

Ioannis Saresberiensis
Historia Pontificalis

John of Salisbury's
Memoirs of the Papal Court

Translated from the Latin with Introduction
and Notes by

Marjorie Chibnall D.PHIL.

Fellow of Girton College, Cambridge

Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd

London Edinburgh Paris Melbourne Toronto and New York

Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd

London Edinburgh Paris Melbourne Toronto and New York

THOMAS NELSON AND SONS LTD
Parkside Works Edinburgh 9
36 Park Street London W1
312 Flinders Street Melbourne C1
218 Grand Parade Centre Cape Town

THOMAS NELSON AND SONS (CANADA) LTD
91-93 Wellington Street West Toronto 1

THOMAS NELSON AND SONS
19 East 47th Street New York 17

SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE D'ÉDITIONS NELSON
25 rue Henri Barbusse Paris V^e

First published in this series 1956

TO
PROFESSOR J. B. BLACK

“... dominorum amicorumque
karissimo ...”

PREFACE

MY THANKS are due to Mr A. L. Poole and the Delegates of the Clarendon Press for permission to quote at length from the text published by Mr R. L. Poole in 1927; and to the Librarian of the Municipal Library at Berne for his great courtesy in giving me access to the manuscript of the *Historia Pontificalis* at a time when the Library was closed. I am also very grateful to Mr C. N. L. Brooke for allowing me to read the manuscript of his Introduction to the *Letters* of John of Salisbury; to Mr R. W. Southern and Mr R. W. Hunt for advising me on the translation of the philosophical chapters in the *Historia Pontificalis* and to Miss E. M. Jamison for information on the Counts of Molise. My greatest debt is to the General Editors, whose patience and learning have saved me from many errors and enabled me to bring this work to its completion.

MARJORIE CHIBNALL

GIRTON COLLEGE
CAMBRIDGE

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	x
Introduction	xi
i John of Salisbury and his times	xi
ii The writing of the <i>Historia Pontificalis</i>	xix
iii John of Salisbury as a historian	xxxix
iv The historical value of the <i>Historia Pontificalis</i>	xl
v The manuscript and its transmission	xlvii
Latin Text	<i>verso</i> 1-89
English Translation	<i>recto</i> 1-89
Appendix	91
i Henry of Blois at the Papal Curia	91
ii Sigebert of Gembloux	95
iii John of Salisbury and Gilbert de la Porrée	96
iv Stephen's Lombard grandmother	97
v The divorce of Hugh of Molise	99
Index	101

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>E.H.R.</i>	<i>English Historical Review</i>
<i>M.B.</i>	<i>Materials for the History of Thomas Becket</i> (Rolls Series, 67)
<i>M.G.H.</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>
M. E. Williams	M. E. Williams, 'The teaching of Gilbert Porreta on the Trinity' (<i>Analecta Gregoriana</i> , vol. lvi, 1951)
<i>P.L.</i>	Migne, <i>Patrologia Latina</i>
Poole, <i>Hist. Pont.</i>	The <i>Historia Pontificalis</i> of John of Salisbury, ed. R. L. Poole
<i>R.S.</i>	Rolls Series

INTRODUCTION

I

JOHN OF SALISBURY AND HIS TIMES

JOHN OF SALISBURY belongs to that group of scholars and statesmen, like St Anselm and Hugh of St Victor, whose character and motives have never given rise to controversy. The few extant judgments of his contemporaries have been confirmed by later historians. The churchman who was to Benedict of Peterborough 'a man of much learning, great eloquence and profound wisdom . . . firmly established in the fear and love of God',¹ and who in the conventional eulogy of the Chartres necrology was 'a man of profound religion, distinguished in every kind of learning',² is still recognisable as 'the central figure of English learning',³ or the man of 'deep yet sober piety and quiet humour . . . convinced that the highest function of knowledge is to be an instrument of the good life'.⁴ Yet perhaps because of this unanimity of opinion the man himself is not easily painted in living colours. The characters of such men as Abailard and St Thomas of Canterbury emerge all the more clearly from the criticism or appraisal directed at them from every angle by men who knew them. John of Salisbury is known principally through his own writings, which are the works of the most accomplished Latin stylist of the twelfth century, produced in the active, mature years of his

¹ *M.B.*, ii 9

² *Gall. Christ.*, viii 1148

³ Stubbs, *Lectures on Medieval and Modern History*, p. 159

⁴ C. C. J. Webb, *John of Salisbury*, p. 177

life, between thirty and fifty. Consequently it will always be easier to know the scholar than to know the man.

The only glimpse of his early life is given in his *Policraticus*, where he tells how he was sent for instruction to a priest who practised magic in secret, and who tried to persuade his pupils to assist him in crystal-gazing. With the practical common sense that was to be with him all his life, John refused to see anything but the familiar objects, and so succeeded in being shut out of the room whenever his instructor was practising his unholy arts.¹ Thereafter he can be seen more clearly as a student in Paris and Chartres, steadily deepening his knowledge and widening the circle of his friends and correspondents. There can be no doubt of his talent for making and keeping friends. It was during his student years that he formed what was to become a lifelong friendship with Peter of Celle, a young man of noble birth from the region of Provins in Champagne, who may for a time have been John's pupil and certainly was one of the first to find employment for him. Peter, unlike John, took monastic vows and became abbot successively of Montier la Celle and St Rémi of Rheims; he was the friend to whom John most frequently turned for counsel, who continually encouraged him in his writing and offered him a refuge in his abbey of St Rémi, when in 1164 he was forced into exile. But if Peter was his 'dearest friend and master' there were many others who could be counted amongst his friends: the scholars Gilbert de la Porrée, who had taught him at Chartres, John Sarrazin, famous for his translations from the Greek, and William Brito of Canterbury; amongst ecclesiastical statesmen Nicholas Breakspear, later Pope Adrian IV, archbishop Theobald, Gerard Pucelle, bishop of Coventry, and St Thomas of Canterbury, and many others. When he made enemies it was rather through his principles

¹ *Policraticus*, ii 28 (ed. Webb i, 164)

than his personality; and his friends paid him the surest tribute of respect by their readiness to take criticism from him. The traits of character that emerge in his writings are sanity and moderation, tolerance and readiness to compromise wherever possible, but in the last resort inflexibility of principle. His gentle humour at the expense of others went with a clear perception of his own limitations, and perhaps the most characteristic picture of him is given in his last conversation with archbishop Thomas, as recorded in one anonymous chronicle: Thomas, returning from a stormy interview with Reginald FitzUrse and the other knights, had told his own clerks that he was ready to undergo death for the sake of God and of justice, at which John remonstrated, 'We are sinners and not yet prepared to die: I see no-one here save you who is anxious to die for dying's sake'.¹

Much has been written on his scholarship. Although he studied at Paris as well as Chartres and followed his grounding in the seven liberal arts by attending lectures on theology, he remains above all the finest product of the school of Chartres in its heyday under Bernard and Thierry. As a result of his studies in grammar John became a master of the Latin language and a leading humanist of his day, for he more than any of his contemporaries was soaked in the literary tradition of ancient Rome. He might aptly have quoted the familiar dictum of Hugh of St Victor, 'Learn everything: it will all come in useful somewhere'.² But whereas Hugh used his accumulated knowledge to build up a scheme of study in which every aspect of the works of God might be used to learn something of the Creator's will, and his *Didascalion* embraces the whole of twelfth-century learning, John was most deeply concerned with human conduct and used classical literature as

¹ M.B., iv 74

² 'Omnia discite, videbis postea nichil esse superfluum' (*Didascalion*, vi 3)

a storehouse of moral examples. Men who had never read the Latin classics were, to him, illiterate, even though they could read and write. Even the classical poets who wrote fables in which vice triumphed were not to be shunned as dangerous: they described vice, but did not praise it, and after all, as John observed, 'it is all the easier to avoid evil if you clearly recognise it for what it is'. 'I myself', he declared in one place, 'wholeheartedly agree with those who maintain that a man cannot be regarded as literate unless he is widely read', though he adds characteristically that a man cannot be wise without virtue, and reading alone will be to little purpose without the illumination of divine grace.¹ He has recently been compared to St Jerome for his 'latinity', his acceptance of the Latin classics as part of a living tradition without compromising his Christian morality.²

This Christian, Latin humanism is the keynote of his works. Needless to say he knew as much Greek thought as was the common heritage of educated men in his day; that is, strands of the metaphysical speculations of Plato, in part reshaped by Plotinus,³ and all the logical works of Aristotle, including the recently translated books of the 'new logic' that were just coming into circulation in the West. John himself relied completely on translations: he was no Greek scholar, though he picked up a few Greek words such as *ὑπερουσιος* to convey conceptions where Latin was inadequate, and gave Greek sounding names, *Policraticus* and *Metalogicon*, to his two major works. Of all his writings there is no doubt that his *Policraticus* was the most influential. In part a satire on court life, in part

a work of political thought, it embodied a great deal of his learning and practical wisdom. Characteristically, it was a work of morality intended to influence the conduct of his contemporaries in high places, not least Henry II himself and his chancellor, Thomas Becket. Consequently censures and unwelcome advice had to be presented in the most palatable form that John's experience could devise. He could not conceal his belief in the ultimate authority of the ecclesiastical power, but he could stress the virtues of a Christian prince and his unassailable authority within the state. Whilst much has been made of John's discussion of tyrannicide, it must be understood that to John only a usurper was to be regarded as a tyrant, and a properly constituted ruler—even an unjust one—must be obeyed. Where his views on the moral duties of a prince might seem too new or extreme John took care to veil them in the decent authority of classical tradition, and even invented a treatise, the *Institutio Trajani*, attributed by him to Plutarch, to convey views that have recently been shown to be those of his master, Robert Pullen.¹ Although the structure of the *Policraticus* was artificial and somewhat tortuous, there is clarity and consistency in the thought which made the work widely read in John's own day and throughout the Middle Ages. It became deservedly popular in the fourteenth century amongst the humanistic legists of south Italy, who reacted against the arid technicalities of legal studies just as John had turned critically away from the logic-chopping of many professional masters in his time. Indeed they may be said to carry on the living tradition of humanism as John had interpreted it, and it is a tribute to the independent value of the *Policraticus* that legists such as Lucas de Penna always cited it as though *Policraticus* was the name of a person and

¹ *Policraticus*, vii 9 (ed. Webb ii, 128)

² H. Liebeschütz, *Medieval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury*, pp. 64-7

³ For the various channels by which knowledge of Plato reached the west, see R. Klibansky, *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition* (Warburg Institute, 1939), pp. 11-29.

¹ H. Liebeschütz, 'John of Salisbury and Pseudo-Plutarch', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vi (1943) pp. 33-9

they were ignorant of the real author.¹ This is the more striking since the value of most of John's other writings lies rather in the individual point of view they express than in their furtherance of a growing tradition of thought. Even in the *Metalogicon*, where he defended the liberal arts against the attacks of utilitarian careerists, to whom knowledge was worthless if it did not directly lead to a lucrative profession, his statement of his own philosophical conceptions² was to have little influence on the history of philosophy. In part this may have been because the impact of the metaphysical and scientific works of Aristotle was shortly to transform philosophical speculation in western Europe. More important perhaps was the fact that to John learning and conduct were intimately connected. His studies were a training for his later career as an ecclesiastical statesman; when he wrote it was rather to influence the conduct of others in a particular situation than to make an abstract contribution to scholarship. For this reason he is outstanding as a letter-writer; and it may be added to his lasting credit that he himself never shrank from the course of action he urged as just even when it involved him in 'the pains of exile and the perils of proscription'. But the popularity of his *Policraticus* also shows that he had direct influence on the development of a type of humanism that was essentially Christian.³

¹ W. Ullmann, 'The Influence of John of Salisbury on medieval Italian jurists' in *E.H.R.*, lix (1944) p. 385. John would not however have viewed with approval the emphasis given by these writers to his doctrine of tyrannicide, which tended to exaggerate his point of view.

² These views are explained by A. Forest in *Le mouvement doctrinal du XI^e au XIV^e siècle* (Fliche et Martin, *Histoire de l'Église*, vol. xiii), pp. 86-9.

³ Although the number of quotations is far from being an adequate measure of influence, it is perhaps worth noting that biblical no less than classical citations are numerous in all John's works: in the *Metalogicon* and *Policraticus* there is a slight preponderance of classical quotations, but in the later *Historia Pontificalis* there are three biblical quotations to every classical one. There are also numerous references to the writings of the Early Fathers.

The world he describes in the *Historia Pontificalis* is western Europe during and after the Second Crusade, seen from the angle of an Englishman in the Papal Curia. There could have been no better centre, for in spite of all appearances to the contrary the Papal Curia from 1148 to 1152 was the hub of the political and ecclesiastical world. It is true that the communal revolution in Rome dating from 1143 prevented Eugenius from residing in the city for more than a few months during the whole of his pontificate; that St Bernard was so influential a figure in the Church that he had written to Eugenius in 1145, 'People say I am the real Pope, and I am inundated with papal business';¹ that the news of the disastrous failure in the East, reaching western Europe in 1148, shook the prestige of the pope who had inspired the Second Crusade. But Eugenius was far from being a figurehead, and kept the reins of ecclesiastical authority firmly in his own hands. There was no secular ruler of outstanding ability. Conrad III, king of the Romans, was a poor statesman, handicapped at home by the hostility of Henry the Lion; he hesitated between alliances with the Emperor Manuel, Roger of Sicily, and the papacy, and never succeeded in obtaining imperial coronation; so that Germany was without a dominating ruler until the election of Frederick Barbarossa in 1152. Louis VII of France was far from being master of his own vassals, and the rift between him and his wife Eleanor of Aquitaine, which appeared during the Crusade and led ultimately to the annulment of their marriage, already threatened to deprive him of her magnificent dowry, the most important territorial acquisition of his reign. England was torn by civil war, and though Stephen's claim to the throne was established, his failure to secure the disinheriting of the Angevins and the coronation of his son Eustace fatally weakened his

¹ Ep. 239 (*P.L.* 182, 431): 'Importunus sum, sed habeo excusationem: Eugenii apostolatus excusat me. Aiunt non vos esse Papam, sed me: et undique ad me confluunt, qui habent negotia.'

position. It is true that Roger of Sicily dominated the central Mediterranean and asserted his authority in the churches of his kingdom, to the acute embarrassment of his papal ally, but his sphere of influence was limited. Eugenius not only maintained but extended papal authority: he held a council at Rheims attended by more than four hundred bishops and abbots of England, France and Germany; ¹ kept in close touch with ecclesiastical leaders of known integrity such as Theobald of Canterbury and Wibald of Stavelot, and extended papal influence by sending papal legates to the remoter parts of Christendom — Ireland, Scotland and Scandinavia. St Bernard's influence was declining no less than his health; and if at the beginning of the pontificate, he was the guiding force behind Eugenius, his friend and pupil, by the time of the Council of Rheims a clique of cardinals hostile to Bernard had made its appearance. Eugenius was the real instigator of papal policy even before criticism began, unjustifiably, to be directed against Bernard for the failure of the Crusade. John's memoirs of the papal court deal with the period when Eugenius was holding his general council at Rheims, maintaining Church authority in England and Germany, sending his legates to the north, struggling to establish a *modus vivendi* with Roger of Sicily, and working to restore the authority of the Church and the Christian kingdoms of the Middle East against the threat of the growing power of Nur-ed-Din; whilst negotiations with the rebellious Romans, who had added to their crimes by harbouring Arnold of Brescia, were never far from his mind. He was able to give a cross-section of European affairs, not indeed as they would have appeared to the pope himself, whose information was much fuller, but as they seemed to an intelligent observer in the papal court.

¹ Only one Italian bishop was present, and the decrees of the council were promulgated at a later council at Cremona.

II

THE WRITING OF THE *HISTORIA PONTIFICALIS*

(i) The *Historia Pontificalis* was first printed in 1868 by Wilhelm Arndt as an anonymous continuation of the Chronicle of Sigebert of Gembloux. Within five years Giesebrecht had pointed out that the author was plainly a person of some eminence, and that the only man with the knowledge and experience to have written it was John of Salisbury.¹ Like his other major works, it falls into no clearly defined category of writing: though cast in the form of universal history it remains in substance his memoirs of the papal court, combined with a lengthy treatise on the teaching of Gilbert de la Porrée, and enriched with learned allusions and digressions. It covers four years only, 1148 to 1152, but, incomplete and discursive though it is, its value has never been questioned: the vividness of the detail and the demonstrable integrity of the author make it a historical source of the first importance. The text has been edited with great learning by R. L. Poole; but this is the first English translation to be published.

The chronology of John of Salisbury's life has been worked out by C. C. J. Webb in his biography, and R. L. Poole in a number of individual studies, and is in process of revision by C. N. L. Brooke.² Born between 1115 and 1120, he went to Paris the year after Henry I died, and carried on his studies principally there and in Chartres from 1135–6 for 'nearly twelve years'. He then passed into administrative service, first

¹ *Arnold von Brescia* (Munich, 1893), pp. 6–7

² C. C. J. Webb, *John of Salisbury*; R. L. Poole, *Studies in Chronology and History*, chs. xv, xvi, xvii; C. N. L. Brooke, Introduction to the *Letters of John of Salisbury* (1955). See also H. Liebeschütz, *Medieval Humanism in the Life and Writings of John of Salisbury*, pp. 8–22

in an uncertain capacity in the Papal Curia and a few years later in England as secretary to Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury. Here he was closely associated with many clerks who were to rise to prominence during the stormy archiepiscopate of Thomas Becket, and in particular became the close friend of Thomas himself. Throughout the whole period of Thomas's quarrel with the king, John appears as mentor and critic, gently urging as moderate a policy as was compatible with his belief in the dignity and authority of the Church. Though ready to criticise Thomas with the assured immunity of an older friend, he was equally unbending on the principles of ecclesiastical freedom; and much as he desired a settlement he preceded Thomas into exile, returning only just in time to be present at his martyrdom. He probably remained at Canterbury for the next few years until, in 1176, he was elected to the bishopric of Chartres. At Chartres, in 1180, he died.

For the student of the *Historia Pontificalis* two periods in John's life are of particular importance—the years covered by the *Historia*, and the period when he was engaged in writing it. There is a large element of autobiography in all his works: the *Metalogicon* embodies the experience of his student years, and the *Policraticus* his recollections of service at court, chiefly in England. The *Historia Pontificalis* is concerned with the early years of his immersement in 'courtiers' trifles', when he had completed his academic studies and was employed in some capacity in the Papal Curia. This was a period of his life for which no letters survive, and we are dependent for knowledge of his actions on the *Historia* itself, hints in his other writings and occasional charter evidence; it is not surprising therefore that the details of his movements are sometimes obscure. It is still impossible to be certain of the exact date of his entering the papal service or of the exact capacity in which he was

employed there. Since Poole's suggestion that he entered the papal service in 1146 and was not employed by Theobald until late 1153 or early 1154 has recently been questioned,¹ the evidence of the *Historia Pontificalis* needs careful re-examination. He was undoubtedly present at the council of Rheims in 1148, and during the proceedings after the council had formally dissolved. For about a year after Eugenius left Rheims his narrative follows the movements of both Theobald and Pope Eugenius. He describes Theobald's return to England, where the king's anger drove him into exile, and speaks of the great respect in which he was held at St Omer; his narrative then follows Theobald's ambassadors across the Alps to Brescia, where they found the pope, probably in late July,² and secured letters imposing an interdict on England, and ordering the English clergy to obey the archbishop. At this point too he inserts an account of the council held by the pope at Cremona on 7 July. He then picks up the thread of Theobald's movements, and describes with circumstantial detail his consecration of Gilbert Foliot as bishop of Hereford on 5 September at St Omer; and his return to England and struggle with the monks of St Augustine's, Canterbury, who ignored the interdict and appealed to the pope. Fresh embassies travelled to the curia, but by 12 March Theobald had been confirmed in his actions and the monks of St Augustine's had accepted the penance imposed for their disobedience. John also mentions the brief visit of Eugenius to Rome, as he journeyed from Viterbo to Tusculum at the end of March; but it is with the return of the French king and queen from the Holy Land,

¹ See C. N. L. Brooke, *op. cit.*, pp. xv–xxiii, where the theory of Schaar-schmidt that he entered Theobald's service in 1148 is revived. Liebeschütz contended that he joined the papal retinue in the spring of 1147 (*op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 1).

² Eugenius reached Brescia on 15 July; the interdict was to begin on 12 September, and an interval of some weeks must be allowed for the papal mandate to reach England.

and their passage through Italy in the summer of 1149 that the narrative settles down in the curia: and for the remainder of the short history the curia is the focal point of almost every incident described.

John cannot have been an eye-witness of everything he describes during this year. He mentions Theobald's return to England in April 1148, and also Eugenius's journey to Clairvaux in the same month.¹ In March 1149, he describes both Theobald's absolution of the monks of St Augustine's at Northfleet on 11 or 12 March,² and Eugenius's passage through Rome on his way to Tusculum, where he arrived not later than 30 March.³ Nevertheless it is striking that, whereas in the greater part of the narrative Rome is the pivot of every episode described, for this one year the narrative moves to and fro across the Alps, with circumstantial details on both sides; and apart from a few brief notices the central theme is that of the negotiations between Theobald and the curia.

My suggestion is that John was employed in these negotiations. It would be difficult to say exactly when he joined Theobald, but it may be noted that he does not mention that Theobald went to Arras when he first left England, and gives only an account of his residence at St Omer. Now if John accompanied Eugenius as far as Clairvaux, obtained then an undated letter of recommendation from St Bernard,⁴ and presented it at once to Theobald, it would be reasonable to suppose that Theobald then took him into his service. If John

¹ Eugenius was at Clairvaux from 24 to 26 April. See Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard* (Paris, 1920), ii 355-58.

² 11 March was the last day they defied the interdict; on 12 March they were silent.

³ See Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, p. 200 (no. 182)

⁴ Ep. ccclxi (Migne, *P.L.* 182, 562) is addressed to Theobald, and asks him to provide for John of Salisbury, whom Bernard had previously recommended in person and now recommends by letter. The date of this letter is not known.

were one of the envoys of Theobald who found the pope at Brescia, that would account for the remarkably full details he gives of their reception and of all the letters written by Eugenius on Theobald's behalf. Such an interpretation would mean that he was not present at the Council of Cremona, but his notices of the council are brief and factual, and could easily be second-hand. If he then returned with Eugenius's letters he could have been at St Omer in time to witness the consecration of Gilbert Foliot, and give the fullest account of it that we have from any contemporary. I suggest that he returned with Theobald to England, possibly, but by no means certainly, taking part in the second embassy to oppose the appeal of the monks of St Augustine's, and remained with him until at least March 1149. From the summer of 1149 I am inclined to agree with Poole that he was in the Papal Curia: he writes too much as an eye-witness of all that took place to have been long away, at least before the beginning of 1152, when the surviving narrative of the *Historia* comes to an end.

Such an interpretation cannot be regarded as more than a hypothesis, but would explain how John obtained the information he gives in his history. If he travelled to Italy with Eugenius, it is difficult to see why he says so little of the business before him except when the envoys of Theobald found him at Brescia, and yet gives such warm personal comment on Theobald's sojourn at St Omer and later return to England.

It remains to consider the capacity in which he was employed in the curia from 1149 onwards. Whether or not he acted on behalf of Theobald, the material in the *Historia Pontificalis* seems to give support to Poole's contention that he was also in the papal employment. He had access to the papal registers, and was intimately informed of the contents of Eugenius's letters: ¹ indeed the substance of these letters is an important

¹ *Infra*, pp. 25, 70

source for his history. He could write with the rhythms of the papal cursus, and he knew enough of chancery practice to be able to detect forged bulls.¹ Unless we are to believe that such information could be acquired by an intelligent man acting in the curia on behalf of others, then we must agree with Poole that temporarily at least he was employed by Eugenius, though the evidence is too slight to assert positively that he was a clerk in the papal chancery. Certainly his return to England late in 1153 or early in 1154, as the secretary to archbishop Theobald, marked a new phase in his career. And whatever the nature of his employment, he was in a position to gather first-hand information on events in the curia during the few years covered by the *Historia Pontificalis*, and there is no reason to doubt his claim that he described only what he himself had seen, or had from reliable witnesses.

(ii) It is by no means easy to determine when John began to write the *Historia Pontificalis*. Apart from a little mainly negative evidence from the state of the manuscript and the use of the work by other historians, it can be dated only from internal evidence. There is no mention of it elsewhere, not even in the letters of John himself. A reference to the consecration of Robert of Melun as bishop of Hereford in December 1163, proves that it cannot have been completed before 1164. This leaves, however, a period of some sixteen years from the date of the Council of Rheims when he may have been concerned in the writing of it. During these years of immersion in curial business there were two periods when it is particularly likely that he turned his mind to literary composition: the first from 1156 to 1159² when even after he had been restored

¹ *Infra*, p. xl

² Giles Constable has proved (*E.H.R.*, lxix (1954), pp. 67-76) that John fell from royal favour in 1156-7, not as Poole supposed in 1159; he was therefore writing in his spare time, not in a period of enforced leisure.

to favour at the English court he found time to produce the *Policraticus* and *Metalogicon*; the second when he preceded Thomas of Canterbury into exile and took refuge at St Rémi of Rheims. But it is still possible that at other times he may have been able to continue writing, or at least to keep an intermittent journal.

Some hints of the date of composition can be obtained by analysis of the work itself. In addition to the historical passages, there are two more philosophical sections: the preface, which states John's views on history, and the long discussion, in chapters 13 and 14, of the doctrines held by Gilbert de la Porrée. Though these were not necessarily composed at the same time, they have some common characteristics, and to me it seems likely that John wrote them at St Rémi in 1164. Both are addressed to Peter of Celle, abbot of St Rémi, at whose instigation John states that he wrote the work. Both are marked by quotation from, or detailed reference to, other authorities; and this is striking because on the whole the *Historia Pontificalis* lacks the tracery of quotation and learned reference that embellishes John's other works. Needless to say, it is heavy with allusion, but mostly of a kind that could be provided from the author's well-stocked memory: the numerous scriptural references, the brief classical quotations, such as the lines from Horace with which he had mocked Bishop Henry of Winchester in 1151 would come naturally to his pen. Citations so precise and lengthy that they must have been made directly from other works are few in number, and all occur in these two sections of the book.

Even here they are not numerous: the total list consists of St Jerome's 'Letter to Paulinus', from which John takes, as it were, the text of the preface; Geoffrey of Auxerre's *Libellus*, which provides the four articles of the profession of faith drawn up by St Bernard; the *De Trinitate* and *De Synodis* of St Hilary;

the *De Fide* of St Ambrose, and possibly the *De Trinitate* of St Augustine, though the one quotation from the last work is very brief indeed. These works make up the total number of books that must certainly have been at John's elbow when he was writing his history. If indeed he did write these passages in the early years of his exile at Rheims, he must have been without his own collection of books; as he told Archbishop Thomas on arriving in France, he had left the country with less than twelve pence of his own in the world, and a few chattels worth about five marks, and had been obliged to borrow for the expenses of his journey.¹ Some time later he commented with relief on the fact that he was now better off, and could afford to have some works of Aristotle transcribed for his own use.² But if he was without his own familiar volumes he must have been able to draw on the library of St Rémi: and it is certain from references in his letters that he had access to some of the works quoted in the *Historia* about this time. Writing to Henry, count of Champagne, on the subject of the number and order of the books of the Old Testament, he refers extensively to the letters of St Jerome;³ and in a letter to John Sarrazin he speaks of reading, if not St Ambrose's *De Fide*, at least his *De Incarnatione Verbi*, and cites at length from Hilary's *De Synodis*.⁴

Apart from these few quotations, mainly from works known to have been in his mind in the early part of his exile, the discussion of Gilbert's doctrines has every appearance of having been written from memory some years after the events described. It must be later than the date when, as John tells us, the two chief protagonists had become reconciled in death, and later

¹ M.B., v 101

² Ep. no. ccxi

³ Ep. no. cxliii

⁴ Ep. no. clxix

than the writing of Geoffrey's *Libellus* in 1154. It is reflective in tone, and again and again John writes as though he were plunging into the recesses of his memory for a true account of the events which impressed him so powerfully at the time. 'As far as I can recall', he says in one place, 'there was not a single cardinal except Alberic, bishop of Ostia, who was not wholeheartedly opposed to the abbot in spirit and in deed'; or again, 'I recollect that I myself, on behalf of the abbot, entreated the bishop to meet him in some religious house'. Hayen believed that John cited from memory Gilbert's revised prologue to his commentary on Boethius, and added to it a variety of arguments recollected from Gilbert's statements and writings.¹ And this argument can be strengthened by a significant misquotation from Augustine. At one point John explains that Gilbert held to the end of his life 'that there are certain eternal principles, which have neither beginning nor end, but are so much an essential part of truth that even if the whole world perished, they would remain. Augustine states this in the *Hypognosticon* and several of his works'.² This theory does not appear in the *Hypognosticon*, which was generally but wrongly at the time attributed to Augustine; instead it can be found in the *De Libero Arbitrio*, to which John quite correctly refers it in the *Metalogicon*.³ The implication is that John wrote this chapter of the *Historia* without his notes beside him, and indeed he may have been summarising from memory arguments first worked out, with detailed references at hand, in the *Metalogicon*. The period after 1159 when he had leisure, and yet was separated from his notes, was 1164, and this is the date indicated by the other evidence. He was then in daily contact with Peter of

¹ A. Hayen, 'Le concile de Rheims et l'erreur théologique de Gilbert de la Porrée', *Arch. hist. doctr. litt. du moyen âge*, 10 (1935-36), p. 94

² *Infra*, p. 31

³ *Metalogicon*, ii 17 (ed. Webb, p. 94)

Celle, who may well have expressed a desire for him to record his memories of papal history, and recollections of Gilbert de la Porrée's teaching. John makes it clear that he writes with encouragement from his friend, and there is nothing in Peter's surviving correspondence to suggest that the request came at an earlier date: indeed when John appealed for advice at the time of his earlier disgrace Peter had recommended spiritual contemplation.¹

On the other hand R. L. Poole believed that the discussion of Gilbert's doctrines was possibly drafted during John's residence at Tusculum in 1149, written out some time after the appearance of Geoffrey of Auxerre's *Libellus* in 1154, and only revised after 1163. To me the evidence seems to suggest that the substantial part of the writing was done in 1164. Given John's trained and retentive memory and his absolute integrity, this redating would in no way reduce its value as an accurate historical record. The evidence is still not conclusive, and the treatise is concerned with philosophical problems that were living issues throughout the century; but it reflects John's intellectual background at St Rémi, and contains one wrong reference that would surely have been corrected had it been written before the *Metalogicon*, or even when the author was still in England and could have referred to his own statements in that work. To me, the Preface seems to belong to the same period of writing, and I would date it too in 1164.

Some parts of the narrative plainly cannot have been written very early. The details of the Vermandois family history, retailed in Chapter 6, may well have been related to John, as Poole suggests, by Count Philip of Alsace at L'Ecluse, where he paused on his way to Paris early in 1164.² Other sections of the narrative contain no hint as to when they were

¹ Ep. no. lxxi (Migne, *P.L.* ccii 517)

² cf. Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. lxxvii–lxxviii

written down. It is noteworthy, however, that John makes one or two slips hard to explain if he were not writing at least a few years after the event. He states that Theodwin, cardinal bishop of Porto, died in the East and was succeeded by Guy of Florence; whereas Theodwin was alive in Italy at least two years after Guy had taken up his duties.¹ Again, in describing the election of Gilbert Foliot as bishop of Hereford in 1148 he states that he was accepted by the duke of Normandy 'who is now king', so antedating Henry's investiture with the duchy of Normandy by over a year. Even if the first mistake might be due to faulty information, and the second to slipping in the words 'qui modo rex est' during revision (so transferring to Henry a narrative which related to his father),² there are two other errors which cannot be explained away so easily. Amongst Stephen's molestations of the Church up to the time of the Council of Rheims John states that he had forbidden John Paparo, papal legate to Ireland, to cross England on his way to take up his duties. Now it is true that Stephen in some way impeded St Malachy, the previous legate, on his return from Ireland about this time; but John Paparo did not become legate until after the Council of Rheims, and the most likely date for his molestation is the summer of 1150.³ And it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that John made a mistake in describing the visit of Henry of Blois to the Papal Curia: either Henry did not, as John says, go to Compostella when he left Rome, or John has telescoped two visits into one.⁴ All

¹ cf. Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, p. 63 n. 3

² This suggestion was made by Richard Howlett in a review of Kate Norgate's *England under the Angevin Kings* in *The Academy* 12 November 1887.

³ Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, p. 6, n. 18

⁴ *Infra*, Appendix I. If the mistake is one of telescoping, it would confirm the suggestion that John is more likely to have been at St Omer than with Eugenius in the autumn of 1148; I cannot believe, in view of his substantial accuracy, that even sixteen years later he could have confused the two visits if he had actually been present on both occasions.

these mistakes become reasonable if he were writing from memory after a lapse of twelve to sixteen years.

My conclusion is that certain sections of the work were written in 1164, and the remainder, even if not drafted at this date, underwent a reshaping more drastic than revision. When John conceived the idea of writing a fragment of papal history we do not know. Even if the idea was a new one in 1164 he probably had a diary to draw upon, or he may have begun to put together at an earlier period such of his memoirs as were not suitable raw material for the *Policraticus* or *Metalogicon*. He could have included a volume of notes among the 'few poor chattels' he was able to take abroad with him.¹ But all this is speculation, and the date and method of composition still cannot be determined with absolute certainty. The one serious discussion of date comes from Poole,² who seems to me to have put the bulk of the writing too early, and unfortunately does not give his reasons for thinking that John was at work on it in 1149. I incline to believe that John's work on the *Historia* in 1164 amounted to the writing rather than the revision of it; the evidence for this is slight, but includes the late references incorporated in the body of the text, and a handful of errors, apparently of memory; there are in addition certain legitimate inferences to be drawn from John's intellectual development and attitude to history.

¹ See M.B. v 101

² R. R. Darlington in *Anglo-Norman Historians* (Inaugural Lecture, 1947) states the same conclusions as Poole, that the work was written at various times from the Council of Rheims onwards and revised in 1164, but gives no reasons for this belief. I am at a loss to know why Ghellinck (*L'Essor de la littérature latine* (1946), i 131), and Manitius (*Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, iii 260) give the date as 1162, unless they have accepted it from the earlier suggestion of Arndt.

III

JOHN OF SALISBURY AS A HISTORIAN

JOHN OF SALISBURY lived at a time when historical writing throughout western Europe achieved more varied forms and finer expression than at any other period in the Middle Ages.¹ Not that history was ever the chief end of intellectual activity: it simply did not appear in most conventional schemes of learning, and was never a subject of study in any of the schools. But the compilation of annals and the writing of chronicles, memoirs, lives of kings and saints, even autobiography, became a serious preoccupation both within the cloister and in the Church at large. The range is wide; from William of Malmesbury's careful work of critical research to Abailard's vehement justification of his early life, from Otto of Freising's universal history of the 'Two Cities' to Abbot Suger's methodical account of the domestic history of St Denis under his administration. It is not surprising, then, that John of Salisbury, the most widely-read man of his age, should have made at least one venture into the field of history. But it would be wrong to suppose that he was continuously preoccupied with the writing of history, or ever wrote it for its own sake.

Judging from the works he habitually cites, his historical reading was patchy. He knew Suetonius's *Lives of the Caesars* far better than most of his contemporaries, and drew freely upon it for illustration in the *Policraticus*; and he makes a

¹ For a general survey, see C. H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, ch. viii; and for detailed studies W. A. Schneider, *Geschichte und Geschichtsphilosophie bei Hugo von St Victor* (in *Münstersche Beiträge zur Geschichtsforschung*, 3e Folge, ii Heft, Munster, 1933); V. H. Galbraith, *Historical Research in Medieval England* (London, 1951); C. C. Mierow, Introduction to *The Two Cities of Otto of Freising*. For the characteristics of medieval historical writing see Collingwood, *Idea of History*, pp. 52-6.

number of references to Sallust's *Jugurtha*. But his knowledge of Livy was possibly mostly derived from Florus; and in common with most men of his day he knew nothing of the works of Caesar. Many of his classical anecdotes come from Valerius Maximus and Macrobius, or from Lucan's *De Bello Civili*,¹ which, as Macaulay said, far from conforming to the laws of history, could scarcely be reconciled with the laws of fiction. To a great extent he used these works in the spirit in which they were written, as a storehouse of moral examples.

His classical studies were reinforced by his knowledge of Christian chronicles, and here no doubt the influence of Hugh of St Victor shows itself. Hugh was the most outstanding exponent after Augustine of a philosophy in which history appeared as the working out of God's purpose on earth; it found a place in his philosophical system, and he maintained that the course of history since the Creation was the visible record through which the invisible things of God might be perceived.² He had been teaching in Paris during John's early student years, and John may even have been his pupil.³ Certainly John knew and mentions a chronicle of his, which is probably the *Excerptio Liber primus*, but may have been the *Liber de tribus maximis circumstantiis*.⁴ From his acquaintance with the thought of Hugh, his consideration of the letters of St Jerome on the significance of the various books in the Bible, and his reading of early church chronicles, especially the chronicle of Eusebius of Caesarea, which he knew in the translations of Rufinus and Jerome, John came to regard the history of the

¹ See Webb's Index to the *Polieraticus* for classical historians occasionally cited by John of Salisbury.

² cf. Migne, *P.L.* 177, 203.

³ See Hofmeister, *Studie*, in *Neues Archiv*, xxxvi 645, and Schneider, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁴ For a discussion of Hugh's chronicles see Schneider, *op. cit.*, p. 15; and Manitius, iii 117-18.

Church as a single theme. It began with the book of Chronicles, and continued through the Gospels and Early Fathers to Isidore and Bede and, in most modern times, Hugh of St Victor and Sigebert of Gembloux with his continuators.

But if he knew anything of other contemporary works of history he only rarely refers to them.¹ In some cases this is not surprising: Otto of Freising had completed his studies in Paris in 1133, before John's first arrival there, and it seems unlikely that the two men ever met or that John ever saw the Chronicle which Otto wrote at the Emperor's court. Robert of Torigni, who also regarded himself as a continuator of Sigebert, lived and worked mainly in Mont St Michel, outside John's orbit.² But it is harder to understand how he missed the historians of St Denis. He shows some acquaintance with the internal politics of the monastery in the time of Suger, and may very likely have met Odo of Deuil on his return from the Crusade in the time of Louis VII, when he was engaged in writing the *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*.³ Again, he was a close friend of Pope Adrian IV and certainly knew his biographer, Cardinal Boso; yet he never refers to Boso's continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis*, and conversely there is no clear echo of John's *Historia* in Boso's work. As far as his contemporaries were concerned, John seems to have written his history in isolation. When he stated that he knew of no histories carrying on the theme of church development after the Council of Rheims he may have been thinking of universal histories only, and so excluded the biographies: and the works of Suger and Odo of Deuil in any case ended before this date.

¹ Mr C. N. L. Brooke tells me that there is evidence in the letters that he knew MS F of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, a Canterbury manuscript.

² Robert of Torigny however began his chronicle at Bec and left a manuscript there. It is remarkable if John had never heard of it through Theobald.

³ See *De Profectione Ludovici in Orientem*, ed. V. G. Berry, p. xxii (1735)

But he may simply not have known about them; all the more because the writing of history does not seem to have been one of his main preoccupations, and he may have given his serious attention to it for only a short period of his life.

The list of John's historical works seems at first sight to include a *Life of St Anselm* and a *Life of St Thomas of Canterbury* as well as the *Historia Pontificalis*. Yet both to a great extent are conventional works, and are more accurately described as hagiography than as history. The life of Anselm was produced in 1163 in support of the movement for his canonisation: in substance it is merely an abbreviation of the *Life* by Eadmer, with an elegant preface describing his character. The *Life of St Thomas* has given rise to regrets and even reproaches from later historians; for John, in spite of his intimate acquaintance with Becket throughout the whole of his official career, and his unrivalled command of the Latin language, was content to produce a *Life* that was brief and trite. Indeed, apart from the account of the actual martyrdom, it was composed mainly of extracts from the *Lives* by William of Canterbury and the *Anonymous* of Lambeth.¹ But John's intention was simply to write an introduction to Thomas's letters and the biographies of others, and his purpose, as he stated in his preface, was merely to add his testimony to the archbishop's sanctity.² He did not regard a full-scale biography as necessary, whereas when he undertook to write the history of the Church in the *Historia Pontificalis* he feared that the events he recounted might fall into oblivion unless he recorded them. The *Historia Pontificalis* remains, then, his only considered, wholly original, historical work.

His introduction states briefly his view of history, and his

¹ F. G. E. Walberg, *La Tradition Hagiographique de Saint Thomas Becket* (Paris, 1929, pp. 173-85)

² Robertson, *M.B.*, ii 302

purpose in writing. The great chronicle of the Church had found no continuator, as far as John knew, since the work of Sigebert of Gembloux came to an end in 1148,¹ and even that had been unduly biased in favour of the Germans. Unlike Otto of Freising he did not recast the earlier narratives into a complete universal history of his own, but began in the year 1148, giving his work the superficial appearance of a further continuation of the *Continuatio Gemblacensis*. He closes his preface with a careful statement of the triple value of history: to show the working out of God's purpose in the world, to act as a storehouse for moral examples, and to provide precedents for securing privileges. Perhaps it is an indication of the eclectic character of his scholarship that he was content to let these three conceptions—the Christian, the Roman, and the medieval—lie peacefully side by side, without investigating their mutual compatibility; just as he was content to call his detailed and elegant narrative a continuation of the bare annals of Gembloux, with which it has nothing in common except perhaps a common view of history.

Of his method he gives only one conventional hint: that he would write nothing but what he himself had seen and heard and knew to be true, or had on good authority from the testimony or writings of reliable men. He does not indicate his test of reliability: whatever it was, the most exacting modern research has never found him guilty of worse errors of fact than occasional slips in chronology or place names. There is no acid test of the validity of judgments on character, and one writer at least has accused John of partisanship against Arnulf of Lisieux;² but again and again John's judgment has been accepted as a fair one, and his characterisations have at

¹ See *infra*, Appendix II

² Barlow, Introduction to *The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux* (Camden Third Series, lxi) p. xxv

least the merit of being humanly probable. He made up for a lack of historical training, which was inevitable at the time, by the sureness of his historical sense and his meticulous sense of justice. He is not detached from the events described; rather he is impartial with the impartiality of Acton, adopting a single moral standard for all persons and measuring them relentlessly against it. Much as St Bernard and Gilbert de la Porrée differed, he could regard them both sympathetically because both strove honestly after the truth. For all forms of self-seeking—above all, those that created scandal or schism in the Church—he had only the harshest condemnation. His standard is plain in his references to Gilbert Foliot, both in his letters and in the *Historia Pontificalis*. In 1166 John was to denounce Gilbert in a letter comparing him to Judas, Doeg and Achitophel, as a destroyer of ecclesiastical unity and fomentor of discord.¹ In 1164 when—whatever the method of its composition—the *Historia* was unquestionably still under his pen, he knew of Foliot's opposition to Becket; and it might have been expected that in describing Foliot's consecration as bishop of Hereford he would have seized the opportunity of denouncing his dishonesty. For in 1148 Hereford had been in the hands of Matilda, and Foliot had taken a solemn oath not to swear fealty to Stephen, an oath he had broken immediately after consecration. John however merely states the arguments by which Archbishop Theobald had tried to appease the Angevins: that the pope had recognised Stephen, and that no bishop had the right to foment schism in the Church by refusing him allegiance.² In fact, it was by the same canon of conduct that Foliot was acquitted in 1148 and condemned in 1166; and that canon was the preservation of unity in the Church.

¹ Ep. no. clxxxiii

² *Infra*, pp. 48-9

This surely is the standard by which he measured the conduct of Arnulf of Lisieux on the Second Crusade. The fact that Arnulf showed personal malice against John and that John at times made bitter references to him does not turn his narrative of the Crusade into a 'racy, but thoroughly prejudiced account'. The picture is not all black; even though John repeats—expressly stating that they are hearsay—the stories that both Arnulf and Godfrey, bishop of Langres, were mischief-makers and made money out of the expedition, he grants that the confusion of authority and the weak leadership of the legates Theodwin and Guy played into their hands. He allows the bishop of Lisieux the worldly virtues of eloquence and practical ability, and concludes 'to tell the truth, the two bishops would have been of great service if they had worked together in the Lord'.¹ If this is malice, it is temperate malice; the accusations are not out of keeping with Arnulf's character and the worst that can be said of it is that John did not go out of his way to suppress unproven charges unfavourable to Arnulf. To John the prime cause of the tragic failure of this Crusade was dissension among the participants, and those who seemed responsible for dissension could not hope to escape his censures: they were destroyers of the unity of the Church.² This attitude may account also for his readiness to criticise the Germans and the Roman populace, both of whom had supported pretenders or anti-popes, and who come in for some satirical comment and oblique criticism in the course of the narrative.³

¹ *Infra*, pp. 54-5

² Certainly his impartiality is so great that it is impossible to date his work by reference to his personal feelings for any character. If he wrote it shortly after the events described, he had nothing personal against either Arnulf or Gilbert; if in 1164 then both were discredited in his eyes. Yet in the work there is strong censure of Arnulf and hardly a word against Gilbert. This seems to point to freedom from personal malice.

³ cf. *infra*, pp. 76, 80

Occasionally he states explicitly that he was an eye-witness of the events described: he is insistent on this in his account of the Council of Rheims,¹ and again in retailing the efforts of Eugenius to reconcile count Hugh of Molise and his wife. But there are other occasions when, though he did not claim to be present, his presence can be inferred.² Indeed, when referring to his own opinion, he shows a restraint almost equal to that of Suetonius, though for a very different reason, since Suetonius wrote principally of events before his own day. Possibly he was influenced by this author, whom he had read closely, but greatly surpassed in historical judgment; more probably the exclusion of his personal verdict except when he was strongly moved or knew a question to be highly controversial sprang naturally from his impartial outlook. There are other times when he stresses that what he records is hearsay; such remarks as 'it is believed' or 'they say' become particularly numerous in his account of the Second Crusade; or when, as in his description of Arnold of Brescia,³ he has to record evil of a man.

In many places, however, John does not even reveal whether his knowledge is first- or second-hand; sometimes no doubt it was a mixture of the two. The history he recounts is history as it appeared to an observer in the papal court between 1148 and 1152: after the first year almost every event narrated has its starting point in some papal letter or judgment, or the business of some distinguished visitor to the papal court; but he never hesitates to supplement it with material gleaned from his later experience, or conversations with such men as count Thierry of Flanders or Archbishop Theobald. In arranging his material he is selective; he deliberately omits facts that can

¹ cf. also *Policraticus*, ii 22 (ed. Webb i, 124)

² cf. R. Pauli, 'Über die kirchenpolitische Wirksamkeit des Johannes Saresberiensis' in *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, xvi (1881) 265-87; and R. L. Poole, *Studies*, ch. xvi.

³ *Infra*, p. 63, 'Sed, ut aiunt, sediciosus erat et auctor scismatis'.

be found elsewhere, such as the canons of the Council of Rheims, which were included in the papal registers. Up to a point no doubt chance restricted his knowledge: he was able to illustrate the fulfilment of St Bernard's prophecy of evil for the Vermandois family because he happened to know their later history, whereas he gave no indication that the dramatic reconciliation effected by Eugenius between Hugh of Molise and his wife was not to last, probably because he knew nothing of their lives after their case passed out of the papal court.¹ Sometimes, too, personal interests guided his selection; he has much to say about English affairs and the teaching of his former master, Gilbert de la Porrée. The work as a whole may be criticised for its lack of a clear plan, its discursiveness and unevenness; and the version that we have may not have been finally revised to John's satisfaction. But each separate episode and characterisation is the product of matured thought; the details, from whatever source they may have been derived, have been assimilated, and are presented with grace and finality.

It is this quality of judgment and maturity, and the smooth combination of early and late sources that suggest that John wrote the work some time after the events described, and persuade me to place it in 1164. No doubt he had some notes or a diary beside him to supplement his memory; but it seems unlikely that he went so far as to turn these notes into a history until the crises in the Church—the schism of 1159 and the exile of Becket—made him wish to add his contribution to the long chronicle of the Church's struggles and underlying unity. Had he been even intermittently occupied with the writing of contemporary history over a period of fifteen years it is difficult to see how he could later have resisted the temptation to record at length his memories of the life of his friend and

¹ See E. M. Jamison, 'I Conti di Molise e de Marsia' in *Atti del Convegno storico abruzzese-molisano*, vol. 1 (Casalbordino, 1932).

master, Thomas of Canterbury. For he had, pre-eminently amongst his contemporaries, the temperament of a historian: moderation, insight into character, readiness to consider all sides of a question, the power to select what is significant, the mastery of words. He had even a rudimentary training in the examination of sources, acquired in the papal court, though it went no further than testing the authenticity of papal bulls.¹ Perhaps nothing is more indicative of the pervasive, yet subordinate, place of history in twelfth-century culture than the fact that in spite of this, John's historical activity was confined to a very short period of his life, and his only serious work of history is the brief and possibly even unfinished *Historia Pontificalis*.

IV

THE HISTORICAL VALUE OF THE *HISTORIA PONTIFICALIS*

JOHN's apprehensions were justified: many of the facts recorded in the *Historia Pontificalis* would have passed into oblivion but for him; and often he has corrected the misstatements of other twelfth-century writers. Where he recounts his own experience his testimony is of the highest value. His account of the Council of Rheims and the trial of Gilbert de la Porrée is the best of the three detailed contemporary records; for Otto of Freising was absent on the Crusade and gives a second-hand report, and Geoffrey of Auxerre was an im-

¹ cf. Poole, *H.P.* p. li; and *Lectures on the Papal Chancery*, pp. 143-62. There is a discussion of a forged mandate in one of John's letters (ep. 129, ed. Brooke no. 157); the suggestion of forgery on this occasion was made by one of the parties to a suit, but archbishop Theobald's advisers agreed that the mandate seemed suspicious and should be referred to the pope.

passioned partisan of St Bernard; whereas John was an eye-witness who admired both adversaries.¹ Consequently when John differs from the other two, as for instance when he puts St Bernard's meeting with the French clergy at the beginning instead of the end of the proceedings against Gilbert, there is a presumption in his favour, which on this particular point is confirmed by a comparison of Bernard's method during the trial of Abailard. On the other hand John was writing some years later, and was not at pains to give a strictly chronological record; he is writing down the impressions that remained most forcibly, and sometimes introduces his recollections with some such general phrase as 'another day'.² The great independent value of his discussion of the subject is in his estimation of character and opinion; in the chronology he is suggestive, but needs to be checked.

It is not so certain that he wrote at first-hand of Arnold of Brescia. Poole believed that Arnold may have become reconciled to Eugenius at Viterbo in the autumn of 1146, and that possibly John met him there.³ John's account of Arnold's conduct in Rome is certainly vivid enough to have been written by an eye-witness; but it is straining the evidence to make John enter the papal service so early. He could have learned all that he records of Arnold from cardinals or papal clerks who had met him when he came to Viterbo in 1146 to make his peace with the pope,⁴ and from his own experience in the curia later when Arnold was drawn into the political

¹ A detailed comparison of the sources is given by Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. xxxvi-xlvi, and *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought*, ch. vi.

² *Infra*, p. 21

³ *Studies in Chronology and History*, pp. 250-2

⁴ Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, pp. 30-1 brings forward further evidence in favour of 1146 as the date when Arnold met Eugenius at Viterbo. Although Gleber accepts Poole's argument that John joined the papal chancery in 1146 (*ib.* p. xxii), he implies on pp. 29-30 that John may have obtained information from others in the curia, and not necessarily have been an eye-witness of the reconciliation.

revolt at Rome. John confines himself to a statement of Arnold's appearance and actions rather than his character; and indeed when he does make a general and derogatory remark—that Arnold was seditious and a fomentor of schism—he gives it as the opinion of others. This should, I think, be weighed in the scale against the evidence for John's having met Arnold; he did not normally shelter behind the opinions of others when he wished to criticise the character of men whom he knew personally, like the cardinals Octavian and Jordan.

Whatever the truth of this, there is no doubt that John's source of information was reliable, and that his account of Arnold's behaviour is so important that its publication necessitated a re-writing of Arnold's life. The value of John's contribution was first assessed by Giesebrecht and later by Poole,¹ and there is no need to retail it at length here. Suffice it to say that John proved beyond doubt that Arnold was not associated with the Roman rebellion until after the establishment of the Senate, and gave a mass of new details on other matters, as for example, that Abailard had returned to Paris and was at the church of St Hilary when Arnold went there in 1139.

The other outstanding topics for which John's history is a source of the first importance are the affairs of England during the civil wars, the Second Crusade, and the character and policy of Eugenius III. John had very naturally a keen interest in all English business that came before the papal court and has given it a prominent place in his history. His employment in the papal court gave him an insight into some of the English business being transacted at Rome, and he had opportunities later of supplementing his knowledge when he was in the household of Archbishop Theobald. He is able to give an

¹ Giesebrecht, *Arnold von Brescia* (Munich, 1873), pp. 7 sqq.; Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. lviii–lxx

account of Matilda's appeal against Stephen's claim to the throne, which was heard by Innocent II in 1139, and states fully the arguments used in her support by bishop Ulger.¹ His work is of value in illustrating the growing suspicion of successive popes towards Stephen, notwithstanding their refusal to reverse Innocent II's approval of his claims in 1136; and for the detailed charges of simony in connection with the elections to St Augustine's Canterbury, and London in 1151. It contains too a graphic account of Archbishop Theobald's escape from England against the king's orders, and his dramatic appearance at the Council of Rheims: perhaps no single work gives more eloquent testimony to the efforts of Theobald to maintain the unity of the Church throughout the difficult period of civil dissension in England. Among the more local affairs discussed is the disobedience of the monks of St Augustine's, and in his account of their resistance to the interdict and subsequent penance John gives a full statement that in the main corroborates the internal chronicles of the monastery.² He showed moreover a critical attitude to some of the abbey's charters of privilege which was rare in a twelfth-century historian, and would indeed have been impossible in any save one trained in the papal court.

He did not attempt a full narrative of the Second Crusade, but put together fragments of information that he had learned, probably from someone in the train of Louis VII, and very likely supplemented by conversations with one of the cardinal legates and Count Thierry of Flanders. He had no sources of information about the German army, and like most of the

¹ See Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, Appendix VI. Since John was not present when the case was heard it cannot be assumed that all the arguments put into Ulger's mouth by him were in fact used on this occasion, and perhaps Poole is too summary in dismissing the contradictory statement of Gilbert Foliot that no reply was given to the charge of illegitimacy brought against Matilda. The arguments may have been elaborated later.

² See Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. xlvi–lii

crusaders themselves was wholly ignorant of the Greek Emperor's outlook and the complicated politics of the Latin kingdoms in Syria. Necessarily then his narrative is limited both in scope and in purpose; and he seems to have been conscious of the difficulty of disentangling the truth from the numerous contradictory rumours. The phrase 'as it is believed' occurs more commonly here than anywhere else in the book. Sometimes too he withholds judgment altogether: in describing the motives of the eunuch Terricus in persuading the king to leave Antioch he leaves the question open—'either because he hated the queen, or because he really believed what he said'; and over the crucial question of responsibility for the raising of the siege of Damascus it is only by implication that he throws the blame on those whose one desire was to return to their own affairs at home. But within its limits, what he has to say is remarkably accurate and valuable. Kugler first saw the importance of it, and pointed out that John gives the clearest and most convincing account of the events at Antioch, and of the discussions leading up to the withdrawal from Damascus.¹ Even where his account is one-sided it is not necessarily wrong; his suggestion that the German king, Conrad, returned home by Constantinople through fear of the Norman fleet may give one of his motives, though Conrad was also fulfilling a promise made to the Emperor Manuel, and was anxious to secure an alliance with him.² As to the confused sea-battle involving the Greek, French and Sicilian forces, in which the ship carrying Queen Eleanor was captured by the Greeks and rescued by the Normans, it is unlikely that the full truth will ever be known. John rightly states that the ship

¹ *Studien zur Geschichte des Zweiten Kreuzzuges*, p. 185 n. 17; 201 n. 63. It is striking that Kugler always prefers John's statements when they conflict with the statements of other chroniclers.

² Kugler, *op. cit.*, p. 205 n. 2; see also Chalandon, *Jean II Comnène et Manuel I Comnène*, p. 326

captured was the queen's, not the king's as some rumours had it; but whether the Greeks deliberately lay in wait for the returning French forces as John believed, or had no unfriendly designs and only unintentionally went into action against them, as the Greek Cinnamus states, must remain an open question.¹

Of the last stage in the French king's journey home John is able to write from his own experience. Louis landed in Calabria, and after a few weeks in Sicilian territory crossed into the papal lands and saw Eugenius at Tusculum. It was here that Eugenius made every effort in his power to reconcile the king and queen after their quarrel at Antioch, and to put an end to the suggestion of consanguinity that the queen had again brought forward. Since John was then with the pope at Tusculum he was able to write with assurance.

Though John did not profess to write a biography of Eugenius, he has left an illuminating commentary on his character and actions. There is no flattery about it; just as he frankly told Adrian IV the causes of the popular disrespect for the Roman Curia,² he dispassionately analysed the failings of Eugenius—his suspicious character, his obstinacy and exaggerated reliance on his own judgment.³ Yet at other times he did not conceal his admiration for the actions of 'this great pope'; and his record of Eugenius's judgments in some of the cases that came before him give striking proof of his sincerity, personal incorruptibility, and refusal to put diplomatic considerations above spiritual welfare. These cases are indeed one of John's valuable contributions to history, for he wrote from his own knowledge of matters that lay outside the sphere of most chroniclers.

¹ Kugler, *op. cit.*, p. 209 n. 14; Chalandon, *op. cit.*, pp. 330–32

² *Policraticus*, vi 24 (ed. Webb, ii 67 sqq.)

³ *Infra*, p. 51

Needless to say, the *Historia Pontificalis* is not without its limitations. It was completed some fifteen years after the events described, and from time to time the author's memory failed him. Moreover it was probably never finished; the arrangement is confused, and the author seems never to have decided whether to treat his material by subjects or chronology. At one point he may follow a theme for many years; after describing the divorce case of Ralph, count of Vermandois, in 1148 he was induced by a prophetic utterance of St Bernard to leap ahead and describe the misfortunes of the family up to 1163; elsewhere he sticks so rigidly to chronology that the story of the excommunication of the monks of St Augustine's for their disregard of the interdict is related in two parts under the general heading of 1148, with the consecration of Gilbert, bishop of Hereford, and the Council of Cremona inserted between. As a work of reference, then, it is difficult to use with precision, the more so since John gives only three dates in the whole work, and two of them are wrong. So, however suggestive the evidence John records, it should not be strained unduly in the elucidation of knotty problems of genealogy and chronology. In such questions as the ancestry of King Stephen, when John mentions that two of the cardinals 'boasted that they were relatives of the king of England because his grandmother was a Lombard', but none of the possible identifications of Stephen's paternal grandmother fits John's statement, it is perhaps unwise to try to force too much significance into his words.¹

¹ *Infra*, Appendix IV

V

THE MANUSCRIPT AND ITS TRANSMISSION

THE WORK survives in a single manuscript written in the late thirteenth century and corrected later.¹ It follows a copy of the chronicle of Sigebert of Gembloux, with the additions of Anselm of Gembloux and the *Continuatio Gemblacensis*; and is written as though it were a further continuation. The manuscript, which came from the monastery of Fleury, is now MS 367 in the town library of Berne. The text of the *Historia* ends abruptly in the middle of a sentence, but at the end of a column, on f. 124v. and the following column and three whole leaves are left blank. Poole conjectured that the scribe left his work unfinished, and that the whole history, as John of Salisbury wrote it, should have filled these blank pages. It may, therefore, have been continued to the end of the pontificate of Eugenius III, or until John left the Papal Curia; but the fact that the blank pages were never ruled might suggest that the scribe had written all he had before him.

Though the loss of the concluding chapters is unfortunate, it is not remarkable that only one manuscript has survived, for the work was probably never polished and revised to the satisfaction of its author, and was certainly very little known in the Middle Ages. As it stands it is almost a private record for the interest and instruction of his friend Peter; a first draft rather than a complete work ready for publication:—and the lack of finish is obvious if it is contrasted with the *Policraticus*, the most popular and widely disseminated of John's works. Presumably the original manuscript existed for a time at Rheims, and has perished. Mabillon may have had access to

¹ For a full description see Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. lxxxvi–xc1

another manuscript, for he copied a passage from chapter 45 in his edition of St Bernard's works,¹ giving the name of Odo, abbot of St Denis, which is omitted in the Berne MS, but he may have added the name from his own knowledge. William of Nangis made use of the work for his account of the Council of Rheims and the Second Crusade, and copied parts of chapters 5, 23 and 28 into his chronicles;² we do not know which manuscript he used.

Consequently the only manuscripts known with certainty to have existed are the Berne MS and the earlier manuscript from which it was copied. Whether the work was known at all in England is a matter of dispute. Stubbs believed that Gervase of Canterbury knew the work:³ but Poole came to the conclusion that Gervase's narrative of the Council of Rheims was written independently of the *Historia Pontificalis*,⁴ and that there was no valid reason for believing that any copy of it ever came to England. I myself incline to the view of Stubbs. In the first place, Gervase's statement of his difficulty in dating the Council of Rheims is almost too close to the narrative given by John for the resemblances to be coincidental. In explaining the difficulties of dating which induced him to assign the Council of Rheims to the year 1147, Gervase says that he has found the account of events at the Council of Rheims during Lent, Archbishop Theobald's exile as a punishment for his attendance, the interdict imposed in September and the disobedience of the monks of St Augustine's, the archbishop's reconciliation with the king and the punishment of the monks beginning in Lent, all in 'several manuscripts' under the year 1148; which, he concludes, 'is impossible unless there be two

¹ *Sancti Bernardi Opera* (Paris, 1719), i, lxxx (note to ep. 285)

² Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France* (Paris, 1840-71),

xx 733-5

³ Preface to *Opera* (R.S.) i, xlv

⁴ Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. lxxxiii-lxxxiv

Lents in one year'.¹ Now, although the details of events recounted by John and Gervase differ, at times substantially, all these events do in fact occur in the *Historia Pontificalis* under the year 1148 and in the order mentioned by Gervase. The divergences of detail may easily be explained by the temperament and method of Gervase: he liked his own judgment and did not borrow wholesale from all sources; and even if he used the *Historia Pontificalis* he may have preferred other authorities for some details. Secondly, it is possible that a manuscript of the work existed at Canterbury at least until the end of the thirteenth century. One volume in the catalogue of books at Christ Church in the time of Prior Henry of Eastry is described as *Libellus J. Sarum de statu curie Romane*.² This seems more likely to be the *Historia Pontificalis* than anything else: and as John went to Canterbury when he returned to England he may well have taken a copy of the work there.

But even if this identification is correct the truth remains that the work was little known in the Middle Ages. It existed in possibly no more than three or four manuscripts, known only to a handful of readers, until Arndt published it seven hundred years after its composition.³ Since that time the editions of Arndt and Poole have made it widely known.

I have used Poole's scholarly text as a basis of the present edition. Both Professor Mynors and I have however compared it with the manuscript at Berne, and in a number of places small improvements have been possible. In some places where the text is plainly corrupt I have suggested emendations different from those made by Poole, and these are indicated in the footnotes to the text. It is hardly necessary to indicate all the

¹ *Opera*, i 139-40

² M. R. James, *Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover*, p. 115 no. 1352; cf. J. Leland, *Collectanea* III 190 (ed. 1774, IV 121). I owe this reference to Professor Mynors.

³ *M.G.H. (Scriptores)* xx 515-45
(1785)

places where minor errors of the text have been emended by Poole, and indeed even Poole did not do this. His general principles of correction can, however, be found in his Introduction, and many of the scribal peculiarities are noted in Arndt's edition. Words omitted by the scribe have been supplied in square brackets. The pages of Poole's edition are given in the margin.

In translating John of Salisbury's quotations from Scripture I have used the text of the Douai translation of the Bible because of its closeness to the Vulgate. My rendering of the title is not, I hope, unduly free. It must be remembered that John himself never called the work *Historia Pontificalis*. This title appears to have been given to it by Arndt, presumably because, after his long digression on the teaching of Gilbert de la Porrée, John writes, *Superest ut ad pontificalem redeamus hystoriam*. The work has indeed no title in the Berne manuscript: in substance it is John's 'Memoirs of the Papal Court'; and this translation is further justified by the title of the Canterbury manuscript, *Libellus J. Sarum de statu curie Romane*, which I have ventured to identify as the *Historia Pontificalis*.

LATIN TEXT
and
ENGLISH TRANSLATION

[PROLOGVS]

IERONIMVS ecclesie doctor insignis, uir fere omnium conscius litterarum, librum Paralipomenon talem dicit et tantum ut asserat illum seipsum irridere, qui sine eo diuinarum scientiam uendicat scripturarum.¹ Rationemque subiungit assertionis sue, quod in aliis libris pretermittas tangit hystorias, ex quarum intelligentia soluuntur innumerabiles Euuangelii questiones. Est enim quasi compendiosus epilogus Veteris Instrumenti, cui siquis Esdre et Machabeorum libros adiciat, diuine dispensationis magnalia que nobis in patribus exhibita sunt percurrere poterit usque ad tempus quo medium silentium tenentibus uniuersis, necessitas humani generis et diuine dispositionis ratio exigebat, ut consubstantialis et coeternus Dei Filius uterum semper incorrupte Virginis ingrederetur, et sic Verbum caro fieret et habitaret in nobis.² Quem locum sancti euuangeliste excipiunt, edocentes quid in homine et pro homine gesserit Deus homo, et alis pernibus in quatuor mundi climata euolantes, uerbum seminant quod animas [2] credentium saluat, et Christo iungit ecclesiam non habentem maculam neque rugam. Lucas, Pauli discipulus, apostolorum gesta describens, nascentis ecclesie textit infantiam; cui succedens scripturarum clauis Eusebius Cesariensis, adolescentis ecclesie processus enarrat, eamque in uirilem producit etatem, et uirorum in Christo

¹ St Jerome, *Opera*, Ep. 53.8 (Migne, *P.L.* xxii 548)

² St John i.14

PROLOGUE

JEROME, the renowned father of the church, a man of wide learning, had so high an opinion of the Book of Chronicles as to assert that anyone who claimed to know holy scripture without it would make himself a laughing-stock.¹ The reason he gave was that it touched on events omitted from other books which were the key to many problems in the gospels. For it is, as it were, a comprehensive epilogue to the Old Testament in which, with the books of Esdras and Machabees, we may read the mighty works of divine mercy manifested to us in our fathers; up to the time when, in a moment of universal silence, the needs of humanity and the purpose of the divine will required that the consubstantial and coeternal Son of God should enter the womb of an immaculate Virgin, that the Word might be made flesh and dwell among us.² At this point the holy evangelists take up the story, teaching what God as man performed in man for man; and, flying on swift wings to the four corners of the earth, spread the word which saves the souls of the faithful and unites the church without spot or stain to Christ.

Luke, Paul's disciple, who described the acts of the apostles, covered the infancy of the newly-born church; and Eusebius of Caesarea, who succeeded him as an interpreter of scripture, told the story of the church in its youth, and finally, in describing the torments and triumphs of illustrious Christians, showed it as it came

illustrium agones depingit et triumphos. Cassiodorus quoque ex gentili Christianus, monachus ex senatore, ex oratore doctor ecclesie, palmas Christiane militie uisus et acceptas a patribus preconatur, et sicut preuios in cronicis descriptionibus habuit, sic illustres uiros huius studii reliquit successores. Versantur in hoc Orosius, Ysidorus, et Beda, et alii, quos enarrare longum est, etatis quoque nostre quam plurimi sapientes, labore huiusmodi prodesse presentibus et coetaneis curauerunt. Inter quos magister Hugo canonicus sancti Victoris Parisiensis fere nouissimus floruit, qui ab inicio nascentis seculi usque ad tempus domini Innocentii pape secundi et Christianissimi regis Francorum Ludouici seriem temporum digessit, et uariationes regnorum succincta narratione complexus est.¹ Secutus est eum Sigebertus / [3] Iamblensis monachus,² qui ab anno primo Valentiniani et Gratiani telam narrationis ordiens, eam produxit usque ad concilium Remense, quod tempore iam dicti Ludouici regis Francorum celebratum est, Conrado regnante in Alemannia, anno dominice incarnationis M^oC^oXLVIII^o. Verum exinde cronicum alicuius librum non potui repperire, licet aliquas rerum memorabilium subnotationes in archiuis ecclesiarum inuenerim, que possint si qui forte scripturi sunt eorum diligentiam adiuuare. Set nec ea que sub prefato pontifice gesta sunt, memoratus retulit Sigebertus: tacuit enim plura memorabilia digna relatu, uel quia ad ipsius non

¹ The chronicle mentioned here has not been identified. Fragments of the *Liber de Tribus Maximis Circumstanciis Gestorum* (Pertz, *M.G.H.* xxiv 90-7) and the first ten books of the *Excerptiones Allegorice* (Migne, *P.L.* clxxvii 193-284) have been published; but John evidently refers to a more comprehensive work. Poole suggests that it may have been one of the unpublished MSS listed by Waitz (Pertz, *Archiv für Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, xi 306-9).

to manhood. Then Cassiodorus, who was converted from a Gentile to a Christian, from a senator to a monk, from an orator to a doctor of the church, lauded the palms that the Christian host had seen and received from the fathers; and, following in the path of other chroniclers, left as successors men distinguished in this art. Orosius, Isidore and Bede, and others whom it would be tedious to enumerate practised it; our own age too is not without numerous scholars who have undertaken to enrich their contemporaries with work of this kind. Amongst them one of the latest is Master Hugh, canon of St Victor of Paris, who related the order of events from the beginning of the world up to the time of Pope Innocent II and Louis, most Christian king of the Franks, and included all the vicissitudes of kingdoms in a concise narrative.¹ After him Sigebert, monk of Gembloux,² wove the pattern of his narrative from the first year of Valentinian and Gratian to the council of Rheims, celebrated in the year of our lord 1148, in the time of Louis king of the Franks, when Conrad was reigning in Germany. From that time, however, there is not a single chronicle that I can discover; though I have found in church archives notes of memorable events which could be of help to any future writers who may appear. Sigebert, however, did not even describe everything that took place in the time of Pope Innocent; he was silent on several important points, either because

² Sigebert of Gembloux. The chronicle of Sigebert himself ends in 1112, but was continued in his own monastery down to 1148 (*M.G.H. Scriptores*, vi 268-390). The chronicle used by John is described in detail by Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. lxxxvi-lxxxvii.

peruenere noticiam, uel quia aliis prepeditus est causis. Fuit tamen sollicitus multorum percurrere momenta regnorum, set in hiis amplius et diligentius studuit immorari, que ad suos Teutones pertinere noscuntur. Quorum etiam fauore cronicis suis nonnulla inseruisse uisus est, que uidentur ecclesie Romane priuilegiis obuiare, et sanctorum traditionibus patrum.¹ Vnde uoluntati tue, dominorum amicorumque karissime,² libentius acquiescens, omissis aliis, ea que ad pontificalem hystoriam pertinent, prout precipis, Dei gratia preeunte perstringere curabo, idem habens propositum, coetaneis et posteris proficiendi, quod cronici scriptores [4] alii / ante me noscuntur habuisse. Horum uero omnium uniformis intentio est, scitu digna referre, ut per ea que facta sunt conspiciantur inuisibilia Dei,³ et quasi propositis exemplis premii uel pene, reddant homines in timore Domini et cultu iustitie cautiore. Hiis enim incognitis, merito seipsum dicitur irridere, quisquis diuine pagine uel prudentie mundane sibi periciam uendicat. Nam, ut ait ethnicus, *aliena uita nobis magistra est*,⁴ et qui ignarus est preteritorum, quasi cecus^a in futurorum prorumpit euentus. Valet etiam noticia cronicorum ad statuendas uel euacuandas prescriptiones et priuilegia roboranda uel infirmanda; nichilque post gratiam et legem Dei uiuentes rectius et ualidius instruit

^a secus Poole

¹ The *Continuatio Gemblacensis* of Sigebert in fact gives no more than the briefest summary of the acts of the Council. The writer merely records that the acts of Innocent II were ratified and those of Peter Leonis invalidated and that the heretic called Eunus was condemned. He estimates the numbers present at 1100. (The actual number was about 400: see Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, V¹ 823 n. 2.) If there is any hostility to the Church, as John implies, it can only lie in omission.

² Peter of Celle, who in 1162 became abbot of St Remigius of Rheims.

they had escaped his notice, or for some other reason. For although he was anxious to handle great events in many kingdoms, he gave more space and care to those which concerned his Germans. Out of zeal for them, probably, he inserted some things in his chronicle which seem contrary to the privileges of the Roman church and the traditions of the holy fathers.¹ And so, my dearest friend and master,² I gladly obey your command; and will undertake, by the grace of God, as you bid, to give a short account of events touching papal history, omitting all else. My aim, like that of other chroniclers before me, shall be to profit my contemporaries and future generations. For all these chroniclers have had a single purpose: to relate noteworthy matters, so that the invisible things of God may be clearly seen by the things that are done,³ and men may by examples of reward or punishment be made more zealous in the fear of God and pursuit of justice. Yes indeed, anyone ignorant of these things, who claims knowledge of holy writ or worldly wisdom, may be said to make himself a laughing-stock. For, as the pagan says, 'The lives of others are our teachers';⁴ and whoever knows nothing of the past hastens blindly into the future. Besides, the records of the chronicles are valuable for establishing or abolishing customs, for strengthening or destroying privileges; and nothing, after knowledge of the grace and law of God, teaches the living more surely and soundly than knowledge of the deeds of the departed.

He was John's closest friend, and had at one time employed him in his service; for a discussion of this, see C. N. L. Brooke, op. cit. pp. xvi-xvii.

³ Romans i.20. cf. Hugh of St Victor, Migne, *P.L.* clxxvii 203

⁴ Cato, *Distichs*, iii 13: *Vita est nobis aliena magistra.*

quam si gesta cognouerint decessorum. In hiis autem que dicturus sum nichil auctore Deo scribam, nisi quod uisu et auditu uerum esse cognouero, uel quod probabilitium uirorum scriptis fuerit et auctoritate subnixum. Sit ergo nostri sermonis initium Filius Virginis intemerate, qui in principio erat Verbum,¹ ceptumque promoueat opus ad salutem nostram, et ecclesie sue utilitatem, qui recte gradientium dux est et finis omnium gerendorum.

I

Vt itaque, mi Petre, cui sicut apostolo future uirtutis presagio quodam a fidei soliditate nomen inditum est,ronicis Sigeberti narratio nostra continuari possit, a concilio Remensi, in quo ille suam finit, ordimur nostram, subtexentes ea que ab illo constat fuisse preterita, et ecclesiasticis negotiis adminiculari posse [5] creduntur. Et quidem primo / de proclamationibus ibi factis, eo quod auctoritate sanctorum constat synodali proclamatione, quasi litis contestatione, possessionis interruptionem ciuilitate fieri.² Quas si retulero, mihi non debet aliquis indignari, quia nullius hystorie fides est incorrupta, si scriptor adulationi pocius seruiat quam ueritati, et dum paucis placere nititur, in sui ipsius perniciem decipit uniuersos. Archiepiscopus itaque Lugdunensis ecclesie, que, sicut apud ueteres hystoricos legitur, prima Galliarum sedes est, protestatus est Rothomagensem, Senonensem, et Turonensem archiepiscopus et prouincias eorum sibi et ecclesie sue ^a iure

^a *om.* Poole

¹ St John i. 1

In what I am going to relate I shall, by the help of God, write nothing but what I myself have seen and heard and know to be true, or have on good authority from the testimony or writings of reliable men. So may the beginning of my discourse be that Son of the immaculate Virgin who 'in the beginning was the Word';¹ and may He guide the work I have undertaken for our salvation and the welfare of His church, for He is the guide of all who walk rightly and the end of all that we do.

I

AND NOW my Peter—named like the apostle from the strength of your faith as a presage of future virtue—in order to make my chronicle a continuation of Sigebert's I will begin mine at the council of Rheims, where he ended his; but I will add the things he omitted which may be useful to those who have the conduct of church affairs. First I will deal with the proclamations made there; because canon law prescribes that in a synodal proclamation, as in legal pleading, possession should be disturbed only by due process of law.² Let no-one blame me for repeating them, since no history is trustworthy if the writer is more anxious to flatter than to tell the truth, and by striving to please a few deceives all to his own peril. To continue, the archbishop of Lyons, according to ancient histories the first see in Gaul, complained that the archbishops and provinces of Rouen, Sens, and Tours ought to be subject to him and his

² Codex, iii 9 and 20 bear on the question, though neither precisely. For the *litis contestatio*, or formal joining of issue in a suit, see P. Fournier, *Les officialités*, pp. 170-4.

debere primatus esse subiectos, Rothomagensem uendicans et Senonensem; nam Turonensis ei obedientiam exhibebat; at illi prescriptionem longissimi temporis opposuerunt, et quod ad hoc uocati non uenerant.¹ Similiter Vienensi Bituricensem uendicanti responsum est, hoc adiecto quod mirum uideri debet Vienensis oppidi presulem in tantam prorupisse uecordiam ut patriarchatum Bituricensem uelit habere subiectum. Bituricensis autem Narbonensem archiepiscopum et episcopum Aniciensem et abbatem Castridolensis uendicauit. Dominus Theobaldus Cantuariensis proclamauit aduersus Henricum Eboracensem, qui sedem suam posuerat ab aquilone quasi eius locus esset a pari. Set pro eo respondit dominus papa, quod qui nondum habebat sedem, supersedere non poterat, conuenire^a dicens hoc, quia Stephanus rex Anglorum eundem [6] archi/episcopum sede sua priuabat, quia contra uoluntatem et prohibitionem suam electus fuerat,² et a domino papa Autisiodori³ consecratus. Albero Treuerensis archiepiscopus uendicauit Remensem, asserens ex eo ius suum in expedito esse, quod non modo in antiquis hystoriis set etiam in canonibus Romanorum pontificum

^a conueniri Poole

¹ The development of a hierarchy of jurisdictions, inseparable from the development of canon law, made the primacy of a see a question of the extent of jurisdiction as well as of honour. Needless to say, conflicting precedents had been established at an earlier date, when the recognition of primacy resulted from a variety of qualifications, and the practical consequences were slight: so that in the early twelfth century incompatible claims existed and were urged at every ecclesiastical council. On the litigiousness of the period cf. David Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, pp. 273-4. For details of the claims put forward in 1148 see Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, Appendix I. Eugenius III adroitly avoided coming to any decision on these claims.

church by its right of primacy; he claimed thereby the¹¹⁴⁸ obedience of Rouen and Sens, for the church of Tours already obeyed him, but they countered by citing immemorial custom and protesting that they had not been legally summoned to defend their claims.¹ A like reply was given to the archbishop of Vienne who claimed the subjection of Bourges, with the added comment that for the bishop of the town of Vienne to wish to hold subject the patriarch of Bourges was mad presumption which must cause widespread astonishment. Also the archbishop of Bourges claimed the subjection of the archbishop of Narbonne and the bishop of Le Puy and the abbot of Bourg-Dieu. Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury appealed against Henry of York who had taken up his seat in the north as though he were of equal dignity. To this however the pope replied that one who as yet had no seat could not supersede, which was true enough since Stephen, king of the English, had deprived archbishop Henry of his seat on account of his election against the king's wishes, indeed against his express prohibition,² and his consecration by the pope at Auxerre.³ Alberic, archbishop of Trèves, claimed the subjection of Rheims, asserting that his right was unimpugnable since the canons of the Roman pontiffs as well as ancient histories bore witness

² Henry Murdac had been elected to the see of York to succeed St William in 1147. The election was divided, but Eugenius had confirmed it in favour of Henry, and consecrated him at Trèves on 7 December. King Stephen had deprived him of his temporalities, and he did not secure possession of his church until 25 January 1151. His tenure of the see was a short and stormy one. See Poole in *E.H.R.*, 1930 (vol. xlv).

³ An error for Trèves. See Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, p. 71. Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera* (R.S.), i, 135, makes the same mistake.

reperitur quod Treueris Belgica prima est, Remis autem Belgica secunda. Sed tantus Francorum clamor subortus est, ut auditui publico non potuerit responderi, eo quod eis, etsi uir optimus fuerit, insanus uisus est proclamator, presertim qui hoc Remis ausus est protestari. Episcopus Parisiensis uendicauit abbatem sancti Germani, Senonensis archiepiscopus abbates Ferrariensem et sancte Columbe, Eduensis episcopus Viziliacensem, Rothomagensis archiepiscopus Fiscannensem, et alios alii. Sed omnibus responsum est quod Lugdunensi.

II

Et quia prefatus rex Anglorum Iohannem Papa/ [7] ronem¹ diaconum cardinalem et Hybernie legatum, transire per Angliam prohibuerat in prouinciam sibi delegatam, et episcopus et abbates Anglie uocatos ad concilium detinuerat, et supra dictum Eboracensem excludebat ab archiepiscopatu suo, meruerat indignationem domini pape, quia commonitus non modo non satisfaciebat, sed delicta delictis et iniurias cumulabat iniuriis. Miserat tamen tres episcopos, Robertum Herefordensem, Willelmum Norwicensem, et Hylarium Cicestrensem, ut Cantuariensis archiepiscopi et aliorum^a absentiam excusarent. Quod tamen in fraudem et perniciem ipsius Cantuariensis tam a rege et regina et consilio

^a et aliorum *om.* Poole

¹ John Paparo did not become papal legate in Ireland until after the death of St Malachy on 2 November 1148. St Malachy, archbishop of Armagh and papal legate in Ireland, crossed through England in 1148 on a mission to secure the pallium. He was delayed at the coast by Stephen's

that Trèves was the see of *Belgica prima*, Rheims only of ¹¹⁴⁸ *Belgica secunda*. But at this such a clamour arose among the French that it was impossible to answer in the public audience; for although he was a most worthy man they thought him insane in his claims, above all for daring to assert such a thing at Rheims. The bishop of Paris claimed jurisdiction over the abbot of St Germain, the archbishop of Sens over the abbeys of Ferrières and St Colombe, the bishop of Autun over Vézelay, the archbishop of Rouen over Fécamp, and so on. But all received the same answer as the archbishop of Lyons.

II

IT HAPPENED that the King of the English had incurred the pope's wrath. For he had refused to allow John Paparo, cardinal deacon and legate in Ireland, to travel through England to the province delegated to him; ¹ had detained the English bishops and abbots summoned to the council, and was excluding Henry archbishop of York from his see. When admonished, instead of giving satisfaction he made matters still worse, by heaping sin on sin and injury on injury. For instance he sent three bishops, Robert of Hereford, William of Norwich and Hilary of Chichester to present apologies for the absence of the archbishop of Canterbury and the others: but it seems that the intention of the king and queen and their

order, and had to wait some time before crossing the channel. (cf. St Bernard, *Vita Malachi* in *P.L.* clxxxii 1114.) Later, probably in 1150, John Paparo was refused an unconditional safe-conduct when he was on his way to Ireland as papal legate. John of Salisbury may have confused the two episodes, or have forgotten that the trials of John Paparo were after, not before, the Council of Rheims.

eorum quam ab episcopis quibusdam totum procuratum fuisse creditur, sicut ex post factis patenter innotuit. Sed hoc presentiens idem archiepiscopus per fugam elapsus est, quia ei undique pretendebantur insidie, et rex ipse Cantuariam uenerat, quo facilius omnis archiepiscopo precluderetur egressus. Ille tamen sciens obedientiam uictimis preferendam,¹ et confidens de [8] miseri/cordia Domini, piscatoriam nauiculam quam conduxerat in abdito secessu et ab hominum uicinia remoto occultatam, que non plus quam xiii homines capiebat, et erat fere destituta necessariis armamentis, ingressus est, et sic non tam nauigio quam quasi quodam^a naufragio transfretauit. Premiserat autem quosdam de clericis suis, licencia a rege impetrata, sub pretexto excusationis in concilio faciende. Ex insperato ergo ueniens ad concilium cum honore maximo receptus est ab uniuersis, ipsique regi pernecessarius. Cum enim dominus papa nouissimo die concilii surrexisset iam candelis accensis ob causas superiores regem excommunicaturus, et a patribus et a magnis uiris qui conuenerant et satisfactionem promittebant faciende condicionis dilatio non posset impetrari, dominus Cantuariensis affectuosissime supplicauit ut parceret, et solus pre ceteris omnibus, sicut apostolicus ipse publice testatus est, meruit exaudiri. Nam quasi attonitus et stupens immensam hominis benignitatem, post aliquantulam meditationem et suspiria sic exorsus est: *Videte, fratres, hominem qui temporibus nostris euangelicum implet uirum, qui inimicos diligere consuevit et pro persecutoribus suis orare non desinit.*² *Licet ergo rex ille temeritate sua ecclesie Dei et nostram meruerit indignationem, tantam tamen*

^a om. Poole¹ 1 Kings xv.22² cf. St Matthew v.44

council as well as certain bishops was merely to deceive and injure the archbishop of Canterbury, as indeed future events were to reveal. However the archbishop foresaw this; and, since he was watched on all sides and the king himself had come to Canterbury to prevent him leaving, fled away secretly. For he knew well that obedience is better than sacrifices,¹ and trusting in God's mercy went aboard a fishing smack which he had hired and hidden in a remote bay far from the haunts of men: a vessel that would carry no more than a dozen men and lacked even the most essential equipment; and so he crossed the channel rather as a survivor from a shipwreck than in a ship. Certain of his clerks had been sent ahead with the king's permission, ostensibly to make his apologies in the council; and so when he himself arrived there unexpectedly, he was received everywhere with honour. This proved in the end to the king's advantage; for on the last day of the council the pope rose to excommunicate the king for the reasons I have given. The candles had been lighted, and the prelates and leading men, who were assembled there to promise that the king would give satisfaction, could obtain no more delays for negotiations, when my lord of Canterbury most movingly begged for mercy; and he was the only one of them all, as the pope himself has openly avowed, who could gain a hearing. Dumb-founded, not to say thunderstruck, by the boundless charity of this man, the pope at first meditated in silence and then, sighing, spoke as follows: 'My brethren, behold this man who enacts the gospel in our own time by loving his enemies and never ceasing to pray for his persecutors.'² For although the king has by his effrontery deserved our wrath and the wrath of God's church,

[9] *caritatem non possumus non approbare cuius uota | cogimur exaudire. Ad ipsius preces sententiam nunc suspendimus, dantes regi ad satisfaciendum trium mensium dilacionem, et tunc nisi interim satisfecerit, cum accessione dampnationis amplioris retorquetur in caput et terram eius.*

III

DECRETA demum promulgata sunt ¹ cum interpretationibus et causis suis, et assensu publico roborata, uno tamen excepto. Nam cum usus uariarum pellium clericis interdiceretur,² et plurimi interrogati sibi complacere responderent, Raginaldus de Hildenesham ³ et alii Teutones reclamauerunt decretum hoc nec placere presentibus nec posteris placiturum. Vitans autem prolixitatem et quia canonibus inserta sunt, ipsa decreta non insero; de quorundam tamen interpretationibus et causis pauca censui subnectenda, eo quod de hiis quibusdam risus nascitur, aliis questio.

Nam cum inhiberetur ⁴ ne episcopi, abbates, presbiteri, diaconi, subdiaconi, canonici regulares, monachi, conuersi, professi, item ne moniales, coniugia contrahant, et si contraxerint ab inuicem separentur, quia talium personarum nullum est matrimonium, res friuola et risu digna nonnullis acta esse uidetur. Quis enim hoc nescit esse illicitum? Sed quia personas huiusmodi plerumque deponi, plerumque regularem contingit effugere disciplinam, et sic uel inter suos, uel apud extraneos ad seculi redire commercia, et quasi contractis matrimoniis ecclesiam ledi uel scandalizari,

¹ See Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, Preface, iii 2; Hefele, V¹ 824 sqq.

² Canon 2

³ Reynold of Dassel, provost of Hildesheim, appointed chancellor to Frederick Barbarossa in 1156

nevertheless we cannot but commend such love or refuse ¹¹⁴⁸ to hear his prayers. Yielding to his entreaties we now suspend the sentence and grant the king three months delay to give satisfaction. If he fails to do so by that time, the sentence shall then fall on him and his kingdom with heavier damnation than before.³

III

FINALLY the decretals ¹ were promulgated with their interpretations and explanations, and approved by general consent, with one exception. This concerns the banning of multi-coloured cloaks for the clergy,² for though most who were asked signified their approval, Reynold of Hildesheim ³ and the other Germans protested that the decretal would be disliked by both present and future generations. To avoid repetition, I shall not copy these decretals, for they are to be found amongst the canons; but I have thought it worth while to add explanations and interpretations of a few that might otherwise seem unnecessary or hard to understand.

For instance one canon ⁴ forbade bishops, abbots, priests, deacons, sub-deacons, regular canons, monks, lay-brethren, novices, even nuns to contract marriages, and ordered any contracted by them to be dissolved, since the marriage of such persons is null and void; and this decree seemed unnecessary and even ludicrous to some. For who does not know that it is unlawful? However sometimes in the past persons of this kind have been unfrocked, or have fled from the cloister and, returning to worldly affairs either amongst their own people or elsewhere, have brought injury and scandal on the church by

⁴ Canon 7

et liberos ex huiusmodi contuberniis procreatos propinquorum petere successiones, uisum est ecclesie con-
 [10] gruum constitutionem hanc / promulgari. Meminimus quod Capuanus¹ quem Petrus Leonis² consecrauerat, postquam a domino Innocentio depositus est, Rome duxit uxorem et exercuit medicinam; multique alii similia commiserunt, ut Geruasius Remensis archidiaconus, qui per sententiam domini Pascalii pape secundi in concilio Trecensi³ detrusus a cathedra Remensi, quam occupauerat Philippi regis auctoritate, duxit uxorem, cuius adhuc liberi extant.

Queritur autem quatenus protendi debeat ut excommunicati mittantur ad dominum papam absoluendi, qui in clericos, monachos, conuersos, et moniales uiolentas iniecerint manus. Sed dominus papa mentem suam interpretatus est dicens eos hoc canone non teneri, qui ex necessitate iusti officii tale quid commisisse noscuntur. Iusti inquam, quia si quis ex iniquo tyranni cuiusque mandato, uel alterius uiolentia potestatis hoc egerit, non quidem hac seueritate canonis liberatur, sed mandatorem uel uiolentum, sicut auctorem culpe, sic et pene dinoscitur habere consortem. Alias autem si forte quis hostiarius ut irruentes clericos ab introitu repellat, uirga percutit non uoluntate nocendi; item si acolitus phonastro uel correptorio, quod uulgus nostratum bosretum nuncupat,⁴ non tenetur. Item si doctor in scolis discipulum uel condiscipulum alium, /

¹ Peter, archbishop of Capua (Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, Appendix II)

² Peter Leonis, the antipope Anacletus II

³ The Council of Troyes, May 1107

⁴ The text here appears corrupt. Poole suggests that *acolytus uel phonascus* may be intended by *acolytus phonastro uel. . . .* The translation

contracting so-called marriages, and trying to make the children of these concubinages heirs of their relatives: therefore the church has thought fit to promulgate this decree. I recall that after the prelate of Capua¹ consecrated by Peter Leonis² had been deposed by Pope Innocent he married a wife in Rome and practised medicine; and many others have done likewise, like Gervase archdeacon of Rheims who, by decree of Pope Paschal II in the council of Troyes³ was expelled from the cathedral where he had been placed by the authority of King Philip: he married afterwards and his children are alive today.

There was also some doubt about the precise application of the canon that anyone who had laid violent hands on clerks, monks, lay-brethren or nuns must go to the pope for absolution. But the pope made his intention clear by saying that this canon was not to be applied to those who had committed such violence in the performance of their just duty. I say just, because if anyone had used force to carry out a tyrant's unrighteous command or wreak another's violence he would not be spared the rigours of the law, but would share the penalty with the instigator or tyrant who was author of his guilt. But the case would be different if by chance a doorkeeper, trying to hold back a crowd of clerks from rushing through a door, accidentally struck one with his staff; or if an acolyte⁴ struck somebody with his rod or baton, colloquially called a birch. Again the canon would not apply if a master in the schools struck his pupil, or one pupil another, or one

would then be, 'If an acolyte or choirmaster struck somebody with a rod. . . .'

[11] uel claustrensis claustralem aut conuersus conuersum, aut paterfamilias filium uel domesticum suum feriat, hoc canone non tenetur. Possunt enim hec in scholis uel claustris commodius emendari, quam si inde pateat sub pretextu adeundi dominum papam curiosis et dissolutis libertas euagandi. Nam quod nocendi animo non committitur, nec fit in perniciem alicuius aut fraudem, nequaquam tanta pena plectendum est; nec manus uiolenta dici debet, qua constat modestiam uel salutem alterius procurari. Sed nec percussori facile credi debet pro se contra lesam aliquid afferenti, potius ueritas ipsa diligentius perscrutanda est, et quod talium personarum utilitati expedit exequendum. Hoc ita dominus papa interpretatus est, asserens omnes episcopos et fideles ecclesie debere sequi prescriptas interpretationes, quia sub hac intentione promulgauit canones.

IV

PROMPTVS uero, ut apostolus precipit, omnem punire inobedienciam,¹ nominatim suspendit episcopum Wintoniensem et archiepiscopos Maguntinum et Coloniensem, et preterea omnes qui ad concilium uocati non uenerant. Episcopus uero Wintoniensis tandem per fratrem suum comitem Theobaldum et alios magnos uiros impetrauit ut a suspensione relaxaretur, donec infra sex menses adiret dominum papam.² Alii diu in sus-
[12] pensione manserunt, et / Maguntinus tandem depositus est.³ Sic autem concilium solutum est, retentis maioribus

¹ 2 Corinthians x.6

² For Henry of Blois' visits to the curia see Appendix I

³ The archbishop of Mainz was deposed by two cardinals with the

monk another monk, or one lay-brother another, or the head of a household his son or servant. For it is more desirable to settle such matters in the schools or cloisters than to provide an excuse for the idle and dissolute to roam about under pretext of going to the pope. Indeed anything which is not done maliciously, or with evil intent, ought by no means to incur such a penalty; and no hand should be called violent which helps to ensure another's well-being or good behaviour. On the other hand the assertions made by one man against another whom he has struck ought not to be believed too readily, but the truth should be diligently sought out, and the interests of all taken into consideration. Thus the pope interpreted this canon, declaring¹¹⁴⁸ that the bishops and all the faithful ought to apply these interpretations, for he had promulgated it with that intention.

IV

BEING ready, as the apostle commands, to punish all disobedience,¹ the pope suspended the bishop of Winchester and archbishops of Mainz and Cologne by name, and all who had failed to obey the summons to the council in general. Of these the bishop of Winchester, through the intercession of his brother count Theobald and other prominent men, succeeded in obtaining relaxation of the sentence for six months, to enable him to come to the pope; ² the others remained long under the sentence, and the archbishop of Mainz was finally deposed.³ After that the council was dissolved, the most prominent dignitaries remaining behind to settle

king's acquiescence in 1153. See Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, p. 11 n. 20.

personis ad quedam negocia diffinienda. Domino uero Cantuariensi, qui multam gratiam eius promeruerat, concessit ut omnes episcopos et abbates Anglie qui suspensi erant pro beneplacito suo absolueret uel teneret suspensos.

V

ACCIDIT autem post concilium cum dominus papa missam in maiori ecclesia celebraret, et ei pro more Romano calix afferretur a comministris, quod sanguis Domini nescio qua ministrorum negligentia effusus est super tapetum ante altare. Unde omnes plurimum conturbati sunt. Sed dominus papa misit Guidonem Pisanum diaconum cardinalem et cancellarium, et fecit illam tapeti partem in quam sanguis ceciderat abscindi, inter alias reliquias reponendam, ministris indicens penitentiam de tanta negligentia. Sed hec res sapientiores plurimum terruit, optinente indubitata opinione quod huiusmodi res in nulla contingit ecclesia cui non immineat undecunque graue periculum, et quia hoc in apostolica sede contigerat, uniuersalis ecclesie periculum timebatur; certe non fefellit opinio.¹

Eodem enim anno Conradus rex Romanorum et Christianissimus rex Francorum Ludouicus, deletis exercitibus eorum a Sarracenis in oriente,² uix euaserunt, dampno tamen irreparabili illato Christiane religioni.

¹ For John's views on the type of portents that were divine signs and those that were merely superstitions see *Policraticus*, ii 1-17.

² In ch. xxiii John takes up the narrative from the time of King Louis' arrival at Antioch. This is his only reference to the disasters suffered by the French and German armies in the autumn and winter of 1147-48. John's condemnation of Geoffrey of Rancon is supported by Odo of Deuil, whom John may have met; for Geoffrey disobeyed orders whilst crossing

other business. The pope conceded to the archbishop¹¹⁴⁸ of Canterbury, who had won great favour in his sight, that he might absolve all the guilty bishops and abbots of England, or leave them under sentence as he thought fit.

V

IT CAME to pass that after the council, whilst the pope was celebrating mass in the cathedral and the chalice was being brought to him by his assistants according to Roman custom, one of them was careless enough to spill the consecrated wine on the carpet before the altar. This gave rise to general consternation. The pope at once sent his chancellor, the cardinal deacon Guy of Pisa, to cut out the piece of carpet on which the blood of Our Lord had fallen, and place it among the other relics; and imposed penance on the assistants for such negligence. In spite of this many thinking men were deeply alarmed; for the prevailing belief was that such a thing could never happen in any church unless some serious evil threatened it; and since this time the Apostolic See was involved the whole church seemed to be in danger. And indeed this belief did not err.¹

For in that very year Conrad king of the Romans and Louis, most Christian king of the Franks, barely escaped alive after the annihilation of their armies by Saracens in the east;² and thus irreparable harm was

the mountains from Laodicea to Attalia, pressed on too far over the crest of a mountain and allowed the Turks to cut the army in two. Only a remnant of the French army reached Antioch in March 1148. For the misfortunes of the Crusaders up to this time see Grousset, *Histoire des Croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem*, ii 235-45, and Kugler, *Studien zur Geschichte des Zweiten Kreuzzuges*, ch. iv.

[13] Sed exercitus Conradi temeritate Teu/tonum ante con-
fectus est; postea uero periclitari contigit Francos pre-
sumptione et negligentia Gaufridi de Rancuno qui
prime cohortis dux erat et signifer regis.

VI

RADVLFVS comes Viromannensis, qui triennio fuerat
excommunicatus, eo quod uxorem suam, quam iniuste
dimiserat, recipere nolebat,¹ absolutionem quam per
regem Francorum nec in nouissimo colloquio quando /
[14] Ierosolimam proficiscens licentiam petiit, potuit im-
petrare, fretus auxilio et consilio diaconorum cardinalium,
Iohannis Paparonis [et] Gregorii de sancto Angelo obti-
nuit, non sine suspitione interuenientis peccunie. Presti-
terat enim absolute iuramentum mandatum apostolicum
exequendi, quod semper antea detrectauerat; sed
prenouerat per antedictos cardinales quid esset apostoli-
cus mandaturus. Cum ergo die sibi prefixa tam comes
quam uxor eius quam reiecerat in Remensi palatio
quasi causam acturi conuenissent, dominus papa cunctis
exposuit qua ratione fecerit absolui comitem, recepto
secundum morem ecclesie iuramento sollempni; et quia
uerecundebatur facere in facie ecclesie quod tum

¹ Ralph I or IV, count of Vermandois, who was assisting Suger in the administration of France during the king's absence, had married Leonora, a niece of count Theobald IV of Blois. The marriage had been dissolved with the support of the bishops of Noyon, Laon and Senlis; and Ralph had then married Petronilla, sister of Queen Eleanor. The divorce was challenged by count Theobald and St Bernard, and indeed the good faith of the parties might be questioned as Simon, bishop of Noyon, was Ralph's brother and the bishop of Laon figures in a number of prominent divorce cases (cf. *infra*, ch. 23). Innocent II excommunicated Ralph and Petronilla in 1142; and Eugenius III renewed the excommunication in 1145. Meanwhile however Louis VII had made war on Theobald, and persuaded him

done to the Christian faith. Conrad's army was Oct. 1147
destroyed first through the recklessness of the Germans:
later the Franks were imperilled by the rashness and
negligence of Geoffrey of Rancon, leader of the advance Jan. 1148
guard and standard-bearer of the king.

VI

RALPH count of Vermandois, who had been ex- 1148
communicated for three years for refusing to take back
the wife whom he had unjustly repudiated, and even in
the recent conference when the king of the Franks had
sought permission to set out for Jerusalem had failed
to obtain absolution by the king's intercession, now at
last obtained absolution.¹ This was done through the
help and advice of the cardinal deacons, John Paparo
and Gregory of St Angelo, not without suspicion of
bribery. For he took an unconditional oath of obedience
to the papal ruling, which previously he had refused to
take: now however he knew in advance, thanks to the
two cardinals, what the pope would command. When
on the appointed day the count and his rejected wife met
in the palace at Rheims as if to pursue the case, the pope
expounded to the assembly why he had absolved the
count after receiving a solemn oath, according to
ecclesiastical custom; and because he was ashamed to
do in the sight of the church what he then did (he was

by force of arms to work for the revocation of the sentence of excommunica-
tion. There can be no doubt that the pressure to which Eugenius in the
end gave way was purely political, and had no regard to the rights and
wrongs of the case. See Watkin Williams, *St Bernard of Clairvaux*, pp. 209-16.

faciebat (rescindebat enim sententiam decessorum suorum, Innocentii, Celestini, Lucii, et ut credebatur equissimam, qui dampnauerant adulterium quod comes cum sorore regine arguebatur committere), beniuolentiam mulieris et partis sue captare plurimum uisus est, dicens se id agere ut illa debitam consolationem recipiat, et tandem a dampnis et laboribus eruatur, et de nullo grauamine queri possit. *Queris inquit tibi audientiam fuisse denegatam et te circumscriptam dolo et uiolentia partis aduerse. Nos autem te ad causam restituimus, ut liberum sit tibi et tuis pro te sicut comiti pro se quod placuerit allegare.* Illa autem sentiens se ad hoc inuitari ut acta ageret, / nec [15] cupida redire ad comitem, cuius animum sibi preripuerat alia, gratias egit, dicens se libenter audituram, quid a parte diceretur aduersa. Quid multa? Processerunt Bartholemeus Laudunensis episcopus et alii, parentelam, quam alia uice uitauerant, tactis euuangelis iuraturi. Sed apostolicus prohibuit episcopum sacra tangere, dicens sufficere debere si episcopus sacris inspectis testimonium dicat. Sic prestito iuramento, diuertium factum est, et utrique data facultas matrimonium contrahendi pro libitu tantum in Domino.¹ Comes autem condemnatus est mulieri in dote restituenda; at ille respondit, se iam refudisse comiti Theobaldo: unde presumpum est ab uniuersis, inter partes fuisse collusum.

¹ 1 Corinthians vii.39

rescinding the sentence of his predecessors Innocent, ¹¹⁴⁸ Celestine and Lucius, and a most just sentence at that, for it condemned the adultery with which the count was charged with the queen's sister), he deemed it proper to gain the goodwill of the lady and her party by saying that he acted as he did so that she might secure due reparation and be freed at last from her injuries and griefs without any just cause for complaint. 'You complain,' he said, 'that hearing was refused you and you were cheated dishonestly and ruthlessly by the opposing party. We however revive your case, so that you and your supporters have an equal right with the count to bring forward any evidence you choose.' She for her part, feeling that she had been invited there to endorse decisions already taken, and having no desire to return to the count who had given his affection to another, thanked him and said she was prepared to hear whatever the opposing party had to say. Need I say more? Bartholomew, bishop of Laon, and others came forward to swear on the gospels to the consanguinity which they had not mentioned before. But the pope forbade the bishop to touch the gospels, on the grounds that it would suffice if he gave evidence after merely looking at them. So, when the oath had been taken, divorce was pronounced, and both were given power to contract marriage freely 'only in the Lord.'¹ Further, the count was sentenced to restore the lady's dower to her; but he replied that he had already restored it to count Theobald. This was generally taken to prove that the parties had been in agreement beforehand.

VII

INTERFVIT uir sanctissimus et precepte auctoritatis domnus Bernardus abbas Clareuallensis et comitis Theobaldi, pro cultu iusticie et honestatis titulo et religionis ueneratione et beneficentia in pauperes Christi, uehementissimus amator. Hic uidens comitem Radulfum diu scandalizasse ecclesiam et adhuc in contubernio a tribus apostolicis condemnato permanere, dixit, sicut multi testantur adhuc, nescio si ex indignatione quam zelus accenderet, siue in spiritu prophetie, quod nunquam erat de lecto illo soboles egressura que laudabilem fructum faceret in populo Dei, et quod diu non erant ad inuicem gauisuri. Vaticinium pro parte impletum est. Illa namque non diu superuixit, pepererat tamen ante ^a filium ¹ et duas filias: ² sed filius in puericia leprosus [16] factus / miserrimus uiuit adhuc; filie eius nupserunt, altera comiti Flandrensi, altera Niuernensi, sed nulla earum adhuc sustulit prolem, licet tempore multo maritis cohabitauerint. Comes autem Radulfus terciam duxit uxorem, filiam Theodorici comitis Flandrorum nomine Lauram.³ Post non multum tempus, de graui conualescens infirmitate, a medico qui eum curauerat sub

^a *om.* Poole

¹ The son was count Ralph II or V, the Leprous, of Vermandois. In 1163 his lands passed to his sister Isabella and her husband Philip of Alsace; John's account makes it plain that he did not die in that year as Pirenne assumed (*Histoire de Belgique*, i 416), but merely became incapacitated through illness. He probably died in 1167. See *L'Art de Vérifier les Dates* (Third Edition, Paris, 1783-7) ii 707.

² The elder daughter Isabella married Philip of Alsace, count of Flanders; the younger, Eleanor, married first Godfrey, count of Ostrevant, son of Baldwin IV, count of Hainault (d. 1163); then William IV, count of Nevers (d. 1167), and afterwards Matthew of Alsace, count of Boulogne and Matthew of Beaumont-sur-Oise. Both remained childless to the

VII

AMONGST those present was a man of great sanctity ¹¹⁴⁸ and weighty influence, Bernard abbot of Clairvaux, fervently attached to count Theobald because of his pursuit of justice and reputation for uprightness, his reverence for the church and generosity towards the poor. He, knowing that count Ralph had scandalized the church for many years and was still living in a concubinage condemned by three popes, declared in the hearing of many still alive—whether simply from righteous indignation or in a spirit of prophecy I cannot say—that no issue springing from that bed would bear worthy fruit among the people of God, and that they themselves would not enjoy each other for long. That prophecy has been fulfilled in part. She did not survive for long; and though she bore a son ¹ and two daughters ² before her ¹¹⁴⁸⁻⁶³ death, the son became a leper in his boyhood and now drags out a wretched life: her daughters married, one the count of Flanders, the other the count of Nevers, but neither has yet borne any offspring though they have cohabited with their husbands for many years. As for count Ralph, he married as his third wife a daughter of Thierry count of Flanders called Laura.³ Shortly afterwards, when he was recovering from a serious illness,

time of their death. Poole suggests that John may have learned the details of the Vermandois family history from Philip of Alsace, when he met him at L'Écluse in the early spring of 1164 (*Hist. Pont.*, Preface, vii 3). At this date Eleanor cannot have been married to the count of Nevers for more than a year, but John was probably considering also her first marriage in suggesting that she had been childless for a long time.

³ Laura or Lauretta, daughter of Thierry of Alsace and his first wife, and widow of Iwan, count of Alost.

interminatione mortis accedere prohibitus est ad uxorem; at ille, ut erat uxorius, accessit. Quod cum medicus deprehendisset in urina, precepit ut disponderet domui sue,¹ quia erat infra triduum moriturus; unde uerbo uiri Dei creditur amplius in hiis que complenda restant, et, quod frequens est, ex eo uicio periit, cui ardentius inseruiuit; ei namque libido semper dominata est. Sic ad Philippum comitem Flandrie, licet proceribus inuitis, per serenissimi regis beniuolentiam Veromannensis deuolutus est comitatus.²

VIII

EVOCATVS apparebat in curia uir etate nostra litteratissimus magister Gislebertus episcopus Pic-tauorum,³ responsurus clarissime opinionis et eloquent-issimo uiro abbati Clareuallensi, super quibusdam questionibus que anteriori anno Parisius mote quidem sed in hoc tempus dilate fuerant.⁴ Nam et in commento eiusdem episcopi super Boetium de Trinitate⁵ et in /
[17] scriptis discipulorum inueniebantur plura digna ut sapientibus uidebatur reprehensione, uel quia non consonabant regulis, uel quia ex nouitate uerborum absona uidebantur. Sed cum obloquerentur multi, in eum tamen acrius insurgebant Sigerius abbas Sancti

¹ cf. Isaiah xxxviii. 1

² The county of Vermandois was held by Philip until the death of his wife in 1182, when it passed to his sister Eleanor, then married to her fourth husband, Matthew of Beaumont. It was however at once claimed and annexed by Philip Augustus.

³ See Appendix II

⁴ The charges against Gilbert were first made early in 1147, when the pope was at Siena, and he began an examination of the case in a council at Paris at Easter in the same year.

⁵ Hayen (op. cit., p. 94) is of the opinion that the published text of

the doctor who was attending him warned him, as he¹¹⁵² valued his life, to abstain from intercourse with his wife; but he disregarded the warning, for he was very uxorious. When the doctor detected from his urine that he had done so, he advised him to set his house in order,¹ as he would be dead within three days. So it seems, first that we should believe the words of the man of God in matters that still await fulfilment; secondly, as often happens, that this man perished through the vice by which he was most passionately enslaved, for he was always dominated by lust. Thereafter, in spite of opposition from the nobles, the county of Vermandois devolved on Philip¹¹⁶³ count of Flanders, by the gracious will of the lord king.²

VIII

MASTER GILBERT, bishop of Poitiers,³ the most¹¹⁴⁸ learned man of our day, was summoned to the court to answer the abbot of Clairvaux—a man of the greatest eloquence and highest repute—on certain matters which had been brought up the year before at Paris, but postponed until then.⁴ For certain statements had been found in the bishop's commentary on the *De Trinitate* of Boethius⁵ and the writings of his pupils which seemed reprehensible to the learned, either because they were inconsistent with accepted beliefs or because, through novelty of expression, they seemed inconsistent. Many attacked him, but the fiercest assailants were Suger,

Gilbert's Commentary on Boethius (*P.L.* lxiv) is the uncorrected text of the first version; and that Gilbert never in fact carried out the revision he undertook to make, but contented himself with writing a new preface (printed by M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode* (1911), ii 417 n. 3).

Dionisii, uir litteratus et eloquens, et Pictauensis ecclesie canonici, Calo qui postmodum eiusdem ecclesie episcopus factus est, et magister Ernaldus, cui cognomen est Non Ridentis; magistri quoque scolares, Petrus Lombardus,¹ postea Parisiensis episcopus, et Robertus de Meliduno,² postmodum Herefordensis presul, suas et aliorum linguas in eum acuebant. Incertum habeo an zelo fidei, an emulatione nominis clarioris et meriti, an ut sic promererentur abbatem, cuius tunc summa erat auctoritas, cuius consilio tam sacerdocium quam regnum pre ceteris agebatur.

De ipso tamen uaria opinio est, aliis sic et aliis sic sentientibus de eo, quod uiros in litteris famosissimos, Petrum Abaielardum et prefatum Gislebertum, tanto studio insectatus est, ut alterum Petrum scilicet condemnari fecerit, alterum adhibita omni diligentia nisus sit condemnare. Set mihi persuaderi non potest quod homo tante sanctitatis non habuerit zelum Dei, uel quod episcopus tante grauitatis et litterature in scriptis suis redegerit quippiam, cuius ei licet plurimos lateat, ratio non constaret. Erat enim uir ingenii perspicacissimi, legerat plurima, et ut ex animi sententia loquar, circiter annos lx expenderat in legendo et tritura litterarum, sic in disciplinis liberalibus eruditus, [18] ut eum in uniuersis / nemo prederet; credebatur ipse potius in uniuersis precedere uniuersos. Et ut arbitror nunc ab abbatis et aliorum sanctorum sententia non discordat, quia simul semper optatam inspiciunt

¹ Peter Lombard showed his opposition to Gilbert's doctrine in his *Sententiae*. See de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique au xii^e siècle*, p. 179.

² Robert of Melun, who became bishop of Hereford in December 1163, had been one of John's masters in the schools of Paris. He at least seems unlikely to have acted out of flattery to Bernard, as he had previously

abbot of St Denis, a learned and eloquent man, and two canons of Poitiers, Calo who later became bishop of the same church, and master Arnold nicknamed 'straightface': the masters of the schools also, Peter Lombard later bishop of Paris,¹ and Robert of Melun afterwards bishop of Hereford,² led an embittered attack on him. I cannot say whether they acted out of zeal for the faith, or jealousy of his fame and merit, or a desire to propitiate the abbot, whose influence was then at its height and whose counsel was most weighty in the affairs of church and state alike.

Various opinions are held of the abbot himself, some saying one thing and some another, because he attacked the two men most famous for their learning—Peter Abailard and this same Gilbert—and pursued them with such zeal that he secured the condemnation of Peter and only just failed to have the other condemned. For my part I cannot believe that a man of such sanctity was not guided by the love of God, or that a bishop of such prudence and learning should commit to writing anything whose meaning was not clear to him, however obscure it might seem to others. For he was a man of the very keenest intelligence, who had read most things and who, I may say from intimate knowledge, after spending almost sixty years in reading and close study, was so learned in the liberal arts that no one could surpass him in all subjects; nay rather he was held to surpass all in every subject. And I am sure that now he no longer disagrees with the abbot and the other saints, for they both see face to face the truth they spent their

defended one of Abailard's assertions against Bernard's attack. See J. R. Martin, 'Pro Petro Abaelardo; Un plaidoyer de Robert de Melun contre Saint Bernard' in *Rev. sciences philos. et théolog.*, xii (1923), 308-33.

ueritatem.¹ Ceterum familiaris erat beato Hilario et Augustino, pre ceteris doctoribus, et sepe uerbis utebatur doctorum quorum est infrequens usus. Hoc tamen certum est quod publico nunc plura scolarium teruntur usu, que tunc ab ipso prolata uidebantur esse prophane nouitates.²

Sed antequam ipsum prefatus abbas in audientia publica conueniret, uenerabiles uiri qui oppinione litterarum et auctoritate religionis uel officii ceteris preminebant, petitione ipsius in eius hospicio conueniunt.³ Quod uidi loquor et scribo, sciens mihi apud Deum et homines conscientie et fame dispendium imminere, si falsitas presertim de re tanta fuerit in ore et opere meo. Nec deerit qui redarguat mentientem: supersunt enim plures pleni fide et graues auctoritate uiri, quos huic uerbo interfuisse certissimum est. Affuerunt enim bone memorie Theobaldus Cantuariensis et Gaufridus Burdegalensis et Henricus Eboracensis archiepiscopi, Sigerius sancti Dionisii, et Balduinus Castellionis super Secanam abbates, et qui adhuc supersunt Thomas Cantuariensis et Rogerus Eboracensis archiepiscopi et alii plurimi quos enarrare longum est. Abbas ergo, ut erat religiosissimus et disertissimus, ad eos elegantem et compendiosum sermonem habuit, subiciens ^a in fine, quod illorum erat de ecclesia Dei tollere scandala, precesque subintulit, ut eum corripere[n]t [19] si / in causa contra magistrum Gislebertum suscepta uideretur errare. Nam si arguendo factus est insipiens,

^a subicicus Poole

¹ Bernard died in 1153 and Gilbert in 1154.

² 1 Timothy vi. 20. Geoffrey of Auxerre in his *Libellus* (St Bernard, *Opera*, ed. Mabillon, Paris, 1719, ii 1342) states 'Horrebant Catholicorum aures profanam novitatem . . .', and John may have had this in mind.

lives in seeking.¹ But of all the doctors of the church he ¹¹⁴⁸ was most conversant with the works of blessed Hilary and Augustine, and often used words from their writings which are uncommon in modern works. One thing is certain: that now several terms are hackneyed in the schools which, when he introduced them, seemed to be 'impious novelties.'²

Before the abbot of Clairvaux met Gilbert publicly in court, he sent asking all the leading churchmen, those who were distinguished by their learning or sanctity or office, to meet him privately in his lodging.³ I speak and write what I myself have seen, knowing that I would imperil my immortal soul and my worldly reputation if I should either relate or write anything untrue in a matter such as this. There will be some, too, ready to refute me if I do not speak the truth; for several men of high repute and weighty judgment are yet living who were certainly present at this meeting. Those present included the late Theobald archbishop of Canterbury and Geoffrey of Bordeaux and Henry of York, and the abbots Suger of St Denis and Baldwin of Châtillon-sur-Seine; and of those now living Thomas archbishop of Canterbury and Roger of York and many others whom it would be tedious to enumerate. The abbot, the most pious and learned among them, then delivered a short and eloquent discourse, concluding that it was their duty to remove all scandals from the church of God, and beseeching them to correct him if they thought he was mistaken in the case he had brought against master Gilbert. If he had pressed his argument foolishly, it was

³ There is a difference of opinion on the exact time this meeting took place: Otto of Freising and Geoffrey of Auxerre both place it later in the proceedings. Poole inclined to the view that John was more likely to be right (*Hist. Pont.*, Preface, iv 4).

caritas et zelus fidei coegerat ipsum. Si uero non errabat, rogauit ut suum explerent officium, et sinceritatem fidei tuerentur. Hec enim causa non ad monachos et heremitas pertinet, sed ad ecclesie prelatos qui tenentur animas ponere pro ouibus suis.¹ Et ut possent facilius examinare si ipse erraret an non, precatus est ut audirent in quibus articulis a sepe fato episcopo dissentiret, et audita probarent uel improbarent. Illis assentientibus, dixit se credere quod *Deus est deitas, et e conuerso*. Quam propositionem excipiens ex ore eius monachus suus Gaufridus Autisiodorensis scripsit, scriptamque recitauit, subiungens in fine, *Placet uobis?* quomodo fieri solet ubi decreta promulgantur aut leges. Et responsum est, *Placet*. Deinde procedens abbas ait se credere quod *tres persone sunt unus Deus, et e conuerso*. Facta est item annotatio, interrogatio, et responsio, ut in priore. Displicebat tamen grauioribus modus iste, sed uerebantur abbatem et suos offendere, si non ei gererent morem. Secutus abbas adiecit, *Credo quod essencia Dei incarnata est siue natura*. Et hic ut in prioribus factum est. Quarto loco subintulit, quod *quoniam Deus simplex est, et quicquid in Deo est a Deus est, proprietates personarum sunt ipse persone, et quod Pater est paternitas, Filius est filiatio, Spiritus est processio; et e conuerso*.

Que cum similiter prioribus excepta essent et interrogata, surgens archidiaconus quidam Catalaunensis, [20] scilicet magister Robertus de Bosco, et tam / uoce quam manu silentium impetrans, petiit huius responsionis dilationem. Audierat enim, ut dicebat, in scolis clarissi-

^a ect Poole

¹ cf. St John x. 15

because he had been carried away by charity and zeal¹¹⁴⁸ for the faith. But if he was not mistaken, he asked them to do their duty and preserve the purity of the faith. For cases such as this were the business not of monks and hermits, but of the prelates of the church who were bound to lay down their lives for their sheep.¹ And to help them in judging whether he was right or wrong, he asked them to listen to the articles in which he differed from the bishop, and then approve or reject them. On their agreeing, he said he believed that 'God is deity, and the converse.' As he made this statement Geoffrey of Auxerre, one of his monks, wrote it down word for word and then read it out with the question, 'Do you accept this?' after the fashion when decretals or laws are promulgated. And they replied, 'We do.' Proceeding, the abbot said he believed that 'three Persons are one God and the converse'. This too was recorded, put to the vote, and accepted as before. The more thoughtful men did not approve of this method: but they feared offending the abbot and his followers if they did not fall in with his wishes. Then the abbot went on, 'I believe that the essence or substance of God was incarnate.' This was treated in the same way. Fourthly he propounded that, 'Since God is simple and whatever is in God is God, the properties of the Persons are the Persons themselves, and so the Father is paternity, the Son, filiality, the Spirit, proceeding; and the converse.'

When this, like the other propositions, had been written down and put to the vote, a certain archdeacon of Châlons, master Robert de Bosco by name, rose holding up his hand and calling out for silence, and besought them not to give a hasty answer. He had heard, he said, that this had been propounded in the

morum doctorum fratrum Anselmi et Radulfi Laudunensium hoc fuisse quesitum,¹ sed ab eis minime receptum est, quia uerebantur transgredi terminos quos posuerant patres. Sed nec Gislebertus Uniuersalis qui post fuit episcopus Lundoniensis, nec Albericus Remensis qui post in archiepiscopum Bituris sublimatus est, hoc ob eandem causam admittere uoluerunt.^a Nam et istos audierat et super hoc interrogauerat. Item, ut aiebat, omnibus hiis sibi^b litteratior uisus est Gislebertus abbas Westimonasterii prope Lundoniam, qui hoc nunquam concedere adqueiuit.² Consuluit ergo ut in re tanta non precipitarent sententiam, presertim cum ab hac diffinitione tanti uiri abstinerent interrogati, et dominus papa presens esset et ecclesia Romana; et ad illam conuenerant qui prestantiores esse uidebantur in orbe Latino. Paritum est consilio eius, conuentu sic soluto.

IX

QVOD cum ad cardinalium audientiam peruenisset, supra modum indignati sunt aduersus abbatem et illos qui prece eius conuenerant: condixerunt ergo fouere [21] causam domini Pictauensis, dicentes quod / abbas arte simili magistrum Petrum aggressus erat; sed ille sedis apostolice non habuerat copiam, que consueuit machinationes huiusmodi reprobare et de manu potentioris

^a uoluit Poole

^b om. Poole

¹ Anselm and Ralph of Laon, for whom John of Salisbury had the greatest respect (cf. *Metalogicon*, I v (ed. Webb, p. 18)) were possibly not very far from the position of Bernard; but Gilbert the Universal is probably

schools of the renowned doctors, brothers Anselm and Ralph of Laon,¹ but rejected by them because they were unwilling to go beyond the definitions of the Fathers. For the same reason neither Gilbert the Universal, who later became bishop of London, nor Alberic of Rheims, afterwards raised to the archbishopric of Bourges, had been prepared to accept it. He knew this because he had heard them lecture, and questioned them on the subject. Again, Gilbert abbot of Westminster near London, whom he considered even more learned than the others, had never been willing to admit this.² Consequently his advice was that they should not make a hasty judgment on so weighty a matter, especially as such men had expressly declined to make this definition: the pope and the cardinals should be present and the most distinguished men in the western world had met to discuss it. His advice was followed, and the assembly broke up.

IX

WHEN the news came to the hearing of the cardinals they were very wrath with the abbot and those who had assembled at his request: they agreed among themselves to support the cause of the bishop of Poitiers, saying that the abbot had attacked master Peter in exactly the same way; but he had not had access to the apostolic see, which was accustomed to confound schemes of this kind

the Gilbert attacked by Abailard in his *Theologia Christiana* for the fantastic distinctions that he introduced into the idea of God. Cf. *Hayen*, op. cit., pp. 45-7.

² Gilbert's hesitancy is shown in his treatise *De sancto spiritu*. See J. Armitage Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin, abbot of Westminster* (C.U.P. 1911), p. 71.

eruere pauperem.¹ Suspiciabantur enim aut se suspicari simulabant quod abbas in partem suam allicere, et post se trahere uellet Gallicanam et Anglicanam ecclesiam, contra quarum subscriptiones salubriter nichil diffinire posset apostolica sedes, in eo presertim loco et tempore constituta, nec magistrum Gislebertum posset sine seditione absolvere condempnantibus illis. Non fuit unus cardinalium, quod meminerim, preter Albericum sancte recordationis episcopum Hostiensem qui non animo et opera et diligentia aduersaretur abbati; et, quod falso dictum puto, abbatem sancti Dionisii qui uices habebat regis in Francia, et uiros in ecclesia potentissimos dicebant ad hoc fuisse conuocatos, ut apostolica sedes metu scismatis cogereetur abbatem sequi. Sed nec illum latere poterat cardinalium motus, qui preueniens alios, accessit ad dominum papam familiariter, exhortans eum ut zelum et animum uirilem indueret in causa Domini, ne langor corporis Christi et fidei plaga deprehenderetur esse in capite. Exposuit quid crederet super articulis in questione propositis, et persuasit ut apostolicus eisdem passibus graderetur. Erat enim uir potens in opere et sermone² coram Deo ut creditur, et ut publice notum est, coram hominibus.

¹ The synod of Sens in 1140 produced such violent polemics that the details of the proceedings are hard to reconstruct. There is no doubt that Bernard drew up a number of *capitula* as a necessary preliminary to his attack, and it seems that the assembled bishops fairly rapidly confirmed the heterodoxy of these *capitula*. The further charge implied by John of Salisbury is that St Bernard persuaded a party of bishops to condemn the *capitula* in advance. (Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, Preface, iv 4; J. Rivière, 'Les *capitula* d'Abélard condamnés au concile de Sens', in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 1933, pp. 5-22). Abailard himself, like Gilbert, insisted in addition that some of the errors with which he was charged were not to be found in his works (See P. Ruf & M. Grabmann: 'Ein neu aufgefundenes Bruchstück der *Apologia* Abaelards', in *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen*

and snatch the weak from the clutches of the strong.¹ 1148 They suspected, or made a show of suspecting, that the abbot wished to win the English and Gallic parts of the church to his side and induce them to follow him; so that the papacy should be powerless to pronounce any sound judgment in opposition to them—especially at that time and in that place—or clear master Gilbert if the church in England and Gaul were against him without provoking sedition. As far as I recall there was not a single cardinal except Alberic bishop of Ostia of holy memory who was not wholeheartedly opposed to the abbot in spirit and deed; saying—falsely as I believe—that the abbot of St Denis, who was acting as regent for the king in France, and the leading men of the church had been called together for the express purpose of forcing the papacy to accept the abbot's views under threat of schism. But as the abbot could not fail to hear of the cardinals' conspiracy, he forestalled them all, and going to the pope as a friend, urged him to put on zeal and manly courage in the Lord's cause, lest the weakness of the body of Christ and wounds of the faith should be found to be in the head. He explained his beliefs about the articles set out in the proposition, and persuaded the pope to keep in step with him. For he was a man mighty in deed and word,² with God as some believe, and with

Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. hist. Abteilung, 1930, v 10-18). See also J. G. Sikes, *Peter Abailard*, pp. 231-3. John of Salisbury seems to believe that Bernard used the same procedure on both occasions; for he says nothing to contradict the rumour, whereas he explicitly states that he considers the more exaggerated suspicions of Bernard's methods to be false. For the phrase 'de manu . . . pauperum', cf. Jeremiah xxxi. 11.

² cf. Acts vii. 22

Nam data sibi dicendi facultate, fere persuadebat
 [22] semper desiderio suo. / Erat autem certum quod ei
 quidam cardinalium plurimum inuidebant, nec a
 detractioe poterant continere.

X

EPISCOPVS uero fretus auxilio et consilio cardinalium
 conflictum adiit confidenter, et de pluribus et a pluribus
 interrogatus, sic auctoritatibus et rationibus responsa
 muniebat, ut capi non potuerit in sermone. Contentio
 tamen protracta est, et quando conueniebatur acrius
 super re quam nolebat admittere, respondebat ^a se non
 legisse quidem, sed se per omnia secuturum fidem
 et doctrinam apostolice sedis. Non memini tamen
 quempiam gloriatum ibi se legisse quod ille non legerat.
 Tandem a curia digressi sunt cardinalibus plerisque aliis
 dicentibus de episcopo, quod nunquam sic locutus est
 homo.¹ Altera die, cum dominus papa sederet in
 consistorio, iterato in propria persona super iam dictis
 capitulis conuenit episcopum, et cuidam subdiacono
 curie, Henrico scilicet Pisano, precepit ut quaternum
 legeret, in quo tociens dicti episcopi contineri dicebantur
 errores. Proclamauit ergo episcopus se debere non de
 alienis, sed de operibus propriis conueniri, et neminem,
 nedum episcopum, nisi confessum aut conuictum ex
 causa criminis condempnandum. Dicebat se nec esse

^a respondit Poole

¹ St John vii.46. All contemporaries are agreed on the impression made by bishop Gilbert's learning. 'He read not from extracts of the Fathers, but from their complete works', Otto of Freising records (*Gesta Friderici*, Lib. I cap. 58). The author of the *Liber de diversitate* (possibly Anselm, bishop of Havelberg), notes the astonishment of the cardinal of Tusculum, Peter of Pavia, at Gilbert's wide knowledge of Greek no less than Latin

men as we all know. Once given the chance of speaking, ¹¹⁴⁸
 he almost always made his will prevail. Besides, it was
 certain that some of the cardinals were filled with envy
 of him, and could not refrain from slander.

X

THE BISHOP, trusting in the support and advice of the
 cardinals, joined conflict with confidence, and though
 many men questioned him searchingly he supported his
 answers with such sound arguments and authorities that
 he could not be tripped up verbally. However the dis-
 putation was prolonged, and when issue was joined
 fiercely on a statement he was unwilling to admit, he
 replied that he had not even read it, but would accept
 the faith and doctrine of the apostolic see in all matters.
 I cannot recall that anyone boasted there of having
 read anything he had not read. Finally they left the
 court, the cardinals and several others saying of the
 bishop that never had a man spoken like this man.¹
 Another day, when the lord pope was sitting in con-
 sistory, he himself questioned the bishop again on the
 same chapters, and ordered one of the subdeacons of
 the court, called Henry of Pisa, to read aloud the book
 which was said to contain the bishop's errors. Whereat
 the bishop cried out that he ought to be judged on
 his own works, not the works of others; and that
 no-one, least of all a bishop, ought to be condemned
 unless he had either confessed or been convicted of
 a crime. He was not, he said, a heretic and would

authors (Cambridge University Library, MS Ii 4. 27 fol. 131 [130] recto).
 cf. also de Ghellinck, op. cit., p. 178.

hereticum nec futurum, qui paratus erat et semper fuerat acquiescere ueritati et apostolicam sequi doctrinam; hereticum namque facit non ignorantia ueri, sed mentis elatio contumaciam pariens, et in contentionis et scismatis presumptionem erumpens: in scolis et in ecclesiis palam mundo, et se in occulto dicebat nichil esse locutum,¹ se scripsisse / in Psalterium et in epistolas Pauli,² et ex hiis si ibi error est satisfactioni obnoxium esse uel pene. Item in Boetium de Trinitate; et si ibi quid inuenitur erroneum, suum esse professus est, et correctioni daturum operam. De quaterno illo ait nichil ad se. Legit tamen subdiaconus et in primo capitulo habebatur quod dampnandis nichil remittitur in baptismo, nec habet in talibus efficaciam ^a sacramenti, sed est eis quasi balneum. Quo audito excaudit episcopus dicens domino pape, *Videte, pater, qualiter me tractetis, cum in infamiam meam in sacro consistorio uestro alieni recitantur errores. Fateor me plures habuisse discipulos, qui me quidem omnes audierunt, sed quidam minus intellexerunt: quod opinati sunt scripserunt de corde suo, non de spiritu meo. Inter hos fuerunt duo pre ceteris insignes ex nota singularitatis, cerebrosus quidam qui adhuc moratur in Francia, et alius non minus cerebrosus qui transiuit in Angliam.*³ *Illos et conformes eorum super hoc libello et similibus poteritis rectius conuenire. Quid a me uultis amplius? Ego libellum istum cum auctore suo et omnes hereses que in eo scripte sunt anathematizo uobiscum, ut quisquis ille est cum aliis hereticis in die Domini morte damp-*

^a efficaciam Poole

¹ cf. St John xviii.20

² The commentaries on the Psalms and the Epistles of St Paul have not yet been printed. See M. E. Williams, 'The teaching of Gilbert Porreta on the Trinity' (*Analecta Gregoriana*, vol. lvi, 1951), p. 3.

³ These persons cannot be identified with certainty. For the disciples of Gilbert see Vernet's article on Gilbert de la Porrée in *Dict. de Théol. Catholique* (vi 1355-6), and de Ghellinck, p. 176.

never be one, for he was ready and always had been to recognise truth and respect apostolic doctrine; for it was not ignorance of truth that made a heretic, but pride of spirit giving rise to contumacy and presuming to cause disputes and schisms: he said he had spoken openly to the world in schools and churches, and had taught nothing in secret:¹ he had written on the Psalms and the epistles of Paul,² and if there was error in these works he was willing to submit himself to correction or punishment. Likewise he had written on the *De Trinitate* of Boethius: and if any error should be found in that he admitted it would be his, and would be at pains to make amends. There was nothing of his, he said, in that book. However the subdeacon read on, and in the first chapter was the statement that baptism does not bring remission of sin to the foredoomed, and has not the virtue of a sacrament for such persons, but is no more value than a bath to them. Whereat the bishop flared up and exclaimed to the pope: 'You see, Father, how you treat me when the errors of others are recited in your holy consistory to my shame. I avow that I have several pupils who, admittedly have all heard me lecture, though some of them have not understood a word I said; what they have written is their interpretation, not my meaning. Amongst them were two who stand out for their eccentricity: one hothead still living in France and another no less hotheaded who has crossed over to England.'³ You would do better to summon them and their kind to answer for this pamphlet and others like it. What more can I say? Like you I pronounce anathema on this book and all the heresies written in it, and on its author; whoever he is may he be condemned to eternal death on the Judgment Day with all other heretics,

netur eterna, nisi penituerit et ad catholicam redierit fidem.

Clamauerunt cardinales et alii hoc pro episcopo contra accusationem libri debere sufficere, iussitque dominus papa librum destrui, qui statim ab eodem subdiacono coram omnibus in minutas particulas cesus [24] est et dispersus.¹ / Sed quia multitudo laicorum aderat, ipse apostolicus ad excusationem episcopi Gallica utens lingua dixit hoc non factum esse in iniuriam eius, quia liber illius non fuerat, quoniam ipse catholicus in omnibus inuentus est et apostolice doctrine consentiens, utpote qui has et omnes alias hereses cum ecclesia Romana condempnat.

XI

TVNC dominus papa conuersus ad episcopum conuenit eum super quibusdam articulis qui in commento eius super Boetium de Trinitate dicuntur contineri, iubens ut liber ille traderetur ei corrigendus. Dixit etiam se rasurum si quid ibi radendum fuerit et immutaturum quod nouerit immutandum. Cui episcopus, *Absit, domine, ut hunc laborem omni iure mihi debitum subeat alius. Iustum enim est, si ego peccaui scribendo, idem puniar in radendo, et erit mihi penitentiae pars, si errores meos ipse deleuero: uos potius prescribite quid eradi oporteat, et ego mandatum uestrum sedulus adimplebo.* Cardinales et alii probauerunt responsum eius, clamantes undique nichil ulterius exigendum. Ergo dominus papa quatuor capitula, prout in camera abbatis, unde supra tetigimus, prenotata fuerant, et sicut abbas ibidem ad memoriam reducebat,

¹ This book has been identified by Poole as the *Sententiae Divinitatis*, edited by B. Geyer in 1909.

unless he first repent and return to the Catholic faith.' 1148

The cardinals and others cried out that this should be sufficient defence for the bishop against accusations based on this book; and the pope commanded it to be destroyed. At once, in the sight of all, the subdeacon cut it into tiny fragments and scattered them.¹ But as a great crowd of the laity was present the pope explained in the vernacular on the bishop's behalf that this had not been done to his discredit, for the book was not his; and indeed he had been found orthodox on all points and faithful to apostolic doctrine, and was at one with the Roman church in condemning these and all other heresies.

XI

THEN the pope turned to the bishop and charged him with certain statements which were said to occur in his commentary on the *De Trinitate* of Boethius, and ordered that the book should be given to him for correction. He said too that he would erase anything that needed erasing and change anything that ought to be changed. To which the bishop answered: 'Forbid it, master, that anyone else should undergo a toil that is rightly mine. It is just that if I have erred in writing I should be punished by expurgating, and deleting my own errors will be a part of my penance: do you rather command what should be erased, and I will carry out your instructions to the last letter.' The cardinals and others, who approved his reply, demanded that nothing more should be required of him. So the pope expounded the four propositions just as they had been written down in the abbot's chamber—as I have already related

exposuit, precipiens ut episcopus ad formam eorum librum corrigeret, et de cetero sicut doceret. Sunt autem in hunc concepta modum, fortassis de conscientia domini pape, a domno G. Autisiodorensi, qui postmodum Clareuallensis abbas a sancto Bernardo quartus effectus est: /

[25] Credimus simplicem naturam diuinitatis esse Deum, nec aliquo sensu catholico posse negari, quin diuinitas sit Deus, et Deus diuinitas. Si uero dicitur Deum sapientia sapientem, magnitudine magnum, eternitate eternum, unitate unum, diuinitate Deum esse, et alia huiusmodi; credimus nonnisi ea sapientia que est ipse Deus sapientem esse, nonnisi ea magnitudine que est ipse Deus magnum esse, nonnisi ea eternitate que est ipse Deus eternum esse, nonnisi ea unitate unum que est ipse Deus, nonnisi ea diuinitate Deum que ipse est; id est, se ipso sapientem, magnum, eternum, unum Deum.

Cum de tribus personis loquimur, Patre, Filio, Spiritu sancto, ipsas unum Deum, unam diuinam substantiam esse fatemur; et e conuerso cum de uno Deo, una diuina substantia loquimur, ipsum unum Deum unam diuinam substantiam esse tres personas profitemur.

Credimus solum Deum Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum eternum esse, nec aliquas omnino res siue relationes, siue proprietates, siue singularitates uel unitates dicantur, et huiusmodi alia, inesse Deo, et esse ab eterno, que non sint Deus.

Credimus ipsam diuinitatem, siue substantiam diuinam siue naturam dicas, incarnatum esse, sed in Filio.¹

¹ These articles are copied out of the *Libellus contra Capitula Gilleberti* of Geoffrey of Auxerre in St Bernard's Works, ed. Mabillon, ii 1325 sqq. They are also recorded by Otto of Freising (*Gesta Frid.*, Lib. I, cap. 59).

—and as the abbot had recorded them: and commanded ¹¹⁴⁸ the bishop to bring his book into conformity with them, and make other corrections as he should instruct him. They have been formulated in this way, possibly with the pope's cognisance, by master Geoffrey of Auxerre, who later became the fourth abbot of Clairvaux after St Bernard:

'We believe that the simple essence of divinity is God, and that it cannot be denied in any orthodox way that divinity is God and God divinity. And if it is said that God is wise by wisdom, great by greatness, eternal by eternity, one by unity, God by divinity and so on, we believe that He is wise only by that wisdom which is God Himself, great only by that greatness which is God Himself, eternal only by that eternity which is God Himself, one only by that unity which is God Himself, divine only by that divinity which is God Himself; that is, that He in His own essence is wise, great, eternal, indivisible God.

'When we speak of three persons, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we understand them to be one God and one divine substance; and conversely, when we speak of one God or one divine substance we profess that one God and one divine substance are three persons.

'We believe that only God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit is eternal, and that no things whatsoever, whether they are called relations or properties, singularities or unities or anything of the kind exist and have existed eternally in God, unless they are God.

'We believe that that divinity whether it is called divine substance or essence, is incarnate, but only in the Son.'¹

Hiis episcopo consentiente, precepit dominus papa ut hiis aduersa, si in libro suo repperirentur, corrigeret, inhibens ne retineretur ab aliquo iam exscriptus, uel [26] traderetur alicui exscribendus, ante/quam ad hanc formam corrigeretur. Sed et hiis episcopus annuens absolutus est ab aduersariorum impetitione et nota. Capitula autem superius posita non in concilio promulgata sunt, sed postea in palatio Tau,¹ iam elapsis diebus quindecim a soluto concilio, commanentibus adhuc diuersarum prouinciarum archiepiscopis et episcopis ad huius cause decisionem retentis. Vnde eadem capitula, licet ea audierim, utpote qui presens aderam, publicari, tamen nec inter acta concilii, nec in domini Eugenii regesto potui repperire, sed in scriptis memorati Gaufridi repperi, qui postea abbas Igniacensis contra eundem episcopum, sed iam defunctum, scripsit librum² eleganti quidem stilo, recte gratus uniuersis, nisi uideretur inuehenti habere speciem, et ex quacunque causa conceptam amaritudinem continere. Hoc tamen ad humanum non spectat examen, quia nemo nouit penitus quid sit in homine, nisi spiritus qui in ipso est,³ et conscientiarum Iudex, qui solus nouit abscondita cordis.⁴ Hoc autem certum est, quod contra episcopum sepe locutus est palam memoratus ille sanctissimus abbas, et post hanc examinationem pleraque scripsit in suggillationem eius, et in epistolis et in libro de Consideratione⁵ ad eundem Eugenium, et in illa subtilissima et utilissima expositione Canticorum,⁶ quam procul dubio per os [27] eius dictauit / Spiritus sanctus; sed non creditur scripsisse aliquid quod non fidei zelus et caritatis feruor expresserit.

¹ A T-shaped hall in the archiepiscopal palace

² The *Libellus* of Geoffrey of Auxerre

⁴ Psalms xliiii.22

⁶ *Lib. de Consid.*, v 7

³ 1 Corinthians ii.11

⁶ *In Cant. serm.*, 80

To these propositions the bishop agreed; and the 1148 pope commanded him to correct any conflicting statements that might occur in his book, forbidding any copy already made to be kept, or any further copy to be made until it had been brought into line with this formula. As the bishop entirely concurred, he was acquitted of the charge and stigma of his opponents. These propositions were promulgated, not during the council, but a fortnight after its dissolution, in a room called Tau¹ in the archbishop's palace, before the archbishops and bishops of various provinces, who had remained behind to settle this case. Consequently I have never been able to find these propositions either among the records of the council or in the register of Pope Eugenius, though I was present and heard them published. But they can be found in the writings of that same Geoffrey who later, as abbot of Igny, when the bishop was already dead, wrote a book refuting him:² a book elegant in style and rightly pleasing to readers, except that it seems to have the character of a polemic and embodies a certain spleen. However no human judgment is competent to decide this, for no-one knows fully the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him,³ and the Judge of consciences, who alone knows the secrets of the heart.⁴ What is certain is that the saintly abbot of Clairvaux often spoke openly against the bishop, and after this enquiry wrote many things to his discredit, both in letters and in his book *De Consideratione*⁵ to Pope Eugenius, and also in that most subtle and precious exposition of the *Song of Songs*,⁶ which assuredly the Holy Spirit dictated through his mouth: but he at least seems to have been inspired by zeal for the faith and ardent charity in all he wrote.

XII

OPINATI uero sunt aliqui episcopum non ea sinceritate incedere quam fatebatur nec conscium esse humilitatis quam uerbis pretendebat et gestu. Tunc enim sicut in tota anteacta uita moderatissimus fuit, et quia ab aduersantibus non potuit comprehendi, dicebatur a multis quod astu et obscuritate uerborum occultabat perfidiam, et religionem iudicis circumuenerat arte.¹ Inter ipsum [et] abbatem concordia inita est, et a plurimis sub discendi specie temptabatur, sed auctoritatibus quas habebat ad manum et maxime Hilarii omnium tendiculas euadebat. Memini me ipsum ex parte abbatis episcopum sollicitasse quatinus conuenirent in aliquo religioso loco, siue in Pictauia siue in Francia siue in Burgundia, ubi episcopo uisum esset, ut amice et sine contentione conferrent super dictis beati Hylarii. Ille uero respondit iam satis esse quod hucusque contenderant, et abbatem, si plenam intelligenciam Hylarii affectaret, prius in disciplinis liberalibus et aliis prediscendis ^a plenius instrui oportere. Erant tamen ambo optime litterati et admodum eloquentes sed dissimilibus studiis. Abbas enim, quod ex operibus patet, predicator erat egregius, ut ei post beatum Gregorium neminem censeam conferendum; singulariter eleganti pollebat stilo, adeo diuinis exercitatus in litteris ut omnem materiam uerbis propheticis et apostolicis decentissime explicaret. Sua namque fecerat uniuersa et uix nisi uerbis autenticis nec [28] in sermone communi nec / in exhortationibus nec in

^a predicendis Poole

¹ Otto of Freising suggests the same possibility, but confines himself to saying that it is not his business to decide whether the abbot was deceived by frailty or the bishop evaded judgment by an astute use of his learning (*Gesta Frid.*, Lib. I, cap. 61).

XII

SOME people believed that the bishop was not as sincere as he professed to be and was making a false show of humility (for on that occasion he showed the great moderation always habitual to him); and because his adversaries had difficulty in understanding him, many declared that he was taking advantage of verbal subtleties and cunningly deceiving the orthodoxy of his judge.¹ Peace was made between him and the abbot, and though many tempted him under pretext of learning from him, he was able to escape their tentacles by referring to the authorities he had to his hand, St Hilary in particular. I recall that I myself on behalf of the abbot entreated the bishop to meet him in some religious house in Poitou, or France, or Burgundy, wherever he preferred, to discuss the writings of the blessed Hilary amicably and without rancour. He however replied that they had already disputed sufficiently on the matter, and if the abbot wished to reach a full understanding of Hilary he should first seek further instruction in the liberal arts and other preliminary studies. For though they were both exceptionally learned and eloquent men, they excelled in different branches of learning. The abbot for his part, as his works show, was so distinguished a preacher that I can think of no-one after St Gregory comparable to him: he surpassed all in the elegance of his style and was so saturated in the Holy Scriptures that he could fully expound every subject in the words of the prophets and apostles. For he had made their speech his own, and could hardly converse or preach or write a letter except in the language of scripture. I

epistolis conscribendis loqui nouerat. Non memini me legisse auctorem qui poeticum illud tanta felicitate fuerit assecutus:

Dixeris egregie, notum si callida uerbum
reddiderit iunctura nouum.¹

Seculares uero litteras minus nouerat, in quibus, ut creditur, episcopum nemo nostri temporis precedebat. Vterque ingenio perspicax et scripturis inuestigandis deditus, sed abbas negociis expediendis exercitior et efficacior. Et licet episcopus bibliothecae superficiem non sic haberet ad manum, doctorum tamen uerba, Hylarii dico, Ieronimi, Augustini, et similium, sicut opinio communis est, familiarius nouerat. Doctrina eius nouis obscurior sed proeuctis compendiosior et solidior uidebatur. Vtebatur, prout res exigebat, omnium adminiculo disciplinarum, in singulis quippe sciens auxiliis mutuis uniuersa constare. Habebat enim connexas disciplinas easque theologie seruire faciebat, et cohibebat omnium regulas infra proprii generis limitem.² Sunt enim singule suis addicte generibus et statim ut alio traducte fuerint uiciantur. Proprietates figurasque sermonum et in theologia tam philosophorum et oratorum quam poetarum declarabat exemplis. Quietus tardior sed quaestionum stimulis prouocatus et iniuriatus argucii plenior et planior apparebat. Velles semper esse commotum, ut ignee mentis te pariter illustraret et accenderet uigor. Vtrumque in suis studiis multi conati sunt imitari, sed nec unus, quod meminerim, alterutrum assecutus est. /

¹ Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, 47, 48

² Gilbert in his commentary on Boethius points out that in every discipline the first requirement is to grasp the fundamental *regulae*. The *regulae* he applied to theology were, however, a confused medley of general observations, first principles and articles of faith. See M. D. Chenu,

cannot recall any writer who more aptly illustrated this ¹¹⁴⁸verse:

How fine your style, if by a skilful turn
You make old words seem new.¹

But he had little knowledge of secular learning, in which the bishop, it is believed, had no equal in our own day. Both were keenly intelligent and gifted interpreters of scripture: but the abbot was more experienced and effective in transacting business. And though the bishop had not the text of the Bible quite so much at his fingertips, it is common knowledge that he was more thoroughly conversant with the doctors—Hilary, for example, Jerome, Augustine and others like them. His doctrine seemed obscure to beginners, but all the more compendious and profound to advanced scholars. He made use of every branch of learning as occasion demanded, knowing that all were consistent with each other, and mutually illuminating. (For he held that the disciplines are interrelated, and made them minister to theology, yet applied all rules strictly to their own class; for individual rules apply only to their own class, and are misused whenever they are more widely applied).² Even in theology he explained the properties and qualities of words by quotations from philosophers and orators as well as poets. Slow to be roused, he could be stimulated by discussion, and if attacked became fuller and more intelligible in his argument. It was best to find him stirred, to win light and heat from his force and fire of mind! Both these men had many would-be imitators, but I cannot call to mind one who could touch either of them.

'Un essai du méthode théologique au XII^e siècle' (*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, xxiv (1935) 258-67).

XIII

[29] FUIT autem inter scolasticos etatis nostre doctores excellentissimus gratie predicator, et qui ceteris subtilius et fortius, quociens inter legendum se locus ingerebat, impugnans hereses edocebat a quibus articulis scripturarum eas eruere et tueri conati sint heresiarche, et que quibus originem dederint, et a quibus et qua ratione et quibus auctoritatibus fuerint condempnate. Vnum non potuit non reuocare ad animum, quod ipsum inurere nomine et nota heretici tanta sedulitate curauerunt, qui inter ipsas hereses discernere nondum uidebantur edocti. Scripsit ergo postea contra illos alterum prologum in expositionem Boetii sui.¹ In quo quosdam uidelicet emulos suos asserit sic hereticorum uitare nomina ut tamen errores eorum sequantur et doceant. Se uero dicebat non maiori sapientia uel gratia peditum quam apostolos et prophetas, qui, licet in eis loqueretur Spiritus sanctus, tamen *aliis facti sunt odor uite in uitam et aliis odor mortis in mortem.*² Nam et Sabellius³ audiens in lege quoniam Deus unus est euacuare nititur Trinitatem, et Arrius⁴ legens dictum esse a Domino *Pater maior me est,*⁵ Filium suspicatur esse degenerem. Sic et singuli

[30] scripturas sacras inueniunt / uasa mortis; non tamen quod ille uenena habeant, sed illi corruptos et toxi-

¹ For this other preface see A. Hayen, (op. cit., *supra*, p. xxvii) p. 94. Hayen's opinion is that the published text contains the complete preface as Gilbert wrote it, and not a fragment as Poole implies in one place (*Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought*, p. 367).

² 2 Corinthians ii. 16

³ Sabellius is considered the founder of the Monarchian (or Patripassian) group. Monarchianism was a heresy of the late second and third centuries that, under the pretext of preserving the unity of God, denied the Trinity. See 'Monarchianisme' in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, x 2193-2209.

⁴ Arianism was the most prominent heresy of the fourth century, which

XIII

FURTHER, amongst the scholastic doctors of our age, he (Gilbert) was an outstanding exponent of the doctrine of grace, more subtle and profound than the rest. In his lectures he took every opportunity to fight heresies by showing how the heresiarchs had striven to twist passages of scripture in support of their errors, whence they had derived them, and by whom and with what arguments and authorities they had been condemned. There was one thing he never could dismiss from his mind, that men had striven sedulously to brand him with the name and shame of heresy who were themselves not learned enough to distinguish between these same heresies. Consequently he later wrote against them another preface to his commentary on Boethius: ¹ here he asserted that some of his critics who had escaped condemnation as heretics had none the less both imbibed and taught heretical errors. He said that he was not endowed with greater wisdom or grace than the apostles and prophets who, albeit the Holy Spirit spoke through them, were yet to some the savour of life unto life, to others the savour of death unto death.² For Sabellius,³ after hearing in the Law that God is one, strove to diminish the Trinity; and Arius,⁴ after reading our Lord's saying 'The Father is greater than I' ⁵ believed the Son to be of less than divine origin. In this way some men find the holy scriptures vessels of death; not because there is any poison there, but because they come

denied explicitly the co-eternity, consubstantiality and divinity of the Word, and so imperilled the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. See 'Arianisme' in *Dict. de Théol. Cath.*, i 1779 sqq.

⁵ St John xiv. 28

catos afferunt sensus. Suo ergo uicio pereunt, nec est quod litteris ex sua peruersitate non intellectis debeant imputare. Sibi dicebat fortasse similiter patribus prouenisse ut ingenia peruersa et minus exercitata errauerint ex uerbis eius, que, sicut ait familiarissimus beatus Hylarius, habere poterant et fidei conscientiam et fraudem paratam. Adiciebat se coram simplicioribus ne scandalizarentur uerba posse mutare; sed de fide quam ei contulerat Spiritus sanctus nihil immutaturum. Nam sola mutatione uerborum non relinquitur ueritas, pro qua certum est scandala fideliter sustineri.

Capitula uero superius posita fidei et doctrine sue non aduersari protestabatur, si tamen sane fuerint intellecta. Neque enim absolutiora sunt uerbo Dei dicentis per Moysen, *Audi, Israel, Deus tuus Deus unus est*:¹ quod, ut superius dictum est, male acceptum Sabellianos obligauit dampnationi. Primo uero non se et alios catholicos aiebat percelli, sed fantasiastas, quales sunt antropomorfite et similes, qui diuine simplicitati derogantes Deum putant compositioni esse obnoxium et formis uel substantialibus uel accidentalibus subiacere. Sed me, inquit, non ita docuit apostolus nosse Deum, *apud quem non est transmutatio nec uicissitudinis obumbratio*;² nec Hylarius, dicens in libro ix de Trinitate, *Deus simplex religione nostra intelligendus est, pietate profitendus est, sensu uero non persequendus est, sed adorandus, quia natura* [31] *moderata / et infirmis, nature infinite^a et potentis sacramentum*

^a infirme Poole

¹ St Mark xii.29

² St James i.17

to them with corrupt and poisoned minds. Thus they perish by their own fault, and no slur can be cast on the writings which they, in their perversity, have not understood. He said that perhaps he had shared the fate of the Fathers, in that obstinate and untrained minds had read errors into his words; which, as his great favourite St Hilary says, might contain true knowledge of the faith and yet lay traps for uninstructed readers. He added that he could change his words to avoid leading simple minds astray; but of the faith that the Holy Spirit had bestowed on him nothing should be changed. For mere change of words does not mean an abandoning of truth, for the sake of which scandals ought faithfully to be borne.

The propositions stated above were not, he insisted, contrary to his belief and doctrine, if only they were rightly understood. But they were no more immune from misinterpretation than the words of God sent through Moses: 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one God',¹ which, as I said before, were misunderstood to the perdition of the Sabellians. The first, he said, did not strike him or other true catholics, but only eccentrics such as anthropomorphites and their like, who, disparaging divine simplicity, believed that God was composite and attributed forms, either substantial or accidental, to him. But it was not thus, he said, that the apostle taught me to know God 'with whom there is no change nor shadow of alteration';² nor Hilary, who said in the ninth book *On the Trinity*, 'God who is simple is to be comprehended by our religion and professed by our faith: not pursued by our understanding but adored; because a limited and frail nature cannot grasp the sacred mystery of an infinite and powerful

*intelligencie opinione non occupet.*¹ Non est itaque diuersis compositus^a diuinitatis partibus ut sit in eo aut post stuporem uoluntas, aut post silentium sermo, aut post ocium opus; ut aut uelle aliquid nisi ad uolendum motus sit non putetur, aut loqui quid nisi post silentium sonent uerba non possit, aut agere aliquid nisi in opus exeat non intelligatur. Non subiacet nature legibus a quo legem omnis natura sortitur. Item, inquit, ne Deum suspicer partibus aut figuris aut quibuscumque formis obnoxium, me tum multi tam nostri quam gentiles, tum Ambrosius mellifluus ecclesie doctor instituit, qui in libro primo de Trinitate capitulo sexto ait, *Deus nature simplicis est, non coniuncte atque composite, cui nihil accidat, sed solum quod diuinum est in natura habeat sua, complens omnia nusquam ipse confusus, penetrans omnia nusquam ipse penetrandus, ubique totus, eodemque tempore uel in celis uel in terris uel in nouissimo maris presens, uisu incomprehensibilis, fatu ininterpretabilis, sensu inestimabilis, fide sequendus, religione uenerandus: ut quicquid religiosius sentiri potest, quicquid prestantius ad decorem, quicquid sublimius ad potestatem, hoc Deo intelligas conuenire.*² Congerebat et alia quibus refertus erat testimonia scripturarum, ut per ea diuine simplicitatis astrueret ueritatem.

Secundum capitulum facit contra illos qui habita [32] ratione personarum diuine substantie distrahunt / unitatem, uel qui contemplatione unius simplicis singularisque nature non minori uesania trinitatem confundunt personarum. Sed ecclesia catholica dicit anathema ei

^a composite Poole

¹ Hilary, *De Trinitate*, ix 72

² Ambrose, *De Fide* (also called *De Trinitate*), i 6

nature in the compass of its intellect'.¹ God, then, is not made up of distinct parts of godhead, in which inertia is succeeded by an act of will, silence by speech, inactivity by action; as if He cannot be thought to will anything unless He begins to will, or say anything unless His words come after silence, or do anything unless He sets to work. For He is not subject to the laws of nature, from whom every nature derives its law. Again, he said, lest I imagine that God is composed of parts or figures or forms of any kind, many writers both Christian and Gentile have taught me the opposite. Amongst these is Ambrose, the sweet-tongued father of the church, who says in the sixth chapter of the first book *On the Trinity*, 'The nature of God is simple, not complex or composite. He has no accidents, but His nature consists only of that which is divine; filling all things, He is never Himself dispersed, penetrating all things He is Himself impenetrable; He is all everywhere, at one and the same time present in the heavens and the earth and the uttermost part of the sea; beyond the reach of vision, inexplicable by speech, incomprehensible by mind; to be followed by faith and venerated by religion, so that whatsoever can be felt most devoutly, whatsoever is most excellent in virtue, whatsoever is most exalted in power, this you may know is fitting to God.'² He collected too the testimony of other writings of which he had an abundant store, so that by them he might prove the truth of divine simplicity.

The second chapter tells against those who, out of consideration of the persons, divide the unity of the divine substance, or, in contemplating one simple and singular nature, no less insanely confuse the persons of the Trinity. The catholic church pronounces anathema

qui coniungit, et anathema ei qui diuidit. Nam qui confundit cum Sabellio Patripassianus aut Euticianus est; et qui diuidit Arrium aut Nestorium uel similes imitatur. Porro uiam iustorum ¹ inter Scillam diuidentium et confundentium Caribdim dirigit Dominus; et qui ad alterutros transit, periculum dampnationis incurrit.

Tercium uero capitulum in illos dicebat retorquendum qui putant Deum extrinsecis more naturali ^a indigere ut alienum quid a se sibi habeat coeternum. Sed ab ipso et per ipsum et in ipso sunt omnia ² et que in celis et que in terra,³ omnis substantia, omnis forma substantie, uel proprietas uel accidens uel pars, omnis etiam compago partium. Et licet angeli legantur ante tempora extitisse, tamen ad coeternitatem aspirare non possunt qui sicut omnia alia a Deo creati initium habuisse non dubitantur. Nichil ergo est in toto nature regno, siue substantia siue accidens sit, quod eternum recte dicatur; sed solus ille qui ipsi nature presidens creauit omnia, disponit et continet. Sequens tamen Augustinum et quosdam alios doctores usque in nouissimum diem uite rationes quasdam esse docuit sempiternas,⁴ ut nec habuerint initium nec finem habiture sint, tanta quidem ueritatis necessitate subnixae ut etsi totus mundus intereat, ille tamen nequeant interire. Hoc profecto et in *Ypognosticon*⁵ et in

^a non indigere Poole

¹ Psalms i.6

² Romans xi.36

³ Ephesians i.10

⁴ M. E. Williams, *Analecta Gregoriana* (1951), pp. 107–8, states that this may refer to Gilbert's doctrine on exemplars, but that the term 'rationes sempiternae' does not occur in his commentary on Boethius. From this point, however, John is giving his own commentary on Gilbert's views, and may, as Hayen suggests, be drawing in part on his memories of Gilbert's lectures.

⁵ The argument does not appear in the *Hypognosticon* or *Hypomnesticon*, wrongly attributed to Augustine (*Opera S. Augustini* ed. Benedictines of St Maur, Paris, 1679–1703, vol. x, Appendix). In the *Metalogicon*, ii 17 (ed. Webb, p. 94), however, John cites the same argument with a correct reference to Augustine's *De Libero Arbitrio* (*P.L.* xxxii 1265–6).

equally on those who confuse and those who divide. For he who confuses is like Sabellius a Patripassian or a Eutychian, and he who divides imitates Arius or Nestorius and their kind. However the Lord directs the way of the righteous ¹ between the Scylla of those who divide and the Charybdis of those who confound; and whoever goes too far to either side runs the risk of damnation.

The third chapter he said, should be directed against those who think that God has need of external things in a natural way, so that he has something other than Himself coeternal with Himself; but of Him and by Him and in Him are all things ² which are in the heavens and in the earth,³ every substance, every form of substance, or property or accident or part, and even every structure of the parts. And though the angels are described as existing before time, even they cannot aspire to coeternity, for, being like all other things created by God, they are known to have had a beginning. So there is nothing in the whole realm of nature, whether substance or accident, which can rightly be called eternal save He alone who, governing that same nature, created all things, orders and preserves them. But following the teaching of Augustine and certain other doctors he maintained up to the last day of his life that there are certain everlasting principles,⁴ which have had no beginning and will have no end, and are so much an essential part of truth that even if the whole world perished they would remain. Augustine indeed affirmed this in the *Hypognosticon*,⁵ and in several of his works, but

[33] plerisque operibus suis / astruit Augustinus, sed uario modo exponitur a diuersis. Illi uero erat indubium, siue res sint siue res non sint, tamen uerum esse et a Deo sciri substantiam esse si homo sit et si margarita sit lapidem esse. Sed quod scibile est non nichil esse fatebatur, eo quod scientia sit comprehensio ueritatis existentium. Nam et philosophi sapientiam diffiniunt esse comprehensionem ueritatis rerum que sunt et sui immutabilem essentiam sortiuntur.¹ Et sicut opinio in uanis fluctuat et uacillat, sic intelligentia, que solius Dei est et admodum paucorum hominum, uera comprehendit et certa.² Et quidem scientia esse non potest sine certo et solido fundamento ueritatis quam immediate, id est reuelata facie³ contemplatur, opinio uero incerta fluctuat, quia firmiter solide non innititur ueritati; fides autem inter utramque, quia media gradiens opinionem quidem superat, quia certitudinem tenet; sed superatur a scientia, quia ueritatem non conspicit facie reuelata.

Aliquid ergo est quod alius per scientiam, alius per fidem speculatur, quod anima naturaliter appetit, quod in eternitate promittitur electis et fidelibus salubriter speratur. *Vita*, inquit, *eterna est ut cognoscant te uerum Deum et quem misisti Iesum Christum*.⁴ Tunc omnes articulos fidei et omnia oracula prophetarum, que procul dubio plura sunt, contemplantur et personarum in Trinitate distinctionem et nature unitatem intuebimur

¹ Boethius, *De Arithmetica*, I, 1 (*P.L.* lxxiii 1079–80)

² cf. Plato, *Timaeus*, 51 E. Here John summarises a discussion of intellect, knowledge, faith and opinion that appears at much greater length in the *Metalogicon*, lib. iv, especially caps. 13–18.

³ cf. 2 Corinthians iii.18. M. E. Williams, p. 109, observes that John's definition is nearer to Hugh of St Victor than to Gilbert. In the *Metalogicon*,

it is expounded in various ways by others. For to him there was no doubt that—whether the things actually exist or not—it is true and known to God that if a man exists a substance exists, and if a pearl exists a stone exists. He declared that whatever is knowable cannot be nothing, for knowledge is understanding of the truth of that which is. The philosophers too define knowledge as understanding of the truth of the things that are, and are each assigned their unchanging essence.¹ And as opinion wavers and vacillates in its delusions, so understanding, which belongs only to God and at most very few men, embraces things which are true and enduring.² And indeed knowledge cannot exist without an assured and firm foundation of truth that is seen immediately—that is, face to face³—but opinion wavers from one doubt to another because it has no firm resting ground on solid truth: faith is between the two, for it takes the middle road: above opinion, since it has certainty, but surpassed by knowledge, because it does not see the truth face to face.

And so there is something that one attains by knowledge, another by faith, that the soul naturally inclines towards and that is both promised to the elect in eternity and desired by the faithful for their salvation. 'This is life eternal,' he said 'that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.'⁴ Then we shall contemplate all the articles of the faith and sayings of the prophets, which indeed are more than we know, and shall understand the distinction of persons

iv 13 (ed. Webb, p. 179), John gives the view of Hugh of St Victor: *Fides est uoluntaria certitudo absentium, supra opinionem, infra scientiam constituta*.

⁴ St John xvii.3

sicuti est. Sed de illis plura pie credi et fideliter pre-
 [34] dicari possunt, ita quidem / de singulis quod de nullo
 aliorum nec de aliqua creatura, nec eis ceperunt ex
 tempore uel cum tempore conuenire. Nam Patrem
 habere Filium coeternum et testimonium daturum
 Filio dicendo, *Hic est Filius meus dilectus*, etc.,¹ uerum
 fuit antequam mundus esset: alioquin ante mundi
 creationem non habuit Filium coeternum, aut testi-
 monium tale non erat daturus Filio. Similiter de Filio,
 quod incarnandus, quod accepturus a Patre iudicium
 et celebraturus illud in forma hominis; de Spiritu, quod
 super Dominum in specie columbe, quod super apostolos
 in linguis igneis descensus: alioquin hec ante mundum
 futura non fuerant, et in hunc modum plura sunt
 singularum propria personarum que de eis pie creduntur
 et fideliter predicantur. Que si quis propria, quia
 quodammodo complexa sunt,² non esse contendat,
 meminerit proprie dici proprium quod omni et soli et
 semper conuenit, et quod cum eo cuius est conuertibilem
 habet consequentiam uel predicationem. Sic enim
 substantie proprium esse dicitur, quod, cum sit unum

¹ St Matthew iii.17

² In discussing properties John introduces the terms 'sermo complexus' and 'sermo incomplexus'. M. E. Williams (pp. 110-11) points out that these terms seem to be John's own, and are not found in Gilbert. He is unable, however, to suggest their meaning. John seems in this passage to use them as synonymous with *oratio* and *dictio*; and there is a hint of his meaning in the *Metalogicon* (iii 4; ed. Webb, p. 135): 'Liber Periermeniarum . . . ratione proportionis sillabicus est sicut Predicamentorum elementarius; nam elementa rationum, que singulatim tradit in sermonibus incomplexis, iste colligit et in modum sillabe comprehensa producit ad veri falsique significationem'. He seems, then, to be contrasting isolated or uncombined words as they are discussed in the Categories with propositions as explained in the second book of the Organon, 'On Interpretation'. This section of the *Historia Pontificalis* is full of echoes from the Categories with the interpretation of Boethius, but I cannot find the expressions

and unity of substance in the Trinity as verily it is. But there are certain attributes which can be devoutly believed to belong to them and faithfully taught—attributes, that is, peculiar to one of the individual persons, not to be assigned to any creature—which did not begin to be applicable to them in time or when time began. For it was true before the creation of the world that the Father had the Son coeternal with him, and would bear witness to the Son saying, 'This is my beloved Son' etc.;¹ otherwise there would be a time before the creation of the world when the Son was not coeternal with him and when he was not to bear witness to the Son in this way. Similarly of the Son that he was to be incarnate, to receive the right of jurisdiction from the Father and triumph in the form of a man; of the Spirit, that it should descend on Our Lord in the semblance of a dove and on the apostles in tongues of fire: otherwise before the world began these things would not have lain in the future; and similarly there are several properties of the single persons which can be devoutly believed and faithfully taught concerning them. If anyone argues that these are not properties, because in a sense they are propositions,² let him remember that that is rightly called a property which applies to the whole of anything, to that alone, and always and necessarily accompanies that of which it is predicated. So the property of a substance is said to be that, whilst

'sermo complexus' and 'sermo incomplexus' in Boethius. John seems concerned to dismiss a logical quibble of his own day to the effect that complex propositions could not be properties: but whatever meaning is to be attached to his peculiar technical terms the quibble, as he remarks, does not affect the argument.

et idem numero, secundum sui mutationem susceptibile est contrariorum:¹ quantitatis, ut secundum eam dicatur equale uel inequale;² relatiuorum, ut uno eorum definite cognito, definite cognoscatur et reliquum, et ut eis esse sit ad aliud se habere;³ qualitatis, ut secundum eam dicatur aliquid simile uel dissimile.⁴ Et hec quidem et similia in speculatione naturalium propria assignantur, non impediendo rationem proprii assignandi complexorum natura sermonum. Similiter in ethicis proprium dicitur esse uirtutis, ut habitum [35] animi bene componat et in modum nature rationem faciat esse conformem;⁵ iusticie, ut reddat unicuique quod suum est. In rationali quoque facultate dicitur proprium esse nominis significare substantiam cum qualitate, uerbi actionem uel passionem cum tempore;⁶ contradictoriarum, ut altera uera sit, altera falsa. Mathematicus etiam in materia sua simili ratione propria distinguit eorum de quibus tractat. Verbi gratia, parium numerorum proprium est ut in partes equas recipiant sectionem, imparis uero ut in duas equas partes diuidi nequeat. Interdum uero propositis rebus propria sua sermo coaptat incomplexus^a; ut si dicas proprium hominis esse risibile, uel spiritus rationale: si tamen ad nuncupationem angeli uel anime humane,

^a in complexus Poole

¹ cf. Aristotle, *Categories*, trans. Boethius (*P.L.* lxiv 198), 'Maxime uero substantiae proprium esse videtur, cum unum et idem numero sit, contrariorum susceptibile esse'.

² cf. *ibid.*, p. 216, 'Proprium autem maxime quantitatis est, quod et aequale et inaequale dicitur'.

³ cf. *ibid.*, p. 237, where the definition is more diffuse.

⁴ cf. *ibid.*, p. 259, 'Quare proprium erit qualitatis secundum eam simile et dissimile dici'.

it is numerically one and the same, it is capable of receiving contrary qualifications;¹ of quantity, that according to it is judged equality or inequality;² of relatives, that if one of them is definitely known the other will be definitely known, and that their being is what they are to another thing;³ of quality, that by it things are judged similar or dissimilar.⁴ These and other properties are assigned in speculations on natural things, and the complexity of the propositions in no way prevents them being assigned as properties. Likewise in ethics the property of virtue is said to be that it rightly shapes the character of the mind, and makes reason conform to the design of nature;⁵ of justice, that it renders to each one what is his own. In logic also the property of a noun is said to be that it signifies substance and quality, of a verb, action or suffering in time;⁶ of contradictories, that one is true, the other false. A mathematician too in his subject distinguishes likewise the properties of the things with which he is concerned. For example, the property of even numbers is that they can be divided into two equal parts, of odd that they cannot be divided into two equal parts. Sometimes indeed there are things of which the properties are described in a single word; as when we say that it is the property of man to be risible, or of spirit to be rational: provided that the word spirit is used to

⁵ John here combines the two definitions of virtue in general use at the time: 'habitus mentis bene constitutae' (Boethius, *De differentiis topicis* ii (*P.L.* lxiv 1188)), and 'animi habitus naturae modo atque rationi consentaneus' (Cicero, *De Inventione*, ii. 159). cf. O Lottin, 'Les premières définitions et classifications des vertus au moyen âge' in *Psychologie et Morale aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles* (1949), iii 100 sqq.

⁶ cf. Priscian, *Institut. gramm.* ii 4 18 (ed. Krehl, 1819-20)

nomen spiritus deuocetur. Sed nichil refert complexus an incomplexus sermo, suum cuique proprium reddat; dum tamen prorsus, semper, et soli conueniat, aut si non ea districcione agitur, si conueniat uel prorsus uel soli uel semper.

Theologia uero in assignandis propriis prefatas sequitur facultates, et nunc solis dictionibus, nunc etiam orationibus¹ ea designat. Dicitur enim Patris proprium generare, Filii generari, Spiritus sancti procedere; et solis nominibus facta est assignatio. Si uero secundum Hylarium dicatur proprium Patris esse quod semper est pater, item Filii quod semper est filius, Spiritus sancti quod eternaliter a Patre procedit et Filio, sua singulis reddidit sermo complexus. Sunt ergo, ut dictum est, plura singularum propria personarum, sunt quedam [36] communia omnium, sunt aliqua duarum / excepta tertia. Trium namque proprium est et commune ad inuicem, unum Deum esse; conuenit enim omni et soli et semper, id est ab eterno. Creasse uero omnia proprium quidem est, nec tamen conuenit ab eterno, sed ab initio creature. Patris autem et Filii, quod ab eis procedit Spiritus sanctus, Filii uero et Spiritus, quod a Patre eternaliter sunt; Patris autem et Spiritus, quod habent communem cum Filio deitatem et quod ei erant secundum carnem baptizando sensibile testimonium perhibitori. Nichil istorum nouum, quia uniuersa hec temporis initium precesserunt. Cum uero in naturali facultate, item morali et rationali et matematica sit difficilis propriorum,

¹ cf. Aristotle, *De Interpretatione*, trans. Boethius (*P.L.* lxiv 311), where a distinction is made between *oratio* and *dictio*: 'Oratio autem est vox

designate either an angel or a human soul. But it matters not whether a property is assigned in a proposition or in a single word, provided that it entirely and always and solely applies to that thing or—more loosely—if it applies *either* entirely *or* solely *or* always.

Theology in assigning properties follows these branches of study, and distinguishes them sometimes merely in single words, sometimes in propositions.¹ So it is said that the property of the Father is to beget, of the Son to be begotten, of the Holy Spirit to proceed: and here the properties are described in single words. If however with Hilary it is said that the property of the Father is that he is eternally father, of the Son that he is eternally son, of the Holy Spirit that it proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, then the property of each is described in a proposition. There are, as it has been said, several properties of the single Persons, some common to all, some to two but not the third. For it is the property of all three, which they have in common, to be one God: it is true wholly and solely and always, that is from eternity. It is the property of all to have created, though this has been true not from eternity, but from the beginning of creation. It is a property of the Father and Son, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from them, of the Son and the Spirit, that they are eternally from the Father, of the Father and Spirit that they have a common divinity with the Son and were to give tangible witness to him by baptizing him in the flesh. None of these is new, because all these things were before the beginning of time. And though, as the philosophers

significativa, cujus partium aliquid significativum est separatum, ut dictio, non ut affirmatio, vel negatio'.

sicut philosophis notum est, assignatio, in theologicis¹ difficillima est. Quod quidem ex tribus causis certum est euenire, tum ex subtilitate et difficultate rerum, tum ex ingenii tarditate, tum ex defectu uerborum. Non latuit hoc nec Platonem ethnicum, cum dixit quia opificem uniuersitatis Deum tam est inuenire difficile quam inuentum digne profari impossibile.²

Nec mirum si de eis nequaquam digne loquimur, cum propriis ad hoc sermonibus careamus, et nominibus et uerbis alienis rerum temporalium et fragilium nos uti necessitas ipsa compellat. Sermones enim instituti sunt ea significare que continentur in mente. Sed theologica dumtaxat fide, spe, et caritate in mente sunt, [37] alias autem, sicut / apostolus ait, superant omnem sensum.³ Eis ergo proprie non conueniunt uerba que sua sunt aliorum. Sed ne deuotio muta sit, translatis utitur uerbis uel ad se excitandam, uel ut instruat paruulos suos, uel ut confundat et conterat inimicos. Docet hoc Boetius in libro de Trinitate, dicens decem esse predicamenta quae predicantur de rebus omnibus, sed de Deo predicata mutantur, quia talia sunt predicata, qualia subiecta permiserint.⁴ Cum enim Deus dicitur magnus aut iustus et similia, non utique quantitas aut qualitas ut in naturalibus, sed substantia predicatur, immo que supra omnem substantiam est diuina essentia, quam Greci, eo quod uniuersa transcendat, rectius

¹ M. E. Williams suggests that one of the principal reasons for the misunderstanding of Gilbert by his contemporaries was a failure to follow the movements of his thought from natural to theological reasoning (pp. 53, 112). John's emphasis on the difficulty of transferring terms from one faculty to another is, then, important as an interpretation of Gilbert's thought.

² Plato, *Timaeus*, 28 c

know, it is difficult to assign properties in natural and moral philosophy, logic and mathematics, it is most difficult of all in theology.¹ This is due to three things, partly to the subtlety and difficulty of the subject itself, partly to the dullness of our wits, partly to the inadequacy of words. Even Plato the pagan realised this when he said that it is difficult to find God the artificer of the universe but impossible to describe him worthily when he has been found.²

Nor is it strange that we cannot describe these things worthily, since we have no words fitting for such matters, and necessity compels us to use the alien names and descriptions of temporal and fragile things. For words were introduced to explain the things which are comprehended in the mind. But theological truths, though by faith, hope and charity they are in the mind, sometimes nevertheless, as the apostle says, pass all understanding.³ So words which belong to other things are not properly fitting to them. But lest devotion should be dumb, words may be used figuratively, either to stimulate our devotion, or to teach our children, or to confound and destroy our enemies. This is taught by Boetius in his book *De Trinitate*,⁴ where he says that there are ten predicates which are predicated of all things, but the predicates are changed in describing God, because only such things can be predicated as the subjects permit. So when God is called great or just or the like, we do not indeed predicate quantity and quality as in natural things, but substance, or rather that divine essence which is above all substance, which the Greeks,

³ Philippians iv.7

⁴ Boetius, *De Trinitate*, i 4 (P.L. lxiv 1 252)

yperusiam¹ dicunt. Exuuntur ergo sermones propriis significationibus, et cum hii, sicut ait Aristotiles, sint *note earum passionum que sunt in anima*,² id est intellectu,³ res illas conantur ostendere quas sine defectu suo aut nunquam aut raro percipit intellectus.

Testatur hoc Hylarius libro primo de Trinitate dicens, *Extra significantiam sermonis est, extra sensus intentionem, extra intelligentie conceptionem. Verborum significantiam rei ipsius natura consumit.*³ Et infra: *Perfecta scientia est sic Deum scire ut licet non ignorabilem, tamen inenarrabilem*⁴ et incomprehensibilem scias. *Credendus est, intelligendus est, adorandus est*; et hiis officiis eloquendus. Augustinus quoque hoc ipsum astruit, monens *ut Deum intelligamus* [38] *sine quantitate magnum, / sine qualitate bonum*,⁵ et plura in hunc modum quasi patenter dicat. Cum uentum fuerit ad inuisibilia Dei conspicienda⁶ a nature recedatur usu, abigantur fantasie creaturarum, tollatur rerum quas nouimus imaginatio, et mens per ea que facta sunt ad ea que facta non sunt erigatur, et affectus seipsum in superiora extendens, quia non sufficit apprehendere, saltem suspendat se et temporalia deserat mente dum interim celestia penetrare non potest; hoc suspendium contemplatiuus eligit, nec abhorret sed potius delectatur quociens ipsum gratia introducit, ut quo modo fieri potest uideat que ab eterno singularum in Trinitate sint propria personarum. Spiritualis enim est, licet eum

¹ intellectuum Poole

² ὑπεροβίσιος

³ See Aristotle, *De Interpretatione*, ch. i. with the commentary of Boethius (*P.L.* lxiv 297).

⁴ Hilary, *De Trinitate*, ii 5 (*P.L.* x 54).

⁵ *Ibid.*, ii 7 (*P.L.* x 57)

⁶ Augustine, *De Trinitate*, v 2 (*P.L.* xlii 912). M. E. Williams (p. 112) points out that in the *De Duabus Naturis* Gilbert de la Porrée gives the same interpretation of this passage from Augustine.

⁶ cf. Romans i.20

because it transcended all things, rightly called 'beyond being.'¹ So words are divested of their ordinary meanings, and though they are, according to Aristotle, 'symbols of the feelings that are in the soul'²—that is, in the intellect—they strive to make plain those things that the intellect rarely or never perceives without failing.

Hilary speaks to the same purpose when he says in the first book *On the Trinity*, 'It is beyond the meaning of words, beyond the reach of the senses, beyond the grasp of the intellect. The nature of the subject surpasses the meaning of words.'³ And later, 'Perfect knowledge is to know God so that you realise that, though he is not unknowable, yet he is indescribable'⁴ and incomprehensible. 'He is to be believed, understood, adored,' and described by these means. And Augustine taught the same thing when he urged 'that we should know that God is great without quantity, good without quality';⁵ and he has quite openly made several statements to the same purpose. When we come to gaze at the invisible things of God,⁶ let the habit of nature be withdrawn, the phantasies of created things driven away, the image of the things that we know removed; and let the mind raise itself through created to uncreated things, and let our desires as they stretch out towards higher things, which they are powerless to apprehend, at least be suspended and, by the operation of mind be divorced from temporal things; so long as he cannot lay hold on celestial things the contemplative man prefers this state of suspension of desire, and instead of dreading it rejoices whenever grace brings him to it so that in some way he may see what are from eternity the properties of the single persons in the Trinity. For he

redarguat animalis fantasiasta, qui non didicit differentias et fines facultatum, et quod in fisicis rationabiliter, in mathematicis doctrinaliter, in theologicis intellectualiter¹ uersari oportet. Ipse enim in omnibus naturaliter credit esse uersandum. Et cum audit formam Dei,² quod tamen apostolus dicit, et proprietates personarum, uel communes eis omnibus aut pluribus rationes, putat quod, sicut inest corpori color, cupiditas anime uel iusticia, sic Deus accidentibus informetur aut formis substantialibus que ei existendi causa sint, ut ipse merito credatur non esse omnium causa. Si uero didicisset facultatum fines et theologicas rationes, rationis euctus beneficio in intelligentiam puriorem, fantasiis huiusmodi non seruiret. Hec tercii capituli explanandi gratia secundum ipsum dixisse sufficiat, qui quasi fantasiastas redarguebat eos qui theologiarum ignari rationum ipsum conati sunt infamare. /

XIV

[39] **Q**UARTVM uero Patripassianos et corrupticolas itemque Manicheos arguit, aut nichil agit aut inducit errorem. Nam qui eundem credit Patrem, Filium et Spiritum sanctum, diuinam naturam in solo Filio audiat incarnatam, qui uero Filium putat Deum esse non ueritate nature sed adoptione gratie, aduertat ad

¹ cf. Boethius, *De Trinitate* c.2 (P.L. lxiv 1250), 'In naturalibus igitur rationaliter, in mathematicis disciplinaliter, in diuinis intellectualiter uersari oportebit'. *Doctrinalis* and *disciplinalis* were traditionally regarded as equivalent. See M. D. Chenu, 'Notes de lexicographie philosophique médiévale', in *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, xxv (1936) 686-92.

² Philippians ii.6

is spiritual, though this may be denied by the man of carnal imaginings who has not learned the differences and distinctions between the disciplines, and that one must proceed by rational hypothesis in physics, by rational certainty in mathematics, and by intellectual illumination in theology.¹ He however believes that one should proceed in all things as in natural science, and when he hears of the form of God,² which the apostle mentions, and the properties of the persons, or the qualities common to all or some of them, he imagines that as colour is present in a body or greed or justice in a mind, so God is determined by accidents or substantial forms which are the cause of His existence, so that He may justly be held not to be the cause of all things. If instead he had learned the limits of the disciplines and the methods of theology, he would be raised by the aid of reason to purer intelligence, and would not be the slave of such phantasies. This may suffice to outline his explanation of the third chapter, in which he reproved as wild eccentrics those who, themselves ignorant of the methods of theology, had striven to cast ignominy on him.

XIV

As FOR the fourth chapter, unless it reproves the Patripassians and those who worship that which is corrupted, also the Manichaeans, it is useless or breeds errors. For he who believes that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are the same should hear that the divine nature was incarnate only in the Son; and he who thinks that the Son is not God through truth of nature, but by adoption of grace, should turn to the declaration

quantam expressionem fidei fateatur ecclesia, quoniam ipsa diuinitas incarnata est. Quod si Filium Dei Deum non ueram carnem sed fantasticam gestasse suspicatur, et sic illusisse hominibus quos uenerat illustrare, ipsam diuinam substantiam incarnatam esse meminerit. Ceterum si horum occasione uerborum putat in Trinitate aliquid plus aut minus incarnatum esse quam Filium, error est. Apices enim sine crimine sunt, sensus in crimine. Et ut ait Hylarius, sensus non sermo fit crimen.¹ Expressio ergo uerborum recte fidei intelligentiam non subuertit, eritque perinde accipiendum, Deitas, diuinitas, aut diuina essentia incarnata est, ac si uerbis aliis diceretur, Filius qui plenitudine diuinitatis² et ueritate nature non adoptione Deus est, ille inquam incarnatus est. Nam plerumque, uel ad errores euitandos uel ad sensum inculcandum et mentibus quodam modo profundius et fidelius intimandum, expressiones huiusmodi solere fieri explorate ueritatis est. Apud Ezechielem licet ratio compendii eadem ponere uerba non permiserit, legitur quia qualis consultor talis propheta eius.³ In liberalibus quoque traditur disciplinis quia interdum fit solutio ut ad hominem, interdum ut ad orationem, et quod uehementer instanti resistendum / [40] est uehementer et uehementer resistenti uehementer instandum.

Hinc est quod doctores ecclesie habita ratione personarum cum quibus agitur sepe non nulla proponunt, que si alias^a dicerentur fidei uiderentur aduersa.

^a alia Poole

¹ cf. Hilary, *De Synodis* (P.L. x 523)

² Colossians ii.9

³ Ezechiel xiv.1-11

of faith in which the church says that that divinity was incarnate. Or if anyone fancies that God the Son of God put on not true but only imaginary flesh, so deceiving the men He had come to enlighten, let him remember that the divine substance itself was incarnate. But if anyone on account of these words thinks that anything in the Trinity more or less than the Son was incarnate, that is error. For though the words are without fault the interpretation may be at fault. And, as Hilary says, the meaning not the word makes the error.¹ Therefore the form of words does not vitiate the understanding of the true faith, and it would be equally acceptable to say that deity, divinity, or the divine essence was incarnate, or if it were expressed in other words, that the Son, who is God in the plenitude of divinity² and truth of nature, not by adoption, that He, I say, was incarnate. Indeed it is surely a well-known fact that expressions of this kind are used freely either to avoid errors or to explain the meaning and impress it more deeply and truly on men's minds. In Ezechiel, though for the sake of brevity I cannot quote his words in full, you may read that the prophet is of the same virtue as those who consult him.³ There is also a doctrine in the liberal arts, that sometimes an explanation is made with reference to a particular man, sometimes to a particular formulation; and also that it is necessary to resist a strong attack with violence and bring a violent attack against a strong resistance.

Consequently the doctors of the church, considering the quality of the persons with whom they are dealing, often propound certain things which, if stated elsewhere, might seem contrary to the faith. If Auxentius the

Si Auxentius Arrianus¹ Christum de Maria natum predicet, sustinuisse esuriem et sitisse, passum et mortuum, ei beatus Hylarius aduersatur. Si Fotinus² cum eodem asserat Christum timuisse et fuisse tristatum aut sustinuisse aculeos, Hylarius contradicit, non quod fidei hoc habenti se statuat aduersarium, sed quod uerbis catholicis in ore talium sentit subesse perfidiam. Non enim predicant hec ut humane nature doceant ueritatem sed ut, diuinitatem adimentes, Christum creaturam esse conuincant et subiciant tam necessitati quam uanitati. Vnde Hylarius in libro de Synodis: *Non audio, Christus ex Maria natus est, nisi audiam In principio erat Verbum et Deus erat Verbum. Non audiam, Christus esuriuit, nisi audiam post quadraginta dierum ieiunium, Non in solo pane uiuit homo, etc. Non audiam, Sitiuit, nisi audiam, Qui biberit ex aqua quam dedero non sitiet in eternum. Non audiam, Passus est, nisi audiam, Nunc est hora ut Filius hominis clarificetur. Non audiam, Mortuus est, nisi audiam, Resurrexit. Nichil solitarium ex diuinis sacramentis ad suspicionem audientium et ad occasionem blasphemantium proferamus.*³ Idem de Trinitate libro x: *Si in passione Christi necessitas est et non salutis tue donum; Si in cruce dolor compungendi est et non decreti, quod in te mors est scripta, confixio; si in morte uis mortis est et non per potestatem* [41] *Dei carnis / exuue sunt; si denique mors ipsa aliud est quam*

¹ Auxentius, an Arian who became bishop of Milan in 355. In spite of being publicly accused by St Hilary of Poitiers in 364 and condemned by Pope Damasus in 369 he succeeded in retaining possession of his see until his death in 374.

² Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, was attacked by St Hilary and condemned by a synod held at Sirmium in 351. He was guilty of various Trinitarian heresies, of which the crudest was his assertion that Christ was mere man.

Arian¹ pronounced that Christ was born of Mary, endured hunger and thirst, suffered and was buried, blessed Hilary opposed him. If Photinus² asserted with him that Christ had been afraid or discouraged or had endured wounds, Hilary contradicted him; not because he opposed himself to the faith which contained this, but because he felt that catholic words in the mouths of such men had been falsified. For they professed these things not to teach the truth of His humanity, but by destroying His divinity, to prove that Christ was a creature subject to both necessity and weakness. So Hilary wrote in his *Of Synods*, 'I do not hear that "Christ was born of Mary" unless I also hear, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God." I do not hear "Christ was hungry" unless I hear after forty days of fasting, "Not in bread alone doth man live." I do not hear that he thirsted unless I hear, "He that shall drink of the water that I will give him shall not thirst for ever." I do not hear "He suffered" unless I hear, "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified." I do not hear "He died" unless I hear "He rose again." We should take no isolated texts from the divine revelation that may give doubt to the hearers or an occasion for blasphemy.'³ Again in the tenth book *On the Trinity*: 'If in the passion of Christ is necessity and not the gift of your salvation; if in the cross is the anguish of suffering and not a taking on Himself of the decree of death made out against you; if in His death is the power of death and not the despoiling of the flesh through the power of God; if finally in death is anything other than

³ Hilary, *De Synodis, seu de Fide Orientalium*, 70 (P.L. x 526-7)

*potentatum dehonestatio, quam fiducia, quam triumphus: ascribe infirmitatem, si ibi necessitas est et natura, si ibi est uis et diffidencia et dedecus.*¹ Patet ergo quia necessitatem negat ut miserationis et uoluntatis edoceat sacramentum, nec inficiatur quod honorat, quod amplectitur et adorat in Christo, sed occurrit perfidie, propulsat errores. Hic tamen loquendi modus incautos plerumque decipit, non aduertentes quid simpliciter enunciatum sit, quid modaliter licet tacito predicamenti modo. Nam cum Christus in euangelio dicat *Ego non iudico quemquam*,² error erit in intellectu, nisi modus ante positus repetatur, uidelicet *secundum faciem*. Quod qui non aduertit in lectione scripturarum non poterit non errare. Necesse est ergo ut ad causam dicendi recurratur, quoniam, ut in secundo de Trinitate ait Hylarius, omne dictum ut dicatur ex causa est et dicti ratio ex sensu erit intelligenda dicendi.³

XV

HEC, amicorum karissime,⁴ diffusius fortasse quam ratio propositi exigebat prosecutus sum, tum ut hominem plenius noueris quem te uidisse gaudes et doles non audisse, tum ut tue satisfacerem uoluntati, edisserens intelligentiam quam prefatus episcopus in supra positis credebatur habere capitulis. Superest ut ad pontificalem redeamus hystoriam.

Cum patres ergo qui huius uerbi occasione detenti fuerant dimitterentur ad propria, dominus papa uersus Italiam direxit iter, causam episcoporum Anglie domino

¹ Hilary, *De Trinitate*, x 48 (P.L. x 382), citing Colossians ii. 13 sqq.

² St John viii. 15

³ Hilary, *De Trinitate*, ii 31 (P.L. x 71) cf. *ibid.*, iv 14

⁴ Peter of Celle

the overthrow of the proud, than trust, than victory—then consider it weakness, if He was subject to necessity and nature, to violence and shame and dishonour.’¹ It is clear then, that he denies necessity, in order to preach the gospel of pity and free-will; that he does not deny what he honours and cherishes and adores in Christ, but attacks unbelief and refutes errors. But this fashion of speaking has often misled the unwary, who do not understand what has been stated simply and what argumentatively, because nothing is said of the method of predication. For where Christ says in the Gospel, ‘I judge not any man’² he will be misunderstood unless the reservation before is repeated, namely ‘according to the flesh.’ And if anyone fails to notice this in reading the scriptures he will be bound to err. For we must seek the antecedent cause for every statement, since, as Hilary says in the second book *On the Trinity*, there is an antecedent cause for every saying that is uttered, and the meaning of the saying is to be understood from the purpose of what is said.³

XV

I HAVE dwelt on these matters, my dearest friend,⁴ longer perhaps than the nature of the subject required: but I was anxious to give you a fuller picture of the man whom you have had the good fortune to know though not to hear, and to obey your request by explaining to the best of my ability the bishop’s interpretation of these propositions. Now I must return to papal history.

When the dignitaries detained to discuss this matter¹¹⁴⁸ had been sent away home, the pope delegated the case of the English bishops to archbishop Theobald of Canter-

Theobaldo Cantuariensi committens.¹ Qui cum applicuisset, occurrerunt ei nuncii regis, ipsi / archiepiscopo fidelitate astricti, Ricardus de Luci et Guillelmus Martellus² et alii, denunciantes ei ut festinanter egrederetur de terra, quia contra prohibitionem regis ad concilium uenire presumpserat. Confiscata sunt bona eius, et secundo proscriptus est pro obediencia Romane ecclesie. Nam et alia uice propter obedienciam sedis apostolice proscriptus fuerat, quando, urgente mandato domini Henrici Wintoniensis episcopi tunc legatione fungentis in Anglia, post alios episcopos omnes receperat imperatricem.³ Sed neque in hac proscriptione neque in priori, licet inimicissimos habuerit regem et consiliarios suos, aliquis amicorum uel fidelium archiepiscopi proscriptus aut exulare coactus est, nec eciam illi qui maluerunt coexulare domino suo quam in patria remanere.⁴ Exilii molestias et dampna proscriptionis solus archiepiscopus sensit: liberum erat amicis pro libitu transire ad ipsum et redire in patriam, et, si uoluissent, in subleuandis necessitatibus afferre solatium; sed ipse, pro sorte que communis est omnibus desolatis, in paucissimis repperit fidem, et sepe expertus est uerum esse prouerbium quia

Nulla fides^a umquam miseros elegit amicos.⁵

Mansit interim apud Sanctum Audomarum, carus omnibus pro honestate morum, pro reuerentia dignitatis, sed maxime quia dulcis affatu, pius in pauperes, unicum uidebatur benignitatis et liberalitatis exemplum. /

^a fide Poole

¹ This repeats the statement made in chapter 4.

² Richard de Lucy, 'the loyal', was Stephen's justiciar, and William Martel his steward.

³ In April 1141, he had been present at the election of the Empress

bury, and took the road for Italy.¹ When Theobald April 1148 landed, he was met by messengers of the king who were also his vassals, Richard de Lucy and William Martel² and others, warning him to leave the country with all speed, since he had dared to attend the council in defiance of the king's prohibition. His property had been seized and he had been proscribed a second time for obedience to the papacy. The first time had been when, at the urgent request of lord Henry, bishop of Winchester, then exercising the office of legate in England, he had received the empress last, after all the other bishops.³ But on neither occasion, though he numbered the king and his counsellors amongst his bitterest enemies, was one of the archbishop's friends or supporters proscribed or driven into exile, not even those who chose to share their master's exile rather than remain in their own country.⁴ The archbishop alone suffered the miseries of exile and the pains of proscription; his friends were free to come and go as they wished and even, if they chose, to bring him material assistance for his needs. In spite of this he, suffering the common lot of all unfortunates, found few who were faithful and again and again proved the truth of the proverb that

'No loyalty compels one to befriend the unfortunate.'⁵

He remained for the time being at St Omer, beloved by all for his upright character and dignified bearing, but above all for his gentleness and care for the poor, which made him seem a perfect example of kindness and generosity.

Matilda at Winchester. See L. Voss, *Heinrich von Blois* (Historische Studien, 210, Berlin, 1932), pp. 27-30.

⁴ John is implicitly comparing the treatment of Theobald's friends with his own trials as a supporter of Becket.

⁵ Lucan, *Pharsalia*, viii 535

XVI

[43] RECEDENTEM ab urbe Remensi dominum papam multa supplicatione prosecuti sunt tam prenomiatus uenerabilis abbas et uniuersa congregatio Clareuallis quam totus ordo Cistercii, quatinus dominum Philippum, qui Turonensem ecclesiam occupauerat et depositus erat ab ordine presbiteratus, quia ordinatus fuerat et consecratus a Petro Leonis,¹ restitueret ad presbiterii gradum. Nam in transitu, quia monachus illius ordinis fuerat, ab eis apostolicus licentiam decreuit accipere; sed nec tunc neque alia uice, quando omnes Clareuallenses ei prostrati supplicauerunt, potuit optineri. Nam quamuis eis aures quasi propicias apperiret, negocium tamen reiciebat in cardinales. Illi uero, hoc impossibile esse dicentes, opponebant constitutionem domini Innocentii de perpetua dampnatione eorum qui ordinati fuerant a Petro Leonis,² et ipsius Eugenii decretum quod in concilio Remensi nuper fuerat promulgatum.³ Dicebant etiam ipsum ceteris errasse deterius qui sciens et prudens, ambitione tractus, se precipitauit in scismatis crimen et Rome in ecclesia beati Petri armatam miliciam non timuit exercere. Referebant enim quod consecrationem ab Innocentio petiit, et quia repulsus est se transtulit ad Petrum, dicens in audientia multorum,

Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta mouebo.⁴

¹ Philip, a monk of Fontaines-les-Blanches in deacon's orders, had been irregularly elected to the bishopric of Tours in 1133, and received ordination and consecration from Anacletus II. He was expelled from Tours, and Anacletus gave him the archbishopric of Taranto by way of compensation. After his degradation by Innocent II in 1139 he became

XVI

As THE pope journeyed from Rheims he was pursued ¹¹⁴⁸ by urgent requests both from the venerable abbot and united congregation of Clairvaux and from the whole Cistercian order that he would restore to priestly rank Philip, formerly bishop of Tours, who had been degraded for receiving ordination and consecration from Peter Leonis.¹ For when he passed through the pope ^{24-26 April 1148} declared that he would hear them indulgently, since he was a monk of that order; but neither then nor later when the whole of Clairvaux pleaded on bended knee, could they obtain what they sought. For although the pope seemed to lend a favourable ear to their appeals, he always referred the matter to the cardinals; and they maintained that no concession could be made on account of the constitution of Pope Innocent condemning in perpetuity all who had received ordination from Peter Leonis,² and the decree of Eugenius himself just promulgated in the council of Rheims.³ Further they alleged that this man had erred more grievously than all the rest, for knowingly and with open eyes he had let ambition tempt him into the sin of schism, and had even dared to lead an armed force into the church of St Peter at Rome. They recalled that he had asked Innocent for consecration and, on his refusal, had then applied to Peter, openly saying in the hearing of many,

'If I cannot move the Gods, I will prevail in Hell.'⁴

a monk at Clairvaux. See Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard* (1920) i 345-50: Watkin Williams, *St Bernard of Clairvaux*, pp. 124-6.

² Second Lateran Council, 1139, canon 30

³ Council of Rheims, canon 17

⁴ Virgil, *Aeneid*, vii 312

XVII

MORINORVM sanctus episcopus Milo, missus in [44] Angliam ad petitionem Gaufridi comitis Ande/gauorum, ut regem super periurio et regni occupatione conueniret et ducatu Normannie quem inuaserat,¹ hoc retulit responsum, quod rex utrumque honorem et iure suo et ecclesie Romane auctoritate adeptus erat,² nec refugerat stare iudicio apostolice sedis quando eum comes uiolenter ducatu spoliauit et parte regni, quibus non restitutis non debebat subire iudicium; sed si ei fieret restitutio, iuri libenter obtemperaret.³ Comes uero, edoctus spem precio non emendam,⁴ et quia meminerat se audisse a domino Gisleberto cardinali sancti Marci regna debere non actionibus sed gladiis uendicari, dimicare maluit quam contendere, ueritus perfidiam regis et auariciam et uersuciam Romanorum, et quia certus erat se Romanam ecclesiam offendisse,⁵ quod nec dominum papam nec aliquem legatum passus erat ingredi terram suam.

¹ Stephen's invasion of Normandy was a failure, and by 1148 Geoffrey had long been in complete occupation of the duchy of Normandy. He acted, however, on behalf of his son Henry, and withdrew in his favour when Henry came of age in 1149-50.

² Innocent II undoubtedly confirmed Stephen's claim to the kingdom of England in 1136, and repeated his confirmation in 1139. In spite of increasing hostility to Stephen, the Papal Curia continued to respect this decision. See Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, Appendix VI. Stephen's charter of liberties speaks of himself only as king of England by papal approval; but his claims to Normandy may also have been included in Innocent's recognition.

³ It seems plain from John's narrative that the episode was immediately after the Council of Rheims. J. Chartrou dates it in 1150, but gives no reason except a suggestion that Geoffrey invested his son Henry with the duchy of Normandy as a reply to Stephen's haughty message (*L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151*, pp. 67-8). There is no reason to suppose that Geoffrey's

XVII

MILES, the saintly bishop of T rouanne, was sent to 1148 England at the request of Geoffrey count of Anjou to charge the king with perjury and seizure of the kingdom and invasion of the duchy of Normandy.¹ He brought back the reply that the king had acquired both dignities by his own right and with the sanction of the Roman church;² that he had been willing to accept papal judgment when the count had violently despoiled him of the duchy and part of the kingdom, and until these were restored he ought not to be judged: as soon as restitution had been made he would willingly submit to judgment.³ The count, however, well knowing the dangers of payment in advance,⁴ and remembering that he had learned from Gilbert cardinal of St Mark, that kingdoms should be defended not by law-suits but by the sword, preferred fighting to litigation: indeed he feared the king's faithlessness and the greed and cunning of the Romans, and knew well that he had aroused the enmity of the Roman church by refusing to allow either the pope himself or any legate to enter his lands.⁵

action was an immediate reply: but if, after the failure of the bishop of T rouanne's mission in 1148 he declared his intention of investing Henry with the duchy, this may explain why both John of Salisbury and Arnulf of Lisieux refer to Henry as duke of Normandy in 1148 and 1149 (cf. *infra*, p. 47, n. 2).

⁴ Terence, *Adelphoe*, 220

⁵ In spite of Geoffrey's insistence on his rights of r gale and his spectacular exclusion of legates and even the pope from his territories, he was by no means an enemy and oppressor of the Church. See J. Chartrou, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

XVIII

CVM itaque causa tantorum principum que in consistorio sperabatur dominum papam non retardaret, Italiam ingressus est et ideo, prout ab aliquibus dicebatur, festinancius, quia iam audierat Christianorum exercitus in oriente esse confectos. Nolebat enim in tanta tristitia Francorum et Alemannorum manere inter illos, licet in Francia posset esse tutissimus. Inuenerunt eum apud [45] Brixiam¹ nuntii / domini Cantuariensis et exposita causa facile optinuerunt ut redirent compotes uoti. Eis tamen aduersabantur quatenus audebant cardinales Octavianus et Guido Cremensis, gloriantes se cognatos esse regis Anglorum, eo quod auia eius Lumbarda fuerit;² Guido quoque de Summa fauore domini Wintoniensis, modestius tamen: sed preualuit ueritas et apostolici fides. Scripsit enim tocius Anglie episcopis et communiter et sigillatim, ut commonerent regem quatinus, omni occasione et dilatione seposita, archiepiscopo omnia ablata restitueret et de iniuriis condigne satisfaceret.³ Et nisi obtemperaret monitis, in uirtute obediencie precepit ut incontinenti et cessante omni appellatione terram eius sub interdicto concluderent, eique denunciarent quod dominus papa ipsum erat excommunicaturus ex nomine in proximo festo sancti Michaelis. Scripsit etiam episcopis et principibus regni Francorum rogans ut archiepiscopum iuuarent in oportunitatibus suis. Preterea iussit ut omnes qui

¹ He was at Brescia from 15 July to 8 September.

² See *infra*, Appendix IV

³ The resistance of the English bishops to Theobald on his return from Rheims is described in detail by Poole (*Hist. Pont.*, Preface, v).

XVIII

WHEN the case of these princes, which was pending¹¹⁴⁸ in his consistory, no longer delayed the lord pope he returned to Italy—all the more speedily, as some alleged, because news of the total destruction of the Christian armies in the east had already reached him. He was unwilling, at a time of such disaster to the French and Germans, to remain in their midst, although he would have been perfectly safe in France. Representatives of the archbishop of Canterbury found him at Brescia,¹ and after expounding their case they easily obtained the gratification of their wishes before returning. It is true that two of the cardinals—Octavian and Guy of Crema, who boasted kinship with the king of the English because his grandmother was a Lombard²—opposed them as violently as they dared; and also Guy of Summa, a partisan of the bishop of Winchester, more moderately: but truth and the pope's good faith prevailed. He wrote to all the bishops of England, both individually and as a body, ordering them to admonish the king to restore the archbishop's confiscated goods without prevarication or delay, and provide due compensation for his injuries.³ And he commanded, as they were bound to obedience, that if the king did not comply with their admonitions they were at once, without allowing any appeal, to place his land under an interdict and warn him that the lord pope would excommunicate him personally at Michaelmas. He wrote too to ask the bishops and princes of France to assist the archbishop to the best of their ability. Finally he commanded all in the province of Canterbury

de prouincia Cantuariensi sunt, archiepiscopo irrefragabiliter obedirent et uenirent ad uocationem eius tanquam esset in sede sua.

Sed episcopi fere omnes facti sunt ei in arcum prauum¹ qui erant in regis potestate, et clerus obedientie quietem pretulit, alii namque subterfugiebant ut absentibus nichil precipi posset; alii sua et amicorum pericula et ecclesiarum dampna et iustum quasi imminentis scismatis metum [pretendebant]. Verum primo omnium crimen inobedientie incurrerunt Londonienses confugientes ad appellationem, cum tamen in litteris [46] apostolicis esset inhibita / appellatio. Fecerant hoc iam alia uice quando episcopus eorum bone memorie Robertus expulsus est,² cui hanc exhibuere deuocionem ut omni diligentia procurarent ne patri exulanti in aliquo prodessent. Horum signifer et in hac et in illa causa fuit Guillelmus archidiaconus gente eorum qui a Bello Manso³ traxere cognomen. Cantuariensis episcopatus solus paruit interdicto, excepto tamen monasterio sancti Augustini in quo monachi presumpserunt celebrare diuina.⁴ Archiepiscopus uero tantam temeritatem non habuit impunitam, sed capita presumptionis, Siluestrum priorem, qui postea ibidem abbas fuit, et Guillelmum sacristam, qui nunc prior est, excommunicauit ex nomine et complices eorum. Hugonem uero abbatem eorum precepit ab excommunicatorum participatione recedere, qui satis humiliter

¹ Psalms lxxvii.57

² Robert de Sigillo, bishop of London, 1141–51, was appointed by the Empress Matilda, and when the Londoners expelled her in 1141 he also was driven out.

³ The Norman family of Belmeis was powerfully entrenched in the church at this time.

to show steadfast obedience to the archbishop, and answer his summons as readily as if he were in his see. 1148

But almost all the bishops proved 'a deceitful bow,'¹ for they were at the king's mercy, and the clergy preferred peace to duty. Some slipped away by stealth, so that no mandate could be received in their absence, others excused themselves on the pretext of dangers to themselves and their friends, evils to the church, and the imminent peril of schism. The first to fall into the sin of disobedience were the London clergy who lodged an appeal, though appeal had been forbidden in the papal mandate. They had sinned in the same way once before when their bishop Robert of holy memory was driven from his see,² and they had shown the extent of their devotion by diligently preventing any succour being sent to their spiritual father in his exile. Their leader in both cases was archdeacon William, of the family of Belmeis.³ Only in the archbishopric of Canterbury did the clergy observe the interdict, with the exception of the monastery of St Augustine, where the monks still presumed to celebrate mass.⁴ Such disobedience however was not allowed to pass unpunished, and the archbishop excommunicated by name prior Silvester, the instigator of the presumption, who later became abbot, and William the sacristan, who is now prior, together with their accomplices. Abbot Hugh, who obeyed with due humility, since he recognised that his profession bound him to obedience to the archbishops of

12 Sept.
1148–
12 March
1149

⁴ For the resistance of the monks of St Augustine's, Canterbury, see Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, Preface, v 2.

paruit, recolens se ad obediendum Cantuariensibus archiepiscopis ex professione teneri. Hoc enim publice fatebatur et domino pape scripto suo testatus est, manens [47] in insula cui Tenedos nomen est et excom/municatos euitans usque ad exitum cause. Iterato itaque partes ad ecclesiam Romanam nuntios transmiserunt sed archiepiscopus uicit. Confirmauit enim dominus papa sententiam anathematis latam in monachos et eos archiepiscopo prestita satisfactione absoluendos commisit, precipiens ut tamdiu cessarent a diuinis quamdiu post interdictum celebrare presumpserant.

XIX

ELECTVS est interea Gillebertus Claudiocestrensis abbas ad episcopatum Herefordensem consilio et uoluntate archiepiscopi Cantuariensis.¹ Placuitque satis duci Normannorum qui modo rex est,² et in cuius potestate tunc erat episcopatus electio, propter personam; sed tamen assensum dare uel regalia reddere noluit antequam electus se fide corporaliter prestita obligaret ad faciendam ei fidelitatem infra mensem post consecrationem, et quod fidelitatem non faceret regi Stephano, quem tota Anglicana ecclesia sequebatur ex constitutione ecclesie Romane; licet enim proceres diuisi diuersos principes sequerentur, unum tamen habebat ecclesia.

¹ Gilbert Foliot appears to have been provided to the see of Hereford by Eugenius III, on the suggestion of archbishop Theobald, and did not undergo any canonical election. See David Knowles, *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket*, p. 43. He was consecrated on 5 September 1148, at St Omer.

² This cannot be right, as Geoffrey of Anjou was still duke of Normandy in 1148. Henry was not invested with the duchy of Normandy before December 1149 at the earliest, or more probably 1150. See Z. N. &

Canterbury, was warned to have no dealings with the 1148-9 excommunicates. He publicly professed his obedience, and gave proof of it in a letter to the pope, whilst he remained in the island of Thanet, avoiding the excommunicates until the conclusion of the case. Again both parties sent representatives to the Roman curia, but it was the archbishop who triumphed. For the lord pope confirmed his excommunication of the monks and authorised him to absolve them when they had made due submission, but admonished them to refrain from celebrating mass for as long as they had celebrated it during the interdict.

XIX

DURING these proceedings Gilbert, abbot of 1148 Gloucester, was elected bishop of Hereford at the request of the archbishop of Canterbury.¹ He was personally acceptable to the duke of Normandy, now king,² who then controlled the election to this see; but the duke was unwilling to confirm the election or restore the *regalia* until the elect had sworn on the gospels to do fealty to him within a month of consecration, and not to do fealty to king Stephen, whom the whole English church followed by papal decree: for although individual dignitaries followed different lords, the church as a whole

C. N. L. Brooke, 'Henry II, Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine', in *E.H.R.*, lxi (1946). cf. *supra*, Introduction, p. xxix. It is possible, however, that contemporaries were uncertain of the date of cession, and that Henry became Duke of Normandy in common parlance before he acquired the title by law; for Arnulf of Lisieux, writing to the bishop of Lincoln in the summer of 1149, speaks of Henry as duke of Normandy (*Letters*, ed. Barlow, no. 4, p. 7).

Cum uero ad archiepiscopum consecrationis gracia peruenisset, preceptum est episcopis qui ad hoc euocati presentes erant, Roberto uidelicet Londoniensi, Jocelino Saresberiensis, et Hylario Cicestrensis, auctoritate domini [48] pape / quatinus archiepiscopo cooperarentur in consecratione fratris sui. At illi, pretendentes quod fidelitatem fecerant regi, et erat contra consuetudines antiquas ut aliquis consecraretur extra regnum, presertim sine assensu regis et qui ei fidelitatem non fecerit, obedire noluerunt. Archiepiscopus tamen nichilominus processit in consecratione, assistentibus et cooperantibus ei in ecclesia beati Audomari Nicholao Cameracensi, Milone Morinensi, et aliis episcopis de regno Francorum, ex mandato domini pape. In euuangelio sententia hec pronostica inuenta est, *Dormis? non potuisti una hora uigilare mecum?*¹ quod ideo nonnulli recte contigisse suspicati sunt, quia in Angliam rediens regi Stephano contra obligationem qua duci tenebatur fidelitatem fecit. Disponebat auctoritate archiepiscopi retinere abbatiam suam cum episcopatu; sed monachi explorato consilio eius Hamelinum, qui nunc est abbas, sibi per Symonem Wigornensem episcopum fecerunt in abbatem festinantius benedici. Dux autem audito quod episcopus Herefordensis regi fidelitatem prestiterat [49] iuramento sollempni, per / litteras et per nuntios eum apud archiepiscopum impetiit de fide lesa, iurans quod eum nunquam esset episcopum habiturus qui contra fidem publice et corporaliter prestitam uenire nec timuit nec erubuit. Sed archiepiscopus, tum minis, tum

¹ During the ceremony of episcopal consecration the gospels were opened and held on the head and neck of the new bishop. See *Consécration épiscopale* in Cabrol-Leclercq *Dict. d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*. It was

recognised only one. When he had come to the arch- 5 Sept. 1148
 bishop to receive consecration, Robert of London, Jocelin of Salisbury and Hilary of Chichester, the bishops summoned for this purpose, received a papal mandate to assist the archbishop in the consecration of their brother. They however refused to obey, protesting their fealty to the king and alleging that it was contrary to ancient custom for anyone to be consecrated outside the kingdom, especially if he had not received the royal assent or done fealty to the king. The archbishop nevertheless carried on with the consecration in the church of St Omer, with Nicholas of Cambrai, Miles of Térouanne and other French bishops acting as witnesses and assistants by papal command. When the gospel was consulted this prophetic sentence was discovered 'Sleepest thou? Couldst thou not watch one hour with me?',¹ which many supposed was fulfilled later when, on his return to England, he did fealty to king Stephen disregarding his obligation to the duke. He was making preparations with archiepiscopal authority to hold his abbey together with his bishopric: but the monks on 26 Sept. 1148
 learning his intentions hastily had Hamelin (who is still abbot) consecrated as their abbot by Simon, bishop of Worcester. When the duke heard that the bishop of Hereford had solemnly sworn fealty to the king, he sent messengers and letters to the archbishop charging him with breach of faith, and protesting that a man was not worthy to be a bishop if he could break an oath publicly sworn on the gospels without fear or shame. But the archbishop, partly by threats, partly by promises,

then that the 'prognostic' might be taken, when the first sentence to catch the eye was noted. cf. St Mark xiv.37.

blandiciis, placauit ducem, persuadens ei quod episcopo non licuerat ecclesiam scindere, ei subtrahendo fidelitatem quem ecclesia Romana recipiebat ut principem.

XX

REX autem perseuerabat in incepta malicia, frētus quorumdam episcoporum consilio et spe concepta de aliquorum fauore cardinalium, quos ad auram eruginosi marsupii trahi posse uidebat in cuiusque turpitudinis cenum. Episcopi quos euocabat interdum pretendebant ad inobedientie patrocinium, quod eis sine licentia regis exitus non patebat. Ecclesia Romana quod promittebat iugiter differebat afferre subsidium.

Vnde habito consilio sapientum ¹ Angliam ingressus est, receptusque cum summa deuotione et reuerencia a comite Hugone Bigoto mansit in castro cui nomen est Framelingaham. Illuc ad se conuocabat episcopos,² examinabat causas, et in omni rigore suum expleuit officium, donec sibi pax reformata est et satisfactum de ablatis, et noue carte confecte de ecclesie priuilegiis et dignitatibus obseruandis, et sic remeauit ad propria./

¹ This implies that a party in England was prepared to protect Theobald from Stephen's anger. It included Hugh Bigod, earl of Norfolk, who had never hesitated in the past to transfer his allegiance to the stronger party, and was now manoeuvring towards the Angevin side. It was on the territory of Hugh Bigod at Gosford that Theobald landed, and he was

appealed the duke, and persuaded him that a bishop ¹¹⁴⁸ had no right to cause schism within the church by refusing fealty to the prince approved by the papacy.

XX

THE KING meanwhile held to his evil purpose, supported by the advice of certain bishops, and hoping for the partisanship of certain cardinals, who as he knew could be drawn through the mire of any disgrace at the mere gleam of a rusty purse. The bishops the archbishop had summoned meanwhile excused their disobedience by saying that they could not leave the kingdom without the king's permission. The papacy repeatedly postponed sending its promised aid. So on the advice of able men ¹ he returned to England, and after being received by earl Hugh Bigod with all possible affection and respect, resided for a time in the castle of Framlingham. There he summoned bishops to meet him,² investigated law-suits and carried out all the duties of his office, until peace had been re-established, compensation offered for the seizure of his goods, and new charters made safeguarding ecclesiastical privileges and offices; this done he returned to his own estates.

received by the earl in person. Gervase of Canterbury *Opera* (R.S.), i 136, probably uses the *Hist. Pont.* for this episode, but adds details.

² Gervase mentions the bishops of London, Chichester and Norwich (loc. cit.).

XXI

[50] DOMINVS papa Cremona residens conuocatis Italic episcopis concilium celebrauit,¹ iturus Romam. Nullus enim Italorum concilio Remensi interfuit, excepto Crassantino episcopo Mantuano. Solent de presessione contendere Rauennas Ligurie et Mediolanensis metropolitani Emilie.² Sed dominus papa eis loca uelut a paribus prouideri faciens, famosam de medio sustulit litem. Ibi proclamationes synodales propositae sunt. Mediolanensis enim Ianuensem archiepiscopum tamquam de iure suffraganeum suum uendicabat, Rauennas Placentinum: episcopus Maurianensis aduersus Mediolanensem questionem proposuit finium regundorum, rogans ut eum liceret egredi de cauernis montium, sicut decessoribus suis antiquitus licitum fuerat; et alii alias. Sed omnibus responsum est quod proclamantibus in synodo Remensi, in utroque concilio decreta eadem promulgata sunt. Ceterum ciuitas Mutinensis in hoc [51] ex culpa ciuium suorum condempnata est, ne de cetero proprium haberet episcopum. Diocesis eius in / quatuor uicinos episcopatus distributa est. Quia tamen sedis illius episcopus inuentus est innocens, ei relicta est dignitas episcopalis, ut ei liceret nullius urbis esse episcopum. Sed condempnatio hec non diu uiguit, quia Mutina beneficio sedis apostolice in antiquam a multo tempore restituta est dignitatem.

¹ Eugenius arrived at Cremona on 7 July 1148, and held a council of Italian bishops. Its main work was to promulgate the decrees of the Council of Rheims, and determine the claims of precedence put forward by various sees (Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, VI, 839). It is unlikely that Arnold of Brescia was condemned at this Council, as Hefele and

XXI

WHILST the lord pope was at Cremona on his way 7 July 1148 to Rome he summoned a council of the Italian bishops,¹ for of all the Italians only Crassantinus, bishop of Mantua, had been present at the council of Rheims. Normally there was a dispute about precedence between the Emilian archbishop of Ravenna and the Ligurian² archbishop of Milan: but the lord pope by providing seats of equal dignity for them removed a long-standing cause of dispute. On this occasion synodal claims were put forward; the archbishops of Milan and Ravenna claimed the archbishop of Genoa and bishop of Piacenza respectively as their suffragans; the bishop of Maurienne raised a plea against Milan about the jurisdiction which his predecessors had enjoyed, asking permission to leave his mountain valleys; others made other claims. But the same reply was given to all these as to the claimants at Rheims, and the same decrees were promulgated in both councils. In addition the city of Modena, condemned for the disobedience of its citizens, was deprived of the dignity of an episcopal see, and the diocese was divided amongst four neighbouring sees. Since the bishop was personally innocent he retained his episcopal rank, though he was without a see. This condemnation however was short-lived, for Modena was restored to its ancient and well-established dignity by the mercy of the Holy See.

Giesebrecht suggest. See Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, p. 106.

² *Ligurie* and *Emilie* appear to have been accidentally transposed in the manuscript.

Et nescio quo pacto plurime sententie Eugenii tam facile retractentur, nisi forte ex duabus acciderit causis. Hoc enim forte promeruit, quia decessorum sententias facile retractabat, nedum coepiscoporum, et quia in ferendis sentenciis spiritum proprium maxime sequebatur. Erat namque suspiciosissimus, ut uix alicui crederet nisi in hiis que rerum experientia uel auctoritas perspicua suadebat. Suspicionem uero ex duabus causis prouenisse arbitror, tum ex infirmitate nature, tum quia conscius erat egritudinis laterum suorum; sic enim assessores et consiliarios consueuerat appellare.¹ Hiis expletis dominus papa ad urbem profectus est,² a magnatibus honorifice susceptus, qui aurum et argentum olfecerant Galliarum.

XXII

REVERTENTIBVS nunciis domini Cantuariensis et /
[52] monachis sancti Augustini, iam Cantuariensis ecclesie pace composita, coacti sunt predicti excommunicati, Silvester prior et Willelmus sacrista, sese cum litteris apostolicis archiepiscopo presentare, confiteri culpam, promittere satisfactionem, ut mererentur absolui.³ Quo facto absoluti sunt apud Norfletam, uerberati quidem prius ad ostium ecclesie secundum canonum disciplinam.

¹ In the comparison of the state to a human body developed in the *Policraticus* the counsellors and courtiers are likened to the sides (*Polic.* v 2; ed. Webb i 283). If, as Liebeschütz suggests, the *Institutio Trajani* is really an invention of John's to cover contemporary ideas, he may have derived this part of the comparison from Eugenius (See 'John of Salisbury and Pseudo-Plutarch' in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vi 33-9).

² Eugenius paid a brief visit to Rome in the spring of 1149, on his way to Tusculum. He may have been in Rome on Palm Sunday (27 March); but a recently discovered letter dated at Tusculum on 30 March 1149,

Indeed I am at a loss to explain why many of¹¹⁴⁸⁻⁹ Eugenius' judgments were so easily revoked, unless for these two reasons: first that he had merited it by so readily revoking the sentences of his predecessors, not to mention his fellow-bishops, and secondly that he was too ready to rely on his personal opinion in imposing sentences. For he was of such a suspicious nature that he would rarely believe anyone, unless he were convinced by his own personal experience or the highest authority. I think there were two reasons for this suspicion: both weakness of character and consciousness of the failings of his 'flanks,' as he used to call his assessors and counsellors.¹ When this business had been^{March 1149} completed the pope went on to Rome² and received a splendid reception from the nobles, whose noses had sensed the gold and silver of Gaul.

XXII

AFTER the return of the archbishop of Canterbury's^{12 March 1149} messengers and the monks of St Augustine's, peace was restored in the church of Canterbury and the excommunicates, Silvester the prior and William the sacristan, were compelled to appear before the archbishop with papal letters, confess their guilt and promise amends before receiving absolution.³ When they had done this they were absolved at Northfleet, after undergoing canonical discipline at the door of the church. This is

shows that he cannot have been there at Easter, as R. L. Poole suggests (Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, pp. 108, 200).

³ cf. Eugenius III, ep. ccclii (*P.L.* clxxx 1392)

Iniuncta est eis penitentia: monasterium, quod in ecclesie luctu cecinerat, sub interdicto conclusum, ut in maiori ecclesia sua quam prophanauerant non liceret diuina celebrare. Et quia centum nonaginta diebus¹ extiterant sententie transgressores, totidem diebus suspensi sunt a diuinis in basilica celebrandis. Hanc enim eis ex mansuetudine fecit archiepiscopus gratiam, ut alibi missas licenter audirent. Construxerunt ergo altare in capitulo, ubi tanto tempore cantantibus aliis ipsi in luctu et rubore diuina celebrando se consolari potuerunt. Sic risus eorum transiit in merorem et obedientium tristitia in gaudium commutata est.²

XXIII

ANNO uero gratie millesimo centesimo quadragésimo nono uenerat Christianissimus rex Francorum, fractis in oriente uiribus, Antiochiam,³ ibique a principe [53] Reimundo, fratre Guillermi bone memorie / comitis Pictauensis, honorifice receptus est. Erat enim regine patruus, et regi fidem, amorem, et reuerentiam debebat ex multis causis. Sed dum ibi morarentur ad naufragi exercitus reliquias consolandas, fouendas et reparandas, familiaritas principis ad reginam et assidua fere sine intermissione colloquia regi suspicionem dederunt. Que quidem ex eo magis inualuit quod regina ibi uoluit

¹ Poole points out (*Hist. Pont.*, Preface, p. xlix) that, as the interval from 12 September 1148 when the interdict was imposed to 11 March 1149, the last day of the monks' defiance, is a hundred and eighty days, this is evidently a scribal error. The last thirty-eight days of the penance were remitted.

² St James iv.9

³ For John's treatment of the Crusade see *supra*, Introduction, pp. xliii–xlv. There is a detailed account of the course of the Crusade in S. Runciman,

the penance imposed on them: the monastery, which had sung during the church's mourning, was placed under interdict, so that they could not perform the divine office in the monastic church that they had profaned. Since they had ignored the sentence for a hundred and ninety days¹ they were to be suspended from saying mass in the basilica for the same length of time; though the archbishop graciously conceded that they might hear masses elsewhere. So they raised an altar in the chapter house, and there for the prescribed period, whilst other churches sang, they were able to find consolation by celebrating the divine office in mourning and shame. So their laughter was changed to grief and the mourning of those who had obeyed to joy.²

XXIII

IN THE year of grace 1149 the most Christian king of the Franks reached Antioch,³ after the destruction of his armies in the east, and was nobly entertained there by Prince Raymond, brother of the late William, count of Poitiers. He was as it happened the queen's uncle, and owed the king loyalty, affection and respect for many reasons. But whilst they remained there to console, heal and revive the survivors from the wreck of the army, the attentions paid by the prince to the queen, and his constant, indeed almost continuous, conversation with her, aroused the king's suspicions. These were greatly

A History of the Crusades, vol. ii. The fullest and most critical study of the sources is still Kugler, *Studien zur Geschichte des Zweiten Kreuzzuges* (Stuttgart, 1866). Kugler stresses the importance of John's testimony for the events at Antioch. John's date is a year late.

remanere, rege preparante recessum; eamque princeps studuit retinere, si pace regis fieri potuisset. Cum uero rex eam inde properaret auellere, ipsa parentele mentionem faciens dixit illicitum esse ut diutius commanerent, quia inter eos cognatio in quarto gradu uertebatur et quinto. Hoc autem uerbum antequam recederent auditum fuit in Francia,¹ Bartholomeo bone memorie Laudunensi episcopo gradus cognationis computante; sed fida fuerit an infidelis supputatio incertum est. Vnde rex plurimum turbatus est; et licet reginam affectu fere immoderato diligeret, tamen acquieuisset eam dimittere si consilarii sui et Francorum proceres permisissent. Erat inter secretarios regis miles eunuchus quem illa semper oderat et consueuerat deridere, fidelis et familiarissimus regi, sicut et patri eius antea fuerat, Terricus scilicet Gualerancius. Is ei persuasit audentius ne ipsam Antiochie morari diutius pateretur, tum quia

cognato poterat nomine culpa tegi,²

tum quia regno Francorum perpetuum opprobrium imminebat si inter cetera infortunia rex diceretur spoliatus coniuge uel relictus. Hoc ille, uel quia [54] reginam oderat uel quia sic sentiebat, diuulgata / fortasse motus opinione. Abstracta ergo coacta est cum rege Ierosolimam proficisci, et in cor utriusque uicissim altius ascenderat et, licet dissimularent ut poterant, manebat iniuria.

¹ There had been open mention of the consanguinity of the king and queen; in 1143 Bernard went so far as to declare that they were related within the third degree. See letter 224 (*P.L.* clxxxii 394).

² Ovid, *Heroides*, iv 138

strengthened when the queen wished to remain behind, although the king was preparing to leave, and the prince made every effort to keep her, if the king would give his consent. And when the king made haste to tear her away, she mentioned their kinship, saying it was not lawful for them to remain together as man and wife, since they were related in the fourth and fifth degrees. Even before their departure a rumour to that effect had been heard in France,¹ where the late Bartholomew bishop of Laon had calculated the degrees of kinship; but it was not certain whether the reckoning was true or false. At this the king was deeply moved; and although he loved the queen almost beyond reason he consented to divorce her if his counsellors and the French nobility would allow it. There was one knight amongst the king's secretaries, called Terricus Gualerancius, a eunuch whom the queen had always hated and mocked, but who was faithful and had the king's ear like his father's before him. He boldly persuaded the king not to suffer her to dally longer at Antioch, both because

'guilt under kinship's guise could lie concealed,'²

and because it would be a lasting shame to the kingdom of the Franks if in addition to all the other disasters it was reported that the king had been deserted by his wife, or robbed of her. So he argued, either because he hated the queen or because he really believed it, moved perchance by widespread rumour. In consequence, she was torn away and forced to leave for Jerusalem with the king; and, their mutual anger growing greater, the wound remained, hide it as best they might.

PRETER incomoda que dolo Constantinopolitani imperatoris et Turcorum uiribus acciderant Christianis,¹ exercitum eorum debilitabat inuidia principum et contentio sacerdotum. Teutones enim Francorum in rebus trans Hellespontum gerendis usque adeo dedignati² sunt habere consortium, ut rogati regem qui eos prosequeretur aliquo dierum itinere interiecto noluerint expectare, respondentes nichil sibi cum Francis, nec se quempiam expectaturos, nisi capta Edissa quam uenerant liberare. Procedentes ergo in impetu spiritus sui,² primo in desertis locis inedia macerati sunt ut plurimi perirent, deinde confecti a paganis transmissa legatione optinuerunt a rege Christianissimo ut eos expectaret. Rex enim regem Conradum diligebat et uenerabatur, et ipsius gaudebat habere consortium. Sed cum Francorum exercitus antea militari disciplina et iusticie rigore et peccatorum correctione caruerit, exinde nec spem [55] habuit discipline. Arnulfus Lexouiensis³ et Godefridus Lingonensis episcopi, gloriantes se fungi in exercitu legatione sedis apostolice,⁴ cum tamen hanc non acceperint potestatem, adeo discordes erant ut uix aut nunquam in aliquo consilio conuenirent. Quicquid predicabat unus alter depredicabat, ambo facundi,

¹ dedignitati Poole

² In explaining the causes of weakness in the army, John here goes back to the early history of the Crusade, before the arrival of the shattered French army at Antioch.

³ cf. Ezechiel iii.14

⁴ For John's attitude to Arnulf see *supra*, Introduction, pp. xxxv-xxxvii. The Chronicle of Odo of Deuil (ed. Berry, pp. 70-1, 75-9) gives examples of the dissensions of Arnulf and Godfrey. Arnulf was inclined to favour the Greeks, whereas Godfrey was violently opposed to them.

⁵ The chronicles of the monastery of Sainte Barbe and William of Tyre

BESIDES the misfortunes that befell the Christians through the deceit of the Byzantine Emperor and the forces of the Turks,¹ their army was weakened by the jealousy of princes and the wrangling of priests. The Germans declined to have anything to do with the Franks in shipping their baggage across the Hellespont, and went to the length of refusing a request to wait for the king, who was following a few days' journey behind, saying that the Franks were nothing to them, and they would wait for no-one whatsoever until Edessa, which they came to liberate, had been captured. Pressing on in the full flush of pride² they were so tortured by starvation in the desert that many died; later they were so harried by the infidels that at last they sent ambassadors to the most Christian king, who consented to wait for them. For the king loved and honoured king Conrad, and rejoiced in his company. But from that moment the French army, which even before had had neither military discipline nor a strong hand to dispense justice and correct faults, lost all hope of ordered strategy. Arnulf bishop of Lisieux³ and Godfrey bishop of Langres, boasting that they held the office of papal legate in the army though they had never received any such charge,⁴ were in such constant disagreement that rarely, if ever, could they agree on any plan. Whatever one recommended the other decried; both were smooth-tongued, both extravagant, both (it is said) mischief-makers,

Oct.-Nov.
1147

1147-8

both give the bishops some legatine authority, at least at first (*The Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux*, ed. Barlow, p. xxvi n. 3). The bishops, however, were later superseded by or subordinated to the two cardinals, Theodwin and Guy.

ambo sumptuosi, ambo (ut creditur) discordie incentores et expertes timoris Domini; sed consiliosior et magnanimior Lingonensis. Exercitui et publice rei Christianorum rarus aut nullus fuit hiis perniciosior. Habebat uterque populum qui sibi crederet, et ab egrotantibus et morientibus quos uisitabant et absoluebant uice domini pape, quam se habere iactitabant, multam accipiebant pecuniam, ut plus lucrati esse credantur in expeditione quam ibi de proprio expendisse. Legati uero erant a domino papa missi, Taduinus Portuensis episcopus, natione Teutonicus, et Guido presbiter cardinalis sancti Grisogoni, genere Florentinus, uiri quidem boni sed tanto officio minus idonei. Tadewinus enim moribus et lingua dissonans Francis barbarus habebatur. Guido uero linguam Francorum tenuiter nouerat, et erat pro facultate liberalis, natura benignus, dulcis affatu, et minimum habens de fastu Romano, sed litterarum amator et scrutator librorum; tumultus oderat, collationibus delectabatur, et questiunculas dyalecticas et philosophicas sepius et libentius agitabat. Horum [56] ergo defectus magnam / prefatis episcopis contulit auctoritatem, fuissentque reuera perutiles si coararent in Domino. Lingonensis precipuam uendicabat auctoritatem, pretendens habitum religionis, ut qui prior Clareuallensis extiterat et cuius consilio ille sanctus abbas predicator huius expeditionis commiserat regem. Nec erat inter eos qui magnanimitate prior haberetur. Lexouiensis autem nitebatur de eloquencia et industria

devoid of the fear of God; but of the two the bishop of ¹¹⁴⁷⁻⁸ Langres was more prudent and more high-minded. Few if any have brought more harm on the Christian army and whole community. Each had his own following who believed in him, and both received large sums of money from the sick and dying whom they attended and absolved in the name of the pope, claiming to be his representatives. Indeed they are believed to have accumulated more wealth during the expedition than they paid out of their own pockets.

The truth is that the legates sent by the pope were Theodwin bishop of Porto, a German, and Guy, cardinal priest of St Chrysogonus, of Florentine stock; decent men, but far from equal to such high office. For Theodwin, differing from the Franks in language and customs, was regarded as a barbarian. As for Guy, he had scant knowledge of French; he was liberal in outlook, with a kindly nature and a sweet mien, wholly devoid of Roman arrogance; a lover of letters and insatiable bookworm, who hated crowds, delighted in learned disputations, and welcomed any chance of threshing out dialectical and philosophical quibbles. The failings of these men put great authority into the hands of the two bishops, who—to tell the truth—would have been of great service if they had worked together in the Lord. The bishop of Langres claimed special authority on the grounds of his order, professing that he had been prior of Clairvaux and that the saintly abbot himself, the preacher of this expedition, had committed the king to his counsel. No-one among them was held to be more high-minded. On the other hand the bishop of Lisieux relied on his eloquence and skill in affairs, on his reputation for broadmindedness and courtly jests,

negociorum, de titulo liberalitatis et nugis curialibus, quas sub facetiarum colore uenustabat. Et quia Lingonensis erat impetuosior, ipsum deridebat, dicens eum habere naturam Ciprici uini, quod in ore quidem dulce est, sed occidit si non aqua fuerit temperatum. Comes Flandriensium Theodericus festinus ad reditum, prout se Baldwino filio suo promisisse dicebat, et suadens hoc ipsum aliis, oderat Lingonensem, eo quod ille semper grandia suadebat, et ut morarentur in terra donec reparatis uiribus fecissent aliquid Deo dignum et rege et regno Francorum et tantorum aduentu procerum: Lexouiensis uota comitis promouebat. Rex Conradus prefatum comitem habebat familiarem, tum quia lingua Teutonum utebatur, tum quia militibus habundabat pre ceteris Francis et regi milicia destituito sepe solatium faciebat. Ibi ergo adeo regis illius meruit gratiam, ut ei [57] Cameracensis pagi tributum / concederet,¹ quod uulgato sermone gablum dicunt. Cessit ergo Conradus in sententiam comitis Flandriensis, sed rex Francorum pronior erat ad moram. Et quia sepe fatus comes se Baldewini filii sui dicebat affectione trahi, et ita est ecclesie orientalis impedita utilitas, nutu Dei post breue tempus in Flandria idem obiit Baldewinus, unde ad Philippum,² natu posteriorem, patris est deuoluta successio.

XXV

REGES associatis sibi uiribus regni Ierosolimitani profecti sunt expugnare Damascum, gentiles obuios

¹ Henry V had previously granted a right of gabelle in Cambrésis to Charles the Good, and Conrad probably did little more than confirm the same right to Thierry. See *Gestes des Evêques de Cambrai*, ed. Ch. de Smedt, p. 225 n. 2.

² John of Salisbury met Philip, count of Flanders, at L'Écluse near Douai on his first arrival in Flanders in 1164 (Robertson, *Materials*, v 96).

which he decked up in the guise of wit. Since the bishop 1147-8 of Langres was more impulsive, he mocked him saying that he was just like the wine of Cyprus, which is sweet to taste but lethal unless diluted with water.

Thierry count of Flanders, in haste to return as he alleged he had promised his son Baldwin, and urging the same course on the others, hated the bishop of Langres because he was always demanding great deeds, and urging that they should remain in that country until they had rallied their forces to achieve something worthy of God and the king and the Frankish kingdom, and the coming of so many men of high rank: the bishop of Lisieux pressed the count's wishes. King Conrad treated the count as a close friend, for he spoke the German tongue, and, having more soldiers than the other Franks, often gave support to the king who was destitute of troops. Consequently he won such favour that the king granted him tribute from the district of Cambrai, called 'gabelle' in common speech.¹ So Conrad came round to the opinion of the count of Flanders, but the king of the Franks was more inclined to remain. And because the count alleged that he was moved by love of his son Baldwin, and the welfare of the eastern church suffered thereby, the same Baldwin died in Flanders shortly afterwards by God's will, and the father's succession devolved on Philip, his younger son.²

XXV

THE KINGS after joining forces with the army of the July 1148 kingdom of Jerusalem set out to storm Damascus; they

conferunt, et uersos in fugam compulerunt ortos intrare. Acriter ibi pugnatum est, nec fuit qui ea die credatur manu fortius egisse rege Conrado. Sed Christiani magna uirtute irrumpentes subactis hostibus optinuerunt ortos. Impetum eorum nec famosa flumina Damasci, Abbana et Farfar,¹ nec ortorum munimina nec hostium uigor quin procederent usque ad muros potuit cohibere. Ante urbem castra metati sunt, eamque essent (ut proculdubio creditur) habituri, si perstitissent diebus quindecim. Municipis enim iam conficiebat desperatio [58] et admira/tio fortitudinis eorum qui flumina transuaduerant, quos nec murorum nec armatorum presidia poterant impedire. Inclusi sine timore non audiebant exteriorum nomina potestatum. Et profecto nulla unquam etate tante uirtutis titulus deleretur, si tanta fuisset constantia perseuerandi, quanta erat alacritas dimicandi. Sed eadem nocte regibus persuasum est quod ciuitas ab ea parte non poterat expugnari, quia inde erant turres et munimina tutiora, et quod a parte opposita, utpote munitionibus carente, facile capi posset. Die ergo sequenti auulsere tentoria, ut credebatur in partem alteram transituri, sed in ueritate reditus parabatur. Celebre est interuenisse prodicionem² et circumuentum esse Christianissimum regem; quod alii Templariis diu imposuerunt, alii uero hiis quos amor patrie reuocabat; sed rex fratres Templi semper studuit excusare. Cum uero egressi in planiciem deliberarent

¹ cf. 2 Kings v.12

² The most contradictory rumours were current about the 'betrayal' that led to the raising of the siege of Damascus. See Kugler, *op. cit.*, p. 196 n. 49. Grousset (*Histoire des Croisades*, ii 265 sqq.) considers that the attack on Damascus had been ill-advised; and that the Syrian barons, realising that it was forcing Muin-al-Din Unur into the arms of Nur-ed-Din, deliberately intrigued to have the siege raised. He does not, however, fully consider the dissensions in the western armies.

defeated and put to flight the opposing forces of un- July 1148
believers, driving them into the suburbs. Here a bitter struggle took place, and no-one in that day it seems dealt more doughty blows than king Conrad. At last the Christians, attacking with great valour, overthrew the enemy and gained the suburbs. Neither Abana and Pharpar,¹ renowned rivers of Damascus, nor the fortifications of the suburbs nor the strength of the enemy could check their advance until they had pressed on to encircle the walls. They pitched camp before the city, and would have occupied it (as the best authorities believe) if they had persevered for fifteen days. For the townsmen were overwhelmed with despair and wonder at the courage of the men who had crossed the rivers, who were checked neither by fortifications nor by armed resistance. The besieged were terrified at the mere mention of their name. And surely the memory of such valour would have endured for ever, had they been as determined to press on as they were eager to join battle. But that very night the kings were persuaded that the city could not be stormed from that side because the towers and fortifications were stronger there, and that it could more easily be captured from the other side, which was less heavily defended. So the next day they struck camp, apparently to move to the other side, but in reality preparing for retreat. It is notorious that meanwhile the most Christian king had been betrayed and deceived;² some impute the treachery to the Templars, others to those who were moved by a desire to return home: certainly the king himself always endeavoured to exonerate the brothers of the Temple. When they had streamed out into the plain and were debating what

quid fieri oporteret, qui reuertebantur animo consuluerunt, ut quia imparati uenerant ad moram obsidionis, redirent Ierusalem, alio tempore preparatis necessariis commodius reuersuri. Rex Conradus approbavit [59] con/silium; dissuasit episcopus Lingonensis. Comes uero Flandriensis contendere cepit cum episcopo habente fautores aliquos, et tandem conuersus ad Conradum Teutonice dixit ei quod satis indignum erat sustineri ut temeritate illius presbiteri reprobaretur consilium quod tanti principes dederant et ipse probauerat. Missus est ergo idem episcopus cum quadraginta militibus in speculam, ut exploraret accessum ab altera parte urbis, et sicubi prope flumen locus aptus castris inueniretur. Interim fautores consilii prioris regem Francorum traxerunt in partem, persuadentes ei ut tum pro publica utilitate, tum pro reuerencia regis Conradi acquiesceret ad presens, quia ei plus oportebat deferri quam si pares haberet uires et eiusdem fauoris esset in terra cuius et ipse. Sic itaque flexus est, et omnes ad sua redierunt.

XXVI

REX CONRADVS militia destitutus et minus fauoris habens in terra noluit remanere, nec ausus est reuerti nauigio, quia inter ipsum et Rogerum regem Siculum inimicitie uertebantur.¹ Vsus ergo consilio Rodberti principis Capuani, quem prefatus Siculus exhere-

¹ Conrad's movements may have been determined as much by the hope of securing an alliance with the Emperor Manuel as by fear of the naval power of his enemy Roger. Further, he had promised in 1148 to

ought to be done, the party who were for turning back advised that, since they had come unprepared for a long ^{July-Sept.} ¹¹⁴⁸ siege it would be wiser to return to Jerusalem and come back better prepared some other time. King Conrad approved their counsel; the bishop of Langres resisted it. The count of Flanders for his part entered into dispute with the bishop who had some supporters; at length, turning to Conrad, he remarked to him in German that it was disgraceful to hear the advice given by so many princes and supported by Conrad himself opposed by this rash priest. As a result the bishop was sent off on patrol with forty knights, to reconnoitre the approaches from the other side of the city, and see whether any place suitable for a camp could be found near the river. Meanwhile the adherents of the first plan won the king of the Franks to their side by persuading him that it would be in the interests of all as well as more considerate to king Conrad if he gave way for the time being; and that he ought to show even more respect for Conrad's opinion than if they had had equal forces and been equally popular in the country. In the end he gave way, and all returned home.

XXVI

KING CONRAD, who had lost his army and was unpopular in the country, could not remain there, and dared not return by sea on account of the enmity between him and king Roger of Sicily.¹ So relying on the counsel of Robert prince of Capua, whom the Sicilian

pass through Constantinople on his return. See F. Chalandon, *Jean II Comnène et Manuel I Comnène* (Paris, 1912), p. 326; and Chalandon, *Histoire de la Domination Normande en Sicile*, ii 141.

dauerat,¹ profectus est Constantinopolim et auxilio /
 [60] imperatoris tutus sine dispendio rediit in terram suam.
 Similiter et principes regni Francorum, sed nauigio
 redierunt. Milicia sic defluxit urgente inopia ut rex
 Francorum fere solus remanserit.

XXVII

DOMINVS papa urbem egressus est propter impro-
 bitatem Romanorum, qui ei et suis multas iniurias
 irrogabant.² Nam ille prefecture maximus et anti-
 quissimus honor, ab ecclesia habens auctoritatem iuris
 dicendi usque ad centesimum lapidem et utens gladii
 potestate ad inane nomen redactus erat. Senatores
 enim, quos populus propria creabat auctoritate, omnem
 in tota ciuitate reddendi iuris et exequendi occupauerant
 potestatem. Regalia beati Petri sue reipublice uendica-
 bant, ut inde sustinerentur honera ciuitatis. Patricium
 sibi creauerant Iordanum, uirum maximum in gente
 Leoniana. Chenchii Frangentis panem,³ cuius familia
 necessitatibus ecclesie semper astitit, palatium diruerant⁴
 in iniuriam domini pape. Regalia tamen ea conditione

¹ Robert, prince of Capua, had revolted against Roger of Sicily in 1135, and was expelled from his duchy. He was a constant ally of the enemies of Roger. For a time he found refuge in Germany, and in 1146 was employed by Conrad on a mission to Constantinople (Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, p. 125).

² In explaining the pope's residence at Tusculum, John recapitulates the early history of the Roman rebellion, which began in 1143 and led to the establishment of a commune under senatorial government. In 1144 the office of prefect was abolished, and Jordan, son of Peter Leonis, appointed 'patricius'. By 1145 Eugenius had been forced to recognise the legal existence of the senate. The independence of the commune increased during his residence in France. See L. Halphen, *Études sur l'administration de Rome au moyen âge* (Paris, 1907), pp. 52 sqq.; G. W. Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia*, pp. 103 sqq.

³ Although the Frangipani had given assistance to Urban II and were

king had disinherited,¹ he set out for Constantinople, and 8 Sept. 1148
 with the emperor's aid reached his own country in
 safety, without further loss. Likewise the Frankish
 princes returned, though they went by sea. So the
 army melted away, impelled by want, until the king of 1148-9
 the Franks remained almost alone.

XXVII

THE LORD pope had been forced to leave Rome by April 1149
 the turbulence of the citizens, who had inflicted many
 outrages on him and his followers.² For that greatest
 and most ancient of offices, the prefecture, authorised 1143-9
 by the church to give justice within a radius of a hundred
 miles, and enjoying executive power, had been reduced
 to an empty name. Instead the senators, created by the
 populace on its own authority, usurped all powers of
 jurisdiction and administration throughout the city.
 Appropriating the regalian rights of the Holy See for their
 republic, they used them to support the public burdens.
 As patricius they chose Jordan, a prominent member of
 the Leonis family; and undermined the pope's position
 by destroying the palatine fortress of Cencius Frangipani,⁴
 whose family had always come to the assistance of the
 church.³ They would undertake to restore the regalia

later among the friends of Innocent II, John passes over the fact that Cencius Frangipani had ill-treated and imprisoned Gelasius II (F. Ehrle, 'Die Frangipani', in *Mélanges offerts à M. Émile Chatelain*, pp. 454-6).

⁴ In spite of this, the material power of the Frangipani does not seem to have suffered any diminution at this time. See E. Tea, 'La Rocca dei Frangipani', in *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* xlv (1921), 246-7.

se reddituros promittebant, ut ecclesia salarium senatoribus prouideret et portaret onera ciuitatis, si ex ea [61] uellet emolumenta percipere. Tusculanum se receperat / dominus papa, ubi conductis militibus decreuit infestare Romanos.¹ Milicie prefecit cardinalem Guidonem cognomento Puellam. De terra regis Siculi auxiliares recepit milites, sed infeliciter pugnabatur. Ecclesia namque fecit sumptus maximos et profectum minimum.

XXVIII

ANNO gratie millesimo centesimo quinquagesimo rediit rex Francorum. Sed redeunti galee imperatoris Constantinopolitani tetenderunt insidias, a quibus et regina capta est et alii qui in eius uehebantur nauis.² Rex eciam conuentus ut rediret ad fratrem suum et amicum Constantinopolitanum, et iam uis^a parabatur. Sed ab aduerso subuenientes galee regis Siculi reginam liberauerunt et expedierunt regem, et eos leti cum gloria et triumpho in Siciliam deduxerunt.³ Nam ut ita fieret procurauerat Siculus rex, timens insidias Danaorum⁴ et desiderans oportunitatem exhibendi deuotionem quam habebat regi et regno Francorum. Occurrit ergo ei et

^a ius Poole

¹ In 1149 Eugenius unsuccessfully attacked the Roman commune, using Sicilian troops with the papal militia. He merely earned the condemnation of Gerhoh of Reichersberg and St Bernard for resorting to weapons of war. An uneasy truce began in November 1149, when Eugenius returned to the Lateran for a few months. Cf. Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, pp. 111, 125.

² Various accounts are given of this incident. The French force fell in with the Sicilians at the time of a naval battle with the Byzantines off Corfu. Some sources state that the French, sailing in Sicilian ships were accidentally captured and that after a time Manuel restored the captives to King Louis. See F. Chalandon, *Manuel Comnène*, pp. 330-1, Kugler, *op. cit.*, p. 209 n. 14.

only on condition that the church should pay the senators' salaries and, if it wished to receive any emoluments, should bear the burdens of the city. The pope meanwhile had betaken himself to Tusculum, where, mustering his forces, he ordered an attack on Rome,¹ and gave cardinal Guy, nicknamed the Maiden, command¹¹⁴⁹ over the army. Auxiliaries were received from the lands of the king of Sicily, but the fighting was unsuccessful. The church merely incurred the heaviest expenses to little or no purpose.

XXVIII

IN THE year of grace eleven hundred and fifty the king of the Franks returned home. But the galleys of the Emperor of Constantinople lay in wait for him on his return, capturing the queen and all who were journeying in her ship.² The king was appealed to to return to his Byzantine brother and friend, and force was being brought to bear on him when the galleys of the king of Sicily came to the rescue. Freeing the queen and releasing the king, they escorted them back to Sicily^{29 July 1149} rejoicing, with honour and triumph.³ This was done by order of the king of Sicily, who feared the wiles of the Greeks⁴ and desired an opportunity of showing his devotion to the king and queen of the Franks. Now therefore he hastened to meet him with an ample retinue,

³ Louis arrived in Calabria on 29 July 1149, under Sicilian protection.

⁴ cf. Virgil, *Aeneid*, ii. 36. Odo of Deuil (ed. Berry, p. 26) remarks that this proverb was widely known.

adductis equitaturis ad sufficienciam perduxit eum Panormiam¹ cum summo honore, et tam illum quam omnes suos multis donariis studuit honorare; et cum eo proficiscens fecit ei per totam terram suam usque ad Ciparanum pro uoto suorum necessaria ministrari. Hic est enim terminus et limes principatus Capuani et Campanie ad domini pape mensam pertinentis.

XXIX

CARDINALES et ministri ecclesie ibi occurrunt regi, et omnia prouidentes ad nutum perduxerunt Tusculanum [62] ad dominum papam. A quo tanta humanitate / et deuotione receptus est ut non mortalem quempiam sed angelum Domini recipere uideretur. Discordiam regis et regine, quae Antiochie concepta fuerat, auditis querelis utriusque seorsum omnino sedauit, prohibens ne de cetero consanguinitatis inter eos mentio haberetur; et confirmans matrimonium tam uerbo quam scripto, sub anathematis interminatione inhibuit ne quis illud impetens^a audiretur et ne quacunq[ue] solueretur occasione. Regi uisa est placuisse plurimum constitutio, eo quod reginam uehementer amabat et fere puerili modo. Fecit eos in eodem lecto decumbere, quem de suo preciosissimis uestibus fecerat exornari. Et singulis diebus illius morule² familiari colloquio redintegrare studuit caritatem. Honorauit eos muneribus et tandem in eorum dimissione, quamuis esset homo seuerior, non

^a impugnans Poole

¹ Probably Potenza, for Louis did not go to Palermo. See Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, p. xxix.

and escorted him most honourably to Palermo,¹ heaping gifts both on him and on all his followers; thereafter he travelled with him right across his territory to Ceprano, supplying all his needs on the way. This is the last point on the frontier between the principality of Capua and Campania, which is papal territory. Aug.-Sept.
1149

XXIX

AT CEPRANO the cardinals and officials of the church met the king and, providing him with all that he desired, escorted him to Tusculum to the lord pope, who received him with such tenderness and reverence that one would have said he was welcoming an angel of the Lord rather than a mortal man. He reconciled the king and queen, after hearing severally the accounts each gave of the estrangement begun at Antioch, and forbade any future mention of their consanguinity: confirming their marriage, both orally and in writing, he commanded under pain of anathema that no word should be spoken against it and that it should not be dissolved under any pretext whatever. This ruling plainly delighted the king, for he loved the queen passionately, in an almost childish way. The pope made them sleep in the same bed, which he had had decked with priceless hangings of his own; and daily during their brief visit² he strove by friendly converse to restore love between them. He heaped gifts upon them; and when the moment for departure came, though he was a stern man, he could 9 Oct. 1149

² The visit lasted only two days, 9 and 10 October 1149.

potuit lacrimas continere; et dimittens benedixit eis et regno Francorum quod ab ipso meruerant super omnia regna mundi.

XXX

NON LONGE progressus est a Tusculano cum, ecce, senatores et nobiles Romani occurrerunt, se et urbem exponentes obsequio eius; et quo propius accedebat, eo crebrior erat salutantium turba. Dum loca sancta circuiret in urbe, egredientes religiose mulieres et pueri applaudebant dicentes, *Benedictus qui uenit in nomine Domini*.¹ Comitati sunt eum Gregorius sancti Angeli et Iacinctus scole Grece diaconi cardinales et ministri domini pape a Ciparanno usque ad Aquam Pendentem, [63] ut illi et / comitatu suo necessaria ministrarent. Exinde auctore Domino prospere migrauit in Franciam.

XXXI

THADVINVS episcopus Portuensis obiit in oriente.² Guido collega eius, cuius supra memini, Palestine et utriusque Phenicie legationem administrabat.

Inter dominum papam et Romanos de pace tractabatur et ad alterutros hinc inde crebra legatio discurrebat. Sed pacem tum multa prepediebant, tum

¹ According to cardinal Boso, Eugenius III received a similar reception from the Romans when he returned to the city a month later: 'Universus etiam Romanus clerus psallebant in unum, dicentes: *Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini*'. (*Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, ii 387).

not hold back his tears, but sent them on their way ^{10 Oct. 1149} blessing them and the kingdom of the Franks, which was higher in his esteem than all the kingdoms of the world.

XXX

THE KING had scarcely set out from Tusculum when behold, the Roman senators and nobles came hastening to meet him and place themselves and the city in subjection to him; and the nearer he drew the denser became the throng of cheering people. As he went from one holy place to another in the city the nuns and boys poured out acclaiming him and saying: 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the lord.'¹ The cardinal deacons Gregory of St Angelo and Hyacinth of St Mary in Cosmedin, and officials of the pope accompanied him from Ceprano to Aquapendente to minister to his needs and those of his retinue. Thence by God's aid he journeyed to France in safety.

XXXI

THEODWIN, bishop of Porto, died in the east.² Guy, ¹¹⁴⁹ his colleague, whom I have mentioned above, carried on the duties of legate in Palestine and both parts of Phœnicia.

Negotiations for peace were proceeding between the pope and the Romans, and numerous legations sped to and fro between the two parties. But there were many obstacles in the way of peace, the greatest of all being

² This statement is untrue. Theodwin did not die, but returned to Europe. Wibald, writing in the spring of 1150, mentions letters received from him in Sicily on his way home (*Wibaldi Epist.* no. 252 in *Monumenta Corbeiensia*, ed. P. Jaffé, Berlin, 1864, p. 377).

maxime quod eicere nolebant Ernardum Brixensem,¹ qui honori urbis et reipublice Romanorum se dicebatur obligasse prestito iuramento, et ei populus Romanus uicissim auxilium et consilium contra omnes homines et nominatim contra dominum papam repromisit; eum namque excommunicauerat ecclesia Romana et tamquam hereticum preceperat euitari. Erat hic dignitate sacerdos, habitu canonicus regularis, et qui carnem suam indumentorum asperitate et inedia macerabat. Ingenio perspicax, peruicax in studio scripturarum, facundus eloquio, et contemptus mundi uehemens predicator. Sed, ut aiunt, sediciosus erat et auctor scismatis, et qui ciues, ubicumque locorum degebat, cum clero pacem habere non sineret. Fuerat abbas apud Brixiam,² et dum episcopus Roman profectus aliquantulum moraretur, sic interim ciuium flexit animos ut episcopum uix uoluerint admittere redeuntem. Ob quam causam a [64] domino Innocentio papa depositus / et extrusus ab Italia, descendit in Franciam et adhesit Petro Abaielardo, partesque eius cum domino Iacincto, qui nunc cardinalis est, aduersus abbatem Clareuallensem studiosius fuit. Postquam uero magister Petrus Cluniacum profectus est, Parisius manens in monte sancte Genouefe diuinas litteras scolaribus exponebat apud sanctum Hylarium, ubi iam dictus Petrus fuerat hospitatus. Sed auditores non habuit nisi pauperes et qui ostiatim elemosinas

¹ For the relations of Arnold of Brescia with Eugenius III see Giesebrecht, *Arnold von Brescia*; Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, Preface vi; Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, pp. 27-33.

² John here recapitulates the life of Arnold; his first expulsion from Rome had been in 1139 and he had then become a follower of Abailard in Paris, so that John had very probably heard of Arnold's activities during

the refusal of the Romans to expel Arnold of Brescia,¹ 1149 who was said to have bound himself by oath to uphold the honour of the city and Roman republic. The Romans in their turn promised him aid and counsel against all men, and explicitly against the lord pope; for the Roman church had excommunicated him and ordered him to be shunned as a heretic. This man was a priest by office, a canon regular by profession, and one who had mortified his flesh with fasting and coarse raiment: of keen intelligence, persevering in his study of the scriptures, eloquent in speech, and a vehement preacher against the vanities of the world. Nevertheless he was reputed to be factious and a leader of schism, who wherever he lived prevented the citizens from being at peace with the clergy. He had been abbot of Brescia,² and when the bishop was absent on a short visit to Rome had so swayed the minds of the citizens that they would scarcely open their gates to the bishop on his return. For this he was deposed by Pope Innocent and expelled 1139 from Italy; crossing the Alps into France he became a disciple of Peter Abailard, and together with Master Hyacinth, who is now a cardinal, zealously fostered his cause against the abbot of Clairvaux. After Master Peter had set out for Cluny, he remained at Paris on the Mont Sainte Geneviève, expounding the scriptures to scholars at the church of St Hilary where Peter had been lodged. But he had no listeners except poor students who publicly begged their bread from door to

his student years. John says nothing of his movements in Germany after his expulsion at the instigation of St Bernard, but takes up the narrative again when he made his peace with Eugenius III.

publice mendicabant, unde cum magistro uitam transigerent. Dicebat que Christianorum legi concordant plurimum et a uita quam plurimum dissonant. Episcopis non parcebat ob auariciam et turpem questum, et plerumque propter maculam uite, et quia ecclesiam Dei in sanguinibus edificare nituntur. Abbatem,¹ cuius nomen ex multis meritis clarissimum habebatur, arguebat tamquam uane glorie sectatorem, et qui omnibus inuideret qui alicuius nominis erant in litteris aut religione, si non essent de scola sua. Optinuit ergo abbas, ut eum Christianissimus rex eiceret de regno Francorum. Exinde post mortem domini Innocentii reuersus est in Italiam et promissa satisfactione et obediencia Romane ecclesie a domino Eugenio receptus est apud Viterbum.² Iniuncta est ei penitentia, quam [65] se in / ieiuniis, uigiliis, et orationibus circa loca sancta que in urbe sunt professus est esse facturum; et quidem de seruanda obediencia sollempne prestitit^a iuramentum. Dum sub optentu penitentis Rome degeret, urbem sibi conciliauit, et domino papa agente in Galliis liberius predicans hominum sectam fecit que adhuc dicitur heresis Lumbardorum. Habuit enim continentie sectatores, qui propter honestatis speciem et austeritatem uite placebant populo, sed maximum apud religiosas feminas inueniebant subsidium. Ipse frequenter in Capitolio et in publicis contionibus audiebatur. Iam palam cardinalibus detrahebat, dicens conuentum eorum ex causa superbie et auaricie, ypocrisis et multimode

^a perstitit Poole

¹ St Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux

² Poole has dated this reconciliation in 1146, not 1145 as earlier writers believed (*Hist. Pont.*, Preface, pp. lxiv-lxv); and his dating is supported by

door to support themselves and their master. He said ^{c. 1141} things that were entirely consistent with the law accepted by Christian people, but not at all with the life they led. To the bishops he was merciless on account of their avarice and filthy lucre; most of all because of stains on their personal lives, and their striving to build the church of God in blood. He denounced the abbot,¹ whose name is renowned above all others for his many virtues, as a seeker after vainglory, envious of all who won distinction in learning or religion unless they were his own disciples. In consequence the abbot prevailed on the most Christian king to expel him from the Frankish kingdom; from there he returned to Italy after Pope Innocent's death and, after promising reparation and ^{24 Sept. 1143} obedience to the Roman church, was received at Viterbo by Pope Eugenius.² Penance was imposed on him, ¹¹⁴⁶ which he claimed to have performed in fasts, vigils and prayers in the holy places of the city; and again he took a solemn oath to show obedience. Whilst dwelling in Rome under pretext of penance he won the city to his ¹¹⁴⁷⁻⁹ side, and preaching all the more freely because the lord pope was occupied in Gaul he built up a faction known as the heretical sect of the Lombards. He had disciples who imitated his austerities and won favour with the populace through outward decency and austerity of life, but found their chief supporters amongst pious women. He himself was frequently heard on the Capitol and in public gatherings. He had already publicly denounced the cardinals, saying that their college, by its pride, avarice, hypocrisy and manifold shame was not the

Gleber (op. cit., pp. 30-2). Arnold cannot, then, have become associated with the political movement in Rome before 1147.

turpitudinis non esse ecclesiam Dei sed domum negociationis¹ et speluncam latronum² qui scribarum et Phariseorum uices exercent in populo Christiano. Ipsum papam non esse quod profitetur, apostolicum uirum et animarum pastorem, sed uirum sanguinum qui incendiis et homicidiis prestat auctoritatem,³ tortorem ecclesiarum, innocentie concussorem, qui nichil aliud facit in mundo quam carnem pascere et suos replere loculos et exhaurire alienos. Dicebat quod sic apostolicus est, ut non apostolorum doctrinam imitetur aut uitam, et ideo ei obedientiam aut reuerentiam non deberi; preterea non esse homines admittendos qui sedem imperii, [66] fontem / libertatis, Romam, mundi dominam uolebant subicere seruituti.

XXXII

NON FERENS dominus papa uexationem Romanorum Anagniam profectus est,⁴ de pace cum rege Siculo per nuncios tractaturus. Rex enim aliorum more tyrannorum⁵ ecclesiam terre sue redegerat in seruitutem, nec alicubi patiebatur electionem libere celebrari, sed prenominabat quem eligi oporteret, et ita de officiis ecclesiasticis sicut de palatii sui muneribus disponebat. Ob hanc causam taliter electos inhibuit Romana ecclesia consecrari, adeoque^a processerat inhibitio ut pauca sedes propriis gauderent episcopis et fere in omnibus ecclesiis residebant uiri a multis annis electi. Nam consecrationis

^a adeo quod Poole

¹ St John i.16

² St Mark xi.17, 18

³ cf. Psalms v.8; xxv.9. Arnold may have been moved to the statement by the attack of Eugenius on Rome in 1149.

⁴ Although John does not explicitly mention the pope's residence in

church of God, but a place of business¹ and den of¹¹⁴⁹ thieves,² which took the place of the scribes and Pharisees amongst Christian peoples. The pope himself was not what he professed to be—an apostolic man and shepherd of souls—but a man of blood who maintained his authority by fire and sword,³ a tormentor of churches and oppressor of the innocent, who did nothing in the world save gratify his lust and empty other men's coffers to fill his own. He was, he said, so far from apostolic that he imitated neither the life nor the doctrine of the apostles, wherefore neither obedience nor reverence was due to him: and in any case no man could be admitted who wished to impose a yoke of servitude on Rome, the seat of Empire, fountain of liberty and mistress of the world.

XXXII

SINCE the tumults of the Romans were unbearable to^{June 1150} the pope, he took the road for Anagni,⁴ to treat for peace by ambassadors with the king of Sicily. For the king, after the fashion of tyrants,⁵ had reduced the church in his kingdom to slavery, and instead of allowing any freedom of election named in advance the candidate to be elected, so disposing of all ecclesiastical offices like palace appointments. Consequently the Roman church had forbidden the consecration of men elected in this way, and the prohibition had gone to such lengths that few sees were blessed with bishops of their own, and men who had been elected years before, but never consecrated, resided in almost every cathedral church. For

Rome from November 1149–June 1150, this refers to his departure from the Lateran about 15 June 1150.

⁵ Probably a direct reference to the practices of Henry II.

oleum defecit in terra eius, ex quo cepit Innocentium papam.¹ Preterea legatos ecclesie Romane non patiebatur intrare terram suam,² nisi a se uocatos aut licentia ante impetrata destinatos, et eos tunc non ecclesie sed ipse propriis sumptibus exhibebat aut faciebat ab / [67] ecclesiis exhiberi. In ecclesiarum uero ordinationibus a symonia que a manu est credebatur immunis, et probos undecumque essent in eas introducere gaudebat uiros. Et si forte proscriptum aut exulem inueniebat episcopum, ei libenter subueniebat. Omnes aduene aliquod inueniebant solatium in terra eius, nisi quod de regno Teutonicorum non facile aliquos ad obsequium admittebat. Gens enim suspecta erat, et barbariem eorum ferre non poterat. Electi ecclesiarum de consciencia regis seruebant et obediebant Romane ecclesie, sed nullus eorum consecrationem poterat promereri. Optinuit ergo rex colloquium domini pape, et prope Ciparannum in terrarum confiniis accedens ad pedes eius, liberas electiones concessit ecclesiis, et ut dominus papa iam factas electiones examinans, eas probaret aut improbaret pro libitu. Similiter et liberam ecclesiarum dispositionem, prout eas per se uel per legatos suos decreuerit ordinare. Supplicauit ut dominus papa reciperet hominum suum et priuilegia innouaret. Sed nec prece nec precio meruit exaudiri.³ Sic reformata

¹ Innocent II had been captured by King Roger's son at Galluzzo on 22 July 1139. See Romuald of Salerno (*M.G.H.* xix) p. 423.

² Since the Normans had won Italy from the infidel, count Roger was rewarded by a grant of ecclesiastical privileges by Urban II. For the next half century the extent of these privileges, which the Norman rulers declared to include full legatine rights, was hotly contended between them and the popes. cf. Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, p. 66 n. 16.

³ Eugenius was probably unwilling to commit himself too far because he was hoping to establish friendly relations with Roger's enemy, king

the country had been deprived of consecrated oil, as a July 1150 penalty for the capture of Pope Innocent II.¹ As an added injury, the king would suffer no papal legate to enter his territory,² except at his summons or with his express permission, and these were not supported by the churches independently, but either out of his own revenues or by the churches at his command. It is true that in making appointments to churches he was held guiltless of open simony, and took pride in presenting decent men wherever they might be found. If he came across any bishop who was proscribed or exiled he gladly aided him, and all foreigners were more or less welcome in his domain, except men of the kingdom of Germany, whom he was unwilling to have among his subjects; for he distrusted that people and could not endure their barbarous ways. Those elected to churches with the king's cognisance offered obedience and reverence to the papacy; but not one of them could secure consecration. So the king sought for a conference with the lord pope, and flinging himself at his feet near Ceprano on the boundary between their dominions agreed to grant free elections to churches and allow the pope to examine elections already made, approving or rejecting them as he thought fit; he also granted him free disposal of the churches, as he or his legates on his behalf should ordain. Then he besought the pope to accept his homage and renew his privileges, but neither his prayers³

Conrad. Moreover, though John is concerned with ecclesiastical abuses only, there was also friction over the conquests made by Roger's sons along the boundaries of the papal states, and the boundary disputes were not settled until the Treaty of Benevento in 1156. See E. M. Jamison, 'The Norman Administration of Apulia and Capua' in *Papers of the British School at Rome*, vi (1913), 256, 261; and Gleber, *Papst Eugen III* pp. 133-4.

pace inter ecclesiam et regem amici ab inuicem discesserunt. Ipse domino pape seruiuit et curie et eis terram suam exponens se necessitatibus apostolice sedis promisit fideliter affuturum. Electorum plurimi consecrati sunt, et alii prout domino pape placuit reprobati. Sed nullus examinationibus tanta diligentia prestabatur, nec aliquos tam facile reprobabat, ut ecclesie innotesceret uniuersis.¹ Turabatur sepe ab electoribus quod mandatum regis aut prenominatio, per ipsum aut per [68] suppositam facta / personam, causam non dederat electioni. Electi uita, scientia, conditio, et natiuitas discuciebatur, et ab hiis qui admittebantur ad consecrationem nichil uolebat recipere, nec de conscientia sua recipi paciebatur ab aliquo, conscientie prospiciens et fame: uerebatur enim ne uersutus ille rex Siculus qui ecclesie semper insidiabatur qualemcumque ex causa probabili haberet materiam detrahendi.

XXXIII

CONSECRATO Panormitano electo Hugone, qui a sede Capuana ad illam migrauerat, institit rex per litteras et nuncios suos ut ei daretur pallium et aliqui suffraganei assignarentur. Dicebant enim sine pallio, cum quo officii traditur plenitudo, et sine suffraganeis nomen archiepiscopi non constare. Sed non potuerunt suffraganeos optinere, quia eos illa sedes nunquam habuerat.² Pallium uero concessum est secundum pristi-

¹ The text is obscure. 'Uniuersis' is probably an error for 'universe'.

² It was not until after the settlement at Benevento in 1156 that

nor his gifts were of any avail. When peace had been made in this way between the church and the king, they parted friends: the king offered devoted service to the pope and curia, and placing his lands at their disposal promised that in future he would faithfully minister to the needs of the papacy. Most of the elect were consecrated, the remainder rejected as the lord pope thought proper; but none were subjected to such a searching examination, and none so lightly rejected that it became common knowledge in the church.¹ The electors swore repeatedly that they had not been influenced in their choice by the king's mandate or nomination, directly or indirectly. The life, learning, status and birth of the elect were discussed; and the pope refused to take anything from those who were accepted for consecration, or knowingly to permit others to take anything, both for reasons of conscience and to avoid scandal; for he was afraid of giving the crafty king of Sicily, who perpetually tried to catch the church in some fault, any plausible grounds for accusation.

XXXIII

AFTER the consecration of Hugh, elect of Palermo, who had been translated from the see of Capua, the king sent letters and ambassadors to demand that the pallium should be granted and suffragans assigned to him; for he maintained that the name of archbishop was meaningless without either suffragans or the pallium, which carried the plenitude of authority. He failed to procure suffragans, for the see had never had any;² the pallium

suffragans—the sees of Girgenti, Mazzara and Malta—were placed under Palermo. See Romuald of Salerno (*M.G.H.* xix) p. 429.

num morem. Illis autem replicantibus sine suffraganeis nullum esse collati pallii usum, respondit dominus papa quia preter officium quod in eo confertur archiepiscopis, solet quibusdam episcopis dari ad ostendendam suarum sedium dignitatem,¹ quam certum est prouenire ex tribus causis. Assertionem suam propositis iuuuit exemplis. Episcoporum namque sedes, in quibus alicuius gentis primi predicatorum resederunt, honore pallii redduntur insignes; hinc est quod dominus Papiensis utitur pallio [69] propter beatum Sirum qui Domino / Ticinum acquisiuit. Alii uero, quia ad illos pertinet primatum uel archiepiscoporum suorum consecratio, sicut Eduensis et Lausennensis. Ostiensis quoque episcopus eo utitur in consecratione Romani pontificis et postea in sollempnitate missarum, quod tamen non presumat nisi fuerit apostolici consecrator; hoc est enim priuilegium sedis eius. Tercii uero hoc recipiunt, quia principalibus aliquarum gentium ciuitatibus president, et freti priuilegiis ecclesie Romane principes in gente sua creare possunt. Dimissi sunt in uerbo isto.

XXXIV

REX SICVLVS, audita ista tercia clausula distinctionis huius, exhilaratus est sumens inde occasionem faciendi consecrari filium suum Guillerum, Romano pontifice inconsulto; quod ideo de iure non licebat, quia totam

¹ In the early church the pallium had been, as Eugenius contended, a mark of distinction conferred first on individual bishops and then on certain sees. In the ninth century the popes strove to convert the pallium into the indispensable source of metropolitan authority (cf. *Pallium* in *Dict. d'Arch. et de Lit. Chrét.*, and Philip Grierson, 'Rostagnus of Arles and the Pallium', in *E.H.R.* xlix (1934), 81-3). The reasoning of Eugenius proves

however was granted in accordance with former custom. ? 1151
To those who objected that where there were no suffragans the grant of the pallium would be without effect, the pope replied that besides conferring authority on archbishops the pallium was occasionally granted to bishops to mark the dignity of their sees,¹ which might be necessary for three reasons. He supported this statement with examples. First, the episcopal sees where the first missionaries of a people had been established were made famous by the distinction of the pallium: in this way the lord bishop of Pavia enjoyed the pallium because of St Syrus, who converted Ticino to the faith. Others were distinguished because of their right of consecrating their primates or archbishops, such as the bishops of Autun and Laon. The bishop of Ostia wore the pallium for the consecration of the Roman pontiff and afterwards for the solemnisation of mass, which he would never have presumed to do if he had not been the consecrator of the pope: for this is the prescriptive right of his see. Thirdly, some received it because they presided over the chief cities of certain peoples, and were privileged by the papacy to crown princes for their own people. With these words he sent them away.

XXXIV

ON HEARING the third clause of this pronouncement 1151
the Sicilian king was overjoyed, for he took it as an excuse for having his son William consecrated without consulting the pope: a proceeding certainly not lawful,

that some relics of the earlier use of the pallium still survived in the twelfth century.

Siciliam constat ad Romane ecclesie patrimonium pertinere.¹ Rex tamen allegat hoc sibi negari non debere, quia, cum ecclesia Dei Sarracenis inpugnantibus [70] Siciliam per multa secula amiserit, / sua et antecessorum uirtute restituta est fidei.² Conuocatis ergo archiepiscopis et episcopis Panormie in sollempnitate paschali, ab antistite Panormitano filium suum consecrari fecit in regem. Sollempniter tamen ante consecrationem, patre in audientia publica dictante, professus est [quod] pacem et iusticiam seruari faceret in diebus suis, quod ecclesie Dei reuerentiam exhiberet et quod ipsi patri in tota uita seruiret ut domino. Professionem uero prestito iuramento firmavit. Factum moleste tulit dominus papa, sed urgente malicia temporis non potuit uindicare.

XXXV

OBEVNTE episcopo Beluacense substitutus est ei Henricus monachus Clareuallensis, eo quod erat frater regis Francorum. Sed infra breue tempus inter ipsum et fratrem suum tanta discordia orta³ est ut rex exercitu congregato delere Beluacum properaret; sed uiri sapientes, Gauslenus Suessionensis episcopus et Sigerius abbas Sancti Dionisii, et precipue regina Adeleida,

¹ In addition to the fact that in 1059 Robert Guiscard had formally accepted papal suzerainty over all lands that he held or might conquer, Sicily, as an island, was held to be under papal authority. Cf. *Metalogicon*, iv 42 (ed. Webb, pp. 217-8), 'Nam omnes insule de iure antiquo ex donatione Constantini, qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur ad Romanam Ecclesiam pertinere'.

² Roger was probably referring to the privilege of Urban II granting certain rights in the Church as a reward for the reconquest of Sicily from the infidel. See Geoffrey of Malaterra, iv 29 (in Muratori, *Scriptores*, v 108). The authenticity of the bull has been questioned, and the kings of Sicily interpreted it in the widest possible sense.

since it is common knowledge that all Sicily belongs to¹¹⁵¹ the patrimony of the papacy.¹ The king for his part maintained that he had a right to this, because after the church of God had lost Sicily to the invading Saracens for centuries, his valour and that of his ancestors had restored it to the faith.² So summoning the archbishops and bishops to Palermo for the Easter celebrations, he had his son consecrated king by the bishop of Palermo. But before consecration he solemnly undertook in a public assembly at his father's precept that he would preserve peace and justice all his days, show reverence for the church of God, and throughout his father's life obey him as his lord. This undertaking he confirmed with an oath. The pope took it ill, but oppressed by the evils of the time could offer no resistance.

XXXV

ON THE death of the bishop of Beauvais, a monk of¹¹⁴⁹ Clairvaux, Henry, succeeded him because he was a brother of the king of the Franks. But within a short time there was such strife between the brothers³ that the king summoned an army and was hastening to annihilate Beauvais when prudent advisers—Jocelin bishop of Soissons and Suger abbot of St Denis—and Queen Adelaide most of all, urged the bishop to be less reckless

³ Henry had refused to pay the *beneficia denariorum* or customary charges paid by previous bishops to the feudal lords of his diocese for their 'protection'. Although he was defending the liberties of the Church, John implies that his instability of character made the situation more difficult, and St Bernard strongly criticised the methods of his brother Robert of Dreux, who supported him. (Watkin Williams, *St Bernard of Clairvaux*, 185-6).

represserunt episcopi leuitatem et composuerunt inter fratres. Episcopus eodem anno Romam profectus dominum papam repperit Ferentini,¹ a quo et honorifice tum pro reuerentia regis, tum contemplatione ordinis Cisterciensis, tum gratia dignitatis et persone receptus est. / Ibi familiaris admissus supplicauit, ut ei liceret honus episcopale deponere, an leuitate animi an feruore religionis an conscientia defectus, incertum est. Sed non est exauditus, uel quia credebatur habere zelum Dei,² uel quia timebatur scandalum, et ne rediens ad Claram Vallem periret in difficultatibus quas ferre non poterat, aut causas induceret perniciosius in ordine dispensandi. Reuersus in Franciam oblitus est, quid super hac re inter dominum papam et ipsum conuenerit. Vnde urgente scrupulo conscientie rescribens consuluit dominum papam, quid facto opus esset et quid conuenerit inter eos. Precepit ergo iterum dominus papa litteris propria, ne ad notariorum conscientiam perueniret, manu exaratis,³ quatinus iniunctum sibi cum omni sollicitudine procuraret officium, reducens ei ad memoriam quod ipsum nunquam absoluerat; et delens scrupulum conscientie uerbis consolatoriis mitigauit.

XXXVI

NVNTII regulorum et ecclesie Hiberniensis iam altera uice redierant ut legatum quem petierant optinerent.

¹ Eugenius was at Ferentino from 23 November 1150, to 22 June 1151; but Henry's visit was not later than February, since the pope's first letter to him after his return home is dated 8 March (ep. 433, Migne, *P.L.* clxxx, 1459).

² cf. Romans x.2

³ This information is exactly borne out by Eugenius' letter (ep. 433),

and made peace between the brothers. In the same year the bishop set out for Rome, and at Ferentino found the lord pope,¹ who received him most honourably, alike out of reverence for the king, regard for the Cistercian order, and esteem for his person and office. Welcomed as a friend there, he pleaded to be allowed to give up the burdens of a bishopric, though whether from inconstancy of character, religious zeal, or knowledge of his limitations is uncertain. But his prayer was not heard, either because he was believed to be inspired by the love of God,² or through fear of scandal, for if he returned to Clairvaux he might be engulfed in unendurable difficulties, or begin law-suits undermining the validity of the dispensation. On his return to France he forgot what agreement he had reached with the lord pope; and troubled by conscientious scruples wrote again to ask him what ought to be done, and what they had decided. At this the lord pope, in letters written by his own hand so that they should not come to the knowledge of notaries,³ again enjoined him to undertake the duties of his office with all care, reminding him that he had never been absolved from them, brushing aside his scruples and soothing him with words of consolation.

XXXVI

DELEGATES of the princes and church of Ireland had now come back once again to ask for the legate they

where he says he is writing with his own hand. He wrote a second letter (ep. 435) on 11 March.

Decreuerat dominus papa in terra illa archiepiscopos, quos nondum habuerat, ordinare. Hoc procurabat diaconus cardinalis Iohannes Paparo quando ei Stephanus rex Anglorum (ut supradictum est) / transitum denegauit.¹ Electi sunt in curia promouendi Rolandus in presbiterum ad titulum Sancti Marci, Girardus et Chenchius, qui postea fuit episcopus Portuensis, in diaconos, et de cardinalibus diaconis in presbiteros Iohannes Paparo et Octavianus filius Iohannis Maledicti. Sed solus Paparo, in uirtute obedientie iussus ascendere, renuit ordinari. Vnde et dominus papa se ab illius communione suspendit, et eum de statione diaconorum comministrancium precepit exire et sacras exuere uestes. Ille uero tanta confusione permotus, quia nobilis erat, se ad urbem reuersurum esse minatus est et inducturum Romanos ut alium crearent papam, qui pacem reformaret; erat enim artifex in calliditatibus excogitandis, et post Chencium efficacissimus institutor Gregorii de sancto Angelo.² Cardinales ergo turbati Iohannem unanimiter conuenerunt, ut a furore desistens rediret ad cor, et persuaserunt ei ut ueniam imploraret, peteret sacerdocium, omnem pretenderet humilitatem; dicentes indecens esse ut / diaconus benediceret archiepiscopis et quod dominus papa legationem Hibernie non nisi presbitero daturus erat. Acquieuit, et ordinatus in mediana interuenientibus amicis subtractam recuperauit legationem, quatuor pallia in Hiberniam delaturus.

¹ See *supra*, ch. 2. At the time of his first attempt to carry out his legation to Ireland he had been in deacon's orders: Eugenius III raised him to the priesthood in spite of his opposition, and he was ordained priest on 31 March 1151. In May he set out for Ireland (Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, p. 167).

desired. The pope decreed that archbishops should be 1150-1
ordained in that country, for as yet there were none. Cardinal deacon John Paparo had obtained this concession when Stephen king of the English (as I have already related) refused him transit.¹

The following had been chosen for promotion in the curia: Roland as cardinal priest, with the title of St Mark, Girard and Cencius afterwards bishop of Porto as cardinal deacons, and John Paparo and Octavian son of John Maledictus, who had been cardinal deacons, to be priests. Paparo alone, though bound in obedience to accept the decreed promotion, refused to be ordained. At this the lord pope both broke off all communion with him, and ordered him to leave the ranks of the deacons assisting at divine office and lay aside his holy vestments; whereupon he was moved with such anger—for he was a noble—that he threatened to return to the city and incite the Romans to create another pope who would restore peace: for he was ingenious in planning stratagems and, after Cencius, the most able instructor of Gregory of St Angelo.² The cardinals, greatly distressed, all combined to urge John to come to his senses, and persuaded him to beg for pardon, ask for ordination as priest, and profess all humility, pointing out that it was not seemly for a deacon to bless archbishops, and that the lord pope would not give the Irish legation to anyone who was not a priest. Finally he acquiesced; and thanks to the intercession of friends he was ordained in 31 March
Mid-Lent, recovered the legation of which he had been 1151
deprived, and set out to carry four pallia to Ireland.

² John brings several charges of corruption against Gregory of St Angelo. cf. *supra*, p. 12 and ep. 305.
(1735)

Sed proficiscens, non ausus intrare Angliam, nauem conscendit in Flandria, qua in Scotiam deuectus est. Ibi regis et gentis Scotorum sibi familiaritatem concilians, promisit se effecturum apud dominum papam et ecclesiam Romanam, ut episcopo Sancti Andree daretur pallium,¹ et ut sedes eius Scotorum, Orcadum² et adiacentium insularum metropolis fieret. Licet enim archiepiscopus Eboracensis a tempore domini [74] Calisti³ eis secundum priuilegiorum / auctoritatem preesse debeat, Scoti tamen ei obedire detrectant. Cantuariensi uero archiepiscopo sepenumero obedientiam obtulerunt si acquieuisset apostolica sedes.⁴ Progressus in Hiberniam Iohannes duos ibi creauit archiepiscopos,⁵ concilium celebrauit, constituit canones qui et in terra illa et in archiuis apostolice sedis habentur, et ordinauit inter cetera ne abbatisse Sancte Brigide in conuentibus publicis de cetero ante episcopos habeant presessionem; solebant enim sedere pro pedibus eius.

¹ The Scottish church was without a metropolitan of its own, but any attempt to create one met with strong opposition from the archbishop of York, whose claims had been in part conceded by Lanfranc. (H. Böhmer, *Die Fälschungen Erzbischof Lanfranks* (1902); Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, 167-8; David Patrick, *Statutes of the Scottish Church* (1907) pp. xxvii sqq.)

² Not only did the bishop of St Andrews fail to secure a pallium, but Orkney became shortly afterwards subject to the Norwegian church. Eugenius, who showed deep concern for the organisation of the northern churches, sent Nicholas of St Albano as cardinal legate to Norway and Sweden, and as a result of this legation the see of Trondhjem was raised to an archbishopric in 1152. The bishopric of Orkney was then placed under Trondhjem. (Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, pp. 168-70.)

³ Calixtus II, in 1119 and 1122 declared the Scottish bishops to be suffragans of York (Haddan & Stubbs, ii 217). It was not until 1188 that the Scottish church was declared to be dependent on the Roman see.

⁴ John probably had in mind the demand of Eadmer, when he was

As he dared not land in England he took ship to Flanders, and from there sailed to Scotland. There he won the friendship of the king and Scottish people, and promised that he would persuade the lord pope and the Roman church to grant the pallium to the bishop of St Andrews,¹ so that his see might become the metropolitan of Scotland, Orkney and the adjacent islands.² For although ever since the time of Pope Calixtus³ the archbishop of York had been entitled by his privileges to exercise authority, the Scots refused to obey him. They had at times offered obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury, if the pope would have agreed to this.⁴ Going on to Ireland, John created two archbishops there,⁵ held a council and published canons which are preserved both in that country and in the archives of the papacy: amongst other things he decreed that the Brigittine abbesses should no longer take precedence over bishops in public assemblies, for they had been accustomed to sit at the bishop's feet. May 1151
March 1152

elected to the see of St Andrews in 1115, to receive consecration from the archbishop of Canterbury. King Alexander however, though he had appealed to Christ Church, Canterbury, for help in finding an archbishop, opposed his request; and this combined with the resistance of Thurstan of York, who secured the verdict of Calixtus II in his favour, induced Eadmer to resign the see without ever receiving consecration (Eadmer, *Hist. Novorum*, (ed. M. Rule, R.S. 282 sqq.). The Scottish bishops were more concerned to secure a metropolitan of their own than to recognise the jurisdiction of either York or Canterbury.

⁵ He held a council at Kells in March 1152, and raised the sees of Dublin and Tuam to metropolitanical rank. The other two *pallia* had already been bestowed on the archbishops of Armagh and Cashel. (Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, p. 168; Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, p. 74 n. 5; J. D. Seymour, in *History of the Church of Ireland* ed. W. Alison Phillips (O.U.P. 1933-4) ii 41 sqq.)

XXXVII

GVIDO FLORENTINVS, legatione fungens in oriente, sinodum conuocauit.¹ Antiochie portis fere diebus /
 [75] singulis iminebant Sarraceni, omnem depopulantes prouinciam, nec erat qui eis resistere preualeret. Adeoque Domino permittente manus eorum inualuit, ut postea Reimundum principem Antiochenum (de quo superius dictum est) in bello occiderint. Non est relictus defensor patrie preter patriarcham² et uiduam principis quae paruulum filium nutriebat.³ Euocatus ergo ad concilium patriarcha suam excusauit absentiam, et denuntiauit omnibus suffraganeis ne suas in tanto periculo desererent ciuitates, uel quia fortasse uenire non poterat, uel (quod magis creditur) quia non uolebat. Perspicuum tamen erat periculum. Tripolitanus electus,⁴ quia tunc illa sedes archiepiscopum non habebat, tum in aliis offenderat legatum, tum in eo maxime quod preceptis eius et uocationibus patriarche mandatum
 [76] pretulerat. Eum / ergo in concilio suspendit legatus, et electionem eius euacuasset omnino, si non esset a procuratoribus ad sedem apostolicam appellatum. Ad curiam uenit electus appellationem prosequens et durius receptus est, quia eum preuenerant nuntii domini Guidonis. Afflictus est mora, et tandem, cum eum instantis nauigii necessitas redire compelleret, amaras hystorias preaudire coactus est. Exposita est in con-

¹ Raymond was killed on 27 June 1149; and since John mentions the grave threat to Antioch when the synod was held it is likely to have been shortly afterwards. Cahen places it in 1149 (*La Syrie du Nord*, Paris, 1940 p. 505).

² Aimery of Limoges, probably the ablest and most ambitious of the patriarchs of Jerusalem, who organised the resistance of Antioch. For his

XXXVII

GUY OF FLORENCE, who was acting as legate in the 1149 east, summoned a synod.¹ The Saracens were threatening to storm Antioch almost daily, devastating the whole province and overwhelming all resistance. God so strengthened their arm that later they killed Raymond, prince of Antioch (of whom I have spoken above) in battle: and not a single defender of the country was left save the patriarch² and the prince's widow, who was nursing an infant son.³ So when the patriarch was summoned to the council he sent excuses for his absence, and forbade all his suffragans to desert their cities in such a crisis, either because he could not or (as is more probable) because he would not come. However the danger was plain to see. The bishop elect of Tripoli⁴—at that time the see was under no archbishop—had offended the legate in many ways, but most of all by obeying the patriarch's mandate in preference to his summons and precepts. For this the legate, when the council met, suspended him from office, and would have nullified his election altogether had not his representatives appealed to the papal curia. When the elect[?] 1150 came to the curia to prosecute his appeal he was coldly received, for the messengers of Lord Guy had preceded him. His case was continually put off, and when finally he was obliged to return as his ship was waiting to sail, he had first to endure bitter reprimands. He was shown

career see Cahen, pp. 504–10.

³ Constance, daughter of Bohemund II, prince of Antioch. In 1153 she married, as her second husband, Reynald of Châtillon (Cahen, p. 391).

⁴ The name of the bishop elect of Tripoli is unknown.

sistorio causa eius qui pretulerat quantum libet patriarcham legato Romane ecclesie. Lecta sunt tam in historiis principum, quam in decretis et gestis conciliorum, de primatu sedis apostolice priuilegia multa et manifesta in auribus electi stantis in conspectu omnium.¹ Hiis actis, ait ad electum conuersus dominus papa, *Frater, nunc ecclesie Romane iura cognoscis: uides meritum tuum et apostolice sedis iniuriam. Audisti quam sententiam dictent canones in similiter delinquentes. Superest ergo quod tibi ex mansuetudine sedis apostolice concedimus, ut causam tuam colligas in sinu tuo et iudices iudicium tuum.* Confusus electus unum pre stupore uerbum uix potuit respondere, et dicens, *Peccauit*, descendit de consessu episcoporum et humi inter nouissimos uoluit residere. Sed dominus papa ipsum redire precepit ad sedem suam, dicens quod ibi potius debebat humiliari, ubi contra Romanam ecclesiam erexerat calcaneum suum.² Dum sic electus quasi depositus haberetur a cunctis et ipse nichil aliud expectaret, recedenti litteras tradidit legato deferendas, quibus precipiebat ut electum ad omnia restitueret, eumque in plenitudine gratie receptum preciperet [77] consecrari. Electus tamen / nesciebat an ferret litteras uite an mortis, domino papa sic omnia moderante, ut liceret sperare timenti³ et iustum esset sperantem tremere. Sociis uero nauigii familiaribus legati qui electum impugnaverant alias tradidit, quibus arguebat

¹ cf. St John viii.9

² St John xiii.18

³ Lucan, *Pharsalia*, ii 15

in consistory how pitiable was the cause of one who set ¹¹⁵⁰ any patriarch whatever before a legate of the Roman church. Extracts from histories of princes and decrees and acts of councils, which contained many unquestionable privileges establishing the primacy of the papacy were read out for the elect to hear as he stood in the sight of all.¹ After this the lord pope turned to him and said: 'Brother, now you understand the law of the Roman church: you see your worth and the harm you have done the Holy See. You have heard the penalties pronounced by canon law for such crimes. All that remains, which we freely grant you by the mercy of the Holy See, is to study your case in your own heart, and pass judgment on yourself.' Confounded, the elect could scarcely stammer out a word in his bewilderment; and murmuring, 'I have sinned,' he stepped down from his place among the bishops and made as though to seat himself on the ground among the lowest. But the lord pope commanded him to resume his seat, since it was more fitting that he should be humbled in the place where he had kicked against the Roman church.² Whilst all present considered the elect as good as deposed, and he himself expected nothing better, the pope gave him letters to take with him, in which he commanded the legate to restore him to his former position, receive him back in the fullness of grace, and have him consecrated. The elect himself, however, did not know whether he carried letters of life or death, for the pope preserved so non-committal a manner that a timid man might have had grounds for hope,³ and a confident man might justly have felt alarm. To the legate's close associates in his ship, who had come to carry the case against the bishop elect, he gave other letters in which he accused the legate

eum^a indiscretionis et immoderationis, qui ecclesiam a Sarracenis supra modum uexatam litigiis amplius uexare presumpserat et sumptibus attenuare, ut non haberent tempus aut materiam resistendi. Precepit itaque ut sub omni celeritate rediret.

XXXVIII

REX CONRADVS ad imperium aspirabat, et ob hanc causam tam ad ecclesiam quam ad urbem destinauerat nuntios suos.¹ Rogauit etiam dominum papam quatinus a latere suo destinaret aliquos quorum consilio regno disponderet et qui uice sua causas ecclesiasticas diffinirent. Ad hoc missi sunt presbiteri cardinales, Iordanus Sancte Susanne et Octauianus Sancte Cecilie, moribus ut professione dissimiles, nisi quod uterque cupidus et in genere suo rapax. Iordanus enim, sub pretextu Cartusiensis [78] ordinis, uilibus utens indumentis et seuerus alloquio / et gestu, sumptibus quoque parcus, auariciam palliabat, et quasi ex consortio cognate religionis fuerat camerarius domini pape. Octauianus autem, et genere nobilior et affatu benignior et beneficentia liberalior, fastuosus erat et pomposus, cultor Teutonum et fauoris Romanorum (quem nunquam habuit) plurimus appetitor. Vterque uero lupum tegebat in pellibus agninis. Et licet eos dominus papa ad unanimitatem gerendorum obligauerit, tamen ex quo recesserunt facta est contentio inter eos, quis eorum uideretur maior esse.²

^a cum Poole

¹ After his return from the Crusade Conrad entered into negotiations with Eugenius, with a view to securing imperial coronation. Wibald, ep. 231; Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, pp. 129 sqq.

of folly and recklessness for presuming to disturb the church with lawsuits when it was already tried beyond measure by the Saracens, and to exhaust it with expenses until it had neither time nor resources for resistance. And he commanded him to return with all speed.

XXXVIII

KING CONRAD at this time was aiming at the imperial crown, and sent ambassadors to further his cause both with the papacy and the Romans.¹ He asked the pope to send him some legates *a latere* who might advise him on the settlement of his kingdom and judge ecclesiastical cases by papal authority. The men sent at his request were the cardinal priests, Jordan of St Susanna and Octavian of St Cecilia, equally unlike each other in character and habit, except that both were greedy and grasping after their own fashion. For Jordan, wearing wretched clothing, stern in speech and mien, and saving of expense, hid his avarice under cover of his Carthusian habit; and—since like order attracted like—was made papal chamberlain. Octavian on the other hand, noble by birth, more affable in countenance and more open-handed in his generosity, was yet proud and pompous, a sycophant of the Germans and an avid seeker after Roman favour (which he never won). Each was at heart a wolf in sheep's clothing. And although the pope had bound them to act in concert, they had no sooner set out than strife began between them as to who was the greater.² The pope had fixed their retinues, 1150

² St Luke xxii.24

Hanc eis prescripsit apostolicus moderationis formam, ut Iordanus non nisi quindecim, Octavianus non ultra uiginti equitaturas ulla ratione habere presumeret, et ut ab exactionibus magis continerent quam si ad regem Siculum mitterentur, eo quod Teutones ecclesie Romane magis semper insidiati sunt, et ex causis leuibus eam sepiissime depresserunt. Precepit etiam ut nichil contra equitatem facerent fauore personarum, quia gens illa pre ceteris solet ingratitude uitio laborare; et si metus incuteretur, ut constantie et auctoritatis munimen opponerent. Inhibuit quoque ne magnum uel paruum offenderent temeritate uel fastu, et ne declinarent ad dexteram uel ad sinistram, sed uia regia graderentur¹ ut eos Dominus honestaret in laboribus suis.² Sed illi prescripte legis nec iotam nec apicem seruauerunt: discordantes in omnibus ecclesiam Romanam fecerunt esse ludibrio. Nam litigatorum alius hunc, alius adibat illum, et quem unus legatorum absoluebat, alius ab opposito condempnabat. Concutiebant innocentiam, [79] loculos excutiebant, tor/torres hominum, peccunie extortores.³ Ob hanc causam appellantium examina ad sedem apostolicam conuolabant, quia sic isti excutiebant ecclesias quomodo excuti solent aluearia quo mel partum facilius apibus subtrahatur. Scripsit eis dominus papa, ut ista corrigerent, nec profecit. Iterum scribens reuocauit eos, sed illi litteras suppresserunt. Res tamen latere non potuit, quia redeuntes ab urbe uerbum publicauerunt. Cum ergo necessitate reuerti cogerentur, Octavianus regni magnates allexit, inita cum eis de

¹ Numbers xx.17; xxi.22

² St Matthew v.18

³ When John satyrised the conduct of legates in the *Policraticus* he probably had Octavian and Jordan in mind. He even used the same

commanding that Jordan should on no account have ¹¹⁵⁰⁻¹ less than fifteen or Octavian more than twenty horses; and that they should be more careful to avoid exactions than if they were being sent to the king of Sicily, for the Germans were always most treacherous to the papacy and ready to oppress it on the slightest pretext. He warned them further to do nothing unjust out of respect for persons, since that people above all others was guilty of the sin of ingratitude; and if they had cause for fear, to put on a show of firmness and authority. Finally he forbade them to offend great or small through foolhardiness or pride, and to turn neither to left nor right, but follow the king's road¹ that the Lord might look with favour on their works.² But they observed neither one jot nor one tittle of the law laid down: quarrelling over everything they made the church a laughing-stock. For of two litigants one would approach one legate, the other the other; and whoever was acquitted by one was condemned by the other in contradiction. Tormentors of men and extorters of money, they oppressed the innocent and emptied coffers.³ In consequence swarms of appellants flew off to the papacy, for they disturbed the churches as hives are disturbed that honey may be taken from the bees. The lord pope wrote ordering them to amend their ways, but in vain. He wrote again to recall them, and they suppressed the letters. But the truth could not be hidden, for men returning from Rome spread the news. When therefore they had no choice but to return, Octavian won the magnates of the kingdom to his side, entered into a mutual bond of aid and counsel

phrases (cf. *Policraticus*, viii 17 (ed. Webb, ii 355). 'Quis ergo credit quod patres ecclesiae provincias concutiant ut excutiant, loculos exinanient alienos').

prestando auxilio et consilio in posterum mutua obligatione, recepitque commendaticias eorum ad dominum papam. Ab illo uero tempore semper in curia patronus extitit Teutonicorum.¹ Ambo itaque recesserunt, ecclesiam Romanam odibilem et contemptibilem relinquentes in terra.

XXXIX

OCTAVIANO repatriante, Iordanus in Franciam de-
 flexit iter, ut dicebat causa uisitandi heremum et fratres
 in Monte Dei, sed (ut credebatur a plurimis) lucri
 gratia et dominationis in transitu protendende.² Et
 quidem ueniens ad Montem Dei, ubi quondam religionis
 indumenta susceperat, amice et reuerenter susceptus est,
 sicut ecclesie Romane recipi decuit cardinalem, mansit-
 que pro libitu. Sed cum recessurus sancto Hugoni priori
 loci illius uiginti marcas de Mammona iniquitatis ad
 [80] ecclesie necessitates / explendas optulisset, eas uir beatus
 recipere non acquieuit, licet plurimum indigeret, utique
 respondens homini Petri spiritu et fere uerbis, *Peccunia
 tua tecum sit in perditione, quia non est tibi pars in sorte hac,
 nec nobis, Deo propiciante, pars erit in sorte tua.*³ Et statuens
 eum contra faciem suam, amaras audire coegit hystorias
 uite sue et fame, quas retexere longum est. Ipse namque
 Cartusiam suam ex causa marce, que alias transcendit
 in pondere, qua donaria summi pontificis, dum camer-
 arius esset, appendere consueuerat, fecit insignem. Nam

¹ Octavian led the German party among the cardinals; and in 1159 was elected anti-pope as Victor IV.

² John's story is corroborated by a letter of St Bernard, written in 1152 to the cardinal bishop of Ostia, denouncing Jordan. He accuses him of extortion and disregard of canon law, saying that he is universally hated by

for the future, and accepted letters of recommendation from them to the pope. From that time forward he was always the advocate of Germans at the papal court.¹ So both retreated, leaving behind them hatred and contempt for the papacy.

XXXIX

WHEN Octavian came back to Italy, Jordan turned ¹¹⁵¹⁻² aside into France for the purpose, he pretended, of visiting the hermitage and brethren of Mondaye but actually (according to common belief) with an eye to gain and to prolonging his authority on the journey.² And indeed, when he came to Mondaye, where once he had been received as a novice, he was welcomed with all the love and reverence due to a cardinal of the Roman church, and remained there at his pleasure. But when, on his departure he offered the holy prior Hugh twenty marks of his ill-gotten gains for the expenses of his house, the good man refused to receive them, great though his needs were; but instead answered him in the spirit, and almost in the words of Peter, 'Thy money perish with thee, for thou hast no part in our lot nor we, by the grace of God, part in thine.'³ And as Jordan stood before him, he poured into his unwilling ears bitter stories of his life and reputation, which it would be tedious to repeat. For Jordan had made his Charterhouse a byword by means of the standard weight, heavier than others, with which papal dues were weighed whilst he

laymen and clerks alike. He adds that he is writing at the instigation of the prior of Mondaye (ep. 290).

³ Acts viii.20

adhuc Rome dicitur, *Inconsultus est cui soluitur, si non ad marcam Cartusiensem appendit; si credit, appendat ad urbanam.* Sic enim Iordanus in contractibus uersabatur. Confusus ergo discessit a sancto loco, et tandem tractus ad urbem reuersus est domini Eugenii increpatione iterato confusus.

XL

EPISCOPOS et abbates Anglorum a suspensione relaxauerat dominus Theobaldus Cantuariensis archiepiscopus, preter Henricum Wintoniensem, qui Romam profectus in persona propria satisfecit.¹ In facie uero hominum receptus in gratiam, per Guidonem de Summa, episcopum Ostiensem, Gregorium de sancto Angelo, et alios amicos, sicut illi postea confessi sunt, elaborare cepit, ut ei pallium daretur et fieret archiepiscopus occidentalis Anglie, uel ut ei legatio regni concederetur, uel saltem ut ecclesia sua eximeretur a iurisdictione [81] Cantuariensis. / Et licet ex contingentibus nichil omiserit, improbe repulsus est. Tandem supplicauit ut ipse personaliter eximeretur. Sed ad omnia uota eius obsurduit dominus papa, tum quia male suspicabatur de eo et in eum pestem tocus Anglie refundebat, tum quia Cantuariensis ecclesie iusticiam nouerat. Credebatur fratrem suum regem contra ecclesiam instigare. Sed rex (quod manifesta declarant opera) nec illius nec sapientis alterius consilio agebatur. Accidit interim ²

¹ See *infra*, Appendix I

² Poole states, without giving any evidence (*Hist. Pont.*, p. 81 n. 10) that the new oppressions were Stephen's attempt early in 1152 to force archbishop Theobald to crown his son Eustace. There seems no reason to

was chamberlain. Indeed there is still a saying at Rome, 'A man is foolish if he does not use the Carthusian weight in taking payments, let him use the town measure when he lends.' Such was Jordan's reputation in business dealings. Humiliated, he departed from the holy place, and when at long last he came back to the city he was again humiliated by the rebuke of Pope Eugenius.

XL

THEOBALD, archbishop of Canterbury, released from ? 1148 suspension all the English bishops and abbots except Henry of Winchester, who set out for Rome and made his peace in person.¹ After being publicly received back into favour, he began to intrigue with Guy of Summa, bishop of Ostia, Gregory of St Angelo and other friends ¹¹⁴⁹⁻⁵⁰ (as they afterwards confessed) to secure a pallium for himself and become archbishop of western England, or else to be granted legatine office in the kingdom, or at least to secure exemption for his see from the jurisdiction of Canterbury. And though he left no stone unturned, he was severely repulsed. As a last resort he asked that he personally might be granted exemption: but to all his pleas the pope turned a deaf ear, either because he had dark suspicions of him and believed him responsible for the corruption of all England, or because he recognised that the church of Canterbury was in the right. Henry was believed to be instigating his brother the king against the church, though indeed the king took no advice from him or any other counsellor, as his actions plainly show. It chanced meanwhile that the king oppressed the church ²

suppose that this is meant; Stephen continually gave the church grounds for complaint, and 1152 is too late for Henry's visit to the curia.

ut rex nouis tumultibus infestaret ecclesiam. Quod cum, presente Wintoniensi, domino pape nunciaretur, *Gaudeo*, inquit episcopus, *me nunc illic non esse presentem, quia mihi imponeretur ista turbatio*. Subridens apostolicus in huiusmodi prorupit apologum: *Diabolus et mater sua, ut fit inter amicos, familiariter loquebantur, et dum illa, ut filii maliciam reprimeret, obiurgaret eum et peruersitatem operum improperaret, sub aspectu eorum orta tempestate naues multe submerse sunt. Ecce, inquit diabolus, si presens fuisset, et hoc maleficium mihi imponeres. Et illa: Et si presens non fuisset, constat te prius illic traxisse caudam*. Et ad episcopum dirigens uerbum, *Vide*, inquit, *frater, ne et tu in mari Anglico pretraxeris caudam tuam*. Cum uero episcopus preter absolutionem se nichil optinere posse uideret, accepta licentia rediens ueteres statuas emit Rome, quas Wintoniam deferri fecit.¹ Vnde, cum eum uidisset gramaticus quidam barba prolixa et philosophi grauitate [82] ceteris in curia spectabiliorem idola coemere, / subtili et laborioso magis quam studioso errore gentilium fabrefacta, sic lusit in eum:

Insanit ueteres statuas Damasippus emendo.²

Idem quoque aliam in episcopum intorsit ledoriam, audito consilio quod in deliberatione dederat requisitus. Ait enim,

Dii te Damasippe deeque
uerum ob consilium donent tonsore.³

¹ Edmund Bishop (*Liturgica Historica*, Oxford, 1918, pp. 396, 400) suggests that some of the objects bought at Rome may have been among the valuables bequeathed by Henry to his cathedral church at Winchester. They include two silver candlesticks in the shape of a man, and a silver vessel in the shape of a man, as well as one or two jewels.

² Horace, Satires, II. iii 64

³ Horace, Satires, II. iii 16, 17

with fresh persecutions, and when the news was brought ¹¹⁴⁹⁻⁵⁰ to the pope the bishop of Winchester, who happened to be with him, exclaimed: 'How glad I am that I am not there now, or this persecution would be laid at my door.' Smiling, the pope gave tongue to the following fable: 'The devil and his dam were chatting to each other, as friends do, and whilst she was endeavouring to curb her son's evil-doing by rebuking him and chiding him for his misdeeds, a storm arose in their sight and many ships were sunk. "See," said the devil, "if I had been there you would have blamed me for this mischief." Said she, "Even if you were not actually on the spot, you have certainly trailed your tail there beforehand." And, turning the moral against the bishop, he added, "Ask yourself, my brother, if you have not been trailing *your* tail in the English sea.'"

When the bishop realised that he could hope for nothing more than absolution, he obtained permission before leaving to buy old statues at Rome, and had them taken back to Winchester.¹ So when a certain grammarian saw him, conspicuous in the papal court for his long beard and philosophical solemnity, engaged in buying up idols, carefully made by the heathen in the error of their hands rather than their minds, he mocked him thus:

'Buying old busts is Damasippus' craze.'²

The same man aimed another jest at the bishop, when he had heard his reply to a request for advice during a discussion. He said:

'For this good counsel, Damasippus,
May gods and goddesses grant you a barber.'³

Fuit qui suis pro episcopo uerbis sed illius fortasse spiritu responderet, ipsum hac industria Romanis subtraxisse deos suos ne possent (ad quod proni uidebantur) eis ueteres cerimonias exhibere qui iam per innatam et inolitam et radicatam auariciam spiritualiter idolis seruebant. Omnes enim diligunt munera, sequuntur retributiones; et (quod mirandum pariter est et lugendum) plures errore gentili ceca legitur habuisse Roma peccunie contemptores quam nunc illustrata fidei lumine et exemplis apostolicis roborata et diuini uerbi dispensatione preminens uniuersis. Episcopus paucis et pauca dedit, et marino itinere rediens propter insidias quas ei Tusci, Lombardi et Burgundiones tetenderant, peragratis Hispaniis usque ad Sanctum Iacobum, tandem incolumis et opulentus ad propria reuersus est.

XLI

COMES quidam nomine Hugo, Normannus genere, / [83] in Apulia tamen natus, cum diu elaborasset ab uxore diuertere,¹ que progenita erat de nobiliori prosapia Longobardorum et Romanorum,² cognata Ptolomei Tusculani, se presentauit domino pape, adductis catapanis regis Siculi et aliis officialibus et nobilibus Apulie et Calabrie, ut matrimonii diuortium fieret. Sunt autem catapani potestates quedam que in ciuitatibus et castris illius regionis principum uices agunt. Episcopi quoque

¹ See *infra*, Appendix V

² cf. Otto of Freising on the low birth of the Normans: 'Robertus (Guiscardus), ex mediocri stirpe in Northmannia. . . .' (*Gesta Frid.*, i 3).

It was this man who was to reply for the bishop, unprompted but perhaps expressing his point of view: that he had been doing his best to deprive the Romans of their gods to prevent them restoring the ancient rites of worship, as they seemed all too ready to do, since their inborn, inveterate and ineradicable avarice already made them idol-worshippers in spirit. For they all love gifts and strive for rewards and (a fact equally remarkable and deplorable) it is recorded that there were more citizens indifferent to money when Rome was blinded by pagan error than now that she is illuminated by the light of faith, strengthened by the example of the apostles and first in all the world in the teaching of the divine word.

The bishop gave little and that to few; returning by the sea-route to avoid the hostility of the Tuscans, Lombards and Burgundians, he traversed Spain to St James of Compostella and finally reached home safe and prosperous.

XLI

A CERTAIN count named Hugh, born in Apulia but of Norman origin, had long been striving to secure a separation from his wife,¹ who was sprung from the nobler stock of Lombards and Romans² and was a relative of Ptolemy of Tusculum; finally he appeared in person before the lord pope, bringing with him catapans of the Sicilian king and other officials and nobles from Apulia and Calabria, to obtain a dissolution of the marriage. These catapans are powerful officials who exercise the authority of the princes in the cities and castles of that region. The bishops of the country

terre instabant pro comite, scientes hoc regi placiturum. Aduocatis et testibus causam instruxerat, corruperat curiam, ut in deliberatione sententie non essent duo qui diuortium dissuaderent. Apostolicus auditis omnium sententiis, sua non exposita, causam finiturus rediit ad consistorium, et conuersus ad testes, cuiates essent sciscitatus est. Illi responderunt, se esse Normannos, et uenisse ut testimonium perhibeant ueritati, et cognationem suam purgent a crimine et infamia incesti; se enim utriusque coniugum cognatos asserebant. Quesiuit iterum quomodo eis de parentela proposita constaret, et an in Apulia tanti meriti haberentur ut in huiusmodi uerbo deberent audiri. Responderunt se diutius in Apulia conuersatos et tante fidei ut in duobus diuortiis testes admissi sint. Quo audito, ait dominus papa, *Nos uix aliquem testem plusquam in uno diuortio audiremus; nedum uos homines peregrinos, ignotos, et suspectos, audiamus in tertio. Vobis ergo perpetuo silentium imponentes,* [84] *prohibemus auctoritate | apostolorum Petri et Pauli sub anathemate, ne de cetero matrimonium aliquod impetere presumatis. Et quia non est conueniens testimonium quod audiuimus, et rei ueritas aliunde plenius nobis innotuit, matrimonium confirmamus, apostolica prohibentes auctoritate, ne quis episcoporum uel quecumque persona illud audeat attemptare.* Suffusus ergo lacrimis, de sede corruens, in conspectu omnium, quantus erat, prostrauit se ad pedes comitis, ita etiam quod mitra delapsa capiti puluerulenta, postquam eum episcopi et cardinales erexerant, inter pedes stupefacti hominis inuenta est. Supplicauit itaque et suasit,

pressed the count's cause, knowing it would please the king. The count had fitted out his case with counsel and witnesses and bribed the curia, so that when the sentence was under discussion there were not two people to oppose divorce. When the pope had heard the opinions of all, concealing his own, he went back into court to finish the case; and turning to the witnesses asked them what manner of men they were. They replied that they were Normans who had come to bear witness to the truth and purge their relative from the sin and shame of incest; for they claimed that they were related to both husband and wife. He asked them how they knew of the alleged relationship, and if they were of such repute in Apulia that their word should be trusted in a case of this kind. They replied that they had long dwelt in Apulia and were of such integrity that they had already been admitted as witnesses in two divorce cases. On hearing this the pope said, 'We would be most unwilling to hear any witness whatsoever in more than one divorce suit; much less will we hear you, who are strangers, men of doubtful character and no fixed abode, in a third. We therefore impose perpetual silence on you, and forbid you under pain of anathema, by the authority of the apostles Peter and Paul, ever again to impeach the validity of any marriage. And since the testimony that we have heard is not consistent, and the truth is fully known to us from another source, we confirm the marriage, and command by papal authority that no bishop or any other person whatsoever should presume to attack it.' And then, bursting into tears, he hastened down from his seat in the sight of all, great as he was, and prostrated himself before the count so utterly that his mitre, slipping from his head and rolling in the dust, was found after the bishops and

quantum ualebat affectio patris et facundia oratoris et ueneranda fidelibus eminencia Romani pontificis, ut omni rancore deposito comes uxorem benigne reciperet, non tam iuris obsequens necessitati quam fidem exhibens et affectionem coniugii. *Et quo facias, inquit, dilectissime fili, libentius et utilius quod imploro, ecce ego, Petri successor, Christi uicarius, cui (licet indigno) clauces regni celorum tradite sunt, facio, si acq̄ueris, ut hec filia mea, uxor tua, inestimabilem tibi afferat et conferat dotem, immunitatem uidelicet peccatorum, ut quicquid hactenus peccasti a me in die iudicii exigatur dum illi de cetero serues fidem.* Omnes qui aderant conlacrimati sunt, et ipse comes madens lacrimis se promisit cum reuerencia et gaudio pariturum. Eugenius ergo comitem et mulierem ad se iussit accedere, illamque manu propria marito tradidit, dicens, *Ecce ego, Eugenius apostolice sedis episcopus, in receptione et conseruatione mulieris huius inuestio te remissione omnium peccatorum tuorum et gratia Dei, dummodo fideliter impleas promissionem.* Et [85] extrahens / anulum de digito suo, misit eum in digitum comitis, et adiecit, *Hic anulus signaculum fidei et inite pactionis testimonium coram Domino sit inter me et te, quod ego tibi in facie ecclesie tradidi coniugem, et tu eam recepisti in fidem tuam.* Et sic ab inuicem discesserunt. Hiis presens interfui, unde ea ad gloriam Dei et honorem tanti pontificis curauit diligentius enarrare.

cardinals had raised him under the feet of the dumb-¹¹⁵⁰ founded count. And he begged and entreated him, as far as a father's affection, an orator's eloquence and the venerable dignity of the Roman pontiff in the church could prevail, to put aside all ill-will and take back his wife affectionately, not merely in enforced obedience to the law, but with all the trust and love of a husband. 'And my dearest son,' he added, 'to persuade you to do as I ask more fully and freely, behold I, the successor of Peter and vicar of Christ, to whom (unworthy though I am) the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given, will grant if you consent that this my daughter, your wife, may bring and confer on you a priceless dowry, namely the forgiveness of your sins, for all the sins you have yet committed shall be laid on me in the judgment day, if henceforth you remain loyal to her.' All present wept with him, and the count himself, bathed in tears, promised to obey with reverence and joy. Then Eugenius bade the count and his wife draw near, and giving her to her husband with his own hand, said: 'Behold, I, Eugenius, bishop of the apostolic see, grant you who receive and keep this woman, remission of all your sins by the grace of God, provided you faithfully keep your word.' And taking a ring from his own finger he placed it on the count's, adding, 'Let this ring, a token of faith and contract, be a witness before God between thee and me, that I have given thee a wife in the sight of the church, and that thou hast received her into thy protection.' And so they all departed. I was present when these things happened, and have been at pains to relate them fully for the glory of God and the honour of this great pope.

XLII

HENRICVS Eboracensis archiepiscopus, cum Stephano rege Anglorum faciens pacem, promisit se daturum operam et diligenciam ut apostolicus Eustachium filium regis coronaret;¹ quod utique fieri non licebat, nisi Romani pontificis uenia impetrata. Regi enim sepe questio mota fuerat super usurpatione regni, quod contra sacramentum Henrico regi prestitum dinoscitur occupasse.² Iurauerat enim Matildi imperatrici, filie iam dicti Henrici, fidelitatem, et quod post decessum patris illam in adoptione et conseruatione Anglie et Normannie contra omnes homines adiuuaret. Querimoniam imperatricis ad papam Innocentium Vlgerius Andegauorum uenerandus antistes detulit, arguens regem periurii et illicite presumptionis regni. Sed ex aduerso steterunt a rege missi Rogerus Cestrensis episcopus, Lupellus clericus Guillermi bone memorie Cantuariensis archiepiscopi, et qui eis in causa patrocinebatur, Ernulfus archidiaconus Sagiensis, qui postea Lexouiensis episcopus /
[86] ordinatus est. Hic aduersus episcopum allegauit publice quod imperatrix patris erat indigna successione, eo quod de incestis nupciis procreata et filia fuerit monialis, quam rex Henricus de monasterio Romeseiensi extraxerat eique uelum abstulerat.³ Iuramentum confessus est, sed adie-

¹ On 25 Jan. 1151 Henry obtained possession of the church of York. He visited the curia at Easter, but failed to secure papal support for the coronation of Eustace (Poole, 'The appointment and deprivation of St William, archbishop of York', in *E.H.R.* xlv (1930) m 280; Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, pp. 163-5).

² In explaining the reasons why Eugenius refused to establish the succession in Stephen's family, John describes the litigation between Matilda and Stephen after the death of Henry I. The only other source for these proceedings is a letter of Gilbert Foliot to Brian FitzCount (Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. 110-11), and there is some controversy about the date.

XLII

WHEN Henry, archbishop of York, made his peace Jan. 1151 with king Stephen of England, he promised to endeavour by every means at his disposal to induce the pope to crown Eustace the king's son; ¹ for the coronation would never be possible unless the pope's favour were secured. For the king had frequently been charged with the usurpation of the kingdom, which everyone knew he had seized regardless of his oath to king Henry.² Indeed he had sworn fealty to the Empress Matilda, Henry's daughter, and had undertaken to help her to secure and hold England and Normandy against all men after her father's death. Ulger, the venerable bishop of Angers, had brought the empress's complaint to Pope Innocent, charging the king with perjury and unjust seizure of the kingdom. But on the other side were ranged Roger, bishop of Chester and Lupellus, clerk to William the late archbishop of Canterbury, the king's representatives, and another supporter of their cause, Arnulf archdeacon of Sééz, who later became bishop of Lisieux. He publicly alleged in answer to the bishop's charge that the empress was not entitled to succeed her father, because she had been born of an incestuous union and was the daughter of a nun whom Henry had dragged from the monastery of Romsey and deprived of her veil.³

Chartrou (*L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151*, pp. 240-3) suggested 1136 when Innocent II held a council at Pisa; but since Gilbert's letter states that the litigation took place in a council at Rome, 1139, Poole's date, seems more likely.

³ This charge was particularly ill-founded, since Anselm himself had heard the case of Matilda's mother, declared her free to marry, and officiated at the ceremony (Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.*, *R.S.* pp. 121 sqq.). The evidence about the oaths and last wishes of Henry I was more confused and contradictory.

cit uiolenter extortum, et sub conditione, scilicet, imperatrici successionem patris se pro uiribus seruaturum, nisi patrem uoluntatem mutare contingeret et heredem alium instituere; poterat enim esse ut ei de uxore filius nasceretur. Postremo subiecit quod rex Henricus mutauerat uoluntatem et in extremis agens filium sororis sue Stephanum designauit heredem. Et hec iuramento comitis Hugonis et duorum militum probata esse dicebat, in facie ecclesie Anglicane, Guillelmo Cantuariensi archiepiscopo, sedis apostolice legato, qui recepta probatione Stephanum unanimi consilio et uoluntate episcoporum et procerum sublimauit in regem: unde quod tanta sollempnitate factum est, intulit retractari non posse.

Ad hoc prefatus Ulgerius, qui ceteris Galliarum / [87] episcopis tam etate quam litterarum et morum titulo et inflexibili rigore iusticie et libertate spiritus preminebat, in archidiaconum exandescens, *Mirum est, inquit, Ernulfe, qua fronte nunc persequeris mortuum quem uiuum semper adorasti, sicut patres, fratres tui, et cognatio uniuersa, qui te et totum genus tuum erexit de stercore.*¹ *Mirum est qua impudencia sic mentiris, nisi quia totum genus tuum loquax est et sublimari meruit uite maculis et arte et audacia mentiendi. Hiis artibus apud Normannos estis insignes. Et qui uelut proditor defunctum dominum condempnas incesti, aduersus matrem tuam sanctam Romanam ecclesiam, calcaneum con-*

¹ cf. Psalms cxii.7. Nothing is known of the origin of Arnulf's family. His uncle, John, was archdeacon of Sééz and later bishop of Lisieux; his brother John was archdeacon, then bishop of Sééz, and two of his nephews rose to high preferment in the church. (Barlow, *Letters of Arnulf of Lisieux*, pp. xi-xii). Though Ulger plainly exaggerates, the family, which in Arnulf's lifetime had become an ecclesiastical dynasty, probably owed its advancement to Henry I.

He did not deny the oath, but maintained that it had¹¹³⁹ been extorted by force and was conditional only: namely that he would uphold the empress's right to succeed her father to the best of his ability unless her father changed his mind and named another heir; for it was still possible that a son might be born to him and his wife. Afterwards, he declared, king Henry had changed his mind, and on his death-bed had designated his sister's son, Stephen, as his heir. And he declared that this had been proved publicly before the English church to William, archbishop of Canterbury and legate of the holy see, by the oath of earl Hugh and two knights; and that on hearing the proof the archbishop had recognised Stephen's claim to the crown with the unanimous consent and approval of the bishops and nobles. What had been done with such ceremony could not, he concluded, be undone.

On hearing this Ulger, the leading bishop of Gaul, outstanding both for his age and learning and good repute and for his unbending justice and freedom of mind, flared up at the archdeacon, and cried: 'I marvel, Arnulf, at your presumption in attacking now he is dead the man whom you and your fathers and brothers and whole family worshipped as long as he was alive; the man who raised you and all your kindred from the dust.¹ I would marvel at the shamelessness of your lies were it not that your whole race is garrulous and deserves to be held up as an example of sinful life and skill and effrontery in lying. In these arts you are conspicuous even among the Normans. Further, by treacherously accusing your dead lord of incest, you lift up your heel against your

tumaciter erigis.¹ *Ipsa enim confirmavit matrimonium quod accusas,² filiamque ex eo susceptam dominus Paschalis Romanus pontifex inunxit in imperatricem.³ Quod utique non fecisset de filia monialis, nec eum ueritas latere poterat, quia non fuit* [88] *obscurum matrimonium aut contractum in tenebris, quas desiderant opera similium tui. Rex enim nobilissimus regis illustris filiam sollempniter duxit. Quod regem dicis mutasse uoluntatem, conuincetur falsum per illos in quorum manibus idem rex expirauit. Nec tibi nec Hugoni de ultima uoluntate constare potuit, quia pariter aberatis. Probatio quam receptam fingis, obesse non potest imperatrici, quia absens et que citata non fuerat nullo iure potuit condemnari, presertim ab hiis qui non erant iudices eius sed subditi et ei iuramento et fidelitate tenebantur astricti et in simili crimine uersabantur. Non tulit ulterius contentiones eorum dominus Innocentius, nec sententiam ferre uoluit aut causam in aliud differre tempus: sed contra consilium quorundam cardinalium et maxime Guidonis presbiteri sancti Marci, receptis muneribus regis Stephani, ei familiaribus litteris regnum Anglie confirmavit et ducatum Normannie. Ulgerius uero, cum cognitioni cause supersederi uideret, uerbo comico utebatur, dicens de causa sua querentibus, *Intus despondebitur;*⁴ et adiciebat, *Petrus enim peregre profectus est, nummulariis relicta domo.**

Postea cum prefatus Guido cardinalis promoueretur in papam Celestinum, fauore imperatricis, scripsit domino Theobaldo Cantuariensi archiepiscopo, inhibens

¹ St John xiii. 18. John quotes from this text on page 74.

² Gilbert Foliot says that Ulger made no reply to the charge of illegitimacy. cf. *supra*, Introduction, p. xliii. No doubt John constructed this defence from arguments he had heard used on other occasions.

³ Matilda never received imperial coronation from Paschal; she was crowned by the anti-pope Gregory VIII in 1118. Giesebrecht noted that she was never given the title of Empress in any official documents (*Geschichte*, iii 1213).

⁴ Terence, *Andria*, 980

mother, the holy Roman church; ¹ for the church confirmed the marriage which you attack, ² and lord Paschal, ¹¹³⁹ bishop of Rome, anointed the daughter born of it as empress. ³ This he could never have done to a nun's daughter, nor was he ignorant of the truth, for it was not a secret marriage contracted in the darkness dear to the works of men like you: on the contrary a highly-born king solemnly married the daughter of a famous monarch. As for your statement that the king changed his mind, it is proved false by those who were present at the king's death. Neither you nor Hugh could possibly know his last requests, since neither was there. The proof that you claim was accepted cannot injure the empress; for since she was neither present nor duly cited she could not be lawfully condemned, least of all by men who were not her judges but her subjects, bound to her by oaths and fealty and involved in the same offence.' Pope Innocent would not hear their arguments any further: nor would he pronounce sentence or adjourn the case to a later date; but acting against the advice of certain cardinals, especially Guy, cardinal priest of St Mark, he accepted king Stephen's gifts and in friendly letters confirmed his occupation of the kingdom of England and duchy of Normandy. Ulger for his part, when he learned that the hearing had been suspended, made a witty saying, remarking to those who inquired after his case, 'The bethrothal will take place indoors,' ⁴ and adding, 'for Peter has left home, and the house is given over to money-changers.'

Later when the same cardinal Guy was with the ¹¹⁴³⁻⁴ empress's support raised to the papacy as Celestine, he wrote to lord Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury forbidding him to allow any change to be made in the

ne qua fieret innouatio in regno Anglie circa coronam, quia res erat litigiosa cuius translatio iure reprobata est. Successores eius papa Lucius et Eugenius eandem prohibitionem innouauerunt. / Vnde contigit ut prefatus Eboracensis archiepiscopus promotionem Eustachii non potuerit impetrare.

XLIII

OBIIIT HVGO abbas sancti Augustini Cantuarie, cui successit Silvester eiusdem ecclesie prior.¹ Sed electio eius apud multos suspensionem contraxit symonie, eo quod rex quingentas marcas accepit ut abbate defuncto liceret monachis libere quem uellent eligere et ecclesie uacantis bona pro arbitrio dispensare. Et quia prior contraxit et soluit et electus est, hanc incurrit suspensionem. Ceterum, quia non erat qui publice crimen argueret (quod nec tutum erat, quia regem ipsum et aule² capitaneos contingebat), Cantuariensis archiepiscopus confirmauit electionem. Sed de loco benedictionis contentio suborta est ex causa quorundam priuilegiorum statuentium ut abbas eiusdem loci in proprio monasterio benedictionem recipiat nec alio trahatur. Ipsa tamen priuilegia suspecta habebantur, tum quia concepta non erant in ea scribendi forma quam sequitur ecclesia Romana, tum quia ex collatione scripture et bulle uidebantur non esse pontificum quorum nomina

¹ Silvester had already incurred Theobald's displeasure by leading the resistance of the monks during the interdict. *Supra*, pp. 46, 51.

² In twelfth-century terminology the *aula* and *camera* were still regarded

position of the English crown, since the transfer of it had been justly denounced, and the matter was still under dispute. His successors Popes Lucius and Eugenius repeated the same prohibition. So it came about that the archbishop of York, as I was saying, could do nothing to further the coronation of Eustace.

XLIII

HUGH, abbot of St Augustine's Canterbury, died and was succeeded by Silvester, prior of that monastery.¹ But his election gave rise to widespread suspicion of simony, because the king had accepted five hundred marks to allow the monks complete freedom of election and the unimpeded disposal of their goods during the vacancy. Since the prior made the agreement, paid the money, and was elected, he came under suspicion. However, as no one would openly accuse him of the crime (indeed it was scarcely safe, since it touched the king himself and the officials² of the household) the archbishop of Canterbury confirmed the election. Next a dispute arose about the place of consecration, since certain privileges laid down that the abbot of this house should be consecrated in his own monastery and not dragged elsewhere. However the authenticity of these same privileges was questioned, both because they were not drawn up in the style of handwriting always used in the papal curia and because, by comparison of the text and bull it was evident that they could not have been

as the two great branches of the royal household. Herbert of Bosham speaks of Thomas Becket as *aulae cancellarius*. Cf. Tout, *Chapters in the Administrative History of Medieval England*, i 139 n. 1; ii 315 n. 4.

preferabant.¹ Preterea non usi fuerant hac consuetudine, quia abbates alios sancti Augustini in ecclesiis archiepiscopi benedictionem recepisse constabat. In annum fere protracta contentio tandem ad dominum Eugenium delata est.²

XLIV

DEFVNGITVR SIGERIVS abbas Sancti Dionisii, ecclesiam/
[90] suam in optimo relinquens statu. Succedit ei [Odo]³ primus abbas Compendiense, qui et sancti Dyonisii monachus fuerat. Sed immemor beneficiorum Sigerii, totam cognacionem eius delere conatus est, et ecclesiam attenuavit et lesit in multis.⁴ Non erat qui Sigerii cognatos protegeret, rege dissimulante et quosdam eorum persequente, eo quod Symon, prefati Sigerii nepos, indignationem eius incurrerat, et ex suspicione nominis odiosi cancellariam regis amiserat, et eliminatus a regno confugit ad dominum Eugenium. A quo benigne receptus, sine exemplo sed non sine admiratione, in litteris protectionis preter formam communem hoc emeruit priuilegium, ut nonnisi in presentia summi pontificis cogi posset super aliquo crimine respondere. Tandem patrocinate Eugenio contra Christianissimum et amicissimum principem, eidem Symoni pax reformata

¹ This illustrates John's close knowledge of the methods of detecting forgery employed in the Papal Curia.

² Eugenius instructed Theobald to consecrate the abbot of St Augustine's without exacting any profession from him, but the archbishop appealed again, and ultimately Silvester was forced to make the customary profession (Poole, *Hist. Pont.*, pp. li-lii).

³ There is a gap in the Berne manuscript, and the name is supplied from Mabillon's text (*Sancti Bernardi Opera*, Paris, 1719, i, lxxx (note to ep. 285)).

issued by the popes whose names they bore.¹ Further the custom had never been observed, for it was known that other abbots of St Augustine's had been consecrated in churches belonging to the archbishop. The dispute dragged on for nearly a year and was finally referred to lord Eugenius.²

XLIV

SUGER, abbot of St Denis, died leaving his church ^{12 Jan. 1151} in perfect order. He was succeeded by Odo,³ first abbot of Compiègne, who had also been a monk of St Denis. But forgetting the achievements of Suger, he strove to ruin his whole family, and weakened and injured the church in many ways.⁴ No-one could be found to protect Suger's relatives, since the king temporised and avenged himself on some of them because Simon, Suger's nephew, had incurred his anger and been dismissed from the king's chancery on account of his unpopularity and forced to leave the kingdom to take refuge with lord Eugenius. Welcomed by the pope, he was granted letters of protection containing, as well as the common form, a privilege—unprecedented but not unremarkable—exempting him from answering any charge except in the presence of the pope himself. Finally, since Eugenius had supported Simon against the most Christian and most beloved prince, he was received into

⁴ There is very little evidence for judging Odo's actions. Though Eugenius evidently regarded his treatment of Simon as unjust, St Bernard wrote very warmly on Odo's behalf (ep. 285-7).

est, episcopis grauitur ferentibus iam dicti priuilegii formam, quod prestare uidetur audaciam delinquendi et criminum conscios ad simile priuilegium animare.

XLV

DEFUNCTO Roberto Lundoniensi episcopo quem multi ueneno periisse suspicati sunt,¹ precepit dominus Eugenius clero Lundoniensi, quatinus eligerent infra tres menses uirum honestum et litteratum et religionis habitu decoratum.² Illi timentes uniuersitatem suam excludi miserunt ad ecclesiam Romanam et hanc nouissime clausule reportauerunt in litteris apostolicis interpretationem, ut non modo monachi et canonici [91] regulares, sed etiam illi quos uulgas / seculares nominat, intelligantur religionis habitu decorati; quia quando quis attondetur in clericum, sicut ipsius benedictionis edocent uerba, tunc habitum sacre religionis assumit. In ipsa tamen curia fuere nonnulli qui hanc interpretationem causarentur ineptam uel anterioris mandati formam fuisse superfluam, nisi forte timebat apostolicus ne Lundonienses aliquem de laicis in episcopum eligere destinarent. Rex uero eis eligendi libertatem concedere noluit antequam quingentas libras, exemplo monachorum sancti Augustini, ei appenderint. Quo facto electus est Ricardus eiusdem ecclesie archidiaconus, qui prefatam peccuniam, non sine nota symonie, dinoscitur

¹ John of Hexham (§23, in Simeon of Durham *Opera* (R.S. ii 324) declares that he died from eating poisoned grapes; but he is the only other chronicler who hints at poison.

² Eugenius' intervention was designed to prevent baronial interference.

favour: though the bishops were gravely perturbed at the form of this privilege, which seemed to confirm sinners in their misdeeds, and encourage men guilty of crimes to seek similar privileges.

XLV

AFTER the death of Robert, bishop of London, by poisoning as the rumour went,¹ lord Eugenius instructed the clergy of London to elect within three months a man of good morals, literate and 'clad in the habit of religion.'² They, fearing that this prevented them from electing one of their own number, sent to Rome and brought back papal letters which gave this interpretation of the last clause: that not only monks and regular canons, but also those who are popularly known as 'seculars' might be described as 'clad in the habit of religion;' for when anyone received the clerical tonsure—as the words of consecration explain—he straightway puts on the garb of holy religion. In the curia itself there were some who argued that this interpretation was foolish, or else that the clause in the first mandate was superfluous unless by chance the pope feared that the Londoners intended to elect some layman as bishop. The king for his part would not grant them freedom to elect until they had paid him five hundred marks, after the precedent of the monks of St Augustine's. When this had been done, Richard, archdeacon of London, was elected; ¹¹⁵¹ not without suspicion of simony, since he was known to

See Gilbert Foliot, ep. 95; and Z. N. Brooke, *The English Church and the Papacy*, p. 183.

exsoluisse; ea namque tempestate sub optentu libertatis redimende prauitatem symoniacam plurimi palliabant.

XLVI

REX STEPHANVS et Matillis uxor sua fundant monasterium de Fauresham in Cancia eique Clarembaldus . . .¹

¹ Clarembald was consecrated abbot of Faversham on 11 November 1148. The text breaks off abruptly at this point.

have handed over the money, and at that time many¹¹⁵² concealed the sin of simony under pretext of redeeming a right.

XLVI

KING STEPHEN and Matilda his wife founded the¹¹⁴⁸ monastery of Faversham in Kent, and Clarembald¹ [became abbot].

APPENDIX

I

HENRY OF BLOIS AT THE PAPAL CURIA

THE EVIDENCE for Henry of Blois' visit to the curia after the Council of Rheims is extremely confused and contradictory. We have the following contemporary evidence:

(1) The account in the *Historia Pontificalis*. John of Salisbury states that when Henry had been suspended for his non-appearance at the Council of Rheims he was ordered to seek absolution in person within six months. Later, without specifying the date, John says that Henry came to seek absolution, and also petitioned in vain for a renewal of his legateship and privileges for the see of Winchester. Although the place is not specified, the description of Henry, outstanding in the curia for his venerable appearance, buying up old statues in Rome implies that the curia was in Rome at the time. John concludes that he could not return through north Italy and Burgundy because of the dangers of the route, and took the sea-route home calling at Compostella. This is the fullest and most reliable account that we have, but unfortunately John gives no dates: and as the *Historia Pontificalis* consists of a number of disconnected episodes and is not chronological at this point the place of the visit in the narrative is no help in dating it.

(2) A charter granted to Cluny by Henry of Blois, dated 1149, and describing himself as *rediens a Roma* at Cluny. (*Chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny*, ed. A. Bruel, v 488). This cannot

be earlier than Christmas 1148 (if the dating of the year began at Christmas) or later than 24 March 1150 (if, as is more probable, it began at the Annunciation). This is the one solid piece of evidence available, and establishes that Henry was returning 'from Rome' between these dates. But Rome at this period was used loosely to mean the Papal Curia wherever it might be; and I do not think we should be justified in citing it as positive proof that Henry had just returned from the city of Rome and not from Viterbo.

(3) The statement of John of Hexham that Henry went to 'Rome' in 1149 to secure absolution, and brought back letters from Eugenius, addressed to Henry archbishop of York, commanding him to cease molesting Henry's nephew, Hugh du Puiset (Simeon of Durham, R.S., ii 322). Since from 1140-53 the text of John of Hexham is dated consistently one year too late this date has been corrected to 1148 by his editor.

(4) The statement of the Winchester annalist (*Annales Monastici*, R.S., ii 54-5) that he visited Rome in 1151 to refute the charges brought against him by the monks of Hyde and St Bernard. The dating of the Winchester annalist is not reliable for this period.

(5) An undated letter from Henry to Suger, abbot of St Denis, asking him to obtain a safe-conduct for him from the countess of Flanders, since the hostility of the Angevins prevents him crossing Normandy (Bouquet, xv 494-5). The probable date is 1148-49; but it proves no more than that Henry was contemplating a visit to Rome at this period and hoped to travel and return by way of Flanders.

The conclusion reached by Poole was that though John spoke of one visit only, Henry in fact went twice, once in the autumn of 1148 to obtain absolution, returning by way of Cluny: and a second time in 1151, returning by Compostella

in 1152. This conclusion has been accepted by Gleber (*Papst Eugen III*, pp. 98, 165) and Voss (*Heinrich von Blois*, p. 65 n. 57).

The difficulties in accepting this interpretation are:

1. John of Salisbury speaks of one visit only, and he is the most reliable witness.

2. It is impossible that the second visit was so late, because:

(i) Theobald was granted the legateship not later than March 1150; it must therefore be assumed that Henry had left England before that date, since he was seeking the legateship for himself.

(ii) John writes as though the second visit was paid to the city of Rome: but the curia was at Rome only from 28 November 1149 to mid-June 1150.

Another possible interpretation is that Henry paid only one visit, and there is a *prima facie* case for this, since no authority clearly mentions two visits. But there are difficulties too in assuming that John of Salisbury is entirely right, and that Henry paid one visit only to the curia, whilst it was in Rome. The chief objection in John's own statement that he returned by Compostella. The curia did not reach Rome till the end of November; Henry's business seems to have been lengthy, yet we know from the Cluny charter that he was at Cluny not later than 24 March. This does not leave him time for more than a very hasty visit to Compostella; and moreover, in view of the difficulties he had in traversing northern Europe, seems to make a return from Compostella by way of Cluny pointless. This interpretation would also involve rejecting the dates of both John of Hexham (corroborated by the *Gesta Stephani* ed. K. R. Potter, pp. 141-2) and the Winchester annalist.

The evidence is still open to different interpretations, since it is impossible that all the contemporary statements should be

entirely true, and opinions on what should be rejected may reasonably differ.¹ My own belief is that Henry paid two visits to the curia:

(1) The first in the autumn of 1148, to secure absolution within the prescribed limit, returning by Cluny where he granted a charter early in 1149. If Suger secured the desired safe-conduct, he could then have completed his journey through Flanders, carrying the letters mentioned by John of Hexham.

(2) The second in 1149-50, during the period of papal residence at Rome. He must have left England before it was known there that Eugenius had granted the legateship; and he returned by sea calling at Compostella.

Such an interpretation involves recognising two errors in contemporary sources:

(1) The date in the Winchester chronicle would then be a year out. There is no difficulty in believing this.

(2) John of Salisbury would be wrong in stating that Henry transacted all his business in one visit only, and in view of John's reliability this is harder to accept. But the alternative is to believe that he is wrong in the details he gives of Henry's return home. I think it is more likely that he telescoped two visits, the more so if he were at St Omer when Henry first came to seek absolution, and so was an eye-witness of one visit only, than that he was guilty of plain error of fact in describing Henry's route home.

¹ For another suggestion see C. N. L. Brooke, App. I to the *Letters of John of Salisbury*, vol. i.

II

SIGEBERT OF GEMBOUX

SIGEBERT was born about 1030 and entered the monastery of Gembloux at an early age. After a period of teaching at Metz he returned to Gembloux shortly after 1071 and settled down to a life of study and writing. He produced several short biographies, and the chronological difficulties in which these involved him induced him to attempt his great chronicle. This work was designed as a continuation of the chronicle of Jerome, and began in 381. The early part aimed almost exclusively at establishing the chronology of events important in his estimation, and fixing the dates of kings, emperors, popes and saints: the later part from 1024 was more detailed, and towards the end he even incorporated the text of a few letters in his narrative. He carried on the work until his death in 1112. From this point there are a number of continuations, including one made in his own monastery by Anselm, abbot of Gembloux from 1113-36, and others who brought it up to the year 1148; and an independent version of Robert of Torigni, who gave specially full details of events in France. It was the continuation made at Gembloux that was known to John, who treats the whole chronicle with its later accretions as the work of Sigebert.

It was becoming known even before its completion, for Ekkehard, abbot of Aura, referred to it in 1105, and thereafter most of the great chroniclers were familiar with it. Amongst the many who made use of it are Ralph de Diceto, Alberic of Trois Fontaines, Matthew Paris and Vincent of Beauvais.

Sigebert's life and works are described briefly by Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1931) iii 332-46; and in detail by S. Hirsch, *De vita et scriptis Sigeberti* (Berlin, 1841). A detailed description of the various continuations will be found in Pertz, *M.G.H.* vi.

III

JOHN OF SALISBURY AND GILBERT DE LA PORRÉE

THE VALUE of John of Salisbury's record of the proceedings against Gilbert de la Porrée at Rheims has been fully discussed by R. L. Poole (*Hist. Pont.* Preface, iv and *Illustrations of the History of Medieval Thought*, ch. vi). The many works on twelfth-century theology written since 1927 have on the whole confirmed his main conclusions whilst modifying some of the details. Gilbert's trinitarian doctrines have been discussed in detail by A. Hayen in 'Le Concile de Rheims et l'erreur théologique de Gilbert de la Porrée' (*Arch. hist. doct. litt. moyen age* x (1935-36) 26-102), who comes to the conclusion that, though Gilbert was not guilty of heresy and was not formally condemned by the Council of Rheims, his work was found to contain theological error. Gilbert's doctrine and contemporary interpretations of it have been examined by M. E. Williams, 'The teaching of Gilbert Porreta on the Trinity' (*Analecta Gregoriana*, 1951). For a consideration of the thought and influence of Gilbert, and a bibliography of recent work on the subject, see J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique au xii^e siècle* (2nd edition, 1948), pp. 175-80.

IV

STEPHEN'S LOMBARD GRANDMOTHER

THE REFERENCE in the *Historia Pontificalis* to the boast of cardinals Octavian and Guy that they were *cognati* of the King of England 'because his grandmother was a Lombard' is baffling. Poole (*Hist. Pont.* Appendix IV) pointed out that as Stephen's maternal grandmother is known to have been William the Conqueror's wife, Matilda of Flanders, this must be his paternal grandmother. Stephen's father Stephen was the son of Theobald of Blois, who married first Gersendis of Maine and, after the dissolution of this marriage, Adela of Valois. Gersendis later married Azzo Marquess of Liguria. There is also a possibility that Theobald had a second wife, Gandrea, mentioned in one charter only as the mother of the elder Stephen, and otherwise unknown. The parentage of the two cardinals is not known with certainty: but Poole conjectures (1) that the elder Stephen was the son of Gersendis of Maine; (2) that Gandrea is a variant of Gersendis 'for we can hardly suppose that Theobald married two ladies named respectively Gersendis and Gandrea', and (3) that the cardinals merely claimed to be fellow-countrymen of the lady, who, as a result of her second marriage, 'acquired an Italian status'.

G. H. White, however, has produced a serious objection to this theory ('The Parentage of Herbert the Chamberlain' in *Notes and Queries*, clxii (June 1932), 439-453). He points out that if Stephen were the son of Gersendis of Maine he would have inherited his mother's claim to Maine; but no such claim was ever put forward or even hinted at. He therefore revives the claims of Gandrea, first put forward by Kate Norgate and rejected by Poole more summarily than logically, but observes that even if Gandrea were the second wife of Stephen there is

no proof that she was a Lombard, or even if she were a Lombard that she was related to the cardinals.

In 1160 Arnulf of Lisieux, describing the election of Octavian as the antipope Victor IV, refers to some of his English supporters who said they were his relatives (Letter 28, ed. Barlow p. 43); and John of Salisbury speaks of Henry bishop of Winchester and Hugh bishop of Durham as Octavian's supporters (ep. 59 [ed. Millor, Butler and Brooke, no. 124]). Since Henry was the brother of Stephen of Blois this gives some support to Octavian's boast to be related to Stephen. But we are still left with some doubt as to whether there were any solid genealogical grounds for the cardinals' boast; and I suspect that if there was a relationship it was more remote than they imply, and that they may have been mistaken. Since Arnulf corroborates John it seems reasonable to suppose that the cardinals did make a claim to kinship: but that in itself is no proof that kinship existed; and the available evidence is inadequate to establish any solid family connection.

V

THE DIVORCE OF HUGH OF MOLISE

WHILST the most likely date for the divorce proceedings between Hugh II of Molise and his first wife is 1150 when the pope was at Ceprano, it is impossible to be certain that the case was not heard later.

The clearest discussion of the identity of Hugh of Molise's first wife is given by E. M. Jamison, 'I Conti di Molise e di Marsia nei secoli XII-XIII' (Convegno storico abruzzese molisano, Casalbordino 1932), pp. 89-94. She discusses a charter of Countess Adelaide of Molise, an illegitimate daughter of King Roger, who was still alive in 1206 and describes herself as the wife of Count Hugh; and points out that it is most unlikely that this is the lady from whom Hugh sought divorce in 1150, as King Roger was assisting him in the case. Her conclusion is that Hugh had married a relative of Ptolemy II of Tusculum whilst he was a rebel against the king, and later wished to free himself to marry the king's daughter: and further, judging from the behaviour of the bishops, that the divorce had already been granted in the kingdom of Sicily and the new marriage contracted. There is no evidence to suggest whether the reconciliation effected by Eugenius was only temporary, or whether Adelaide was obliged to retire to Palermo, though still regarding herself as the wife of Count Hugh. But since the 1206 charter calls her the wife of Count Hugh, and since, as John of Salisbury points out in another place, many of the decisions of Eugenius were later reversed, I think that of the two alternatives it is more probable that the reconciliation of Hugh and his first wife, effected about 1150 by Eugenius, was no more lasting than his equally moving reconciliation of Louis VII and Eleanor of Aquitaine shortly before.

This paper is important, since R. L. Poole (*Hist. Pont.*, App. V) appears to regard the illegitimate daughter of King Roger (whom Hugh Falcandus calls the widow of Count Hugh in 1160) and the relative of Ptolemy of Tusculum from whom Hugh sought divorce in 1150 as one and the same person. Miss Jamison has clearly demonstrated that Hugh was twice married, though the evidence for the identity of his first wife is mainly negative. There are no grounds for regarding her as either Countess Clementia of Catanzaro, or Sichelgaita, Clementia's mother. The evidence is fully discussed in Miss Jamison's paper, but since this is not easily accessible, and R. L. Poole's note is confusing, the argument has been summarised here.

- Abailard, Peter, xi, xxxi, xli, xlii, 16, 19, 63
 Abana, river, 57
 Adela of Valois, wife of Theobald III of Blois, 97
 Adelaide, Queen, mother of Louis VII, 69
 — illegitimate daughter of Roger II, second wife of Hugh II of Molise, 99-100
 Adrian IV, pope (1154-59), xii, xxxiii, xlv
 Aimery of Limoges, patriarch of Jerusalem, 73
 Albéric, archbishop of Trèves, 5
 — (formerly abbot of Vézelay), Cardinal bishop of Ostia, xxvii, 20
 — of Rheims, archbishop of Bourges, 19
 — of Trois Fontaines, 95
 Alexander I, king of Scotland, 72 n 4
 Ambrose, St, xxvi
 — *De fide* of, cited, 30
 Anacletus II, antipope (1130-38). *See* Peter Leonis
 Anagni, 65
 Angers, bishop of. *See* Ulger
 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, xxxiii n 1
 Anjou, count of. *See* Geoffrey
 Anselm, abbot of Gembloux, continuation of Sigebert, xlvii, 95
 — bishop of Havelberg, 21 n 1
 — St, archbishop of Canterbury (1093-1109), xi, xxxiv, 83 n 3
 — of Laon, 19
 Antioch, xlv, xlv, 11 n 2, 52-3, 54 n 1, 61, 73
 — prince of. *See* Raymond
 Antipope. *See* Anacletus II, Gregory VIII, Paschal III, Victor IV
 Apulia, 80, 81
 Aquapendente, 62
 Aristotle, xiv, xvi, xxvi
 — *Categorias* of, cited, 33 n 2, 34 nn 1-4
 — *De Interpretatione* of, cited, 33 n 2, 35 n 1, 37 n 2
 Arius, 28, 31
 Armagh, archbishop of, 72 n 5. *See* Malachy, St
 Arndt, editor of the *Historia Pontificalis*, xix, xlix, 1
 Arnold, abbot of Brescia, xviii, xxxviii, xli, 50 n 1, 63-5
 — canon of Poitiers, 16
 Arnulf, archdeacon of Seez, later bishop of Lisieux (1141-81), xxxv, xxxvii, 44 n 3, 47 n 2, 54-6, 83, 84, 98
 Arras, xxii
 Attalia, 11 n 2
 Augustine, St, bishop of Hippo, xxvi, xxvii, xxxii, 17, 27
 — *Hypognosticon* attributed to, cited, 31
 — *De Libero Arbitrio* of, cited, 31 n 5
 — *De Trinitate* of, cited, 37
 Aura, abbot of. *See* Ekkehard
 Authors cited by John of Salisbury:
 St Ambrose, *De fide*, 30
 Aristotle, *Categorias*, 34; *De Interpretatione*, 35, 37
 St Augustine, *Hypognosticon* (attributed to), 31; *De Trinitate*, 37
 Boethius, *De Arithmetica*, 32; *De Differentiis Topicis*, 34; *De Trinitate*, 36, 38
 Cato, *Distichs*, 3
 Cicero, *De Inventione*, 34
 Geoffrey of Auxerre, *Libellus*, 24
 St Hilary, *De Synodis*, 39, 40; *De Trinitate*, 29-30, 37, 40, 41
 Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, 27; *Satires*, 79

INDEX

- Authors cited:
 Lucan, *Pharsalia*, 42, 74
 Ovid, *Heroides*, 53; Plato, *Timaeus*, 32, 36
 Priscian, *Institutiones grammaticae*, 34
 Terence, *Adelphoe*, 44; *Andria*, 85
 Virgil, *Aeneid*, 43, 60
 See also Biblical citations
 Autun, bishop of, 6, 68
 Auxentius, bishop of Milan, 39-40
 Auxerre, 5
 Azzo, Marquess of Liguria, 97
- Baldwin, abbot of Châtillon-sur-Seine, 17
 — son of Thierry of Flanders, 56
 Bartholomew, bishop of Laon, 12 n 1, 13, 53
 Beauvais, bishop of. See Henry
 Bede, xxxiii, 2
 Belmeis, family of, 46 n 3
 Benedict of Peterborough, xi
 Benevento, treaty of (1156), 66 n 3, 67 n 2
 Bernard, St, abbot of Clairvaux, xviii, xxii, xxv, xxxvi, xxxix, xli, xlvi, 12 n 1, 14, 15 sqq., 60 n 1, 63 n 2, 64, 69 n 3, 77, 87 n 4, 92
 — his articles on the Trinity cited, 24
 — *De Consideratione* of, 25
 — *In cant. sermones* of, 25
 — of Chartres, xiii
 Berne, manuscript of *Historia Pontificalis* at, xlvii-1, 87 n 3
 Bible, Douai translation of, 1
 Biblical citations, 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 46, 48, 52, 54, 65, 70, 74, 75, 76, 77, 84, 85
 Boethius, *De Arithmetica*, cited, 32
 — *Commentary on Aristotle*, cited, 33 n 2, 34 nn 1-4, 35 n 1, 37 n 2
 — *De Differentiis topicis*, cited, 34 n 5
 — *De Trinitate*, cited, 36, 38
 Bordeaux, archbishop of. See Geoffrey
 Boso, Cardinal, xxxiii, 62 n 1
 Bourg-Dieu, abbot of, 5
 Bourges, archbishop of, 5
 Brescia, xxi, xxxiii, 45
 — abbot of. See Arnold
 Brian FitzCount, 83 n 2
 Burgundians, 80
 Burgundy, 91
- Caesar, Julius, xxxii
 Calabria, xlv, 60 n 3, 80
 Calixtus II, pope (1119-24), 72
 Calo, canon and (later) bishop of Poitiers, 16
 Cambrai, right of gabelle in, 56
 Campania, 61
 Canterbury, xx, 1, 7
 — archbishop of, 72. See Anselm, Lanfranc, Theobald, Thomas Becket, William
 Canterbury, St Augustine's, xliii; abbey and monks of, 46-7, 51-2; privileges of, 86-7
 — abbot of. See Hugh, Silvester
 — prior of. See Silvester, William
 — sacristan of. See William
 Canterbury, Christ Church, xlix
 Capua, archbishop of. See Hugh, Peter
 — prince of. See Robert
 — principality of, 61
 Cashel, archbishop of, 72 n 5
 Cassiodorus, 2
 Cato, *Distichs*, cited, 3
 Celestine II, pope (1143-4), 13. See Guy de Castello, cardinal priest of St Mark
 Cencius, cardinal deacon of St Mary in Aquiro, 71
 Cencius Frangipani, 59
 Ceprano, 61, 62, 66, 99
 Châlons, archdeacon of. See Robert de Bosco
 Chancellor, papal. See Guy of Pisa.
 Charles the Good, count of Flanders, 56 n 1
 Chartres, bishop of, xx
 — necrology of, xi
 — schools of, xii, xiii, xix
 Chester, bishop of. See Roger
 Chichester, bishop of. See Hilary

- Chronicles, book of, 1
 Cicero, *De Inventione*, cited, 34 n 5
 Cinnamus, xlv
 Clairvaux, xxii, 43, 70
 Clarembald, abbot of Faversham, 89
 Clementia of Catanzaro, 100
 Cluny, 63, 91-4
 Cologne, archbishop of, 10
 Compostella, xxix, 80, 91-4
 Conrad III, king of the Romans, xvii, xlv, 2, 11, 12, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59 n 1, 66 n 3, 75
 Constance of Antioch, wife of Raymond, 73
 Constantine, Donation of, 69 n 1
 Constantinople, 58 n 1, 59
 Corfu, 60 n 2
 Coventry, bishop of. See Gerard Pucelle
 Crassantinus, bishop of Mantua, 50
 Cremona, council of (1148), xviii n 1, xxi, xxiii, xlvi, 50
 Crusade, Second, xvii, xxxvii, xxxviii, xl, xlii, xliii-xlv, xlviii, 11-12, 45, 52-9
- Damascus, siege of, xlv, 56, 57
 Divorce suits, xxxviii-xxxix, xlv, 12-13, 80-2, 99
 Dublin, archbishopric of, 72 n 5
 Durham, bishop of. See Hugh du Puiset
- Eadmer of Canterbury, bishop-elect of St Andrews (elected 1120, resigned without consecration, 1121), xxxiv, 72 n 4
 Edessa, 54
 Ekkehard, abbot of Aura, 95
 Eleanor of Aquitaine, queen of France, wife of Louis VII and later of Henry II of England, xvii, xxi, xlv, 52-3, 60-2, 99
 — daughter of Ralph I or IV of Vermandois, 14 n 2, 15 n 2
 Esdras, book of, 1
 Eugenius III, pope (1145-53), xvii, xviii, xxi, xxii, xxiii, xxix n 4, xxxviii, xxxix, xli, xlii, xlv, xlvii, 5, 7-13, 20-5, 41, 43, 45, 47, 50-1, 55, 59-62, 64-72, 74-5, 76-83, 86-8, 92, 94, 99
 Eunus, the heretic, 3 n 1
 Eusebius of Caesarea, xxxii, 1
 Eustace, son of King Stephen, xvii, 78 n 2, 83, 86
 Eutychian heresy, 31
- Faversham, abbey of, 89
 Fécamp, abbey of, 6
 Ferentino, 70
 Ferrières, abbey of, 6
 Flanders, 72, 94
 — count of. See Charles the Good, Philip of Alsace, Thierry of Alsace
 — countess of, 92
 Fleury, abbey of, xlvii
 Florus, xxxii
 Framlingham, castle of, 49
 Frangipani, family of, 59
 Frederic Barbarossa, Emperor, xvii
- Galluzzo, 66 n 1
 Gandrea, possibly second wife of Theobald III of Blois, 97
 Gelasius II, pope (1118-19), 59 n 3
 Gembloux, annals of, xxxv. See also Sigebert
 — abbey of, 95
 — abbot of. See Anselm
 Genoa, archbishop of, 50
 Geoffrey, archbishop of Bordeaux, 17
 — count of Anjou, father of Henry II, xxix, 44, 47 n 2, 48-9 (?)
 — of Auxerre, abbot of Igny and later of Clairvaux, xl, 17 n 3, 18, 24, 25
 — *Libellus* of, xxv, xxvii, xxviii, 17 n 2, cited, 24
 — of Rancon, 11 n 2, 12
 Gerard Pucelle, bishop of Coventry (1183-4), xii
 Gerhoh of Reichersberg, 60 n 1
 Germans, 66, 76-7
 — at council of Rheims, 8
 — on Second Crusade, 12, 54

- Gersendis of Maine, first wife of Theobald III of Blois, 97
 Gervase, archdeacon of Rheims, 9
 — of Canterbury, xlviii–xlix, 5 n 3, 49 n 1
Gesta Stephani, 93
 Gilbert, cardinal priest of St Mark, 44
 — Crispin, abbot of Westminster, 19
 — his treatise, *De sancto spiritu*, 19 n 2
 — de la Porrée, bishop of Poitiers, xii, xix, xxv, xxvi, xxvii, xxviii, xxxvi, xxxix, xl, xli, 1, 15–41, 96
 — his commentaries on the Psalms and the Epistles of St Paul, 22
 — his commentary on the *De Trinitate* of Boethius, 15, 22, 23, 27 n 2, 28
 — his *De Duabus Naturis*, 37 n 5
 — his knowledge of Greek, 21 n 1
 — his pupils, 22
 — his views on universals, 31 sqq.
 — Foliot, abbot of Gloucester, later bishop of Hereford (1148–63), xxi, xxiii, xxix, xxxvi, xxxvii n 2, xliii n 1, xlvi, 47–9, 83 n 2, 85 n 2
 — the Universal, bishop of London (1128–34), 19
 Girard, cardinal deacon of St Mary in Via Lata, 71
 Girgenti, see of, 67 n 2
 Gloucester, abbot of. See Gilbert Foliot, Hamelin
 — monks of, 48
 Godfrey, bishop of Langres, xxxvii, 54–6, 58
 — count of Ostrevant, 14 n 2
 Gosford, 49 n 1
 Gratian, Emperor, 2
 Greeks, xlv–xlv, 60
 Gregory VIII, antipope (1118–21), 85 n 3
 — cardinal deacon of St Angelo, 12, 62, 71, 78
 Guy, cardinal (called ‘Puella’; ? cardinal priest of St Pudentiana), 60
 — (de Castello), cardinal priest of St Mark, later Celestine II, 85
 Guy, of Crema, cardinal deacon of St Mary in Porticu, later antipope Paschal III, 45, 97
 — of Florence, cardinal priest of St Chrysogonus, xxix, 54 n, 55, 62, 73–4
 — of Pisa, cardinal deacon of SS Cosmas and Damianus, papal chancellor, 11
 — of Summa, cardinal priest of St Lawrence in Damaso, from Jan. 1149 cardinal bishop of Ostia, 45, 78
 Hamelin, abbot of Gloucester, 48
 Henry V, Emperor, 56 n 1
 — I, king of England, 83–5
 — of Anjou, duke of Normandy, later king of England (Henry II), xv, xx, xxix, 44 m 1, 3, 47 n 2, 48–9 (?), 65 n 5
 — brother of Louis VII, bishop of Beauvais (1149–62), archbishop of Rheims (1162–75), 69
 — I, count of Champagne, xxvi
 — of Blois, bishop of Winchester (1129–71), brother of King Stephen, xxv, xxix, 10, 42, 45, 78–80, 91–4, 98
 — of Eastry, prior of Canterbury, xlix
 — of Pisa, subdeacon, later cardinal priest of St Nereus and St Achilles, 21
 — the Lion, duke of Saxony, xvii
 — Murdac, archbishop of York (1147–53), 5, 6, 17, 83, 86, 92
 Herbert of Bosham, 86 n 2
 Hereford, xxxvi; bishop of. See Gilbert Foliot, Robert of Melun
 Hilary, bishop of Chichester (1147–69), 6, 48, 49 n 2
 — St, of Poitiers, xxv, xxvi, 17, 26, 27, 29, 35, 40
 — *De Synodis* of, cited, 39, 40
 — *De Trinitate* of, cited, 29, 37, 40–1
 Horace, xxv
 — *De arte poetica* of, cited, 27
 — *Satires* of, cited, 79

- Hugh, abbot of St Augustine's, Canterbury, 46–7, 86
 — archbishop of Capua and later of Palermo, 67
 — II, count of Molise, xxxviii, xxxix, 80–2, 99–100
 — first wife of, 80–2, 99–100. See also Adelaide
 — prior of Mondaye, 77
 — du Puiset, nephew of Henry of Blois and bishop of Durham (1153–95), 92, 98
 — of St Victor, xi, xiii, xxxii, xxxiii, 2, 32 n 3
 — *Didascalion* of, xiii
 — Bigod, earl of Norfolk, 49, 84, 85
 — Falcandus, 100
 Hyacinth Orsini, cardinal deacon of St Mary in Cosmedin, 62, 63
 Hyde, monks of, 92
 Innocent II, pope (1130–43), xliii, 2, 3 n 1, 9, 12 n 1, 13, 43, 44 n 2, 59 n 3, 63, 64, 66, 83, 85
Institutio Trajani, xv, 51 n 1
 Ireland, legate in, xviii, 6, 70–2
 Isabella, daughter of Ralph I or IV of Vermandois, 14 n 1
 Isidore of Seville, xxxiii, 2
 Iwan, count of Alost, 14 n 3
 Jerome, St, xiv, xxv, xxxii, 1, 27, 95
 — letters of, xxvi, 1
 Jerusalem, 53, 58
 — kingdom of, 56
 — patriarch of. See Aimery of Limoges
 Jocelin, bishop of Salisbury (1142–84), 48
 — bishop of Soissons, 69
 John, archdeacon of Séz and later bishop of Lisieux, uncle of Arnulf, 84 n 1
 John of Hexham, 88 n 1, 92–4
 John of Salisbury, *passim*
 — eye-witness of events, 17, 79–80, 82
 — mediator between St Bernard and Gilbert de la Porrée, 26
 John of Salisbury, manuscripts of *Historia Pontificalis*, xlvii–1
 — Letters of, xxvi, xxx, xxxvi, 71 n 2, 98
 — *Metalogicon* of, xiv, xvi, xx, xxv, xxvii, xxviii, 31 n 5, 32 m 2, 3, 33 n 2, 69 n 1
 — *Policraticus* of, xii, xiv–xvi, xx, xxv, xxx, xxxi, xlvii, 51 n 1, 76 n 3. See also Authors cited
 John Paparo, cardinal deacon of St Adrian, subsequently cardinal priest of St Lawrence in Damaso, xxix, 6, 12, 71–2
 — Sarrazin, xii, xxvi
 Jordan, cardinal priest of St Susanna, xlii, 75–8
 — son of Peter Leonis the elder, brother of Anacletus II, 59
 Kells, legatine council at (1152), 72 n 5
 Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury (1070–89), 72 n 1
 Langres, bishop of. See Godfrey Laodicea (Lattakieh), 11 n 2
 Laon, bishop of, 68. See also Bartholomew
 Laura (Lauretta), daughter of Thierry, count of Flanders, 14, 15
 L'Écluse, xxviii
 Le Puy, bishop of, 5
 Legates, papal, xviii, 6, 44 n 5, 55, 66, 70–8, 84
 Leonora, wife of Ralph I or IV of Vermandois, and niece of Theobald IV, count of Champagne, 12 n 1, 13
Liber de diversitate (? of Anselm of Havelberg), 21 n 1
 Lincoln, bishop of. See Robert de Chesney
 Lisieux, bishop of. See Arnulf, John
 Livy, xxxii
 Lombards, 80
 — heretical sect of, 64
 London, bishop of. See Richard of Belmeis, Robert de Sigillo

- London, bishopric of, xliii
 Louis VII, king of France, xvii, xxi, xliii-xliv, 2, 11, 12, 12 n 1, 20, 52-4, 56-62, 64, 87, 99
 — brother of. *See* Henry, Robert
 — wife of. *See* Eleanor
 Lucan, xxxii
 — *Pharsalia* of, cited, 42, 74
 Lucas de Penna, xv
 Lucius II, pope (1144-45), 13, 86
 Luke, St, 1
 Lupellus, clerk of William, archbishop of Canterbury, 83
 Lyons, archbishop of, 4-5, 6
- Mabillon, xlvii, 87 n 3
 Machabees, book of, 1
 Macrobius, xxxii
 Mainz, archbishop of, 10
 Malachy, St, archbishop of Armagh (1134-7; translated to Down, 1137-48), xxix, 6 n 1
 Malta, see of, 67 n 2
 Manichaeans, 38
 Mantua, bishop of. *See* Crassantinus
 Manuel I Comnenus, Emperor, xvii, xlv, 54, 58 n 1, 59, 60
 Matilda, empress, mother of Henry II and wife of Geoffrey of Anjou, xxxvi, xliii, 42, 46 n 2, 83-5
 — of Flanders, queen, wife of William I, 97
 — queen, wife of Henry I, 83-5
 — queen, wife of king Stephen, 89
 Matthew of Alsace, count of Boulogne, 14 n 2
 — of Beaumont-sur-Oise, 14 n 2, 15 n 2
 — Paris, 95
 Maurienne (St Jean-de-Maurienne), bishop of, 50
 Mazzara, see of, 67 n 2
Metalogicon. *See* John of Salisbury
 Metz, 95
 Milan, archbishop of, 50
 Miles, bishop of Téroouanne (1131-58), 44, 48
- Modena, bishop of, 50
 — city of, 50
 Molise, count of. *See* Hugh
 Monarchianism, 28. *See also* Patripassian heresy
 Mondaye, Carthusian monastery of, 77
 — prior of. *See* Hugh
 Mont St Michel, abbey of, xxxiii
 Montier la Celle, xii
 — abbot of. *See* Peter
 Muin-al-Dîn Unur, 57 n 2
- Narbonne, archbishop of, 5
 Nestorius, 31
 Nevers, count of. *See* William
 Nicholas, bishop of Cambrai, 48
 — cardinal bishop of St Albano, 72 n 2
 Norfolk, earl of. *See* Hugh Bigod
 Normandy, duke of, 47-9. *See also* Henry of Anjou
 — duchy of, xxix, 44, 85
 Normans, xlv, 84
 — in Sicily, 80-1
 Northfleet, xxii, 51
 Norway, 72 n 2
 Norwich, bishop of. *See* William Turbe
 Notaries, papal, 70
 Noyon, bishop of. *See* Simon
 Nur-ed-Din, xviii, 57 n 2
- Octavian, cardinal priest of St Cecilia, later antipope Victor IV (1159-64), xlii, 45, 71, 75-7, 97-8
 Odo of Deuil, chronicler, elected abbot of St Denis in 1151, xlviii, xxxiii, 11 n 2, 54 n 3, 60 n 4, 87
 Orkney, bishopric of, 72
 Orosius, 2
 Ostia, cardinal bishop of, 68, 77 n 2.
See also Guy de Summa
 Otto of Freising, xxxi, xxxiii, xxxv, xl, 17 n 3, 21 n 1, 24 n 1, 80 n 2
 Ovid, *Heroides* of, cited, 53
- Palermo, 61, 69
 — archbishop of. *See* Hugh

- Palestine, 62
 Pallium, 67-8, 71-2, 78
 Paris, xxviii, xlii
 — bishop of, 6
 — council at (1147), 15 n 4
 — schools at, xii, xiii, xix, xxxii, xxxiii, 16 n 2; schools on Mont Sainte Geneviève, 63; schools at the church of St Hilary, 63
 Paschal II, pope (1099-1118), 9, 85
 Paschal III, antipope (1164-68).
See Guy of Crema
 Patripassian heresy, 31, 38. *See also* Monarchianism
 Pavia, bishop of, 68
 Peter, archbishop of Capua, 9
 Peter of Celle, abbot of Montier la Celle, and later of St Rémi of Rheims, xii, xxv, xxvii-xxviii, xlvii, 3, 4, 41
 — of Pavia, cardinal bishop of Tusculum, 21 n 1
 — Leonis, became antipope as Anacletus II, 3 n 1, 9, 43
 — brother of. *See* Jordan
 — Lombard, 16
 Petronilla, sister of Eleanor of Aquitaine, 12 n 1, 13, 14
 Pharpar, river, 57
 Philip I, king of France, 9
 Philip Augustus, king of France, 15 n 2
 — of Alsace, count of Flanders, xxviii, 14 n 1, 2, 15, 56
 — of Fontaines - les - Blanches, irregularly elected bishop of Tours, 43
 Phoenicia, 62
 Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, 40
 Piacenza, bishop of, 50
 Pisa, council at (1136), 83 n 2
 Plato, xiv; *Timaeus* of, cited, 32, 36
 Plotinus, xiv
 Plutarch, xv
 Poitiers, canons of. *See* Arnold, Calo
 — count of. *See* William IX, duke of Aquitaine
Policraticus. *See* John of Salisbury
 Pope. *See* Adrian IV, Calixtus II, Celestine II, Eugenius III, Gelasius II, Innocent II, Lucius II, Paschal II, Urban II. *See also* chancellor, papal; legates, papal; notaries, papal; registers, papal
- Potenza, 61 n 1
 Priscian, *Institutiones grammaticae*, cited, 34 n 6
 Ptolemy II of Tusculum, 80, 99
- Ralph I or IV, count of Vermandois, xlv, 12-15
 — II or V, count of Vermandois, 14 n 1
 — de Diceto, 95
 — of Laon, 19
 Ravenna, archbishop of, 50
 Raymond of Poitiers, prince of Antioch, 52-3, 73
 Registers, papal, xxxiii, xxxix, 25
 Reynold of Châtillon, husband of Constance, princess of Antioch, 73 n 3
 — of Dassel, provost of Hildesheim, later archbishop of Cologne, 8
 Richard of Belmeis, bishop of London (1152-62), 88
 — de Lucy, justiciar, 42
 Rheims, xxvi, xlvii, 6
 — council of, xviii, xxi, xxiv, xxix, xxx n 2, xxxiii, xxxviii-xl, xliii, xlviii, 2, 3 n 1, 4 sqq., 43, 44 n 3, 50, 91, 96; canons of the council of, 8-10
 — abbey of St Rémi, xii, xxv, xxviii
 — abbot of. *See* Peter of Celle
 Robert, prince of Capua, 58, 59 n 1
 — of Béthune, bishop of Hereford (1131-48), 6
 — de Bosco, archdeacon of Châlons, 18-19
 — de Chesney, bishop of Lincoln, 47 n 2
 — of Dreux, brother of Louis VII, 69 n 3
 — of Melun, bishop of Hereford (1163-67), xxiv, 16
 — de Sigillo, bishop of London (1141-51), 46, 48, 49 n 2, 88
 — of Torigni, xxxiii, 95

- Guiscard, 69 *n* 1, 80 *n* 2
 — Pullen, xv
 Roger II, king of Sicily, xvii, xviii, 58, 59 *n* 1, 60, 65–9, 76, 80–1, 99
 — count of Sicily, 66 *n* 2
 — de Clinton, bishop of Chester (1129–48), 83
 — of Pont L'Évêque, archbishop of York (1154–81), 17
 Roland, cardinal priest of St Mark, 71
 Romans, xviii, xxxvii, 44, 62–3, 80
 Rome, xxi, xxii, xxix, xli, xlii, 50–1, 62, 70–1, 79–80, 91–4
 — commune of, xvii, 59–60, 62 sqq.
 — Second Lateran Council held at, 83 *n* 2
 Romsey, Abbey of, 83
 Rouen, archbishop of, 6
 — province of, 4–5
 Rufinus, xxxii
 Sabellians, 29
 Sabellius, 28, 31
 St Andrews, bishop of, 72
 — bishop elect of. *See* Eadmer
 St Colombe-de-Sens, abbey of, 6
 St Denis, xxxiii
 — abbot of. *See* Odo of Deuil, Suger
 St Germain-des-Prés, abbey of, 6
 St Omer, xxi, xxii, xxiii, xxix *n* 4, 42, 48, 94
 St Syrus, 68
 Sainte Barbe, chronicle of, 54 *n* 4
 Salisbury, bishop of. *See* Jocelin
 Sallust, xxxii
 Scotland, xviii, 72
 Senlis, bishop of, 12 *n* 1
 Sens, archbishop of, 6
 — province of, 4–5
 — synod of (1140), 20 *n* 1
Sententiae Divinitatis, 23 *n* 1
 Sichelgaita, mother of Clementia of Catanzaro, 100
 Sicily, kingdom of, 99
 — count of. *See* Roger
 — king of. *See* Roger II
 Siena, 15 *n* 4
 Sigebert of Gembloux, xix, xxxiii, xxxv, xlvii, 2–4, 95
 Silvester, prior, later abbot, of St Augustine's, Canterbury, 46, 51, 86, 87 *n* 2
 Simon, bishop of Noyon, 12 *n* 1
 — nephew of abbot Suger, 87
 Sirmium, synod at (351), 40 *n* 2
 Soissons, bishop of. *See* Jocelin
 Spain, 80
 Stephen, king of England, xvii, xxix, xxxvi, xliii, xlvi, 5, 6, 7, 42, 44, 47, 48, 71, 78, 83–6, 89
 — his 'Lombard grandmother', 45, 97–8
 — of Blois, father of king Stephen, 97
 Stubbs, xlviii
 Suetonius, xxxi, xxxviii
 Suger, abbot of St Denis, xxxi, xxxiii, 15–16, 17, 20, 69, 87, 92, 94
 Sweden, 72 *n* 2
 Templars, Order of, 57
 Terence, *Adelphoe* of, cited, 44;
Andria of, cited, 85
 Terricus Gualerancius, secretary of Louis VII, xlv, 53
 Thanet, island of, 47
 Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury (1139–61), xii, xviii, xx–xxiv, xxxiii *n* 2, xxxvi, xxxviii, xl *n* 1, xlii, xliii, xlvi, 5, 6–7, 11, 17, 41–2, 45, 47–9, 51–2, 78, 85, 86, 87 *n* 2, 93
 Theobald III, count of Blois and Champagne, grandfather of king Stephen, 97
 — IV, count of Blois and Champagne, brother of king Stephen, 10, 12 *n* 1, 13, 14
 Theodwin, cardinal bishop of Porto, xxix, xxxvii, 54 *n* 4, 55, 62
 Thierry of Alsace, count of Flanders, xxxviii, xliii, 14, 56, 58
 — of Chartres, xiii
 Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury (1162–70), xi, xiii, xv, xx, xxv, xxvi, xxxiv, xxxvi, xxxix, xl, 17, 86 *n* 2

- Thurstan, archbishop of York (1119–40), 72 *n* 4
 Tours, bishop of. *See* Philip
 — province of, 4–5
 Trèves, 5 *n* 3, 6
 Tripoli, bishop-elect of, 73–5
 Trondhjem, archbishopric of, 72 *n* 2
 Troyes, council of, 9
 Tuam, archbishopric of, 72 *n* 5
 Tuscans, 80
 Tusculum, xxi, xxii, xxviii, xlv, 51 *n* 2, 59 *n* 2, 60, 61, 62
 Ulger, bishop of Angers, xliii, 83–5
 Urban II, pope (1088–99), 59 *n* 3, 66 *n* 2, 69 *n* 2
 Valentinian, emperor, 2
 Valerius Maximus, xxxii
 Vermandois, count of. *See* Ralph
 — county of, 15
 — family of, xxviii, xxxix
 Vézelay, abbey of, 6
 Victor IV, antipope (1159–64).
See Octavian
 Vienne, archbishop of, 5
 Vincent of Beauvais, 95
 Virgil, *Aeneid* of, cited, 43, 60 *n* 4
 Viterbo, xxi, xli, 64, 92
 Wibald of Stavelot, xviii
 William, St, archbishop of York (1143–47 and 1153–4), 5 *n* 2
 William IV, count of Nevers, 14 *n* 2
 William IX, duke of Aquitaine and count of Poitiers, 52
 William, sacristan, later prior of St Augustine's, Canterbury, 46 51
 — son of Roger II of Sicily, 68–9
 — of Belmeis, archdeacon, 46
 — of Canterbury, xxxiv
 — of Corbeil, archbishop of Canterbury (1123–36), 83, 84
 — of Malmesbury, xxxi
 — of Nangis, xlviii
 — of Tyre, 54 *n* 4
 — Brito, xii
 — Martel, steward, 42
 — Turbe, bishop of Norwich (1146–74), 6, 49 *n* 2
 Winchester, annalist of, 92–3
 — bishop of. *See* Henry of Blois
 York, archbishop of, 72. *See also*
 Henry Murdac, Roger, Thurstan,
 William