert as *sanctae memoriae*: S. Bernardi opera (as in n. 32), 177, no. CCLXVIII.

37 HPCE (as in n. 3), 39: Lambert »suscepit regimen Engolismensis ecclesiae«.

38 Chronique latine de l'abbaye de La Couronne (as in n. 33), 23; HPCE (as in n. 3), 42.

39 See for instance Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Cybard, ed. by Paul Lefrancq, Angoulême 1930 [henceforth Cart.St.Cybard], nos. 41, 42; Angoulême, Archives départementales de la Charente, 2H 89/1 (chirograph of 1143 for La Couronne); Cart.St.A.B. (as in n. 31), no. 322. Hugh, abbot of the reformed Saint-Cybard, adopted a similar phraseology, »Hugo abbas et indignus minister« – Cart.St.Cybard, no. 186, dated 1128. In a charter of 1083/1098 of Baigne, Bishop Ademar is uncharacteristically called »Engolismensis ecclesie rector immeritus«, a flattering epithet from a reformed environment: Cart.Baigne (as in n. 15), no. LXIV.

40 See the references in Favreau, Évêques (as in n. 35), 34.

to accept his nomination as bishop of Poitiers: Grimoard, who had been abbot of Les Alleuds (an eremitical monastery of strict observance founded by his brother Géraud de Sales), was consecrated in Angoulême by Archbishop Geoffrey of Loroux.[41] It seems particularly appropriate that Lambert was among bishops who took part in the reform, on Innocent II's instructions, of the canons of Saint-Hilaire of Poitiers in 1143 – though there are no indications that comparable reform was imposed on the Angoulême canons.[42] Bishop Lambert followed legate Geoffrey of Chartres's instructions, relayed to him by Innocent II at the Second Lateran Council in 1139, to remove all traces of Bishop Gerard's rule: the HPCE bitterly recorded that, despite Gerard's being a »magnificum sidus quod claritate sui partes occiduas illustraverat«, his body was cast out of the cathedral he himself had built to be buried »sub vili […] lapide – pro dolor!«.[43]

The reaction on the part of the Angoulême cathedral canons to the regime represented by Lambert emerges from the letter of Saint Bernard to Pope Eugenius III objecting to the choice of their cantor, Hugh of La Rochefoucauld, as successor to Bishop Lambert in 1149. Hugh, according to the HPCE, was made bishop »electione cleri, petitione populi, principis assensu«, showing that he was legitimately elected. Other sources suggest that the election was contested. Saint Bernard described Hugh as driven by ambition: »de ambitione notatum, convictum, condemnatur«, and noted that, as bishop, Lambert had demoted him and made him ineligible for promotion (»a spe totius promotionis solemniter, ut debuit, degradavit«).[44] Here, Bernard was responding to the canons of La Couronne, who had called for Hugh's election to be nullified. Their credentials as radical reformers are indicated by the fact that they went on under Lambert's successor as abbot to develop links with the abbots of Clairvaux, Cîteaux and Cluny, doubtless to the annoyance of the An-

41 Chronique de Saint-Maixent, ed. by Jean Verdon, Paris 1979, 196; Marcel Pacaut, Louis VII et les élections épiscopales dans le royaume de France, Paris 1957, 92–93, 151.

42 Louis Rédet, Documents pour l'histoire de l'église de St-Hilaire de Poitiers, in: Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest 14 (1847), 1–362 and 19 (1852), 1–462, vol. 14, no. 23.

43 La chronique de Morigny (1095–1152), ed. by Léon Mirot, Paris 1909, 72–73; Charles Joseph Hefele, Henri Leclercq (eds.), Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux, vol. 5, part 1, Paris 1912, 721–723; Pontificum Romanorum qui fuerunt inde ab exeunte saeculo IX usque ad finem saeculi XIII vitae ab aequalibus conscriptae, ed. by Johann Matthias Watterich, vol. 2, Leipzig 1862, 250–251; HPCE (as in n. 3), 38. Geoffroi de Breuil, Chronique (as in n. 13), 46, related the removal of Gerard's tomb to the direct instructions of Innocent II.

44 S. Bernardi opera (as in n. 32), 177, no. CCLXVIII.

goulême canons. The same position was shown by their election as abbot, on the death of Lambert's successor Fulk Arradi, of one Helias Grataud, a venerated brother of exemplary piety. Their hope that spiritual qualities were sufficient to run an institution was confounded: Helias at once was deemed incapable of the administrative duties of an abbot and had to be replaced.[45] In the event, Eugenius III rejected the advice of his mentor, Saint Bernard, and confirmed Hugh as bishop. The Angoulême canons clearly resented the interference of Bernard and of the Cistercians in general. In a subtle attack on the saint, they recorded in the HPCE that Hugh had been an enthusiastic follower of Gilbert de la Porrée, since 1142 bishop of Poitiers, the theologian systematically hounded by Saint Bernard as a heretic for his doctrine on the Trinity.[46] This represented a very different position from that of Bishop Lambert, who, if not recorded as attending the council of Paris in 1147, was certainly at Eugenius III's council in Reims in March 1148 where Saint Bernard launched a major attack on Gilbert.[47] Once elected, Bishop Hugh saw to the removal of the Cistercians from the diocese. In 1153, he led the delegation to Clairvaux where the return of land at Échoisy to Saint-Amant-de-Boixe was arranged. The election of Hugh as bishop in 1149 marked an assertion of independence by the Angoulême canons in the face of those promoting strict reform.[48] The ejection of Cistercians from the diocese was a clear indication that there was limited enthusiasm for reformed monastic orders or subjection to outside institutions within the diocese. This may have been a more general prejudice within the province of Bordeaux, since no Cistercian rose to become bishop there in the twelfth century.[49] The same rejection of outside interference can

45 Chronique latine de l'abbaye de La Couronne (as in n. 33), 27, 30.

46 HPCE (as in n. 3), 44: »magistro Gisleberto in Galliis adhaerens, illum maxime in theologia sequutus est«.

47 Ibid.; Pontal, Conciles (as in n. 5), 324–325, 328–332; Nikolaus M. Häring, The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers, Toronto 1966, 3–5; Dinzelbacher, Bernhard (as in n. 9), 307–310. Lambert's presence at Reims, with the archbishop of Bordeaux and the bishop of Saintes, is recorded in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 137, fol. 100v; the list of attenders at Reims is not noted in Rodney M. Thomson, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts of Corpus Christi College Oxford, Cambridge 2011, 68–69.

48 See the account of the election by Sabine Teubner-Schoebel, Bernhard von Clairvaux als Vermittler an der Kurie. Eine Auswertung seiner Briefsammlung, Bonn 1993, 237–242.

49 A list of Cistercian bishops is given in René Crozet, L'épiscopat de France et l'Ordre de Cîteaux au XII[e] siècle, in: Cahiers de civilisation médiévale 18/71–72 (1975), 263–268, DOI 10.3406/ccmed.1975.2012.

be seen when Saint-Cybard, aided by Bishop Peter of Angoulême, managed to negotiate an end to its subjection to the Cluniac Saint-Jean d'Angély in 1161. The latter had the power of appointing the abbot, prior and other offices of Saint-Cybard; Saint-Jean d'Angély pointed to the comital gift to them of the abbey by Counts Fulk in c. 1073 and his son William in 1087/1091 as the basis of their jurisdiction,[50] to which Saint-Cybard responded that their »liberty and immunity« had greater weight. In the event, the papal legate, William of San Pietro in Vincoli, confirmed an agreement by which Saint-Cybard ceded the church of Haimps to Saint-Jean d'Angély to buy its freedom.[51] But tensions remained within the diocese. It may have been under Bishop Hugh, or his successor Bishop Peter, previously abbot of Saint-Amant-de-Boixe, that election procedures were modified to give a voice to abbots within the diocese: this may explain the election of Jean de Saint-Val, abbot of La Couronne, on Peter's death in 1182, as a result of which enormous tensions arose between the conservative canons and a radical cleric from an abbey of strict observance, necessitating papal intervention.[52]

Appeals to history and the claim to royal protection

The other change of regime to which the rulers of Angoulême had to adjust at the end of the Anacletian schism was the advent of Louis VII as duke on his marriage in late July 1137 in Bordeaux to Eleanor of Aquitaine, the heiress of Duke William X. The sources that describe the duke's choice of King Louis VI as the guardian of his daughter all come from outside Aquitaine. Suger described how the duke's messengers, on reaching Louis VI in Béthisy after the duke's death in Santiago de Compostela, informed him of the duke's decision to commit his daugher to the king, a decision said to have been taken by the duke both before and during his last journey. It is tempting to see William X's choice to make the Capetian monarch responsible for his heir, Eleanor, as consequent upon his rallying to the party of Innocent II, whose theological view would have taken the duke as a vassal subordinate to Louis VI. In a situation where there was uncertainty about principles of inheritance,

50 Cart.St.J.A.(as in n. 14), vol. 1, no. CCCXXXIII.

51 Ibid., vol. 2, pièces annexes nos. XVII, XVIII. The abbot of Saint-Cybard asserted that »se et ecclesiam suam ab illius subiectione fore prorsus liberam et immunem«.

52 Cécile Piveteau, Les évêques d'Angoulême aux XIII[e] et XIV[e] siècles, in: Bulletins et mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente (1983), 119–139, especially 120–121; Favreau, Évêques (as in n. 35), 39.

Louis saw fit to send immediately a very sizeable army to get hold of Eleanor in Bordeaux, where, it is reasonable to assume, the new archbishop, Geoffrey of Loroux, made sure Eleanor was safe from any prince who might seize her and acquire the duchy once a marriage had been arranged and consumated. Louis VI's actions can be seen as a coup.[53]

The HPCE was very quiet about relations between count and duke when the latter was Louis VII. In 1145 and 1151/1152, Louis VII's *prévôt* in Saintes was one William Maingot: if this is the »G Maengot« mentioned in the HPCE who tried to help Arnald Bochard in a dispute with Count William after 1147, it might indicate that officials of the king were indeed continuing to get involved with the affairs of the county of Angoulême.[54] Other than Count William's following Louis VII on crusade in 1147, though in an independent party, the only evidence that he waited upon Louis as duke comes from 1152, less than two months before his separation from Eleanor of Aquitaine, when he attended Louis at Saint-Jean d'Angély in February, after which he was designated an assessor in a case brought before Louis in March that year.[55] The HPCE makes no reference to Louis VII as duke, only as king.

Any criticism of the counts of Angoulême would be quite inappropriate in a panegyric like the HPCE, and reference to disputes between the counts and church institutions was totally avoided. Charter sources show that clashes between the counts and clergy were not uncommon, and that the count often claimed rights over ecclesiastical land which ecclesiastics disputed. Such rights became clearly defined only when a compromise or agreement was reached in particular instances. Thus in 1138 a dispute arose when the servants of Count Vulgrin claimed rights over cattle on cathedral lands near Hiersac and Puy-

53 Suger, Vie de Louis VI le Gros, ed. by Henri Waquet, Paris 2007, 280; La chronique de Morigny (as in n. 43), 65–67; Jane Martindale, Succession and Politics in the Romance-Speaking World, c. 1000–1140, in: ead., Status, Authority and Regional Power: Aquitaine and France, 9th to 12th Centuries, Aldershot 1997, 19–41, no. V. Boutoulle suggests that Eleanor had been left for safekeeping with Archbishop Geoffrey in Bordeaux rather than in Poitiers: Frédéric Boutoulle, 1137. Aliénor d'Aquitaine épouse Louis le Jeune et devient reine de France, Portet-sur-Garonne 2021, 11.

54 HPCE (as in n. 3), 45; for Maingot with Louis at Saintes and Saint-Hilaire-sur-l'Autize, see Luchaire, Études (as in n. 26), nos. 163 (1145/1146), 268 (1151/1152).

55 Ibid., no. 270. The documents of February and March 1152 were printed in Jean Besly, Histoire des comtes de Poictou et ducs de Guyenne, Paris 1647, 309–311, that of February reprinted in Gallia christiana (as in n. 6), Instr., cols. 282–283, and that of 8 March mentioned in ibid., col. 1367. See also Richard, Comtes de Poitou (as in n. 4), vol. 2, 104.

moyen in the vicinity of Angoulême, as well as military service, while in March 1141 Count William had to agree that he had no claim on straw which his officials had seized on the cathedral's lands near Soyaux in the shadow of Angoulême.[56] The nearest the HPCE got to censuring comital activity comes in a passage concerning Vulgrin, count in 1120–1140. A list of his virtues is qualified by the remark that he imposed some evil customs on the lands of his own men, useful for the historian in suggesting that the count could have the same kind of dispute with his lay subordinates as with the church, and also indicating the audience for which the HPCE was intended, that is to say lay landowners who may have had to suffer from comital impositions and taxes – such people might also have appreciated the flattering epithets given to the lords of the region.[57]

The importance for the authors of the HPCE of establishing a direct link with the Capetian monarchy overrode the impulse to present their counts in a systematically favourable light. As bishop, Lambert appealed directly to Louis VII to complain that Count William was persecuting the church. Lambert had apparently taken to heart the royal privilege issued at the time of Eleanor of Aquitaine's marriage to Louis VII in 1137 about the freedom of the church in the province of Bordeaux, where the monarch was presented as protector of church lands. Louis VII's rebuke to Count William, best dated before 30 March 1141,[58] was cited in full in the HPCE, as it was in the cathedral's cartulary being compiled at about this time: the count's fault was thus made clear to all.[59] Perhaps out of delicacy, Count William's subsequent oath to Lambert to behave responsibly was included only in the cartulary.[60] If Lambert's action was provoked by a minor affair such as the seizure of straw in 1141, it would show that the case was generated to establish a principle rather than settle a difficult dispute. Louis VII had heard that William, addressed as a royal *fidelis* (which the HPCE would have been keen to stress), was harassing the church of Angoulême (»in bonis Engolismensis ecclesiae manus extendis«), the church being one founded by royal endowments (»de regalibus bonis fundata erat«). Royal responsibility for the church in An-

56 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 19), nos. CXLI, CXLV.

57 HPCE (as in n. 3), 32: »[Vulgrin comes] pro proprietatis suae amplificandae cupidus, quosdam terrae suae homines malas imponendo consuetudines gravavit«.

58 Louis's letter refers to a future visit to Aquitaine, which must be that between 30 March 1141 and April 1142 and before his presence in front of Toulouse on 24 June 1141: see Marcel Pacaut, Louis VII et son royaume, Paris 1964, 31–32. Luchaire, Études (as in n. 26), no. 74, dates the letter to before the summer of 1141.

59 HPCE (as in n. 3), 42–43; Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 19), no. CLV.

60 Ibid., no. CCIX: »[Ego Willelmus] servabo fideliter et honorabo personam ipsius [i.e. Lamberti] […] in his quae ad eum pertinent«.

goulême was made clear. William was ordered to cease persecuting the church, and Louis threatened to judge the case himself when next in Aquitaine if bishop and count were not reconciled.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the threat of enhanced Poitevin power, as Henry II became duke on marrying Eleanor in May 1152 and then king of England in 1154, made the authors of the HPCE insist on Angoulême's subordination to the Capetian monarchs and their predecessors. Whether or not Henry II performed homage to Louis VII in 1156 when they met on the border of Normandy and the royal domain, and whether or not Henry recognised that he held Aquitaine from the French crown at this juncture, the authors of the HPCE could only be aware that a new status of subjection to Plantagenet power was a real possibility.[61]

The HPCE furthered Lambert's initiative by providing historical precedents for a direct link with the Capetian crown. Lambert, it was said, informed Louis VII that the bishops of Angoulême had always acted as royal chaplains whenever the king crossed the Loire into Aquitaine – »quod Ludovicus rex non contradixit«.[62] This can only have been a spurious claim. The theme of royal engagement with Angoulême was taken back as far as Merovingian times. Following Ademar of Chabannes († 1034), the HPCE stated that King Clovis (481–511) had rebuilt the cathedral and that Oliba (recorded as bishop in 875–892) and Count Vulgrin († 886) had been appointed by Charles the Bald. The HPCE went beyond this in saying that Launus, bishop in 848–862, had also been designated by a Carolingian, Pippin II, king of Aquitaine in 838–851/852.[63] Bishop Grimoard (991–1018), it was claimed, obtained a privilege from Hugh Capet as king of France, just as his successor Roho, bishop in 1018–1032, obtained one from Hugh's son King Robert – these were imagined sequels to the genuine privilege of Charles the Bald of 852 mentioned in the chronicle.[64] There is absolutely no corroborating evidence for these claims,

61 Robert of Torigni described how Henry II and Louis VII met on the border of Normandy and Francia in 1156 but says nothing about whether homage of any kind was performed (The Chronicle of Robert of Torigni, ed. by Richard Howlett, in: Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I., vol. 4, London 1889, 186). Jacques Boussard, Le gouvernement d'Henri II Plantegenêt, Paris 1956, 408–409, n. 4, states that the meeting was »la preuve qu'Henri prêta hommage à Louis VII pour la Normandie, l'Aquitaine, l'Anjou, le Maine et leurs dépendances«. Yves Sassier, Louis VII, Paris 1991, 250, is less sure.

62 HPCE (as in n. 3), 43.

63 Ibid., 4.

64 Ibid., 4–5: »tempus Caroli cuius regis scripto et impressione anuli sui possessiones clericorum confirmari fecit«; 15: »[Grimoardus episcopus] per quem Hugo rex Francorum

any more than there is for the story that Gerald, bishop in 1037–c. 1043, fled the »tyrannidem dapiferorum suorum« to the safety of the royal abbey of Saint-Denis outside Paris where he died and was buried. Reference to the inscription on Bishop Gerald's tomb in Saint-Denis gives the story an air of credibility, though the idea that he fled from his *dapiferi* does not seem plausible: Gerald appeared regularly in the charters of Count Geoffrey, and we can assume he was thus protected by comital authority.[65] By 1159, the community in Angoulême would find the idea of a direct link with the French crown reassuring, as it began to be seen that Plantagenet power threatened the independence of the diocese and county of Angoulême itself.

Warfare in the HPCE

The theme of warfare runs throughout the HPCE. What weight to give the accounts of warfare is one of the major challenges in interpreting the chronicle. The HPCE necessarily resorted to boastful and enthusiastic hyperbole as it sought to create a glorious past for Angoulême, so that we can be sceptical about some of its claims. The question arises as well whether accounts of wars between c. 1040 and 1159 should lead us to see a period of social disorder and an ongoing »feudal anarchy« after the supposedly more controlled conditions of the Carolingian era, or whether the period was part of a continuum where something called »war« was an accepted means of conflict resolution, governed by a set of conventions, and not signifying major social disruption. What our sources call warfare can usually, in fact, be seen as part of a conventional process, a way of regulating social relations, with codes of conduct more or less respected by the ruling classes, the populations they controlled having little voice in the matter.[66]

The wars recounted in the HPCE need not be taken to indicate all-out war or war with strategic intent to modify the feudal geography of the area. The wars represent rather jostling between lords to interpret custom to their advantage. It would be dangerous to take this as the sign of a breakdown of a notional order, one that the Plantagenets endeavoured to restore once they had

privilegium cathedrali ecclesiae Engolismensi dedit«; 16: »[Roho episcopus] cuius manu Robertus rex Gallicanus cathedralem Engolismensem ecclesiam privilegiavit«.

65 Ibid., 24.

66 Hélène Couderc-Barraud, La violence, l'ordre et la paix. Résoudre les conflits en Gascogne du XI^e^ au début du XIII^e^ siècle, Toulouse 2008, DOI 10.4000/books.pumi.11598, 195–196.

conquered the area.[67] The assumptions of nineteenth-century historians, too easily following Anglo-Norman chroniclers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, live on, with Aquitaine often seen as an area of endemic violence populated by untrustworthy ethnic groups.[68] The accession of Henry II to the dukedom on his marriage to Eleanor of Aquitaine in May 1152 is more convincingly seen as marking a real watershed in the politics of the duchy. Those resisting the Plantagenet regime thereafter were not troublesome feudatories disturbing the peace but independent rulers opposing, to use modern parlance, subjection to an imperialist power with its ability to assemble armies of overwhelming military strength, its endless financial resources, its prescriptive legal assumptions, its imposition of rigid hierarchical subordination, its foreign language and culture and its view of Aquitaine as a land of incomprehensible customs and strange laws.[69] Richard as king in 1194 told Philip Augustus that it was an ancient custom for *magnates* in Poitou and his other lands in Aquitaine to settle their disputes »by the sword«, indicating that he accepted the tradition.[70] The term *magnates* here would refer to the lords who might act as guarantors of the terms of a treaty, but references to wars in charters show that they could also characterise relations between those of lesser rank, landowners who were knights. A charter of 1200 illustrates this tradition.[71] A noble lady, Agnes, daughter of Count Ademar's uncle Geoffrey Martel, after »multarum guerrarum turbacionem« between her two sons (by different fathers) Pons of Mirebeau and Reginald of Pons, imposed a compli-

67 See the discussion in Philippe Buc, What is Order? In the Aftermath of the »Feudal Transformation« Debates, in: Francia 46 (2019), 281–300, DOI 10.11588/fr.2019.0.83886, especially 294–295.

68 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. Literature and Society in Southern France between the Eleventh and Thirteenth Centuries, Woodbridge 2005, 57–81.

69 Nicholas Vincent, King Henry II and the Poitevins, in: Martin Aurell (ed.), La cour Plantagenêt (1154–1204), Poitiers 2000, 103–135, 105–106, discusses the nature of the Plantagenet *Empire*, citing John of Salisbury about the strangeness of Aquitaine (125). Martin Aurell, Aliénor d'Aquitaine. Souveraine femme, Paris 2024, 229, talks of Henry II's imposition of justice, as reported by Ralph de Diceto, as marking »une rupture avec l'ancien système seigneurial« in the region.

70 Roger of Howden, Chronica, ed. by William Stubbs, 4 vols., London 1868–1871, vol. 3, 254–255, commented that King Richard, in negotiations with Philip Augustus in 1194, »violare nolebat consuetudines et leges Pictaviae vel aliarum terrarum suarum, in quibus consuetum erat ab antiquo, ut magnates causas proprias invicem gladiis allegarent«.

71 Layettes du trésor des chartes, vol. 5, ed. by Henri-François Delaborde, Paris 1909, DOI 10.11588/diglit.33531, no. 131.

cated settlement to end the dispute, with a provision that should Gifardus, lord of Didonne, contest the final arrangements, the brothers were to support the title of each »sive in pace, sive in guerra«; since all the lands were within the *dominium* of Count Ademar of Angoulême, he was called on to sanction the arrangement, having had, as far as one can tell, no part in intervening in the *guerras*. Ademar had no role in supressing a *guerra* but only in confirming its outcome.

The authors of the HPCE took it as axiomatic that military activity was an integral aspect of nobility, a mark of effective government; the honour and prestige of the counts could not have been demonstrated without reference to successful warfare, with skill in fighting the essential attribute of a great ruler. The centrality of warfare in aristocratic thinking appears, for instance, in the troubadour literature of a poet like Bertran de Born; that the love poetry of troubadours could abound with military metaphors illustrates the same point. It was from this culture that tournaments developed, as a training and even a substitute for war.[72] In writing of war, the canons resorted to a literary form that most satisfied the military classes. The counts were necessarily handsome and warrior-like. Count William († 1120) possessed unparalleled strength (»in corpore quantitatis maior virtus non extitit«), his skill with his lance a defining quality; his son Vulgrin, »pulcherrimae compositionis«, was »militiae peritus« and »timor hostium, […] summus miles prae caeteris« – his fame as a cult figure seems confirmed in the charters of his son William, count in 1140–1179, where he frequently appeared in the suscription with a new epithet as »comes Engolismensis, filius Vulgrini comitis«. This William was not honoured by martial epithets, though in 1140 he was a »iuvenis elegantis formae«. The counts' enemies were necessarily worthy opponents: Duke William IX was »praeclarissimus et strenuissimus«, while Bardon of Cognac was »illustris ac benignae largitatis vir«, and Audouin of Barbezieux »vir bellicosus«, in a context indicating that this was a compliment; Hugh VI of Lusignan was a »vir prudens and bellicosus«, Ademar of La Rochefoucauld a »dominus magnae audaciae et calliditatis«, Ademar of Archiac a »praestans vir«. When we see from other sources that these lords were closely linked by intermarriage and

72 Laurent Macé, Petite histoire des troubadours, Morlaàs 2023, 95, discussing Bertran de Born: »Pour ce troubadour du dernier quart du XII^e siècle, l'activité guerrière fait partie intégrante de ce qui est l'essence du chevalier; pour lui, elle est la vie même«. Michel Parisse, Le tournoi en France, des origines à la fin du XIII^e siècle, in: Josef Fleckenstein (ed.), Das ritterliche Turnier im Mittelalter, Göttingen 1985, 175–201, 181, suggested that the sculptured panel on the facade at the west end of the cathedral of Angoulême depicted jousting – see Watson, Bishops (as in n. *), 174 n. 137.

by marriages to the comital family, they appear as a close-knit community.[73] Other than a reference to Ralph of Jarnac as the count's brother-in-law, the HPCE does not mention these links – and it avoids mentioning, for instance, that Count Vulgrin, by his second marriage to the daughter of the viscount of Châtellerault, was brother-in-law to Duke William X.[74] The compliment the canons paid to their fabulously wealthy colleague Itier Archambaud († 1125), that he was »militari progenie ortus«, indicates that they shared the values of their secular masters.[75]

As a panegyric, the HPCE could hardly praise the economic advantages that came with successful warfare, but the canons were supremely aware that this was the case and that with warfare came conventions to be respected during military operations. Count William was congratulated for repulsing his enemies from the honours of Barbezieux and Cognac in 1087/1120; the comment that »non paucos ex eorum militibus cepit« can only indicate that profitable ransoms for the knights were in the offing. A difficult phrase even suggests that Count Vulgrin's generosity extended to helping his knights buy their way out of similar captivity: »largitas illius [*sc.* Vulgrini] in reficiendis et procurandis honorifice ac devinciendis militibus«. Respect for peers was maintained: when William Maingot was captured during an incursion into the county in the 1150s, he survived to enjoy a successful career as servant of the Plantagenet dukes, having probably bought himself out of captivity through a ransom or through negotiation.[76]

Though the HPCE mentions an instance when the duke supported Count Vulgrin – in a dispute about the fourth part of the castle of Montignac – it seems clear that counts gained the greatest glory when outwitting the duke. This of course was not appropriate in 1137–1152 when the duke was King Louis VII, so there is a discrete silence about that period. The instinctive suspicion of Poitevin power is shown in the brief reference to comital intervention in Limoges under Count William († 1120). No context is given, but con-

73 André Debord, La société laïque dans les pays de la Charente, x^e^–xii^e^ siècles, Paris 1984, 168–171.

74 HPCE (as in n. 3), 45. Aimery, viscount of Châtellerault (c. 1101–1151), had two daughters: Aénor married Duke William X, dead by 1137 (Eleanor of Aquitaine was an issue of this marriage), while Amabilis was the second wife of Count Vulgrin (HPCE [as in n. 3], 42). See Alfred Hérault, Histoire de Châtellerault, 4 vols., Châtellerault 1927–1928, vol. 1, 58; François Chamard, Chronologie historique des vicomtes de Châtellerault, in: Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest 35 (1870–1871), 79–122, 107.

75 HPCE (as in n. 3), 28, 35.

76 Ibid., 29, 32–33, 42, 45; Vincent, King Henry II (as in n. 69), 114; Debord, Société laïque (as in n. 73), 519.

temporary readers would have known that the dukes had great authority in Limoges, so that William's protecting the *castellum* of Saint-Martial from harassment (»a multis infestationibus«) and relieving the *castellum* of Aixe-sur-Vienne from a siege by the duke would indicate praiseworthy support for an ally who lived in the shadow of ducal power. The duke's power base in Limoges was the cathedral, whereas the viscount was associated with the abbey of Saint-Martial, both institutions with their own burgh. Count William's sister was said to be married to Viscount Itier of Limoges which was likely to have been a factor in this intervention, one of the few in the HPCE outside lands where the count had some control.[77]

Use of the term *guerra* in the HPCE appears dramatic and has been taken to indicate prolonged warfare that disrupted the region; it has also been seized on by historians developing enthusiastic narratives of heroic battles, political conflict and power struggles.[78] However, in conventional usage as found in charters drawn up by churchmen and others, it referred to an accepted state of relations between individuals or groups, a state that was temporary and involved negotiation and compromise.[79] The way warfare was discussed in the HPCE allows us to see that it involved much posturing. Duke William IX's public boasting in Limoges that he would reverse Count Vulgrin's seizure of the heiress of Chabannais and Confolens could hardly be a unique instance: his failure to take action was interpreted as a great victory for Vulgrin. By the same token, Count Vulgrin's disagreement with Duke William IX concerning Blaye was resolved by negotiation, though the HPCE took the opportunity to glamorise the military preparations that preceded the settlement.

In the chronicle, it often seems best to translate the term *guerra* as »dispute« rather than »war«. Bishop Hugh (973–990) had »maximas guerras« with Count Arnald – reasons for doubting this have been given in part 1[80] – though in 988 he was participating with Count William to establish the monastery of

77 HPCE (as in n. 3), 29; Geoffroi de Breuil, Chronique (as in n. 13), 36, 47; Charles de Lasteyrie, L'abbaye de Saint-Martial de Limoges. Étude historique, économique et archéologique, précédée de recherches nouvelles sur la vie du saint, Paris 1901, 91.

78 Apart from Richard, Comtes de Poitou (as in n. 4), see Prosper Boissonnade, L'ascension, le déclin et la chute d'un grand état féodal du Centre-Ouest. Les Taillefer et les Lusignan comtes de la Marche et d'Angoulême et leurs relations avec les Capétiens et les Plantagenets (1137–1314), in: Bulletins et mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente (1935) [1936], 3–258, 25–31.

79 Pertinent are the remarks of Patrick J. Geary, Vivre en conflit dans une France sans État: typologie des mécanismes de règlements des conflits (1050–1200), in: Annales ÉSC 41/5 (1986), 1107–1133, DOI 10.3406/ahess.1986.283335, 1118–1119.

80 Watson, Bishops (as in n. *), 155, n. 48.

Saint-Amant-de-Boixe. It was said that Bishop William (1043–1076) had »maximas guerras« and military confrontations with his brother Count Fulk (1047–1087), though both appeared together regularly in charters – it is difficult anyway to see how sustained warfare between bishop and count could be carried out when the bishop's premises in Angoulême were in the shadow of the count's castle in the city and where, in all probability, the count controlled the gates to the city.[81] Count William (1140–1179) was said to have »magnas guerras« with his brother-in-law Ralph of Jarnac and with his own half-brothers, Fulk of Matha and Geoffrey Martel. Nothing is known of what was at stake, but the half-brothers appear supporting Count William in charters of 1147 and 1161, as if relations were normal – the career of Fulk as seneschal for Henry II dates only from 1170.[82] There was also a *guerra* with Guy of La Rochefoucauld, one of the rare occasions when the HPCE described the consequences of war for non-combatants (everything outside the keep was destroyed by fire and pillaged – if there was brutality, it was matched only by Vulgrin's taking of Mansle when he was said to have killed, beheaded and drowned the *malefactores*). In all these cases, *guerra* did not lead, it seems, to long-term enmity.

The word creeps into documentary sources from the mid-eleventh century to describe temporary states of relations between two parties. Hugh VI of Lusignan mentioned his *guerra* with Duke Guy-Geoffrey in 1069 while appearing with the duke in charters of 1072 and 1074.[83] The rulers of the area made provision for periods when they were in a state of *guerra*, so that exemptions from some privilege, taxation or right granted previously to a religious institution could be suspended. The word *bellum* appears as a synonym. Duke William in 1126 exempted the men of Montierneuf from duties known as *exercitus* and *expeditio* except when he was in a state of *bellum*, and by the same token, Count William of Angoulême in 1147 was able to demand military service from his men in Bouteville, Archiac and Châteauneuf but only

81 The earliest detailed information on comital control comes from 1255 and the following years. See the documents in Edmond Martène, Ursin Durand, Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum historicorum, dogmaticorum, moralium, amplissima collectio, vol. 7, Paris 1733, cols. 148–168, from Paris, BNF, lat. 13913, and Prosper Boissonnade, La décadence de l'état féodal des Lusignans-Taillefer, in: Bulletins et mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente (1943) [1948], 3–48, 38–39.

82 Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 19), no. CLXI; Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 14), vol. 2, pièces annexes no. XIX; Debord, Société laïque (as in n. 73), 400–401.

83 Richard, Chartes et documents (as in n. 10), vol. 1, CXXIV; Joseph-Louis Lacurie, Histoire de l'abbaye de Maillezais, Fontenay-le-Comte 1852, 216–218, note XXII; Archives historiques du département de la Gironde 3 (1861–1862), no. II, 44–45.

when he was attacked.[84] The stipulation in a charter of 1104/1126 that relief from ducal taxes over land of Saint-Jean d'Angély should be suspended when the »populus undecunque vocatus, etiam de alaudiis militum [i.e. even from allodial land held by knights], ad […] bellum pro patria pugnaturus«, was an indication that services were demanded and exemptions cancelled as a state of military law was imposed in areas under seigneurial control which ignored any tenurial relations.[85] These terms were also used to describe moments in a process leading to a resolution of differences. In 1112, for example, the powerful landowner Peter Baudrant gave his rights over the church of Haimps to Bishop Gerard and persuaded his son, with whom he had been in a state of *guerra*, to participate in the gift.[86] In c. 1119, Airaudus Jammo »guerram habuit« with his lord, the abbess of Notre-Dame de Saintes, but was brought round to *amicitia* and eventually »dedit illi suum fidium [*sic* for *fidem*]«.[87] In 1130/1136 Abbot Ramnulf of Lesterps drew up a long account of the vicious acts and seizures perpetrated by one Itier Boso and his henchmen; there had been a number of court appearances whose judgements Boso failed to recognise. During this process were periods of *guerra* which appear as moments of disagreement in an ongoing series of negotiations.[88] That some form of warfare was an acknowledged and expected element in resolving specific disputes is seen in the document of c. 1109 by which the abbot of Saint-Jean d'Angély and Ademar of Rancon agreed to maintain good relations with each other should either of them ever find themselves in a state of conflict with the duke.[89] In all these examples, warfare did not involve the suspension of relations and prolonged antagonism between parties in dispute.

The HPCE makes clear that in the wars it described there were ever-shifting patterns of alliance with little consistency of alignment. Ademar of Archiac, Auduin of Barbezieux and Bardon of Cognac, supported by Duke William,

84 Recueil des documents relatifs à l'abbaye de Montierneuf de Poitiers (1076–1319), ed. by François Villard, Poitiers 1973, no. 61; Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 19), no. CLXI.

85 Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 14), vol. 2, no. CCCCXCI, datable by the reference to Abbot Henry, elected in 1104, and the duke's death in 1126.

86 Ibid., pièces annexes no. XI.

87 Notre-Dame de Saintes (as in n. 15), no. CCXIX.

88 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, 3e série, 4 (1862), 47–63, 57–62.

89 Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 14), vol. 1, no. XXIX. The »pactiones et conferationes« referred to the anger of the duke (*ira*) and the possibility of *discordia* with him; should Ademar have to oppose the duke (»si molestat cum comite Pictavensi«), he was not to cancel the *fidelitas* owed to the abbot.

might be enemies of Count William († 1120) on one occasion, but before this father's death, Vulgrin regained the castle of Archiac, presumably for Ademar, against Duke William IX, Bardon of Cognac and Auduin of Barbezieux.[90] In this latter instance, the help of Bishop Gerard was mentioned. As in the case of Vulgrin's support for the »proceres et milites et populus« of Pons against the duke's seizure of two towers »in honore castri Pontis«, the HPCE was glorifying as war the military preliminaries in a process where negotiation played the major part.[91] Count Vulgrin in 1120/1126 had the help of Duke William when he faced Itier of Villebois, Bardon of Cognac, Geoffrey of Rancon and Hugh VII le Brun of Lusignan in a dispute about a quarter part of the castle of Montignac.[92] Shortly before 1140, Vulgrin ensured that Bardon of Cognac's son, Helie, regained his share of the castle of Villebois which had been seized by Itier of Villebois and Geoffrey of Rancon.[93] In this environment, it would be dangerous to follow André Debord in taking these details from the HPCE, and the fact that Bardon of Cognac and Ademar of Archiac subscribed a charter for Bayonne of Duke William IX dated 1120 at Saint-Sever in Gascony, as evidence that these lords had joined the clientele of the duke.[94] A charter of 1120/1127 shows Count Vulgrin together with Ademar of Archiac settling a dispute over a gift to La Couronne of land at La Gravolière near Archiac rather undermines this assumption. By the same token, Itier of Cognac was a comital enemy in the 1150s according to the HPCE but appeared with Count William in 1157 in the company of Itier of Barbezieux and others to adjudicate a case about inheritance dues owed by a comital vassal – Itier of Barbezieux had in 1141 stood as witness to Count William's oath to Bishop Lambert, suggesting a tradition of family loyalty.[95] At the consecration of the new church of Saint-Amant-de-Boixe in 1170, Count William could be found with Itier of Cognac, Guy of La Rochefoucauld and Arnald Bochard, all of them mentioned as comital enemies in 1159, but by 1170 apparently acting in conjunction with the count.[96] The evidence of charters provides a foil to the hyperbole of the HPCE. Count William's wars in the 1150s

90 HPCE (as in n. 3), 29, 32.
91 Ibid., 39–40
92 Ibid., 34–35.
93 Ibid., 41.
94 Jean Justin Monlezun, Histoire de la Gascogne depuis les temps les plus reculés jusqu'à nos jours, vol. 6, Auch 1849, 391; Debord, Société laïque (as in n. 73), 172.
95 Ibid., 172, 523; Watson, Counts of Angoulême (as in n. 33), cat. nos. 130, 320–324 (copy of 1644 of a lost original), 161, 345 (Paris, AN, K 1144, no. 17); Cart.Égl.Ang. (as in n. 19), no. CCIX.
96 Cart.St.A.B. (as in n. 31), no. 273.

with his brothers Fulk of Matha and Geoffrey Martel did not prevent them cooperating when in 1161 all three participated as Fulk ceded his rights over the church in Haimps to Saint-Jean d'Angély.[97] The situation appears little different from that described in the 1020s, when the *Conventum* shows the duke, at the height of his power, enjoying stable and even good relations with his vassals that were punctuated with disagreements and war.[98]

Disagreement very often can be seen to involve the terms by which the counts held honours or rights of the duke. The focus was on those areas of the Saintonge and Angoumois where the parties described had interests – it is worth saying this, since the counts in the late eleventh century had interests in Gascony at Saint-Macaire and at Benauges, acquired through marriage, which are barely commented upon, apart from reference to a campaign to recover these places from the »homines […] infideles« who had temporarily seized them.[99] Relations with the duke were the chief concern. When towers were built in Pons (in the *castrum* or in the honour) in the Saintonge, Duke William IX arrived to demolish them, so that the injured parties called on Count Vulgrin in 1120/1127 to defend their position. The dispute revolved around who had the right to license new fortifications – in this case the matter was settled by negotiation, though as mentioned above, the HPCE relished the count's military preparations to enforce his right. Vulgrin's intervention in Mansle, where a *munitio* had been erected against him, shows how jealously guarded was the seigneurial right to licence fortifications.[100] For much of the twelfth century, there was no agreement about rules governing the succession of an heiress. The problem surrounding the heiress of Jordan Eschivat, lord of Chabannais and Confolens, was mentioned above. When he died, both count and duke claimed the right to dispose of her, and, with her, control of Chabannais and Confolens.[101] Vulgrin managed to seize the heiress and bestow her first on Robert Burgundus (a man from a family linked to

97 HPCE (as in n. 3), 45; Cart.St.J.A. (as in n. 14), vol. 2, pièces annexes no. XIX.

98 Jane Martindale, Dispute, Settlement and Orality in the *Conventum inter Guillelmum Aquitanorum comitem et Hugonem Chiliarchum.* A Postscript to the Edition of 1969, in: ead., Status, Authority and Regional Power (as in n. 53), 1–36, no. VIII.

99 HPCE (as in n. 3), 29; Richard, Comtes de Poitou (as in n. 4), vol. 1, 412, refers to a dating clause in a charter of 1096 from Saint-Jean d'Angély (Cart.St.J.A. [as in n. 14], vol. 1, no. CLXXXIII) which alludes to Duke William IX occupying the stronghold (*arcis*) of Saint-Macaire and expelling the population: Richard suggests the duke may have then handed over the place to Count William.

100 HPCE (as in n. 3), 41.

101 Ibid., 33–34, 39–40.

that of the dukes)[102] and then on William of Matha, fighting off the ambitions of Ademar of La Rochefoucauld, who claimed the honours through his wife, probably another daughter of Jordan – Ademar here was supported by the duke. On another occasion, Hugh VI of Lusignan claimed the right »occasione iuris hereditarii« to the county of La Marche, but his pretentions were resisted by the count of Angoulême – the HPCE does not indicate why Count William contested Hugh's claim, though he may have been involved in a disputed succession after the deaths of Counts Audebert and Boso in 1088 and 1091.[103] A later chronicle pointed to the problem that arose after the death of Bardon of Cognac in 1136 or 1137. Though Bardon appears to have left a male heir – it is not known whether he was a minor or not – control of his widow, Emma, daughter of the viscount of Limoges, was claimed by Duke William X, who planned to marry her. In the event, William, son of Count Vulgrin of Angoulême, asserted the right of the Angoulême counts to control succession: he captured Emma and married her before the duke could act and before he himself became count. The prize here may have been Limoges itself. Emma's father, Ademar, had no male heirs, so that Emma may have been a contender. Ademar in 1139 was to designate two grandsons as heirs, an agreement said to have been ratified by Louis VII, who fined them as having acted without his consent rather than dismissing their right.[104] It is clear in the case of Cognac that Count William claimed overlordship, though he was summoned to Poitiers by Henry II, probably in 1166, where he was forced to relinquish any such claim.[105]

---

102 Scott Jessee, Crusaders and Templars: Robert the Burgundian Lord of Craon and Sablé and his Descendants, 1095–1192, in: Medieval Prosopography 30 (2015), 31–58, 41–42.

103 HPCE (as in n. 3), 29; Clément de Vasselot de Régné, Pouvoir et solidarités d'une famille seigneuriale. Le »Parentat« Lusignan entre France, Îles Britanniques et Orient latin (x^e–xiv^e siècles), Turnhout 2024, 55; Georges Thomas, Les Comtes de la Marche de la maison de Charroux, x^e siècle–1177, in: Mémoires de la Société des sciences naturelles et archéologiques de la Creuse 23 (1925–1927), 561–700, 601; Martindale, Succession and Politics (as in n. 53), 35.

104 Geoffroi de Breuil, Chronique (as in n. 13), 39, 47, 49. In an undated charter from Dalon, Emma was »comitissa, uxor comitis Engolismensis, filia Ademari vicecomitis Lemovicensis«: Le cartulaire de l'abbaye Notre-Dame de Dalon, ed. by Louis Grillon, Périgueux 2004, no. 870. Emma probably died early: a charter dated 1171 of Count William with his later wife, Margaret (sister of the viscount of Turenne), refers to six adult children, apparently all theirs (Cart.St.A.B. [as in n. 31], no. 302). Geoffroi de Breuil commented that William was Margaret's third husband and that, with her, he was »multorum pater liberorum« (54).

105 Registre des comptes d'Alfonse comte de Poitiers (1243–1247. Archives nationales KK. 376; musée 247.), ed. by Abel Bardonnet, in: Archives historiques du Poitou 4

Although the lords mentioned in the HPCE were identified by their attachment to individual castles and honours, their resources and power in the twelfth century appear based on conglomerations of rights and lands rather than unified honours. The scope for ambiguity and disagreement was enormous. It was a quarter part of the castle of Montignac that generated a dispute under Count Vulgrin, and one part of the *castellum* of Villebois which provoked a quarrel between Itier of Villebois, Geoffrey of Rancon and Helias of Cognac that Vulgrin had to settle by arms.[106] A charter of Count William datable only to 1155/1179 refers to a comital *firmitas* in Archiac, and we should entertain the possibility that while Ademar of Archiac was either an enemy or an ally of the counts in the HPCE, the count may have had at the same time his own premises in Archiac itself, alongside those of its lord.[107] These details in the HPCE imply that the kind of coseigneurie well documented in Gascony and the Midi also characterised these parts of southern Aquitaine. Coseigneurie is quite clear in some instances: Count Vulgrin himself in 1131 was one of four lords »qui pariter in castello Oleronis dominabantur«; at a later date, joint owners of rights and property would be termed *portionarii*, so that in 1239, for example, Itier, lord of Barbezieux, in ceding his rights in the lordship of Merpins to the count and countess of Angoulême, Hugh X of Lusignan and Queen Isabella, stated that they had been *portionarii* in the *dominium* of the lordship of Merpins.[108] For the twelfth century, there is no evidence as clear as that for Pierre-Buffière in the Limousin, where Viscount Ademar in 1129 settled a dispute by agreeing that one lord would hold the castle for six months and two others for three

(1875), 1–234, 21–22. Dating relies on periods when it is known that Henry II was in Poitiers.

106 HPCE (as in n. 3), 34–35, 40–41. In both these cases, the aggrieved parties had *dominium* over their share.

107 Watson, Counts of Angoulême (as in n. 33), cat. no. 176; the original is in the Archives départementales de la Charente, H 2/29.

108 Cartulaire saintongeais de la Trinité de Vendôme, ed. by Charles Métais, Paris, Saintes 1893 (Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis, 22), no. LV; Hélène Débax, La seigneurie collective. Pairs, pariers, paratge: les coseigneurs du XI^e^ au XIII^e^ siècle, Rennes 2012, DOI 10.4000/books.pur.128058, see especially 27–28, 49–50. For the *portionarii* of Merpins in 1239 (in other sources, the spelling *partionarii* was common), see Georges Thomas, Cartulaire des comtes de La Marche et d'Angoulême, Angoulême 1934, 66–68, no. XXXIII. The Livre des fiefs de Guillaume de Blaye, évêque d'Angoulême [1273–1307], ed. Jean Nanglard, in: Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente, 7^e^ série, 5 (1904–1905) [1906], refers regularly to minor properties held jointly by *parcionarii*, and not at the level of the lordship.

months each.[109] These instances illustrate well the kinds of disagreements that could arise when the power of a lord relied on fragmented resources rather than clear control of a lordship.

The case of Blaye is particularly difficult to interpret. It is worth considering in detail since it indicates how dangerous it can be to take literally the claims made by the HPCE. Blaye was among benefices given by Duke William the Great to Count William before 1028. Count William's son Alduin, count in 1028–1031, fought for it with his brother Geoffrey and granted him three parts of it with the fourth part retained by the count – an early instance of coseigneurie; when Geoffrey became count in 1031, Blaye was given to his younger son Geoffrey Rudel, whose descendants, given the title *dominus*, were attached to Blaye up to the late twelfth century and beyond.[110] Its lords were also at times closely associated with the dukes. William Fredelandus was an intimate member of the group that governed the dukedom when William IX was a minor after 1086.[111] A document of 1079/1097 described William Fredelandus as *de Blavia oppido*. He was in control of shipping dues but had only a part-share in the cens to which ships were liable; he exempted La Sauve Majeure from these taxes for one ship a year, as he endowed the abbey as well with land in Blaye and some vines. Count William of Angoulême and his uncle Bishop Ademar validated the gift, so we can assume they had an interest in the rights being ceded.[112] William Fredelandus also had property in the county of Angoulême which needed the agreement of Count William and Bishop Ademar to bestow it on Charroux in 1100.[113] William Fredelandus belonged to a line of rulers of Blaye given the title *dominus*, and these instances show that his exercise of rights in Blaye was subject to the agreement of the comital family; they also show how someone with the title *dominus* could have resources far from the castle from which they took their name. Blaye was surely of crucial strategic importance for Poitevin power once Duke Guy-Geoffrey and his successors operated in Gascony after 1058: control of

109 Geoffroi de Breuil, Chronique (as in n. 13), 44–45; Vincent Roblin, Recueil des actes des vicomtes de Limoges (x^{e}–xiv^{e} siècle), Geneva 2009, no. 74, 189–190.

110 Ademar of Chabannes, Chronicon, ed. by Pascale Bourgain, Richard Landes, Georges Pon, Turnhout 1999, 188 (III 67); HPCE (as in n. 3), 26; Paul Cravayat, Les origines du troubadour Jaufré Rudel, in: Romania 282/2 (1950), 166–179, DOI 10.3406/roma.1950.3702; Debord, Société laïque (as in n. 73), 208.

111 Richard, Comtes de Poitou (as in n. 4), vol. 1, 390–391.

112 Grand cartulaire de la Sauve Majeure, ed. by Charles Higounet, Arlette Higounet-Nadal, 2 vols., Bordeaux 1996, vol. 2, no. 946, 513–514.

113 Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'abbaye de Charroux, ed. by Dom Pierre de Monsambert, Poitiers 1910, no. XXII.

Bordeaux was essential in this activity, and Blaye guarded what was by far the best route from Poitiers and Saintes to Bordeaux, Gascony and beyond – indeed, it was the conventional route. The twelfth-century pilgrim's guide to Compostela shows Blaye as a necessary site to visit on the itinerary from Saintes and Saint-Eutrope to Bordeaux. After Eleanor of Aquitaine's marriage to the young Louis VII in Bordeaux in July 1137, the large army dispatched by Louis VI to collect her returned to Poitiers through the Saintonge, which makes it more than likely that the route went through Blaye.[114] How the interests of duke, count of Angoulême and the lords of Blaye were reconciled does not appear. The HPCE tells us that Duke Guy-Geoffrey seized Blaye – thus before 1086 – and that his son William IX held it until Count Vulgrin gained it back in 1120/1127, improving the fortifications such that it could resist Duke William »usque in hodiernum«.[115] It seems most likely that Count Vulgrin, and his father before him, had some kind of understanding about their respective rights in Blaye: for the HPCE to boast that ducal authority was excluded from Blaye seems excessive. It does not seem conceivable that the dukes could tolerate anything other than direct control of such a place or have a secure base there, though there is no indication of this until 1158, when Henry II held a major diplomatic conference there as part of his plans to take Toulouse.[116] Certainly, it was under the Plantagenet dukes that Blaye was unquestionably under their direct control, though what rights accrued to any *dominus* of the place is not evident.

The disputes recounted in the HPCE have been interpreted as part of power struggles to control lordships in the Saintonge and Angoumois, with the counts of Angoulême determined to prevent their falling into the hands of the dukes of Aquitaine – the discussion in this essay has aimed to modify this approach.[117] André Debord's magisterial study of the Charente basin tends to force the evidence to fit the pattern made canonical by Georges Duby's study of the Mâconnais, whereby the region experienced an *éclatement* of a public

114 Suger, Vie de Louis VI le Gros (as in n. 53), 282–283; Le Guide du pèlerin de Saint-Jacques de Compostelle, ed. by Jeanne Vielliard, Mâcon ³1963, 64–65, 78–79.

115 HPCE (as in n. 3), 33.

116 The Chronicle of Robert of Torigni (as in n. 61), 200; Jane Martindale, »An Unfinished Business«: Angevin Politics and the Siege of Toulouse, 1159, in: John Gillingham (ed.), Anglo-Norman Studies XXIII. Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2000, Woodbridge 2001, 115–154, 120–121.

117 Richard, Comtes de Poitou (as in n. 4), takes this view, as does Debord, Société laïque (as in n. 73), and, most recently, Robert Favreau, Le comté d'Angoulême au début du XIII^e siècle, in: Isabelle d'Angoulême, comtesse-reine et son temps (1186–1248), Poitiers 1999, 9–16.

authority – that of the count – as castellans emancipated themselves from comital control from the mid-eleventh century, before a *redressement* as the counts reimposed their authority from the 1150s. Given the qualities of the HPCE, as discussed above, it would be unwise to use the references to comital wars against neighbouring lords in the first half of the twelfth century to support this theme, any more than to rely on witness lists in charters to track the association of these lords with the count. Performance of homage by the counts to the dukes in the eleventh century and up to 1126, addressed above, indicates that there was some kind of stability in the framework within which the counts operated. The HPCE was silent on the nature of specific relations between the count and lords of the region. The counts were evidently the heroes of the narrative, but the implication is that the *guerras* between them and the lords of the region were wars between equals, the count gaining preeminence on the basis of his superior character and military abilities.

Against the background of wars described in celebratory tones, the occasional insertion in the HPCE of the term *comitatus* shows an awareness on the part of the canons of a new legal principle that underpinned comital authority, one that marked the independence of the county as an integrated unit of government with rights inherent in the office, and not in the person, of the count. Its appearance in the HPCE provides an early example of this new legalistic vocabulary in Aquitaine; it was to flourish in the thirteenth century, as comital government sought to consolidate the rights that formed the basis of their power, with homage demanded of lords and others »ratione comitatus«. The twelfth-century manuscript of Ademar of Chabannes' chronicle includes the remark that the castles of Archiac and Bouteville had always belonged »ad comitem Engolismensem«, which the HPCE transformed into »ad comitatum Engolismensem«; Fulk in 1047 was said to have inherited the »comitatum Engolismae« from his father, Count Geoffrey, just as Count William before 1120 was said to be »consulatum tenente«. La Marche was also referred to as a *comitatus*. The term crops up as well in institutions where there were legally-educated clerics, so that a charter from Baigne of 1101/1109 could refer to »Willelmus Taliafer […] Engolismensem regens comitatum«.[118] The lords with their flattering epithets were collectively known as barons, though how this term related to the *comitatus* for the authors of the HPCE is not totally clear, beyond the idea that it implies a group of nobles in some way of a lower social rank than a duke or a count. It is only in a very general way that the HPCE uses the term to suggest subordination to the count. A lord like

118 Cart.Baigne (as in n. 15), no. 288.

Geoffrey of Rancon, whose enormous resources stretched across the Saintonge and the Aunis, and who was among comital enemies under Count Vulgrin, had his own barons.[119] The term baron was used in charters of the early twelfth century, but almost always to indicate a group with individuals not identified. Bardon of Cognac was described in the HPCE as one of a group of barons, and, as mentioned above, Count William claimed the homage of its lord; in the event, it was wrenched from him by Henry II. As to the nature of the relations of the lords just mentioned, one can do no more than remark that William in 1043, Ademar in 1076, Lambert in 1136 and Hugh in 1149, when they became bishops, were described as »natione Engolismensis«, in Hugh's case also as *oppidanus* of La Rochefoucauld; if there was such a thing as an Angoumoisin nation, then it was surely the count who was in some way regarded as its overlord. Of other bishops, Hugh in 973 was »natione Xantonicus«, Grimoard in 991 »natione Petragoricus«, Roho in 1018 »natione Pictaviensis«, and even Gerard, the most celebrated of Angoulême bishops, was »natione Normannus«. This sensitivity about ethnic origins was quite lacking in the early eleventh-century chronicle of Ademar of Chabannes.[120]

The HPCE finishes with an abrupt break in the narrative. After an incidental reference to Count William joining Henry II's campaign against Toulouse in 1159, the text ends with a full description of the death in that year of Bishop Hugh, preceded by an account of Hugh's leading role in excluding Henry II from the election of the archbishop of Bordeaux in 1158 – the HPCE could thus end on a heroic note. The compilers of the chronicle cannot have been unaware of the implications of the comital participation in Henry II's campaign. The size of the army was unprecedented, a demonstration that a new superpower had arrived in the region.[121] This reference to the 1159 expedition was entirely casual, used to date the terminal illness of Bishop Hugh – it very probably represented some kind of feudal service imposed on the count by the duke, but to have commented upon it would have undermined the chronicle's main purpose, which was to celebrate Angoulême's past as an independent authority, one whose power had been guaranteed by the qualities of its

119 Cart.St.A.B. (as in n. 31), no. 102 (1136/1142); Debord, Société laïque (as in n. 73), 189–193, sees the terms *barones* and *proceres* as replacing adjectives of nobility (*nobiles*) in the first part of the twelfth century, disappearing after the mid-twelfth century, *barones* like *proceres*, being from the class that could hold seigneurial rights (the *bannum*) and not indicating tenurial dependency as it did in the thirteenth century.

120 HPCE (as in n. 3), 27, 38, 44; 13–14, 15, 16, 30.

121 Wilfred Lewis Warren, Henry II, London 1973, 86; Boussard, Le gouvernement (as in n. 61), 418–419.

secular and clerical rulers. When Count William was termed »permissione divina comes Engolismensis« in a charter of 1157 for Saint-Florent de Saumur, it appears as a declaration of independence.[122] The years after 1159 were to demonstrate what Henry II and Richard as duke could inflict on those resisting Plantagenet rule in Aquitaine, and this was infinitely more destructive than the wars described in the HPCE. The loss of comital castles in 1169, the taking of Angoulême by Richard Cœur de Lion followed by the despatch of Count William to England in 1176, and the surrender of Angoulême by Count Vulgrin to Richard in 1179 were catastrophes which would be too painful to record but which increased the need for a history that glorified the achievements of an independent Angoulême.[123] On Bishop Hugh's death on 12 August 1159, tensions in Angoulême escalated into a riot (»tota civitas in seditionem versa est«): nothing is known of these tensions, but description of them could have no place in a work whose aim was to propagate a myth of success and harmony delivered by the independent ecclesiastical and secular leaders of the city over the preceding centuries. The last paragraph of the HPCE provides the most powerful argument that the chronicle was intended above all as a panegyric conceived at a difficult phase in Angoulême's history, a panegyric that needs to be treated with circumspection by modern historians.

Resümee

Die *Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium* (HPCE) berichtet über die Bischöfe und Grafen von Angoulême vor 1159. Als Panegyrikus darf man ihre Schilderungen nicht zu wörtlich nehmen. Für die Zeit nach 1130 erwähnt die Chronik Bischof Gerard von Angoulême, einen ehemaligen päpstlichen

122 Chartes saintongeaises de l'abbaye de Saint-Florent près Saumur de 1067 à 1200 environ, ed. by Paul Marchegay, in: Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis 4 (1877), 17–73, no. XXXII. Count Fulk in 1077 was *gloriosissimus* (Cart.St.J.A. [as in n. 14], vol. 1, no. XCVI), but none of his forbears were count *Dei gratia*, though Geoffrey in 1031/1043 was »largiente Deo Engolismensium comes« (Cart.Égl.Ang. [as in n. 19], no. VI). A charter of Saint-Jean d'Angély of 1108 described William as *comes Dei gratia*, by then the standard epithet for charters drawn up in the names of bishops (Cart. St.J.A. [as in n. 14], vol. 2, no. IX).

123 John Gillingham, Richard I, New Haven, London 1999, 39, 55, 61–62; Roger of Howden, Gesta Henrici II et Ricardi I, ed. by William Stubbs, vol. 1, London 1867, 121.

Legaten, und dessen Unterstützung des Gegenpapstes Anaklet vor 1136 nur am Rande – wahrscheinlich, um die Erinnerung an diese Episode des Schismas auszulöschen. Nach 1135/1136 waren die Bischöfe und Grafen gezwungen, sich an eine neue kirchliche Herrschaft anzupassen, nachdem Innozenz II. in der Provinz von Bordeaux als Papst anerkannt worden war. Graf Vulgrin ahmte die Bußgesten von Herzog Wilhelm X. gegenüber dem heiligen Bernard von Clairvaux nach. Lambert von La Couronne, der 1136 nach Gerards Tod zum Bischof ernannt wurde, spielte eine zentrale Rolle in der neuen, integristischen Führung, die vom Klerus geleitet wurde, der Innozenz II. treu ergeben war. Eine neue Situation entstand, als der Kapetinger Ludwig VII. 1137 Herzog von Aquitanien wurde. Daraufhin versuchte die HPCE, historische Verbindungen zwischen der Kirche von Angoulême und den karolingischen sowie kapetingischen Herrschern herzustellen, indem sie auf Privilegien verwies, die jedoch gefälscht waren.

Berichte über die militärischen Siege der Grafen über die Herzöge und Herren der Region – mal Feinde, mal Verbündete – deuten darauf hin, dass Krieg eher als anerkanntes Mittel zur Konfliktlösung zu verstehen ist, denn als Versuch, die politischen Grenzen der Region strategisch neu zu gestalten. Letztendlich dienten diese Berichte dazu, die Vergangenheit von Angoulême zu verherrlichen, zu einer Zeit, als seine Zukunft durch die Macht der Plantagenets zunehmend gefährdet erschien.

Résumé

L'*Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium* (HPCE) constitue un tableau des évêques et comtes d'Angoulême avant 1159, trompeur si on le prend trop littéralement. Pour la période postérieure à 1130, la chronique passe sous silence le soutien de Gérard, évêque d'Angoulême et légat pontifical, à l'antipape Anaclet avant 1136 – apparemment pour effacer la mémoire de cet épisode schismatique. Aussi bien les évêques que les comtes furent forcés de s'adapter à un nouveau régime ecclésiastique après 1135/1136, quand Innocent II fut accepté comme pape dans la province de Bordeaux. Le comte Vulgrin mima les gestes expiatoires de Guillaume X vis-à-vis de saint Bernard de Clairvaux. Lambert de la Couronne, nommé évêque à la mort de Gérard en 1136, joua un rôle de premier plan dans le nouveau régime intégriste dirigé par le clergé loyal à Innocent II. Une nouvelle situation survint quand le capétien Louis VII devint duc d'Aquitaine en 1137. En réponse, la HPCE chercha à affirmer les liens historiques entre l'église d'Angoulême et les souverains capétiens comme carolingiens, citant des privilèges en fait forgés.

Les récits des victoires militaires sur les ducs et seigneurs de la région – parfois ennemis et parfois alliés – suggèrent que la guerre se comprend mieux comme un moyen accepté de résolution des conflits que comme un effort stratégique pour remodeler les frontières politiques de la région. Finalement, ces récits étaient conçus pour glorifier le passé d'Angoulême au moment où son futur semblait de plus en plus mis en péril par le pouvoir Plantagenêt.

Abstract

The *Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium* (HPCE) gives an account of the bishops and counts of Angoulême prior to 1159. As a panegyric, it can be misleading if taken too literally. For the period after 1130, the chronicle makes minimal reference to Gerard, bishop of Angoulême and former papal legate, and his work for the antipope Anacletus before 1136 – apparently to efface the memory of this schismatic episode. Both bishops and counts were compelled to adapt to a new ecclesiastical regime after 1135/1136, once Innocent II was accepted as pope in the province of Bordeaux. Count Vulgrin mirrored Duke William X's expiatory gestures toward Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. Lambert of La Couronne – appointed bishop following Gerard's death in 1136 – played a prominent role within the new fundamentalist regime led by clergy loyal to Innocent II. A new situation arose when the Capetian Louis VII became duke of Aquitaine in 1137. In response, the HPCE sought to assert historic ties between the church of Angoulême and both Carolingian and Capetian rulers, citing privileges that appear to have been fabricated.

Accounts of the counts' military victories over the dukes and the lords of the region – sometimes foes and sometimes allies – suggest that warfare can best be seen as an accepted means of conflict resolution rather than as an effort to remodel strategically the region's political borders. Ultimately, these accounts were designed to glorify Angoulême's past at a juncture when its future appeared increasingly imperilled by Plantagenet power.