THE ORIGINS OF THE DUCHY OF AQUITAINE AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE COUNTS OF POITOU (902 - 1137)

BODLEIAN LIBRARY OXFORD
DEPOSITED
THESIS
8.IV.65

[MT 1965]

A B S T R A C T

At the end of the ninth century the members of two rival families were struggling to gain possession of the county of Poitou. Although the comital appointment was in theory still royally controlled, Ademar (the candidate of King Odo) was unable to maintain his position in the county when Ebles (the descendant of former Carolingian counts) seized Poitiers in 902. After an attempt by King Lothair and Duke Hugh the Great to capture Poitiers in 955 there was no further royal intervention in the county; and Ebles and his descendants, even though they maintained contacts with the royal court, ruled independently in Poitou.

The history of Poitou at this period is important because documentary material survives to link the Carolingian county, where the count was still merely a royal official, with the feudal principality which was later evolved.[1] For instance Ebles held malli publici in due Carolingian form and - where the Norman ravages had not been too great - took over the local administration; both he and his son seem to have established their own viscounts. Lands and rights which had once belonged to the royal fisc, (including palaces and royal monasteries) provided the foundations of Ebles' power;

---

1. Contrast the history of Normandy. No Norman ducal acts survive for the first half of the tenth century.

A B S T R A C T

and the significance of these usurpations may be judged from the fact that the authority of the Count of Poitou was never so strong where it did not rest upon the débris of Carolingian public authority. The acquisition of the title of Duke of Aquitaine, for instance, did not bring its holder any such solid advantages as the acquisition of the county of Poitou.

It is by no means certain what led the Counts of Poitou to become Dukes of Aquitaine; all that can be said is that, after political activity in the counties of Limoges and Auvergne by Ebles and his son William Tête d'Etoupe, the latter's son is found assuming the title for the first time in 965. For, in spite of the account given by the chronicler Ademar of Chabannes, there is no contemporary evidence to prove that the Counts of Poitou claimed this title at an earlier date, or that they "inherited" a territorial duchy of William the Pious, the founder of the abbey of Cluny, even though this theory seems soon to have been accepted. Perhaps the title was at first assumed to justify the authority of the Count of Poitou over the rulers of other counties, but this cannot be proved.[2]

The duchy of William Fier-à-bras and William the Great

---

2. Chapter I.

A B S T R A C T

(died 1030) seems to have consisted of the former Carolingian counties of Limoges, Angoulême, Saintonge, Périgord, Auvergne, together with la Marche which was a territory recently created on the boundaries of Poitou and the Limousin. The Duke's authority varied considerably according to time and place : William the Great destroyed the pretensions to independence of the rulers of la Marche, on one occasion he regulated the succession to the county of Périgord, on another he appointed the Viscount of Limoges; but he never intervened in the internal affairs of the county of Angoulême or, probably, in the Auvergne. The Carolingian fiscal lands in these counties had presumably been dispersed before the Count of Poitou became Duke: the Saintonge was the only county where he acquired land on a considerable scale.

The power of the first two Dukes of Aquitaine should not be underestimated because their duchy lacked uniformity ; it can best be demonstrated by the number of their fideles in view of the strength of the tie still binding man and lord.[3] Although William the Great had no territorial power in the county of Angoulême and no authority in its internal affairs he bound Count William to him as counsellor and friend; the

---

3. An analysis of the evidence for the feudal relationship in this region before 1030 will be found in Chapter III. These paragraphs otherwise summarise Chapter II.

A B S T R A C T

Count of Anjou was also a ducal fidelis, under William the Great he was employed in the Saintonge and acted for the Duke at the royal court. And moreover, the surviving documents prove that the different rulers of the duchy were found in the Duke's presence, although there are few references to ceremonies of homage or even to oaths of fealty at this period.

A sense of unity was provided by the Church, for these two Dukes identified themselves with ecclesiastical efforts to stamp out general lawlessness; and all the Bishops and important clergy (together with lay subjects of the Duke) congregated under ducal protection to promote the "peace of God". Many of the episcopal appointments were in any case controlled by the Duke; William the Great's protection of the clergy and support of reform seems to have led to the clergy's general support of the ducal government.

However, the events which occurred on William the Great's death reveal the extent to which effective control of the duchy depended upon the personal strength and authority of the Duke for, after several years in captivity Duke William the Fat apparently no longer had the authority to summon assemblies to promote peace as his father had. Politically the duchy became subject to about thirty years' Angevin domination. In the first instance this was brought about by the marriage of Agnes (William the Great's widow) to

A B S T R A C T

Geoffrey Martel of Anjou and the latter's capture of the Duke in battle (1033); then a few years later Geoffrey became guardian when Agnes' own young son became Count of Poitou (c.1038). This provided the opportunity to increase the Angevin possessions in the Saintonge and to strengthen Geoffrey's hold over his Poitevin benefices, and it was not until the 1060's that any stand was taken against the Angevin encroachment. Duke Guy-Geoffrey was then met with the assertion that the Count of Anjou held the whole county of Saintes by hereditary right; he eventually completely ejected the Angevins from this county, but the Poitevin benefices (which the Count of Anjou came to regard as terra sua) were left untouched - a perpetual source of weakness in the county where the Duke of Aquitaine wielded the greatest power.

The Duke's problems were further increased by the addition of Gascony to the duchy. It seems probable that one of the chief reasons for Poitevin interest in this province was the result of the political geography of the period for the archbishopric of Bordeaux came under the control of the Gascon ruler, although the Bishops of his province were for the most part politically subject to the Duke of Aquitaine; and there can be little doubt that the control of Bordeaux was one of the ducal ambitions. Nevertheless, the Chronology and history of the acquisition of

A B S T R A C T

Gascony by the Poitevins remains extremely obscure.[4]

By the acquisition of Gascony the Duke's domination was extended to the Pyrenees, but contemporaries do not seem to have been conscious of any "constitutional" problem in the addition of this vast province to the older territories of the duchy. Guy-Geoffrey and his successors used the title of Duke of Aquitaine in the province; Bordeaux became the southern capital of their domains; the Duke exercised the rights formerly enjoyed by the Gascon rulers (e.g. they apparently minted coin in their own name) and received the fealty of the Gascon counts and viscounts; but there was no attempt at fusion. Although the northern magnates of the duchy are found in Gascony, there is no record of visits by any great Gascon vassal of the Duke to the northern part of the duchy.

As a result of the acquisition of Gascony the political outlook of the Dukes of Aquitaine - previously directed towards northern France - completely altered, and by 1137 the duchy had become a meridional power. This development was a gradual one : Guy-Geoffrey led an army to Spain to help the Spanish Christians and married two daughters to Spanish kings; his son William the Troubadour made several attempts to gain possession of the county of Toulouse and became involved in Spanish internal politics. There is some

---

4. Part II, Chapter I. Cf. Part I, Chap. II for Bordeaux.

A B S T R A C T

evidence to suggest that this was the result of the closeness of the ties between the King of Aragon and some of the Duke's great Gascon vassals (both the Viscount of Béarn and the Count of Bigorre were also the men of this Spanish king).[5]

It might also be argued that the addition of Gascony to the duchy prevented the Dukes from establishing a stable government in the northern counties between the mid-eleventh century and 1137; but the sources for these years are thin, and it is impossible to draw conclusions for the whole duchy from information available for one or two counties. It can be seen, however, that the Dukes no longer consistently maintained the same authority in the city of Limoges as in the early eleventh century, that they faced persistent attempts by the Counts of Angoulême to gain lands in the Saintonge and Bordelais, and that in some regions (e.g. Auvergne) the ducal authority was nominal. These Dukes were often more successful in enforcing their will on individual occasions than historians have realised, but success still depended entirely on the Duke's personal activity. There was no more uniformity in the northern counties of the duchy in the twelfth century than in the tenth, and no ducal government seems ever to have

---

5. Part II, Chaps. II and III.

A B S T R A C T

been evolved for them. In addition the Dukes could no longer rely very greatly on the personal ties of lord and man, although the evidence on this aspect of the ducal authority is also sparse.[6]

These criticisms do not apply to Poitou and the Saintonge - or perhaps to the Bordelais. In the two former counties the building and tenure of castles was controlled by the Duke and - in spite of historians' statements to the contrary - even the greatest vassals like the lords of Lusignan, could not revolt with impunity.[7] And, although the literary and documentary sources available do not yield precise details about the changing feudal relationships, they do reveal that the Dukes still disposed personally of great resources which brought them infinitely greater power and revenues than any of their vassals. There can be no doubt either of the importance of the ducal curia and the household knights and officers whom Guy-Geoffrey and his successors gathered round them. Central institutions - if indeed they existed at all - remained rudimentary; but local administration underwent fundamental changes, for which Guy-Geoffrey was probably

---

6. Chaps. II and III. Cf. Chap. V.

7. Chaps. II and III. Cf. Part I, Chap. III.

A B S T R A C T

responsible in the first instance. For instance, the prepositi of Poitiers and Saintes were important officials who were delegated to hear judicial cases brought before the Duke, as well as being concerned with his territorial and financial interests. By 1137 there seems to have been an elaborate local administrative system.[8]

It is also impossible to neglect the changed relationship of the Dukes to the Church in their domains during the later eleventh century. During the rule of Guy-Geoffrey the tradition of co-operation between Duke and ecclesiastics continued; reform was promoted in the duchy and, it appears, the Gregorian decrees were accepted. Numerous reforming councils were held under ducal protection at Poitiers, Bordeaux, and Saintes; but they were summoned by the papal legates and no longer exclusively concerned the clergy of the Duke's domains. The minority of William the Troubadour (1086 onwards) gave the legate Amatus the chance to dispense with the secular authority in ecclesiastical affairs : from this period onwards the Duke lost his old position of acknowledged protector of the Church and occasionally resorted to force to make good his rights to make episcopal and abbatial appointments. Both the last two Dukes suffered excommunication

---

8. Chapter V.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PREFACE		pp	i-vii
BIBLIOGRAPHY		pp	viii-clix
PART I (902-1030)			
CHAPTER I	THE COUNTS OF POITOU UNTIL THEIR ASSUMPTION OF THE DUCAL TITLE (902-65)	pp	1-44
CHAPTER II	THE GOVERNMENT OF DUKES WILLIAM FIER-A-BRAS AND WILLIAM THE GREAT (965-1030)	pp	45-72
CHAPTER III	THE DEVELOPMENT OF FEUDALISM BEFORE 1030 AND THE DUCAL AUTHORITY	pp	73-88
PART II (1030-1137)			
CHAPTER I	ANGEVIN DOMINATION IN POITOU AND THE SAINTONGE AND THE ACQUISITION OF GASCONY	pp	89-107
CHAPTER II	THE RULE OF GUY-GEOFFREY (1058-86)	pp	108-128
CHAPTER III	THE TWO LAST INDEPENDENT DUKES (1086-1137)	pp	129-163
CHAPTER IV	THE CHURCH IN THE DUCHY (1030-1137)	pp	164-189
CHAPTER V	THE RESOUCES AND GOVERNMENT OF THE DUKES OF AQUITAINE (1030-1137)	pp	190-232
APPENDIX I	THE CONVENTIO INTER WILLELMUM DUCEM AQUITANIAE ET HUGONEM CHILIARCHUM	pp	235-50
APPENDIX II	SOME UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS CONCERNING THE DUKES OF AQUITAINE (Photograph facing p. 267)	pp	251-90
GENEALOGICAL TREE			
MAPS TO SHOW CASTLES, BISHOPRICS AND RELIGIOUS HOUSES			AT END.

A B S T R A C T

and were attacked by clerical writers - it seems that the hostility of these writers has caused historians to dismiss these Dukes' secular achievements too summarily.[9]

The addition of Gascony to the duchy, the political consequences of this, the development of administration and the failure to evolve a stable system of government for the duchy as a whole, as well as the changed situation of the Church in the duchy, took place against a background of gradually increasing royal claims. For the most part royal activity was restricted to the frontiers of the duchy (the county of Auvergne) and, when Louis VI took the opportunity to marry his son to Eleanor of Aquitaine, this was chiefly the result of the historical accident that (unlike the Capetians) the Poitevin Duke had failed for the first time to produce a male heir.[10]

---

9. Chapter IV.

10. Chapter III.

PREFACE.

The wide scope of this study has been imposed by the political events of the history of Aquitaine. The Counts who ruled Poitou in an unbroken male line from 901 to 1137, and who became Dukes of Aquitaine in the latter part of the tenth century, attained power when they achieved independence from royal control; through Eleanor's marriage to Louis VII Aquitaine returned to royal control after an interval of two hundred years.[1] The subject is not a new one, and much of the material has been used by historians before but - perhaps because the duchy of Aquitaine, unlike the duchy of Normandy, was never a well-knit whole - there has been a tendency to concentrate on one or two aspects of its history.

I am much indebted to those who have dealt with the difficult problem of the origins of the duchy (in the last instance Jan Dhondt), to Marcel Garaud who has investigated so many aspects of Poitevin history, and to many other historians and antiquarians; but it has nevertheless been possible to follow a different course from theirs. I have tried to place the political activity of the Counts of Poitou against the background of the resources at their

---

1. The already wide scope of this study made it impossible to add a study of the years 1137-52, as it had been hoped to do.

disposal, and to trace the changes which took place in their government as their domains increased in size and their vassals and the Church became increasingly independent.

The breadth of this enquiry has meant that some important subjects have received rather summary treatment. For instance, far more could have been said about the development of feudal institutions outside ducal control in different parts of the duchy, but this would have entailed neglecting ecclesiastical affairs and, without some investigation into the movement for church reform in the duchy, it is impossible to appreciate the changes which occurred in the government of the later Dukes of Aquitaine.

There are several general points to be made about the sources available for this study. Firstly, the documentary material for the early period (that is the tenth and early eleventh centuries) is abundant compared with many other regions of France; and the chronicle of Ademar of Chabannes and the curious Conventio inter Willelmum comitem et Hugonem chiliarchum[2] are also directly concerned with the affairs of the Dukes of Aquitaine. By contrast the later literary sources throw less light than the early ones on secular affairs and, although many documents survive, these continue

---

2. Edited in appendix (pp.239-50 , below).

to be the products of monastic scriptoria even at the end of the period. Secondly, the problem of the geographical distribution of the sources must be taken into account, since no literary sources at all were written in Gascony during this period and there are also fewer documents for this region. Thirdly, it is a little surprising that - in spite of the numerous nineteenth century editions of chronicles and documents - the historian still has to rely heavily for printed sources on the works of the great seventeenth century antiquarians Besly and Marca, on Labbe's Novae bibliothecae...collectio, the Gallia Christiana and the Recueil des Historiens.

LITERARY SOURCES.

The two chief literary sources for the history of the duchy are the chronicle of Ademar of Chabannes, monk of St. Cybard d'Angoulême and of St. Martial de Limoges, whose methods of composition can still be studied in an autograph draft in the Bibliothèque Nationale,[3] and the anonymous chronicle of St. Maixent. This composite source covers the years down to 1137 (Ademar's chronicle stops c.1028), and probably incorporates material from annals written in the chapter of St. Hilaire de Poitiers,[4] which had close

---

3. Ms.lat. 6190. See the article by L. Delisle, cited in the bibliography of printed sources under 'Ademar'.

4. Article by Halphen, cited in the bibliography of printed sources. M. Boussard is preparing a new edition of this: it will be the first critical one.

associations with the Counts of Poitou. Other literary sources of importance written in Aquitaine are the Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium and the chronicle of Geoffrey of Vigeois. Much information about the Dukes' affairs is also to be gained from sources written outside the duchy from Angevin annals and Norman chronicles, as well as from those written from a royal standpoint (Flodoard's annals in the tenth, Suger's Vita Ludovici grossi in the twelfth century). Various Saints' lives are also of use; while the vernacular songs of Duke William the Troubadour are unique, although they provide little which is of a purely historical interest.

DOCUMENTARY SOURCES.

It was intended to support this study with a calendar of acts of the Counts of Poitou and Dukes of Aquitaine but, although this calendar has been compiled, the plan had to be abandoned because the 430-odd entries[5] could not be included without far exceeding the limits imposed on a thesis presented for examination. The documentary sources consist almost entirely of charters or notices written in religious establishments and destined for ecclesiastical beneficiaries, although there are a few exceptions.[6]

---

5. These entries include grants to which the Dukes gave their consent, as well as documents drawn up in their own names.

6. Eg. Duke William the Troubadour's grant to the Count of Bigorre (below p.135), some Spanish documents (pp.126,157), and probably some early charters written by a comital notary (p. 23, n.76).

Original documents, and the cartularies of various religious houses endowed by the Dukes and their subjects, are scattered throughout various departmental archives in France from the Loire to the Pyrenees; although by far the richest collection is in the Archives départementales de la Vienne at Poitiers - the earliest capital of the ducal domains. Numerous cartularies, and a few original documents, are also to be found in the Bibliothèque Nationale; little of importance for this period or region has entered the Archives Nationales.

The destruction and loss of much medieval material throughout the centuries means, however, that many documents survive only in transcripts made during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Bibliothèque Nationale has the widest range of such material: the papers of Baluze and Besly,[7] the copies made for Dom Estiennot[8] and for Moreau, the transcripts made by Dom Housseau (the collection Anjou-Touraine) and by Dom Col (ms.lat.9193 and onwards). The most important single collection of copies was made by the Poitevin Dom Fonteneau, and is now in the Bibliothèque municipale of Poitiers.

Many of these documentary sources are in print, although more complete examples occasionally exist in ms.

---

7. The Collections Baluze and DuPuy.

8. These were gathered into volumes of <u>Antiquitates benedictini</u> (mss.lat. 12751 *et.*).

form.[9] Notable exceptions are the cartularies of the Bordelais monastery of la Sauve-Majeure, the documents of Montierneuf at Poitiers[10] and of the Angevin monastery of Bourgueil - all three of which were ducal foundations. Some documents from these houses are given in appendix.

---

9. The copies inserted in the Preuves of Besly's Comtes de Poictou are often much abbreviated.

10. M. Villard, the archivist of The Vienne, is preparing an edition of the documents of this house.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

NOTE: 1) If no place of publication is given, French works were published in Paris, English ones in London.

2) Critical works dealing with primary sources are indicated after the source in the bibliography.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN BIBLIOGRAPHY AND TEXT.

AA.SS,	Acta Sanctorum (see bibliography of printed sources, III Bollandus and Mabillon)
AHG,	Archives historiques de la Gironde
AHGasc,	Archives historiques de la Gascogne
AHP,	Archives historiques du Poitou
AHSA,	Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis
BEC,	Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes
BEHE,	Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études
Besly,	(see bibliography of printed sources, III)
BSAO,	Bulletins de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest
Gallia,	(see bibliography of printed sources, III)
Halphen, Anjou	(see bibliography of secondary sources).
HGL,	Histoire générale de Languedoc (see bibliography of printed sources, III, Vaissète)
HPCE	Historia Pontificum et comitum Engolismensium (see bibliography, I)
J-L,	Jaffé-Löwenfeld (see Jaffé, bibliography of printed sources)
Labbe,	(see bibliography of printed sources III, P. Labbe)
MA,	le Moyen Age
MGH,	Monumenta Germaniae Historicae
MGH, SS,	" " " , Scriptores
MSAO,	Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest
Ms.lat,	manuscrit latin, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

ms n.a.l.,	manuscrit, nouvelles acquisitions latines, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
PL,	Patrologia Latina (see bibliography of printed sources, III Migne)
RBPH,	Revue belge pour philologie et histoire
RH,	Revue Historique
RHC,	Recueil des Historiens des Croisades
RHDFE,	Revue historique de droit français et étranger
RHF,	Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de France (see bibliography of printed sources III, Bouquet)
Richard, Comtes,	(see bibliography of secondary sources, A. Richard)

SOURCES CONSULTED in MANUSCRIPT.

I. MANUSCRIPTS of LITERARY SOURCES.

PARIS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE

Manuscrits latins

2400 - Ms of Ademar of Chabannes
2469 - " " " " "
4892 - Chronicle of St.Maixent; Peter of Maillezais
5927 - Ademar of Chabannes; Conventio
6190 - autograph Ms. of Ademar of Chabannes
9767 - Conventio
14167 - letters of Fulbert of Chartres

II. DOCUMENTARY SOURCES.

1. ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS and CHARTERS.

PARIS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE

Manuscrits latins

9084)
9230) miscellaneous charters
11826)

Nouvelles acquisitions latines

2182)
2306) miscellaneous charters
2386)

Collection de Bourgogne

vols 76,78,80 (charters formerly in the fonds de Cluny)

ANGERS: ARCHIVES DEPARTMENTALES DU MAINE-ET-LOIRE

H 1-3 (Fontevrault)
H 2107)
H 336)
H 3368-71) St. Florent de Saumur.
H 3467)
H 3476-7)
H 3494)
H 3497)

H 3579-80)
H 3615) St.Florent de Saumur
H 3618)

BLOIS: ARCHIVES DÉPARTEMENTALES de LOIR-et-CHER

H 124)
H 146)
H 163) la Trinité de Vendôme
H 173)
H 183)

BORDEAUX: ARCHIVES DÉPARTEMENTALES DE LA GIRONDE

G 8)
G 267-8) archbishopric of Bordeaux
G 334-6)

H 12)
H 23)
H 182) la Sauve-Majeure
H 244)

PAU: ARCHIVES DÉPARTEMENTALES DES BASSES-PYRÉNÉES

G 1 bishopric of Bayonne

POITIERS: ARCHIVES DÉPARTEMENTALES DE LA VIENNE

D 119)
D 160) priory of Loudun

G 192 cathedral chapter

G 483-4)
G 486-91)
G 591) chapter of St.Hilaire de Poitiers
G 870)
G 886)

G 1344)
G 1437) chapter of Ste.Radegonde
G 1499)

H. charters of Fontaine-le-Comte, St.Cyprien, Ste.Croix de Poitiers, Triou, Vouzailles

Fonds non classé, charters of Montierneuf, Nouaillé

Fonds de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest - charters of St. Maixent.

BIBLIOTHÈQUE MUNICIPALE

Chartes, liasse B, St.Maixent.

LONDON: BRITISH MUSEUM

Additional Charters

1538)
1542-3) miscellaneous charters of
11227-30) religious houses

2. CARTULARIES

PARIS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE

Manuscrits latins

3851 A - Paunat
5448 - "Liber de constitutione Karrofensis coenobii"
5652 - Condom
8878 - The Beatus of St.Sever, with documents for this house
9189 - Lézat
10122 - St. Cyprien de Poitiers
10124 - Vaux
10936 - Morlaas
18363 - Solignac

Nouvelles acquisitions latines

182 - Sorde
461 - Solignac
1560 - Aubazine
1930 - St.Florent de Saumur
1935 -)
1936 -) la Trinité de Vendôme
2414 - Fontevrault

PARIS: ARCHIVES NATIONALES

J.460 (roll) - Montierneuf
LL.1419 - Barbezieux
LL.1599 A - Fontevrault

ANGERS: ARCHIVES DÉPARTEMENTALES

H.3713 -5 - St. Florent de Saumur

BORDEAUX: ARCHIVES DÉPARTEMENTALES

G.1030 - St. Seurin
H. 639 - Ste Croix de Bordeaux

BIBLIOTHÈQUE MUNICIPALE

Ms. 745 - Bigorre
Mss.769-70 - la Sauve-Majeure

PAU: ARCHIVES DEPARTEMENTALES

G.54 - bishopric of Bayonne

POITIERS: ARCHIVES DÉPARTEMENTALES

Fonds Montierneuf, cartularies of St. Nicolas and Montierneuf (unclassified)

3. MISCELLANEOUS TRANSCRIPTS

PARIS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE

Manuscrits latins

5441
9193-7
12663
12669
12685
12688
12690
12697
12700
12733
12745
12751-5
12757
12763-8
12773
12775-7
12820
12878
12898
16188
17127

Collection Anjou-Touraine
vols 1-4

Collection Baluze
vols 38-9,40-1,47,72,74,76-7,139

Collection DuChesne
vols 20,114

Collection DuPuy
vols 828,841

Collection Moreau
vols 18,25-31,33-4,36,47,275

Collection de Périgord
vols 30,33,35,77

ARCHIVES NATIONALES

J. 190

POITIERS: BIBLIOTHÈQUE MUNICIPALE

Collection Dom Fonteneau
vols 1-4,8-10,13-17,19-21,
23-7,27 bis and ter, 62-3,82

BORDEAUX: ARCHIVES DÉPARTEMENTALES

H.6
H.8
H.266
H.279
H.485
H.640

PRINTED SOURCES

I. LITERARY SOURCES

Adémar de Chabannes, Chronique, ed. J. Chavanon (Collections de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire). 1897.

Etudes critiques sur divers textes des Xe et XIe siècles: l'Historia d'Adémar de Chabannes, ed.J.Lair. 1899.

Commemoratio abbatum Lemovicensium, ed.H.Duplès-Agier (Chroniques de Limoges), 1874.

see L.Delisle, "Notice sur les manuscrits originaux d'Adémar de Chabannes" (Notices et Extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationales et autres bibliothèques, vol.35, 1896).

L.Halphen, "Une rédaction ignorée d'Adémar de Chabannes", (BEC 66,1905). id. "Remarques sur la chronique d'Adémar de Chabannes" (RH 98, 1908).

J.de la Martinière, "Essai de classment des manuscrits et des rédactions de l'Historia d'Adémar de Chabannes", (MA 3rd series, 7, 1936).

Aimoin, Vita Sancti Abbonis Floriacensis, (HL 139).
see also Miracula Sancti Benedicti

Albert of Aix, Historia Hierosolymitana (RHC, Historiens Occidentaux vol.4), 1884.

Annales Auscienses, (MGH,SS,II).

Annales Bertiniani, ed.G Waitz (MGH, in usu scholarum) 1883.

Annales Compostellani, (España Sagrada, 23). Madrid,1767.

Annales Engolismenses, (MGH,SS, IV and XVI).

Annales Floriacenses, (MGH,SS,II).

Annales Fuldenses, ed. F.Kurze (MGH, in usu scholarum) 1891.

Annales Lemovicenses (MGH,SS, II).

Annales Mettenses (MGH,SS, I).

Annales Nivernenses, (MGH,SS, XIII).

Annales S.Columbae Senonensis, (MGH,SS, I).

Annales Vedastini et Xantensis, ed.B.de Simson, (MGH in usu scholarum). 1909.

Arnulf Bishop of Lisieux, Tractatus de schismate orto post Honorii II mortem, (PL 201).

Bernard, St. of Clairvaux, Vitae and Epistolae, (PL 182,185).

Bernard, St. of Tiron, Vita, (AA.SS, 14 April).

Bernard Itier, Chronique de Limoges, ed. H.Duplès-Agier (Chroniques de St.Martial de Limoges), 1874.

Brevis chronicon abbatiae Saviniacensis, (RHF,XI).

Bruno, De bello saxonico, (MGH,SS,V).

Conventio inter Willelmum ducem Aquitaniae et Hugonem Chilliarchum, ed. P.Labbe, Novae bibliothecae II. 1657.

Chronicon Aquitanicum, (MGH,SS, II).

Chronicon Lusitanum, ed.E.Florez (España Sagrada,14). Madrid, 1758.

Chronicon Moissiacense, (MGH,SS, II).

Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise, ed.L.Halphen et R. Poupardin (Collection des textes...), 1913.

Chroniques des Eglises d'Anjou, ed. P.Marchegay et E. Mabille (Société de l'histoire de France). 1869.

Chronique de Nantes, ed. R. Merlet (Collection des textes...) 1896.

Chronique de St.Maixent, see Chronique des Eglises d'Anjou

Chroniques de St.Martial de Limoges, ed. H.Duplès-Agier (Société de l'Histoire de France), 1874. See Adémar de Chabannes, Bernard Itier.

Chronique de St. Pierre le Vif de Sens, ed L. Duru (Bibliothèque Historique de l'Yonne, II) Auxerre.1863.

Crònica de San Juan de la Pena, ed. T.Ximenez de Embrun (Biblioteca de escritores Aragoneses), Saragossa, 1876.

De Aquitania opusculum, ed. P.Labbe (Novae Bibliotecae II) 1657.

Diego de Gelmirez, Archbishop of Compostella, Historia Compostellana, (España Sagrada, 20); (PL 170).

Dudo of St.Quentin, De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum, ed. J.Lair. Caen, 1865.

Ekkehard of Aura, Hierosolymita, ed. H. Hagenmeyer. Tübingen, 1877.

Ermentaire, Translatio S.Philiberti, (MGH, SS, XV).

Flodoard, Annales, ed. P.Lauer (Collection des textes...) 1906.

Fragmentum de Petragoricensibus episcopis, ed. P. Labbe, Novae Bibliothecae, II 1657.

Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, Epistolae, (RHF,X)

Fulcher of Chartres, Historia Hierosolymitana, ed. H. Hagenmeyer. Heidelberg. 1913.

Geoffrey, Abbot of Vendôme, Epistolae (PL 157).

Geoffrey, Prior of Vigeois, Chronica, ed. P. Labbe (Novae Bibliothecae, II). 1657.

Gerald, St. of la Sauve-Majeure, Vita (AA.SS., 5 April).

Gesta Barcinonensium comitum, ed. L. Barrau-Dihigo and J. Masso-Torrents, (Cròniques catalanes). Barcelona, 1925.

Gesta Francorum et aliorum Hierosolimitanorum, ed. R.Hill (Nelson's Medieval texts), 1962.

Guibert of Nogent, Gesta Dei per Francos, (RHC Historiens occidentaux, IV).

Historia Francorum Senonensis, (MGH,SS, IX).

Historia Patriarcharum archiepiscoporum Bituricensium, ed. P. Labbe (Novae Bibliothecae II) 1657.

Historia Pontificum et comitum Engolismensium, ed. J. Boussard. 1957.

Hugh of Flavigny, Chronicon, (MGH,SS, VIII).

Lambert of Schaffenburg, De rebus gestis Germanorum (RHF, X).

Liber Sancti Jacobi, ed. J.Vieillard (book V only), as Le Guide du pélerin de St.Jacques de Compostelle. Mâcon, 1950.

Liber miraculorum Sanctae Fidis, ed. A. Bouillet (Collection des textes). 1897.

Loup de Ferrières, Correspondance, ed. L.Levillain (Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen age, 2 vols). 1927, 35.

Martin, monk of Montierneuf, Fragmentum historiae monasterii novi Pictavensis, ed. E. Martène and U.Durand (Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, III), 1717.

Cf. M.de Chergé (MSAO, 1844).

Miracula Sancti Benedicti, ed. E. de Certain (Société de l'histoire de France), 1858; also (MGH, SS, IX and XV).

Nithard, Historiarum libri III, ed. E.Müller (MGH,SS in usu scholarum). 1956.

Orderic Vitalis, Historia Ecclesiastica, ed. A. LePrévost and L. Delisle (Société de l'histoire de France,) 5 vols. 1838-55.

Ordo ad benedicendum ducem Aquitaniae, (RHF, XIII).

Peter, monk of Maillezais, Qualiter fuit constructum Malliacense monasterium et corpus Sancti Rigomeri translatum, ed. P. Labbe (Novae Bibliothecae). 1657. See L. Halphen, "L'Histoire de Maillezais du Moine Pierre", (RH 69. 1908).[1]

Petites chroniques du moine de St.Cybard, ed. P. de Fleury. Angoulême, 1882.

---

1. Re-printed in A travers l'histoire du moyen âge

Ralf Glaber, Historiarum libri V, ed. M. Prou (Collection des textes...) 1866.

Recueil des annales angevines et vendômoises, ed. L. Halphen (Collection des textes...). 1903.

Regino of Prüm, Chronicon, ed. F. Kurze. (MGH in usu scholarum) 1890.

Richer, Histoire de France, ed. R. Latouche (Classiques de l'histoire de France... 2 vols). 1930-37.

Richard le Poitevin, Chronicon, (RHF XII); see E.Berger, "Richard le Poitevin, moine de Cluny, historien et Poète", (Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 16. 1879).

Robert, St. of Chaise-Dieu, Vita and Miracula (AA.SS, 24 April).

Robert of Torigny, Chronique... ed. L. Delisle. Rouen. 1872.

Suger, Abbot of St.Denis, Vita Ludovici Grossi, ed. A. Molinier (Collection des textes...), 1887.

William of Jumièges, Gesta Normannorum ducum, ed. J. Marx (Société de l'Histoire de Normandie). 1914.
see J. Lair, Matériaux pour l'édition de Guillaume de Jumièges. 1910.
see L. Halphen, "Guillaume de Poitiers et Guillaume de Jumièges" (Mélanges F.Lot), 1925

William of Malmesbury, De gestis pontificum, ed. N. Hamilton (Rolls Series), 1870.
De Gestis Regum Anglorum, ed. W.Stubbs (Rolls series) 2 vols 1887-89.
Historia Novella, ed. K. Potter (Nelson's mediaeval texts), 1955.

William of Newburgh, De Rebus Anglicis (RHF, XIII).

William of Poitiers, Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant, ed. R. Foreville (Classiques de l'Histoire de France...) 1952.

William of Tyre, Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum, (RHC, Historiens occidentaux, vol.I). 1844.

William, Duke of Aquitaine, Les chansons de Guillaume IX duc d'Aquitaine, ed. A.Jeanroy (Les classiques français

<u>du moyen âge</u>). 1913.

II DOCUMENTARY SOURCES.

ANGERS (1) St.Aubin. Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St. d'Angers, ed.B. de Broussillon. 3 vols (Documents historiques sur l'Anjou.) 1903.
(2) Cathedral chapter. Cartulaire noir de la cathédrale d'Angers reconstitué, ed. Ch.Urseau. (Documents historiques sur l'Anjou). 1908.

ANGOULÊME (1) Cathedral chapter. Chartularium ecclesiae Engolismensis, ed. l'Abbé Nanglard. (Bulletins et mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente, 6th series, 9). 1889.
(2) St.Cybard. Cartulaire de St.Cybard d'Angoulême, ed. P.Lefrancq. 1930.

AUCH Cartulaires du chapitre de l'église métropolitaine de Ste. Marie d'Auch, ed. C. LaCave la Plagne-Barris. (AHGasc, 2nd series, 3-4). 1899.

BAIGNE Cartulaire de St.Etienne de Baigne en Saintonge, ed. l'Abbé Cholet. Niort. 1868.

BAS-POITOU Cartulaires du Bas-Poitou, ed. P. Marchegay. Les Roches-Baritaud. 1877.

BAYONNE Le Livre d'Or de Bayonne, ed. l'Abbé Bidache. Pau. (no date).

BEAULIEU-EN-LIMOUSIN Le Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Beaulieu-en-Limousin, ed. M. Deloche (Société de l'histoire de France). 1859.

BORDEAUX (1) Ste.Croix. Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Ste. Croix de Bordeaux, ed. Ducannès-Duval. (AHG 27). 1892.
(2) St.Seurin. Cartulaire de l'église collégiale de St. Seurin de Bordeaux, ed. J.Brutails Bordeaux. 1897.

BRIOUDE Cartulaire de Brioude, ed. H.Doniol. Clermont-Ferrand. 1863. See also (i) A. Bruel, "Essai sur la chronologie du cartulaire de Brioude" (BEC, 27, 1866). (ii) A-M and M. Baudot, "Grand cartulaire du chapitre de St. Julien de Brioude: essai de restitution" (Mémoires de l'Académie de Clermont-Ferrand, 35, 1935).

CHARROUX Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'abbaye de Charroux, ed. P. de Monsabert (AHF, 39). 1910.

CLUNY Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny, ed. A. Bernard and A. Bruel. 5 vols. (Société de l'histoire de France). 1876-1903.

CONQUES Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Conques en Rouergue, ed. G. Desjardins. 1879.

FRONSAC Cartulaire du prieuré de Ste. Geneviève de Fronsac, ed. J. dela Martinière. (AHG. 38). 1903.

GIMONT Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Gimont, ed. l'Abbé Clergeac. (AHGasc 2nd series, 9). 1905.

JUMIÈGES Chartes de l'abbaye de Jumièges (vers 825 à 1204) conservées aux Archives de la Seine-Inférieure, ed. J. Vernier. 2 vols (Société de l'histoire de Normandie) 1916.

L'ABSIE Cartulaire et chartes de l'abbaye de l'Absie, ed. B. Ledain. (AHP, 25). 1895.

LA COURONNE Chartes saintongeaises de l'abbaye de la Couronne, ed. G. Gabinet de Rencogne and P. de Fleury. (AHSA, 7.) 1880.

LA GRACE NOTRE-DAME Cartulaire de la'abbaye de la Grace Notre-Dame ou Charron-en-Aunis, ed. L. Meschinet de Richemond. (AHSA, II). 1883.

LA RÉOLE Cartulaire du prieuré conventuel de St.Pierre de la Réole en Bazadais du IXe au XIIe siècle, ed.C. Grellet-Balguerie (AHG 5). 1864. See also Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de St.Benoît-sur-Loire, ed. M. Prou and A. Vidier. vol. I. 1900.

LIMOGES Cathedral chapter. Sancti Stephani Lemovicensis Cartularium, ed. J. Font-Réaulx (Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique du Limousin vols 68-9, 1919-20).

LUCQ-EN-BÉARN Cartulaire de St.Vincent de Lucq, ed. L. Barrau-Dihigo and R. Poupardin. (Revue historique et archéologique du Béarn et du Pays Basque, 1904).

MARSEILLE Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St. Victor de Marseille, ed. M. Guérard (Société de l'histoire de France) 1857.

MAULEON Documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'abbaye de la Trinité de Mauléon, ed. B. Ledain. (AHP 20). 1889.

MORLAAS Cartulaire de Ste. Foi de Morlaas, ed. L. Cadier (Bulletins de la Société des sciences, lettres et arts de Pau, 2nd series 13). 1884.

NOUAILLE Chartes de l'abbaye de Nouaillé de 678 à 1200, ed. P. de Monsabert. (AHP 49). 1936.

ORBESTIER Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St.Jean d'Orbestier, ed. L. de la Boutière (AHP 6). 1877.
See also, by the same author, "Note sur la date de fondation d'Orbestier" (BSAO, 1877).

PAUNAT Fragments du cartulaire du monastère de Paunat (Dordogne), ed. R. Poupardin and A. Thomas (Annales du Midi 18, 1906).

POITIERS (1) Bishopric Cartulaire de l'Evêché de Poitiers, ou "Grand Gauthier", ed. L. Rédet (AHP X). 1881.
(2) Ste.Croix. Documents pour servir à l'histoire de Ste. Croix de Poitiers (994-1250), ed. P. de Monsabert (Revue Mabillon 9-10, 1913-14).
(3) St.Cyprien. Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St. Cyprien de Poitiers, ed. L. Rédet. (AHP. 3). 1874.
(4) St.Hilaire. Documents pour l'histoire de St.Hilaire de Poitiers, ed. L. Rédet. 2 vols (MSAO, 1st series 14-15). 1847,52.
(5) St.Nicolas. Cartulaire du prieuré de St. Nicolas de Poitiers, ed. L. Rédet. (AHP 1). 1872.

REDON Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Redon en Bretagne, ed. A. de Courson. (Société de l'histoire de France). 1863.

ROYAN Cartulaire du prieuré de St.Nicolas de Royan, ed. A. Dupré. (AHSA 19). 1891.

SAINTES (1) Bishopric and Chapter. Recueil des titres rélatifs à l'évêché et au chapitre de Saintes (AHSA 10), 1882.
(2) Notre-Dame. Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Saintes, ed. T. Grasilier. (Cartulaire inédits de la Saintonge, 2). Niort. 1871.
(3) Ste. Eutrope et son prieuré, ed. L. Audiat. (AHSA 2), 1875.

ST. BENOÎT-SUR-LOIRE Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de St.Benoît-sur-Loire, ed. M. Prou and A. Vidier. 2 vols. (Documents de la Société historique et archéologique du Gâtinais 5-6.) 1900-07.

ST. FLORENT DE SAUMUR (1) Chartes poitevines de St. Florent de Saumur, ed. P. Marchegay. (AHP 2). 1873.
(2) Chartes saintongeaises de l'abbaye de St. Florent près Saumur (de 1060 à 1200 environ), ed. P. Marchegay. (AHSA 4). 1877.
(3) Chartes bordelaises tirées des archives de St. Florent près Saumur, ed. P. Marchegay. Les Roches-Baritaud. 1879.
(4) Chartes anciennes de St.Florent près Saumur pour le Périgord (1080-1186), ed. P. Marchegay. (Bulletins de la Société historique et archéologique du Périgord 6, 1879).

ST.JEAN D'ANGÉLY Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St.Jean d'Angély, ed. G. Musset. 2 vols (AHSA 30,33). 1901-3.

ST.JOUIN-DE-MARNES Chartularium Sancti Iovini, ed. Ch. Grandmaison (Société de Statistique du département des Deux-Sevres) Niort 1854.

ST. MAIXENT Chartes et documents pour servir à l'histoire de l'abbaye de St.Maixent, ed. A. Richard. 2 vols. (AHP 16-17). 1886.

ST.MAUR-SUR-LOIRE Chartularium S.Mauri ad Ligerim, ed. P. Marchegay (Archives d'Anjou 1). 1843.

SAINT-MONT Cartulaire du prieuré de St.Mont, ed. J. de Jaurgain (AHGasc. 2nd series 7) 1904.
See Ch. Samaran "Le plus ancien cartulaire de St.Mont", (BEC 110 1952).

ST. PHILIBERT Monuments de l'histoire des abbayes de St. Philibert, ed. R. Poupardin (Collection de textes), 1905.

ST.SAVIN EN LAVEDAN Cartulaire des Bénédictins de St. Savin de Lavedan, ed. Ch.Durier Tarbes 1800.

ST.SEVER Reliquiae Sanctae Severianae, ed. A. Degert (Bulletins de la Société de Borda, 1913).

SAUXILLANGES Cartulaire de Sauxillanges, ed. H. Doniol. Clermont 1864.

SAVIGNY Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Savigny, ed. A. Bernard (Société de l'histoire de France) 1853.

SORDE Le cartulaire de l'abbaye de St.Jean de Sorde, ed. P. Raymond Pau. 1873.

SURGERES L'Aumonerie de St.Gilles de Surgères (1105-1147). Documents tirés des manuscrits de Dom Fonteneau, ed. P. de Fleury. (AHSA 6). 1879.

TALMOND Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Ste.Croix de Talmond (MSAO, 36) 1872. see M. Garaud, Essai sur le cartulaire de Talmond. 1914.

TIRON Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Ste.Trinité de Tiron, ed. L. Merlet 2 vols. (Societe archéologique d'Eure et Loir) 1883.

TOURS St. Martin, La Pancarte noire de St. Martin de Tours, brûlée en 1793 restituee daprès les textes, E. Mabille. 1866.

TULLE Le cartulaire de l'abbaye bénédictine de St.Martin de Tulle en Limousin, ed. J. B. Champeval. Brive 1903.

UZERCHE Le cartulaire de l'abbaye d'Uzerche (de Xe au XIVe siecle), ed. J.B. Champeval. Tulle. 1901.

VAUX Cartulaire de l'abbaye de St.Etienne de Vaux de l'ordre de St.Benoît, ed. T. Grasilier (Cartulaires inédits de la Saintonge) Niort 1871.

VENDÔME (1) Le cartulaire de l'abbaye cardinale de la Trinité de Vendôme, ed. C. Métais 4 vols.Vannes. 1893-97.
(2) Le cartulaire saintongeais de l'abbaye de la Trinité de Vendôme ed. C. Métais (AHSA 22) 1893.

VIGEOIS Cartulaire du monastère de St.Pierre de Vigeois, ed. H. de Montrégut (Bulletins de la Société archéologique et historique du Limousin, 39) 1890.

III MISCELLANEOUS WORKS CONTAINING LITERARY AND DOCUMENTARY SOURCES.

d'Archéry. L, Spicilegium, sive collectio veterum aliquot scriptorum 3 vols. 1723.

Arcère. L, Histoire de la ville de la Rochelle, et du pays d'Aulnis. 2 vols. La Rochelle. 1756-7.

Baluze. E, Miscellanea novo ordine digesta..., Lucca. 1761-4.

Servati Lupi Opera, 1664,1710.

Besly. J, Histoire des comtes de Poictou et Ducs de Guyenne. 1647.

Böhmer. J, Die Regesten des Kaiserreichs unter den Karolingern (751-918)... (continued by E. Mühlbacher). 1880-89, 1908.

Bollandus J & Henschevius G, Acta Sanctorum quot quot toto orbe coluntur... Editio novissima 1863 onwards.

Boretius. A and Krause. V, Capitularia regum Francorum, 2 vols, (MGH Legum sectio II). 1881,90.

Bouquet, M. Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de France, vols. 10-14. 1738 onwards.

Bréquigny. L, Table chronologique des diplômes, chartes, titres et actes imprimés... 8 vols. 1769-86.

Brugèles, Dom, Chroniques écclésiastiques du diocèse d'Auch. 1746.

Brunel. C, Recueil des actes des comtes de Pontieu (Société de l'histoire de France) 1930.

Caspar. E, Register Gregors VII, (MGH, epistolae). 1920.

Champollion-Figeac. J, Documents historiques inédits tirés des collections manuscrites... 5 vols. 1841-74.

Del Arco. R, Documentos Aragoneses de los siglos XI y XII, (Estudios de Edad media de la corona de Aragon, 3). Saragossa. 1947-8.

Delisle. L, and Berger. E, Recueil des actes d'Henri II, roi d'Angleterre concernant les provinces françaises et les affaires de France (Chartes et diplômes relatifs à l'histoire de France) 2 vols. 1909.

Dillay. M, Les Chartes de franchises de Poitou. 1927.

Fauroux. M, Recueil des Actes des Ducs de Normandie (911-1066), (Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie 26). Caen. 1961.

Gallia Christiana in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa, ed D. Ste. Marthe. 16 vols. 1715 onwards.

Jaffé. P, Regesta pontificum Romanorum. Lipskie 1885 (re-edited and annotated by G. Wattenbach, S. Löwenfeld, F. Kaltenbrunner, and P. Ewald).

Labbe. P, and Cossaert. G, Sacrosancta concilia ad regiam editionem exacta, quae nunc quarta parte proditi auctior... Editions of 1671, 1728, 1748. (Cf. also Mansi).

Labbe. P, Novae Bibliotherae manuscriptorum... Collectio. 2 vols. 1657.

Lauer. P, Recueil des actes de Louis IV, roi de France (936-54). (Chartes et diplômes...) 1914.

" Recueil des actes de Charles III, le Simple, (Chartes et diplômes...). 1940.

Levillain. L, Recueil des actes de Pépin Ier et de Pépin II, rois d'Aquitaine (Chartes et diplômes...). 1926.

Lobineau. G, Histoire de Bretagne, 2 vols. 1707.

Lot. F and Halphen. L, Recueil des actes de Lothaire et de Louis V, rois de France (Chartes et diplômes...). 1908.

Luchaire. A, Etudes sur les actes de Louis VII. 1885.

Mabillon. J, Acta sanctorum ordinis Sancti Benedicti. 1688; Venice 1733.

" Annales ordinis Sancti Benedicti, 6 vols. 1703-39.

Magin. A, & Tholin G, Archives municipales d'Agen, chartes première Séire (1189-1328). 1876.

Marca. P de, Histoire de Béarn. 1640.

Marrier. M & DuChesne A, Bibliotheca Cluniacensis... 1614.

Mansi. J, Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio. Venice, 1759 onwards.

Martène. E and Durand. U, Thesaurus novus anecdotorum... 5 vols. 1717.

Migne. J, Patrologiae cursus completus... Series secunda in qua prodeunt doctores...ecclesiae Latinae... 217 vols. 1844 onwards.

Morice. A, Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire de Bretagne 3 vols. 1742-6.

Newman. W, Catalogue des actes de Robert II. 1937.

Poupardin. R, Recueil des actes des rois de Provence (855-928), (Chartes et diplômes...). 1920.

Prou. M, Recueil des actes du roi Philippe Ier, (Chartes et diplômes..) 1908.

Soehnéé. F, Catalogue des actes d'Henri Ier roi de France (1031-60), (BEHE fasc. 161). 1907.

Tessier. G, Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve, 3 vols. (Chartes et diplômes...). 1943 onwards.

Vaissète J. and Vic.C.de, Histoire Générale de Languedoc, (revised A. Molinier), 10 vols. 1872 onwards.

Vercauteren.F, Actes des comtes de Flandre (1071-1128), (Commission royale d'histoire. Recueil des actes des princes belges). 1938.

Zeumer. K, Formulae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi (MGH Legum Sectio V). 1886.

S E C O N D A R Y W O R K S.

Andrieu. J, Une Province à travers les siecles - Histoire de l'Agenais. 2 vols. 1893.

Aubenas. R, "Les Châteaux-forts des Xe et XIe siècles" (RHDFE 4th series, 17, 1938).

Auzias. L, "Bernard le Veau et Bernard Plantevelue" (Annales du Midi, vol. 44 1932).

" "Les fluctuations de quelques grands d'Aquitaine au temps de Charles le Chauve (846-74)" (Annales du Midi, 44, 1932).

" "Le personnel comtal et l'autorité royal en Septimanie meridional (872-8)" (Annales du Midi 45, 1933).

" "L'Origine carolingienne des ducs féodaux d'Aquitaine et des rois capétiens" (RH [redacted]. 173, 1934).

" L'Aquitaine Carolingienne (778-987). Toulouse, Paris, 1937.

Baluze. E, Histoire généalogique de la Maison d'Auvergne. 2 vols. 1708.

Barbier. F, "Etudes sur le Châtelleraudais" (MSAO 2nd series, 16, 1893).

Barrau-Dihigo.L, "Les Origines du Royaume de Navarre d'après une théorie récente". (Revue Hispanique, 7, 1900).

" "Les Premiers Rois de Navarre, Notes critiques" (Revue Hispanique 15, 1906).

Barthelemy. A de "Note sur quelques monnaies de la vicomte de Turenne" (Bulletins de la Société des lettres, sciences et arts de la Corrèze II, 1885

Beaumont. Chde, "Trésor numismatique de la Francherie (Dordogne)", (Bulletins de la société historique et archéologique de Périgord, 1914).

Bédier. J, "Les Légendes Epiques. Recherches sur la formation des chansons de geste. 4 vols. 1908-13.

Bemont. C, "Les Institutions Municipales de Bordeaux au Moyen Age", (RH, 123, 1916).

Berger. E, "Note sur le formule rex Francorum et dux Aquitanorum dans les actes de Louis VII", (BEC 45, 1884).

" "Les Aventures de la Reine Eleanor", (Comptes Rendus [redacted] de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1906).

Bernard. St., Bernard de Clairvaux (ed. Commission de l'Histoire de l'Ordre de Cîteaux. Etudes et Documents, no.3). 1953.

Bienvenu. J, "Recherches sur les péages angevins aux XIe et XIIe siècles", (MA, 63-4, 1957).

Biron. R, "Les doyens du chapitre métropolitain de Bordeaux" (Revue Historique de Bordeaux, 1931).

" "L'Épiscopat bazadais (Ve siècle-1792)", (Revue Historique de Bordeaux 1924).

Bladé. J-F de "Notice sur le vicomté de Bézaume, comté de Bénauge, vicomtés de Bruilhois et d'Arvillars et le pays de Villandraut et de Cayran", (Revue de l'Agenais 1877, 78.)

" "Géographie politique du sud-ouest de la Gaule franque au temps des rois d'Aquitaine" (Revue de l'Agenais, 1895).

" "Les Origines du Duché de Gascogne" (Recueil des Travaux de la Société d'Agriculture, Sciences et Arts d'Agen 2nd series, 13, 1897).

" Les grands fiefs de Gascogne. 1897.

Blanchet. A and Dieudonné. A, Manuel de Numismatique française. 4 vols. 1912-36.

Bloch. M, Les rois thaumaturges (Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, fasc. 19). 1924.

" Les caracteres originaux de l'histoire rurale française (2nd ed.) 1952.

Bloch. M, "Le probleme de l'or au moyen age" (Annales d'histoire économique et sociale 1933).

" Feudal Society (transl. L. Manyon) 1961.

Boissonade. P, Histoire du Poitou (Collection Vieilles Provinces de France). 1915.

" Du nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland. 1923.

" "L'Organisation du travail en Poitou" (BSAO 2nd series 22, 1898).

" "Les Îles du Bas-Poitou pendant les cinq premiers siecles du haut moyen âge" (BSAO, 3rd series 4, 1918).

" "Les deux derniers Guilhem, Comtes de Poitiers, Ducs d'Aquitaine: leur influence sur la naissance et le developpement de la poésie lyrique romane" (BSAO 3rd series, 7, 1925).

" "Cluny, la papaute et la premiere grande croisade internationale contre les Sarrasins d'Espagne. Barbastro (1064-5)", (Revue des questions historiques, 1932).

" "Les Premiers croisades françaises en Espagne", (Bulletin Hispanique 36, 1934).

" "L'ascension, le déclin et la chute d'un grand état feodal du centre-Ouest - les Taillefers et les Lusignan - comtes de la Marche et d'Angoulême", (Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société historique et archéologique de la Charente, 1935).

" "Les relations des Ducs d'Aquitaine, Comtes de Poitiers avec les états chrétiens d'Aragon et de Navarre (1014-1137)" (BSAO 1934-5).

Bongert. Y, Recherches sur les cours laiques du Xe au XIIIe siecle. 1949.

Bonnaud-Delamare. R, "Fondement des institutions de paix au XIe siecle" (Mélanges Louis Halphen).

Boüard. A. de, Manuel de Diplomatique française et pontificale. 2 vols & plates (Diplomatique générale, 1929. L'Acte privé, 1948. Transcription et explication des planches 1929).

Boussard. J, Le comté d'Anjou sous Henri Plantegenet et ses fils (1151-1204), (BEHE 271). 1938.

" Le Gouvernement d'Henri II Plantegenêt. 1956.

" "Le seigneurie de Bellême au Xe et XIe siècles" (Mélanges Louis Halphen)

"Le comté de Mortain au XIe siecle" (MA 4th series, 7, 1952).

Boutruche. R, Une Societé provinciale en lutte contre le régime féodal: l'alleu en Bordelais et en Bazadais du XIe au XVIIIe siècle. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 100 bis) Rodez. 1947.

Brequigny. L, "Observations sur le testament de Guillaume X, duc d'Aquitaine et Comte de Poitou" (Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1786).

Breuils. A, "La Ténarèze, voie romaine et pré-romaine" (Revue de Gascogne, 32, 1891).

" "Les principaux barons du Fézensac a l'époque féodale" (Revue de Gascogne, 37, 1896).

Brooke ZN & CNL, "Henry II, Duke of Normandy and Aquitaine" (English Historical Review, 61, 1946).

Brulit. R, "Le château de Gourdon (XIe - XVIIe siècle)", (Bulletin de la Société des Études Littéraires, Scientifiques et Artistiques du Lot, 1931).

Brussel. N, Nouvel examen de l'usage général des fiefs en France pendant le XIe, le XIIe, le XIIIe et le XIV siecles. 2 vols. 1750.

Bulst-Thiele. M, Kaiserin Agnes (Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, herausgegeben von Walter Goetz, Band 52) Leipzig & Berlin. 1933.

Calmette. J, La question des Pyrénées et la Marche d'Espagne au Moyen Age, 1947.

Caron. E, Monnaies féodales françaises, 1882.

Cate. J-L, "A Gay Crusader" (Byzantion, 16, 1942-3).

" "The Crusade of 1101" (A History of the Crusades, I, ed M. Baldwin) Philadelphia. 1955.

Catel. G. de, Histoire des comtes de Tolose (710-1271). Toulouse. 1623.

Chamard. "Chronologie historique des vicomtes de Châtellerault" (MSAO 1st series, 35, 1871)

Champeval. J-B, "Généalogie de la maison de Comborn" (Bulletin de la Société Scientifique, Historique et Archéologique de la Corrèze, II, 1889).

Chaplais. P, "Le traite de Paris de 1259 et l'infeodation de la Gascogne allodiale" (MA, 4th series, 10, 1955).

Chartrou. J, L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151. Foulques de Jerusalem et Geoffroi Plantegenet. 1928.

Chénon. E, Étude sur l'histoire des alleux en France. 1888

" Les marches séparantes d'Anjou, Bretagne et Poitou. 1892.

Claude. D, Topographie und Verfassung der Städte Bourges und Poitiers bis in das II Jahrhundert. Lübeck. 1960.

Compain. L, Etude sur Geoffroi de Vendôme (BEHE, 86). 1891.

Corona Baratech. C, "Las tenencias en Aragon desde 1035 a 1134". (Estudios de Edad Media de la Corona de Aragon, 2, 1946).

Courteault. E, "Un texte du Xe siècle sur Blaye, Bordeaux et St. Seurin" (Revue Historique de Bordeaux, 1922).

Cosnac. R, "La maison de Malemort en Limousin" (Bulletin de la Société scientifique et historique et Archéologique de la Corrèze 1945-7).

Cousseau. "Mémoire historique sur l'église Notre-Dame de Lusignan et ses fondateurs". (BSAO 1894).

Crozet. R, Villes d'entre Loire et Gironde. Poitiers. 1949.

" "Le voyage d'Urbain II et ses négociations avec le clergé de France," (RH, 179, 1937)

" "Le voyage d'Urbain II en France (1095-6)" (Annales du Midi, 49, 1937).

" "Recherches sur la cathédrale et les évêques de Poitiers des origines au commencement du XIIIe siècle" (BSAO 4th series, 6, 1962).

David. M, Le Serment du sacre du IXe au XVe siècle. 1951. / La souveraineté et les limites juridiques du pouvoir monarchique du XIe au XVe siècle. 1954.

David. P, Études Historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal du VIe au XIIe siècle (Collection portuguaise, 7). Coïmbra. 1947.

Declareuil. J, Histoire générale du droit français des origines à 1789. 1925.

Defourneaux. M, Les Français en Espagne aux XIe et XIIe siècles. 1949.

Degert. A, "L'Evêché de Gascogne" (Revue de Gascogne 41, 1900).

" "Une Charte fausse et un concile Gascon suspect" (Revue de Gascogne 41, 1900).

Degert. A, "Histoire des Evêques de Dax" (Bulletin de la Societé archeologique de Borda, 1899-1900).

" "Le pouvoir royal en Gascogne sous les derniers Carolingiens et les premiers Capétiens" (Revue des questions Historiques, 1902).

" "Amat d'Oloron: un ouvrier de la réforme au XIe siècle" (Revue des Questions Historiques, 1908).

Delcambre. E, "Géographie historique du Velay" (BEC 98, 1937)

Deléage. A, La vie rurale en Bourgogne jusqu'au début du onzième siècle. Mâcon. 1941.

Delisle. L, "Des revenus publics en Normandie au XIIe siècle" (BEC 10-11, 13, 1848, 1852).

" Notes sur les Poésies de Baudri, Abbe de Bourgueil. 1872.

Denyse. J, "L'Abbaye royale de Bassac". (Bulletin de la société archéologique et historique de la Charente 5th series, 3, 1880).

Depoin. J, "Les comtes héréditaires d'Angoulême de Bougrin Ier à Audoin II (869-1032)" (Bulletins et mémoires de la Societe archéologique et historique de la Charente, 1903-4).

Desages. O-G, "Essai sur la généalogie des comtes d'Angoulême (IXe-XIe siecles)" (Bulletins et memoires de la société archéologique et historique de la Charente, 1905-06).

Dessalles. L, Histoire du Périgord. 3 vols. Libourne. 1886.

Dhondt. J, Etudes sur la naissance des principautés territoriales en France. (IXe-Xe siècles). Bruges. 1948.

Dhondt. J, "Le Titre du Marquis a l'époque Carolingienne" (Bulletin Ducange 19, 1945-6).

" "Henri Ier, l'Empire et l'Anjou (1043-56)" (RBPH, 25, 1946-7).

" "Quelques aspects du règne d'Henri Ier" (Melanges Louis Halphen).

Diez. F.C, Leben und Werke der Troubadours. Zwickau. 1829.

Dillay. M, "Le "service" annuel en derniers des fiefs de la région angevine" (Mélanges Paul Fournier, 1929).

Dion. R, Essai sur la formation du paysage rural francais. Tours. 1934.

" Les frontieres de la France. 1947.

Douglas. D, "Companions of the Conqueror" (History, 28, 1943).

" "The Earliest Norman Counts" (English Historical Review, 61, 1946).

Dozy. R, Recherches sur l'Histoire politique et litteraire de l'Espagne pendant le moyen age. 2 vols, 3rd ed. Paris, Leiden. 1881.

Drochon. l'Abbé, "Château l'Archer et ses seigneurs" (MSAO 38 1875).

Drouin. A, "Les Marais salants d'Aunis et de Saintonge" (Revue de Saintonge et d'Aunis. 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1941)

Duby. G, "Recherches sur l'évolution des institutions judiciaires pendant le Xe et XIe siecles au sud de la Bourgogne". (MA 4th series, 1-2, 1946-7).

Duchesne. L, Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule 3 vols, 2nd ed. 1907-15.

" "St. Jacques en Galice" (Annales du Midi, 12, 1900).

Dufourcet. E, "Catalogue raisonné des Vicomtes de Dax" (Bulletin de la Société archéologique de Borda, 1879).

Dumas. A, "Encore la question 'Fidèles ou vassaux'?" (RHDFE 3rd series, 44, 1920).

" "Quelques observations sur la grande et petite propriété à l'époque carolingienne" (RHDFE 4th series, 5, 1926).

" and Amann. E, L'Eglise du pourvoir des laïques (888-1057) (Histoire de l'Eglise, VII) 1948.

Duval. F, De la Paix de Dieu à la paix de fer. 1923.

Eckel. A, Annales de l'histoire de France à l'époque carolinglenne. Charles le Simple (BEHE, 124) 1899.

Engel. A, & Serrure. R.C, Traité de numismatique du moyen age. 3 vols 1891 & 1905.

Escande. J, Histoire du Périgord 2nd ed. 1955.

Estienne. C, Le guide des chemins de France de 1533, ed. J. Bonnerot (BFHF 265, 267). 1936.

Ewald. F, "Die Päpstbriefe der Britischen Sammlung." (Neues Archiv, 5, 1880).

Eygun. Fr, Sigillographie du Poitou jusqu'en 1515. Poitiers. 1938.

" "Rapport sur les fouilles dans la grande salle du Palais de Justice de Poitiers" (BSAO 3rd series, 13, 1942-5).

Fage. R, "La maison de Ségur" (Bulletins de la Société archéologique et historique du Limousin, 26, 1878).

Favre. E, Etudes comte de Paris et Roi de France, 882-898. (BEHE, 99). 1893.

Fawtier. R, La chanson de Roland, étude historique. 1933.
" Les Capétiens et la France, 1942, transl by L. Butler & A. Adam as The Capétian Kings of France, Monarchy and Nation (987-1328) London; New York. 1960. (ed)., Histoire des institutions françaises au moyen age 1957 onwards.

Faye. L, "Recherches géographiques sur les viqueries du pays d'Aunis" (MSAO 1845)

" "Recherches sur l'ancienne maison de Châtelaillon en Aunis" (MSAO 1846)

Fayolle. L, "Le Palais Carolingien de Cassanogilum était a Chasseneuil" (BSAO 1936-7)

Feuchère. P, "Essai sur l'évolution territoriale des principautés françaises (Xe-XIIIe siecles)" (MA 4th series, 7, 1952)

Ferrand. M, "Origines de Justices féodales" (MA 2nd series, 23, 1921)

Flach. J, Les origines de l'ancienne France. La condition des personnes et des terres de Hughes Capet à Louis le Gros. 4 vols. 1886-1917

" "Les diplômes de Philippe Ier" (Journal des Savants, 1911)

Fliche. A, Le regne de Philippe Ier, roi de France (1060-1108). 1912.

" La réforme Grégorienne (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense.. Etudes etc). 2 vols. Louvain. 1924.

" La reforme Grégorienne et la reconquête Chrétienne (1057-1123) (Histoire de l'Eglise, VIII) 1950.

" "La papauté et les origines de la croisade" (Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique 34, 1938)

Font-Réaulx. J.de, "Les diplômes carolingiens du cathédrale de St. André de Bordeaux" (MA 2nd series, 19, 1915).

" "Propos sur les diplômes des derniers Carolingiens"(Recueil Clovis Brunel). 1955.

" "Les Actes de Comtes de Poitou au XIe siècle", (Bulletins philologiques et historiques du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 1926-7. Distributed 1929)

Fournier. P, "De quelques questions concernant l'ancien droit public" (Journal des Savants, 1919)

Fuchier. E, "La Baronnie de Mirebeau du XIe au XIIIe siècle" (MSAO 2nd series, I. 1877).

Fustel de Coulanges. N, Histoire des institutions politiques de l'ancienne France. 6 vols. 1888-92.

Galbraith. V, "Monastic Foundation charters of the eleventh and twelfth centuries", (Cambridge Historical Journal 4, 1934).

Gams. B, Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae. Ratisbon. 1873.

Ganshof, F-L, Qu'est-ce-que la Féodalite? 2nd. edition. Neuchâtel 1947 (transl. by F. Crierson as Feudalism. London 1952)

" La Flandre sous les premiers comtes. Brussels. 1949.

" "Etude sur l'administration de la justice dans la région bourguignonne de la fin du Xe au début du XIIe siècle" (RH 135, 1920)

" "Contribution à l'étude des origines des cours féodales en France". (RHDFE 4th series, 7, 1928)

" "Depuis quand a-t'on pu en France être vassal de plusiers seigneurs?" (Mélanges Paul Fournier, 1929)

" "Benefice and Vassalage in the age of Charlemagne" (Cambridge Historical Journal, 1939)

" "Le Roi de France en Flandre en 1127 et 1128", (RHDFE, 4th series 27, 1949).

Garaud. M, Essai sur les institutions judiciaires du Poitou sous le gouvernement des Comtes indépendants (902-1137) Poitiers, 1910.

" L'abbaye de Ste.Croix de Talmond en Bas-Poitou. Poitiers. 1914.

Garaud. M, "Le droit romain dans les chartes poitevines du IXe au XIe siècle" (Mélanges Cornil, 1). 1927.

" "Les incursions des Normands en Poitou, et leurs consequences", (RH 180, 1937).

" "Les vicomtes du Poitou (IXe-XIIe siècles)", (RHDFE, 4th series 16, 1937)

" "Les origines du pagi poitevins du moyen âge (VIe-XIe siecles)" (RHDFE, 4th series 27, 1949)

" "La construction des châteaux et la destinée de la vicaria et du vicarius carolingien en Poitou", (RHDFE, 4th series 31, 1953)

" "Les circonscriptions administratives du comté de Poitou et les auxiliaires du Comte au Xe siecle", (MA, 4th series 8, 1953)

Giry. A, Les Etablissements de Rouen, Etudes sur l'histoire des institutions municipales de Rouen, Falaise, etc. (BEHE, 55) 1883.

" Manuel de Diplomatique. 1894.

Grand. R, "La vie de Saint-Amant, les origines de l'Abbaye, sa dépendance de St. Gérard d'Aurillac (VIe-XIVe siècle)", (Bulletin et Mémoires de la Société archéologique et historique de la Charente, 1939).

Grenier. P, "La cité de Limoges", (Bulletin de la Société archéologique du Limousin 57, 1907).

Grierson. P, "The identity of the unnamed fiscs in the Brevium Exemplar ad describendas res ecclesiasticas et fiscales" (RBPH 1938)

" "Commerce in the Dark Ages: A critique of the evidence" (Transactions of the Royal Historical Society 5th series, 9, 1959)

Guibert. L, — La monnaie de Limoges. Limoges. 1893.

" — "Tableau historique et topographique du Limousin", (Bulletin de la Societe archéologique du Limousin, 59, 1909).

Guilhermoz. P, — Essai sur l'origine de la noblesse en France au moyen âge. 1902.

Halphen. L, — Le comte d'Anjou au XIe siecle. 1906.

" — A travers l'histoire du moyen age. 1950.[1]

" — Mélanges d'Histoire du Moyen Age dédiés à la mémoire de Louis. Halphen. 1951.

Haskins. C, — Norman Institutions. (Reissue). New York. 1960.

Havet. J, — "Les couronnements des rois Hugues et Robert: un document interpolé par Pierre Pithou" (RH 45, 1891).

Hefele. C, and Leclercq. H, — Histoire des Conciles (transl. into French by Leclercq). 1907 onwards.

Higounet. C, — Le comté de Comminges de ses origines a son annexion à la Couronne. 2 vols. (Bibliotheque méridionale, 2nd series, 32). Toulouse/Paris. 1949.

" — "Bastides et frontières", (MA 4th series, 3, 1948).

" — "Esquisse d'une géographie des châteaux des Pyrénées francaises au moyen age". (1 congreso internacional de Pirenéistas del Instituto de estudos pirenaicos) Saragossa. 1950.

" — "Un grand chapitre de l'histoire du XIIe siècle: la rivalite des maisons de Toulouse et Barcelone" (Mélanges Louis Halphen)

" — "Les chemins de St.Jacques et les sauvetés de Gascogne", (Annales du Midi 63, 1951)

Note 1 This volume contains reprints of many articles by Halphen which are scattered throughout learned periodicals.

Hill. L. & J, Raymond IV de St.Gilles, Comte de Toulouse (1041 ou 1042-1105) (Bibliothèque Meriodionale 2nd series 35). Toulouse. 1959.

Huberti. L, Studien zur Rechtsgeschichte der Gottefrieden und Landfrieden. Ansbach. 1892.

Imbert. H, "Notice sur les vicomtes de Thouars de la famille de ce nom" (MSAO 1st series, 29, 1864).

" "Histoire de Thouars" (Mémoires de la Société de Statistique des Deux-Sevres, 1870).

Jarry. E, Provinces et Pays de France (vols 1, 2ii, 3ii published so far) 1942 onwards.

Jeanroy. A, La poésie lyrique des troubadours 2 vols. 1934.

Jaurgain. J, La Vasconie. Étude historique et critique. 2 vols. Pau. 1898.

Jullian. C, Histoire de Bordeaux depuis les origines jusqu'en 1895. Bordeaux. 1895.

" "Le palais Carolingien de Cassinogilum", (Etudes d'Histoire du moyen âge dédiees a Gabriel Monod) 1896.

Jusselin. M, "La chancellerie de Charles le Chauve" (MA, 2nd series 24, 1922).

" "Liste chronologique et lecture des mentions en notes tironiennes dans les diplômes de Charles le Chauve" (MA, 2nd series 30, 1929).

Kienast. W, Untertaneneid und Treuvorbehalt in Frankreich und England. Weimar. 1952.

Labande. E, "Pour une image véridique d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine" (BSAO 1952).

Labastide. M, "Les voies romaines et mérovingieunes dans le département de la Charente", (Bulletins de la Société historique et archéologique de la Charente 8th series 12, 1922).

Lacurie. A, — Histoire de l'Abbaye de Maillezais depuis la fondation jusqu'a nos jours. Fontenay-le-Comte. 1852.

Lamberterie, Baron de Turenne, — "Carte de la Vicomte et Vue de chef-lieu" (Bulletins de la Société des lettres, sciences et arts de la Correze, 1885)

Lasteyrie. C.de, — L'Abbaye de St. Martial de Limoges.1901.

Lasteyrie. Comte R. de, — Etude sur les comtes et vicomtes de Limoges antérieurs à l'an 1000 (BEHE 18) 1874.

" — "Les vicomtes de Ségur", (Bulletins de la Société des lettres, sciences et arts de la Correze, 1880).

Latouche. R, — Histoire du comté de Maine pendant le Xe et XIe siecles (BEHE 183). 1910.

" — "Défrichement et Peuplement rural dans le Maine du IXe au XIIIe siecle", (MA 4th series 3, 1948).

Lauer. P, — Annales de l'histoire de France a l'époque carolingienne. Le règne de Louis IV d'Outremer (BEHE 127). 1900.

" — Annales de l'histoire de France à l'époque Carolingienne. Robert et Raoul de Bourgogne, rois de France (923-936) (BEHE 188). 1910.

Lecointre-Dupont M, — "Essai sur les monnaies frappées en Poitou" (MSAO, 1840)

" — "Rapports sur une decouverte de monnaies de Moyen Age" (MSAO, 1840).

Ledain. B, — Dictionnaire Topographique du département des Deux-Sèvres (Dictionnaire Topographiqes de la France) Poitiers. 1902.

" — "Les châteaux féodaux du Poitou du IXe au XIIIe siecle" (Revue Poitevine et Saintongeaise, 1891).

Léonard. E, — "Chanceliers, notaires comtaux et notaires publics dans les actes des Comtes de Toulouse" (BEC 113, 1955).

Lemarignier. J-F, Étude sur les privilèges d'exemption et de juridiction ecclésiastique des abbayes Normandes depuis les origines jusqu'en 1140 (Archives de la France monastique, 44). 1937.

" Recherches sur l'Hommage en marche et les frontières féodales (Travaux et memoires de l'Université de Lille, 24), 1945.

" "La dislocation du pagus et le probleme des consuetudines (Xe-XIe)" (Mélanges Louis Halphen)

" "Les Fidèles du roi de France" (Mélanges C. Brunel).

" "Autour de la royauté française du XIe au XIIIe siècle" (BEC, 113, 1956)

" "Structures monastiques et Structures politiques dans la France de la fin du Xe et du debut du XIe siecle" (Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alta medievo IV: Il Monachesimo nell alto medievo e la Formazione della Civilta Occidentale April 1956) Spoleto 1957.

Le Saintongeais. J, "Taillebourg et ses seigneurs", (Revue de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis, 1911).

Lesne. E, Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France. 6 vols. Lille. 1910 onwards.

Levillain. L, "Note sur l'immunité mérovingienne" (RHDFE 4th series 6, 1927)

" Adhémar de Chabannes, généalogiste (BSAO 3rd series, 10, 1934)

Lobineau. G, Histoire de Bretagne, composée sur les titres et les autres originaux. 2 vols. 1707.

Lodge. E.C, Gascony under English Rule. 1926.

Longnon. A, Atlas Historique de la France depuis Cesar jusqu'à nos jours. 3 vols. and plates. 1885-9.

Lot. F, Les derniers Carolingiens. (BEHE, 87). 1891.

" Études sur le règne d'Hughes Capet (BEHE, 147). 1903.

" Fidèles ou Vassaux? Essai sur la nature juridique du lien qui unissait les grands vassaux à la royauté depuis le milieu du IXe jusqu'à la fin du XIIe siècle. 1904.

" "La vicaria et le vicarius" (RHDFE, 3rd series 17, 1893).

" "Garsie-Sanche duc de Gascogne", (Annales du Midi 46, 1904).

" "Le roi Eudes 'duc d'Aquitaine' & Adhémar de Chabannes", (Annales du Midi 46, 1904).

" "Réponse à la défense de M. Alfred Richard", (BSAO 2nd series, 10 1905).

" "La grande invasion Normande de 856-62" (BEC 69 1908)

" "La Loire, l'Aquitaine et la Seine de 862 à 866", (BEC 76, 1915).

" "Les tributs aux Normands et l'Église de France", (BEC 85, 1924).

" "L'Evêché de Bayonne" (Mélanges Louis Halphen).

Luchaire. A, Histoire des Institutions Monarchiques de la France sous les Premiers Capétiens (987-1180). 2 vols. 1892

" Manuel des Institutions Français (période des Capétiens directs). 1892

Lyon. E, "Comment fut elaborée l'ordonnance sur les rachats en Poitou (Mai 1269)", (BEC 88, 1927)

Manduyt. "Notice sur Gencay et son château", (BSAO 1838-40)

Maratu l'abbé, "Girard, évêque d'Angouleme", (Bulletins de la Societé archeologique et historique de la Charente 4th series 4, 1864)

Marca. P, Marca hispanica, sive limes hispanicus. 1688.

Martiniere. J. de la St. Cybard, étude critique d'hagiographie (VIe-XIIe siècle). 1908

Marvaud. F, "Notice sur les seigneurs de Montbron" (Bulletins de la Societe archéologique et historique de la Charente, 5, 1851-2).

Massiou. D, Histoire politique, civile et réligieuse de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis depuis les premiers temps historiques jusqu'à nos jours 5 vols. 1838-46.

Maubourget. J-M, Le Périgord meridional des origines a l'an 1370. Cahors. 1926.

Mitteis. H, Der Staat des Höhenmittelalters. Weimar. 1948.

Monlezun. J, Histoire de la Gascogne depuis les temps les plus recutes jusqua nos jours. 6 vols. Auch. 1846-50.

Newmann. W.M, Le domaine royal sous les premiers Capétiens (987-1180). Strasbourg. 1937.

Noaillac. J, Histoire du Limousin et de la Marche. 1931.

Oihenart. A. d', Notitia utriusque Vasconiae tum Ibericae tum Aquitanicae. 1656.

Painter. S, "Castellans of the Plain of Poitou", (Speculum 31, 1956)

" "The lords of Lusignan in the eleventh and twelfth centuries" (Speculum 37, 1957)

" Feudalism & Liberty (ed. Fr. Cazel). Baltimore. 1961.

Palustre. L, Histoire de Guillaume IX, dit le Troubadour, duc d'Aquitaine. 1882.

Pariset. G, "L'établissement de la primatie de Bourges", (Annales du Midi 14, 1902).

Perrot. E, Les cas royaux. 1910.

Petit-Dutaillis. C, The Feudal monarchy in France and England from the tenth to the thirteenth century (transl. E. Hunt). 1936.

Petot. P, "L'hommage servile: essai sur la nature juridique de l'hommage", (RHDFE 4th series 6, 1927).

Pfister. C, Etudes sur le regne de Robert le Pieux (996-1031), (BEHE 64) 1885.

Poey d'avant. F, Monnaies féodales de France. 3 vols. 1858-1862

Poole. R.L, Studies in chronology and history. Oxford. 1934

Porée. C, Études historiques sur le Gévaudan. 1919.

Port. C, Dictionnaire historique, géographique, biographique de Maine-et-Loire. 3 vols. 1874-1878.

Potthast. A, Bibliotheca Historica Medii Aevi. 2 vols. Berlin. 1896.

Poupardin. R, Le Royaume de Provence sous les Carolingiens (BEHE, 131). 1901.

Prou. M, Manuel de paléographie latine et française (revised by A. de Bönard). 1924.

" "La forêt en Angleterre et en France", (Journal des Savants 1915)

Rebsomeu. A, "Les droits de naufrage, de baleine et d'ambre gris sur la côte du pays de Buch", (Revue Historique de Bordeaux, 1931-2).

Rédet. L, "Notice historique sur l'abbaye de Fontaine-le-Comte" (MSAO 1837)

" "Mémoire sur les halles et foires de Poitiers", (MSAO 1845)

Rédet. L, Dictionnaire topographique du département de la Vienne. (Dictionnaires Topographiques de la France) 1881.

Renouard. Y, "Le duché d'Aquitaine", (Histoire des Institutions seigneuriales).

Richard. A, Histoire des Comtes de Poitou (778-1204). 2 vols. 1903

" "La Theifalie et le pays de Tiffauge" (BSAO 1896).

" "M. Lot & l'Histoire du Poitou", and
" "Observations sur la Réponse de M. Lot" (BSAO 2nd series, 10, 1904-5).
" "Rapport sur une découverte de monnaies des Comtes de Poitou", (BSAO 2nd series, 10, 1906)

Richard. J, Les Ducs de Bourgogne et la formation du duché (XIe-XIVe siècles) (Publications de l'Université de Dijon, 12). 1954.

" "La mention du chancelier dans les actes privés du XIe siecle en Bourgogne", (BEC 112, 1954).

Ritter. R, Le Château de Pau. 1919.

Runciman. S, A History of the Crusades. 3 vols. Cambridge. 1951-4.

Sackur. E, Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeingeschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur mitte des elften Jahrhunderts 2 vols. Halle. 1892,94.

Sachse. M, Über das Leben und die Lieder des Troubadours Wilhelm IX Graf von Poitiers. Leipzig. 1882.

Schieffer. Th, Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich (vom vertrage von Meersen bis zum Schisma von 1130), (Historische Studien, Heft 263)

Semichon. E, La paix et la trêve de Dieu. 1857.

Southern. R, The Making of the Middle Ages. London. 1953.

Stephenson. C, "The Origin and Significance of feudalism" (American Historical Review, 1941).

Taillebois. E, "La monnaie morlane au nom de Centulle" (Bulletins de la Societé de Borda, 1878 and 1883)

Tenant de la Tour. G, L'Homme et la terre de Charlemagne a Saint Louis, 1943.

Thomas. A, "Les archives du comté de la Marche" (BEC 42 1881)

Thomas. G, Les comtes de la Marche de la maison de Charroux. 1928.

Thompson. J.W, The dissolution of the Carolingian fisc in the ninth century. Berkeley, California. 1935.

" The Literacy of the Laity in the Middle Ages. Berkeley, California. 1939.

Tucoo-Chala. P, La vicomté de Béarn et le probleme de sa souveraineté des origines a 1620. Bordeaux. 1961.

Vacandard. E, Vie de St. Bernard, Abbé de Clairvaux 2 vols. 1895.

Waddell. H, The Wandering Scholars. 1952.

Zurita. G, Anales de la Corona de Aragon (ed. A. de Morales) 6 vols. Saragossa 1610.

PART I.

POITOU AND AQUITAINE (TENTH CENTURY-1030).

CHAPTER I.

THE COUNTS OF POITOU UNTIL THEIR ASSUMPTION OF THE DUCAL TITLE

At the beginning of the tenth century in the western Frankish Kingdom royal officials had frequently established a hereditary right to their offices and to the lands attached to them, so that the kingdom was broken up into numerous "principalities" in which the royal authority was reduced almost to nothing. The process and degree of emancipation from royal control, and the stability of the different "principalities" varied considerably; but, although the general history of the period has been much discussed recently, the history of individual regions often remains obscure.[1]

---

1. J. Dhondt (Etudes sur la naissance des principautés territoriales en France: IXe-Xe siecle, 1948) whose views have influenced such studies as J.F.Lemarignier's ("Les fidèles du roi de France", Recueil des travaux offerts à M.Clovis Brunel; "Structures monastiques et structures politiques...", II monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale). Older studies must be modified in the light of Dhondt's work - e.g. F.Lot (Les derniers Carolingiens, Etudes sur le regne de Hugues Capet, and Fidèles ou vassaux?...). Although written in 1903 A. Richard's Histoire des comtes de Poitou is still the "basic work" of local history (Painter, Speculum 1956, p.246 n.12). It provides much detail but "aucune des questions que soulèvent la naissance et le développement des grands états féodaux n'a été posée" (R. Latouche, Histoire du comté du Maine...p.vii). L. Auzias, L'Aquitaine carolingienne was published posthumously, and contains contradictions. Marcel Garaud's numerous articles (below, passim) only concern Poitou, and [redacted] rarely touch problems connected with the duchy.

For instance, the period when the counts of Poitou achieved a hereditary position independent of royal control is debatable; and the problems connected with their exercise of comital government are complicated by their assumption of the title of Duke of Aquitaine. Indeed it is often supposed that Count Ebles of Poitou (902-934/5) or his son William Tête d'Etoupe (934/5-963) inherited the title as distant relatives of Duke William the Pious, the founder of Cluny (d.918), although the first Count of Poitou to be styled dux Aquitanensium was Ebles' grandson, William Fier-à-bras, in 965. The consolidation of power in Poitou seems to have been of the first importance, although both earlier counts achieved considerable power outside it.[2]

The achievement of comital independence in Poitou.

Ebles was the illegitimate son of Count Rannulf II of Poitiers and grandson of Rannulf I, killed in battle against the Normans in 866.[3] When he entered Poitiers by night in 902[4] and took up the government of the county he brought to an end a struggle for Poitou which had reached the third generation, for Charles the Bald had tried to prevent Ebles'

---

2. Below pp. 34-42. For these 'Nicknames', which are contemporary ones, see Richard (Comtes, I, pp. 74-5, 99 n.3, 100 nn. 1-2)

3. Ademar (Chron, p.140); F. Lot "La Loire, l'Aquitaine et la Seine de 862 à 866" (BEC, 1915, esp. pp.505-6). Cf. below n.102.

4. Below, n.8.

father from inheriting the "paternal honours" in 868.[5] In 890 on Rannulf's death, King Odo set aside Ebles' claims and appointed as count a man called Ademar.[6] However, Ademar's position was jeopardized by the activity of Ebles' two powerful uncles in the county; even when the latter were defeated by Odo in 892,[7] Ademar did not continue the struggle after Ebles captured Poitiers.[8] The impression of royal authority given by Odo's intervention is largely illusory, for Ademar was a rival of Ct. Rannulf whose family

---

5. Annales Bertiniani, a 868 (MGH, in ususcholarum, p.91) He had returned by 878 when a Poitevin charter bears the subscription R.Comes (Docs.St. Hilaire, No.8) The history of the county in the intervening period is obscure (Dhondt, Principautés, pp.203-4; Richard, op. cit.I, p.28; Auzias, op.cit., pp.529-30).

6. Ademar (loc.cit).

7. The King undertook a campaign ut eorum insolentiam reprimeret (Regino, Chron I [illegible].p.140; Annales Vedastini, p.72; Ademar, Chron, pp.139-40). M.Garaud ("Les Circonscriptions du comté du Poitou et les auxiliaires du comte au Xe siècle", Le Moyen Age 1953, p.13) referred to Ademar as "un prétendant audacieux," although he was a royal nominee.

8. DCCCC II Pictavis nocte ingreditar Ebolus (Chronique de St. Maixent, ed Marchegay and Mabille, p.373) - probably an entry deriving from lost annals of St. Hilaire de Poitiers. (L. Halphen, "La Chronique de St. Maixent" reprinted A. Travers l'histoire du Moyen Age, pp.149,150. n.2).

had been sent to the region[9] by Charles the Bald; so that Odo did little more than manipulate in his own interest the internal struggles in the county, and was unable to oppose Ebles' entry in 902.

A series of documents drawn chiefly from the archives of the Poitevin religious houses between the years 903 and 934[10] show that Ebles had complete control of the county; on his death[11] he was immediately succeeded by his son William Tête d'Etoupe whose activity is mentioned in the years preceding King Raoul's death in 936.[12] It is important to emphasize this because it is asserted that William was

---

9. Ademar (Chron, p.139 note C): Ramnulfus quoque Pictavensis et Ademarus filius Emenonis inimici erant pro urbe Pictavis. See L. Levillain ("Adhémar de Chabannes Généalogiste", BSAO 1934-5, pp.237-8,245) and M.Bloch, (Feudal Society, p.195 - but the comital family was established before 885, and Ebles was undoubtedly illegitimate).

10. Chartes Nouaillé nos.31,32,35,37,40,42; Chartes St. Maixent nos.8,11; Cartul St. Cyprien no.528; a charter of Ste.Radegonde (Besly,Poicton,p.225). Eight of these exist in original; dating problems etc. cannot be discussed here. Cf. also Cartul Redon, no.283 (Breton); Besly (op.cit. pp.218-20 - St. Martin De Tours). I have found no trace of Ademar, Ebles' rival, in documents, although according to the Chron.Aquitanicum (p.253) he did not die until 930.

11. Ebles was alive in Jan.934(original,Archives...de la Vienne, ed. Cartul.St.Cyprien p.318.n.2 - this refutes no.126 of the same cartulary,placing Ebles' death in 932; cf.Richard op.cit.p.72;Auzias,p.476 n.40); but the exact date of his death is unknown. Since his son was count before Jan 936, I have placed it 934/5.

12. Cartul.St.Cyprien nos.3,23,118,545-all dated regnante Radulfo rege.The king died in Jan.936 (Lauer,Recueil Des Actes...Louis IV,p.LXXIV):These therefore must be attributed to an earlier period.

displaced by Louis IV in favour of Hugh the Great in the same way that Rannulf and Ebles had been ejected by Charles the Bald and Odo,[13] although the facts suggest that the Counts of Poitou were already too firmly established to be displaced. Moreover the assertion that Duke Hugh held Poitiers and obliged the king to remain hostile to William until 942 can be utterly disproved, since there is a dated charter of the Count for 939,[14] who in 940 took part in Louis' siege of Laon and accompanied the king on an expedition to Burgundy.[15] The alliance between the King and William resulted in a royal visit to Poitiers in January 942;[16] later in the same year the Count of Poitou again

---

13. Richard (op.cit.pp 88-90), Auzias (op.cit.pp 481-5), Dhondt (op.cit.pp220-1). On the evidence of the subscriptions S. Willelmi comitis, Hugonis comitis to a charter of 936-7 (Cartul.St.Cyprien, no 549) and the dating clause regnante Ludovico rege et Hugo comes Pict (sic) (Ibid.no.65). A double subscription including the Count of Poitou cannot surely be used to prove that Hugh replaced William as Count; the form of the dating clause is curious (cf. St.Maixent no.16: quando fuit Hugo Pictavis - a.955), and does not prove Hugh's tenure of the county either.

14. Chartes St. Maixent, no.14; cf. Dhondt (loc.cit).

15. Flodoard (Annales, p.77)

16. Recueil des Actes.....Louis IV, (ed. F. Lauer Nos. 18-19)

attended the king at a meeting at Rouen with the princeps Nordmannorum.[17]

The real reversal of political alliances[18] occurred during the minority of King Lothair, when Hugh the Great undertook an expedition to Aquitaine in 955, and laid siege to Poitiers during Count William's absence in the Auvergne.[19] The pretext for this was undoubtedly a royal grant of Aquitaine and Burgundy to Hugh in 954;[20] but even for a

---

17. Flodoard (Annales, p.85) cf. Richer Historia, ed Latouche I, pp.168-9). This meeting was perhaps preceded by William's marriage to a Norman princess who first appears in Feb. 942 (Chartes Nouaillé no.54) Cf. Dudo of St. Quentin (De Moribus...,ed.J.Lair pp.192-3) William of Jumièges, (Gesta...ed. J. Marx p.35) and Ademar (Chron. pp.143-4,198). Ademar's errors were pointed out by Richard (op.cit II, pp.460-74).

18. Auzias (p.494) ignored the relations of the Count of Poitou and the king in 940 and described the visit to Poitiers as "un véritable renversement des alliances". He was followed by Le Marignier ("Les Fidèles"...pp. 146-7), although there seems no reason for discarding Flodoard's 940 annal (for the latter's trustworthiness, (Le Marignier op.cit. p.142 n.1).

19. The Annales S. Columbae Senonensis, Historia Francorum Senonensis and Annales Nivernenses (MGH SS, vol. I, p.104; IX, p.366; XIII p.89) all attributed the expedition to the initiative of Hugh the Great. Flodoard (Ann. pp.140-2) and Richer (Historia I, pp. 11-13) wrote as though the King directed the expedition, although he was then only twelve years old. F. Lot (Les Derniers Carolingiens, pp. 13-15) ingeniously connected the expedition with the absence of the Count of Poitou in the Auvergne. Below, nn 133-34.

20. Flodoard (op.cit. p. 139), Richer, (op.cit. p.8)

Carolingian king there was no longer any local support. Poitiers was not taken and, even though one source states that Count William was defeated in a skirmish in the field, Hugh and King Lothair had to withdraw north of the Loire.[21]

A second, more specific, grant of the pagus Pictavensis by Lothair to Hugh Capet in 960[22] reveals the King's powerlessness to dispose at will of territory still nominally within his control, but in reality quite independent; for, whereas the reliable annalist Flodoard mentions the grant, it is not recorded in any Poitevin source and Hugh did not apparently undertake any expedition to Poitou to vindicate the royal grant.[23]

---

21. Richer alleged that the city was captured, but this is false: compare the silence of Flodoard and the statements of the Sens and Nevers annals that Hugh was unable to take the city (loc.cit). He set fire to the church of Ste. Radegonde lying outside the city walls. Ademar (Chron. p. 151), placed this siege in the time of King Hugh and William Fier-à-bras (i.e. c.987)—a confusion of dates which should not be taken to indicate a second siege (Lot, loc.cit. and p.210; cf. Hugues Capet, p.201 n.2).

22. Flodoard (p.149). It is impossible to say whether this grant was meant to include the whole of the county of Poitou, or simply the Carolingian administrative pagus. (below, nn 31-4).

23. He was in any case probably married to a member of the Poitevin count's family. (Lot. Hugues Capet, p.201; Derniers Carolingiens, pp.358-60).

Norman attacks

The Normans laid waste the long Poitevin coastline before Ebles became Count: no religious houses survived there and none were rebuilt until the late tenth century.[24] The devastation inland, where a city such as Poitiers withstood attacks from 863 onwards,[25] was far less complete; although various references show that attacks continued. Ademar wrote of raids per Pictavorum terminos,[26] in 924 the monks of Redon in the county of Nantes fled to Poitiers,[27] and even in the 940's the Bishop of Poitiers made a grant of land near Niort which lay vacant propter infestationen Normannorum,[28] although a great band of Normans had been

24. M. Garand ("Les incursions des Normands en Poitou et leurs conséquences", RH 1937, pp.248,253,256. The monks of St. Vivien d'Olonne left for the Auvergne in the mid-ninth century). The priory of St. Michel en l'Herm seems to have been the first to be rebuilt (Ademar, Chron., p. 147).

25. Annales Bertiniani (p.66). The city was sacked in 857 with the aid of King Pippin II (ibid p. 47; Auzias, op.cit. pp. 291 n.45, 324).

26. Ademar (Chron. p. 144). The date of this was probably later than Garand supposed (op.cit. pp.256-7, giving year 866), since the Count Aldwin mentioned by Ademar (loc.cit) did not die until 916 (Annales Engolismenses, MGH, SS. IV p.5; XVI, p. 486).

27. Cartul. Redon no. 283.

28. Cartul St. Cyprien No 553. This does not prove recent devastation, but it shows its gravity. Cf. Cartul... Engolismensis no 2 - a 918.

defeated by King Raoul in the Limousin in 930.[29]

The coastal areas probably remained sparsely populated and scarcely cultivated for many years, but the restoration and re-building of many monasteries began in the mid-tenth century,[30] which suggests that contemporaries considered that the attacks had at least died down.

The Territorial Composition of Poitou and the Foundations of Comital Government.

Even when allowance is made for the devastation caused by the Normans, the area which Ebles sought to control when he became Count was an extensive one; for the Carolingian county of Poitou was one of the largest administrative units in Aquitaine, consisting of six pagi (Poitiers itself, Brioux, Thouars, Tiffauges, Mauges and Herbauges).[31] The neighbouring

---

29. Flodoard (Annales, p.45); Richer (Historia I, p.110). Ademar mistakenly called the French King rex Burgundie (Chron, p.139); Cf. his error in calling Odo dux Aquitanie (F.Lot, "Le roi Eudes 'duc d'Aquitaine' et Adhémar de Chabannes" AM 1904, pp.509-14).

30. Ademar (Chron, pp.146-7). The work seems to have been begun by Bishop Ebles; the Counts' interest was later (below Chapter II, pp. 61-2).

31. M. Garaud ("Les Origines des pagi Poitevins du Moyen Age", RHDFE 1949, passim). The pagus Arbatilicensis (i.e. Herbauges) was however only incorporated into Poitou after the death of its own Count in 835 (Chron. Aquitanicum, p.252; Ann. Engolismenses, p.485). Cf. the fate of the county of Saintes, below n 39.

county of Angouleme, for instance, consisted of only one pagus, the county of Saintes of two (Saintes itself and the Aunis).[32]

At first Ebles' county probably had the same extent as during the time when his father and grandfather ruled it as Carolingian officials: his authority was certainly acknowledged in the pagi of Brioux and Thouars as well as that of Poitiers itself;[33] and the administrative subdivisions of Carolingian times - the vicariae - had largely survived.[34] There is less evidence for the pagi of Herbauges, Mauges and Tiffauges; but these consisted of land on the coast and near the Loire where the Norman attacks were most strongly felt. In the ninth century they were also plundered by the Bretons;[35] and William Tête d'Etoupe was later forced

---

32. E. Jarry (Provinces et Pays de France, II, pp. 84 and 247; A. Longnon (Atlas historique de la France, p. 147 of the text).

33. Documents concerning Ebles which mention Pagus of Poitou: Besly (Poictou pp. 209-11 & p. 225), Chartes Nouaillé no.35, 37, 42; Brioux: Besly (pp.209-11) ; Thouars: Chartes Nouaillé no. 37.

34. M. Garand ("Les circonscriptions"...pp.21-38, 60-61); Rédet (Cartul St. Cyprien, introd. pp. xix-xxi - a valuable description).

35. Praedas agit Nemenoius
Instando Redonensibus,
Deinde Pictavensium
Trans Ligerim manentium
Pagum petit Medalgicum
Glomnan locum pulcherrimum...(ed A.Morice,Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire de Bretagne,1742 ed. I col. 277 - from the archives of St. Florent-de-Saumur).

to cede these three pagi (as far east as the Rivers Layon and Ironne, as far south as Chiré and Pierrefitte) to the Breton Count Alan of Nantes. Although this changed the shape of the Carolingian county, it did not at this period seem to lessen the political power of the Count of Poitou. In any case the region was regained by William Fier-à-bras, probably after the Breton defeat at the battle of Conquereuil.[36]

Of more immediate importance was the annexation of the pagus of Aunis, which can be deduced from the extensive comital possessions in the area. The way in which this took place is unknown but it was certainly achieved by the time of Ebles' death,[37] and was a consequence of the Norman invasions, in which Saintes was so devastated that it had neither Count or Bishop at the end of the ninth century.[38]

---

36. Chronique de Nantes (ed.Merlet,pp.96-7,119). The boundaries are given in the text (see Chénon, Les marches séparantes d'Anjou,Bretagne et Poitou,p.11). Alan's conquest probably took place between 937 when he defeated a Norman band and 942, when he and Count William visited Rouen with King Louis (Flodoard,Annales, p.68; above n.17).

37. He made a grant of marshland there in 934(Cartul.St.Cyprien no.528). Cf. Cartul.St.Cyprien nos.545,549; Chartes St. Maixent no.14; Chartes Nouaillé nos.42-51 (acts concerning Count William, between c. 934/6-942).

38. In 866 Count Landricus of Saintes was killed (Chron. Aquitanicum,p.252). For the bishopric see Duchesne (Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule, II,p.75). Gauzbert, brother of Rannulf II, may have acted briefly as count of Saintes but the evidence for this is only one document of 878 (Docs.St.Hilaire, no.8; cf. Auzias, op.cit., pp.358,432,436,528).

The Aunis region became so closely associated with the county of Poitou that confusion arose later as to whether it was actually situated in Poitou or the Saintonge: thus the Carolingian administrative divisions were modified by changing political circumstances.[39]

The eastern frontier of Poitou raises rather different problems. This was the area which contemporaries called either marca lemovicina, or simply marca. Both origins and extent of this march are obscure, although it undoubtedly included some Poitevin territory.[40] The earliest surviving reference to the march or to its ruler is dated 951, when a Boso marchio subscribed a charter for the cathedral chapter of Limoges.[41] In spite of this historians have supposed it to be the creation either of King Odo in the late ninth century, or of King Raoul in the early tenth

---

39. Land was described both as in Pictavo in territorio Alniensi (Besly, Poictou pp.356-7 - incomplete; Cf. ms. lat 17127, p.133. Charter for Bourgueil of 7 Oct, 1000 AD) and in Sanctonico in pago Alniso (Chartes Nouaillé no.125, a 1074). Both are ducal charters.

40. Ademar (Chron. pp.156-7) referred to it both as marca lemovicina and marcha Pictavis et Lemovicae, and to its ruler as de Marca (p.150). The Conventio (Appendix I, p. 244) referred simply to marca; Aimoin to marcha .... ipsius regionis (Miracula S. Benedicti, p.119)

41. Cartul. S. Stephani Lemovicensis (no.8) citavi.... in conspectum et presentiam (thus) seniorum meorum, scilicet Rainaldi vicecomitis et Bosonis marchionis et aliorum nobilium... (with subscriptions of the same).

century - that is as much as fifty years before the first known reference to it.[42] It is improbable either that the march or 'marquis' were created by Ebles or William Tête d'Etoupe because no contact between a Count of Poitou and the ruler of the march can be traced before the time of William Fier à Bras.[43] It is surely significant that, when the Count of Poitou eventually succeeded in subduing the ruler of the march, the title of marchio disappeared, for in Carolingian times it implied a charge more important than that of a count; it seems possible that when the marca lemovicina first appeared its ruler was a usurper (in the sense that his office was not the creation of any legitimate authority),[44] intent upon creating an independent

42. R.de Lasteyrie (Etudes sur les comtes et vicomtes de Limoges antérieurs à l'an 1000, p.55) showed that there was no proof for the creation of a "Count of la Marche" by King Odo at the end of the ninth century. Again there is no evidence for Richard's theory that this county was instituted in order to counterbalance the power of Ebles (Comtes Ip.70), because the earliest specific reference is the 951 act; in any case the idea of a "county of a march" is anachronistic at this period. Cf. G. Thomas (Les Comtes de la Marche de la Maison de Charroux, pp.3-6).

43. The Miracula S. Benedicti (ed. de Certain, p.118) referred to the Count of Poitou as lord of one of Boso's sons before 986 (reference to time of King Lothair, who died in that year).

44. Dhondt (op.cit.p.147) was uncertain whether the Count of la Marche was originally a usurper. Elsewhere ("Le Titre du Marquis à l'Epoque Carolingienne", Bulletin DuCange 1945-6, pp.407-9 and 411) he supposed that after the withdrawal of royal authority the title marchio simply designated "les comtes des anciennes régions-marches" (p.417). This cannot apply to the Poitevin-Limousin march, which had been neither a march nor a county in Carolingian times and did not have its own ruler until the mid-tenth century.

territory to straddle Poitou and the Limousin.

The county of Poitou which Ebles and William acquired therefore had dimensions based on those of the Carolingian county with the exception of the desolate coastal area between the Loire, parts of the Carolingian *pagi* of Mauges, Tiffauges, Herbauges, and some territory on an eastern march, but with the Aunis added. Their government was also based upon Carolingian foundations but, before this is discussed, it is important to investigate the sources of the Count's power in Poitou.

Ebles' power in Poitou was undoubtedly territorial: the nucleus consisted of former comital benefices, or of lands which were usurped from the fisc in the county.[45] In the case of ecclesiastical charges or benefices granted on ecclesiastical lands (which the Carolingian kings had

---

45. A. Dumas ("Quelques Observations sur la grande et petite propriété à l'époque carolingienne", RHDFE 1926, p.225) showed that, according to Carolingian legislation, a Count was expected to possess about 200-400 *mansi*. Since comital holdings nearly always increased during the course of the ninth century (*ibid*, pp. 254, 259, 260-86) at the expense of the fisc, the Count of Poitou might be expected to be a very large landholder. Usurpations were generally unrecorded; it is only in exceptional cases that evidence for continuity is found - *e.g.* in a group of manors in Flanders which were traced from the fisc to the possession of the Count. P. Grierson ("The Identity of the unnamed fiscs in the *Brevium exempla ad describendas res ecclesiasticas et fiscales*", RBPH, 1938 pp. 438, 442, 451). The evidence for Poitou is fragmentary.

often attached to the comitatus) it is possible to see that all the important charges in Poitou fell into the hands of the Count.[46] Unfortunately the nature of the surviving evidence makes it very difficult to trace the history of the comital demesne back into the Carolingian period; but the coincidence of a few references in Poitevin documents suggests that this may have originated in the widespread seizure of fiscal lands.

The dispersal of the fisc in Aquitaine admittedly began long before Ebles became Count of Poitou: Charlemagne severely reprimanded Louis the Pious for his extravagance in granting out fiscal land in benefice as King of Aquitaine;[47] and, even if all these benefices were returned to the fisc as the Emperor ordered, much more was undoubtedly lost during the wars between Charles the Bald and Kings Pippin I and Pippin II of Aquitaine.[48] Nevertheless, a few

---

46. Below, nn.58-68.

47. J. Westfall Thompson (The Dissolution of the Carolingian Fisc, p.18 n.42).

48. Auzias (op.cit.,pp. 100-218) for the period down to the treaty of St. Benoit-sur-Loire. Carolingian legislation referred to comital benefices which were not returned to the fisc, or were misappropriated by being converted into allod (Boretius-Krause, Capitularia....I, pp. 64,93,131). A Limousin example illustrates the point: the villa Cavaliacus (Cauvagnac, département Hte-Vienne) which Charles the Bald gave to his fidelis Hildebert in benefice (Tessier, Recueil des Actes.. de Charles II le Chauve, vol.II p.420) was later given by Hildebert's son to the canons of the cathedral of Limoges as allod (R. de Lasteyrie, op.cit. pp.57 and 62).

important examples show that at some undefined date, the Counts of Poitou benefited considerably from the fisc.

The Carolingian palace in Poitiers is mentioned in a diploma of 839.[49] During the civil wars in Aquitaine either Charles the Bald or Pippin I or II kept control of the city and, presumably, of the palace within it.[50] Excavations at Poitiers in the Palais de Justice - the site of the former comital palace - revealed the débris of a Carolingian building which, from the quality of the masonry, was probably the royal palace.[51] There seems no doubt that the Count simply took over this important site in the capital of his county; possibly the usurpation took place during

---

49. Actum Pictavis civitate palatio regio (Böhmer-Mühlbacher, Regesta Imperii no. 970; J. Mabillon, De Re Diplomatica, 2nd ed, p. 314).

50. Recueil...Charles II (Vol. 1, p.282): Actum in civitate Pictavis. Cf. L. Levillain (Recueil des Actes de Pepin Ier et de Pépin II [redacted] Rois d'Aquitaine, p.114).

51. Fr. Eygun undertook the excavation and came to this conclusion (BSAO, 3rd series, 1942-5, particularly p.325). The identification seems certain since there is no basis for the view that the Carolingian palace lay outside the walls (D. Claude, Topographie und Verfassung der Städte Bourges und Poitiers bis das 11 Jahrhundert, p.99).

the period of Ebles' rule for, although King Odo may have come to Poitiers to give support to Count Ademar in 892, Charles the Simple and Raoul never seem to have visited the city. Ebles may even have taken possession of the palace in 902; but the Count's possession was secure when Poitiers was besieged in 955.[52]

The Carolingian kings also had a palace outside Poitiers at Chasseneuil-sur-Clain[53] (not at Casseuil-sur-Garonne[54] as Aimoin supposed) which also passed into the Counts' hands. The link is rather a tenuous one: in the late eleventh century the contemporary Count gave his villa of Chasseneuil to Count William of Angouleme, who immediately granted it to the Angoumois abbey of St. Amant-le-Boixe.[55]

---

52. Cf. above, nn.19-22.

53. ...in Casanogilo villa palatio nostro in pago Pictavo secus alveum Clinno (L. Levillain, op.cit., p.46; cf. p.31 - Actum in Casanogilo palatio).

54. Vita S. Abbonis (PL vol.139, col.409). Aimoin's statement was used for identification by Mabillon (op.cit., p.289) and taken as decisive by C. Jullian ("Le Palais Carolingien de Cassinogilum", Etudes d'Histoire dédiées à Gabriel Monod, pp.90-94) and Westfall Thompson (op.cit, map of the Carolingian Fisc 752-900). The Poitevin identification was preferred by L. Fayolle ("Le Palais Carolingien de Cassanogilum était à Chasseneuil" BSAO 1937, pp.465-6).

55. M.R. Grand (Bulletins...Société...de la Charente, 1939, pièce just. no.6): Ego...Guillelmus dux Aquitaniae concedo de alodio meo Guillelmo comiti Engolismensis civitatis, dilecto meo, villam quae dicitur Cassanolium... If the Count of Angoulême had not immediately given this to St. Amand, no knowledge of the Count of Poitou's tenure would have survived. This illustrates the difficulties of tracing the fate of fiscal land.

Before the grant the villa was apparently held in demesne (no reference is made to infeudation) and, even though there is a long break between the ninth century reference to the royal palace and the eleventh century reference to the comital allod, there is a strong circumstantial case for the usurpation of Chasseneuil from the royal fisc by an early Count of Poitou.

The Counts also gained possession of land in the former royal villa of Angeriacensis (St. Jean d'Angély) where King Pippin I founded a monastery.[56] In the early eleventh century the aula ducis stood near the monastic buildings; again this probably derived from the former royal villa, which cannot have been entirely used for the original endowment of the abbey.[57]

This impression of comital usurpation, which for Poitou rests upon little evidence, is strengthened when it is realised that all the royal monasteries in this

---

56. Ademar (Chron. p.132). Discipline was restored by an act of Louis IV at the request of William Tête d'Etoupe's brother Ebles and Count Roger of Laon (above n. 16 ref.)

57. The monks' familia attacked the Duke's in the time of William the Great and nearly destroyed aula ...quae eidem coenobio contigua est. (Ademar, Chron. p. 211):

county came into comital hands.

The abbey of St. Maixent, where the Carolingians had had the right of hospitium,[58] was under comital control by the time of William Tête d'Etoupe who granted a benefice from its lands on one occasion and appointed an avocatus on another.[59] Towards the end of the tenth century the Count held Nouaillé in demesne, although this was an establishment which King Pippin I had taken under his special protection.[60] The evidence for the monastic chapter of St. Hilaire is more complicated, but it shows the way in which royal authority was gradually relinquished. This establishment was protected by a royal grant of immunity but the Carolingians nevertheless kept the right of hospitium;[61]

---

58. Levillain (op.cit. pp.clxiii-v, and p.268): Actum... in monasterio Sancti Maxentii-(anno 848).

59. Chartes St. Maixent nos. 14,27-beneficiamus in advocationem ...(a. 939 and c. 942.)

60. Levillain (op.cit. pp. 21-3) The act recording the comital renunciation (Docs.St.Hilaire no.50) cannot be any more closely dated than between 975 and 991. The Count's tenure had not disrupted monastic life, for there is a series of grants to Nouaillé during this period (Ch.Nouaillé nos. 68-87).

61. Levillain (op.cit., p.114) The clause Actum Sancti Hilarii monasterio (a.838) shows the King's right of hospitium, although in 835 he had granted it immunity (op.cit. pp. 87-93 - interpolated, but Levillain considered the immunity clause trustworthy).

King Odo gave it to the Bishop of Poitiers for life, and at the same date Count Ademar may have been its lay-abbot.[62] By 940 William Tête d'Etoupes' brother Ebles (later Bishop of Limoges) was rector of the chapter - an office which he probably assumed without royal permission;[63] at about the same period the Count began to grant benefices from the lands of St. Hilaire,[64] although William Fier-à-bras was the first Count of Poitou to take the title of Abbot of the chapter.[65]

The control of these religious establishments brought definite territorial advantage, both because the Count took ecclesiastical land in return for his protection and because he could dispose of these lands to his fideles.[66] William

---

62. Docs.St.Hilaire,no.12-royal diploma granted at the request of the marchio Ademar (i.e.the then Count of Poitou, cf. above nn.6-8) The Count always held a benefice from the lands of St.Hilaire; Ramnulf I had certainly done so (Recueil...Charles II, vol.II pp. 45-7 - an exchange by the Count de ratione Sancti Hilarii).

63. Docs.St.Hilaire no.17(April 940). This disproves Lesne's theory (Histoire de la Propriété Ecclésiastique, II fasc. iii, p.4) that Louis IV bestowed the office during his stay in Poitiers in Jan.942 (above n[16]).

64. Docs.St.Hilaire nos.20 (Jan 942), 36 (944-63).

65. Ibid. no.32: Guillelmus divina gratia ordinante clementia Aquitanensium dux et cenobii pretiosissimi confessoris Hylarii abbas (March 965).

66. The Count's strength in Poitou is shown by the fact that the benefices of an avocatus were not usurped to found the basis of a private lordship, as they were elsewhere - e.g. in the case of the Count of Pontieu, originally only avocatus of St. Riquier (C.Brunel, Recueil des Actes des Comtes de Pontieu, pp.ii-iv).

Fier-à-bras even disposed of the important estate of Vouzailles (deriving from St. Hilaire) to his wife.[67] At an earlier date Count Ebles probably attempted to make similar use of the lands attached to the bishopric of Poitiers, since a reference mentions that on his death the potestatem Sancti Petrio was returned to Bishop Frotier.[68] The Count presumably also enjoyed numerous rights formerly attached to the comital office - and even ones which had been regalian but for the most part there is only information about these in later sources. For instance in Poitou and the Aunis the ius monetae (always peculiarly regalian) fell into the Count's hands,[69] and there was no independent

---

67. Besly (Poictou, pp.273); half was granted to Emma's foundation of Bourgueil (ms.lat.17127, pp.129-31) although it had formerly been given to the chapter by King Odo (Docs.St.Hilaire no.9). Below, pp.176.

68. Cartul.St.Cyprien no.126 (above, n.11 for the error in date). Lesne (op.cit., p.48) assumed that this referred to the episcopal estates and I have followed this interpretation rather than that of Auzias (op.cit., p.476) and Imbart de la Tour (Histoire des élections épiscopales.. p.250 n.3) supposing that Frotier was ejected from his see. Apart from the problem of the meaning of potestas, the latter co-operated in Ebles' government (Besly, p.220-a. 926).

69. There is no evidence to support Richard's statement that Ramnulf II was given the moneta of Poitou in benefice (Comtes I, p.36); cf. Garand ("Les Vicomtes du Poitou" p.44) who accepted Richard's statement.(Cf.below, pp.194-6) But no layman ever had the right to mint coin in Poitou before 1215 (Engel et Serrure, Traité de Numismatique II pp.424 et seq).

ecclesiastical coinage as there was frequently elsewhere in France.[70] Moreover no other layman gained control of the mints in this county;[71] while the fact that in Poitou the coinage continued to be struck on a pattern used for Charles the Bald before he became Emperor suggests the breakdown of royal control even before Ebles became count.[72] The count probably also took over the profits deriving from the exercise of justice, but here again numerous problems arise from the lack of evidence, and particularly because it is impossible to prove that the administration of justice remained exclusively comital even at the beginning of the tenth century.[73]

---

70. Engel et Serrure (op.cit. I, pp.268-73). In Aquitaine money was struck by the Abbot of St. Martial at Limoges, but the date at which this began is unknown (op.cit. II, p.419).

71. [redacted] Above, n.69.

72. Op.cit. (II, pp.422-5 and 464). Cf. E. Caron (Monnaies féodales françaises, pp.127-33) and Lecointre-Dupont (Rapport sur une découverte de Monnaies de Moyen Age, pp.11 and 22); But work on the Poitevin coinage leaves much to be desired, and no satisfactory system of dating has ever been established.

73. Garaud ("Les circonscriptions...", pp.55,58) considered that during the tenth century the Carolingian causae maiores were still heard by the count; but no evidence survives for the administration of criminal justice in Poitou at this period.

But it is certain that when Ebles became count the administration of the county in general continued on a Carolingian pattern. The mallus publicus still functioned, for a Nouaillé document of March 904 refers to a plaintiff's appearance in mallis for two years.[74] The assembly was presided over by Ebles, attended by his fideles, and officials such as auditores, vicarii and his viscounts.[75] For a brief period two comital notaries also survived in Poitiers,[76] and they recorded the decisions of the mallus according to the prescribed formulae of Carolingian times.[77]

---

74. Chartes Nouaillé no.31: cf. no.32 and Chartes St.Maixent no.11.

75. These officials appear in the three documents just mentioned, and in many others both comital and non-comital at this time.

76. Emmo and Adalbertus. After their disappearance, documents, where these bear a scribal note, can generally be proved to have been written by the beneficiary; but Emmo and Adalbertus drew up documents for many religious houses. Apart from those quoted in n.74 Emmo wrote Chartes St. Maixent no. 8, Chartes Nouaillé nos.30,33, 36; Adalbertus wrote Chartes Nouaillé nos.30,40,41,43, 44 and Docs.St.Hilaire nos. 14,15(comital and non-comital documents) See A. de Boüard (Manuel de Diplomatique...II, pp.131 n.2, 135 nn5-6) and following n.

77. Cf. St. Maixent no.11 with the formula printed, MGH (ed Zeumer Legum, sectio V, p.215), Nouaillé no.31 with another formula (op.cit, p.214) Carolingian legislation had ordered notarii to be set up by Counts & Missi (ed Boretius-Krause MGH, legum sectio II, vol.I. pp.115, 190; cf. also I, p.330; II, p.64)

However with the disappearance of these two notaries all reference to the mallus also disappears, although other officials connected with it continue to be found in Poitevin documents.[78] The assembly was probably transformed into a "feudal court",[79] but there is too little evidence for the historian to be certain about the way in which the mallus declined in Poitou.[80]

Local administration also continued to function on the Carolingian pattern, except where Norman devastation had destroyed the territorial framework of the vicaria;[81] and

---

78. Viscounts and vicarii continue to be found in the majority of comital acts during the tenth century (there is of course the possibility that their functions changed). An auditor, Ansemarus and legis doctor, Petronus are found in the early eleventh century (Cartul.St.Cyprien no.310-comital, before 1016). Petronus may have been the son of a man who was legis doctor in the mid-tenth century (Cf. Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély nos.95,255 with Cartul St.Cyprien no.464).

79. F. Ganshof ("Les origines des cours féodales en France", RHDFE 1928) refers chiefly to Burgundy, but mentions Poitou in passing (p.654). Cf.Garaud (Essai sur les institions judiciaires du Poitou sous les comtes indépendants, p.39). Y. Bongert (Recherches sur les cours laïques du Xe au XIIIe siècle, pp.36-9,56) does not raise the problem of the survival of Carolingian officials or procedure.

80. It is possible that it continued to be held although decisions were no longer recorded in the traditional fashion. William Tête d'Étoupe heard judicial complaints, if Chartes St.Maixent no.20 is anything to go by; but the record of his decision bears no resemblance to a Carolingian judicial noticia.

81. Garaud's description of the Poitevin vicariae shows very few on the coast (e.g. only two in the Herbauges - "Les Circonscriptions...", p.25 n.56). The Aunis was divided into three large vicariae (L.Faye, "Recherches Géographiques sur les Viguéries du pays d'Aunis", MSAO, 1845, pp.363-426).

at first Carolingian institutions were even adapted to new needs: either new vicariae were established with their centres at fortified places (as with Châtellaillon in the Aunis) or old ones were superseded by vicariae based on castles.[82] It was only gradually that new divisions and new officials took the place of the Carolingian ones.

Carolingian legislation only provided for one viscount in each county,[83] but from the beginning of the tenth century several are found in Poitou. When Ebles became count, a viscount was already established at Thouars whose charge seems to have become immediately hereditary, if indeed it was not already.[84] Ebles set up a viscount Atto at Melle,

---

82. E.g. Châtellaillon (Faye, op.cit, pp.386-7,393-4). Cf. Garaud's reference to the formation of the vicariae of the castle of Colombiers from the larger vicaria of Sauves (op.cit. p.52). In the early eleventh century the castle of Civray was the centre of a vicaria unknown at an earlier date - in pago briosinse in vicaria Sivriaeo castro (Cartul Lemovicensis ecclesiae, no.9)

83. Comes praecipiat suo vicecomiti suisque vicariis..... (Boretius-Krause, Capitularia II, p.259; cf. I p.185; II, p.315).

84. From c. 876 (Garaud, "Les Vicomtes du Poitou", RHDFE, 1937, p.446 n.5).

but he is not found in any document later than 911[85] and ultimately - for reasons which are quite unknown - Melle was replaced by Aunay as the centre of a viscounty.[86] Eventually, and probably during the time of William Tête d'Etoupe, a viscount was also instituted at Châtellerault.[87]

All the viscounts mentioned were the fideles of Ebles and his son (Viscount Savari on one occasion was described as Ebles' vassallus)[88] and apparently took part in the

---

85. Chartes Nouaillé nos.31,32,35.

86. Garaud (op.cit. p.437). The Viscount Cadelo found in Cartul St. Cyprien nos.119 (934/5-6) and 91 (936-7) was the forerunner of a long line of viscounts also called Cadelo. The only problem lies in the identity of a Maingaudus vicecomes (Garaud, loc.cit.) who may either have been Atto's successor at Melle before the viscounty disappeared from the documents, or else possibly was associated with Cadelo at Aunay.

87. The first specific reference to a viscount de castello Adraldi is mid-eleventh century (Chartes St. Maixent no.92), but there is little doubt that the viscount Adraldus found in two of William Tête d'Etoupe's documents was of the same line (Cartul.St.Cyprien no.549, Chartes St. Maixent no. 20; Richard, Comtes I, p. 78 and Garaud, op.cit. p. 436). The reading Signum Adraldi vicecomitis in a late ninth century document for St. Martin de Tours seems to be an interpolation by Besly which I have not found in Ms. copies. (Collection Baluze, vol. 76 fos. 158r-161r, and 162 r-v cf. Besly, pp. 209-11). There is nothing to prove the year 936 given by Richard and Garaud, however.

88. Chartes Nouaillé no. 31.

administration of the county.[89] The number of viscounts may have been increased for military reasons, in the same way that Ademar of Chabannes writing about the county of Angoulême supposed that the viscount of Marcillac was appointed to combat the Normans;[90] although it is not perhaps necessary to suppose that the Normans were the only enemies envisaged. It is surely significant that all three Poitevin viscounties were placed at the frontiers of the county, rather than at its capital as was previously customary,[91] for Thouars lay close to the boundary of the Carolingian pagus of Anjou,[92] Châtellerault was very close to the frontier of the county of Tours and the ancient boundary of the dioceses of Tours and Poitiers,[93] and Aunay lay near the boundaries of the pagi of Brioux, Aunis and

---

89. Garaud (op.cit. passim).

90. Ademar (Chron. p. 138).

91. Eg. at Angers, where the viscount usurped the comital title. (Halphen, Le Comté d'Anjou...pp.3-4). For Limoges see below n. 121, and pp. 36-7.

92. Near to the Carolingian villa of Doné (C. Port, Dictionnaire... Maine-et-Loire II, p. 54).

93. Châtellerault lies very close to a place called Ingrande, which almost certainly marked the antique limits of the dioceses of Tours and Poitiers. R. Dion (Les Frontières de la France p.33) shows that the Celtic placename Iuvranda/Iguranda marked the boundaries of the dioceses of Nantes and Angers (Ingrandes, Maine-et-Loire) and Tours and Angers (Ingrandes, Indre-et-Loire). Châtellerault also lay near the frontier of the Touraine.

the Saintonge.[94]

AQUITAINE and the acquisition of the ducal title by the Counts of Poitou.

In Imperial times Aquitania formed an administrative province stretching from the River Loire south to the Pyrenees, from the sea eastwards to the cities of Clermont, Le Puy, Rodez and Albi; ecclesiastically the head of the province was the city of Bourges.[95] The Frankish kingdom of Aquitaine was theoretically identical with the Roman province, but in fact the Carolingians virtually lost control of the region north of the Pyrenees which had been settled by the Gascons.[96] Nevertheless medieval writers, relying on classical models, often used the term Aquitania as though it applied to the great Roman province; both

---

94. The limit of Poitou and the Aunis was probably the R. Boutonne (near Melle) which also formed the division between Aunis and the Saintonge. See the map in L. Faye's article (cited above 90) and E. Jarry (Provinces et Pays de France, II p.248).

95. A. Longnon (Atlas Historique de la France, text p.18); E. Jarry, (Provinces et Pays de France II, pp.165-6).

96. ..."la réunion de la Gascogne au royaume d'Aquitaine semble avoir été plus nominale que réelle" (L. Levillain, Recueil des actes...des rois d'Aquitaine, p. clx). Cf. Auzias (L'Aquitaine Carolingienne, pp. 1-124, - unfortunately one of the most fragmentary parts of this work).

Flodoard and Richer used it in this sense in the tenth century.[97] Occasionally concessions were made to political reality, as when Aimoin described the martyrdom of Abbo of Fleury at la Réole in Guasconia, governed by the Burdegalensium comes ac totius Guasconiae dux,[98] but in the Vendôme annals this event is referred to as happening in Aquitania[99] although la Réole was not then within the region governed by the "Duke of Aquitaine".

Aquitania was not a well-defined area such as Normannia came to be; neither the Auvergnat Dukes, nor the Counts of Poitou when they became "Dukes of Aquitaine", ever ruled the whole region which contemporaries described as Aquitania[100] but historians have not always made this clear, and have tried to equate the "duchy" of Aquitaine at different periods with a geographical region which in practice was politically divided.[101]

---

97. Flodoard, (Annales, pp.35,131). On another occasion this author confusingly treated Aquitania and Arverniaas though they were separate regions (p.13). Richer once used the term to describe the Aquitania of pre-Imperial times, elsewhere to include the region between the Loire and Garonne (Historia I, pp.7-8 and Latouche's notes; cf. I, pp.18,31; II, p.11). See also the later Liber de compositione castri Ambaziae (ed.Halphen, Chrons. des comtes d'Anjou, p.7).

98. Vita S. Abbonis (PL, vol.139, col. 406).

99. Annales de Vendôme (ed. L. Halphen, Recueil des annales angevines...p.59).

100. Below, pp. 43, 124-8, 137.

101. Below, passim.

In order to understand the complications connected with the Poitevin acquisition of the ducal title it is necessary to revert to the mid-ninth century, when Regino of Prüm described Count Rannulf I of Poitou as dux Aquitanie in his account of the Battle of Brissarthe of 866.[102] That this title was used in a purely military sense can be proved by a comparison with the account of the same battle in the Miracula S. Benedicti., for the author of the Miracula described all three leaders of the army which fought the Normans (i.e. the Counts of Angers, Poitou and Nantes) as duces.[103] No historian has ever suggested that the other two counts were "Dukes" in a political sense, although this would be the logical implication of using this evidence to prove that the Count of Poitou was already "Duke of Aquitaine". Over twenty years later (888-9) the St. Vaast annalist referred to Rannulf II as dux maximae partis Aquitaniae in discussing the support throughout the kingdom for the young

---

102. Chronicon, p.92 (a. 867). F. Lot assembled the evidence for placing this battle in 866 (article cited above, n.3, p. 506 n.4)

103. Miracula S. Benedicti (MGH, SS, vol. XV, p.494): Fuerunt eorum pessimi (i.e. the Normans) conatus saepe a ducibus illarum regionum sibimet succedentibus frustrati, Lanberto scilicet atque Rotberto necnon Ramnulfo...

Charles the Simple, and the opposition to King Odo.[104] Here the term is not purely military; but on the other hand it certainly cannot be taken to prove that Count Rannulf held territorial authority over "a very large part of Aquitaine" because there is no evidence that he - or incidentally his father - ever held comital office or lands outside the county of Poitou.[105] Therefore, it seems anachronistic to use these references to prove the emergence of "the feudal duchy of Aquitaine" at the end of the tenth century, or to suppose that the Count of Poitou had succeeded "in imposing himself on Aquitaine."[106]

The possessions of William the Pious, on the other hand, far exceeded the single county held by Rannulf I and his son, for William inherited most of the honours of his father Bernard Plantevelue. Outside Aquitaine these

---

104. Annales Vedastini (p.67). Both Regino and the Fulda annalist noted the power of Ramnulf II at this time, but did not give him any particular title (Chronicon, p.140; Ann.Fuldenses, p.116 - Ramnolfus se regem haberi statuit)-but he was not called dux).

105. For Auzias (op.cit., p.438) 889 was "la date initiale de la reconnaissance par un roi, sous une forme peut-être imprécise, du duché féodal d'Aquitaine"., Cf.Flach, Origines de l'ancienne France IV, p.502), Jarry (op.cit., II, p.188) None of these authors remarked on the difficulties connected with the reference to Rannulf I as dux. Dhondt (Principautés, pp.215-16) postulated the existence of a "territorial duchy" at this period, but doubted whether it was recognised by the king.

106. Phrases of Auzias and Jarry (loc.cit).

included the counties of Lyons and Mâcon and the march of Gothia,[107] within Aquitaine the counties of Bourges and Auvergne.[108] He probably also extended his authority to the county of Limoges, but in this case the only evidence is a subscription to a charter from the abbey of Beaulieu, in the extreme south of the Limousin.[109]

There are numerous documentary references to William the Pious as dux, but few have the territorial qualification Aquitanorum. Indeed, it has been suggested that he was given the title of dux because of his vast power in the kingdom of Provence (he is first called dux in an act of Louis the Blind dated 902);[110] but the title dux Aquitanorum as applied to William the Pious cannot imply that he governed a "duchy of Aquitaine" corresponding to the former kingdom, since his possessions in Aquitaine were restricted to two or three of its easternmost counties.

---

107. Flach (op.cit. IV, p.507 and n.2), Auzias (op.cit. p.454).

108. Flach (loc.cit). William's possession of the Auvergne is proved by an enormous number of references from the cartulary of Brioude (given by Flach); possession of the county of Bourges only from his subscription to the foundation charter of the abbey of Déols (RHF, IX,p.715).

109. Cartul.de Beaulieu (no.10 - dated 886-7); Flach (loc.cit) dated it 917.

110. Willelmus inclytus dux et marchio (R.Poupardin, Recueil des Actes des Rois de Provence, no.XLI). He was the brother-in-law of the King of Provence (id., Royaume de Provence...p.194,202-3).

Two of Duke William's nephews, William II (918-927) and Acfred (927-28), succeeded to his possessions in Aquitaine and, although neither of them exercised the same political power as their uncle, both were described by Flodoard and in documents as dux or princeps Aquitanorum.[111] When Acfred died without an heir his lands and rights in Auvergne and Bourges were probably appropriated piecemeal by the local lords (for instance the local viscount, Dalmacius acquired the lay abbacy of St. Julien de Brioude).[112] There was no immediate successor to the title of Duke of Aquitaine.[113]

The whole situation at this period has been confused by the account given by Ademar of Chabannes in his chronicle, written nearly a century later when the Count of Poitou was generally acknowledged as Duke of Aquitaine, and when the title was considered hereditary in the Poitevin family. Ademar wrote that, on the death of William dux Arvernis, Ebles the son of Rannulf Arvernis et Pictavis simul comes

---

111. Flodoard: Willelmus dux Aquitanorum - a. 923 (p.12); Willelmus Aquitanorum princeps - a. 927 (p.38; cf. pp.19-20). cf. Flach (op.cit. pp.513-17).

112. Below, no.128.

113. Below, n. 131.

promotus est; while Ebles was also called dux in the passage referring to his death, when William Tête d'Etoupe was described as becoming Count of Limoges, Auvergne, Velay, and dux Aquitanie.[114] By emphasizing the relationship between William the Pious and Rannulf II Ademar treated the ducal title as though it were already completely hereditary.[115]

However, Ademar's account is full of errors, for, he wrote as though William the Pious was immediately succeeded by Ebles and was quite unaware that the former's lands in Aquitaine passed in turn to William II and Acfred.[116] Moreover, Ebles could not have simultaneously inherited the counties of Auvergne and Poitou because he was established as Count in Poitou long before the death of either William the Pious or his nephews;[117] on the other hand Ademar did

---

114. Ademar (Chron.p.143): Willelmus quoque dux Arvernis mortuus est et filius Ranulfi, Eblus, Arvenis et Pictavis simul comes promotus est and then (Ms.C.only) - a Carolo rege supradicto. Cf.p.146: Interea defuncto Eblo duce, filiorum eius alter comes, alter episcopus factus est... Willelmus vero cognomento Caput stupe Arvernis, Vallatis, et Pictavis comes provectus, dux Aquitaniae extitit.

115. Chron.(p.140) L.Levillain ("Adhémar de Chabannes, généalogiste" BSAO, 1934-5, pp.237-63) gives a masterly description of Ademar's genealogical interests. The relationship between the Duke of Aquitaine and the Count of Poitou cannot now be definitely established.

116. Above, n.111.

117. In any case William the Pious never had any control in Poitou. The Ms. C version contains a further error in describing the "promotion" of Ebles by King Charles the Simple, who was then imprisoned. (Above, n.20).

not mention Limoges, the one county outside Poitou where Ebles undoubtedly acquired some authority.[118] The statements about William Tête d'Etoupe are less misleading, for he certainly extended his influence to Limoges and the Auvergne as Ademar described; but, with the exception of the Limousin, this was a gradual process.[119] In spite of Ademar's errors and simplifications his version of the "inheritance" of the ducal title by the counts of Poitou is still often accepted by historians; although the first count of Poitou to assume the ducal title in charters was Ebles' grandson, William Fier-à-bras, in 965.[120]

Beyond Poitou the only extension of authority made by Ebles was in the Limousin. The date of this is uncertain: in 903 an Aldebertus Lemovicensis (sometimes identified as viscount of Limoges) appeared before the Count of Poitiers to justify his possession of a wood claimed by the monks of

---

118. Below, nn. 121-124.

119. In the Limousin he was able to build on his father's achievements.

120. Richard (Comtes, I pp.65-6) accepted Ademar's version, and was followed by Auzias (op.cit. p.465 nn. 16-17) and even by Painter who described Ebles as "Duke of Aquitaine" in 927("Castellans of the plain of Poitou", Speculum 1956, p.244) and Jarry (op.cit. II p.194). Dhondt (op.cit. p.219) supposed Ebles held the honours but considered Ademar's Chronicle insufficient proof for the use of the ducal title. But Ademar also provides the evidence for the honours. Cf. below n.142.

Nouaillé,[121] but since the disputed property was in Poitou this case hardly proves Poitevin domination in the Limousin.[122] However, some sort of authority was achieved by the Count of Poitou between 903 and 925 when Viscount Hildegarius of Limoges subscribed one of Ebles' acts.[123] It has been supposed that Ebles acquired authority in the Limousin by royal grant; but since the sources for this theory are two suspect royal diplomas from the cartulary of St. Martin de Tulle,[124] it seems improbable that Ebles' power in the Limousin was any more legitimately acquired than his county of Poitou.

---

121. Chartes de Nouaillé no.32. R. DeLastyrie (Etudes sur les Comtes et Vicomtes de Limoges, ..p.63) considered that Aldebert was Viscount of Limoges; but this is difficult to justify as Eldegarius/Hildegarius was Viscount both before and after this date (op.cit, pp. 59 and 62 - references of 884 and 914).

122. ...silva...quae vulgo dicitur Boerecia - ie Bouresse, near Lussac-le-Château (Rédet, Dictionnaire de la Vienne, p.56).

123. Chartes St. Maixent no.11:- Sign/.Heldegarii vicecomiti (mus).

124. Cartul. de Tulle-en-Limousin nos. 14-15. The title attributed to King Raoul would be enough to condemn no. 15 - Rodulfus Dei gratia Francorum et Aquitanorum atque Burgundionum rex pius invictus et semper augustus The phrase suggerente Ebalo comite is unusual also in a royal diploma. (There is no critical edition of Raoul's acts).

The nature of Ebles' authority in the Limousin is unknown, but William Tête d'Etoupe seems to have attempted to strengthen the position of the Count of Poitou by securing the appointment of his brother Ebles as bishop of Lomoges.[125] There can be little doubt however that Poitevin ambitions met with considerable opposition for Bishop Ebles' chorepiscopus Benedict was blinded by the sons of Count Helias of Périgord; the resulting feud between this family and the Vicecomital one dragged on for many years, and was only settled after one of Helias' sons was in his turn blinded at Poitiers by the Count's command, while another had died on a penitential pilgrimage to Rome.[126] The weakness of the counts of Poitou in the Limousin can be attributed to the fact that their power had no territorial basis: the viscount of Limoges had probably already appropriated the comital rights and demesne.[127]

---

125. Ebles succeeded Turpio, who died in 944 (Ann.Lemovicensis, MGH, SS II, p. 251) The first dated reference to him as Bishop is 950 (Chartes St. Maixent, no. 18; cf. nos. 19-20, 26, 33). He is found in documents of the Cartul. Lemovicensis (pp. 26, a 958), 58, 173 a 959); cf. Docs. St. Hilaire nos. 32, 38, 40-42 and ms.lat. 17127, (p. 250 = an unpublished Bourgueil charter).

126. Ademar (Chron, pp.146-7, 150). The causes of the hostility between the Count of Périgord and the Viscount is unknown, possibly Benedict was a member of the vicecomital family. Cf. below pp. 57-8 66-7 for ducal attempts to pacify the Limousin.

127. Above n.48 for the villa of Cattvagnac. None of the charters of the Counts of Poitou refers to the possession of land in the county of Limoges, although they undoubtedly had certain customs in the city (below p[illegible]. 62 n.65).

No Auvergnat documents record any external intervention in this county between Acfred's death and the year 936. Those who benefited immediately were the Viscounts who had been the subordinates of William the Pious and his nephews, for the Viscount Dalmacius became lay-abbot of the chapter of St. Julien de Brioude - an office previously assumed by the ruling Count of Auvergne, which was occupied successively by William the Pious, William II and Acfred.[128] Elsewhere the Viscount of Clermont undoubtedly began the extension of his power which ultimately led to his assumption of the comital title in the mid-tenth century.[129] But in spite of this Ademar's statement that Ebles acquired the county of Auvergne has often been accepted. It is true that Flach produced other material which, he asserted, proved Poitevin authority in the Auvergne; but since this consisted entirely of the form in which the reign of Charles the Simple's reign

---

128. Dalmacius gratia Dei vicecomes rector (Cartul. Brioude no. 28; cf. nos. 63, 65, 249, 261 - all dated 927-36). For the line of lay abbots, A-M and M. Baudot ("Grand Cartulaire du chapitre de St. Julien de Brioude: Essai de restitution", Mém.de l'Académie... de Clermont-Ferrand, 1935, pp. lviii - lx). They omitted the reference to William the Pious' nephew William II, whose rectorship is proved by no. 318 of the cartulary.

129. Below n. 135.

was mentioned in charters from the two counties,[130] and since Ebles is never mentioned in connexion with the Auvergne at all, it does not have any great weight.

The first trustworthy evidence for external intervention in the county of Auvergne concerns Count Raymond-Pons of Toulouse, who in 936 was described as abbas noster et princeps Aquitanorum in the foundation charter of Chanteuge,[131] and elsewhere as dux Aquitanorum; the latest evidence for his activity in the county can be dated about 941, when King Louis IV confirmed the foundation of Chanteuge per consensum

---

130. (Origines IV, pp. 521 et seq.) He supposed that up to c 927-8 scribes of both Auvergne and Poitou mentioned the captivity of Charles the Simple, and that, after this date it was omitted in deference to King Raoul, although Charles lived until 931. Because the Count of Toulouse only accepted Raoul in 932 (Flodoard, Annales, p.53) the dating-clauses "prove" an alliance between Poitou and Auvergne, and therefore Ebles' domination in the latter. Cf. Auzias (op.cit. pp. 458 n.20, 468, 470 n.27), Jarry (op.cit. p. 277 nn. 43-4), Dhondt (op.cit, p. 218). But Flach did not point out that Raoul's reign was often alone referred to before c 927, in both Auvergne and Poitou, in which case his own argument is completely destroyed. In fact over twice as many Auvergnat dating clauses refer to Raoul's reign alone as to Charles' captivity (cf. Cartul. Brioude nos. 63, 104, 111-12, 123, 137, 155, 169, 174, 224, 236, 291 with the four documents quoted by Flach, op.cit. p. 521 n.5, 522 n.1); the proportions are not so high for Poitou.

131. Cartul. de Brioude no. 355; cf. HGL (V, cols. 172-3) Chanteuge was a priory of St. Julien de Brioude.

Regemundi principis Aquitanorum et aliorum ipsius provinciae procerum.[132] The next indication of intervention in the Auvergne and the first evidence from documentary sources for the interest of the Count of Poitou in the area can be attributed to 955 when seniores Arvernici commended themselves to Count William at a meeting held at Ennezat.[133] In view of the long interval between the last reference to the activity of the Count of Toulouse in this county, and the first appearance of the Count of Poitou, it is surely impossible to prove that there was a struggle between them for the possession of the Auvergne, as has often been supposed.[134] In any case William Tête d'Etoupe was unable to establish firm control of the county: in 957 - two years after the commendation of the seniores Arvernici - Viscount Guy of Clermont first took the comital title,[135] while Viscount Dalmacius continued to hold the lay abbacy

---

132. Recueil des actes...Louis IV, no.17. Flach (op.cit., p. 451 n. 1) gave five references to Raymond-Pons as dux Aquitanorum. Four derive from Toulousain sources.

133. Chartes de Cluny, no. 825. See Lot (Les derniers Carolingiens, pp. 13-15; Hugues Capet, p. 201 n.4) for the identification and dating of this document; and above n. 19.

134. As Lot remarked (Fidèles ou vassaux? pp.54-5) no source refers to any such struggle; but cf. Auzias (op.cit. p. 496) Jarry (op.cit. pp. 196-7), Dhondt (op.cit., whose note 1 p. 223 seems to contradict his p. 218).

135. Cartul.de Sauxillanges no. 340, cf. no. 182. Jarry (op.cit. II p. 284 gives the year 980 but on p. 197 c. 955).

of St. Julien.[136] Moreover, episcopal appointments in this county were still made by the King,[137] and for a brief period at the end of the tenth century Lothair even managed to set up his government in the region.[138]

It has been suggested that by the mid-tenth century the assumption of the title dux Aquitanorum depended upon the possession of the county of Auvergne;[139] and this theory can be justified in the case of Raymond-Pons who seems to have been styled Duke of Aquitaine only as long as he had authority in this county;[140] but it does not explain the stages by which the Counts of Poitou in their turn assumed the title. For, although William Tête d'Etoupe gained the commendation of the seniores Arvernici, he was never

---

136. See the list established by A-M and M. Baudot (reference n. 32 above).

137. Recueil des Actes...Lothaire et Louis V (ed. Lot and Halphen, no. 5) and a grant made by Bishop Stephen of Clermont pro seniori meo Clotario rege et anima eius genitoris Ludovici regis (Cartul. Brioude no. 386 - a 962. This charter still exists in original in the Bibliothèque de Clermont).

138. Below, chap II n. 59.

139. Dhondt (op.cit. p. 213), Auzias (op.cit, pp. 499-503).

140. Above nn. 131-2; Flach (loc.cit).

attributed the outright title of "Duke of Aquitaine"[141] which is first found in 965 in a charter of his son William Fier-à-bras for St. Hilaire de Poitiers.[142] Moreover, it came to be universally applied to the Counts of Poitou at a time when Poitevin authority in the Auvergne seems to have decreased.[143]

Indeed, there is no simple explanation for the eventual association of the title dux Aquitanorum with the family of the Counts of Poitou. At first the title had been purely personal with only the vaguest territorial connexions; and certainly neither William the Pious, his nephews, or Raymond-Pons controlled the vast area which had once composed the

---

141. He was given the clumsy titles Pictavensium sive Lemovicensium necne et Arvernensium comes insuper etiam Aquitaniae comes palacii (Chartes St. Maixent no. 27) and totius Aquitaniae ducatus comes (id. no. 20 - both from the lost cartulary of the abbey). The subscription S. Willelmi duci Aquitanorum to another document from the same establishment (no. 23) must be rejected because it occurs at the foot of a notice referring to the grants of a fictitious personage Eblo episcopus Lemovice civitatis et comes Pictavorum, annuente fratre eius Willelmo duce Aquitanorum (!) and also has the impossible subscription Eblonis episcopi nobilissimi et comitis Pictavensi. It is undoubtedly a fabrication but was accepted by Flach (op.cit. II, p. 577) and Dhondt (p.224 n.4)

142. Guillelmus divina ordinante clementia Aquitanensium dux (Docs. St. Hilaire, no. 32).

143. Below pp.59-61.

Carolingian kingdom of Aquitaine. But on the other hand, if the ducal title came to be associated with the possession of one particular county like the Auvergne, it is curious that William Tête d'Etoupe was never in his lifetime called "Duke of Aquitaine". Possibly - although this is mere hypothesis - the title was valued because it had no precise territorial associations for, whereas comes Pictavorum obviously restricted the holder's authority to a particular area, dux Aquitanorum/Aquitanensium could be used to justify control over many counties and over counts who would otherwise have been the equals of the Count of Poitou.

Nevertheless, Ademar of Chabannes' account should not be dismissed altogether: his emphasis on the Poitevin right to "inherit" the ducal title and the honours of William the Pious,[144] although full of errors and omissions, after all provided a basis of legality for the Count of Poitou as Duke of Aquitaine at a time when royal appointment had practically died out of the French kingdom.[145] It is surely significant that the name which came to be associated with this dynasty, and which was borne by every Duke down to 1137, was not either of the names given to their Poitevin

---

144. Above nn. 114-16.

145. Where it was exercised a royal appointment often remained unfulfilled, as in the case of Lothair's grant to Hugh in 960 (above n. 22).

ancestors[146] but William, the name of the Duke and founder of Cluny, with whom Ademar was so anxious to associate them.[147] Ademar's version may not have been historically correct, but it probably soon became the official version of how the Counts of Poitou became Dukes of Aquitaine.

---

146. Neither Rannulf nor Ebles is found again in the family after the mid-tenth century. Even where a younger son was given a different christian name he became William when he succeeded to the county and duchy (below, pp. 91, 108).

147. To a monk like Ademar the link with the founder of Cluny may have been one of the most important aspects of this association.

CHAPTER II.

THE GOVERNMENT OF DUKES WILLIAM FIER-A-BRAS AND WILLIAM THE GREAT (963-1030).

The assumption of the title of Duke of Aquitaine by William Fier-à-bras in 965 can be regarded as the culmination of the territorial acquisitions made since the beginning of the tenth century by the Counts of Poitou; and within Aquitaine the ducal title came rapidly to be used in documents although it never replaced the comital one, which was often employed together with the style dux Aquitanorum.[1] Even outside Aquitaine the Count of Poitou was soon often known as Duke -[2] a testimony to his power at a time when many counts were struggling to maintain their authority in one county, or even part of one.[3] The problem now arises whether, once the Counts had added other territory to Poitou and assumed the ducal title, any specifically ducal authority was evolved to cover all their lands, or whether the title remained a flourish of scribes and chroniclers, merely

---

1. There are 110 references in charters to William Fier-à-bras and his son (including documents confirmed by them, as well as charters drawn up in their own name). Apart from documents which still described them as count, they were styled Aquitanensium dux, Aquitanorum dux (from 989), AEquitanie dux (once in an original), or the two titles were combined as in Pictavensium comes et Aquitanorum dux (Docs.St.Hilaire no.50; cf. St.Maixent no.61, Chartes Nouaillé no.74). There is no foundation for Renouard's assertion that the ducal title was never used alone (Institutions seigneuriales, p. 163).

2. Richer, who wrote before c 998 (LaTouche, Historia, introd. p. vii), even referred to William Tête d'Etoupe as dux Aquitanorum (I, p.169, cf. p. 189), although to Flodoard he had simply been Willelmus Pictavensis (Annales, pp. 77, 84, 129, 141).

3. Eg. the Count of Vendôme (L. Halphen, Anjou, pp. 62,67), the Count of Maine (R. Latouche, Hist. du comté du Maine pendant le Xe et le XIe siècles, pp. 18,23).

denoting a vague acknowledgement of their rule in the regions described in the previous chapter.

For the sixty-five years that William Fier-à-bras and his son William the Great ruled the duchy[4] the only institution of importance was the Church, which at this period relied upon the Duke for support against lay oppression and in return supported the ducal government. In the secular sphere it at first seems scarcely possible to deduce anything about the Dukes' government from the shifting alliances, ill-known campaigns and sieges, or from the vague accounts of benefactions to fideles which are recorded by Ademar and a few other chroniclers interested in the duchy; but in spite of this qualification the surviving charters, when compared with information about the Dukes' political activity, make it possible to draw some general conclusions.

* * * * *

Little is known about William Fier-à-bras except that he married Emma, the daughter of Count Theobald of Blois and Chartres; for the romanesque story of his marital

---

4. Below n. 8. These years naturally fall together because after William the Great's death Aquitaine was threatened by the ambitions of the Count of Anjou (Part II, ch.1 passim); while the acquisition of Gascony by Guy-Geoffrey altered the area of the duchy and the problems of ducal government (below, pp.97-106, 238). For the nickname of Fier-à-bras, above Chap. I, n. 2. for William "the Great" Richard (Comtes, p. 139). He was described as gloriosissimus et potentissimus by Ademar (p.163).

conflicts as recounted by Peter of Maillezais can no longer be accepted.[5] His sister was probably married to Hugh, the first Capetian king of France,[6] but although by these two marriages he was allied to the adversaries of the bitterest contemporary political struggle, he did not apparently become directly involved himself.[7] On the other hand his son, William the Great (c. 995/6-1030),[8] had the reputation of

---

5. Ademar (Chron. p.150); cf. Labbe (pp.225-7), for Peter of Maillezais. The details of the latter were treated with complete scepticism by Halphen (A Travers l'histoire du moyen age, pp. 157-9 et.seq.), who refuted Richard's reliance on the story (Comtes, I pp. 113-20).

6. Chap. I, n. 23.

7. The Capetian kings traditionally supported the Count of Anjou who, from c. 952, was the enemy of the Count of Blois (Lot, Hugues Capet, p. 165).

8. A St.Cyprien charter shows that William Fier-à-bras was alive in May 995 (Cartul.St.Cyprien no. 521), although Raoul Glaber (ed. Prou, p.41) placed his death in 993. He apparently died after the Count of Blois and before King Hugh - i.e. 995/6 (Ademar, Chron. p.156; Lot, op.cit. pp.178,303); but no definite date can be given, and the chronology was the subject of an extraordinary dispute between Lot and Richard at the beginning of this century (BSAO, 1904, p. 176; Lot, op.cit. pp. 423-6; BSAO 1905, pp.272-8). William the Great's death was given as 1030 by Peter of Maillezais (op.cit. p.237), and as occurring on 31 Jan. in the year after he had made a grant of serfs in Celesio villa by the Chronicle of St. Maixent (Labbe, p.207; Marchegay's edition p. 390 has the marginal date 1029 - not in the ms.). Since the grant still survives and is dated May 1029 (Chartes St. Maixent nos. 87-8), the date can be given as 31 Jan 1030, i.e. the year after the grant in Celesio villa was made.

a warrior ceaselessly enforcing his authority by the destruction of castles - a reputation apparently undiminished even by defeat in battle at the hands of the Normans. And, even when allowances are made for the bias of Ademar of Chabannes, this chronicler describes a man stronger (and very possibly more magnificent) than the French king Robert, as revealed by the monk Helgaud.[9] Moreover Ademar's eulogy is supported by the picture which emerges from the Conventio of an arbitrary ruler whose will had to be obeyed, a picture uncoloured by the religious attitude of the monastic chronicler.[10] William the Great's three marriages also suggest an increase in the Duke's prestige for, whereas his first marriage to the widow of the Count of Périgord and la Marche[11] brought the means of controlling a turbulent

---

9. Chron. (especially pp. 163, 208); for Helgand's Vita, PL (vol. 141, cols 909-36). Fawtier however considers that Helgaud's picture of a "veritable monk upon the throne" may be misleading (Capetian kings of France, p. 15).

10. For this source see Appendix I, and pp. 78-9 below.

11. Chron. p. 156 (from Ms.C); she was almost certainly the daughter of the Viscount of Limoges (op.cit., pp. 147-8). In any case there is no reason for supposing that she was the daughter of the Countess of Gévaudan as Richard supposed, (op.cit. pp. 142, 144-7) relying upon Peter of Maillezais. (Halphen, loc.cit.).

region of the duchy, his second to Brisca brought him alliance with the ruler of Gascony;[12] while his marriage to Agnes with her royal connexions enabled him to claim the Lombard crown for his son during the German crisis of 1024.[13]

* * * * *

SECULAR AFFAIRS in the DUCHY.

Both these Dukes had to contend with the ambitions of the Counts of Anjou and of la Marche-Périgord whose alliance on one occasion gravely endangered the ducal government. However, the events preceding this alliance are obscure, and it can only be explained on grounds of general hostility to the ducal government.[14]

At some time between 963 and 973 Geoffrey Grisegonelle of Anjou was involved in a conflict with Duke William which resulted in the grant of the castle of Loudun cum nonnullis

---

12. Ademar (Chron. p.162) and the St. Maixent chronicle (p.387 - with the year 1010). The earliest documentary reference to Brisca occurs in an exchange between the abbeys of Jumiegès and Bourgueil dated 1012 (ed. Fauroux, Recueil des actes des Ducs de Normandie, no. 14 bis).

13. Chron.St.Maixent (p.388, with the year 1023). A hitherto unnoticed charter indicates that Agnes was already married in 1016 (Appendix II, no. 1; Richard, op.cit. p.177, n.2 gave the year 1018-19). Raoul Glaber described her parentage (ed. Prou, pp. 56-7-).

14. Unless Angevin hostility occurred because of Poitevin alliance with the Count of Blois (above n.7); but there is insufficient evidence to prove this.

to the Angevin;[15] since Loudun had formerly been held by the Viscount of Thouars it does not seem that the outcome can have been a victory for the Duke.[16] Moreover, the Count of Anjou had already seized monastic land in Poitou;[17] while his son Fulk Nerra strengthened the Angevin hold on Loudun and increased the Duke's problems by receiving the fealty of Viscount Aimeri of Thouars and installing him as count in Nantes.[18] Some years later the count of Anjou found it expedient to ally with the Count of la Marche, who, after an unsuccessful attack on Poitiers, marched on Tours, took

---

15. Chron. (p.152) and the Fragmentum historiae Andegavensis (ed. Halphen Chrons....comtes d'Anjou, p.233), which gives an account favourable to the Angevins. The latter is a twelfth century work composed to justify Angevin claims (id, Anjou p.7 n.2). The event took place between the Duke's succession in 963, and 973 by which time Geoffrey was certainly the Duke's man (Lot and Halphen, Recueil des Actes des rois Lothaire et Louis V no.62).

16. In 926 Viscount Aimeri held Loudun (notice from the archives of St. Martin de Tours, ed. Besly, pp.218-20).

17. Cartul.St.Aubin d'Angers, no. 224. Cf. Halphen, (Anjou, p. 14 n.2).

18. Chronique de Nantes (ed. Merlet, pp. 132-3) and a Bourgueil charter (Lobineau, Hist.de Bretagne, II, p.97). This event occurred after the battle of Conquereuil (Lot, Hugues Capet, pp. 158-65; Halphen, op.cit. p.18 for the preceding events). Count Fulk had his own vavassores in Loudun, and organised its castleguard (Chartes poitevines de St.Florent...no.7-after 1023, from reference to Bp. Isembert of Poitiers).

it and handed it over to Fulk.[19] This alliance, which might have been so advantageous to both parties, seems to have been destroyed by King Robert's marriage to the widow of Theobald of Blois; for this meant that the Capetians no longer automatically supported the Angevin house.[20] A royal campaign deprived the Angevins of Tours and protected the interests of the house of Blois; Robert also helped Duke William the Great to besiege castles held by the Counts of La Marche,[21] although the latter continued to be troublesome until the Duke defeated Count Boso II in an encounter near the castle of Rochemeaux.[22]

---

19. Ademar (Chron. p.156) and Aimoin (Miracula S.Benedicti, p.147). Halphen refused to accept the idea of this alliance, on the grounds of Fulk's fealty to the Duke (op.cit. pp.29 n.3, 30 n.1); but these sources, though confused, seem to be independent; and in any case Aldebert was also a ducal fidelis, since he subscribed ducal acts of 991 and 992 (Docs.St.Hilaire no.53, Chartes St.Maixent no.61, cf. Collection Baluze 38, fos. 194v - 195 undated).

20. Richer (Historia, II, p.330). Both Lot and Halphen (Hugues Capet, p.18; Anjou, p.30) emphasized the important consequences of this marriage.

21. Richer (loc.cit); Ademar (Chron. pp.156-7,205). Ademar states that the Duke took the king to besiege the castle of Bellac in marcha Pictavis et Lemovicae which Count Boso II was defending after the death of his brother Aldebert at the castle of Gençay; whereas Richer mentioned an expedition against the latter. The chronology is confused, and was again disputed by Lot and Richard (refs. cited ad n. 8); but Ademar appears to have had more local information and his account should in general be accepted.

22. Ademar (Chron. pp.165,208). He states that Boso was taken captive to Poitiers - victor reversus inimicum suum occidere noluit, sed usus pietate illaesum eum cum sacramentis absolvit - (presumably an oath of fealty to the Duke).

These events undoubtedly resulted in an increase of William the Great's authority over both Counts of Anjou and la Marche. From about 1003 Fulk Nerra is found subscribing ducal charters,[23] was employed in William's servicium in the Saintonge and acted for him at the royal court.[24] After a period of captivity at Poitiers Boso II also remained loyal to the Duke: he too subscribed William's charters:[25] on his death the Duke appointed his successor, and divided the family inheritance so that the government of La Marche and Périgord was never again combined.[26] But this event

---

23. Two Bourgueil charters (i) a 1004-ed. Besly (pp.353-4) with the date 1003 which can be corrected from ms.lat. 17127, pp.127-8 and (ii) ms.lat. 17127, p.136. (Appendix II). Cf. Hist.de la Rochelle (II, pp.663-5), and Besly (p.307) - two charters for Maillezais, and Chartes de Cluny no.2716,(a 1018).

24. Chron. (pp.182,211). Fulk pressed the claims of his lord to the Italian crown (Guillelmus Pictavorum comes, herus meus - RHF, X p.500. Cf. also p.489).

25. Cf. n.22. Boso subscribed two of the same acts as Fulk (refs to Hist.de la Rochelle and to ms.lat. 17127 in n.23), as well as a grant of 1003 (Cartul.St. Cyprien no.513). Aldebert had subscribed ducal charters in 991 and 992 (Docs.St.Hilaire, no.53; Chartes St. Maixent no.61) and on one other occasion (Collection Baluze 38, fo. 195r, undated).

26. Ademar (Chron. p.167). The Duke was obliged to lead an expedition to Périgueux to gain the acceptance of his candidate as count, and to set up regents for la Marche (see Levillain, "Adhémar de Chabannes, généalogiste", p.252, n.3). See G. Thomas (Les comtes de la Marche, pp.16, 24-8) for a description of la Marche at this period (it was not yet divided into "Basse" and "Haute Marche", as many historians had supposed).

shows the limitations of a comparison of the position of the Counts of Anjou and la Marche for, whereas the pretensions of the count of la Marche to independence were completely destroyed,[27] the Angevin ambitions were merely temporarily checked; and, besides, Fulk's chief honour lay outside Aquitaine,[28] so that he could not be easily controlled by the Duke.

The destruction of Count Boso's ambitions and of his alliance with Fulk probably enabled William the Great to pursue a policy of expansion into the Saintonge, for there is no evidence for such expansion before the early eleventh century;[29] indeed evidence available for an earlier period suggests that this county - at least in part - had come to be controlled by the Counts of Angoulême, who granted land there to the Bishopric of Angoulême.[30] Ademar of Chabannes

---

27. Thomas (op.cit. p.168); cf. below, pp.120-21. No history of Périgord deals adequately with this period of the county's history (see the ref. to the works of Escande and Maubourget in the bibliography).

28. Angevin ambitions revived with Geoffrey Martel's marriage to William the Great's widow Agnes (Part II, pp.90 et seq).

29. The acts of William Fier-à-bras contain no grants of land in the Saintonge, and only one ducal subscription to such a grant by a private individual in the year 974. (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély, no.95)

30. E.g. Chartul.Ecclesiae Engolismensis no.3 contains a grant of two villae near Pons where there was later a ducal castle (Pérignac-Champagne and Chapdénac: Pedrezacense and Capdom); all the villae mentioned were in pago Xanctonico. Cf. also Cartul.St.Cybard nos.222, 231, 235.

mentions a castle enfieffed by the Count to Aimeri de Rancon in the Saintongue.[31] But in spite of this initial advantage it was the Duke of Aquitaine who gained possession of Saintes, and who probably made the first appointments to the bishopric since the Norman attacks of the late ninth century.[32] By the mid-eleventh century William the Great's sons had extensive demesne forest and lands in the region, but their father's situation at the beginning of the century is not so clear because, in order to gain control of the county, or to reward him for his services, Duke William enfieffed Fulk Nerra with the keep of the city of Saintes;[33] and it is by no means certain whether land and other castles were included in this benefice, as the Counts of Anjou later claimed.[34] William the Great also abandoned Blaye - one of the most important castles in the Saintonge, situated at the mouth of the Gironde - to Count William of Angoulême.[35] The obvious inference is that this was in some sense a compensation for the decline of the Count's position in

---

31. Chron (p.185).

32. Below, n.79. The bishopric was vacant from 864 (Duchesne, Fastes episcopaux II, p.75).

33. Below for references to ducal demesne (p.190) Ademar (Chron. pp. 164, 189). For Fulk's treacherous capture of the Count of Maine in Saintes see Halphen (op.cit., p.68 and n.2).

34. Below, pp. 94-7.

35. Ademar states (Chron, p.165) that it was given in beneficio.

the region, but in view of the close personal relationship between the Duke and this count this explanation may not be correct.

Count William of Angoulême (d. 1028) was described as a man of "great counsel" "loved greatly" by the Duke;[36] he seems to have been the most important secular member of the ducal court and accompanied William the Great to Lombardy, fought in the army which defeated Count Boso, was entrusted with the difficult task of reconciling Hugh of Lusignan to the Duke, and with overseeing the formalities connected with the consecration of a Bishop of Limoges,[37] Ademar stated that, as well as Blaye, he was granted numerous other castles by the Duke including several on the frontiers of La Marche and the Limousin.[38]

There can be little doubt that Count William was a fidelis of the Duke - his presence in the army at Rochemeaux

---

36. ...magni consilii virum (loc.cit).

37. Loc.cit. and pp.188, 182-3. Cf. also the Conventio, (Appendix I, p. 247).

38. Apart from Blaye (see n.35) Ademar mentioned the viscounties of Melle, Aunay (Oenacensis, unidentified by the editor), and Rochechouart, the honour of Chabanias and Confolens, and Ruffec. The viscounty of Melle had apparently become obsolete (chap. I, p.256), while there was a viscount of Aunay throughout this period (he subscribed 13 of William the Great's charters). There is no evidence for the other three castles at this date.

surely proves this[39] - but there is no evidence to show that the Duke exercised any authority in Angoulême itself. Angoulême, like Poitiers, had remained in the hands of a comital family appointed by the Carolingians and, although the Count's authority was weakened by succession disputes during the tenth century,[40] it had never been the object of attacks from the outside unlike the counties of Limoges, Saintes, or Auvergne. The Count of Angoulême controlled the bishopric of the city;[41] in 1028 Count William appointed his successor to the comital office and divided his lands between his descendants.[42]

---

39. Ademar (p.165). The Count subscribed the following ducal charters: Arnière (Hist.la Rochelle II, pp.663-5 - for Maillezais); Docs. St.Hilaire no.71 (1015); Besly (p.307 - for Maillezais); Chartes Nouaillé no 104 (1025). Cartul St. Jean d'Angély no. 9 contains the subscription of William's son Aldwin. Cf. also Docs St. Hilaire nos. 47, 53 (991) for subscriptions to acts of Duke William Fier-à-bras.

40. Ademar (pp.149-50). The chronology is extremely confused; and the two studies of J. Depoin ("Les comtes héréditaires d'Angoulême de Vougrin I à Audoin II", Bulletins... Charente, 1904) and Desages Olphe-Gaillard ("Essai sur la chronologie des comtes d'Angoulême", ibid, 1905-6) are contradictory on many important points.

41. Below, n.71.

42. ...idem Willelmus comes omniaque sua disponens...Cf. the reference to William's father Arnald successorem sibi comitem reliquid (thus) Engol^ismae Willelmum filium suum (Chron, pp. 192, 157).

Although the title comes Lemovicensium was attributed to William Tête d'Etoupe[43] the mere use of the comital title cannot be taken to imply that the Counts of Poitou had the same power in the Limousin as in Poitou: indeed they had few resources in the Limousin and even as Dukes did not succeed in increasing them. For instance the Viscount acknowledged the Duke's right to a receptum in the former royal abbey of St. Martial, but kept control of the abbatia himself,[44] and at the beginning of the eleventh century used the treasure of St. Martial to ransom his wife from the Normans.[45] Both William Fier-à-bras and William the Great intervened in the region, probably with the intention of diminishing the power of the Viscount and of gaining control of Limoges; but before 986 the only precise reference is to a siege of the castle of Brosse,[46] while the first vicecomital subscription to a ducal act is not found until 991.[47] The Viscount apparently resented the

---

43. Above Chap. I n.141. This title was never again used after the assumption of the ducal one.

44. Below, pp. 62 n.65, 165 n.4 for references.

45. Ademar (Chron. pp.166-7). It included gold, silver, ornaments and a golden image of the archangel Michael.

46. Miracula S.Benedicti (pp.118-20). The castle was held in part by a member of the vicecomital family. Contrary to what is often asserted, there was no Viscount of Brosse at this period (Richard Comtes, I p.78; Garaud "Les vicomtes...", pp.427 n.6, 431 n.1 and "Les circonscriptions..." p.15 n.4; Jarry, Provinces et pays de France II, p.202). He is first named c. 1137. Below p. 150, n81.

47. Docs.St.Hilaire no.53 (act of protection for the abbey of Nouaillé).

imposition of ducal authority, for in 1000 Brosse was again besieged by the Duke[48] in spite of a "pact of peace and justice" sworn at an earlier date by both parties and other lords of the Limousin.[49] William the Great, however, was strong enough to enforce his will and from this date the Viscount consented to ducal appointments to the bishopric of Limoges,[50] and subscribed ducal charters;[51] when Viscount Guy died in 1025 William the Great made the next appointment to the vicecomital office.[52]

Limoges was a large county, and it must be pointed out that in spite of general campaigns against lawlessness in

---

48. Miracula, (pp.136-40); cf. Ademar, (pp.159-60, 205-undated). I have preferred the account of the Miracula which is altogether more succinct and includes the plausible reason that Ademar, son of Viscount Guy, seized the castle dum cerneret numerosam coheredum fratrum suorum...stirpem. Both Lot and Richard disregarded the fact that there were two sieges of Brosse (articles cited n.8).

49. Below n.83.

50. Below n.76.

51. Docs.St.Hilaire nos. 47, 53 (991) are subscriptions during the time of William Fier-à-bras (cf. n.39). For William the Great: Arcère (Hist. la Rochelle II, pp. 663-5); Cartul.St.Step. Lemovicensis no.9; Arcère (op.cit. pp.665-7).

52. Ademar (Chron, p.188); for the date Chron.Aquitanicum (p.253).

the region around the city,[53] the Dukes of Aquitaine did not reach the south-east of the county where viscounts had been established at Aubusson, Comborn and Turenne since the early tenth century.[54] These viscounts seem never to have acknowledged the overlordship of the Duke - at least there is no evidence for contacts between them. Admittedly William the Great's eldest son threatened to lead an expedition against the Viscount of Comborn if the latter did not allow the monks of Beaulieu to elect a regular abbot; but there is no evidence that the expedition ever took place.[55] Even today the region in which these viscounties were situated is thickly forested and has poor communications; in the ninth century Turenne was considered inexpugnabilis,[56] so

---

53. Ademar (op.cit, pp.165-6 against the lord of Chabanais) and references above n.48, below n.77.

54. For tenth century viscounts of Comborn, Ademar (Chron. p.147) and Cartul.Tulle nos.286,387; for Viscounts of Comborn, Ademar (p.171) and Cartuls.Beaulieu no.77, Tulle nos.90,103,141,399; for the Viscount of Turenne, Cartul.Tulle no.511. See the map of the Limousin pagi given by Deloche (Cartul.Beaulieu, and introd. pp. ccxxix-lxxxii).

55. Labbe (II, pp.788-9). The lay abbacy was held by the viscount from the Count of Périgord, who held from the Count of Toulouse.

56. During the period of the Norman invasions (L. Delisle, Notices et Extraits, vol.35, p.287 - from an unpublished sermon of Ademar of Chabannes). The Viscount of Turenne was later associated with the Viscount of Toulouse, (Gesta Francorum, ed. R. Hill, pp.83,87).

that the reluctance of the Duke to penetrate into this part of the Limousin is not perhaps surprising. On the other hand both William Fier-à-bras and his son attempted to increase their power over the Viscount of Limoges by extending their activity into the county of Bourges from the north-west of the Limousin, for the Viscount held Brosse in this county and tried to wrest Argenton-sur-Creuse from the lord of Déols.[57] It was the achievement of William the Great to bring the latter, who was one of the most important castellans in the Berry region, into the circle of his fideles.[58]

Since the Dukes of Aquitaine did not succeed in establishing their control throughout the county of Limoges which lay close to their own county of Poitou, it is scarcely surprising that they were unable to exercise any authority in the Auvergne.[59] A grant made by William the Great's youngest son Guy-Geoffrey to the Auvergnat priory of St. Laumer de Moissat in 1064 indicates that the Duke of

---

57. Brosse was in pago Bituricae (Chron, p.207) cf. p.174). Duke William apparently protected the priory of St. Benoît-du-Sault in this region (Vita S.Abbonis, PL 139, col.407; cf. Miracula pp.116-19 and 136-40; Raynal, Histoire du Berry, I, pp. 372-3).

58. He is described as the Duke's satelles fidelissimus et familiarissimus by Hildegarius to Fulbert of Chartes (RHF, X, p.489).

59. King Lothair briefly established his son in the Auvergne c. 982-4 (Richer, Historia II, p.116-20; Lot, Les derniers Carolingiens, pp. 127-8).

Aquitaine held three villae in the county,[60] but there is no evidence for this or for an earlier date to show that the Duke exercised any effective political power. The only proof for the maintenance of the connexion of William Fier-à-bras or William the Great with the Auvergne is the subscription of Count Pons (of Gévaudan) to two ducal charters; but it is by no means clear what conclusions may be drawn from this. Certainly there is no trace of ducal intervention in the two counties of Clermont and Gévaudan in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries.[61]

ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS.

Before investigating the place of the church in the duchy of Aquitaine at this period it is important to point out that William the Great (and possibly his father to a lesser degree) showed considerable personal interest in church reform, which undoubtedly brought the Duke the support of the clergy, even in cases where he had no direct authority over them. William Fier-à-bras and his wife Emma founded two monasteries dedicated to St. Peter, at Maillezais

---

60. AA.SS,OSB p.255, a. 1064 (edition of 1688). The consequences of this grant do not suggest any great power in the county however. (below, pp.122-3).

61. Cartul.St.Cyprien nos. 513, (a.1004) 310. He has generally been described as Count of Gévaudan (eg. Richard, Comtes I, pp.142-7), but cf. Labbe (II, p.795) with a reference to Pontius comes Arvernensis (count of Clermont later thus described). The genealogies and history of these counts is confused (cf. HGL, IV, pp.135 et seq., Jarry, op.cit. pp. 283 et seq.)

in Poitou and Bourgueil in Anjou;[62] but, apart from the fact that Emma subjected Bourgueil directly to the papacy and stipulated regular abbatial election,[63] there is no indication that this Duke was particularly interested in monastic reform, even though he became involved in attempts to apply the "peace of God" in his domains.[64] William the Great on the other hand was responsible for much reforming activity: he re-established monastic life in the abbey of St. Martial,[65] ejected a simoniac abbot of Charroux,[66] laid down the conditions of tenure for the canonical benefices of St. Hilaire de Poitiers,[67] and - most important for the future - called

---

62. Maillezais was subject to St. Cyprien at first (Cartul. St.Cyprien (no.513). See Halphen's criticism of the narrative concerning its foundation by Peter of Maillezais (A Travers... esp. pp.157-8, 160; cf. Richard, Comtes, pp. 126-37). On the other hand Bourgueil is abundantly documented from its foundation (the best collection is in ms.lat. 17127; some charters were printed by Besly, pp. 267-8, 273-5, 280, 353-5, 355-6, 356-7, 365).

63. The privilege of Silvester II contained in ms.lat 17127, (p.245) is far longer (and does not appear inauthentic) than the text printed by Migne (PL, 139, cols. 285-6; J-W no.3940).

64. Below, nn. 81-7.

65. Ademar (Chron. p.166), but cf. below p.165 n.4 [redacted] The Viscount's grant to Cluny survives in ms. nouv. acq. lat. 2182 (pièce 1)

66. Op.cit. (p.184). The Duke apparently asked for the despatch of a band of monks from St. Savin-sur-Gartempe (RHF, X, p.482; Richard Comtes I, pp.206-209).

67. Docs.St.Hilaire nos. 71-2, dated 3 August 1015. Cf. also no.50 (undated).

in the aid of St. Odilo of Cluny to reform the great abbey of St. Jean d'Angély.[68] Although much of this activity would have been condemned by later ecclesiastical reformers, the Duke's concern seems to have been remarkable for a layman at the beginning of the eleventh century; in addition he was literate,[69] corresponded with Fulbert of Chartres, and was probably responsible for securing the appointment of one of Fulbert's pupils as head of the school of St. Hilaire.[70] This background of reforming interest should be taken into account when considering the Duke's relationship to the episcopate and his anomalous position as head of the church in his domains.

During the period in which the royal power declined in Aquitaine the various bishoprics and established religious houses all fell into secular control. Where the Count remained strong, as in Poitiers and Angoulême, complete secular control was established;[71] elsewhere the bishop achieved some degree of independence from the local ruler,

---

68. Chron. (p.184). Cf. also Chartes Cluny nos. 2709, 2716, 2737, for the connexion.

69. Chron. (pp.176-7). Ademar compared the Duke to Theodosius, Octavian, Charlemagne and Louis the Pious.

70. RHF (X, pp. 465-6, 479-80). Fulbert, not Hildegarius (Southern, Making of the Middle Ages, p. 208) was treasurer of St. Hilaire (RHF, X, p.488; Chron. p. 164).

71. Above, Chap. I, nn.58-68. Ademar (Chron, pp.149,157) gives the succession of the Bishops of Angoulême for this period. Two later bishops were drawn from the comital family (below, pp.119-20), which suggests comital control of the appointment.

as in Limoges and Périgueux;[72] but no bishop in Aquitaine took over the secular government or acquired the comitatus, as happened in certain cases, in Burgundy and Normandy for instance.[73] There can be little doubt that, as the Count of Poitou extended his power beyond his own county, he tried to increase the number of bishoprics under his control. Even as Duke of Aquitaine, however, it was not easy to achieve this; there is no foundation for the theory that the Duke controlled - or had the right to control - all episcopal appointments within his domains.[74]

William Tête d'Etoupe appointed his brother Ebles to the bishopric of Limoges;[75] and both his son and grandson

---

72. Indicated by the erection of separate castles for the cathedral and Viscount. (L. Grenier and L. Guibert, articles in Bulletins...du Limousin 1907, esp. by the latter pp.261, 266,271). Cf. Labbe (II, p.737,739) for Périgueux.

73. For Norman examples Haskins (Norman Institutions, p.36) and Douglas ("The earliest Norman counts", EHR 1946, pp.132-3). King Lothair gave the comitatus of Langres to its bishop, the Bishop of Autun had the control of the urbs and the mint (J. Richard, Les Ducs de Bourgogne... pp.52 n.2, 54 n.1).

74. "En Aquitaine l'élection ne dépend que du duc" (Imbart de la Tour, Hist.des élections épiscopales en France du IXe au XIe siècle, pp.250,358). He referred to the bishoprics of la Marche, Angoulême, Périgord, Gévaudan and Clermont, as well as Limoges and Poitiers. But there was no bishopric in la Marche, and the Auvergnat bishopric never fell into ducal hands. Cf. Lesne (Hist.de propriété ecclésiastique II, fas. iii p.54 - included Bordeaux and Saintes) and Dumas (Hist. de l'Eglise VII, p.202).

75. Above Chap. I, n.125.

continued to control the see, for Ademar of Chabannes records a series of "elections" in which these Dukes were involved.[76] The last shows William the Great enforcing his will on the Viscount and principes Lemovicenses who were attempting to get possession of the see after Bishop Gerald's death.[77] The Duke convoked a placitum where he "chose" Jordan, a lay prepositus of St. Léonard in the Limousin, and then escorted him to Limoges where he invested the candidate with the pastoral staff.[78] The bishopric of Saintes also fell into the Duke's hands from the time that he acquired this county;[79] but Poitiers, Limoges and Saintes were the only bishoprics which the Duke controlled directly before 1030, although William the Great made considerable efforts to participate in the election of the Archbishop of Bordeaux, since he could not gain control of the metropolitan see.[80]

---

76. Chron. (pp.157,172-3). Ademar's knowledge undoubtedly derived from his links with St. Martial (op.cit. pp.167-8; cf. Delisle, article cited n.56 , pp.317-18).

77. Chron. (pp.182-3).

78. ...cum baculo pastorali...eum gratis honore pontificali vestavit (loc.cit.)

79. Above n.32. References are found to Islo bishop of Saintes in eleven documents, of which only two are non-ducal (ms.lat.12898, fo.51 and Chartul.Ecclesiae Engolismensis, no.118, a. 1021). Below n.98 for the attempt to promote Islo to the archbishopric of Bordeaux.

80. Below nn.95-8.

At this period, however, the Dukes of Aquitaine increased their influence over ecclesiastical affairs by other means than the control of appointments to religious houses and bishoprics. Both William Fier-à-bras and William the Great were involved in the councils which are alleged to have inaugurated the "movement" for the "peace of God" in the French kingdom:[81] William the Great convoked them and even seems to have directed their affairs.[82]

The first of these councils recorded by Ademar of Chabannes took place at Limoges: the Duke, omnes episcopi Aquitanie, and principes were present to observe a penitential fast and celebrate the translation of the body of St. Martial; the Duke and principes also swore a "pact of peace and justice".[83] This "pact" can almost certainly be connected with decrees issued by a previous council held at Charroux against the spoliation of church property, attacks on clergy

---

81. General bibliography given in chap. 5, livre IV of the Hist.de l'Eglise (vol. VII-chapter by A. Dumas). All the works deal with the ecclesiastical aspects of the peace movement, and are not concerned with its regional differences, or such problems as how it spread, or was received.

82. Below, nn.85-8.

83. Chron. (p.158). Cf. the account of the translation (AA.SS. June 30th [redacted], pp.280-3). There is no proof for dating this definitely to the year 998 (Dumas, op.cit. p.495), although Ademar implies that the Duke involved was William the Great and it could not therefore be earlier than c 995/6 (above n.8).

and the unarmed populace, and the seizure of peasants' livestock;[84] they were issued by the Archbishop of Bordeaux and his comprovinciales, but a reference by Peter of Maillezais suggests that this council too was held under the Duke's protection.[85] Under William the Great a council was held convocante duce some time before the year 1014 (the year traditionally given is 1000 A.D.): this attempted to provide judicial measures to be taken against disturbers of the peace[86] - the only sanction of the Charroux decrees was the threat of excommunication.[87] Other councils with similar aims were held by William the Great, and by his

---

84. Labbe (II, p.764) printed it ex codice Engolismensi - which I have been unable to trace). Labbe attributed the council to the years 989-90: since the seventeenth century it has been ascribed to 989 (in the last instance see Dumas, p.492), although the account is undated. It can be placed before c.989, by which time Hildegarius of Limoges had fled to France (Font-Réaulx, Bulletins... Société..du Limousin, p.200, nn.11-12).

85. Labbe (II, p.226). Halphen considered this one of the more reliable parts of Peter's account (A Travers... pp.157-8; cf. Richard, Comtes p.126; Lesne, op.cit. p.61).

86. The decrees of the council survive (Labbe, II p.765). In the Labbe and Cossaert edition of the Concilia it was placed c. millesimo (1671 ed., vol. IX, col.780) - a date it has since borne (Dumas, op.cit. p.495 for instance), although the only proof is for a period before the death of Bishop Alduinus of Limoges c.1014 (Fort-Réaulx, op.cit., p.200, nn.13-14).

87. The final sanction was force: an expedition against the habitual malefactor by principes.

eldest son in the years before his capture by the Count of Anjou; William the Great was also responsible for setting in motion a persecution of the Manichees in Aquitaine at one of these councils.[88]

Where it is known the composition of these councils is puzzling: at Charroux the Bishop of Limoges is recorded as a comprovincialis of the Archbishop of Bordeaux and his suffragans, although his diocese in fact lay within the metropolitan see of Bourges;[89] the bishop of this diocese again attended the council called by William the Great to Poitiers.[90] But Limoges was of course controlled by the Duke, its bishop was appointed by him and consecrated within the duchy down to 1030,[91] in spite of the excommunication incurred by Bishop Jordan for disregarding the metropolitan rights of Bourges.[92] Indeed most of the bishops present at these councils were drawn from the ducal domains and, if the Duke did not control the appointments

---

88. Chron. (p.194). Cf. Labbe (pp.766-96), an account of a council held at Limoges in 1031, with retrospective reference to a council held at Poitiers, (pp.775-6).

89. Below n.92.

90. Labbe (p.765).

91. Above nn. 75-6, for references to Ademar's chronicle.

92. Ademar (Chron. pp.161, 183-4; cf. Pfister, Le règne du roi Robert, p.190). The clergy of Limoges adopted a righteous attitude because Archbishop Gauzlenus was a bastard son of King Hugh.

to the bishoprics of Angoulême and Périgueux, he was involved in the secular affairs of these counties; so that it seems that these assemblies may be regarded, not so much as synods of clergy of an ecclesiastical province, but as councils of the clergy of the duchy of Aquitaine - a conclusion to some extent borne out by Ademar's passing reference to episcopi Aquitaniae.[93]

The drawback to this interpretation is the appearance of the Archbishop of Bordeaux whose diocese lay outside the domains of the Duke of Aquitaine in the territory ruled by the Gascon Count at the end of the tenth century.[94] Ecclesiastically he was metropolitan of all the bishops (except Limoges) within the Duke's domains;[95] therefore, if the Duke could exercise his influence over the Archbishop or gain control of the archbishopric, both his prestige, and

---

93. Above n. 83. Cf. the position of William the Conqueror at a later date (Haskins, op.cit. pp.35-8). The Duke of Normandy was however fortunate enough to control almost the whole province of Rouen, which was practically co-terminous with his duchy (map in Lemarignier's Etude sur les privilèges d'exemption..., at end).

94. The Charroux decrees were drawn up: Ego Gumbaldus archiepiscopus secundae Aquitaniae cum omnibus episcopis comprovincialibus...decrevimus (Labbe, p.764). For Gascony and Bordeaux before c. 1032 below, part. II, pp. 97-102.

95. The province consisted of Poitiers, Saintes, Angoulême, Périgueux and Agen (see Gallia Christiana II, under Bordeaux. Maillezais, Luçon, and la Rochelle were created later). Agen came into ducal hands in the second half of the eleventh century (below p.174).

his influence over his own bishops would be increased. There is in fact no evidence that the Dukes thought along these lines, but their influence over the Archbishop certainly increased, probably because conditions in Gascony were so unfavourable to reform that the latter could hardly have summoned his suffragans to Bordeaux even if he had been able to assure their safety;[96] his activity as archbishop was thus virtually bound to take place outside his own see. But William the Great also tried to achieve at least some measure of control over the archbishopric: in 1028 he participated in an "election" with the Gascon ruler at Blaye, and eventually a Frenchman called Godfrey was appointed.[97] The significant point is that this election only took place after the Bishop of Saintes had been appointed, and then resigned the office,[98] which suggests that there may have been opposition to the Duke's ambitions.

---

96. St. Abbo was begged to come to la Réole (about 30 miles from Bordeaux) because no one else had been able to stay in such a barbarous region and he was murdered there (PL 139, cols. 406-7, 410).

97. The election took place on 8 September 1028 at Blaye (Ademar, Chron p.194), and a note quoted from an autograph Ms. of Ademar by L. Delisle (Notices et Extraits, vol. 35, pp.77-8).

98. Chron (loc.cit. n.2); but in one document Islo was described as archbishop of Bordeaux (Chartes Nouaillé no.104 - foundation of a priory in the castle of Lusignan), and this is dated 1025 - i.e. three years before the "election" of Godfrey at Blaye, with the Gascon consent.

The different counties which made up the ducal domains before William the Great's death were united only by the personal authority which the Dukes exercised in each of them;[99] and the first two Dukes of Aquitaine seem to have been opportunists in their secular policy for, whereas William the Great established a precedent for ducal appointment in the case of the county of Périgord and the viscounty of Limoges, he seems never to have tried to direct the affairs of the county of Angoulême. The historian may describe this lack of uniformity as a sign of weakness; but to contemporaries the number of ducal vassals and the individual importance of these, as well as the Dukes' position as protectors of the Church, was surely one of the reasons for their reputation - irrespective of the way in which they governed. This reputation is proved by the part which William the Great played in European politics: apart from the exchange of ambassadors and gifts with the Emperor and kings to which Ademar drew attention,[100] he became genuinely

---

99. Contrast the political unity of Normandy, and the uniformity of its customs (LeMarignier, Recheches sur l'hommage en Marche... pp.8-11, 18-33).

100. Ademar (Chron, p.163 and Labbe II, pp.175-6), with reference to regalia munera sent to the Duke. This was undoubtedly inserted to emphasize the Duke's own position. See P. Grierson ("Commerce in the Dark Ages: a critique of the evidence", Transaction of the Royal Historical Society, 1959, esp. pp.137-9) for the survival of "gift exchange".

involved in negotiations to acquire the Lombard crown for his eldest son,[101] while his daughter Agnes made an imperial marriage to the German Henry III.[102]

---

101. Ademar (p.188); cf. the letters printed RHF (X, pp.498-9, 500-03).

102. Not admittedly until after her father's death-in 1043. See M. Bulst-Thiele (Kaiserin Agnes, pp.17-19).

CHAPTER III.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF FEUDALISM BEFORE 1030, and the DUCAL AUTHORITY.

When Ebles became Count the government of Poitou was still based on the Carolingian framework of pagi and vicariae, and the administrative system - where unaffected by the Norman attacks - continued to function. But even at the beginning of the tenth century the viscounts and other officials seem to have been the Count's personal fideles, or his vassals; the administrative system was also slowly transformed throughout the hundred years before the death of William the Great; and other developments took place which changed the basis of comital authority. The most important of these was the emergence of the castle as the basis of authority, but during these hundred years a feudal nobility also appeared.[1]

The SURVIVAL of ALODIAL TENURE and the FEUDAL RELATIONSHIP

It has been suggested that in Poitou the existence of castles built on alodial land accounts for the turbulence of many castellans who were thus able to resist the comital authority;[2] but this view is somewhat difficult to sustain

---

1. Above Chap. I, passim , below pp.76-7.

2. M. Garaud, "La construction des châteaux et les destinées de la vicaria et du vicarius carolingien en Poitou" (RHDFE, 1953 p.57 et seq.) Cf. the views of R. Aubenas "Les chateaux-forts des Xe et XIe siècles - contribution à l'étude des origines de la féodalité" (RHDFE 1938, pp. 567-70, 580) which are substantially different from those of Garaud.

in the light of the evidence. Alodial land was certainly common in Poitou during the course of the tenth century, for grants of alod are numerous in the surviving documents of religious houses;[3] however, since alods normally came to be divided among the members of a family they can rarely have been a great source of power.[4] It also seems possible that, as benefices gradually came to be considered completely hereditary, alodial land lost some of its importance.[5] In practice also the independence of alodial land could not

---

3. The surviving Nouaillé charters contain 28 tenth century references to alod and 8 for the eleventh century ; for St. Hilaire 14 tenth century, 2 eleventh century; St. Maixent 20 tenth century, 10 eleventh century; St. Cyprien 38 references which can be dated between 900-1030, compared with 2 for the rest of the eleventh century. (It is impossible to give citations here). The position seems to be similar with regard to the surviving documents for the houses of Maillezais, Bourgueil, St.Florent; the only exception is the abbey of St. Jean d'Angély, for which there are numerous early eleventh century references to alodial land.

4. A donor gave part of an alod secundum divisionem quae mihi hoc usque advenit (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély no.443 - c. 1060-86). Cf. Chartes St.Maixent no.119; Cartul. St.Cyprien no.369; Cartul...Saintes no.140.

5. When Bishop Ebles (William Tête d'Etoupe's brother) gave an alod to St. Maixent it was described as being de proprio iure hereditatis (Chartes St. Maixent no.33) Cf. the ninth century example in which a donor de patre germano gave an alod which inhereditatem mihi legibus obvenit (Chartes Nouaillé no.22). But by the mid-eleventh century other tenures were also considered hereditary: the son of a vicarius mentioned omnem alodi mei divisionem et omnia quae ego hereditario iure possideo (Chartes St. Maixent no.119, a. 1064).

always be maintained: a man who made a grant of alod to the monks of St. Jouin-des-Marnes had to get the consent of his lord, the Viscount of Thouars.[6]

In any case there is no real proof that castles in Poitou were built on alodial land without the Count's consent, for Lusignan - the most important example suggested - undoubtedly derived from the honor of the Count of Poitou;[7] while Château-l'Archer, although described in the cartulary of St. Cyprien as alodial, seems to have been built on a site given by one of the early Counts to the lord of the castle.[8] Therefore, although on the one hand the extent to which alodial tenure survived down to the eleventh century has probably been underestimated, yet on the other it cannot be proved that its survival greatly affected the establishment or maintenance of comital authority in Poitou.

The viscounts who appear in the documents of the time of Ebles and William Tête d'Etoupe as comital fideles succeeded, like the Counts themselves, in rendering their

---

6. Cartul. Sancti Iovini, pp. 2-3.

7. Unpublished document (appendix II, no.262) iussu itaque voluntate comitis Pictavorum, in cuius honore sunt mea omnia.

8. Cartul.St.Cyprien no.401. In 969 Ebbo and his wife stipulated that the monks tenuerint sicut eis vite nobis comite funditus concedimus iure hereditario. The phrase is obscure but belies Garaud's view (op.cit. p.64) that the castle was built on alodial land without comital intervention.

offices hereditary and in passing their lands from father to son - or at least from one male member of the family to another if there were no son of full age.[9] It is probable that other unidentifiable fideles of this period formed the basis of the new "feudal nobility"; but this is difficult to prove because surnames are rarely given before the second decade of the eleventh century, and only become common at about the time of Angevin domination in Poitou[10] when

---

9. Although the two studies of Imbert on the Viscounts of Thouars and that of Chamard on the Viscounts of Châtellerault (see bibliography) need revision they showed that these viscounties passed by hereditary succession. The viscounty of Thouars was supposed to be subject to the droit de retour or viage (Imbert, MSAO 1864, p.425) by which the office passed from one male of the same generation to another; but Imbert's genealogy does not bear this out and it cannot be proved to have been the rule from the tenth to the twelfth century.

10. In the foundation charters of Notre Dame de Saintes and la Trinité de Vendôme (Cartulaire...Saintes no. I, 1047; Cartulaire de la Trinité, I no.35, 1040) the subscribers are almost all given surnames, perhaps because both Angevins and Poitevins were concerned in the foundation, and might have been unidentifiable outside their own provinces. At an earlier date the surname of an important castellan might be mentioned (Eg Willelmo de Partenaco, Cartul. St.Cyprien no. 489 - a 1023-28/9) but generally an identification can only be made from internal evidence. For instance Hugo vir clarissimus was certainly the lord of Lusignan, since he granted a church in that castle to Nouaillé (Chartes Nouaillé no. 104), but in 1025 he was not yet called de Leziniaco as he was later. (Chartes St. Maixent no. 97, before c 1047). It is impossible to tell how many of the earlier "Hughs" subscribing comital charters could be identified with the ancestors of the lords of Lusignan. It is interesting to notice that the Lusignans themselves were obliged to give a very vague genealogy (Chron.St.Maixent, p.389). Cf. the remarks on the obscurity of the origins of most Norman aristocratic families (D.C.Douglas, "The earliest Norman Counts", EHR 1946, pp. 147-8).

several important cases show that benefices were normally considered hereditary.[11]

At the beginning of this period on the other hand the lord apparently retained considerable powers over the land which he granted in benefice. William Tête d'Etoupe, for instance, deprived a fidelis of land which he had been given, and ordered him to accept instead a money payment from the Abbot of St. Maixent.[12] William Fier-à-bras granted the castle of Loudun to Geoffrey Grisegonelle, Count of Anjou, although the castle had probably been in the possession of the Viscounts of Thouars at an earlier date;[13] on Geoffrey's death and on the Duke's the grant was renewed, which suggests that the lord did not consider the inheritance to be entirely automatic.[14] But nevertheless the presumption does seem to have been in favour of an heir's inheritance since, when William the Great endowed the abbey of Maillezais with the benefice of Bernard Tallupes the explanation quia non habebat heredem was given.[15]

---

11. pp. 94-6 (Saintes) ; 54-6, 119 (Blaye).

12. Chartes St. Maixent no.20, July 959.

13. Ademar (Chron. p.152). Chap. II, nn.15-16.

14. Chron (p.164).

15. Arcere (Hist.de la Rochelle II, p.665; also edited Lacurie, Hist.de Maillezais, pp.202-3). Cf. M.Bloch (Feudal Society, pp.190-92).

The difficulty of course was for the lord to retain control over the land or castle which he had abandoned in benefice and, when Ademar of Chabannes recorded that Count Aldwin of Angoulême took possession of Blaye and invested his brother with a third of the castle, he gave no indication that the Duke's consent was obtained, although Blaye was held by the Count of Angoulême from the Duke.[16] However, throughout this period the personal obligations resulting from the bond of homage and fealty were heavy, and much emphasis was placed on the duties of man to lord. This is perhaps best illustrated by a dramatic story from Ademar's chronicle in which Aimeri de Rancon, who built an unlicensed castle during the absence of his lord the Count of Angoulême, was pursued and killed as a perjurer by the Count's son.[17] The Conventio also yields much detail about the lord's claims on his fidelis, as where William the Great allegedly asserted that he could force Hugh to take a serf as his lord, because Hugh was William's man.[18] Even if this threat was unlikely to be fulfilled William was portrayed as constantly demanding the services of his man; even when Hugh's own benefice was in danger of attack he had to accompany his lord in ostem to a

---

16. Chron. (p.193). Cf. chap. II, n.35.

17. Chron (pp.185-6). Ademar probably stressed the punishment because Aimeri took his oath on the relics of St. Cybard, the patron Saint of one of the monasteries to which Ademar was attached.

18. Appendix I , pp. 242 ; cf. pp. 241, 246.

meeting with the Gascon ruler at Blaye.[19] He was expected to throw all his own resources into a comital dispute with the Viscount of Thouars; and it is clear that Hugh depended upon his lord both for an advantageous marriage and for an increase in his benefice;[20] while after he "defied" his lord he had to renew his oath of fealty before any settlement was made about the honor which he claimed from the Count.[21] In spite of great differences in language and outlook (the Conventio is written in more than usually barbarous Latin, and is wholly secular in tone) there are noticeable similarities between the Conventio and the letter of Bishop Fulbert of Chartres defining the obligations of lord and man - a letter which, it should not be forgotten, was written in answer to a request made by William the Great, the lord of the Conventio.[22]

But in order to gain a benefice a man might well take

---

19. Ibid., p.245.

20. Ibid., p.239, and this source passim.

21. ...comes et filius eius...receperunt Ugonem ad hominem in fide et credentia. Et fecerunt Ugoni relinquere omnia que de retro requirebat. Et iuravit illis fidelitatem, et dederunt illi honorem Ioszelini avunculi sui...(p.250)

22. Ed. RHF (X, p.463). It is cited by Ganshof (Qu'est-ce que la Féodalité? pp. 103-4), Bloch (op.cit. pp.219,228), Mitteis (Der Staat des Hohen Mittelalters, pp.172-3) as though it were simply a "classic" statement of feudal obligations by a trained canonist.

more than one lord and the ensuing relationship would fall far below the ideals of loyalty envisaged by Bishop Fulbert.[23] In practice such a relationship also weakened the lord's position, for his man would not be so completely dependent upon the lord if his benefices derived from more than one source. At a political level there are examples of the difficulties so created: The Viscount of Thouars commending himself to the Count of Anjou for the county of Nantes,[24] the Count of Anjou's own subordination to the Count of Poitou for his benefices in the Saintonge and Poitou[25] - but there is no evidence that they could be solved except by the lord's own personal strength or cunning.[26]

THE ESTABLISHMENT of CASTLES.

During the ninth century the Carolingian kings forbade the building of castles or fortifications without royal permission,[27] although during the period of Norman attacks,

---

23. See Ganshof (Mélanges Paul Fournier, "Depuis quand a-t-on pu en France être vassal de plusieurs seigneurs?", passim)

24. Above, Chap. II, n.18.

25. Chap. II, nn. 15-16, 33.

26. At this period there is no evidence for the evolution of anything resembling liege homage, although in practice it is clear from the Conventio that William the Great considered that he had the first claim to Hugh's services even when he ordered Hugh to take another lord. Below, pp.242.

27. Charles the Bald ordered the destruction of castella et firmitates et haias built sine nostro verbo, and the Counts were to carry out his orders (MGH, Capitularia II, p.328-a. 864). Cf. F.Vercauteren (Etudes sur les civitates de la Belgique seconde, p.191 n.1) and Aubenas (op.cit. p.550 n.2) for examples.

fortification must surely have been undertaken before permission could be obtained; by the early eleventh century the possession or control of castles was clearly considered to be the basis of political authority in Aquitaine, as it was in the rest of the French kingdom.[28] However, since it has been suggested that each castle provided its lord with the "foundations of sovereignty"[29] the problem arises as to the extent to which the Count of Poitou managed to control the castles established within his domains. In spite of the obscurity which surrounds the origins of many of these castles, the only possible way of discovering the Count's authority over them is by means of a survey of those known by the early eleventh century.[30]

The city of Poitiers was the key to the domination of the county, but it was situated at the crossing of numerous Roman roads in an exposed position on the plain of Poitou[31]

---

28. Ademar (Chron. pp. 168 and 208). Aubenas (op.cit. passim), Bloch (op.cit. p.300 et seq.)

29. Garaud (op.cit. p.57, cf. pp. 64-5).

30. Garaud's article is primarily concerned with the survival of the vicaria, and he does not always consider the evidence for comital control. Both this and Painter's article ("Castellans of the plain of Poitou...", Speculum 1956) deal only with Poitou.

31. For its situation see R. Crozet (Villes d'entre Loire et Gironde, p.15), for an excellent plan of the city D.Claude (Topographie und Verfassung... at end).

and, by the early eleventh century it was ringed by castles such as Montreuil-Bonnin, Vivonne, Chauvigny and Château-l'Archer. The first of these was built on comital demesne and kept in the Count's hand,[32] the tenure of Vivonne was arranged by the Duke,[33] and there is no indication that the other two were outside the sphere of comital influence.[34] The family of Lusignan had already begun to consolidate their great honour,[35] and by 1030 Hugh held the castles of Lusignan and Couhé; but apart from the fact that the Conventio leaves the historian in no doubt as to Hugh's personal dependence on the Count, this source also makes it clear that the building of Couhé could only proceed with William the Great's permission.[36]

---

32. His presence at Mosteriolo is recorded in the Conventio (Appendix I, p. 240; Dict. Topographique de la Vienne, p.277). For proof that it was in the comital demesne, below p. 231, n. 178.

33. Conventio (p. 242). In the late eleventh century the Lusignans still held at least part of Vivonne (Cartul.St.Cyprien no.429).

34. For Château-l'Archer, above n.8. Chauvigny was described by Bishop Isembert of Poitiers as castrum suum (Cartul. St. Cyprien no. 210, cf. Chartes Nouaillé no. 78); but it must have belonged to the episcopatus and not to Isembert's family as it remained in the Bishop's hands in the twelfth century (Chron.St.Maixent, p. 426; contrast Garaud, p.63). There is no evidence for comital control in this case, but it should be pointed out that the Conventio proves comital intervention in the case of Vivonne (previous n.) where the agreement was made with the Bishop about Hugh's tenure.

35. Above n.10.

36. For Couhé Appendix I (p. 243). By 1025 Hugh was called dominus de Coec (Chartes Nouaillé no.107).

There is no doubt either that Thouars and Loudun in the northern part of Poitou were held from the Count, although the precise nature of the services he exacted are unknown.[37] The comital control of the castles to the east and south of Poitiers can also be proved: William the Great kept terra dominica attached to Gençay, which had previously been disputed between Hugh of Lusignan and the Count of la Marche,[38] he disposed of Civray to a fidelis called Bernard and,[39] since the Count later had a consuetudinis in the castle of Lussac it was presumably held from him.[40]

---

37. Above, pp.27,49-50.

38. Conventio (p.245-8) cf. Ademar (Chron. p.156). The Duke destroyed the castle of Rochemeaux nearby (loc.cit).

39. The Conventio reference implies that William the Great built this castle (p.242); but Richard (op.cit. I, pp. 161-2) and Garaud (op.cit. p.63, n.93) asserted without evidence that it was built by the Count of la Marche. It is perhaps significant that William the Great gave his consent to a grant made by a fidelissimus, in vicaria Sivria, eo castro (Cartul. Lemovicensis no.9 - Before 1014).

40. The castle is known from c. 991-1014 (Chartes Nouaillé no.84). Si comes Pictavis ibi veniens manducaverit, et aliquid sit forfactum vilanis...sit emendatum in sua mercede (Ibid. no.115).

The castellans of Parthenay, like the Lusignans, had built up a considerable honour based on the possession of this castle by the time of William the Great; again this was undoubtedly held in benefice from the Count.[41] Beyond Parthenay William Fier-à-bras and William the Great themselves held the three castles of Vouvant, Mervent and Fontenay-le-Comte,[42] which guarded one of the regions where they hunted;[43] on the coast Talmont was enfiefed to a man called William, and escheated to the Count in the time of William Aigret.[44] There is little information at this period about the towns of Melle and Niort, although what there is suggests a considerable degree of comital authority (William the Great had the mint at Niort,[45] Melle was the site of a great placitum in the year of this Duke's death).[46] Since the

---

41. Hugh asked the Count to procure him a marriage with the widow of the lord of Parthenay (Conventio, p. 239). A William of Parthenay is known c. 1023-30 (Cartul.St. Cyprien no. 489).

42. William the Great offered the Abbot of Maillezais a place for a church if he felled the forest near the castle of Vouvant (Besly, Poictou p.307); the same document mentions his tenure of Mervent, and of Fontenay-le-Comte (cf. tenth century reference to this last, Chartes St. Maizent no. 61; Painter, op.cit. p. 248 merely says it was built "before 1050").

43. Peter of Maillezais (Labbe, II p. 223).

44. William de castro Thalamoni is mentioned before 1030 (Cartul.St.Cyprien no.581) For details of its tenure and reference to the escheat see Cartul.Ste.Croix de Talmont no.5.

45. Below, p.194, n18.

46. Chartes St.Maixent no.91. Cf. p. 247, below

same Duke made an agreement with Hugh of Lusignan about the tenure of the castle of Chizé he presumably also disposed of it.[47]

The principal castles of the Aunis before 1030 were Châtelaillon and Surgères; in the mid tenth century the former was probably already in the possession of the family which held it down to the twelfth century but, although the lord of Châtellaillon was undoubtedly an important person, he was still a comital vassal.[48] Surgères, on the other hand, is first mentioned in 1016 when the Count held the castle;[49] it was only abandoned in 1199 when King John held the province.[50] It is more difficult to assess the position of the Count of Poitou in the Saintonge where his authority was of more recent date than in the Aunis. William the Great certainly disposed of Saintes and Blaye,[51] and

---

47. Conventio (p. 243). William Aigret later confirmed a grant of land near the castle (Cartul. saintongeais... Vendôme no.16).

48. In 968-9 the holder of the castle was called Isembert (Cartul.St.Cyprien no.522), as he was in the mid-eleventh century when the Count was directly acknowledged as his domnus (Chartes Cluny no.3413). This second Isembert was the son of Eblus/Emblus (Cluny no.2983; cf. Cartul... Saintes no.225). Cf. L. Faye (MSAO vol. 13, 1846, for a rather too ambitious genealogy of the house) and Jarry (op.cit. II, pp. 248-50).

49. He gave houses in the castle to the monastery of Ebreuil (Appendix II, no. 1).

50. Richard (op.cit. II, pp. 344, 362).

51. Above Chap. II, pp.54.

perhaps of Pons also;[52] but many of the important castles of this region are only known from documents of a later date.[53]

William Fier-à-bras and William the Great both had some authority in the city of Limoges but in spite of expeditions against the castellans of the region (for instance the lord of Chabanais)[54] they did not acquire any means of controlling the castles of the Limousin. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that this was because the Dukes of Aquitaine had no rights in the soil, for none of the Limousin lords, apart from the Viscount of Limoges, seems to have held his honour directly from the Duke.[55] As far as it is possible to tell this pattern was repeated in the other counties composing the "duchy of Aquitaine": William the Great intervened occasionally in the affairs of the counties of Angoulême,

---

52. This was one of the castles held by Geoffrey Martel of Anjou (Chartes saintongeaises...St.Florent no.7, retrospective reference in a comital act of 1083) It may therefore have been held by his father Fulk, but there is no evidence for the date at which it was built.

53. Eg. Cognac (below, p.119) and the coastal castles (pp.199, 218), but there is evidence for the erection of castles by the Count of Angoulême - Archiac, Bouteville, and Jarnac (Chron, p.193 - ms.C; HFCE p.14).

54. Ademar (Chron. p. 166).

55. Cf. pp.57-60. This assertion rests on the absence of evidence for the region: there are no subscriptions of Limousin lords to ducal charters, except on the rare occasions when the Duke appeared in Limoges, and no direct references to his lordship.

Périgord and la Marche,[56] but as Duke he had no authority over the castles established by their vassals, although they seem to have exercised control over the erection of castles in their own counties in the same way that the Duke did as Count of Poitou.[57]

During the tenth century the offices of the Carolingian kingdom were transformed into hereditary charges and the inheritance of benefices became the rule, although revocation was not impossible for a strong lord. This development could clearly weaken the comital authority, in the same way that royal government had been weakened when the comital office became hereditary; but in the early eleventh century the Count of Poitou still had the means of counteracting the growth of independence among his vassals and subordinates. Firstly, he could rely on the loyalty of a man to his lord, for the "feudal tie" was as yet far from being one of "pure form";[58] secondly he had acquired the rights connected with the Carolingian comitatus,[59] which meant that when royal control was withdrawn the Count exercised the only legitimate

---

56. Above, pp. 37, 52-3.

57. Ademar (Chron. pp. 159, 167), for references to Périgord and la Marche. Cf. above n. 17 for Angoulême.

58. Phrase of Dhondt (op.cit. p. 254).

59. pp. 14-22.

public authority in the region. Although impossible to prove, it seems that the control exercised by the Count over castles in Poitou and the Aunis and perhaps in the Saintonge, may derive from his acquisition of the comitatus.[60] This would explain the discrepancies between his power as Count of Poitou and as Duke of Aquitaine, for as Duke he had no authority to deny the comital rights acquired by others.[61]

---

60. This seems to have been Aubenas' view (op.cit. pp.567-70, 580). A weak ruler would of course soon lose this control.

61. There was no uniformity in the power exercised by the Duke (above, pp 49-72) and certainly no clearly evolved "feudal rights" connected with the ducal domains, as distinct from the comital ones.

PART II.

1030-1137.

CHAPTER I.

ANGEVIN DOMINATION IN POITOU AND THE SAINTONGE AND THE ACQUISITION OF GASCONY.

ANGEVIN DOMINATION

William the Great was succeeded by his eldest son, William le Gros,[1] who for several years governed Aquitaine according to the model established by his father before 1030. In 1031 the new Duke attended a council at Limoges, where oaths of peace were renewed and where he offered his protection to the monks of the Limousin monastery of Beaulieu against their lay-abbot[2]; in the following year he held a great gathering at Poitiers, and later made sure that the consuetudines of the abbey of St. Maixent were defined.[3] But on September 20th, 1033, this Duke was defeated in battle at Montcoué, captured by Geoffrey Martel (the son of William the Great's fidelis Count Fulk Nerra of Anjou), and held prisoner for three years until a huge ransom was collected and paid.[4] This short period of captivity seems

---

1. The St. Maixent chronicle gives him the nickname pinguis (p.391). For the date of William the Great's death see Part I, Chap. 11. n.8.

2. Labbe (11, pp.781-2 and 789). Cf. above p.59

3. Chartes St. Maixent no.91; Chron. St. Maixent (p.391).

4. For a full discussion of the sources and the chronology of these events see Halphen (Chrons. des Comtes d'Anjou, pp.59-62,235; Anjou, pp.56-7 and notes) whose views are to be preferred to those of Richard (Comtes 1, p.229). B. Ledain identified the place of the battle as being about 8 Km. from St. Jouin-des-Marnes (Dictionnaire Topographique....Deux-Sèvres, p.183).

to have been enough to destroy the foundations of ducal authority established by William the Great: the "peace movement" never again formed one of the bases of government, and the Duke of Aquitaine never again presided over great ecclesiastical assemblies as William the Great had done.[5]

The events leading up to the battle of Montcoué are obscure, although the conflict was surely connected with the marriage of the Countess Agnes, the Duke's stepmother, to Geoffrey Martel in 1032[6]; but even contemporary chroniclers were wrong in supposing that the Duke's capture led to immediate Angevin control of the duchy,[7] for between 1033 and 1036 authority was apparently in the hands of the Duke's wife and Bishop Isembert of Poitiers;[8] while for the short period between his release and death, William

---

5. The "synod" in which Bishop Isembert magnam pacem firmavit in 1036 was surely connected with the Duke's release (Chron. St. Maixent, p. 392).

6. Halphen established the date of the event (Anjou, p.56 n.3; see also pp. 237-8).

7. The Norman chronicler William of Poitiers placed the marriage after Geoffrey's capture of the Duke, and supposed that it led to Angevin control of Poitou and the Bordelais (Histoire de Guillaume le Conquérant, ed. Foreville, p. 32). Cf. the St. Maixent chronicle (pp. 392-3).

8. This is implied by the passage of the St. Maixent chronicle referred to in n.5, and by a grant authorised by Eustachia when the Duke was positus in captione (Chartes St. Maixent, no.93).

le Gros ruled undisturbed.[9] On this Duke's death the character of Angevin ambitions underwent a change and when Odo (William the Great's second son) reached Poitou from Gascony,[10] the lord of Parthenay and other castellans opposed him auxilio Andegavorum; and Odo was killed besieging Mauzé, in an attempt to gain his inheritance.[11] The succession then fell to William Aigret, Agnes' elder son by William the Great;[12] Angevin authority in Poitou was therefore established by "legitimate" means, because Agnes and Geoffrey Martel acted as regents for William Aigret, who was too young to rule alone.

Even in Geoffrey's absence Agnes was a forceful ruler:[13]

---

9. He did not die either in the year of his release or three days after it (Ralf Glaber, Historia, ed. Prou p. 113; William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum, Rolls Series, vol.90, pp.287-8); but was alive in 1037 and still on 6 September 1038 (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély, nos. 42,254).

10. Chron.St.Maixent (p.393);

11. Loc.cit. I have been unable to find any support for Richard's assertion that the castellan William of Talmont was in command of Mauzé (Comtes, 1 pp. 236-7). These events can only be placed between the last reference to William in Sept. 1038 (see n.9), and the first to William Aigret in July 1039 (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély no.186).

12. He was baptised Peter, and apparently took the name William on his succession (Chron.St.Maixent, pp.389, 398 - with the nickname acerrimus and acer).

13. This is deduced from the clause of a charter iamdicta nobilissima comitissa Agnes obsedit castrum Volventem et, ut sua consuetudo, cepit eum (Chartes..Cluny, no. 2855; no evidence for Richard's date of 1044/5 Comtes, I p.146), and from frequent references to Agnes' rule in documents (Chartes St. Maixent nos. 95,102-3,105,107,113).

his support possibly meant that Poitou was spared the usual disorders of a minority;[14] but since his ambitions did not stop at acting as guardian for his stepson, William Aigret could not isolate himself from Angevin politics when he was proclaimed of age in 1044[15] or even after his mother's divorce from the Count of Anjou between 1050 and 1052.[16] In 1053, for instance an Angevin attack on Poitiers was prepared;[17] since William met his own death some years later besieging the Angevin town of Saumur,[18] it can be presumed that no firm peace was ever established. Moreover, Angevin domination seems to have had serious effects on William's position as Duke for, although his presence is recorded in Angers and the Angevin controlled town of Vendôme[19], and, although on one occasion he fought in an

---

14. pp. 131-6 below.

15. Chron. St. Maixent, (p.394). The presence of Geoffrey Martel at Poitiers cum omnibus Pictavorum optimatibus is particularly to be noted.

16. Halphen (Anjou p. 61 n.1).

17. MLlll, scilicet eodem anno quo Gauzfridus comes Andegavensium pugnaturus cum Willelmo comite, cum magno exercitu Pictavum perrexit, eundemque Willelmum, metu pugne perterritum, sibi in amicitia copulavit (Ms. nouv.acq.lat.1935,fo.81 - i.e. the livre noir de St. Florent)

18. Chron.St.Maixent, (p.398). William died of dysentery at this siege.

19. Cartularium ...Beatae Mariae Andegavensis, no.35, March 1047 (see Halphen, Anjou, catalogue no.89) ; Cartul. Trinité de Vendôme, I no. 35, 1040).

Angevin campaign against the Duke of Normandy,[20] apart from the election of a bishop of Limoges in 1052,[21] there is almost no evidence for his activity outside Poitou and the Saintonge, or for contacts with the Counts over whom William the Great had established his ducal authority.[22]

The most serious consequence of the prolonged period of Angevin domination resulted from the lands and power which Geoffrey Martel amassed within the Duke's own domains. In Poitou the castles of Loudun and Mirebeau were firmly

---

20. William of Poitiers (ed. Foreville, p.78). Both Richard and Halphen. (Comtes, I p.272; Anjou, p.78) supposed that in this passage Guillelmo comite Pictavorum, domino suo ought to be identified with William's younger brother but, since this author elsewhere clearly identified Guido frater comitis Pictavensis (op.cit. p.64), I have rejected their view. Halphen's date of 1054 has better support than Richard's of 1058.

21. Cartul.St.Stephani Lemovicensis no.121 ; Cf. no.181.

22. This may be partly accounted for by the fact that the St. Maixent chronicle has little information about activity in the duchy, whereas for William the Great's reign Ademar of Chabannes' contained a great deal; nevertheless there are few references to subscribers from outside Poitou and the Saintonge for the twenty years of William's rule. The Viscount of Limoges subscribed once (see ref. in n.21), the Count of la Marche twice (Chartes poitevines...St.Florent no.72 ; Chartes Cluny, IV p.414), the Count of Angoulême three times (Vendôme no.35 ; Cartul. N-D de Saintes no.1 ; Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély no.216).

established in Angevin hands, and Geoffrey Martel disposed of them without the consent of the Count of Poitou as overlord.[23] Of course these two castles had been held by Count Fulk, and possibly Geoffrey did little more than strengthen his position at a time when hereditary tenure was becoming almost unassailable.[24] However, the situation in the Saintonge was very different: here the Count of Anjou claimed the whole pagus and city of Saintes - a far greater honour than William the Great had granted to Fulk.[25] Documentary evidence proves that Geoffrey Martel did indeed

---

23. An unpublished document from a copy of the cartulary of Bourgueil proves that Geoffrey had granted Mirebeau to his vassal Bartholomew, later Archbishop of Tours, (ms.lat.17127, p.95 ; Collection Moreau, 25, fo.149) This castle is not in the Saintonge as Halphen supposed. (Anjou, p.52) For Loudun, see below, p.144.

24. Cf. the case of Blaye, pp.117-18.

25. Chrons. Comtes d'Anjou, (p.236). For proof that this source represents an autobiographical fragment by Fulk Réchin see Halphen's study in the Bibliothèque de la faculté des lettres : Université de Paris (vol.13, 1901, pp.43-9).

control castles in the Saintonge,[26] pursue private war there,[27] that he enjoyed certain rights connected with the coinage,[28] and held vast stretches of forest in demesne.[29]

William Aigret was never strong enough to deal with this problem - he was after all probably technically responsible for the grant of the Saintonge to Geoffrey;[30] but there can be little doubt that his brother, the Duke Guy-Geoffrey, repudiated the Angevin claims after Fulk Réchin asserted that the Count of Anjou had invested him

---

26. The citadel of Saintes (below, pp.96, 197), the castle of Pons (see the confirmation made by Guy-Geoffrey in 1083 - Cartul.saintongeais St. Florent, no.7), and possibly also the castle of Oléron, since he and Agnes disposed of most of the land on the island (Cartul. N-D de Saintes, no. 1 ; Chartes...Trinité de Vendôme no.35, Cartul.Saintongeais...Vendome, nos.16,19,36).

27. Reference quoted n.25, to guerra with Peter of Didonne. This Castellan held important possessions in the region since Agnes had paid him 6000sol. for land with which to endow the convent of Notre-Dame at Saintes (Cartul. Saintes no.1).

28. Loc.cit., cf. below, pp.194-5.

29. He referred to silva nostra dominica (below, pp. 203, nn.60-61 for details). There is also evidence for his exploitation of a toll at St. Aignan (Cartul. Saintongeais...Vendôme no.18); and possibly also for his administration of justice in Saintes (ibid. no.35) although this notice is undated and may refer to Guy-Geoffrey, rather than to Geoffrey Martel.

30. Presumably the investiture was made during William's minority.

at Angers in 1060 with the whole of this vast honour.[31] In spite of a crushing defeat of the Poitevins in March 1061 at Chef-Boutonne (not far from Melle) Fulk Rechin and his brother were unable to reach the Saintonge;[32] in the following year Guy-Geoffrey laid siege to Saintes, cut it off from all reinforcements, and gained the unconditional surrender of the citizens and the Angevin garrison.[33] No Angevin literary source mentions this blow to Fulk's hopes and the hereditary claims of the Counts of Anjou to the

---

31. Above, n.25. Although Count Geoffrey's investiture of his nephew without the consent of the Count of Poitou as lord must have raised important questions of feudal law, there is no evidence for Guy-Geoffrey's attitude - except that the events of 1061-2 prove that he did not accept Fulk's claims.

32. Chron.St.Maixent (pp.402-3); Chrons.Comtes d'Anjou, (pp.236, and pp.59-62) The latter account confused the battles of Chef-Boutonne and Montcoué-(Halphen, Anjou, pp.57 n.2, 136). The Viscount of Thouars was probably among those captured by the Angevins (Chartes St. Maixent no.118); but there is no evidence for Richard's hypothesis that the Angevin army was smaller than the Poitevin, or that the following campaign was directed by Agnes (Comtes I, pp.283-5).

33. MLXII. Goffridus dux obsedit Sanctonas civitatem, castris in circuitis positis, et fame et gladio vastavit usquequo Andegavenses et cives qui in ea erant se cum omnibus suis in manibus tradiderunt. (Chron. St. Maixent, p.403).

Saintonge are reiterated until the mid-twelfth century;[34] but in fact the capture of Saintes brought about the collapse of Angevin power in the region. Guy-Geoffrey then resumed the rights and lands formerly held by Geoffrey Martel.[35]

THE ACQUISITION OF GASCONY.

At the end of the tenth century the ruler of Gascony was William-Sancius, who was in turn succeeded by his two sons Bernard and Sancius.[36] The death of the latter (probably in 1032)[37] without a son was the pretext for the first period of Poitevin activity in Gascony for, as the son of the Gascon princess Prisca and Duke William the Great, Odo could claim the domains of the Gascon ruler through his mother.[38] But although Gascony was eventually annexed to the duchy of Aquitaine, the Poitevins suffered many setbacks before this was achieved at about the same time that Guy-Geoffrey threw off the Angevin stranglehold

---

34. The Angevin Chronica de Gestis based a hereditary claim on a fictitious Mauricius consul (ed. Halphen, Chrons. Comtes d'Anjou, pp. 45,59; introd. pp.xvii-xix,xxviii-ix for criticism of the text).

35. Below, pp. 199,203.

36. Guillelmus Sanctionis filius Burdegalensium comes ac totius Guasconiae dux is mentioned together with his two sons in Aimoin's life of St. Abbo of Fleury. (PL, 139, col.406). Cf. also Ademar of Chabannes (Chron., pp.161,180).

37. Marca (Hist.de Béarn, p.248) printed an entry from a lost obituary of St.Sever, according to which Sancius died iv nonas oct....anno MXXXII. There is no means of checking this from any other source.

38. Part I, Chap. II, n.12.

in the Saintonge;[39] the problems connected with this achievement are the subject of this section.

The history of Gascony before Guy-Geoffrey established himself is extremely obscure: there are no local chronicles,[40] only one wholly trustworthy original document has survived,[41] while many of those surviving in cartularies are - at least - interpolated;[42] indeed more information can be gained about the native Gascon rulers from Aimoin the monk of Fleury, or

---

39. Below, p#. 110.

40. Lot described the position: "Nous n'avons pas une annale, pas une chronique contemporaines." (Hugues Capet, p.380). Even the source which Lot called the "chronique de Condom" (op.cit., p.387) consists of material taken from the cartulary of Condom (now ms.lat. 5652--ed. in part by L. d'Achery, Spicilegium, 1723 ed., pp.580 et.seq).

41. Archives Départementales de la Gironde, G 334, no.1 -- a grant by Sancius to the canons of the cathedral of Bordeaux, later confirmed by the Duke of Aquitaine (ed. AHG, vol.34, plate 1). The "charter of Arsius" (Archives., Basses-Pyrénées,G.1) is suspect; Lot considered it fabricated c.1030-40 (article in Mélanges Louis Halphen, pp.435-6). These are the only two documents which appear to have survived for the time before Poitevin rule was established in Gascony.

42. There is unfortunately no critical study of these Gascon cartularies; but it should be noted that lack of a critical approach makes the work of J. de Jaurgain (La Vasconie, 2 vols.) extremely difficult to use, and it has almost no value for the early period. (See the merciless criticism by L. Barrau-Dihigo, Revue Hispanique, 1900, p.152 et.seq). To take only one example, the earliest dated document inserted in the cartulary of Ste. Croix de Bordeaux (anno 1027) is in the name of Guillelmus gratia Dei comes Aquitanie simul et dux Vasconie and is clearly unacceptable since it precedes the period at which the count of Poitou as Duke of Aquitaine also ruled Gascony. (Cartul.Ste.Croix...no. 2). The text also is highly suspicious as Lot did not really rehabilitate it. (Hugues Capet, pp.379-80).

even the pages of Ademar of Chabannes' chronicle than from any local source.[43] Nevertheless, it is clear that by the early eleventh century the power of the Gascon ruler was concentrated at Bordeaux and, in the one surviving original document Sancius' title is Wasconice ac Burdegalensis comes ac dominus.[44] In this region the Count struck coin in his own name,[45] probably had extensive demesne lands,[46] and (perhaps the chief reason for Poitevin ambitions in the area) had complete control of the archbishopric of Bordeaux.[47]

It is difficult to establish what was implied by the Gascon title attributed to William-Sancius and his sons,[48]

---

43. Above n.36.

44. In the first document cited, n.41. The majority of references from documentary sources (as contrasted with a literary source such as is quoted n.36) attribute a comital title to the Gascon rulers (a list is unfortunately impossible here). The ducal title of the foundation charter of St. Pé (ed. Marca, Béarn, pp.247-8) is suspect because the document is itself untrustworthy. (Cf. the foundation charter of Saramon, ed Brugèles, (Chroniques... diocèse d'Auch, pp.44-5). On the other hand the reference to Sancius comes et dux tocius Vasconie (Cartul...St. Jean de Sorde, no.150) comes from a notice drawn up after the Duke of Aquitaine had acquired Gascony.

45. No detailed work has been done on the coinage of Gascony, but C. Jullian (Hist.de Bordeaux, pp.108-9) recorded coins struck in the names SANCHIUZ and BERNADU. Sancius granted the third part of the monete, of Bordeaux to the canons of the cathedral (document mentioned n.41)

46. Cf, below p.125, n.70.

47. Above, Part I, Chap.II, nn.94, 96-8.

48. Above n.44. There was of course no Carolingian "county of Gascony", in the same way that there was a Carolingian county of Poitou on which the power of Ebles and his descendants had been based.

whether it applied to the common language and race which continued to bind the Gascons after they had acquired the Frankish city of Bordeaux,[49] or whether it was considered to apply to some specific territory.[50] The Counts apparently controlled the Bazadais where they held the bishopric and protected the monastery of la Réole;[51] but to the east of this region the Agenais may well have fallen under the influence of the Count of Toulouse.[52] South of this region the Counts of Fézensac, Armagnac, Bigorre and the powerful

---

49. Even in the time of the Kings of Aquitaine the Carolingians had little control over the Gascons (Levillain, Recueil des actes..des rois d'Aquitaine, p. CLXVIII et seq; above, pp 28); by the mid-tenth century the latter were in complete control of Bordeaux (Lot, Hugues Capet, p.376 et seq.)

50. Dhondt (Principautés, p.226) supposed that there was a Gascon duchy "parallel" to the Poitevin one; but this hardly emerges from the evidence. J-F Bladé gave an elaborate description of tenth century Gascony attached by ties of "suzeraineté" to Navarre, but his proofs for Gascony are inadequate, and his use of Spanish sources was condemned by Barrau-Dihigo ("Les origines du duché de Gascogne"; cf. "Les premiers rois de Navarre, notes critiques", Revue Hispanique 1906, esp. pp.625,628 nn. 1-2).

51. The brother of William-Sancius was Bishop of Baxas (Cartul...la Réole no.99), and the Count was responsible for seeking a reformer for la Réole from St. Benoît-sur-Loire. (Aimoin, op.cit, in n.36 above).

52. If the Arnaldus Oddo vicecomes Gasconiae, who is described as miles tuus in a papal letter to the Count of Toulouse, can be identified with the Gascon Viscount of Lomagne, as Bladé supposed he could be (PL, vol.155 col.1155; cf. "Géographie politiquedu sud-ouest de la Gaule franque au temps des rois d'Aquitaine", pp.201-3). Lot's assertion that there could not have been Toulousain influence in the Agenais is not convincing (op.cit., p.384).

Viscount of Béarn were already established;[53] but the Gascon Count also disposed of lands or rights in most of these regions, and he undoubtedly had some kind of personal authority over these Counts,[54] although he had almost certainly lost control of the bishoprics in their domains.[55] But the form which this personal authority took can only be guessed at from the evidence of the late eleventh century, when all these Counts attended the court of Guy-Geoffrey and his son.[56] If, in the early eleventh century the

---

53. For tenth century Counts of Fézensac see the Cartul... d'Auch nos.54-5; for the Counts of Bigorre the Cartul. de St. Savin en Lavedan nos. 5-6, and possibly also the Auch cartulary, no. 25. The early documents mentioning the Viscounts of Béarn have recently been collected by P. Tucoo-Chala (La Vicomté de Béarn et le problème de sa souveraineté, Documents). The early history of the county of Armagnac is extremely obscure, but a Count was established by the time that Guy-Geoffrey "bought" Gascony from Bernard Tumapaler (below, nn 71-2).

54. Evidence for this largely rests on grants made by the Dukes of Aquitaine as rulers of Gascony (below, pp 123-9, 135, 151-3).

55. The Count of Fézensac had some control of the archbishopric of Auch, even if he did not make the appointment to the office, since he bestowed salvatio on the city, and promised protection to the Archbishop (Cartul...Auch, no.45 - late eleventh century). The evidence for other Gascon bishoprics is scanty (see Longnon, Atlas Historique de la France, pp. 149-53; cf. Lot, article cited in n.41 above, for Bayonne); while the case for a composite "bishopric of Gascony" does not seem to rest on entirely reliable documents (A. Degert, "L'Évêché de Gascogne", Rev. de Gascogne, 1900, brought together the evidence in favour of it). It certainly was no longer in existence at the period when the Poitevins acquired Gascony.

56. Below, pp. 126-7, 153 and cf. p.157.

authority of the Count of Gascony was based on ties of fealty, these are unrecorded;[57] and the problem has been obscured by the genealogical fancies of a later period, which falsely trace all these Gascon Counts back to a common Castillian ancestor.[58]

Odo, the son of Duke William the Great by his Gascon wife Brisca, is described as Vasconorum comes on his appearance in Aquitaine during the period that William le Gros was Duke,[59] but it is improbable that he ever extended his authority beyond the Bordelais, since the meagre local evidence for his rule - one coin and two documentary references - derive from this area alone.[60] His death at Mauzé fighting to gain his father's inheritance brought to an end the dynastic connexions between the Poitevin and

---

57. Except for one reference (in the account of the council of Limoges) to the dilemma of a man ordered by the dux Gasconiae to kill his lord (Labbe, II, p.796).

58. See the genealogy which forms the introduction to the cartulary of the cathedral of Auch (Cartul...d'Auch nos. 2-5) and which was extensively used to form the basis of early Gascon history by de Jaurgain. (La Vasconie, I, pp. 171-219 and genealogical tables).

59. S. Odonis Gasconorum comitis (Cartul St. Jean d'Angély, no. 42, Mar. 1037).

60. For the coin C. Jullian (Hist. de Bordeaux, p.120); Odo, nepos clarissimus of Sancius is mentioned as confirming a grant made by the latter to the canons of St. Seurin (Cartul..St. Seurin, no.9 - interpolated however); he apparently confirmed Sancius' grant to the canons of the cathedral, but the document is lost (it is mentioned in the confirmation of King John of England - Archives Départementales de la Gironde, G.334-5).

Gascon houses;[61] but it did not put an end to Poitevin attempts to establish themselves in the province. In 1044, according to the Chronicle of St. Maixent, a great gathering held at Poitiers was responsible for sending Guy-Geoffrey to conquer Gascony. This chronicle simply states that he succeeded armis et industria;[62] in the Bordelais - to which his activity was probably at first restricted - he may have had to combat the claims of an Aina comitissa Burdegalensis ac Petragoricensis patriae,[63] and of a Count Berengar of Navarrese origin;[64] but, since both are enigmatic figures, it is impossible to trace the exact course of events. However, the appointment of Archibald Abbot of St. Maixent

---

61. Above, n.11.

62. Chron.St.Maixent, (pp.394,400).

63. Known only from a grant of land inter Dordonia made to the canons of Ste. Croix de Bordeaux in 1043 (Cartul... Ste.Croix no.80). Guy-Geoffrey's first wife was apparently the daughter of the Count of Périgord (Chron. St. Maixent, p.395), but it is impossible to prove Richard's assertion that the condition of this marriage was the renunciation by the Counts of Périgord of pretensions to the Bordelais (Comtes, I p.269).

64. He appears in the cartulary of Sorde (Cartul.no.40), and in a pancarta of the archives of Bordeaux cathedral (Archives...de la Gironde, G 334, pièce 4). Neither can be dated, but the first reference gives him Navarrese connexions. The statement of Jullian (op.cit., p.121) and Richard (op.cit., p.233 n.1) that he was a member of the family of the Counts of Angoulême is based on an unproved hypothesis of Marca (Hist. Béarn, p.249).

to the archbishopric of Bordeaux soon after 1044 proves without any doubt that Guy-Geoffrey's authority was established in the city, for the appointment of a Poitevin cannot really be envisaged in other circumstances.[65] When Guy-Geoffrey in his turn became Duke of Aquitaine in 1058 he apparently left Bordeaux garrisoned with "noble knights"[66] while he attended to the affairs of Poitou.

Guy-Geoffrey's ambition was not satisfied with the possession of Bordeaux, but extended to the rest of Gascony; exactly how, or at what precise date, this ambition was achieved is obscure. All that can be definitely said is that he was acknowledged ruler of the province by 1063 when he led an army across the Pyrenees to go to the aid of the Spanish Christians.[67] A Cluny charter of 1049

---

65. The last dated reference to Archbishop Godfrey is 1043 (Cartul. Ste Croix, no.80); the exact date of Archibald's appointment is unknown although he is called archbishop in St. Maizent charters of c.1045 onwards. (Ch.St.Maixent, nos. 108, 110-12, 114,116,117) Richard (Comtes, p.270) supposed that this election furthered the Countess Agnes' pretensions to the Bordelais but, in view of the resistance previously shown towards a Poitevin candidate to the archbishopric (Part I, Chap.II nn. 97-8), it seems to me that this appointment is proof of Poitevin acquisition of Bordeaux.

66. Chron.St.Maixent (p.401) Milites nobiles...de exercitu Goffridi ducis were found in the city when attacked by the Count of Toulouse, although the Duke was absent - surely proof that he had left a garrison.

67. Below, pp.112-14. If the Duke still had serious political difficulties within his domains he would surely not have made the journey to Spain.

suggests the presence of Poitevins in the county of Agen, but there is otherwise no proof for their influence in the region at this date.[68] Perhaps this reference helps to account for the attack made by Count William of Toulouse on Bordeaux soon after 1058, although it is also possible that the Count of Toulouse himself had hopes of acquiring Gascony.[69] In any case he was excluded from the province by the successful expedition which Guy-Geoffrey led in retaliation against Toulouse.[70] Count Bernard Tumapaler of Armagnac, on the other hand, apparently claimed to be the legitimate heir to the native Gascon counts.[71] Here Guy-Geoffrey seems to have overcome his claims by the

---

68. Ch.de Cluny no.2978. This has the subscription S. G. Pictavorum comitis to a charter which includes the grant of portum de Agenno, but also of a church in episcopatu Basatensi (i.e. Bazas). Alone it can scarcely be taken to prove Poitevin control of the Agenais.

69. Ref. given n.66 (the date cannot be exactly established). The Count of Toulouse was occasionally attributed the title of Count of certain Gascon counties. HGL, V, cols. 648-9, 649-52).

70. Chron.St.Maixent (loc.cit.) The Toulousain attack had been made per traditionem.

71. An entry from the lost cartulary of Lescar referred to him as B. Tumapaler, comes Gasconiae (Marca, op.cit., p.280); while a descendant referred to him as avus meus Bernardus tocius Gasconie comes, cognomento Tumapalerius (Cartul...St.Mont, no. 83). There is no evidence to show whether he was ever acknowledged in the Bordelais.

payment of 15,000 solidi for the potestatem totius Gasconie;[72] but unfortunately the document recording this information cannot be dated with any certainty.[73] Since the seventeenth century it has always also been assumed that the Poitevin acquisition of Gascony culminated in a battle fought on,

---

72. Ms.lat. 11826, pièce no.11 (from the fonds de Cluny, but not edited in the collection of Bernard and Bruel) ... duce Willelmo Pictavensis Aquitaniam et totam Gasconiam regnante et gubernante post commutationem venditionis nostre - videlicet Gasconie - ille mihi dando quindecius millia solidorum, a me denique recipiendo, potestatem totius Gasconie. A similar document is contained in the cartulary of St. Mont (no.9 - with slight differences in the text).

73. It is a composite foundation charter of the type analysed by Professor Galbraith (Cambridge Historical Journal, 1934, esp. pp. 214-22), in which Bishops of the late eleventh century, and Amatus Gregory VII's legate, are mentioned although the "charter" itself bears the date 1062 (regnante Francorum rege Philippo, anno II), and the reference temporibus dompni Pape Leonis nono (died 1054). The text does not seem suspect (detailed examination is not possible here); but it becomes quite impossible to attribute the "sale" of Gascony to a particular year (contrast Richard, Comtes, p.290 and n.1).

or near, the River Adour in the southern part of the province;[74] but the sources for this battle are so confused that it is scarcely possible to credit any part of the tradition connected with it, let alone to fit it into a neat chronological scheme.[75]

---

74. Marca (op.cit., p.280) printed the précis of a lost document from St. Sever stating that Gaufredus dux et comes Pictaviensis, totius Equitaniae et Gasconiae made a confirmation of grants in the year that triumphabat super inimicis insigni victoria, and then proceeded to identify the enemy as Count Bernard of Armagnac (p.279). This has generally been attributed to the year 1063 (Richard, loc.cit. following Marca; cf. Tucoo-Chala, La vicomté de Béarn, p.33, nn.12-13), although the précis printed by Marca has the date 1073. Admittedly the synchronisms (indiction, epact, lunar cycle) do not concur with the year 1073; but they do not prove as "un fait certain" that there was a battle in 1063 (Richard). In any case Richard elsewhere used the same document as though it proved a date of 1070 (op.cit., p.309), and were derived from the chapter of St. Seurin and Bordeaux instead of from the abbey of St. Sever.

75. If the general information of Marca's reference is accepted it seems that the battle could be placed in the period after Guy-Geoffrey was acknowledged as ruler of Gascony. Count Bernard cannot surely have been his adversary, since he had retired to his foundation of St. Mont as a monk (Cartul...St. Mont, nos. 11, 34, 59).

CHAPTER II.

THE RULE OF GUY-GEOFFREY (1058-86).

Guy-Geoffrey,[1] the last son of William the Great to succeed to the duchy of Aquitaine, was the only other Duke whose reputation ever equalled his father's. In spite of the problems which faced him on William Aigret's death - they included the Angevin domination of the Saintonge, revolts by his own vassals, and the unfinished subjugation of Gascony - by 1063-4 he was able to leave the duchy and lead an expedition across the Pyrenees against the Spanish Muslims.[2] There is no biographical description of this Duke but his character seems to have had many of the traits found in other successful rulers of the period, for he combined ruthlessness towards his vassals with piety and support for the monastic life, which naturally earned him monastic praise.[3] But his reputation was far more than a local one: Gregory VII depended upon his support, which was also commented on after his death by Urban II;[4] and his dynastic

---

1. Docs.St.Hilaire no.81: S/.Widonis, quem Gausfridum cognominabamus, abbatis nostri....Actum anno...MLVIII... Aquitanie duce Widone. Because of his inheritance of the duchy he was also given the name William (cf. Docs. St.Hilaire no. 94, 1080) There are many similar examples.

2. Bp. 112, n. 17.

3. Martin of Montierneuf who described the Duke's foundation of his own house inserted a eulogy of him (Martène and Durand, Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, III, cols. 1211-15). Although similar in sentiment to Ademar's praise of William the Great, the passage appears to be independent of it.

4. Cartul. Saintongeais....Vendôme no. 37.

connexions (stressed by contemporaries)[5] exalted him above most European rulers. His sister was married to the Emperor Henry III,[6] by his own third marriage to the daughter of the Duke of Burgundy the Dukes of Aquitaine were once again related to the French royal house and, incidentally, to St. Hugh of Cluny;[7] two of his daughters married Spanish kings.[8] But no chronicler paid any attention to what may have been his most important achievement, the development of the government and administration of his domains, and the methods which he used to gain the adherence of numerous vassals at a period when the bonds of personal fealty were weakening. These can only be discerned from ducal grants or scattered documentary references; although the number of ducal

---

5. Martin (loc.cit). Chron.St.Maixent (pp.403,405); cf. William of Poitiers (ed. Foreville, p.64).

6. Part I, Chap. II, n.102; cf. also below, Chap. IV, nn. 11, 14-16.

7. Chron.St.Maixent (loc.cit.) He was previously married to a daughter of the Count of Périgord (op.cit, p.400) and a lady of unknown parentage called Mathilda whom he did not repudiate until after May 1068 (loc.cit. Docs. St.Hilaire no. 84; Richard, Comtes p.300, n.1). There is no support for Boissonade's theory that she belonged to the family of the Viscounts of Thouars (Revue des Questions Historiques, 1932, p. 281 n.4). For the relationship between St. Hugh and the Duke of Burgundy see the Vita S.Hugonis (ed. Marrier, Biblioteca Cluniacensis, col. 430).

8. Below, n.19.

documents surviving from the years 1058-86 in themselves give some idea of the extent of his power.[9]

The expulsion of the Angevins from the Saintonge in 1063 after the capture of Saintes was of the first importance for the establishment of Guy-Geoffrey's authority in the duchy,[10] and he was fortunate in having little trouble with the Count of Anjou after this period. Perhaps this was because Fulk Réchin was fully occupied in the struggle with his brother Geoffrey;[11] the Duke's attack on Saumur in 1068 was probably connected with this struggle, since the attack occurred immediately after the town was taken from Geoffrey's supporters,[12] and Geoffrey was almost certainly a ducal vassal

---

9. During the twenty years of William Aigret's rule (c.1038-58) I have noted only thirty-eight documents in the Duke's name, bearing a reference to his consent, or containing his subscription. For the twenty-eight years of Guy-Geoffrey's rule (1058-86) there are 114 such references, and a notable increase in the number of judicial decisions which were recorded. (Examples and lists cannot be given here). Cf. below, pp.174-6, 220-23.

10. Above, Chap. I, n.33.

11. Halphen (Anjou, pp. 148-51).

12. The date 1068 occurs in ms.lat. 4892, although the Marchegay edition of the chronicle gave the year 1067 (Chron.St.Maixent, p. 403; Halphen, op.cit., p.150 n.5).

for Loudun and Mirebeau.[13] It is more difficult to find an explanation for the alliance of the Duke and the lord of Preuilly against Count Fulk, but since the only reference to this is undated it may perhaps also be connected with the period before Fulk succeeded in imprisoning his brother.[14]

The Duke's emancipation from Angevin domination may have had even more far-reaching consequences for, whereas both William Aigret and Guy-Geoffrey himself were involved in the political manoeuvres of the Count of Anjou, the Duke of Normandy and the French king before 1058,[15] at a later date Guy-Geoffrey seems to have withdrawn almost completely from political affairs north of the Loire. Indeed, when in 1076 King Philip needed support for his campaign against

---

13. When Fulk Réchin wrote of his investiture with the Saintonge (Chap I, n.31) he did not mention these Poitevin benefices of the Count of Anjou; it therefore seems possible that they were held by his brother Geoffrey Barbu until Fulk defeated him at the Battle of Brissac and took over the whole of Anjou. If this was the case Guy-Geoffrey would have been obliged to go to the aid of his vassal (for a similar case involving Duke and Count in the twelfth century, below, p. 143).

14. Gesta Ambazensium dominorum (ed. Halphen, Chrons.comtes d'Anjou pp. 97-8). Richard (op.cit. p.396) dated it to the period of Guy-Geoffrey's son but, as Halphen pointed out, the lord of Preuilly became Count of Vendôme in 1085 (op.cit. p.176). There is however no evidence either for Halphen's date of 1080.

15. Chap. I, nn.19-20. Dhondt imagined a vast system of alliances stretching from Aquitaine to the Empire ("Henri Ier, l'Anjou et l'Empire", RBPH, 1946-7) but his evidence for Aquitaine is by no means always sound (e.g. pp.102-7 for Agnes' alleged desires to be revenged on Geoffrey Martel for her divorce from him).

the castle of Dol he was obliged to travel to Poitiers with only a few companions (and without his seal or chancery clerks) to ask Guy-Geoffrey for aid.[16] This withdrawal from politics in the north is all the more striking when it is contrasted with Guy-Geoffrey's increasing involvement in the south - the result no doubt of his acquisition of Gascony - and his participation in the affairs of the Spanish kingdoms.

This participation in Spanish affairs began when the Duke commanded the army which captured the Muslim stronghold of Barbastro; and there is no doubt that he gained considerable prestige from this victory, as well as much booty.[17] It may also account for his later reputation with Gregory VII as a supporter of the war against the infidel.[18] However,

---

16. Recueil des actes...Philippe Ier, nos. 83-4. Cf. Chron. St. Maixent (p.406): MLXXVI... Rex Philippus fuit hoc anno Pictavis forte. Cf. Recueil des annales angevines (p.88); Halphen (loc.cit. p.182) and Fliche (Le règne... de Philippe Ier, pp. 270-2) for the history of the dispute over Dol.

17. The Chron.St.Maixent (p.403) and an anonymous French chronicle mentions the Duke's leadership (RHF, XI, p.162). The whole subject was worked over (though not always in a scholarly manner) by P. Boissonade. See Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland, (pp.23-38) and articles in the Revue des Questions Historiques (1932, p.278) and BSAO (1934, pp.271-3). M. Defourneaux has returned to it (Les Francais en Espagne aux XIe et XIIe siècles), but the date of the Barbastro expedition is still not settled (see p.132 of the last work).

18. Register of Gregory VII (lib. II, ep.3, ed. Caspar vol.I, p.128).

Guy-Geoffrey's interest in Spanish affairs did not stop with the "crusade" against Barbastro, for he married two of his daughters to Christian kings of the country - one to Peter of Aragon, another to Alfonso of Castille.[19] His religious interests in part account for these alliances; and it is possible that the replacement of the mozarabic by the Roman liturgy in Castille was a consequence of his daughter's marriage to Alfonso;[20] but they do not entirely account for them, since the acquisition of Gascony gave the Duke of Aquitaine a political interest in Spain as well. It is true that the activity of the Duke of Aquitaine in Spanish affairs only became essential during the early twelfth century when many Gascons held Spanish benefices and served continuously in the armies of one of the Christian kings;[21] but even in Guy-Geoffrey's lifetime Centulle, Count of Bigorre and Viscount of Béarn held extensive lands in Aragon.[22]

---

19. Chron.St.Maixent (pp.400,405). They were daughters of his second and third wives, and both seem to have had the christian name Agnes. Agnes of Castille was replaced by Constance of Burgundy between 1077-78 (Chartes de Cluny no. 3508; cf. P. David, Etudes historiques sur la Galice et le Portugal, p.388).

20. The two events are linked in the St. Maixent chronicle (loc.cit). The direct responsibility for this should probably be attributed to clergy who accompanied Agnes, however (P. David, op.cit. pp. 387-8, 400-02).

21. Below, pp. 154-7.

22. Source cited n.76, below.

At any rate from Guy-Geoffrey's time onwards the Dukes of Aquitaine became increasingly drawn into the political affairs of Spain and the southern French powers.

THE NORTHERN COUNTIES of the DUCHY.

During the latter part of the eleventh century the basis of comital government in Poitou and the Saintonge was changing. For the administration of his domains Guy-Geoffrey depended upon various household officials and local officers called prepositi,[23] instead of upon the vicarii, whose offices were in many cases by now hereditary.[24] At this period too the Count's financial and territorial resources are more clearly revealed through numerous documents describing consuetudines which he enjoyed, or remitted on behalf of various religious houses.[25] It is to be regretted therefore that the political history of these provinces is difficult to establish and recorded only in the St. Maixent chronicle,[26] which is of very uneven quality, and in other fragmentary references.

---

23. Below, pp. 228-32.

24. Below, p.230, n. 167.

25. Below, pp. 199, 203-6.

26. There is nothing to justify Boissonade's assertion that it was the "chronique semi-officielle" of the Dukes (Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland, p.50 - cf. p.67.) Although it contains much genealogical information and many references to the Dukes' activity, this is for a limited area (nothing on Gascony, the Limousin or Auvergne appears in its pages).

For instance there is little detailed information about this Duke's relations with his vassals, although Martin of Montierneuf stated in a general way that he succeeded in subduing the headstrong nobles of the region.[27] The surviving evidence confirms this general statement, although separate incidents can scarcely ever be linked or interpreted. Apart from the successful campaigns against Lusignan, Luçon, and Saintes which are noted in the St. Maixent chronicle,[28] we know that Guy-Geoffrey captured and razed to the ground the great coastal castle of Châtelaillon, and probably granted out land from Isembert's benefice.[29] In 1067 the castle of Talmond was administered through custodes by the Duke[30] and at some period its lord was exhereditatus; there is however

---

27. ...cervicositatem Aquitanorum procerum sibi subdiderat (op.cit. col. 1214).

28. Chap. I, n.33 for the siege of Saintes; pp.401 and 404 of the Chron. St. Maixent for the other two. Guy-Geoffrey killed Hugh of Lusignan in 1060 habens guerram. For a rather far-fetched theory concerning a conspiracy between Hugh and the Count of Toulouse see Richard (Comtes, pp. 278-80; cf. Painter, Speculum 1957, p.33).

29. This is known only from a retrospective reference in a document dated 1114 (Chartes St. Maixent no. 259), when Peter Airaud abandoned part of the marsh of Mouillepié which had been given to him a Widone consule Pictavorum after the latter burnt Isembert's castrum et terram. Perhaps this occurred during the brief period that Count Fulk of Anjou was married to Aurengardis of Châtelaillon - i.e. 1075-80 (Halphen, op.cit. p.169 n.4), but there is no proof.

30. Cartul.Ste.Croix de Talmont no.51. Appendix II, p.256.

no indication of the offence which he had comitted.

Guy-Geoffrey seems to have had the power to enforce his will upon his vassals in cases where his authority was contested or his rights infringed - it is significant that even the laconic St. Maixent chronicler supposed that he had a warlike temperament;[31] but it is almost impossible to discover what his rights were in any individual honour in times of peace. The witness-lists of his charters indicate the numbers of his vassals,[32] and the occasions when they attended him,[33] and both are impressive; but on the other hand it also seems clear that the Count could no longer expect such regular services from his greater vassals as he

---

31. P.401: traditionem ipsam non potuit diu sustinere... This refers to the Count of Toulouse's killing of Guy-Geoffrey's milites nobiles in Bordeaux: Guy-Geoffrey immediately led a retaliatory expedition to Toulouse.

32. Below, nn. 74-5 for his Gascon subjects; cf. also nn. 38, 46-8, 51. For the Count of Angoulême see Chartes St. Maixent no. 116 (1059), Besly (p.338 - with erroneous date of 1040 - in fact 1060), Chartes Saintongeaises St. Florent no. 5 (1067), Besly (p. 379 - undated). The Viscounts of Thouars, Châtellerault and Aunay are all frequently found in the ducal circle, as are the Poitevin lords (Lusignan, Parthenay etc), those of the Saintonge and Aunis. Bishops and Abbots are also frequently found.

33. Below pp. 216-20 for the ceremonial gatherings. Sometimes the Duke's government was less formal, as when he made a grant in via que est inter Malliacense monasterium et Fontanetum castrum Savarici vicecomitis (Chartes Saintongeaises St. Florent no. 7, 1083).

had once done.[34]

At this period the Saintonge took on a new importance because of the increasing exploitation of the saltmarshes on the coast and the creation of "new lands",[35] but above all because it provided the Duke with a route between Poitiers and Bordeaux - from henceforth the two capitals of his domains. However, complete ducal control of the region was prevented by disputes between the Poitevins and Angoumois to the east of the county[36] and communication between Poitiers and Bordeaux was threatened by the Angoumois tenure of the castle of Blaye, which guarded the crossing of the Gironde to Bordeaux.

After Blaye had been given by Duke William the Great to Count William of Angoulême it remained in his successors' hands until Count Geoffrey (d. 1047) gave it to Geoffrey Rudel, one of his younger sons; it was then held by this

---

34. The Viscount of Thouars, for instance, although one of the greatest magnates of Poitou took part in the Norman conquest of England (William of Poitiers, ed. Foreville p.219). Cf. D.C. Douglas ("Companions of the Conqueror", History 1943, pp.135 nn. 4-6, 143 n.6): Viscount Aimeri was not, however, a vassal of the Count of Anjou.

35. A. Drouin ("Les marais salants d'Aunis et de Saintonge", Revue de Saintonge et d'Aunis, 1936-41, passim). Many religious establishments were granted uncultivated land in the Saintonge at this period, see especially the documents of the Dukes for the priory of Ste. Gemme which they founded (Besly, pp.379, 411-abbreviated, 463-4).

36. Below, n.41.

branch of the family for at least two generations.[37] The subinfeudation of such a strategically important castle must have created many problems for the Duke as its overlord, and his rights in such a case cannot be deduced from the surviving evidence; but it is surely significant that Guy-Geoffrey attached the contemporary lord of Blaye to him by other means. This man, William Fredelannus or Fredelensis, held land and tithes from Guy-Geoffrey in the Saintonge and was often in attendance at his court;[38] after Guy-Geoffrey's death he was one of the magnates responsible for the young Duke William's minority.[39]

---

37. HPEE p. 26. William Fredelannus was Geoffrey's son, and is described as the nephew of Count Fulk of Angoulême in the copy of the cartulary of St. Amant de Boixe (ms.lat. 18298, fos 40r-v, 122r and 36r-v); he was the father of Girardus Blaviensis princeps (Chartes Cluny, no.3311).

38. He held the tithe of Niol from Guy-Geoffrey (Cartul... N Dame Saintes nos. 53, 122; cf. no. 98 - probably Nieulle, Charente-Maritime), part of the curtis Campania (ibid. no. 104), and claimed rights over assarted land at Nancras, which the Duke gave to the nuns (ibid. no.78). Cf. Appendix II, nos.263-5, 267-8; Besly, p. 379; Chartes saintongeaises de St.Florent, no. 28.

39. Below, Chap. III, n.20. The identity and connexions of William Fredelannus do not seem to have been recognised; Boissonade referred to two different individuals, the lord of Blaye and "Guillaume Fredeland", (below, loc.cit).

The Historia pontificum et comitum Engolismensium shows that the relationship between the Duke and Count of Angoulême had changed considerably since the days of William the Great, and that the Count generally displayed hostility towards the Duke.[40] This is scarcely surprising in view of the geographical situation of Angoulême and the extent to which the Poitevin acquisition of the Saintonge and Bordelais reduced the possibilities of Angoumois expansion; apart from the aid which he gave to the lord of Cognac,[41] Guy-Geoffrey seems to have retaliated by using the members of the comital family to embarrass Count Fulk (1047-87). For instance he seems to have helped Bishop William of Angoulême in his struggles within the county[42] - the latter was assiduous in his attendance at the ducal court,[43] like the lord of Blaye, Fulk's

---

40. HPE pp. 25-6; below, pp. 149-50.

41. Count Fulk is described as driving Pictavenses back to Cognac (loc.cit). The lord of this castle apparently held part of the offerings of the main altar of St. Jean d'Angély from the Duke (Cartul.St.Jean no.19), and was later the upholder of the Poitevin position against the Angoumois (below, p.149, n76.

42. He was described as familiarissimus of the Duke, and as frequently involved in militari proelio ...cum Fulcone fratre suo (loc.cit.)

43. He accompanied Guy-Geoffrey to Souvigny in 1064 (see reference to St. Laumer grant, below n.56); cf. Chartes Saintongeaises..St.Florent no.5; Besly, p.338 (the date corrected from ms.n.a.lat.1930, fo.49v should be 1060 not 1040); Cartul.Vaux no.53; Cartul.St.Jean nos. 263, 19 (mentions tenure of tithes from Guy-Geoffrey).

nephew. This policy was probably less successful with the pacific Bishop Ademar,[44] but its success as a whole can be judged from the increase in the disputes between Duke and Count under Guy-Geoffrey's son.[45]

A reversal of earlier patterns also occurred in Guy-Geoffrey's relationship with the Count of la Marche, who seems to have played the role of Guy-Geoffrey's personal counsellor which in the time of William the Great was filled by the Count of Angoulême. Count Aldebert attended the Duke on visits outside Aquitaine and on other important occasions,[46] he was present at Poitiers when the King made his hurried visit there in 1076,[47] and there is a record of his being

---

44. ...homo mirae simplicitatis (HPEE p.27). He is however found in association with the Duke (Besly, pp.380-1; Mabillon, De Re Diplomatica, pp. 586-7 of the 2nd ed.) Guy-Geoffrey seems also to have had some influence over the lord of Montauzieh whom he prevailed upon to renounce tithes to the monks of Vendôme, (Cartul.saintongeais ... no.29). For the relationship of this man to Count Fulk, see HPEE (loc.cit.).

45. Below, pp.148-50.

46. Eg. to Souvigny (see n.43). He was with the Duke and Archbishop when the lord of Taillebourg abandoned a church to the nuns of Saintes, and when Hugh of Lusignan made a grant for the foundation of a priory for Chaise-Dieu (Cartul...Saintes no.12; Appendix II, no. 2). Cf. also Cartul.St.Nicolas no.5; Cartul.Vaux no.53; AHP, 44 p.11 and no.4.

47. He subscribed the two acts mentioning the King's presence (above, n.16). I see no reason to suppose with Fliche (Le Règne de Philippe Ier, p.273) that he was in Poitiers as a member of "l'armée de Philippe"...

delegated to hear a suit in the comital curia at Poitiers.[48] Charroux - the place to which William the Great had summoned councils - was now acknowledged as the capital of la Marche,[49] but there is otherwise little evidence for the internal affairs of the county or for the Duke's position vis à vis Aldebert's vassals.[50]

For the Limousin there is a certain amount of information about Guy-Geoffrey's activity which was forceful, even though infrequent. In 1073, for instance, he forced Viscount Ademar of Limoges to make reparation for damage done to episcopal lands after the death of Bishop Icterius;[51] in the 1080's he undertook at least one expedition to the region, which is however only known from brief local references giving no idea of the Duke's object.[52] Such intervention does not seem to

---

48. Chartes Nouaillé, no.152 (a.1081). Cf. below pp.134-5 for the position of his successor during the minority.

49. A grant to the canons of Limoges was made apud Carrofum in domo Hildeberti comitis (Cartul.S.Stephani Lemovicensis no.101); cf. Thomas (Les Comtes de la Marche, p.36) and Chron.St.Maixent (p.396).

50. Thomas (op.cit., pp.34-9).

51. Cartul.St.Stephani no.80. The reparation was made sciente atque annuente domino meo Guillelmo duce Aquitanorum, who was present. Icterius was succeeded by Guy.

52. Besly (p.386) and Labbe (p.289, Geoffrey of Vigeois' chronicle). The two references are similar but not identical: they bear the dates 1082 and 1080 respectively and, although they probably refer to two separate occasions, this is by no means certain.

have been sufficient to reduce the Limousin to order; there is no evidence for ducal intervention in the long feud between the vicecomital family and the castellans of Pierrebuffière and de las Tours;[53] nor did he become involved in the disturbances resulting from the Viscount's grant of St. Martial to St. Hugh of Cluny.[54]

Guy-Geoffrey's first wife belonged to the family of the Counts of Périgord, but after his separation from her there is no evidence to show how - if at all - he maintained his relationship with them.[55] A similar problem exists with regard to the county of Auvergne: there is a single reference to Guy-Geoffrey's grant of three villae in the county to the priory of St. Laumer de Moissat[56] but no trace of intervention in its affairs - and certainly nothing to foreshadow the claims of suzerainty which (according to Suger) were made by the Duke of Aquitaine in the 1120's.[57] It is

---

53. Geoffrey of Vigeois (op.cit. pp.299,304). There appears to be a reference to this in the cartulary of Solignac (ms.lat.18363, fo.19r): proceres terre Lemovicensium, scilicet Gaucelinus Petrebuferiensis et Guido Turrensis, adversus Ademarum Vicecomitem dominum suum acre dimicantes et obpugnantes eum et terram eius cum magno impetu depopulantes....Above Part I, Chap. I, n.126, for Poitevin intervention in a tenth century feud.
54. Below, Chap. IV, n.4.
55. Above n.7. The Count of Périgord is never recorded among the witness-lists of ducal charters at this period.
56. AA.SS.ordinis S.Benedicti (saec.IV, pars 2, p.270 of the 1738 ed), enacted at Souvigny in 1064. The Duke's grant was not very effective, since the villae were seized by viri potentes and were only restored by the good offices of the Count of Auvergne, not the Duke himself.
57. Below, pp.161-2.

true that few of the surviving sources refer to feudal relationships within the duchy at this time, but if Guy-Geoffrey had played an important part in the internal affairs of either of these counties some trace of his intervention would surely have survived in local sources.[58]

GASCONY.

In the foundation charter of Montierneuf preserved in the Cluny archives Guy-Geoffrey was given the style dux Aquitanorum seu Guasconum,[59] but no general change is found in this title to mark the addition of Gascony to the older ducal domains.[60] In Gascony itself the position was different; he was described as dux et comes Aquitanorum et Guasconum,[61] dux Aquitanie et princeps Vasconie,[62] and as dux et comes Vasconie,[63] although also simply as Duke of Aquitaine or Count of Poitou;[64] his "domination" of the

---

58. As it does in the case of the Limousin (nn.51-2).

59. Now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection de Bourgogne vol. 78, pièce 132; ed. in the last instance Chartes Cluny no.3495 (a.1076).

60. In all other documents he is described either as Count of Poitou, or Duke of Aquitaine; the titles are often combined.

61. Cartul...St.Mont. no.1.

62. Cartul. la Réole no.139.

63. Cartul.Ste Croix de Bordeaux no.22.

64. As Guido comes and Guido dux Aquitanorum (Cartul.Sorde no.40); cf. also the titles attributed to him in the charters of la Sauve-Majeure (Appendix II, nos. 10-12).

province is mentioned too in dating clauses.[65] The documents from which these examples are taken of course had widely differing origins;[66] but their lack of consistency, together with the absence of references to Gascony in documents from the older parts of the ducal domains, illustrate many of the historian's difficulties over the place of Gascony in the duchy. It has been suggested on the one hand that Guy-Geoffrey restored "la grande Aquitaine"[67] - presumably no separate title acknowledging his Gascon title was therefore needed; on the other hand it has been suggested that his acquisition brought him a mere "titre nu".[68] Neither view seems to be justified by the supporting evidence.

For instance, after the period when the Count of Toulouse attacked Bordeaux Guy-Geoffrey completely controlled the city

---

65. ...dominante duce Willelmo Equitaniam et totam Gasconiam, imperabat...Gasconibus comes Pictavus (Cartul.St.Mont nos. 86, 59; cf. nos. 7,31,34,43,64,73); ...Gauffredo Guasconiorum duce et Aymerico comite Fezenciaco (ms.lat. 5652, fo. 39 - cartulary of Condom); cf. Cartul.St.Seurin nos. 12-13, 15-16, 18.

66. They were not - even before insertion into a cartulary - the products of a single scriptorium (below, p224, nn. 139-40).

67. R. Boutruche (Une société provinciale...p.59).

68. Richard (Comtes, I p. 293). His view was based on the fact that there are scarcely any references to the Duke's domination in Gascon dating clauses, (he did not refer to the examples cited in n.65); but this is hardly an adequate criterion for government of a province. It is followed by P. Tucoo-Chala (La vicomté de Béarn et le problème de sa souveraineté, p.34); cf. Boutruche (loc. cit).

which was a source of revenue as well as being politically important to him.[69] He took over the ius comitale of Bordeaux and the surrounding countryside: this implied extensive judicial rights, control of the mint, and entailed the possession of land and churches.[70] The demesne land which fell to him as successor of the native Gascon rulers was also more extensive than has sometimes been supposed;[71] his personal authority was considerable, as can be seen from complaints alleged against him and his auricularii by the Abbot of St. Jean de Sorde.[72] Admittedly he did not have the same power over the Church in this province;[73] but nevertheless he made good his rights to far more than "un titre nu".

---

69. Below, pp. 190-5.

70. Below, (loc.cit). He gave land and churches in Bordeaux to Maillezais (Hist.de Maillezais, p.218) and made extensive grants to la Sauve-Majeure (Appendix II, nos. 10-12, 4, no. 13.).

71. See works mentioned, n.68.

72. Cartul.Sorde no.40 - The Abbot iniit fedus et conventiones et pactum, but the Duke permotus et accensus avaricia took the Abbot's money and would not lift the ban he had placed on some of the abbey's possessions.

73. He controlled the appointment to the archbishopric of Bordeaux, and probably to Agen (below, p 174); but with the exception of Bayonne most of the bishoprics of the metropolitan see of Auch lay outside his influence (p.153, n.95).

It is quite clear too that his authority was generally acknowledged after the acquisition of Gascony: the Counts of Fézensac, Armagnac, Bigorre, the Viscount of Béarn and the other Gascon viscounts are either found in his presence at Bordeaux or in his train,[74] or there is a reference to the Duke's presence in their domains.[75] The only direct reference to a feudal relationship between the new ruler of Gascony and these magnates occurs in an agreement between Centulle Count of Bigorre and Viscount of Béarn and King Alfonso of Aragon in which Centulle especially reserved the fealty he owed to Guy-Geoffrey and his son;[76] but there

---

74. For the Count of Fézensac see Cartul.Sorde no.40; for Centulle Count of Bigorre and Viscount of Béarn De Re Diplomatica II (pp. 586-7) and Bordeaux, Bibliothèque municipale ms.770 (pp. 1-3) - both concern la Sauve-Majeure; for other viscounts (Dax, Tartas, and Châtillon-sur-Gironde) Hist. Maillezais (p.218), Gallia I, (col. 189), Cartul.la Réole no.137, Cartul.St.Seurin no.28, Appendix II no.

75. Cartul.St.Mont nos. 1, 35 imply that Guy-Geoffrey visited Armagnac.

76. Bibliothèque municipale de Bordeaux, ms. 745 (fos.16r-v). The best, though by no means faultless, edition is that of Marca (Hist.de Béarn, pp. 812-13); cf. Oihenart (Notitia utriusque Vasconiae, pp. 427-8, 2nd ed.) and Besly (pp.369-70, from Oihenart). This agreement is not included in Tucoo-Chala's catalogue, and he apparently only knows it as a "lost act" (La vicomté de Béarn, p.35 n.17). Centulle was Count of Bigorre by his marriage to its heiress, c 1080. (Cartul.St.Victor de Marseille, nos. 483-4; cf. Marca, op.cit pp.300, 316).

can be little doubt that the other Gascon nobles who appeared at Guy-Geoffrey's court were also his fideles.

There is no evidence that Guy-Geoffrey intended to integrate Gascony into "la grande Aquitaine" however, although this might have masked the rather dubious means by which he acquired it. For although when he came to Bordeaux he was accompanied by subjects from his northern domains[77] and - at least during the early years of his rule - the city was garrisoned from the same region, there is no evidence for the appearance of Gascon nobles outside their own lands.[78] There must have been many contacts between the inhabitants of Gascony and the duchy of course, for the Spanish "crusades" and the Compostella pilgrimage brought many people south of the Garonne;[79] but the language was a barrier[80]

---

77. Hugh of Lusignan was present at the grant to Maillezais (n.70), Viscount Aimeri (of Thouars) and the Bishop of Saintes are mentioned in charters of la Sauve (De Re Diplomatica II, pp. 586-7; & Appendix II no.276), the brother of the Count of la Marche and the Abbot of St. Cyprien (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély no.100 - council at Bordeaux), Robert de Burgundia ~~in the Count's camera~~ (appendix II, p.280).

78. Although a reference from the Vita of St. Gerald of la Sauve suggests that the prepositus of Bordeaux was in Poitiers when the Saint came to Guy-Geoffrey in that city (AA.SS., 5th April, pp. 417-18).

79. The Guide du pélérin de St.Jacques, probably written c. 1139 (ed. J. Vieillard, p. xii) assumed that the pilgrim would pass through Saintes, cross to Bordeaux from Blaye and then proceed through the Landes (pp.64, 79,80).

80. ...lingua rustica, lingua barbara (op.cit. pp.18,20). The author was probably a Poitevin (references, op.cit. p. xiii).

and it cannot be said that there are any signs of the absorption of Gascony or its assimilation into the other provinces of the Duke's domains. At this period only the accident of Guy-Geoffrey's inheritance of the duchy and his acquisition of Gascony joined them under the same ruler.

CHAPTER III.

THE TWO LAST INDEPENDENT DUKES (1086-1137).

During the last years in which Aquitaine was ruled by its native Dukes there were no radical political changes such as had occurred when Guy-Geoffrey added Gascony to his domains, or when Geoffrey Martel captured William the Fat and eventually established Angevin domination in Poitou and the Saintonge. Guy-Geoffrey's son and grandson showed far greater interest in the politics of southern France and northern Spain than had previously been common; for, either from choice or necessity, with the addition of Gascony to the duchy the Duke became a meridional power.[1] The most notable change during this period took place in the Dukes' relations with the church; whereas Guy-Geoffrey, like his predecessors, counted upon the support of both secular and monastic clergy in his duchy and had an advantageous - if undefined position as their protector, his successors fell foul of the church and were both excommunicated on different occasions. The most striking consequences of this can be seen in the events of the Anacletian schism, when only a small number of clergy continued to support the Duke.[2]

---

1. Below, pp.154-7; & 136-9. The importance of the duchy of Aquitaine is not mentioned in Higounet's article, "La rivalité des maisons de Toulouse et de Barcelone pour la prépondérance meridionale". (Mélanges...Halphen, see pp. 313-18).

2. Below, pp. 187-9.

Guy-Geoffrey's son, William the Troubadour (1086-1136), must have been among the most remarkable of European rulers and his surviving poems[3] show why he was so censoriously regarded by chroniclers-who nevertheless recorded his exploits.[4] His reputation as vehemens amator foeminarum undoubtedly blinded chroniclers (and even historians)[5] to his achievements; for he was also described as being audax...et probus,[6] as the man who virtute saecularis

---

3. These were edited by A. Jeanroy in 1913 (Les chansons de Guillaune IX, duc d'Aquitaine), cf. this author's La poésie lyrique des troubadours (vol.II,pp.3-12). I have applied the nickname "troubadour" to this Duke, although it was not contemporary because (i) the number "IX" is incorrect if it is assumed that William Tête d'Étoupe was never Duke of Aquitaine (above, Part I, Chap. I, nn. 141-2) and (ii) because there is no justification for Richard's assertion that this Duke continued to be called iuvenis (Comtes, I, p. 384; cf. J. Cate, "A gay crusader", Byzantion vol. 16, p.506; below nn. 12-13).

4. In particular William of Malmesbury (Gesta regum Anglorum, II pp. 447-8, 510-11). Jeanroy plausibly considered that lost poems of a scurrilous type might well lie behind some of Malmesbury's anecdotes. (Les chansons...p.ix and no.IV); but Cate still recounted these as factual (op. cit., p.524 n.34).

5. Geoffrey of Vigeois (Labbe, II p. 296). Cate (p.522) described him as being without "any real qualities of leadership". This article relies without acknowledgement on Richard's work.

6. Orderic Vitalis (Historia Ecclesiastica IV, p.80; cf. pp. 122).

militiae super omnes mundi principes mirabiliter claruit;[7] and it seems possible that for his contemporaries the victory at Cutanda wiped out the crusading defeat of 1101 on which historians always dwell.[8] In comparison little is known of the last Duke, (the Troubadour's son by Philippa of Toulouse)[9] except for references to activity against his vassals and for the momentous deathbed decision to confide his elder daughter Eleanor to the French King Louis VI.[10]

MINORITY of WILLIAM the TROUBADOUR.

When Guy-Geoffrey died besieging the castle of Chizé

---

7. Chron.St.Maixent (p.431). Cf. also the panegyric of him in the cartulary of Talmont (no.198), which seems to imply that he may have been called "the great"; and the HICE (pp.33-5) which describes him as mirae audaciae et strenuitatis, and calls his son minor by contrast.

8. Below, p.154.

9. Below, nn. 28, 49, 64.

10. Chron.St.Maixent (pp.431-2) noted his activity against his vassals. This is a case where Labbe's edition (p.220) reproduces the order of ms.lat. 4, 892 better than Marchegay's does. There is no historical proof for Boissonade's judgment of this last Duke as "un goinfre allourdi" (BSAO, 1934, pp.302-3; cf. id. Bulletins - Charente, 1935, p.28). He may well have been known as "le Toulousain" by his contemporaries (cf. Cartul.Vaux, nos. 5-6); Cartul.St. Jean d'Angély no.498).

in September 1086 his son William was fifteen years old;[11] the descriptions of him as puer, iuvenis, or even as infans, in documents of the next few years surely indicate that he was considered incapable of ruling alone.[12] A minority always imposed a strain on a medieval state, and Aquitaine was no exception; religious houses found it difficult to get justice;[13] Guy-Geoffrey's great Cluniac abbey of Montierneuf suddenly found its income diminished so that the monks could not complete the towers in fronte ecclesia, or the walls round the monastic buildings;[14] and complaints were later made about plundered and appropriated lands.[15] Unfortunately for the historian such complaints only mentioned the political situation where it was connected with their own grievances. For instance, an act of restoration made by

---

11. For Guy-Geoffrey's death see Chron.St.Maixent (p.408), Martin of Montierneuf (Thesaurus...III, col. 1216); cf. Richard (op.cit., I, p.372 n.2). According to the St. Maixent chronicle (p.405) William was born the 22nd Oct. 1071.

12. Chartes St. Maixent nos. 165, 168-9, 178, 182, 185 (all dated between 1087-94). Cf. Cartul...Saintes no.56: Willelmo puero duce in Aquitania (a.1086); Appendix II, nos. 13-14 and the document cited n.13.

13. Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély no.87 (a retrospective reference) ...iustitiam eo in tempore non repiriebat (sic), utpote comite iuvinculo, necnon et terra turbata dolebat nimium. The monks of Vendôme (below nn 15-16) could not get justice either.

14. Martin of Montierneuf (op.cit. cols. 1216-17).

15. Cf. following note. Cartul.Saintongeais...Vendôme no.37 gives the text of Urban II's threat of excommunication.

the Duke in 1096 to the monks of la Trinité de Vendôme recorded a widespread revolt against ducal authority during the minority: William had been obliged to give the island of Oléron to Ebles of Châtelaillon to prevent the latter joining William's enemies.[16] Possibly a similar motive lay behind the ducal grant of Chasseneuil to the Count of Angoulême, but problems about the date of the charter make this impossible to prove.[17] On the other hand it is possible that the Vendôme document exaggerated the situation in retrospect, since the government of the minority seems to have been entrusted to some of Guy-Geoffrey's greatest vassals, and there is little other evidence for a general conspiracy against the Duke.[18]

The precedent of William Aigret's minority was for the "regency" to be exercised by the Duke's mother; but there is nothing to suggest that Aldiardis wielded the same power

---

16. Cum itaque pater meus ex hoc mundo migrasset satis puerum, ut plurimi norunt, ego remansi. Tunc barones mei, qui me iuvare debuissent, a fidelitate mea recedentes mihi graviter nocere ceperunt...(ibid, no.38 - the renunciation of 1096). The text of this edition is not wholly trustworthy.

17. Bulletins...Charente, 1939 (ed. R. Grand, pièce just. no.6). This can only be dated between 1087, when Fulk was replaced as Count by William (HPCE, pp. 26-8) and 1098 when the Bishop of Poitiers added a church to the villa, after the latter had been given to the abbey of St. Amant de Boixe (ms.lat.12898, fos. 53r-54v; ms. lat. 9197, p.113).

18. Above n.18; but cf. nn. 22-3 for Gascony.

as Agnes did during the years 1038-44.[19] Instead all the documents of the period immediately after Guy-Geoffrey's death are subscribed by three men, the Count of la Marche, William Fredelannus lord of Blaye, and Hugh of Lusignan, who undoubtedly formed the nucleus of a minority government; although they may have been joined by others like the Viscounts of Thouars and Châtellerault whose names are found less frequently.[20] The first three mentioned seem to have been responsible for the young Duke's person on his visits to Bordeaux in 1087 and 1089; on the second occasion they were accompanied by the Viscount of Thouars.[21]

---

19. She subscribed one document of her son's minority (Cartul.St.Cyprien, no.321) and is mentioned in a charter of 1096 (Ch.St.Maixent no.188).

20. Cartul. St.Nicolas no.8 (between September 1086-Feb. 1087); two charters of la Sauve (Appendix II, nos 13-14 1087, 1089); Chartes Nouaillé no.160; Hist.Maillezais pp.226-9; Cartul.St.Cyprien no. 321 (all c. 1086-91 - before the death of Count Boso - see n.24). Count Boso of la Marche is found in all these documents, Hugh of Lusignan and the lord of Blaye in all but one (Boissonade BSAO, 1934, p.281 transformed the latter into two men). There is no proof for Richard's statement that William was immediately declared of age (Comtes, pp.382-3; Cate, op.cit. p.505). There are also some ducal acts of this period without witness lists.

21. Appendix II nos. 13-14 . These documents (which have not been used hitherto) seem to me to prove the existence of "some form of minority council" because the monks of la Sauve-Majeure who undoubtedly wrote them had no interest in recording the presence of these three men who never (from the evidence of the cartulary) made benefactions to their house; whereas the Poitevin houses might well have had motives of self-interest in noting the subscription of, say, Hugh of Lusignan or the Viscount of Thouars.

The main challenge of the minority was to secure William's succession to Gascony where Poitevin domination had only been established for a generation - at least it would be ridiculous to suppose that the Duke was taken to Bordeaux merely to confirm his father's grants to la Sauve-Majeure, although these acts of confirmation alone provide the evidence for his presence in the city.[22] The threat to the ducal succession in Gascony was averted by gaining the support of Count Centulle, who was handsomely rewarded with the valley of Soule and land near Oloron for remaining faithful to the Poitevins and helping the Duke in necessitate sua.[23]

The date at which William began to govern alone is unknown; it may perhaps be placed between the death of Count Boso of la Marche at Confolens in 1091[24] and William's

---

22. On both occasions the grants were made in the church or chapter of la Sauve, in 1089 confirmatum in Burdegalensi urbe coram nobilibus viris.

23. Printed in the last instance by Tucoo-Chala (La vicomté de Béarn, p.147) from Ms. 745 of the Bibliothèque municipale de Bordeaux (the "cartulaire de Bigorre"). This is generally attributed to Guy-Geoffrey (Richard Comtes p.354; Jaurgain - op.cit. II, p.544), but since the grant refers to fisc held from the Duke's father such an attribution is impossible (Guy-Geoffrey's father William the Great was never ruler of Gascony). It can be placed before 1091 when Centulle was certainly dead (Cartul.St. Victor de Marseille, II p.169). Contrary to what has sometimes been supposed (Jaurgain, II, p.379) he was still alive in 1089 (below, p 287). There is no proof for Tucoo-Chala's attribution of 1086 (loc.cit.).

24. Chron.St.Maixent (p.410). For details of the succession G. Thomas (Les comtes de la Marche, pp. 38-42).

appearance at Parthenay in August 1092, since on this occasion the Duke was not accompanied by the train of great nobles who had been with him since 1086,[25] but this is conjectural. Moreover, his first military campaigns date from the following years: in 1093-94 he besieged Germond,[26] in 1096 St. Macaire;[27] while his marriage to Philippa of Toulouse took place in 1094.[28]

THE TOULOUSAIN MARRIAGE and the CRUSADE OF 1101.

It is possible that by this Toulousian marriage William hoped to gain further territory - the resulting principality

---

25. Besly (p.396) - foundation charter of a priory for la Chaise-Dieu. It contains only the Duke's subscription, those of the family of Parthenay and unimportant religious.

26. Chron.St.Maixent (pp.410-11). He became involved in a dispute between the brothers Gelduinus and Ebbo who were lords of Parthenay.

27. Cartul.St. Jean d'Angély no.183. In the same year the Duke gave the canons of Ste.Croix de Bordeaux various rights in St. Macaire (Cartul.Ste.Croix no.3).

28. ....filiam Willelmi comitis Tolosani et neptem Raimundo Sancto Egidio (Chron.St.Maixent, p.411). I can find no evidence for William's previous marriage to Ermengardis a daughter of Fulk Réchin, apart from William of Tyre (RHC, Occidentaux I, p.606) who seems to have been mistaken. A comitissa de Britannia, soror Fulconis comitis was still alive in 1128; there is no proof of a previous marriage to the Duke (Chartrou, l'Anjou... pièces just. no. 39; cf. 28), although the woman is presumably the same, since William of Tyre supposed that she made a second marriage to comitem Brittaniae. See Palustre (Histoire de Guillaume IX, p.225, n.3), Richard (Comtes I, pp.294-5).

would have been even greater in extent than the Plantagenet "empire", and would have more nearly approximated to the old kingdom of Aquitaine than the duchy and Gascony did; but he was unsuccessful, and the chief consequences for Aquitaine must have been the expenditure of men and money on the project.

Philippa was the only surviving child of the Count of Toulouse who had attacked Bordeaux[29] and, although the succession of women did not occur automatically at this period, she had a good claim to be considered her father's heiress. This is surely proved by an episode included in the miracles of St. Robert of La Chaise-Dieu, according to which Raymond of St. Gilles, Philippa's uncle, made a pilgrimage to the monastery where he promised to hold the county of Toulouse from God and St. Robert, si Deus per illum (ie. St. Robert) sibi tradere disposuerit - a promise which is ridiculous if Raymond's right to succeed his brother was undisputed.[30] However, Raymond already had widespread territorial power in the region as Count of Rouergue, St. Gilles, and Marquis of

---

29. Above, pp.104-5.

30. AA.SS. (24 April, p.332). L and J. Hill (Raymond IV de St. Gilles, comte de Toulouse, p.19) place a rather different interpretation on this passage.

Provence, and he had little difficulty in ousting his niece;[31] the legal position is only mentioned by authors of a later period, who were interested in King Henry II's claim to succeed to the county on behalf of Eleanor.[32] William's numerous attempts to gain possession of the county on Philippa's behalf suggest that there may not have been the "renunciation" of the county by the Duke of Aquitaine which historians have postulated.

For in 1098, when Raymond departed for the Holy Land, Duke William led an expedition through Quercy to Toulouse and took possession of the city; in a grant which he and his wife made to the canons of St. Sernin he is given the title of comes Pictavensis et Tolosae.[33] Again there is no

---

31. HGL (V, cols. 649-52, nos. CCXCII-III). The agreement of 1063 mentioning succession in the masculine line (HGL, V, no.CCXXII), contrary to what the Hills supposed, refers only to the protection of the abbey of Moissac by the Count of Toulouse, not to the comital succession (op.cit. p.4 and n.4). Again if Raymond had a legal right to succeed his brother there would be no reason to credit William of Malmesbury's story that Raymond bought the county. Not all these theories can be credited at the same time. (Hill, loc.cit. and p.16, nn.19,22).

32. In particular by Robert of Torigni (ed. Delisle, p.319) and then by William of Newburgh (RHF, XIII, p.105). The errors of the former were pointed out in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Catel, Hist.des comtes de Tolose, pp. 134-6; HGL. IV note XL, pp.193-4); they were nevertheless adapted by Richard (Comtes, p.426) Cate, (op.cit., p.513); Y. Renouard (Hist. des Institutions seigneuriales, pp. 160-1).

33. HGL, V (cols. 754-5). Nevertheless, at this period Bishop Gerald of Cahors referred to honorem Raimundi Tolosani comitis (ibid. cols. 753-4).

trustworthy source for the theory that in 1100, before going on Crusade, William sold his wife's rights to Bertrand;[34] in 1115 he made a determined effort to establish her in the county[35] and, when Alfonso-Jordan was finally acknowledged as Count of Toulouse the Viscount of Béziers promised him aid de comite Pictaviensi et de infantibus suis.[36]

An account of Duke William's expedition through the Balkans and Asia Minor, and the defeat of the crusading army at Heraclea, is scarcely relevant to a study of the duchy of Aquitaine; but because of the problems it raises, and the consequences for the duchy, it cannot be entirely passed over. If only contemporaries had been interested in the financial aspects of such an expedition, or in the provisions made for government in the ruler's absence, the historian would be able to answer far more questions both about the government of feudal states and about the crusading movement. As it is

---

34. The theory of Richard and the other historians cited in n.32; it depends on altering the passage of Robert of Torigni, who stated that Duke William sold Toulouse to Raymond to raise cash for the crusade; although as Catel (see n.32) pointed out Raymond went on crusade before William. Richard altered the name to Bertrand (even though Robert called the buyer Philippa's uncle), and thus provided a possible chronological framework.

35. HGL, V (cols. 849-50) - ducal grant of Aug. 1115 to the abbey of Lézat; cf. Philippa's foundation of a priory for Fontevrault in Toulouse (ibid. col. 846), and the undated oath of fealty taken by the Viscount of Béziers in Toulouse (loc.cit.).

36. Ibid. (col.908). This also is undated.

various sources show that the Duke's army was composed of numbers of his great vassals: Viscount Herbert of Thouars and his brother Geoffrey brought their own contingent from Bas-Poitou,[37] the Viscount of Aulnay took part,[38] and Hugh of Lusignan is mentioned by the chroniclers on account of his relationship to Raymond of St. Gilles.[39] The Bishops of Clermont and Périgueux also accompanied the Duke;[40] but the only one of his familia who can be identified is William Fort, a ducal officer in the Saintonge and brother of the archdeacon of Poitiers.[41] During his absence William seems to have entrusted the government of his domains to Philippa, who travelled as far south as Auch before his return;[42]

---

37. A priory of St. Florent founded by the Viscounts at Chaize-le-Vicomte preserved an account of their expedition (ed. P. Marchegay, Cartuls. Bas-Poitou, pp. 3-8 - the ms. is mutilated). Viscount Herbert died at Jaffa after hearing rumours that his brother was killed in the battle of Rama (pp. 7-8).

38. Cartul...Saintes, no. 217; cf. also Cartul.St. Jean d'Angély nos. 270, 326, 448 for a member of family of the castellans of Archiac in the Saintonge.

39. Fulcher of Chartres (Historia Hierosolymitana, ed. Hagenmeyer, p. 438) and Albert of Aix (RHC, Occid. IV, p.591). See Chron.St.Maixent (p.401) for the relationship.

40. Albert of Aix (op.cit. p.581); Geoffrey of Vigeois (Labbe, II p.306).

41. Cartul.St.Cyprien no.75; Cartul...Angély no.448; below Chap V, n.155.

42. Miracula S. Benedicti (p.312).

otherwise the only deduction of any significance which can be made about this period is that the appointment to the archbishopric of Bordeaux was delayed until the Duke's return.[43]

Orderic's story that before his departure on crusade the Duke tried to "mortgage" his lands perhaps indicates that contemporaries did not consider such desperate measures improbable; but the inconsistencies of the story make it unlikely.[44] However, we can guess that the financial arrangements for the expedition itself were primitive, since when the Turks defeated the Christians at Heraclea William lost both familia et pecunia[45] and, for the rest of his stay in the Holy Land, he depended upon the generosity of Tancred of Antioch to supply his material needs.[46] This loss of the

---

43. Below, Chap. IV, n.88.

44. Hist.Ecclesiastica (Iv, p.80). Orderic had no idea of the real extent of the Duke's domains (he supposed they only reached ad Garronnam fluvium) while the monologue which he attributes to the King is also suspicious. Besides the story is inherently improbable in view of the ducal resources (below, chap.V pp. 190 et seq.).

45. Fulcher of Chartres, (op.cit. p.432); Runciman (A hist. of the Crusades, II, pp. 28-31); Cate (op.cit. pp.522-3).

46. Albert of Aix (op.cit, p.582); Fulcher (loc.cit). This may account for the hospitality later shown to Bohemond in Aquitaine (Chron.St.Maixent p.423; Geoffrey of Vigeois, p. 297), and for the choice of William the Troubadour's son Raymond as husband for the heiress of Antioch in 1136 (Chron.St.Maixent, p.419; Geoffrey, p.297; Runciman, op.cit. pp.199-200).

ducal pecunia must surely be connected with the manipulations of the coinage in Aquitaine which the St. Maixent chronicler noted in the years following the Duke's return.[47] We can suspect, too, that for the duchy this was a far more serious consequence of the expedition than William's temporary loss of face, even though this must have been bitter after the triumphant return of Gaston of Béarn and the Duke's Limousin vassals from the first crusade.[48]

THE NORTHERN COUNTIES to 1137.

From William the Troubadour's return to Aquitaine late in 1102 until his son's death at Compostella the political situation had considerable continuity. It has already been mentioned that these Dukes were increasingly drawn into the politics of the south; but they both had also to deal with the revival of Angevin aggression in the vulnerable region of north Poitou; and both were obliged to engage in series

---

47. Below, Chap. V n.17.

48. For Gaston see the Gesta Francorum (ed. Hill, pp.92,95), Orderic (Hist.Eccles. III, pp.480-1 - named Centorius - p.616). Cf. a Gascon charter of 1101 (Marca, Béarn, p.375). The Gesta Francorum also refers to the exploits of men from the Limousin (pp.73-4, 83, 87-9). Geoffrey of Vigeois attributed the Duke's failure to his immorality (above n.5; cf. William of Malmesbury, refs. cited n.4; Guibert of Nogent, RHC, Occid. IV, p.243). No such judgments were passed by Fulcher, or Albert of Aix.

of military campaigns to increase, or to enforce - we do not know which - the Duke's feudal rights over his vassals.

The revival of Angevin aggression at the expense of the Duke apparently began with William the Troubadour's intervention in a family quarrel between Fulk Réchin and his eldest son Geoffrey for, if the sentiment of a poem written by William may be used as historical evidence, it seems that at the period when the Duke went on Crusade his relations with Count Fulk were friendly.[49] In 1103 William allied with Fulk against Geoffrey[50] but, by the following year, the situation had changed to such an extent that armies summoned by William and Fulk met to fight at Parthenay. An engagement was averted because of torrential rain attributed by the St. Maixent chronicle[51] to divine intervention; the armies

---

49. En guerra laissarai mon fil
E faran li mal siei vezin
- - - -
L'o departirs m'ais aitan grieus
Del seignoratge de Peitieus!
En garda lais Folcon d'Angieus
Toat la terra e son cozi. (ed.Jeanroy, no.XI).

Jeanroy supposed that this referred to Fulk le Jeune of Anjou (born c. 1090-2, and therefore could not refer to the crusade); but it seems far more likely to refer to Fulk Réchin and, moreover, the Duke's son was very young in 1100 (Chron.St.Maixent, p.419 placed his birth in 1099). Flach's view (Origines de l'ancienne France, IV, pp. 596-7) that this sentiment was sarcastic in tone seems out of keeping with the other verses.

50. Annales de St.Aubin (ed.Halphen, Receuil des annales angevines, p.43 from codex F). Fulk had apparently tried to disinherit Geoffrey amore filii sui minoris.

51. Chron.St.Maixent (p.422). I have followed the chronology of Halphen (Anjou, p. 177 nn.2-7) rather than that of Richard, who connected this episode with the period of hostility between Geoffrey and Fulk (Comtes, p.466, nn.1-2).

met again in 1106, but on this occasion peace was negotiated by King Philip.[52]

Orderic Vitalis supposed that the outbreak of hostility between Poitevins and Angevins was caused by the Duke's kidnapping of Fulk's younger son;[53] but neither Angevin nor Poitevin sources mention such a dramatic episode, and it may well be that the conflict was the result of Angevin attacks on Thouars,[54] which the Duke would be bound to revenge. The territorial situation in northern Poitou was of course extremely complicated; by the end of the eleventh century the Count of Anjou was treating his honours of Loudun and Mirebeau as terra sua;[55] they were situated near Montreuil-Bellay the castle of the rebellious Angevin vassal, and the

---

52. Chron.St.Maixent, (p.423).

53. Hist.Ecclesiastica (IV, pp.217-18). William of Tyre (RHC, Occid I, pp.606-7) has a more elaborate version of the story; the two were combined and embroidered by Richard (op.cit. pp.450-51).

54. The burning of Thouars was mentioned by the St. Aubin annalist (loc.cit.); cf. Cartuls.Bas-Poitou (p.24). It is not impossible that the Duke was involved in some episode like the one described by Orderic, but it is extremely curious that no local source should mention it (particularly since Angevin annals are more abundant than Poitevin ones).

55. terram suam...Mirebellum vel Losdunum...(Cartul.Vendôme II, no. 345) - An account of a dispute over the church of Craon, in which the Count of Anjou wished the suit to be heard at a place where he could attend and not at Saintes, named by the legate Amatus.

castles dependent on the great honour of Thouars,[56] so that it is often impossible to disentangle the political and feudal issues involved in the conflicts in this region. By the later middle ages the problems arising from this situation were regulated by the creation of a "marche séparante" with its own custom, differing from that of either Anjou or Poitou;[57] but at the period being studied there are no traces of this.

The Counts of Anjou may have been involved in the conflicts of the Counts of Poitou with their vassals after this date[58] but the details are obscure; in 1129 when Count Fulk le Jeune left for Jerusalem his son Geoffrey le Bel was in his turn faced with a coalition of Angevin and Poitevin castellans against Angevin authority in the region.[59] In order to defeat this he laid siege to the castles of Thouars, Parthenay,[60] and Mirebeau which Duke William unsuccessfully

---

56. Below, Chap. V, n.94. It is impossible here to describe this honour in detail, however.

57. E. Chénon (Les marches séparantes d'Anjou, Bretagne et Poitou - not described as a march until 1372 - p.18); Cf. the remarks of R. Dion (Les frontières de la France, p.43). The situation seems to have been far more complicated than on the frontiers of Normandy (LeMarignier, Recherches sur l'hommage en Marche...pp.7-8, 177-8, and 34-69 for the evolution of the Norman frontiers).

58. Below, n.70.

59. Annales St.Aubin (ed.Halphen, Recueil, p.8), Historia Gauffridi (ed Halphen, Chrons.Comtes d'Anjou, p.201). The second passage misled Chartrou (L'Anjou, p.31) into supposing that Parthenay was held from the Count of Anjou; below nn.65-7.

60. Loc.cit.

attempted to relieve.[61] The revival of Angevin power in the early twelfth century[62] had important consequences for the Dukes of Aquitaine since it forced them to devote a considerable amount of attention to the situation in northern Poitou (far more than in the time of Guy-Geoffrey) and to aid their own vassals when attacked; while the Count of Anjou's own tenure of strongholds in Poitou only exacerbated the situation,[63] for the Duke of Aquitaine no longer had the same means of exacting services for these possessions as he had done when William Fier-à-bras first enfieffed [redacted] Geoffrey Grisegonelle. Perhaps the marriage of one of William the Troubadour's daughters to the Viscount of Thouars best demonstrates the political importance of the region, for no such inequal match had ever been arranged before.[64]

There are also numerous problems connected with these

---

61. Ann.St.Aubin (p.9), Historia Gauffridi (p.204).

62. Fulk Réchin's activity had been curtailed by the need to make concessions to vassals and neighbours on account of his imprisonment of his brother (Halphen, Anjou, pp. 148-51, 190; Chartrou, op.cit. pp.2-3).

63. The lord of Mirebeau was undoubtedly an Angevin vassal: he was the witness to a iuditium made by the Count of Anjou (Archives Dép. de la Vienne, unclassified act, carton 12, no.2) and accompanied him on his Norman expedition of 1118 (Chartrou, op.cit, pp.12, 35).

64. Chron.St.Maixent (p.419); cf. Cartul.S.Iovini, pp.34-5. However, the Duke had five daughters. The last Duke was married to a daughter of the Viscount of Châtellerault (Archives ... de la Vienne, Montierneuf charters, pièce 44).

Dukes' relationships with their other vassals, and the conflicts which occurred during the years 1086-1136. For instance, there is no information about the cause of the war which arose between William the Troubadour and the lords of Lusignan and Parthenay,[65] although it has been plausibly suggested that it began with a disagreement over the relief to be paid for the honour of Lusignan in 1110;[66] and it is to be supposed that the Parthenay family were drawn into it by their close connexions with the Lusignans.[67] Similar obscurity surrounds a conflict over the castle of Talmont immediately after William the Troubadour's death,[68] and an intensive siege of the honour of Châtellaillon in 1131;[69]

---

65. Chron.St.Maixent (p.424) - a.1110, Chartes St. Maixent, no.238; cf. below.

66. Richard (Comtes, p.490), Painter ("The lords of Lusignan..." pp. 35,38). Until 1269 reliefs in Poitou were paid ad voluntatem dominorum (E.Lyon, "Comment fut élaborée l'ordonnance sur les rachats en Poitou", BEC 1927, passim). The strength of the theory applied to the war of 1110 was that it broke out so soon after the death of the previous lord of Lusignan (Chron.St.Maixent, loc.cit).

67. ....Guillelmo comite...propter guerram Hugonis Liziniaco et cognati sui Simonis de Gastina (Chartes St.Maixent no.246 - a.1111), comes pugnavit cum Simone Partiniacensi et avunculo suo (Chron.St.Maixent, p.428 - a.1118).

68. Cartul.Talmont no.167, but the wording of this is difficult even before any explanation is sought for the dispute.

69. Richard the Poitevin (account ed. RHF, XII, pp.418-20). See E. Berger's study (Bibliothèque de l'Ecole francaise d'Athenes et Rome, fasc. 6, esp. p.12).

but in all these cases the Dukes were ultimately successful in subduing their vassals. William the Troubadour captured the lords of Lusignan and Parthenay in battle in 1118,[70] his son kept a firm hold on Talmont,[71] and captured and took the castles of Châtelaillon and l'Ileau into his demesne.[72] William the Troubadour also besieged and then destroyed the castle of Blaye;[73] but it was rebuilt by Count Vulgrinus of

---

70. Not simply Simon, as Painter (op.cit. p.38) implied; if the wording of the Chron.St.Maixent (loc.cit.) is followed. Nevertheless, the subjugation had taken a long time; the Duke undertook an expedition against Champdeniers (Chron.St.Maixent, p.425; see Ledain Dict.Deux-Sèvres, pp.66-7), which belonged to the lord of Parthenay (in 1092 he had a knight from Champdeniers: Gaufridus de Campo-Linario, miles noster. Besly, p.396). It was this expedition, in which Angevins were involved (Chron. loc.cit), which led Richard to suppose that there was continuous Angevin support for the ducal vassals (op.cit. pp.460-1), although the chronicle does not mention on whose side the Angevins fought.

71. Above n.68; cf. Chap. V, n.180.

72. Richard the Poitevin (p.418). Neither Richard (op.cit. II, pp. 15-18) nor Jarry (Provinces et pays...II, p.251) mentioned the outcome of the sieges. Louis VII was forced to give the honour to the family again (Jarry, op.cit. p.252).

73. HFCE (p.33). This source only refers to the Duke's tenure of Blaye in order to recount Count Vulgrinus of Angoulême's recapture of the site.

Angoulême during the rule of the last independent Duke.[74]

The Dukes were frequently in conflict with the Counts of Angoulême during this period, although there is little doubt that the latter remained a ducal vassal.[75] William the Troubadour subsidized the lords of Cognac, Barbezieux and Archiac in their wars with Counts William and Vulgrinus on the frontiers of the Saintonge;[76] it seems probable that the Counts retaliated by helping the lords of the Limousin when they in their turn were engaged in disputes with the Dukes.[77] They also clashed over the succession to the honours of Confolens and Chabanais in the early twelfth century, when the Count of Angoulême betrothed the heiress to one of their castellans while the Duke supported the claims of Ademar of la Rochefoucauld ex parte uxoris sue.[78]

This dispute almost certainly centred upon the rights which

---

74. Loc.cit. There is no evidence for the date of 1136 given by Boissonade (Bulletins...Charente 1935, p.28).

75. The Count was described as dilectus fidelis by the Duke in the grant of Chasseneuil (above, n.17), and his presence is recorded in Poitiers immediately after the Troubadour's death (AHP, vol.44, pp.21-5) - perhaps to do homage to his new lord?

76. HPCE (pp. 29, 32-3). This source does not account for the change in allegiance of the Lord of Archiac, first described as an ally of the Poitevins, then as their enemy.

77. Below n. 82.

78. Op.cit. (pp.33-34). There is no information about the rights on which the claims of the wife of the castellan of la Rochefoucauld were based.

could be exercised by the different lords of the honours (according to Ademar of Chabannes Confolens and Chabanais had been granted by Duke William the Great to the Count of Angoulême, who must have subinfeudated them);[79] this was probably the issue at stake in other conflicts - for instance in the case of Blaye - but the poverty of the sources makes it impossible to be certain.

These Dukes made a determined effort to increase their power in their northern domains, although the only surviving statement of their intentions is connected with the suzerainty of the county of Auvergne and recorded by Abbot Suger of St. Denis.[80] However, there is evidence for the activity of William the Toulousain in the frontier region of Limousin and Berry, where he extended his protection to the priory of St. Benoît-du-Sault against the devastations of the Viscount of Brosse.[81] Geoffrey of Vigeois' chronicle suggests that

---

79. Chron (p.165). Some connexion can be traced between the Duke and the lord of Chabanais: Guy-Geoffrey subscribed a grant made by Jordan of Chabanais to Bourgueil (Besly pp.407-8); and between the Duke and the lord of Rochefoucauld: subscription of grant for St.Florent de Saumur of 1060 (ms.lat.1930, fos. 48r-49v; ed Besly p.338, with date of 1040).

80. Below, nn. 128-29.

81. Chartes de St.Benoît-sur-Loire nos. 126-7. The identification "de Brucia" occurs only in Louis VII's letter of protection (id. no.128). Boussard (Le gouvenement de Henri II, pp. 192-3) describes the chief lordships of the county of Berry as attached to the duchy of Aquitaine; but there is no evidence for ducal intervention except in this case; cf. the early eleventh century example of Odo of Déols (above, p.60, n58).

the ducal domination was resented in the Limousin itself, but he gives little detail, while that of the Historia pontificum chiefly concerns occasions when counts of Angoulême became involved in the affairs of this county.[82] It is clear that the Dukes retained considerable authority in the city of Limoges (William the Troubadour seems to have visited it fairly often);[83] somewhat ironically this is proved by the events of the Anacletian schism when William the Toulousain ejected the Bishop from his see.[84]

GASCONY and SPAIN.

The documents of Gascon religious houses continue to provide evidence for the Dukes' presence in this province. Apart from the minority period which has already been mentioned[85] a charter of the abbey of Ste.Croix proves William the Troubadour's presence in Bordeaux in 1096,[86] while he

---

82. Labbe, (p.304); HPCE (pp.29,34) - the first reference is to a siege of Aixe-sur-Vienne in which the Count of Angoulême and Viscount of Limoges were opposed to the Duke.

83. William the Troubadour took the cross at Limoges (Chron. St.Maixent, p.420); he was also involved in quarrels over a marble altar slab, over the burial place of a bishop, and in a personal dispute with Bishop Eustorgius (Geoffrey of Vigeois, ed. Labbe, pp.287,289,298) - for which there is no other information.

84. Chap. IV, n.93.

85. Above, pp. 135 nn, 22-3.

86. Cartul.Ste.Croix, no.3

possibly made a visit to Armagnac at about this time;[87] he is known to have come to Bordeaux soon after his return from the Crusade,[88] and again in 1108 when he granted a salvitas to a priory founded for Ste.Foi de Conques.[89] A charter of la Sauve-Majeure indicates his presence in Gascony in 1116;[90] on his way to support the Spanish king in 1120 he visited the monastery of St. Jean de Sorde and confirmed all previous grants made to this house - including its spurious foundation charter of Charlemagne.[91] He must also have passed through Gascony in 1123;[92] other undated documents prove his presence at the monastery of St. Sever, and William the Toulousain's presence in Gascony also.[93]

There is no doubt either that the Dukes continued to exercise far more than nominal authority in much of Gascony. For instance when the Viscount of Bézaume levied a new toll

---

87. Cartul.St.Mont, no.20: S.Guillem (thus) ducis Vasconie et Aquitanie. According to the editor this can only be placed c. 1095-6.

88. Below n.94.

89. Cartul.Conques no.481; Chap. V, n.117.

90. AHG (vol.12, p.317).

91. Cartul.Sorde no.81, and introd., p.lv.

92. Below, n.109.

93. Gallia, I (instrum. Cols.201), Cartul.Ste.Croix no.7; cf. AHG vol.34, (pp.1-4 and plate I in facsimile).

at la Réole the monks sent a complaint to Poitiers; the viscount was forced to renounce the toll and later to confirm this in the presence of the greatest magnates of Gascony.[94] William the Troubadour seems to have extended his authority in the cities of Bayonne and Agen -[95] the one important because of its proximity to the county of Toulouse, the other to Spain; a reference in the Miracula Sancti Benedicti suggests also that the Duke had the right of exacting provisions for himself and his entourage even in the southern part of the province.[96] As in the time of Guy-Geoffrey Gascon documents show the Dukes' connexions with the great Gascon magnates: the Counts Gerald and Bernard of Armagnac,[97] Astanova and Fortis of Fézensac,[98] the Count of Bigorre,[99] the Viscount of Béarn,[100] and numerous other Gascon viscounts.[101]

---

94. Cartul.la Réole no.64; cf. below pp. 219.

95. He made a grant of dues in Agen to Chaise-Dieu in 1122 (Gallia II, instr. col.429); but the grant of minting rights is a forgery based on the English writ-form, with numerous anachronicisms in the text. (loc.cit.) Cf. also the extensive grant made to the Bishop of Bayonne (Gallia I, instr.) col.201).

96. If the incident of Philippa's acceptance of hospitium in pago Ausiensi (ie. Auch) may be supposed to derive from her husband's rights as ruler of Gascony (Miracula S.Benedicti, ed. de Certain, pp.312-14).

97. Refs. nn. 67, 94.

98. Refs. nn. 94, and 93 (AHG, vol.30).

99. AHG (vol.12, pp. 319-20) - a grant of the Bishop of Aire for la Sauve - a 1135.

100. Ref. n.94, 95 (Gallia); Cartul.Sorde no.6.

101. Apart from references already cited, see Appendix II nos12,14-15 ;Cartul.Sorde no.81.

The power of the Dukes of Aquitaine, the closeness of Gascony to Spain, as well as the marriage alliances arranged by Guy-Geoffrey, made the Dukes natural allies of the Spanish kings; and during this period there were two occasions on which the latter obtained help from Aquitaine on an important scale. The first was immediately after Guy-Geoffrey's death, when Hugh of Lusignan seems to have led a contingent from Aquitaine to go to the support of Alfonso of Castille.[102] The second was when Alfonso of Aragon wished to undertake an offensive against the Muslims after he had captured the stronghold of Saragossa: William the Troubadour led a large band of knights and was among those responsible for the great Christian victory of Cutanda.[103].

But the situation was complicated by the great honours which the Viscount of Béarn and the Count of Bigorre by now held from the Kings of Aragon, and the amount of service

---

102. Chron.St.Maixent (p.407); cf. Chartes Nouaillé nos.157-8; Defourneaux (Les Français en Espagne, pp.143-4).

103. Chron.St.Maixent (p.428 - with year 1120); the chronicle of S.Juan de la Peña (ed.T.Ximenez de Embrun, Biblioteca de Escritores Aragoneses, p.68) -: strenuus miles comes Pictavensis ...cum sexcentis equitibus; Annales Compostellani (España Sagrada, vol.23, p.320). The list of ducal vassals given by Boissonade for this occasion (Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland, p.51) is for the most part without the support of contemporary sources.

which they owed him as a result.[104] Gaston of Béarn in particular took part in many expeditions against the Muslims,[105] was married to a woman of noble Aragonese birth,[106] was granted numerous lordships in Aragon and, in his turn, sublet them to his own followers.[107]

Moreover, William the Troubadour himself became directly involved in Spanish politics when Alfonso the Fighter of Aragon tried to disinherit his stepson Alfonso of Castille and to unite the two kingdoms;[108] it seems to have been this succession dispute rather than the Spanish commitments of the Duke's Gascon vassals which led to war between the Duke and the Aragonese in 1123.[109] Alfonso of Aragon later

---

104. Below, no.113. J-M Lacarra printed various royal Aragonese diplomas bearing the subscription of the Viscount of Béarn and the Count of Bigorre. (Documentos para el studio de la reconquista y repoblacion del valle del Ebro, in Estudios de Edad Media de la Coroña de Aragon, 1st and 2nd series nos. 39, 124, 137). Cf. Defourneaux (op.cit. p.218 n.2).

105. Defourneaux (pp.157 n.1, 160 n.4, 162 n.1).

106. Tucoo-Chala (La vicomté de Béarn... p.41 n.1)

107. There are over 40 documents in the collection printed by Lacarra which refer to his tenure of the castles of Saragossa, Uncastillo and Montreale between 1119-29 (a list cannot be given here). For Gaston's grants to other Gascons in Spain (op.cit. nos. 14,43). Cf.C.Corona Baratech (Las Tenencias en Aragon desde 1035 a 1134, Estudios, II, pp.391, 395 - & map on pp. 392-3).

108. A letter from the Duke to the Archbishop of Compostella (Espana Sagrada, 2, pp.319-20) proves the Duke's interest; he also visited the estranged Queen Urraka at her court in 1120 (Chartes Cluny, 3947). See Defourneaux (op.cit. p.162).

109. Chron.St.Maixent (p.430); cf. Lacarra (op.cit. no.29).

took the offensive against William the Toulousain when he laid siege to Bayonne with the support of the Archbishop of Auch and other Gascons;[110] but the Spanish were forced to return to an alliance with the Duke after the battle of Fraga in 1134 when King Alfonso, the Count of Bigorre, the Viscount of Béarn, and most of the Christian nobility, were killed during an ill-judged attack on the Muslim baggage train.[111] After this disaster William the Toulousain provided his sister as a bride for King Ramire[112], whom the Aragonese were obliged to take from his monastery.

It has been supposed that the Poitevin Dukes of Aquitaine became involved in conflicts with the Aragonese kings because the latter asserted their suzerainty over the Pyrenean states of the ducal vassals - the county of Bigorre and the viscounty of Béarn - but this view undoubtedly rests upon an error made by the Spanish historian Zurita in the

---

110. Gallia I (instr. col.162); cf. Lacarra (nos.67-8,72,164). The only literary source to mention the siege is the chronicle of Alfonso VII of Castille (España Sagrada, 21, p.339), but it places Bayonne on the R.Garonne (!) According to this the King had to return to Spain without gaining his objective.

111. Defourneaux (pp.160-66).

112. The chronicle of San Juan de la Peña (ref.n.103, p.84); Gesta comitum Barcinonensium (ed. Barrau-Dhigo, Cròniques catalanes, p.45).

seventeenth century when he stated that the Count of Bigorre did homage to the King of Aragon for his Gascon county in 1122, although the document in question only records homage for a Spanish honour.[113] The consequences of such an act must have been serious enough for the Duke of Aquitaine on some occasions - (for instance which lord did the Count support when the Duke was in conflict with the King in 1123?) - but it was not until after a long period in which this region had been neglected by Louis VII as Eleanor's husband that the King of Aragon was sufficiently bold to claim the suzerainty of a Gascon state.[114]

---

113. Zurita (Anales de la Corona d'Aragon, fos. 46r-v) referred to an agreement made by the King of Aragon and the Count of Bigorre at Morlaas in May 1122, but did not give the text. His views were followed by Marca (Hist.Béarn, p.417), Cadier (Cartul.Ste.Foi de Morlaas, p.11). Boissonade (BSAO, 1934, pp.299-300), Defourneaux (op.cit, p.161). The details of place and date given by Zurita surely prove that the document recently printed by Lacarra is the one to which Zurita referred (op.cit. no.26 - a.1122: in mense Mayo in locum qui dicitur Morlans); but it only refers to the castle de Rota and the honor quod senior eneco Galindez tenet de Rota, and to the conditions of service in Yspania. There is no reference to any Gascon honour, or any suggestion that possessions outside Spain were to be held from the King.

114. In 1154 the Béarnais recognised the suzerainty of Raymond-Berengar of Barcelona-Aragon during a period when their viscount was a minor and the regent had just died; this situation persisted until 1187 (La vicomté de Béarn, pp.42,48; docs nos. 6-7).

RELATIONS with the FRENCH KINGS.

At the beginning of the eleventh century there were numerous contacts between the French king and the Duke of Aquitaine (Robert and William the Great were cousins). The King supported the Duke in his attack on the Count of la Marche,[115] and made a ceremonial visit to his domains on the "finding" of the Baptist's head by the monks of St. Jean d'Angély;[116] but it is surely significant that no royal diplomas marked Robert's visit on this occasion, as they had marked the voyages of even the weakest Carolingian kings.[117] Although the Duke undoubtedly attended the royal court and showed deference to the king, the latter was almost powerless to intervene in the internal affairs of Aquitaine.[118]

During the rest of this century the situation did not

---

115. Above, p.51 n.21.

116. Ademar (Chron., pp.184,210).

117. During his stay in Poitiers in 942 Louis IV had issued royal diplomas for St.Hilaire and St.Jean d'Angély (refs. above Part I, Chap. I, n.16). The only two trustworthy documents issued by Robert for Aquitaine concern Hugh of Lusignan's priories founded for Nouaillé (Chartes Nouaillé nos. 106-107); they were enacted at Tours. See J-F Lemarignier ("Structures monastiques et structures politiques...", pp.363-4) for references to this development.

118. RHF (p.485), shows the Duke's interest in affairs at the royal court; (p.468) refers indirectly to the King's displeasure at the Duke's flouting of the rights of the Archbishop of Bourges in his election of the Bishop of Limoges.

change much. There is evidence for Guy-Geoffrey's attendance at Philip's coronation in 1059,[119] while two documents dated 1052 and 1077 indicate the presence of William Aigret and Guy-Geoffrey respectively at Vitry and Orléans[120] - although the first of these has recently been branded as suspect by Mademoiselle Fauroux.[121] These two Dukes are also known to have fought in campaigns when the King was present, but the significance of this fact is not altogether clear because there is a suspicion that they fought in the contingent of the Count of Anjou during his domination of the Poitevin political scene.[122] In any case the incident of 1076, when Philip came hurriedly to Poitiers to seek military support from Guy-Geoffrey against the Duke of Normandy, proves that the King could not arbitrarily summon such a great prince to serve in the royal army.[123]

But even though the Duke of Aquitaine enjoyed complete independence in his domains and performed only nominal

---

119. Fliche (Le Règne de Philippe Ier, p.3) - from ms.lat. 12765, pp. 307-11 - copy of "Exemplar regiae assessionis". As far as I know there is no critical study of this.

120. M. Fauroux (Recueil des actes des Ducs de Normandie, no.127), M. Prou (Recueil des Actes de Philippe Ier, no.86). They bear the subscriptions of, respectively, Willelmi Aquitanensis ducis and Widonis comitis Pictaviensis.

121. Loc.cit. The names of the Archbishops of Reims and Tours do not accord with the date of 1052; but she considered that a "true original" lay behind the forgery. Cf. also her no. 91.

122. Above, p.93 n.20.

123. Above, p.112, n16.

services for the King, there can be little doubt that he regarded the King as his lord, for William the Troubadour, in a verse of a poem already mentioned in another context, referred in passing to l reis de cui ieu tenc m'onor.[124] Moreover, in 1100, when the clergy gathered at Poitiers, they made plain their intention of excommunicating Philip for his adultery with Bertrada, the same Duke attempted to prevent the sentence being pronounced on his lord; and this incident seems to reveal at the same time the King's political weakness in his own kingdom - Poitiers was chosen by the papal legates because it was outside the scope of direct royal control; and the strength of the personal relationship which had been maintained, in spite of the unfavourable conditions of the eleventh century.[125]

The first case of intervention in the internal affairs of the duchy since the time of King Robert occurred with Philip's arrangement of a concordia between the Duke and Count of Anjou in 1106 but, because the circumstances in which this took place are unknown, its importance cannot

---

124. Ref. cited, n.49.

125. Below p.184. Lot (Fidèles ou vassaux? p.77) referred to this as proof that the Duke was vassal of the French king, Flach (Les origines...IV, p.592) as proof of the former's territorial independence; but it is surely significant chiefly because it reveals both aspects of the relationship at this date.

really be estimated.[126] With Louis VI's reign, however, there are definite signs that the King attempted to strengthen his position by whatever means were at his disposal. According to the chronicler of St. Pierre-le-Vif the reign began with a demand for homage from the great magnates of the kingdom (the Dukes of Normandy and Burgundy as well as the consul Pictavorum) which was refused on the grounds that it was not customary.[127] The outcome of this is uncertain; the next occasion of similar importance for the Duke did not occur until the King made a voyage to Auvergne sometime before 1127 to protect the Bishop of Clermont against the oppressions of the Count. When the royal army was encamped before the city Louis was met by the Duke of Aquitaine, who proclaimed the illegality of the royal action and complained that the King should have delegated the Duke to remedy the situation, since he held Auvergne from the King, and the Count held it from the Duke.[128] Again this incident is

---

126. Above, n.52. The chronicle of St. Maixent, the only source to mention this, does not indicate whether the arbitration was made at the request of the parties, or by royal summons, or where it took place.

127. Ed. l'Abbé Duru (Bibliothèque historique de l'Yonne, II p.517). There is no critical study of this source.

128. Alvernensis comes quia Alverniam a me, quam ego a vobis habeo (Vita Ludovici grossi, ed. Molinier, p.108). The date of this cannot be established precisely, for Suger simply noted an expedition to Auvergne by the king, and then another verum temporum lustro peracto. Molinier assumed that it took place five years (!) after the first, in 1126 (it must have occurred before 1127 because that Count of Flanders mentioned by Suger in his account died in that year). Luchaire (Louis VI, p.170), Lot (op.cit. pp.77-8), Richard (Comtes, II pp.3-4) and Flach (op.cit. IV, p.601, n.3) all accepted the date of 1126.

known only from one source - Suger's life of Louis - and it is to be suspected that it was chiefly recounted to prove the Duke's tenure from the King since Suger did not give the sequel. But even if Suger's account represents an "official" version written to further the royal position,[129] Louis' expedition to Auvergne marks a new stage in the King's relationship with the great princes of his realm, which can be better understood if it is compared with royal activity elsewhere - for instance in Flanders in 1128.[130]

The increase of royal demands may have been resented and met with references to custom or precedent; but, if the Duke of Aquitaine had denied the principles upon which these demands were based, would William the Toulousain ever have committed his elder daughter to the care of Louis

---

129. "....discours...destiné à étayer la théorie de l'entourage royal, plutôt qu'à traduire la réalité des faits" (Boussard, Le gouvernement, p.373). This seems a fair comment on Suger's presentation even if it is not necessarily connected - as it was by Boussard - with the problem of whether the Duke owed homage to the King. Suger's statements were taken literally by W. Kienast (Untertaneid und Treuvorbehalt, pp.31-3).

130. F. Ganshof ("Le Roi de France en Flandre en 1127 et 1128", RHDFE 1949, esp. pp.219,227; and for a comparison with the Auvergne campaign, p.215 n.2).

VI before his death at Compostella?[131] With Eleanor's marriage to the young prince Louis,[132] royal activity in Aquitaine took a new turn and the history of the duchy as an independent state comes to an end.

---

131. Suger alone mentions the sending of nuncii ducis Aquitaniae to the French King (ed Molinier, pp.127-8). The Chronicle of St. Maixent refers to Louis' "acceptance" of Eleanor and totum principatum terrae illius (p.432). There does not seem to be any reason for disbelieving Suger's statement of fact; although would William the Toulousain have acted in the same way if his brother Raymond had remained in Europe? Raymond arrived in Antioch in April 1136 to marry the heiress (Runciman, A History of the Crusades, II pp.199-200; above, n.46).

132. Suger (loc.cit.), but cf. also Orderic Vitalis (Hist. Ecclesiastica, V, p.88), William of Malmesbury (Hist. Novella, p.10) and the St. Maixent Chronicle (p.432).

CHAPTER IV.

THE CHURCH IN THE DUCHY (1030-1137).

From the end of the tenth century the Duke of Aquitaine intervened in almost every aspect of ecclesiastical affairs, and attempted to establish law and order in his domains by a combination of secular force and reliance on the ideals, and sanctions, of the Church.[1] The "peace movement" seems to have died out in Aquitaine at about the time that William the Fat was captured by Geoffrey Martel of Anjou, and was never revived;[2] in other respects William the Great's sons - in particular Guy-Geoffrey - kept much of their father's authority over the Church in Aquitaine; and there can be little doubt that this was at least in part because, like him, they actively favoured its reform.

REFORMING CONTACTS with AQUITAINE.

The connexion of the Dukes of Aquitaine with the Abbots of Cluny dated back to the early eleventh century when St. Odilo helped William the Great reform the monastery of St. Jean d'Angély;[3] and Cluny continued to remain the most obvious source for the transmission of ideas on reform - at least on monastic reform - to the Dukes of Aquitaine. Abbot

---

1. Above, pp.51-70.
2. Above, Chap. I, nn. 2-3, 5.
3. Above, Part I, Chap. II, n.68.

Hugh visited Aquitaine frequently[4] and was, moreover, an uncle of Guy-Geoffrey's Burgundian wife Aldiardis;[5] the result of his influence can be seen in direct grants to Cluny itself and in the number of houses which were affiliated to it in this period. Guy-Geoffrey's great "new monastery" was colonised from Cluny,[6] while the church of St. Eutrope at Saintes which became an important stopping-place on the Compostella pilgrims' route was founded as a Cluniac priory.[7] Equally important is the fact that, during these years, a number of Cluniac monks were appointed Abbots of religious

---

4. He was present with the Duke at the election of an Abbot of Maillezais (below, n.42), at a ducal grant to St.Jean d'Angély (Cartul.St.Jean no. 3, cf. no. 96, a.1077), with the Duke when Isembert of Châtellaillon made a grant to Cluny (Chartes Cluny no.3413), and when the Duke made over the church of St.Eutrope (Chartes Cluny no.3508). He also visited Gascony (Marrier, Biblioteca Cluniacensis, col.442), and Limoges over the St.Martial affair (C. de LaSteyrie, L'Abbaye de St. Martial de Limoges, pp. 84-6, pp. 427-9).

5. Above, Chap. II, n.7.

6. i.e. Montierneuf, founded in the suburb of Poitiers, to which Guy-Geoffrey made his most lavish endowments. The archivist of the Vienne is in the process of editing its charters (a few have been inserted in Appendix II). In general see Martin of Montierneuf (op.cit., cols. 1213-14).

7. Above n.4; Cf. Le guide du pélerin de St. Jacques. (ed. J. Vieillard, pp. 65-79).

houses which were not subject to the Burgundian abbey. Gilbert of St.Maixent, Goderannus of Maillezais (later Bishop of Saintes), and Odo of St.Jean d'Angély all came from Cluny.[8] Abbot Odo was one of Guy-Geoffrey's most constant counsellors, and administered extreme unction to him on his deathbed.[9]

Contacts with Rome and the circle of those who surrounded successive reforming Popes provided another source for the transmission of ideas on reform to the Dukes and, although this cannot be proved, it is to be suspected that such contacts were of particular importance in making known general ideas which did not touch the monastic clergy.[10] The personal link here was the Empress Agnes, daughter of William the Great and the Burgundian Agnes,[11] whose friendship with the reformer

---

8. Martin (op.cit. col. 1212). Goderannus had been a monk at St. Rémi de Reims before going to Cluny, where he gained the friendship of St. Hugh (Vita S.Hugonis, Marrier, op.cit. col.443). For the other two see (Chartes St.Maixent (pp. lxxxvii) and Cartul.St.Jean (II, p. xxxii).

9. Martin (loc.cit. and col.1215). The Duke and the Bishop of Angoulême remitted a foedium to him (Cartul.St.Jean no.19); he was witness to an agreement made between the Duke and the monks of Vendôme in 1068 (Cartul. Saintongeais no.23), and is mentioned in twelve other documents in the Duke's company.

10. There is always the problem that the transmission of ideas can only rarely be proved at this period from literary remains: these must have often come about "through the movement of people" rather than "through the impersonal circulation of books" (Southern, The Making of the Middle Ages, p.82). These personal contacts can occasionally be traced.

11. Above Part I, Chap. II, n.102.

Peter Damian probably may have dated back to her imperial coronation in 1046,[12] and who opposed the government of her own son for the sake of the reforming principles enunciated by Pope Gregory VII, who "loved her as a mother".[13] The Empress obtained a papal privilege for her mother's foundation of St. Nicolas in Poitiers,[14] and she interceded for Guy-Geoffrey when Gregory VII was inquiring into the reasons for dissolving his marriage to Aldiardis.[15] Guy-Geoffrey probably visited the Empress in Rome,[16] but she also had contacts with Aquitaine through Ermesindis, the widow of William Aigret,[17] and through Peter Damian himself;[18] while a reference in the account of the Saint's Gallica Profectio

---

12. Bulst-Thiele (Kaiserin Agnes, p.25; cf. pp.65-9, 92, 97-99 for other references to her connexion with the papal curia).

13. Soror vestra, ...quam ut matrem diligimus (Register of Gregory VII, ed. Caspar, p.217). cf. Bulst-Thiele, op.cit. (pp.97-99, 104).

14. ...inclinati precibus tuis atque carissimae comunis filiae Agnetis Romanae imperatricis, tuae quidem carnaliter meae autem spiritualiter ... (Cartul.St. Nicolas no.4; J-L no.4641).

15. See ref. n.13, below n.40.

16. According to Martin of Montierneuf (col.1213) the Duke went to Rome after obtaining a privilege for Montierneuf from the King (in Oct.1076). Since Agnes died in Jan. 1077 (Bulst-Thiele, p.111) and the exact date of his visit is unknown he may perhaps not have seen her.

17. See the letters of St.Peter Damian (PL. vol.144, cols. 443-5) for this connexion.

18. Loc.cit.

suggests that he may even have met Guy-Geoffrey at Limoges.[19] Even though it is only possible to prove the opportunity for the transmission of ideas on church reform from Rome to Aquitaine, Guy-Geoffrey's acquaintance with these ideas can surely be deduced from what is known of his activity in ecclesiastical affairs between 1058-86.

REFORMING ACTIVITY before GUY-GEOFFREY'S DEATH.

Three bishops were deposed during the years that Guy-Geoffrey was Duke. One of them, Arnulf of Saintes, was deposed for simony (for the sale of spiritual office, not because he was guilty of buying his own bishopric);[20] the reasons for the removal of the others (Archibald Archbishop of Bordeaux and Boso of Saintes) are unknown, although even a casual reference in a local cartulary refers to the latter

---

19. PL. vol.145 (cols.865-900). The author described the Saint at Limoges illius civitatis episcopo comiteque consulto (col.876). Since there was no Count of Limoges at this period he must either have referred to the Count of Poitou, or in confusion to the Viscount of the city as comes (the author seems to have been an Italian, and would therefore be unacquainted with political conditions across the Alps). In view of Peter Damian's eminence it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that Guy-Geoffrey had gone to meet him.

20. PL (146 cols.1320-21). This is a précis of a papal letter from a lost register of Alexander II (P.Ewald, "Die päpstbriefe der Brittischen Sammlung", Neues Archiv, 1880) and may be dated either c.1063 or 1067 (p.348). There is no evidence for Richard's detailed descriptions of Arnulf's ejection and his successor's election (Comtes I, p.303).

as rector inmeritus.[21] Abbot Hugh of St.Liguaire was also deposed in 1081 and, since a document in the archives of St. Maixent referred to his son, there is no need to look any further for his offence.[22] Although there is nothing to connect Guy-Geoffrey directly with these depositions, it is interesting to notice that when Bishop Isembert of Poitiers was suspended from his functions by Gregory VII the Pope committed the justice of the see to the Duke,[23] who may therefore have been involved on other occasions. In any case a comparison with what is known about such affairs in other French provinces suggests that it is improbable that the deposition of these men could have been achieved without the co-operation of the secular ruler; while, if the secular ruler had objected, some correspondence would be bound to appear in Gregory's Register.[24] It may surely also be

---

21. A Vendôme charter (Cartul.Saintongeais, no.23) of 1068 refers to Archembaldo archiepiscopo iam deposito, which corrects the view that he resigned. (Gams, Series Episcoporum, p.519); [illegible]. For Boso see Cartul. Baigne no.16, Chron.St.Maixent (p.408), and Cartul.St. Jean d'Angély nos. 131, 349.

22. Chron.St.Maixent (p.407). Cf. Chartes St. Maixent no.147 and introd. (pp. lxxviii-ix). St. Liguaire was a daughter-house of St. Maixent.

23. Register (ed. Caspar, pp.155-6), 16 November 1074.

24. Cf. the forceful letters of Gregory to King Philip and the episcopi Francie in 1074 on the state of the clergy with others of a similar tone (op.cit, pp.105-6, 129-30, 378-80). Fliche (La Réforme grégorienne II, 166-7, 234 n.3) emphasized the Norman Duke's concern with reform but overlooked that of the Duke of Aquitaine.

assumed that Guy-Geoffrey - unlike many other contemporary rulers - was prepared to acknowledge simony as an impediment to spiritual office for, even at the beginning of the century, his father had deposed a man who obtained the abbey of Charroux per simoniacam heresim.[25]

However, there are cases in which the Duke can be far more directly connected with reforming measures. For instance, the decision of the canons of St. Hilaire to exclude the sons of priests and clerks from membership of their chapter was drawn up in the Duke's name;[26] and from henceforth the sons of married clergy do not seem to have had much chance of advancement in Aquitaine.[27] On the same occasion Guy-Geoffrey apparently recognised the ecclesiastical claim that spiritual office ought not to be held by a layman for, instead of the title of Abbot of St. Hilaire which all his predecessors had assumed since the time of William Tête

---

25. Above Part I, Chap. II, n.66.

26. Docs.St.Hilaire no.91, from an original still preserved in the Archives of la Vienne (G.490). This is the only one of Guy-Geoffrey's charters known to have been sealed (with an applied seal).

27. Cf. the case of Hugh of St. Liguiare mentioned above, with that of the married archdeacon Isembert, whose ambitions to become Bishop of Poitiers were thwarted by the Abbot of St. Cyprien (ms.lat.10122, fo.47v - marginal note in contemporary hand; Cartul.St.Cyprien no.201). The son of Guy-Geoffrey's chancellor, who was a canon of St. Hilaire, did not become a clerk; but on the other hand in the 1080's the son of a priest might still expect to inherit his father's benefice (Appendix II, no. 3); cf. pp 230, n. 168.

d'Etoupe,[28] he was referred to as gratia Dei Aquitanorum dux et abbas - quantum laico licet - ecclesię beatissimi patroni nostri Hylarii.[29] From this time none of the Poitevin Dukes was ever again given the title of Abbot in St. Hilaire documents.

There is also a considerable amount of evidence indicating that Guy-Geoffrey fulfilled papal prohibitions against the secular tenure of churches, although this can hardly have been popular with his vassals whose ancestors had long ago received such property in benefice.[30] Between 1058 and 1073 Guy-Geoffrey only renounced the tenure of one church, which he gave to St. Jean d'Angély;[31] from his foundation of Montierneuf in 1076 such grants increased[32] and he gave a church to Maillezais in 1077,[33] a church and its parish to St.Maixent some time before 1083,[34] half a church to the nuns of Notre-

---

28. There are only three cases of the Dukes not being given the title abbas in St. Hilaire documents before this renunciation (Docs. nos. 65, 72, 79).

29. Cf. n.26, above.

30. Fliche (op.cit. II, pp. 173, 178-89), for papal legislation.

31. Cartul.St.Jean no.3.

32. The Duke's original foundation did not include any churches (Chartes Cluny, nos. 3495, 3506), but the Viscount of Aunay renounced churches held from Guy-Geoffrey (below, n.39).

33. Lacurie, Hist.de Maillezais (pp. 218-20).

34. Chartes St.Maixent no.139.

Dame at Saintes[35] and, when he returned the church of Quinçay to the canons of St.Hilaire, he referred to his parents' "sin" in holding it.[36] Not content with renouncing what he held himself he removed St.Eutrope de manu laicali and gave it to Cluny,[37] and St. Serenus (de) possessione militum;[38] it seems also that he forced some of his vassals - the Viscount of Aunay is a case in point - to part with churches and their revenues which, in spite of the risk of sin, they were quite prepared to keep.[39]

Guy-Geoffrey did not accept every claim made by the Church - he did not for instance submit obediently to the dissolution of his marriage with Aldiardis, as some historians

---

35. Cartul...Saintes no. 95. This cannot, however, be dated accurately.

36. Docs.St.Hilaire no. 92. This is undated, but can probably be placed after the document mentioned in n.26 because the Duke is not given the abbatial title.

37. Chartes Cluny no. 3580, 11 Jan. 1081.

38. Besly (pp. 467-8).

39. The Viscount "renounced" the church of St. Paul in Poitiers, and three other churches to Montierneuf: all were held from the Bishop of Poitiers and then from the Count a quo totum procedebat (AHP, vol.44 nos. 4 and 11 - in part). After Guy-Geoffrey's death the Viscount brought a querimonia claiming that the Duke had forced him to give up these churches (ms.lat.12685, fo.155v).

have supposed;[40] and he certainly did not renounce all secular authority over the Church in Aquitaine. It is quite clear that appointments to all religious houses of which he was patron had to be made with his approval, even if great care was taken to provide suitable candidates;[41] two surviving notices show that the Duke was even present at the act of election of the Abbot of Maillezais.[42] There is less information about episcopal elections at this period; but again there can be little doubt that even when the election was made in a council,[43] the Duke's consent was needed, because

---

40. Richard (Comtes, I. p. 319, 321 n.2), Fliche (op.cit. II, p.164 n.1). Richard spoke of a "morganatic marriage" (?) after the "separation" by Gregory. But no source (eg. the Chron.St.Maixent, which mentioned Guy-Geoffrey's earlier separations) mentions a divorce, and in 1075, after Gregory's supposed separation (Register, pp.125-6, 126-8), Aldiardis and the Duke made a grant to the monks of Vendôme (Cartul.Saintongeais no.29; cf. Besly, p.379 - grant of Ste. Gemme to la Chaise-Dieu; above pp.131-6 for the minority of Aldiardis' son). Schieffer (Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich... p.91) was sure "dass es nicht zu Scheidung kam".

41. Above nn. 8-9. Martin of Montierneuf described him as patronus of these establishments. Guy-Geoffrey also seems to have induced Ansegisus of Marmoutier to become Abbot of St. Maixent (Chartes St. Maixent, p.lxxxvii; below, p.175).

42. Hist.de Maillezais (pp.209-10): Aquitanorum principe Gosfredo et comite Pictavorum concedente; (cf. pp.587-8).

43. As in the case of Simon and Rannulf, Bishops of Agen and Saintes (Chron.St.Maixent, p.408) and of Amatus to Bordeaux after Guy-Geoffrey's death (below nn.64-5).

it is otherwise difficult to account for a reference from the minority of Guy-Geoffrey's son that an appointment was made nolente comite.[44] Besides, the appointments made between 1058-86 do not suggest candidates who were in any way unacceptable to Guy-Geoffrey: Goscelin, who became Archbishop of Bordeaux, was already treasurer of St. Hilaire (an office in the gift of the Duke);[45] Bishop Simon of Agen was a canon of the same establishment and does not seem to have been a local candidate;[46] while Goderannus who became Bishop of Saintes had already been elected Abbot of Maillezais in the Duke's presence.[47]

Guy-Geoffrey was responsible for the dissolution of the chapter of St. Nicolas which his mother had founded in Poitiers, and he gave all its property and revenues to Montierneuf.[48] After his death the legate Amatus deplored the Duke's action as secular intervention in ecclesiastical affairs but his

---

44. Below, n.65.

45. Docs.St.Hilaire no.81, a.1058 shows him as treasurer. The date of his appointment to the archbishopric of Bordeaux is not known exactly because it depends on the date of Archibald's deposition (n.21 above) which is also unknown. The first reference to him as Archbishop occurs in a document of 1060 (Cartul.St.Seurin no.12).

46. Chron.St.Maixent (p.408), Chartes St.Maixent no. 244. He was buried at the monastery of Déols in Berry (RHF, XII, p. 456).

47. Above n.42.

48. Cartul.St.Nicolas no.6.

decision could not be reversed because there was no doubt that - as the Duke had complained - the canons had repeatedly refused to live in common.[49] This case is important because it bears out a point which can be deduced from other examples: that during Guy-Geoffrey's lifetime the Duke retained firm control over many matters which were later claimed to belong exclusively to an independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction.[50] There are various examples of his acting as a judge in disputes between two ecclesiastical parties for instance, for his presence in councils where such suits were being heard,[51] and even on one occasion for his refusal to implement any decisions concerning the forest of Sèvre made by the legate.[52]

---

49. Loc.cit. : - apostolici precepti reguleque tradicionis prevaricatores. Cf. no.8, for Amatus' judgment.

50. Below, nn. 70-75.

51. (i) He gave judgment with the legate Amatus in a council at Bordeaux in a dispute between the Abbots of St. Jean d'Angély and Charroux (Cartul.St.Jean no.100); (ii) he heard and confirmed the decision made by the legate in a dispute over the church of N-D de Soulac between the Abbots of Ste. Croix de Bordeaux and St. Sever (Cartul. Ste.Croix no.22). His presence at the 1081 council of Saintes is known from his grant of St.Eutrope to Cluny (above n.37).

52. Chartes St.Maixent no.163. The chronology of this dispute is not very clear, since the Abbot of St. Maixent claimed both in camera comitis and in a council at Charroux, and never obtained restitution of what he demanded. Perhaps he demanded too much: the revesticio 'within a stone's throw of certain crossroads' had been granted by William Aigret, (Chartes...no.108); but in Guy-Geoffrey's time the Abbot demanded the revesticio of the whole forest.

Moreover, where a judgment made in ecclesiastical assemblies was accepted, it seems to have been prudent to obtain a separate ratification from the Duke - this at least was done by the canons of St. Hilaire who had an agreement with the monks of Bourgueil (which had been reached in the council of Issoudun outside the Duke's domains) confirmed in Pictavensi curia.[53]

As in the time of William the Great councils held in Aquitaine were summoned to the cities under ducal control, to Poitiers, Bordeaux or Saintes, and on one occasion for the dedication of the abbey church at Charroux; but in other respects the series of councils held between 1074 and 1086[54] does not bear much resemblance to those held under

---

53. Docs.St.Hilaire no.103. This concerned the curtis of Vouzailles, which in the late ninth century belonged to the chapter of St.Hilaire, then passed into the possession of the Count and used to endow the monastery at Bourgueil (above Part I, Chap. I, n.67).

54. Two letters of Gregory VII which can be dated 10 Sept. and 16 Nov 1074 (Register, ed. Caspar, pp. 125-6, 155) show that a council had already taken place in Poitiers, although the St. Maixent chronicle (p.406) mentioned the first under the year 1075 (cf. Richard, Comtes I, pp. 317, 318 n.1, 320, nn.2-3). Fliche has variously dated this first council as 1074 (La Reforme Grégorienne II pp.147, n.2, 166, n.1), 1075 (Le Règne de Philippe Ier, pp.357-8) and 1076 (?) (Hist.de l'Eglise, vol.VIII, pp. 108-9, with a curious reference to Count Fulk of Poitiers). There are similar dating difficulties over another council held at Poitiers, probably from 15 Jan 1079 (Chron.St.Maixent, p.407; Docs.St.Hilaire no. 91) which has generally been dated 1078 (Fliche, La Réforme II, p.218 n.8, Hist. de l'Eglise VIII, p.93; Hefele-Leclercq, Hist.des Conciles p.229). A Councils was also held at Bordeaux in Oct. 1079 (Cartul.Ste.Croix no.22), and at Saintes in 1081 (above nn.37, 51) and 1083 (Chron.St.Maixent, p.408).

the auspices of William the Great. At this date the councils included clergy from outside Aquitaine,[55] indeed one of the reasons for the tenure of some of these councils in the duchy was to gain the protection of a ruler favourable to Church reform, who would not intimidate the clergy assembled from the regions under royal control.[56] The legates therefore dealt with affairs which did not concern the duchy at all - for instance the hearing of charges against the Archbishop of Tours[57] - as well as with matters of great general importance to the Church like the heresy of Berengar;[58] the councils were also summoned by the legates (sometimes at the Pope's command), who presided over the sessions.[59] And, even

---

55. Cf. below, n.57 for evidence for the presence of the Archbishop of Tours.

56. King Philip had tried to prevent the tenure of reforming councils (conventicula et quasi concilia ...Hugh of Flavigny, MGH, SS VIII p. 418).

57. Loc.cit. He undertook a filibustering campaign when his case came up. Fliche seems to have confused this with the council of 1100 (below nn.81-2) since he supposed that in 1078 the Count tried to keep the legates from the church of St.Hilaire (Réforme II, p.166).

58. Berengar made his submission at Bordeaux (Chron.St. Maixent, p.407).

59. ...concilium nostro praecepto congregatum (Register, ed. Caspar p.155). Cf. Hugh of Flavigny (loc.cit. p.443,449). Docs.St.Hilaire no.91 also refers to Gregory's decree being read by the legate. Fliche (op.cit. p.165) supposed that the only reference to the application of the papal decrees in France occurred in the life of St. Gautier de Pontoise.

though Guy-Geoffrey was undoubtedly present at some of these sessions,[60] his role as protector of the Church was a far more restricted one than his father's had been at the beginning of the century, when the Duke had presided over clergy from his own domains and apparently even taken the initiative in prosecuting the Manichean heretics in Aquitaine.[61]

DUCAL RELATIONS with the CHURCH after 1086.

During Guy-Geoffrey's lifetime there were numerous precedents for independent ecclesiastical action, but the clergy in Aquitaine had little opportunity of emancipation from secular control. The opportunity came with the minority of Guy-Geoffrey's son and the deaths of Goscelin Archbishop of Bordeaux, Bishops Isembert of Poitiers and Guy of Limoges in the same year as Guy-Geoffrey.[62] There can be little doubt that in two of the subsequent elections the papal legate, Amatus Bishop of Oloron, succeeded in diminishing the part played by the Duke in the appointment of Bishops to these sees, although even during his minority William did

---

60. The ceremonial confirmation of la Sauve-Majeure was made in the council at Bordeaux (Gallia II, instr. cols. 314-15).

61. Above, Part I, Chap. II, n.88.

62. Chron.St.Maixent (p.408) for the first two. In 1087 "Umbert" was recorded as Bishop of Limoges in the dating clause of a charter of St. Martin de Tulle (Cartul.Tulle no.105); in 1086 Guy was still referred to as Bishop (ibid. no.388). Although no. 404, dated 1088 also refers to Guy as Bishop, this must be an error.

not relinquish his rights without protest. This development can be seen at its most dramatic in the case of the archbishopric of Bordeaux, it is less obvious in the case of Poitiers; there is no relevant evidence for Limoges.[63]

After Goscelin's death Bordeaux was administered by Bishop Simon of Agen[64] and the see remained vacant for three years, until Amatus summoned a council to meet at Saintes in November 1089, where he was himself elected Archbishop nolente comite.[65] Apart from the question of the Duke's customary rights in the election there must have been a strong conflict of interests on this occasion: for the young Duke (or his advisers) the appointment to the see of Bordeaux had great political importance and the appointment of a Poitevin - Goscelin and his deposed predecessor Archibald were Poitevins - had obvious political advantages.[66] For the legate Amatus

---

63. Below nn. 64-9. For Limoges the only evidence is connected with the deposition of Bishop Umbert/Umbald (he is given both names).

64. Simone Agenensium episcopo locum Burdegalensis archiepiscopatus tenente (Cartul.St.Seurin no. 26, a. 1088).

65. Chron.St.Maixent (p.409). Cf. the reference to the same council (Chartes St.Maixent no.172): factum in quo Amatus Archiepiscopus Burdegale civitati datus est et elevatus nolente comite (from the original charter still in the Archives Départementales de la Vienne: fonds de la Société des antiquaires de l'Ouest, no.6).

66. Above pp.103-4, 174.

we may imagine on the other hand that the archbishopric was a just reward for long service in the cause of the Church - his co-legate Hugh of Die had gained the archbishopric of Lyons, while Amatus had to be content with the poor Gascon bishopric of Oloron.[67] But the Duke could do nothing to prevent the legate's elevation to Bordeaux. The appointment of the archdeacon Peter to Poitiers did not affront the secular authority in quite the same way, and the presence of many influential laymen in the city while Peter was iam a clero in episcopum electum suggests that Duke William's "minority council" may even have been consulted;[68] but at the same time Amatus' presence in the city (this was between September 1086 and February 1087, that is before Amatus became archbishop)[69] suggests that as papal legate he also had a part in the election.

The growing independence of ecclesiastical jurisdiction

---

67. For Amatus' career Degert's study ("Amat d'Oloron: un ouvrier de la réforme au XIe siècle", Revue des Questions Historiques, 1908) is still valuable. There is a considerable amount of evidence to prove that the legate used his position to enlarge the boundaries of his bishopric at the expense of that of Dax; and he was by no means popular, even in Gascony (RHF, XIV, pp.185 and 187).

68. There is no direct evidence for what happened at the election; but one document (Cartul.St.Nicolas no.8,) mentions the presence of the Bishop-elect, the legate Amatus, and many Poitevin magnates in Poitiers. It was surely therefore enacted at about the time of Peter's election since from a comparison with the election to the archbishopric it may be assumed that as legate Amatus would have insisted on taking part.

69. Bishop Peter was "ordained" bishop on 22 Feb. 1087 (Chron. St.Maixent, p.408), his predecessor died in 1086. The document cited n.68 refers to Duke William, and must be placed after Guy-Geoffrey's death in Sept.1086 (above, Chap. III, n.11).

in Aquitaine and the increase in appeals to Rome seem also to date from the time of William the Troubadour's minority; and, even though this was a process which followed naturally from the claims of the papacy and the centralisation of ecclesiastical institutions, it may surely still be connected in part with the political conditions of the region.[70] For instance in Amatus' confirmation of Guy-Geoffrey's ejection of the canons of St. Nicolas, the Duke's right as a layman to judge the case was questioned and his action deplored in retrospect.[71] Two causes célèbres of William's minority which were protracted beyond it show similar tendencies, for Abbot Geoffrey of Vendôme went straight to Rome to complain that Ebles of Châtelaillon had seized land belonging to his abbey with the connivance of the Duke, and the case was never submitted to secular judgment.[72] Similarly the clergy of Limoges during their dispute with Bishop Humbald never referred to the Duke: the clergy took their complaints to the Archbishop of Bourges, Humbald made a journey to Rome;

---

70. See Fliche (op.cit. II, p.261 n.2 and 262) on the effects of direct appeals to Rome. In 1080 Gregory VII gave the monks of St. Cyprien licentia to appeal direct to Rome in case of further exactions by the canons of the cathedral of Poitiers (Cartul.St.Cyprien, no.2); but the practice does not seem to have been usual in Guy-Geoffrey's time.

71. Document cited above n.68.

72. Cartul.Saintongeais...Vendôme no.37, and J-L nos.5516-57.

and the dispute was only settled when Pope Urban II pronounced Humbald's papal letters to be forgeries, and personally deposed the Bishop during his French journey of 1095-6.[73] At an earlier period the secular force of the Duke had been invoked to deal with disputes concerning the bishopric of Limoges,[74] and complaints of religious houses against the Duke could only be settled if he were willing to reach an agreement.[75]

During the years of William the Troubadour's maturity and the ten years in which his son ruled Aquitaine the Dukes frequently came into conflict with individual churchmen and in opposition to the Church. Contemporary ecclesiastical writers saw this development solely in personal terms of worldliness and immorality;[76] but, although one of William

---

73. C. de Lasteyrie (L'Abbaye de St.Martial, pp.429-31) for the letter to the Archbishop of Bourges, Chroniques de St.Martial (ed. Duplès-Agier, pp.186-7, from an account contained in ms.lat. 11019) and Geoffrey of Vigeois' chronicle (Labbe, II, p.295). R. Crozet studied Urban's journey in detail, ("Le voyage d'Urbain II en France (1095-6)", Annales du Midi 1937; "Le voyage d'Urbain II et ses négociations avec le clergé de France", RH 1937).

74. Above, pp.64-6, 121.

75. pp.175-6. In 1098 a dispute over a church between St.Maixent and St.Jean d'Angély was heard and judged in a wholly ecclesiastical assembly, and never submitted to the Duke for ratification (Cartul.St.Jean no.341; cf. later records of the decisions of the legate Gerald of Angoulême RHF, XIV pp. 770-74).

76. Above, Chap. III, nn.4-5.

the Troubadour's surviving poems contains lines which could hardly have pleased any clerk,[77] and although this Duke undoubtedly fell far short of his father's standards of piety, this chronicler's comments make no allowance for the lack of co-operation between Duke and clergy and the independent position demanded by the Church in the duchy. It is also possible for the historian to exaggerate the situation: both Dukes after all remained the protectors of the religious houses in the duchy and showed special favours to some of them.[78] It is noticeable, however, that the older foundations under ducal patronage no longer continued to be liberally endowed[79], and that by the beginning of the twelfth century the abbey of Cluny seemed to have lost much of its great

---

77. Chansons, (ed. Jeanroy, no.V): "Farai un vers" ... See the second stanza.

78. Above, pp.153, 160 for William the Troubadour's abolition of the toll established at la Réole, and his son's protection of St.Benoît-du-Sault. Both Dukes showed special favours to Ste. Gemme, a priory of Chaise-Dieu, which was one of the few establishments to have the privilege of being answerable in judicial proceedings only before the Duke (Besly, p.411 - four grants, pp. 463-4). Besly's edition abbreviated the cartulary entries: the copies of the Collection Baluze (vol.38) are far longer.

79. The majority of documents now concern definition of ducal rights or the settlement of exactions made by the Dukes' servants (Cartul.St.Cyprien, no.321; Cartul.St.Jean nos. 476, 491, 498; Cartul.Saintes no. 78; cf. Besly pp. 438, 442-3, 462 - Ste. Radegonde de Poitiers).

influence in Aquitaine.[80] The events of the council held in Poitiers in 1100 give some idea of the changed position of the Duke for, apart from the plans for the crusading expedition, the legates seem chiefly to have summoned this assembly with the intention of pronouncing King Philip's excommunication for adultery, and to have chosen Poitiers because it lay outside the direct range of royal influence;[81] and in spite of Duke William's own objections to the carrying out of the sentence, he could not prevent its being pronounced.[82] From this period onwards it is rare to find any reference to the Duke in the councils held in the duchy,

---

80. No grants were made to Cluny by the Dukes during this period, although William the Troubadour helped to establish the Cluniac Henry as Abbot of St.Jean d'Angély in 1104 (Cartul.St.Jean no.337). At this period the Burgundian abbey seems to have been attempting to accomplish the legal subjection of houses which had formerly only had loose ties with it. Cf. the way in which the Abbot of St. Cyprien resisted one such attack on his independence (AA.SS. 14 April, p.233).

81. Chron.St.Maixent (p.420). Hugh of Flavigny (op.cit. pp. 492-3). The account of the council in the Vita of St. Bernard of Tiron is far more dramatic: its tone seems untrustworthy, since the author undoubtedly wished to emphasize that Bernard was a willing candidate for martyrdom on this occasion (AA.SS, see n.80).

82. The excommunication is mentioned in the St. Maixent chronicle (p.420). Cf. above n.57 for Fliche's confusion with a council held in the time of Guy-Geoffrey.

although there is no evidence for open hostility apart from this example.[83]

The deterioration of the situation was most severe in the relations between the episcopate and the Duke, probably as a result of difficulties over the method of election and disputes over individual appointments. There was for instance a mysterious episode in 1097 when William the Troubadour held Archbishop Amatus captive for a short while.[84] During the period in which the same Duke was excommunicated - and the cause of his excommunication has never been precisely established[85] - he drove Bishop Peter from Poitiers;[86] while

---

83. The independence of the Church may, it seems to me, have been promoted by Urban II's triumphant progress through Aquitaine, for there are no references to the Duke in the sources which record the Pope's presence (see the articles by Crozet, cited n.73).

84. Chron.St.Maixent (p.413). Degert ("Amat d'Oloron", p.82) supposed that the year was 1096 because of an error made by the chronicler over the date of Easter; but in the early part of 1096 Amatus was in Urban II's retinue in France (Richard, Comtes I, p. 415 n.3). Nothing is known of the repercussions of this affair, which must surely have been serious. Urban had excommunicated a layman for imprisoning the Bishop of Arras on his way to a council (J-L, nos. 5584-85).

85. According to the St.Maixent chronicler this lasted from 1114-17 (pp.425,426); William of Malmesbury - a rather doubtful authority (Gesta Regum II, pp.510-11)-supposed that it was for his adultery,which is possible in view of his reputation; but no local source throws any light on the problem.

86. Chron.St.Maixent and William of Malmesbury (loc.cit); cf. the Vita of St.Bernard of Tiron (op.cit. p.232).

when Bishop Peter of Saintes incurred the Duke's displeasure, he only found favour again when Abbot Geoffrey of Ebreuil threw himself on his knees before William as the ducal party returned from a pilgrimage to Notre-Dame du Puy in Auvergne.[87] Difficulties over appointments can to some extent be inferred from the vacancies which occurred during the period: Bordeaux was vacant from c.1101-1104 on the death of Amatus,[88] Poitiers was twice allowed to remain vacant also (1115-17 and 1123-24);[89] the part played by the Duke can also be deduced from the way in which William the Toulousain forced the acceptance of his candidates to numerous bishoprics during the period in which William the Toulousain supported the antipope Anacletus.[90]

---

87. ...pax inter episcopum et comitem reformata est. William iamdictum episcopum gravi odio infectabatur, but there is no evidence for the cause of his odium (copy of the cartulary of Ebreuil in ms.lat. 12754, p.414).

88. Chron.St.Maixent (p.421) gave 1101 as the year of Amatus' death and his successor's appointment, but a charter of St.Jean d'Angély dated 1102 (Cartul. no.468) refers to the vacancy of the see, while in 1104 another charter of the same house referred to Arnald as Archbishop-elect (no.337).

89. A successor to Peter was only made in 1117, although his death took place in 1115 (Chron.St.Maixent, p.426). The vacancy on the death of the next Bishop is twice mentioned in dating-clauses: nō verit enim Guillelmo Gislēberto mortuo sedes vacua remanserat (ms.nouv.acq.lat. 2414, Cartulary of Fontevrault: fos. 52v, 57r); Cf. Chron.St.Maixent (pp.430-31).

90. Below, nn. 91-6.

After the double papal election of February 1130 the legate in Aquitaine (Bishop Gerald of Angoulême) at first prevailed upon most of the clergy, the Duke, and the Archbishop of Tours, to accept Anacletus as the rightful Pope;[91] it was only gradually that the Duke and legate were left in a position of isolation, unconvinced by the entreaties of the Duke of Burgundy or of St. Bernard of Clairvaux.[92] William the Toulousain drove out the canons of St. Hilaire from Poitiers, ejected Bishops William of Poitiers and Eustorgius of Limoges and replaced them by Peter of Châtellerault and Abbot Rannulf of le Dorat;[93] when Archbishop Arnald of Bordeaux died Gerald was elevated to the see violentia comitis, and in spite of the protests of the legitimate bishops of the diocese.[94] None of these clergy were

---

91. G. Pariset ("L'Etablissement de la primatie de Bourges", Annales du Midi 1902, p.297, nn.2-3). This article is not written so exclusively from the point of view of St. Bernard as Vacandard's Vie de St. Bernard. Cf. the chronological table in Bernard de Clairvaux (Commission de l'Histoire de l'Ordre de Cîteaux III, pp.581-5).

92. A letter to the Duke of Aquitaine in the name of the Duke of Burgundy and addressing him as carne propinquus et corde amicus was probably written by St.Bernard (ep. 128 of the Saint's letters, PL vol. 182). Cf. below, n.98

93. Historia...Bituricensium (Labbe, p.83 - with faulty pagination, p.93); Vita S.Bernardi (PL, vol. 185, col. 287); Arnulf of Lisieux (Tractatus de Schismate... PL vol. 201, cols. 190-91); Geoffrey of Vigeois (op.cit., p.301).

94. Historia...Bituricensium (loc.cit); Arnulf (col.192); Vita S.Bernardi (col.288). See Pariset (op.cit., pp.313-16).

able to enter their cities again until after St. Bernard's spectacular conversion of the Duke at Parthenay, and the latter's formal submission to the legate of the orthodox Pope Innocent II.[95]

The schism was of course a period of crisis for the duchy; but the events which took place then throw a certain amount of light on the powers enjoyed by the Dukes in more normal times, for the excellence of ducal relations with the Church up to the late eleventh century[96] conceal the degree of power at their disposal, which seems only to be revealed when William the Toulousain came into headlong conflict with the majority of the clergy in his duchy. Although no Duke of Aquitaine ever exercised such a stringent control over his clergy as the Dukes of Normandy, at the period when the Duke of Aquitaine was in the forefront of the secular rulers

---

95. Vita (cols.289-90). This must have taken place before (Cartul.N-D...Saintes nos. 213,25), and before St. Bernard went to rally Germany to Innocent's cause in Feb-March 1135 (Vacandard, op.cit. p.587; Pariset, p.313). There is no means of dating it exactly.

96. This is particularly striking in comparison with other regions of France. Eg. the Count of Anjou in 1065 imprisoned the Bishop of Angers, threatened the Archbishop of Tours if he should consecrate the Bishop-elect of LeMans, and forced the monks of Marmoutier to accept his candidate as Abbot (Halphen, Anjou pp.138-41) Cf. the evidence for the Norman Duke's disputes with the Archbishop of Dol, and for the Count of Flanders' with the Bishop of Thérouanne (Register of Gregory VII, lib. IV, ep. 17; IX, epp. 33-4).

who accepted reform this was probably a matter of personal preference; even if Guy-Geoffrey weakened the ducal position in this regard[97] it still remained substantially true in the early twelfth century that non erat in Aquitania qui posset resistere principi.[98]

---

97. William the Conqueror for instance did not allow the legates to enter Normandy (Haskins, Norman Institutions, p.30 n.118, cf. 36-9). See also Imbart de la Tour (Hist.des Elections episcopales..p.396).

98. Vita S.Bernardi (col.286). Cf. the argument-principis error multos involvit-in the letter cited n.92 above.

CHAPTER V.

THE RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OF THE DUKES OF AQUITAINE (1030-1137).

THE DUCAL DEMESNE.

The power of the Dukes of Aquitaine was based upon the possession of territorial resources and the enjoyment of rights and revenues, which in many cases are known only from chance references in the charters and notices of religious establishments—and generally only then when renunciations were made, or the exact nature of the Duke's *consuetudines* was defined.[1] For these reasons it is impossible to make a survey of the lands which constituted the ducal demesne in 1137 when Louis married Eleanor, or to make a complete analysis of the ducal income; but, on the other hand, the material available does indicate the type of revenues collected in the Duke's name and the nature of the lands which composed the demesne even if, like an iceberg, only a fraction is revealed to the historian.[2] But it is in any case clear that the resources of the Dukes of Aquitaine before 1137 have been ridiculously underestimated: one account of the demesne makes no reference to the cities of Poitiers, Bordeaux and Saintes - certainly the most important

---

1. Below, *passim* ; cf. Appendix II, pp. 273.

2. The political changes which took place after 1137 make it dangerous to use late twelfth century material to interpret earlier conditions, unless some connexions can be traced (below, Cf. nn. 11-12).

economic units at the Duke's disposal.[3]

After the acquisition of Gascony Bordeaux was the capital of the Duke's new domains, so that his three chief residences became the palace or aula comitis in Poitiers,[4] his turris in Bordeaux,[5] and his dwelling in Saintes-the city which linked the old and new parts of the duchy.[6] These three cities became the administrative centres of the duchy;[7] but the first two were also of considerable commercial importance and there can be no doubt that their control was a source of financial profit to the Duke, as well as being politically essential to him.

---

3. Petit-Dutaillis (Feudal Monarchy in France and England, p.170). He listed the demesne as consisting of the provostships of Niort, Benon, la Rochelle, Fontenay-le-Comte, St. Jean d'Angély "and several scattered holdings". For centres of local administration before 1137 (below, pp. 228-32).

4. ...auctorizatae sunt et confirmate donationes istae a comite Pictavensi...Pictavis in aula comitis...(Cartuls. Bas-Poitou, p.15, a. 1092). Cf. Chartes St.Maixent, no. 150 (1081). The earliest reference to the aula at Poitiers occurred in 989 (Besly, p.275); Ademar called it the Count's palatium (Chron. p.182).

5. Chartes bordelaises...St.Florent, no.7 (1080); cf. a reference in a document of 1075 to his camera (Appendix II, no. 10).

6. The "palace" which Louis VII had in Saintes must surely have been on the site of a dwelling formerly inhabited by the Dukes of Aquitaine (Cartul.N-D Saintes no.87, a. 1145).

7. Below, pp.228-9.The Dukes never had the same power in Limoges at this period.

In Poitiers the Duke derived considerable profit from everyday commercial transactions, which seem to have been controlled in his name unless part of the revenue was directly abandoned.[8] For instance even before 1058 his servants levied tolls on all goods entering the city, and exacted a sales-tax (venda) of 1d on every measure of salt exposed for sale.[9] The lucrative nature of the salt-trade - salt is the only commodity about which anything much is known for this period - is apparent from the number of concessions connected with its sale and collection which religious houses claimed by comital grant;[10] otherwise the volume of normal trade in Poitiers

---

8. For the commercial importance of Poitiers see D. Claude (Topographie und Verfassung...pp.136-45) and J.Boussard (Le Gouvernement d'Henri II., pp.113-14).

9. This is known because Agnes and William Aigret gave some of their dues to the canons of St. Nicolas (Cartul.St. Nicolas no.1; cf. no.5). A grant by William the Toulousain to Montierneuf in 1126 (AHP, 44, pp. 21-5) proves that the Duke also collected a tax on salt. The customs granted to St. Nicolas are the same as those inserted in the Droicts de prevosté which, although only existing in a late ms., probably go back to the 1120's. (AHP, vol.44, p.53 n.2). If other articles in this ms. concerning the comital dues could be connected with the period of the independent Dukes there would be even more striking proof of their power in the city (op.cit., passim; Claude, pp. 142-45).

10. Previous n. * The monks of St.Cyprien had in their archives an interpolated charter of William the Great (a.1003), supposedly granting them consuetudinem de sale quam malam rapinam vocant. This is not contained in the cartulary copy (ms.lat. 10122, fo. 117v, ed. Cartul. St. Cyprien no. 513 (mod)). The "original" is not of the eleventh century.

can only be deduced from references of the period after the death of William the Toulousain.[11] However, it is clear that there was at least one flourishing fair held in the city even in the time of Guy-Geoffrey, since in 1081 the Duke's venda for one day alone was considered sufficient compensation by the canons of the cathedral for the loss of a church to the monks of Montierneuf.[12]

There is little evidence for commerce in Saintes or Bordeaux (Saintes was probably never important as a trading-centre);[13] but Bordeaux must have been important as a port even in the mid-eleventh century.[14] Again the Duke seems to have controlled the commercial traffic, since he granted

---

11. Cf. n.9. In 1185 Henry II could grant the nuns of Fontevrault £100 [illegible]. annually from the cornmarket (Claude, op.cit. n.1426, cf. n. 1427).

12. ...vendam totius et solius diei Cenae Domini (AHP, vol. 44, p.11 from Archives Dép. Vienne, fonds Montierneuf-carton 6. no.9 - edited in part only). Claude considered that this was a separate fair from the later feriam de Pictavi que est in Quadragesima (op.cit., pp.139-40, nn. 1411,1418-19); but the wording of Guy-Geoffrey's grant suggests that Maundy Thursday was only one of the days (et solius, diei) on which the fair was held - i.e. if held on the previous days it must have been the Lenten fair referred to by Richard in 1187 (Claude, loc.cit.).

13. The earliest evidence for commercial organisation in Bordeaux given by C. Jullian (Hist.de Bordeaux, pp.139-42) only dates from c.1200. From the evidence cited above (nn.9-10) it seems that the centre of the salt-trade was Poitiers, although much of it was produced near Saintes.

14. See the reference in the Compostella pilgrims' guide (ed. J. Vieillard, pp. 78-80).

the monks of La Sauve the right to one load of salt free of taxes each year;[15] and in any case there was sufficient circulation for the same monks to hold an annual fair and to desire the ducal protection for all those travelling to it throughout his domains.[16]

The financial advantages, which the Duke gained from the possession of these cities and from the control of trade, were completed by his control of the issue and alteration of the coinage which he could call in at will, although the first evidence for the use of this expedient dates from 1103 - no doubt connected with the loss of William the Troubadour's pecunia at Heraclea.[17] It has sometimes been supposed that the Dukes of Aquitaine frittered away this regalian right by grants of moneta to Cluny at Niort and St.Jean d'Angély and to the nuns of Notre-Dame at Saintes;[18] but these grants

---

15. Gallia (II, instr. col.274). The load was to consist of 10 modios.

16. Appendix II, nos.11,13.

17. Above, pp.141-2; Chron.St.Maixent (p.421).Other alterations were made in 1112 and 1120 (op.cit., pp.425,429). It has always been assumed that these were successive devaluations (Richard, Comtes I, p.486); cf. the classifications of Dieudonné, (Monnaies féodales francaises, p.335) and Engel and Serrure (Traité de Numismatique II, p.431) made on the same assumption, although in at least one early twelfth century document (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély, no.476) the more recent coins are described as optimae monetae (all seem to have been pictavenses).

18. ...moneta de Nivort...de mea potestate; moneta (m) tota (m) in villa Engeliaco (Chartes Cluny nos. 2737, 2855); Cartul.N-D Saintes no.1. (cf. no.77). See Richard (Comtes I, pp. 216 n.4, 247, 287) and Luchaire (Manuel des Institutions monarchiques, p.270).

seem to have consisted of the dues which would normally have been owed to the Duke, for at Saintes the ducal prepositus was in charge of the operation of calling in, weighing and striking coin;[19] and a similar arrangement may have existed at the mints given to Cluny since no individual coins from St.Jean d'Angély or Niort have ever been found.[20] It is true of course that, although the Duke controlled the coinage of Poitou, Saintonge and the Bordelais,[21] he did not have a monopoly of the coinage throughout his domains. The

---

19. fractio monete mittebatur ad opus comitis, nullo vivente homine ibi participante, praeter comitem et prepositum suum. All justice connected with the mint also pertained to the Count (Cartul.Saintes nos. 51-3), although the nuns had the right to four nummi from XXI solidis in moneta fabricatis (no.46). Boussard referred to these notices as being 1138-74(?) (Le gouvernement, p.321), although clearly referring to clientes Willelmi filii Guidonis comitis i.e. to the years 1086-1126. The arrangement may of course have dated back to Guy-Geoffrey's time.

20. None are listed in the catalogues cited in n.17, although one documentary reference mentions solidi de pecunia S. Ioannis (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély, no.270 - c. a. 1076). One of the Dukes ordained that the Cluniac mints were only to issue coin identical to that issued at Poitiers (Chartes Cluny no. 3432; it can only be dated by St.Hugh's tenure of the office of Abbot i.e., 1049-1109).

21. In Bordeaux coins were struck in the Duke's own name (C. Jullian, Hist.Bordeaux, pp.121-2, Dieudonné, op.cit. p.216). The Cluny document cited in n.20 suggests that the most important mint was at Poitiers; Countess Agnes gave decimam mei monetagii in moneta Pictavensi to the canons of St. Nicolas (Cartul. no.1) Cf. the grant made by Duke Richard II of Normandy to Fécamp, (Haskins, Norman Institutions, p.256).

Counts of Angoulême, for instance, took over the mint in their capital before the Counts of Poitou acquired the ducal title, and continued to strike coin throughout this period;[22] on the periphery of the duchy the Viscount of Béarn minted coin at Morlaas,[23] while the Abbot of St.Martial had minting-rights at Limoges.[24] But at the beginning of the twelfth century the ducal coinage undoubtedly circulated throughout the duchy; whereas the others were only of local importance; for in Angoulême a prepositus paid 1000 solidos Pictavensium pro accaptamento,[25] and even in Béarn the Poitevin and local coinage seem occasionally to have been used side by side for important transactions.[26]

---

22. Engel et Sellvre (op.cit, p. 425).

23. Op.cit. (p.436).

24. Op.cit. (p.419).

25. HPCE (p.28). Since the prepositus could not raise the money it was paid for him by a canon, civis Engolismensis, militari progenei ortus.

26. Cartul.St.Vincent de Lucq (no.16). In the early twelfth century the Abbot of la Sauve-Majeure paid sums in Poitevin coin (Bordeaux, Bibliotheque Municipale, ms. 769, pp. 30, 38; cf. pp. 51, 65), and the monks of Barbezieux were to pay their dues to the canons of St.Seurin de Bordeaux in Poitevin money (Archives Nationales, LL 1419, fo.6). The Archbishop of Compostella, when he crossed the Pyrenees had sol.Pictavienses as well as Milanese, Toulousain and Byzantine coins (Hist.Compostellana, España Sagrada 20, p. 272). On the circulation of coinage in general at this period see Dieudonné (op.cit. p.15).

Because of their military and political importance it is possible to enumerate a number of castles which formed part of the ducal demesne during the period 1030-1137, although there is very little information about the rights enjoyed by the Dukes in individual castles which - like the cities already mentioned - were probably also sources of revenue.[27]

Near Poitiers the only castle to remain in the Duke's hands in 1137 was Montreuil-Bonnin;[28] but on the Poitevin coast Talmont was brought increasingly within ducal control from the time of William Aigret onwards. At one period it was administered by ducal custodes,[29] then the Duke had his own prepositus in the castle,[30] its terragium was divided between the lord of Talmont and the Duke;[31] while Suger's account of Louis VII's acquisition of Aquitaine leaves the historian in no doubt that it was considered one of the key

---

27. Below, nn. 42-4.

28. It was administered by a comital prepositus (below n.178).

29. Above, p.115.

30. Below, n.180.

31. The division is known because Pippin of Talmont gave his part of the terragium in foresta to Abbot Alexander of Ste.Croix (Cartul Talmont no.129).

castles to the control of Poitou.[32] Mervent and Surgères were never enfieffed;[33] Fontenay-le-Comte seems to have returned to the Duke after a period in which it was held by the Viscount of Thouars.[34] Mauzé also seems to have stayed under ducal control;[35] while William the Troubadour built a new castle at Benon in the heart of the ducal forest.[36] Melle and Niort - both of which were places to which the Duke's vassals were summoned - seem also to have formed part of the ducal demesne,[37] and the castle of Chizé also came

---

32. It was usurped occasione custodie (Vita Ludovici, ed. Molinier, p.154).

33. Guy-Geoffrey confirmed a grant to Maillezais in castro Matrevensi, camera comitis (Arcère, Hist.la Rochelle, p.667, a. 1074). The monks of St. Maixent were accommodated in aula comitis et camera Surgeriis (Chartes St. Maixent no. 164; cf. Cartul.saintongeais...Vendôme, no.23).

34. William the Toulousain appointed this castle for the hearing of a dispute between the Abbot of Maillezais and Peter Tronellus (Besly, p.464). For its tenure by the Viscount, Chartes saintongeaises...St.Florent no.7 (June 1083).

35. Below, nn. 148-9, 151-4.

36. ...apud castrum novum meum Benaum (Cartul.saintongeais... Vendôme no.22, a. 1096).

37. Chartes St. Maixent no.91 refers to the Duke's "residence" in the castle of Melle (1030-33); a ducal charter of 1107 factum est ...apud Niortum (Champollion-Figeac, Documents Historiques inédits II, fasc ii no.4). The original is still in the Archives of la Vienne, fonds Montierneuf.

into the Duke's hands at the end of the eleventh century.[38] In the Saintonge Pons was the most important ducal castle, at least after the expulsion of the Angevins from the county;[39] Guy-Geoffrey also had the castle of Brouage opposite the island of Oléron,[40] but there is nothing to show whether he was responsible for its building. Since some of these castles became the centre of ducal _prepositurae_ by the beginning of the twelfth century it can be assumed that these at least were among the most important assets of his demesne after the three ducal cities.[41] Presumably he derived revenue from tolls (as at Vouvant and Mauzé in the time of William Aigret),[42] from the exercise of judicial rights (as William the Fat did in and around Melle),[43] and from numerous other _consuetudines_.[44]

---

38. Below, n. 182.

39. It was still in ducal hands when attacked by Count Vulgrinus of Angoulême shortly before the death of William the Tolousain (_HPCE_, p.40).

40. In 1078 the monks of Vendôme found Guy-Geoffrey in this castle (_Cartul.Saintongeais_ no.34).

41. Below, pp.228-32.

42. William Aigret gave the monks of St. Maixent half the _pedagium_ of the castle of Vouvant, and that of the villa of St. Maixent (_Chartes St. Maixent_ no.108; cf. no.145). On his deathbed he left the canons of St. Nicolas _pedagium quod uxor sua apud Mausiacum tenebat_ (_Cartul.St.Nicolas_ no.1).

43. Above n.37.

44. Below, pp.203-6.

The Duke's territorial resources included large areas of forest in both Poitou and Saintonge which(in spite of the amount of land brought into cultivation in the eleventh century) were still extensive in 1137.[45] These forests varied in character from the rolling, wooded country around the castle of Vouvant to the sandy wastes of the foresta maritima on the coast of the Saintonge.[46] But whatever their character they were used by the Dukes for hunting for, although there is no reference to any ducal forest laws for Aquitaine,[47] Suger's account of the importance attached to William the Toulousain's white falcons suggests that the Dukes of Aquitaine devoted as much time to this pastime as any other medieval prince;[48] and this seems proved by the sites of some of their

---

45. The ducal forest is not taken into account by any historian dealing with the Duke's resources.

46. For the foresta maritima-the region around Marennes - see Cartul.saintongeais..Vendôme no. 16 and Grasilier (Cartuls inédits de la Saintonge, I introd. p.xxi). There is a vast difference in the physical characteristics of these regions.

47. For instance the Viscount of Thouars also had large forest-reserves in his viscounty (Cartuls Bas-Poitou, pp. 24-5). Cf. the situation in Normandy (Haskins, Norman Institutions, pp. 48, 283); and see Prou, "La forêt en Angleterre et en France" (Journal des Savants 1915, esp. pp. 350-54).

48. King Louis super retentionem falconum alborum (qui dicuntur girfaldi) Guillelmi ducis gravissime cohercuisset William of Lezay (Vita Ludovici, ed. Molinier, p.154). Peter of Maillezais referred to the ducal hunting-expeditions around Maillezais in the late tenth century (Labbe, II, p. 223).

castles, such as Benon in the heart of a forest,[49] and by their efforts to keep their forest-areas intact. Apart from the case of the forest of Sèvre which has already been mentioned,[50] the Dukes never seem to have fulfilled the grant of the forest of Argenson (or Benon) which William the Fat made to St.Maixent during his captivity;[51] and it is perhaps significant that William the Troubadour obliged the canons of Ste. Radegonde to give him part of their forest of Vouillé so that he would take their possessions into his protection.[52]

Near Poitiers the Dukes held the forest de Fonte comitis until the last independent Duke founded an abbey on part of it;[53] there was also a large forest-region stretching from Vouvant to Maillezais and Mervent,[54] and another near Talmont

---

49. Below n.56.

50. Above, Chap. IV, n.52.

51. Chartes St.Maixent no.93; cf. nn 36, 56.

52. Besly (pp. 442-3). The same Duke took the forest of Essouvert into his special protection, although the monks of St. Jean d'Angély had held it since a grant by William Fier-à-bras given in 991 (Cartul.St.Jean nos. 7, 491 - between 1104-1126).

53. Gallia II,(instr. col.370). In 1149 the region was called the foresta de fonte comitis(Rédet, Dict. topographique de la Vienne, p.170).

54. See the reference to Peter of Maillezais, n.48. William the Great had begun to clear the forest around Vouvant (Besly, p.307); he and his father had made grants at Poussais, not far from Vouvant, to the monks of Bourgueil. This was then attached to the silva Fusciaco. (ms.lat. 17127, pp. 135-6, 137; cf. Besly, p.280). Guy-Geoffrey retained consuetudines there (see Besly, pp. 341-2).

which according to Suger was the castle where the Duke's white falcons were kept.[55] One of the largest seems to have been the forest of Argenson in Aunis, which provided sites for the comital castles of Benon, Mauzé and Surgères,[56] and incidentally for the only Cistercian house founded by the Dukes of Aquitaine - an uncleared site given by William the Toulousain to St.Bernard after his renunciation of the anti-pope Anacletus.[57] At the end of this period the forest of Chizé was also undoubtedly in comital hands, but its earlier history (which was probably connected with that of the castle)[58] is less clear. However, since the Countess Agnes owned the villa of les Fosses which was on the outskirts of the forest, the forest itself may also have been in ducal hands from an early date.[59] In the Saintonge the foresta maritima passed

---

55. Above nn. 48, 31.

56. Above n.51. In the time of William the Toulousain this was described as foresta sua de Ariansum with roads leading from Mauzé to Benon (see following n.) The whole forest was later described as the forest of Benon (Arcère, Hist.de la Rochelle, I p. 126).

57. Gallia II (instr. col. 387).

58. The Duke had prepositus de Chasiacho sive forestarii in the early twelfth century (Besly, p.438). The area is still wooded.

59. Chartes poitevines St.Florent nos. 58, 70 for Agnes' tenure of les Fosses, which was also the curia disturbed by the ducal servants (mentioned in the previous n.) The Dukes seem to have had two other villae on the edge of this forest, Doeuil (Cartul.St.Cyprien nos. 513, 511) and Usseau (Chartes Cluny, no. 3506). In the second of the grants concerning Doeuil, Guy-Geoffrey gave the monks land stretching to the forest.

directly from the hands of the Count of Anjou to Guy-Geoffrey, and remained in the ducal demesne;[60] the forest Baconesii (which probably stretched to Pont-l'Abbé and Corme-Royale)[61] seems to have had the same history.[62]

Apart from the cities, castles, and forest, it would be difficult to describe the territorial resources of the Dukes of Aquitaine before 1137 except in terms of villae or land which they abandoned. Their other resources are revealed as a medley of revenues, rights and exactions which documents drawn up in religious houses described without discrimination (and often unfortunately for the historian, without detail)

---

60. William Aigret had confirmed grants made by his mother and the Count of Anjou (ref. n.46 above) to the monks of Vendôme; they (later) had also granted land there to the nuns of Saintes (Cartul.N-D no.1); and this was specifically confirmed by William the Troubadour apud Maremniam (Cartul. no.263). The half of Niol which Guy-Geoffrey gave to the nuns seems to have been estirpata from this forest (Cartul. no.53, cf. introd. p. xxiv - probably Nieulle, commune St. Sornin-de-Marennes).

61. When Geoffrey Martel (and Agnes) gave Corma Regalis to the nuns (Cartul.N-D no.1) it was described as being near their silva dominica. On geographical grounds this must have been the forest of Baconais later held by the Dukes of Aquitaine. Eg. Ste.Gemme, which was founded in nemore meo Baconeis, is sited near Corme-Royale (following n. ; cf. introd. to Cartul.Saintes, p. xi).

62. The monks of Ste.Gemme had rights to ligna et arbores... in sylvis totius Baconisii (Besly, p.379 - Guy-Geoffrey's grant of foundation). William the Troubadour referred to this as his forest (previous n., Besly p.411), and the monks of Ste.Gemme complained of the exactions of his forestarii.

as consuetudines or malae consuetudines.[63] One or two references from the Bordelais refer to a ius comitale,[64] but no list of specifically comital or ducal "rights" seems ever to have existed, although even in other parts of the duchy some rights were probably regarded as pertaining to the Duke alone.[65] However, in the majority of documents there is no attempt at classification: consuetudines owed to the Duke included anything from rights of justice to dues on produce.[66]

---

63. Eg. The scribe did not bother to list the bonas vel malas consuetudines which William the Troubadour remitted to the canons of Ste.Radegonde (Besly, p. 462 gives part of the document only), although he did give those which the Duke retained (below, n.66). For a brief discussion of the importance of the consuetudines, see J-F LeMarignier's article in the Mélanges Halphen.

64. Appendix II, nos. 11,13-14, [illegible] Comitale ius and iusticia were renounced by William the Troubadour in 1116 and by his son in 1135 (AHG, vol. 12, pp. 317, 319-20).

65. Eg. moneta Xanctonensis civitatis est comitis propria (Cartul. N-D Saintes no. 51); cf. no. 50 for the Count and his prepositus: inventiones auri, argenti, fortune possederunt in dominio...). A remission of consuetudines by William the Troubadour stated that the land should be immunis, libera, ab omni consuetudinario dominatu meo (Besly, pp. 438-9); but it is not clear whether this refers to specifically "ducal" customs, or merely to those which the Duke exacted in this place before his remission. Certainly there is nothing comparable to the list of Consuetudines et iusticie drawn up for Normandy (Haskins, op.cit. pp. 277-84).

66. The consuetudines of a St.Maixent charter included the profits of justice (Chartes St.Maixent no.91); those kept by the Duke in the land of Ste. Radegonde (see n.63) consisted only de freceniagia xxxta solidos, de avenagia quinque modios aveni, et dimidium pascherium de ovibus. Cf. Appendix II, no. 9 .

For instance, the monks of St. Cyprien considered the rights of the comital prepositus to summon their men ad bellum a consuetudinis,[67] the canons of St.Nicolas also described as a consuetudinis the dues in kind which were owed to the Duke per universa cellaria in pago Pictavensi.[68]

From lists of consuetudines or from individual references in charters ■ the various types of the Duke's revenues are revealed. In addition to the tolls and sales-taxes already mentioned[69] he was owed dues in kind or money on all forms of produce,[70] on fresh and dried fish,[71] on salt at its place

---

67. Cartul.St.Cyprien no.321. The Duke kept bellum, although he permitted the monks to summon their own men; he remitted preposituram, bannum, ucham, expallum, biannum, friscingam, pullos, anseres, annonam (This is one of the longest and most varied lists given).

68. Cartul.St.Nicolas no.11 (Guy-Geoffrey remitted part).

69. Above nn. 10-12, 42. For tolls in Poitiers see also Claude (op.cit. nn. 1320, 1333, 1344).

70. Eg. the list given in nn. 66, 67.

71. William the Great had given half the due of fish owed to him from the Île dê Ré to Cluny (Chartes Cluny, no. 2709); William Aigret granted a due levied on dried fish (sepiae-see DuCange, Glossarium) in the Saintonge to the monks of la Trinité de Vendôme (Cartul.saintongeais, no.16).

of production,[72] on agricultural produce;[73] and, although many of these were limited in their perception, some such as the dues on flesh, wine and bread mentioned in the St.Nicolas document were levied on a general basis.[74] The Duke's officers seem to have had the right to levy a tax when waste-land was brought into cultivation,[75] and they kept a close watch on rights connected with grazing and pasturage in Poitou and the Saintonge.[76]

---

72. The monks of la Trinité successfully contested Guy-Geoffrey's right to levy this due on their land, because from their foundation they had been freed ab omni consuetudine consulari (Cartul.Saintongeais, no.23, Oct.1068).

73. Eg. 3 sextarios of corn levied annually (Besly, p.438).

74. Cf. ref, n.68.

75. At Ansoulesse the Count's servants demanded consuetudinem in terra que populariter frosta vocatur; the defence of the monks of St.Cyprien was that the land frosta non erat. (The interpretation is complicated, but frosta (see DuCange) seems to have referred both to the consuetudo and to the condition of the land (Cartul.St.Cyprien no.322).

76. One of the disputes between William the Troubadour and Abbot Henry of St.Jean d'Angély was over the pascarium of sheep and pigs at Muron (Cartul.St.Jean no. 476). The Duke was to keep a due on the animals of extranei grazed on the abbey's land outside Muron. Guy-Geoffrey had given the monks the pascharium of the suburb of the monastery (Cartul. no.10). Elsewhere, Guy-Geoffrey renounced the consuetudo imposed by his brother by which he allowed two men to graze three horses for an indefinite period in two separate places belonging to the monks of Bourgueil (Besly, pp.341-2).

The administration of justice almost certainly brought in revenue; but the only indication of this is indirectly given by a number of disputes over rights of jurisdiction, for in most cases the establishment of jurisdiction must have brought with it the right to any profits involved. For instance, the monks of Montierneuf asserted their Abbot's jurisdiction over men whom Guy-Geoffrey's prepositus claimed for his master's court;[77] the monks of la Sauve-Majeure tried to protect any of their familia who might be accused of crime by the ducal officers in Bordeaux;[78] and the canons of St. Radegonde also were able to limit the powers of the ducal prepositus over any of their men suspected of crime.[79] Apart from any customary revenues brought in from the routine business of courts held by the Duke's officials, the administration of justice also provided him with an irregular source of revenue, since religious communities (and possibly the Duke's own subjects) paid sums of money to have their

---

77. AHP vol.44, no.6.

78. Appendix II, no.14.

79. This applied to their land at Prunissac (Besly, pp.438-9). The monks of St.Cyprien were to have all the justicia in their land at Ansoulesse (Cartul.St.Cyprien no.321), which presumably refers to jurisdiction and to the profits of justice.

complaints heard personally by the Duke.[80]

In spite of the fact that he had an extensive demesne himself the Duke of Aquitaine seems to have been able to demand hospitality for his household and for his wife's from the religious houses under his patronage,[81] although from some of the smaller ones he may only have demanded what the cartulary of Ste. Croix de Talmont calls auxilium prandii.[82] A single reference to an incident in Gascony suggests that his officers may also have exercised arbitrary rights of procuration as the Duke travelled through his domains,[83] but this is not confirmed by any other evidence.

---

80. The monks of St.Maixent recorded two gifts they made to Guy-Geoffrey in the hopes of obtaining a favourable decision (Chartes nos. 121, 163). The Abbot of St.Jean de Sorde gave the same Duke 200 sol. in eight days but did not get a favourable decision (Cartul...Sorde no.40). The Abbot of St. Jean d'Angély gave William the Troubadour a large sum at a placitum (Cartul.St.Jean no. 476). The Dukes were also often given gifts for confirmations or grants.

81. Above pp. 19-21 ,The only detail we have results from the excessive demands made by the Duke's prepositus on the monks of St.Maixent: it was agreed that the monks had to provide him with 100 sepiae ad curiam comitis and 50 ad curiam comitisse only when the latter came to the monastery (Chartes St.Maixent no.187).

82. Cartul.Ste Croix no.280.

83. The incident refers to the Countess, during the period of William the Troubadour's crusade; but if this were a right and not simply an act of pillage, it would have applied to the Duke in normal times (Miracula S.Benedicti, p. 312-14).

The Duke of Aquitaine retained numerous rights connected with military service and defence for, although both Notre-Dame de Saintes and the priories of la Trinité de Vendôme apparently claimed exemption from military service,[84] Guy-Geoffrey claimed aid from both establishments in time of war.[85] However, he granted the nuns of Notre-Dame the concession that their coloni would not be taken outside the Saintonge unless he were in danger of losing his land.[86] The monks of St.Cyprien gained the privilege of having at least some of their cultores summoned by their own, instead of the ducal, prepositus;[87] but their men had to provide labour-services for castles as well as taking part in expeditions in time of war.[88] From other examples it is clear that performance of

---

84. Agnes and the Count of Anjou exempted the nuns of N-D from exercitus (Cartul. no.1), but this obviously continued to be demanded by Guy-Geoffrey (see following nn.). The exemption ab omni consuetudine consulari did not save the monks of Vendôme from being obliged to provide aid in time of war (cf. n.72), since they had to agree to this in order to obtain ducal remission of dues levied on their salt.

85. Refs, n.72 above and Cartul.Saintes no.53.

86. Loc.cit.: Guido Aquitanorum dux...Sancte Marie colonorum terre audito clamore, dimisit...ne amplius unquam in exercitum ducerentur extra Sanctonicam, nisi amissione sue terre si quis violentia eam sibi vellet auferre. But he did not apparently remit exercitus within the Saintonge.

87. This applied to Ansulesse in the time of William the Troubadour (Cartul.St.Cyprien no.321).

88. Cartul.St.Cyprien no.511. Guy-Geoffrey exempted the monks' familia at Doeuil and Germond from all custom except bellum, and obsidionem castrorum.

services connected with the Duke's bellum, exercitus, or ost, was widely demanded;[89] this must be connected with the publica negotia of Carolingian times because cultores, coloni or homines cannot possibly be identified with knights performing military service of a "feudal" nature.[90]

FEUDAL RESOURCES.

It is now necessary to turn to the problem of the services - and possibly also the revenues - which the Duke could obtain from his vassals for(during the century which intervened between the deaths of William the Great and his great-grandson William the Toulousain) the relationship of lord and man greatly altered after the days of William the Great's arbitrary demands on Hugh of Lusignan.[91] Personal

---

89. The homines monachorum of Montierneuf were to be free from exercitus and expeditio...nisi agatur nomine belli; (Besly, pp. 366 et seq.); the same condition applied to some of the possessions of St. Jean d'Angély (Cartul. no. 491). On the other hand the men of the podium of St. Eutrope were freed in 1128 from all cavalcata and expeditio quod vulgo dicitur ost (AHSA, vol.2, p.267). Where there was no direct remission it can surely be assumed that bellum at least was claimed by the Duke.

90. The monks of Maillezais were granted that omnes coloni qui eas terras incolunt ita sint ab omnibus negotiis publicis absolutis, ut nec ad castella facienda vel in hostem ire vel biduanum reddere (Arcère, Hist. la Rochelle, II, pp. 663-5). Military service had been one of the obligations of pagenses franci in Carolingian times (Dumas, "Quelques observations..." pp.640-43).

91. Above, part I, Chap.III, nn.18-21. From the Conventio it appeared that the Duke could exact military service for most purposes (eg. to pursue guerra with another vassal), and for an indefinite length of time.

and political fortunes also changed greatly during this period: the Lusignans had advanced far from their position of dependence on the Count of Poitou;[92] on the other hand the position of, say, the Viscounts of Aulnay declined, and they no longer matched the Viscounts of Thouars or Châtellerault in importance.[93] But it is clear that by the end of the eleventh century the greatest Poitevin families held honours composed of several castles, which were organised and administered on the same lines as the Duke's own demesne.[94] The problem is to discover what the Duke obtained in return,

---

92. Painter, "The lords of Lusignan in the eleventh and twelfth centuries" (Speculum 1957, esp. pp.33,47). In the late eleventh century they seem to have been on a par with the vicecomital families: in 1098 the lord of Lusignan was married to the daughter of the Viscount of Thouars (Cartuls.Bas-Poitou, Chaize-le-Vicomte no.15).

93. At the very end of this period the Duke was related to the Viscounts of Thouars and Châtellerault by marriage (above p.131); the Viscount of Aulnay on the other hand seems never to have acquired more than one castle, or even to have equalled in power the lords of Lusignan or Parthenay.

94. Below, pp.223-32 for the ducal administration. Several household officials are found attached to the Viscount of Thouars between 1069-1137 (Cartuls.Bas-Poitou, Chaize-le-Vicomte nos. 2,5,15); he also made regulations concerning his judicial rights, the military obligations of the men of la Chaize to him, and the division of game in his forest at the beginning of the twelfth century (op.cit. no.17). The castles in his honour were numerous; among others Tiffauges and Pouzages were held by members of the vicecomital family (op.cit. no.15).

besides the services of fealty and homage which implied recognition that these lands and castles derived from his honor.[95]

The episode of Guy-Geoffrey's expedition to Toulouse after his milites nobiles were betrayed in Bordeaux, the armies raised to expel the Angevins from the Saintonge and to meet them in 1104 and 1106, to say nothing of the one which defeated the rebellious lords of Lusignan and Parthenay in 1118,[96] must all have contained warriors apart from the ducal milites de curia;[97] but there is almost no evidence

---

95. Below p. 262 for the acknowledgement by Hugh of Lusignan that all he held derived from the Count's honor. There are however no references to the ceremonies involved (above, pp. 78-80 for the period before 1030); although from the mid-eleventh century the religious houses began to record homage done to them. See Chartes St.Maixent nos.124,312 (Lusignan), 235 (feci hominium abbati-Lezay, 1110), 298 (Aulnay); Cartul.Saintes nos. 227-8; Cartul. Talmont, nos. 162,260.

96. Above p. 148, n.70.

97. The act of 1110 by which Joscelin of Lezay acknowledged he was the man of the Abbot of St.Maixent has the subscriptions: S.Guillemi comitis. S.Gisleberti dapiferi. S.Petri Nivart. S.Goffredi Roberti. S.aliorum militum de curia (see n.95) Cf. a Gascon reference (Hist.Bearn, pp.283-4) and the mention that in 1069 Hugh of Lusignan was killed by milites comitis. These ought surely to be distinguished from the milites nobiles of the same source (Chron.St.Maixent, pp. 401, 402). There is evidence for such a distinction elsewhere: Constantinus crassus nobilis miles de castello Pontis (Chartes saintongeaises... St.Florent no. 28, c. 1083-86) was clearly of quite different status from the servi whom Engelelmus of Morthemer transformed into milites (Chartes Nouaillé no. 147, before 1091), although it is significant that there were complaints in this case.

for the military obligations of the Duke's great vassals after the period in which the Conventio was written.[98] It is impossible to tell on what basis their service was assessed; whether there was any correlation between the size of the honour held and the number of men provided, or whether contingents were fixed by precedent or bargains made on different occasions.[99] It is also impossible to tell whether subinfeudation took place on the great honours primarily to meet the Duke's demands for military service;[100] and unfortunately a comparison with ecclesiastical cases is not as instructive as might be expected. It is certain that the old-established religious houses (for example St. Maixent) had knights enfieffed on their lands who performed service

---

98. William the Troubadour's crusade was the only occasion when the composition of a ducal army can be ascertained. It clearly included many of his greatest vassals (above Chap. III, nn. 37-41); but this was an exceptional case and it may not have been collected by summons. There is no evidence for the identity of the 600 knights whom the same Duke took to Spain in 1120 (Chap. III, n.103).

99. Cf. the arrangements which Haskins considered existed in Normandy even before 1066 (Norman Institutions, pp.5-24, 60).

100. A feodum militis is mentioned in documents (e.g. Cartul. Saintes no.12, Cartul.Talmont no. 273), and from the Saintes example it is clear that the fee was smaller than the casamentum on which it was created. For the most part there are only references to the relationship of milites to their lords, and no evidence for the size of their fees (the word beneficium becomes less common during this period). For knights of the Viscount of Châtellerault Chartes Nouaillé no. 134,157; of the Viscount of Aulnay Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély nos. 49, 277.

for the Duke;[101] but it is probable that the Duke made such enfiefments directly and possibly even kept the homage of these knights, while the religious houses were unwilling to acknowledge that they owed him military service from their lands.[102]

It is equally difficult to discover what other benefits the Duke obtained from his vassals' lands; although in the last resort he could confiscate the honour, take it into his own demesne and disinherit the holder, as Guy-Geoffrey confiscated Talmont and the honour of the Count of Anjou in Saintonge, and William the Tolousain Châtelaillon.[103] In

---

101. The knight Geoffrey of St.Maixent was established on the lands of the abbey, but held Guy-Geoffrey as his lord (Chartes Nouaillé no.125; cf. Chartes St.Maixent no. 117, 177). Theobald Chabot, enfieffed on the lands of Maillezais by William Aigret, (Arcère, Hist.La Rochelle, II, p.667), was probably a ducal miles also. For his subscriptions to documents with Guy-Geoffrey see Lacurie (Hist.Maillezais, p. 209); Gallia (II instr. col.385); on a charter transcribed in ms.lat. 17127 (p.64) he subscribed after the Duke, but before the Viscount of Thouars.

102. The monks of Maillezais complained of the depredations of Theobald Chabot; Guy-Geoffrey renounced his enfeoffment of a miles Radulfus on the lands of Notre-Dame (Cartul.Saintes no. 226); and William Bastard miles renounced land given him by William Aigret which was claimed by the monks of Nouaillé (Chartes Nouaillé no. 122). On the other hand there are no documents in which the religious houses of the duchy acknowledge services of a specifically "feudal" nature to the Duke.

103. Above, pp. 115, 148.

more normal circumstances it can be assumed that the Duke benefited from rights of wardship - one reference after 1030 mentions his demands for a large sum of money to be paid for marriage to an heiress[104] - and it is probable that he exacted reliefs;[105] but because such practices rarely affected religious houses they are never mentioned in the sources available, any more than the composition of the ducal army or the problems connected with inheritance of fiefs in the duchy. It is not possible to tell what authority the Duke had over lands which were subinfeudated, although examples of political importance suggest that at the end of the period steps were taken to safeguard ducal rights;[106] and (with the exception of the Viscount of Béarn's homage to the King of Aragon)[107] there is little evidence for the institution of liege homage which was elsewhere evolved to

---

104. 2000 *solidi* was the sum promised by *quidam miles nomine Aino de quodam castello quod dicitur Velza* to the Duke for *nobilissima uxor* and her *honor* (*Cartul.St.Nicolas* no.39).

105. Above, Chap. III, nn. 67-8. The only specific examples for this period and region are insignificant: the oven of the canons of St. Hilaire was held *ad casamentum* as long as the man *fidelitatem faciet* and paid 20 sol. *pro relevatione* (*Docs.St.Hilaire*, no.117-*c*. 1135); cf. *Cartul.Talmont* (no.216 - *relevamentum*).

106. Above, pp.146-50, 161-2.

107. Above, Chap. II, n.76.

meet the problems created by a man's tenure of honours from more than one lord[108] - a situation which has often been referred to in a political context and which existed long before 1030.

GOVERNMENT.

The government of the duchy throughout this period continued to depend on the personality and activity of the Dukes for, even though power might be delegated to local or household officials, the fear of the Duke, or his anger, had always to be taken into account;[109] and as the period of William the Troubadour's minority proves, there was no substitute for the enforcement of ruler's personal will.[110] This does not mean that the Dukes of Aquitaine governed alone; wherever they went they were surrounded by members of their court, which was sometimes composed of the greatest vassals and ecclesiastics of the duchy, sometimes merely of

---

108. Again the only references are ecclesiastical, and do not concern men of political importance - a vassal of the Abbot of St. Maixent was described as homine nostro ligio some time before 1133 (Chartes St.Maixent no. 296, cf. no. 281). W. Kienast (Untertaneneid und Treuvorbehalt in Frankreich und England) does not deal with the institution at this level, or at such an early date (see the examples quoted p.33 nn. 1-2, p.47).

109. A St. Seurin document (Cartul. no.28) mentioned a grant being made non timore Domini, sed timore ducis nostri. The monks of Montierneuf made provision for anyone fleeing to their burgum if the Duke (Guy-Geoffrey) was iratum (AHP, vol.44, pp. 17-20).

110. Above, Chap. III, nn. 13, 16.

the knights and personal servants of the household.[111]

The ducal government was at its most formal in these great meetings of vassals and ecclesiastics; and it can perhaps be assumed that ceremonies of homage were performed and decisions made on important secular matters on these occasions; but the sources only reveal grants or acts of confirmation to religious houses or,[112] less often, disputes brought to the Duke's notice in which an ecclesiastical party was involved.[113] In Poitou such assemblies seem frequently

---

111. The word curia seems sometimes to have been used in a restricted sense (reliqua curialis multitudo - Cartul. Talmont no,51); or to refer to a place (in Pictavensi curia, Docs.St.Hilaire no.103). Cf. above n.81 for a different sense.

112. The foundation of the priory of St.Nicolas at Chaize by the Viscount of Thouars Pictavis in aula comitis in presentia optimatum (above n.4). These optimates included Amatus Archbishop of Bordeaux, three Bishops, the vicecomital family, the lords of Lusignan, Parthenay and Blaye, and many others. The grant made at Benon in 1096 (below n.115) was made before the Count of Vendome, the Bishop of Potiers, the lords of Lusignan and Rancon, the dapifer of Duke William, other lords from the Saintonge and Aunis, three Abbots, and the Duke's wife and mother. Many other examples could be given.

113. A claim in Gascony in 1084 was made coram ... Gausfredo duce Aquitanie and in the presence of the Archbishop of Auch, the Bishop of Aire, two Abbots, an archdeacon, the Viscount of Tartas and others whose names have been omitted (Cartul la Reole no.137). Cf. the document referring to the presence of Gaufredus comes Pictaviensis, in quadam collucutione, which included the Archbishop of Bordeaux, the Bishop of Poitiers, and the Viscount of Thouars (Appendix II, nos.3 & no 2.).

to have taken place in aula comitis in Poitiers,[114] but they were also summoned to the castles of the ducal demesne - William the Troubadour's investiture of the monks of la Trinité de Vendôme in 1096 was made in a large company apud castellum novum meum Benaum.[115] In order to govern the duchy effectively the Dukes were obliged to make frequent journeys through their domains and, although there is far from enough evidence to draw up a complete itinerary of their movements, it seems possible that these journeys took place with some regularity, and were arranged to coincide with the great festivals of the churches in their domains where they could expect hospitality. For instance, it was surely not by chance that William the Toulousain summoned the co-lords of Oléron to appear before him at St.Jean d'Angély on June 24th - (the nativity of St. John the Baptist, the monastery's patron)[116] or that William the Troubadour was apparently in Bordeaux on November 30th (the feast of St. Andrew to whom

---

114. Above nn. 4, 112. One suit was however heard in rotonda domo Pictavensis episcopo...ante ducem Guidonem Gosfridum (Cartul.saintongeais..Vendôme no.33, 4 Sept. 1078). The majority of documents, however, bear no indication of place, and many are undated.

115. Cartul.Saintongeais...Vendôme no.38.

116. ...ego Willelmus Dei gratia comes et dux Aquitanorum... precepi ut in natale Sancî Iohannis Baptistae apud Angeliacum...coram me adessent (Cartul.saintongeais... no.55; cf. Cartul.St.Jean no.217). William the Fat was present at St.Jean in June 1031 (Cartul.St.Jean no. 197) but the day is not given.

the cathedral is dedicated).[117]

The Dukes' over-riding power is illustrated by the few recorded examples of judicial cases involving their great vassals: William the Troubadour's summons of a Gascon court (including the Viscount of Béarn and the Count of Fézensac among others) to settle the complaint of the monks of la Réole against the Viscount of Bézaume in 1103,[118] and his son's summons to the co-lords of Oléron (the Count of Angoulême, Viscount of Thouars, the lords of the castles of Didone and Mornay) to appear before him at St.Jean d'Angély,[119] are known only because in each case one of the parties involved

---

117. ...in festivitate beatae Andreae coram principibus patriae (Cartul.Ste.Foi de Conques no.481). Bordeaux is not admittedly mentioned as the place of enactment, but the presence of the Archbishop of Bordeaux (A. (?) Arnald), of W. prepositi (probably of Bordeaux), among nobles of the Bordelais makes it a possibility. Guy-Geoffrey was certainly in Bordeaux on 1st Dec (the day after the festival of St. Andrew) in 1080 (Marchegay, Chartes bordelaises St.Florent no.7); and William the Troubadour spent Lady Day there in 1096 (Cartul.Ste. Croix no.3). Guy-Geoffrey was in the church of St. Hilaire de Poitiers on Jan 13 1079 - i.e. the feast of this Saint - (Docs.St.Hilaire no.93). Perhaps this was also the reason for William the Troubadour's presence in Poitiers on 15 Jan 1092 (the foundation charter of St.Nicolas, above nn. 4, 112) ?

118. Cartul.la Réole no.64.

119. Above n.116. The Duke and the Bishop of Poitiers appointed the day for the querela of the Abbot of Maillezais against Peter Tronellus, but there is no evidence for the composition of tota curia which heard the suit.

was ecclesiastical; but these examples suggest that the Dukes would have had a similarly arbitrary authority in cases which concerned their secular vassals alone.[120] In any case there are references to suits being heard in Pictavensi curia ante principem et eius obtimates, by the Duke cum suis principibus, or of a claim being made in camera comitis in sight of two hundred people;[121] when it can surely be assumed that the Duke was accompanied by his magnates, as well as his own household.

The Dukes' power is also illustrated by their ability to determine the way in which a case was heard. Sometimes a judgment was made by the Duke himself or in association with other judges;[122] but Guy-Geoffrey could also order a

---

120. There is no evidence for the functioning of any "feudal" court in the duchy during this period, although the Conventio proves its existence for an earlier period (Appendix I, pp.239,244 & 249). The type of problem raised is whether for instance Guy-Geoffrey's visit to Limoges in 1073 to condemn the Viscount was preceded by judicial activity; but there is no answer - any more than there is for William the Troubadour's disputes with his vassals (above pp.121,143-51).

121. Docs.St.Hilaire no.103. Cartul.Ste.Croix no.22 (12 Oct. 1079, in concilio Burdegalensi); Chartes St.Maixent no.163 (before c.1082).

122. In the 1078 case heard ante ducem (n.114) the Duke called the witnesses, but other judices agreed that the proof should be by oath; in a suit brought against the lord of Châtellaillon Guy-Geoffrey ordered that the proof used should be legem huius terre (ie. a duel - Chartes St.Maixent no.164). In 1104 William the Troubadour was one of the judges who ordered a duel between his prepositus and the monks of Nouaillé (Chartes Nouaillé no. 182).

case to be heard by Count Aldebert of la Marche,[123] the dapifer Peter de Briderio,[124] one of the local prepositi,[125] or other judges especially appointed;[126] and his successors presumably acted in the same way.[127] The Duke seems rarely to have been present at the administration of the preuve judiciaire (generally a duel),[128] but he seems to have ratified the judges' decision;[129] one document from Maille-

---

123. Chartes Nouaillé no.152 (1081).

124. Chartes St.Maixent no.150 (1081); Cartul.St.Cyprien no.321; Cartul.Talmont no.51.

125. Cartul.St.Cyprien no.321; below nn.126.

126. Eg. the deposed Archbishop Amatus and Gosfridus de Rupeforti in 1068 (Cartul.Saintongeais...Vendôme no.24); custodes Thalemonensium and other officials (Cartul. Talmont 51); the milites de curia in Gascony (Marca, Hist.Béarn pp. 283-4); the Archbishop of Bordeaux, the prepositus of Poitiers and his brother Odo with two others (Cartuls.Bas-Poitou, pp. 93-4).

127. The decision of the court, rather than its composition and details, tends to be given in documents after 1086 - e.g the nuns of Saintes were reinvested in 1133 per rectum iudicium factum in curia comitis Pictavensis (Cartul.N-D no.122), the decisions reached in curia comitis (Chartes St.Maixent 290), or as the result of a placitum (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély no.476). But cf. n.116.

128. Chartes St.Maixent nos. 150, 164, 290; Cartuls.Bas-Poitou pp.93-4; Cartul.Talmont no.51; Chartes Nouaillé no.187 (the Duke's son was present with his tutor). But Guy-Geoffrey apparently attended the bellum arranged in Gascony between the Bishop of Lescar and an unnamed party. (Marca, loc.cit.)

129. Cartul.Talmont no. 51. [redacted]

zais states that Guy-Geoffrey ordered the judges' decision to be written down.[130] Although there is no evidence for an organised hierarchy of courts in the duchy, the few records which survive demonstrate the importance of gaining a hearing coram duce or of having a case settled iussu comitis;[131] there is even one curious case of a dispute being brought to the Duke because there was no Count of Anjou to hear it at the time;[132] and nothing suggests that any of his vassals' courts could compete with the Duke's - at least in the northern part of the duchy.[133] Apart from the publicity of a decision reached in the ducal court - undoubtedly desirable when many decisions were not committed to writing[134] - its chief value lay in the fact that it would normally be enfor-

---

130. Cartul.Saintongeais...no.33. This involved a suit between the Abbot of Talmont and a monk of la Trinité de Vendôme, in which a decision was reached because Theobald grammaticus (below, n.139) bore witness to a decision formerly made before William Aigret on the same matter.

131. William the Toulousain ordered a plea to be heard by his prepositus at Saintes and the Bishop (iussu comitis Pictavensis Cartul. N-D no. 267). The monks of Ste. Gemme had the privilege of appearing in justice only before the Duke (above p.183 n.76).

132. Appendix II, no. 2.

133. "La compétence respective des différéntes cours de justice est mal déterminée dans le haut moyen âge..." (Garaud, Essai sur les institutions judiciaires du Poitou...p.77). There is much detail about procedure in this work but, although the author referred to the courts of the comital vassals (pp.55-6), he did not bring forward any detail to prove that they encroached on the Count's jurisdiction.

134. Above, pn79, below pp. 237-8.

ced, as can be seen from the case of Guy-Geoffrey's distraint in 1081 on a man who defaulted from the method of proof ordered in the ducal court,[135] and as is suggested by the speed with which the monks of la Réole sent a messenger to the Duke at Poitiers to complain of the exactions made against them.[136]

HOUSEHOLD and LOCAL ADMINISTRATION.

The solemn assemblies at which the Duke was surrounded by his vassals were an essential part of his government, but they were obviously unsuitable for everyday business or the administration of his own demesne; and in the second part of the eleventh century Guy-Geoffrey came increasingly to rely upon members and officers of his household (many of whom can be identified from the frequency with which they are found in the ducal circle),[137] and upon local officials whom he set up throughout the duchy.[138] This development cannot be

---

135. Chartes St.Maixent no.150.

136. Reference, cited n.118.

137. Above n.97 for milites de cuñia. There is a single reference to the domus ducal in 1104 (Chartes Nouaillé no.187); but many members of the Duke's household may be identified from before this date from the frequency of their subscriptions to ducal charters. Guy-Geoffrey for instance, was attended by a Gausbert francigena, Fulcho Normannus, Peter son of Mainard (who acted as one of the custodes Thalemonensium - Cartul.Talmont no.51), and others. The process continued under the last two Dukes.

138. Below, pp.228-32.

traced in detail because the Dukes of Aquitaine never developed an organised chancery or writing-office: Theobald, grammaticus of St. Hilaire, who acted for a brief period as the ducal chancellor never had a successor.[139] As a result, although a seal was increasingly used to authenticate charters drawn up in the ducal name,[140] these documents continued to be drawn up by the beneficiaries according to the vagaries of different monastic scriptoria;[141] it seems to be the merest chance when the scribe mentions the office of a member of the Duke's household, or informs the historian that certain men were milites de curia.[142]

---

139. Documents St.Hilaire no.93 (1067), Besly, (pp.351-2, 1068), Prou (Recueil...Philippe Ier, no.83) show Theobald as chancellor. Cf. above n.130. Richard (Comtes I, pp. 376-80) supposed that Theobald was followed by William - but he was cancellarius beati Hilarii (Docs.St.Hilaire no.93). This view is repeated by Renouard (Hist.des Institutions seigneuriales, p.162).

140. Berengarius capellanus comitis super altarem Sancti Andree sigillum impressit (Facsimile, AHG vol.34, planche I - William the Troubadour's confirmation of grants made to the cathedral chapter of Bordeaux). The sealing of the document is mentioned in 11 other ducal acta from Guy-Geoffrey's time onwards. The pendant seal of William Aigret mentioned by Renouard (loc.cit.) was only described in a vidimus of 1527, and the legend could not then be read (Richard, Comtes I, p. 376). It is suspect in view of the absence of seals on his successor's documents (cf. above, Chap IV, n.26).

141. No document bears any note to suggest that it was drawn up by one of the Duke's capellani, and the external appearance of the surviving originals does not suggest a common origin.

142. Above, nn. 97, 137.

In spite of this, the names of Guy-Geoffrey's butler, marshal and camerarius are found in the witness lists of charters;[143] while the dapifer, Peter de Brider is something more than a name.[144] His importance can be seen from his delegation by the Duke to make judgments in cases brought by the Abbots of St. Maixent and St. Cyprien to the court at Poitiers[145] and from his knowledge of the affairs of the ducal vassals,[146] as well as from the frequence of his attendance on his master.[147] After Guy-Geoffrey's death the Duke's dapifer was at first William de Malsiaco (1096-7),[148] then Otho (1097) who seems to have been William's brother.[149]

---

143. Maingot buterius and Gerald camerarius subscribed a Montierneuf charter (AHP, vol.44 no.11) and Airaud mariscallus four documents (Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély nos. 3, 21, 23, 63).

144. Petrus de Brider, dapifer comitis Pictavorum and Goffridi ducis Acquitanorum dapifer (Cartul.St.Nicolas nos.39-40). He is mentioned in other documents in connexion with this Duke (above n. 124), accompanied him to Souvigny (AA.SS.OS.B p.255), subscribed the "foundation charter" of Montierneuf (Chartes Cluny no.3495). Cf. also Cartul.St.Nicolas no.5; Chartes St.Maixent nos. 139,145; Cartul.St.Cyprien no.221; AHP vol.44, p.11 and no.4; for his association with the Duke.

145. Above n.124.

146. Ref. cited n.104. The dapifer acted as intermediary.

147. Above n.144.

148. dapifer comitis (Cartul.saintongeais..no.38).

149. Chartes St.Maixent no.194. The relationship is suggested by a grant of the last Duke made apud Mosiacum in curia Ottonis sub umbraculo, witnessed by W.de Mosiaco, Otone fratre suo (Cartul.St.Jean no.498), but it is not proved.

After William the Troubadour's return from the crusade one of his milites de curia called Gilbert held the office (he is described by the ~~name~~ title in documents of 1105 and 1110);[150] no later document refers to a ducal dapifer although it has always been assumed that the members of the Mauzé family, (who claimed the office by hereditary right after 1137) held it during the life ~~of~~ time of Eleanor's father.[151] It is true that a William of Mauzé continued to appear in the ducal circle:[152] if he was the seneschal of the Duke of Aquitaine before 1137 there is nothing to suggest that his office was purely honorific,[153] since this family was not as illustrious as has sometimes been supposed. The original William of Mauzé appears to have been a bastard knight of the Duke's household, and the prepositus rather than the castellan of

---

150. Cartul.St.Jean no.476, Chartes St.Maixent no.235.

151. Richard (Comtes II, pp.48-9), Boussard (Le gouvernement, pp.126, 353), Painter ("Castellans of the plain of Poitou, pp. 250-51). Petit-Dutaillis on the other hand considered that no "seneschal" was instituted until the time of "Eleanor's father" (Feudal Monarchy, p.169).

152. Possibly Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély nos. 477 (1105); cf. nos. 217 (1131), 498 (c 1132-37).

153. Boussard (loc.cit.).

Mauzé.[154]

Apart from his dapifer William the Troubadour had a cubicularius who accompanied him on crusade and who also briefly held the prepositura of Saintes;[155] the sources do not reveal whether his camerarius Thomas, who retired to the monastery of St. Jean d'Angély before the Duke left for the Holy Land, ever had a successor.[156] The only household officers of the last Duke mentioned in the surviving documents are two camerarii.[157] The lack of administrative documents make it impossible to discover what the functions of these officers were, or to what extent - if at all - they

---

154. An unpublished document (Appendix II, no. 2) is witnessed by Guillelmo Bastardo de Mauusiaco (thus), so that he can certainly be identified with the miles William Bastard who is found in so many of Guy-Geoffrey's acts. (Chartes Cluny no. 3495; Chartes saintongeaises St. Florent no.28; Cartul.St.Nicolas no.40; Cartul. St. Cyprien no.511; Cartul.St.Jean nos. 11, 63; Appendix VIII). He may with less certainty be identified with Willelmus Mausiacensis prepositus who was given land by Guy-Geoffrey (Cartul.N-D Saintes no. 300). The status of the Mauzé family was increased by the extinction of the ducal line and the absence of Louis VII from Aquitaine.

155. Willelmo Fortonis cubiculario (a.1119, Besly, pp.436-7); cf. Cartul.St.Foi de Conques no.481 and Cartul.St.Jean no.491, without reference to office.

156. Cartul.St.Jean no.420.

157. William is called camerarius between 1130-37 (Besly p.462, Collection Fonteneau vol.27, p.491). Chartes St.Benoit no.127), and Rorgo once in 1131. (Cartul. St.Jean no. 217).

directed any rudimentary central institutions.[158]

Both William Aigret and his wife had local officers called _prepositi_ who dealt with the affairs of their demesne;[159] but Guy-Geoffrey was apparently the first Duke to establish _prepositi_ with definite territorial charges in the three capitals of the counties which he controlled directly - probably as a result of the increase in his domains brought about by the acquisition of Gascony and the conquest of Saintes from the Angevins.[160] The _prepositi_ of the three capitals were highly important officials: indeed the charge of _Senioretus_ the _prepositus_ of Saintes seems to have covered the whole Saintonge for, as well as being responsible for the Duke's rights in the city,[161] he was often involved in the affairs of St. Jean d'Angély and other monasteries of the region,[162] and was consulted by Guy-Geoffrey when the

---

158. There is nothing for instance to connect the _camerarius_ with the ducal finances and _camera_ as there is for the duchy of Normandy (Haskins, _Norman Institutions_, pp.40-1 and n.172).

159. _Cartul.St.Jean_ no.24: _Girbertus praepositus comitis et comitissae._

160. Above, pp. 96-7, 117-18.

161. _Cartul.Saintes_ nos. 51-53 (This does not refer to him by name, but deals with the rights of the _prepositus_ in general, above, n.65).

162. _Cartul.St.Jean_ nos. 263 (1069), 3 (1073), 63 (undated); _Cartul.saintongeais_, no.29 (1075), 34 (1078); Besly (pp.380-1 _Semoneto pre-_ (?) is probably a mis-reading for _Senioreto_); _Chartes Cluny_ no. 3508 (1081); _Cartul. N-D Saintes_ no.53; Collection Moreau vol.30, fo. 247; Appendix II, no 7.

consuetudines of the countryside were in doubt.[163] There is less information about the scope of the office held by the brothers Hugh and Odo, who were prepositi of Poitiers from c.1076 to 1103, but again their personal importance is obvious from the fact that they were delegated to hear important cases in the court at Poitiers,[164] and from their concern with every aspect of administration in the city.[165] Ralf the prepositus of Bordeaux appears in few documents but the Vita S.Geraldi shows that like Senioretus he was responsible for knowing the state of the Duke's resources and the condition of the land surrounding the city; while a ducal grant for St. Gerald's monastery of la Sauve indicates that the prepositus of Bordeaux certainly had wide judicial powers in the city.[166]

Unlike the Carolingian vicarii who were to some extent

---

163. In the 1078 document mentioned in the previous note.

164. Above n.125.

165. See Cartul.Saintongeais no.33 (1078), Docs.St.Hilaire no.91 (und); AHP vol.44, p.11 (1081), no.4 (1083), pp. 17-20 (und.); Chartes St.Maixent nos.150, 152 (1081); Cartul.St.Cyprien nos. 18, 20, 221, 321-2; Appendix II, no 7.

166. AA.SS. 5 April, p.418; cf. Appendix II, no. 14.

their forerunners,[167] these prepositi do not appear to have become hereditary officers. In 1103 William the Troubadour replaced the prepositi of Poitiers by William son of Theobald, Guy-Geoffrey's one-time chancellor;[168] later Costio (whose antecedents are unknown) is found holding the same office.[169] The prepositi of Saintes were changed even more often: Fulcaldus Airaudus, fortissimus bellator,[170] William des Forz who was also William the Troubadour's cubicularius,[171] Robert de Jemaudach,[172] Geoffrey de Pichambert.[173] Two

---

167. For the decline of the vicarius in Poitou, M.Garaud ("La construction des châteaux...", RHDFE 1953, p.75, nn. 177-88). No other study goes into the problem in such detail for any part of Aquitaine; but cf. Halphen's article reprinted in A Travers l'hist. du moyen age (pp. 202-225).

168. Above n.130, 139. Anno quo ab Hierosolymis Willelmus Aquitanie ducis (thus) sit reditus, Willelmus quidam Teotbaudi grammatici filius, cum supradicto duce ab Hierosolymis reddit, quem dux arcius diligens Pictaviensem prepositum constituit (Chartes Nouaillé no. 187). Cf. Champollion-Figeac (Documents historiques inédits II, pp. 3-4, 1106).

169. S. Costio prepositi Pictavensis (Collection Fonteneau vol.27, p.91). Cf. also Champollion-Figeac (op.cit. II, fasc. ii, pp. 13-14).

170. Cartul. N-D Saintes nos. 51-2, 90; Cartul.St.Jean d'Angély no.491.

171. Besly (p.411); Cartul. N-D Saintes nos. 121 - Willelmus Forti prepositus Sanctonensis, iussu domini mei comitis Pictavensis, 263. Cf above n.155.

172. Cartul. N-D Saintes nos. 51-2.

173. In 1128 he was prepositus Xanctonicae civitatis (AHSA, vol.2 p. 267).

prepositi, William and Peter, are known for Bordeaux during the same period.[174] There is less evidence for the activities of these men than in the years before 1086: perhaps the proliferation of ducal prepositi elsewhere meant that the power of the prepositi of Poitiers, Bordeaux and Saintes was diminished,[175] but this cannot really be proved. However the close connexion between the Dukes' local administration and his household should be emphasized, for it proves the control he exercised over his affairs.[176]

Guy-Geoffrey is known to have had prepositi at the castles of Surgères and Mauzé as well as in the comital capitals;[177] documents of William the Troubadour's time refer also to such officers at Montreuil-Bonnin,[178] Oléron,[179]

---

174. Cartul.Ste Croix de Bordeaux nos. 3, 7; Cartul.Ste. Foi de Conques no. 481 (above n.117).

175. Below nn. 177-83.

176. Above n. 171, below n. 177. Cf. also the history of William, n. 168.

177. Cartul.St.Cyprien no.511; Appendix II, no 7 . Could this possibly be the same as Airaudus, the Duke's marshal? For William of Mauzé, above n.154.

178. Besly (pp. 342-3). A charter of Montierneuf which can be dated before 1137 (Archives Dép.Vienne, fonds Montierneuf, carton 7 no. 45) refers to consuetudines which the Duke held in lands attached to the prepositura Mosteriolo.

179. Cartul.Saintongeais nos. 38, 55.

Talmont,[180] and generally to his prepositi Alnienses;[181] those of his son add Chizé[182] and Sécondigny[183] to the list. The function of these men seems to have been to collect the dues from the ducal demesne, to hold local courts,[184] and to control the lesser local officials:— the horde of forestarii and venatores and less precisely named ministri and servientes — who must in turn have controlled the inhabitants and labourers of the land belonging to the Duke.[185] If these prepositi had a more important charge - and it might be significant that they were chiefly attached to fortified places[186] - it does not emerge from the documents, which at the end of this period are chiefly concerned with the limitation or remission of exactions made by the Duke's officers.

---

180. Besly (pp. 436-7); Cartul.Talmont nos. 92 - prepositus comitis, 121.

181. Cartul.St.Jean no. 477.

182. Besly (p.438).

183. Poitiers, Collection Fonteneau, vol.27, p.91.

184. The men of the monks of Ste.Gemme were not to be cited before the prepositi (Besly, p.411); cf. the exemption granted to the men of the canons of Ste.Radegonde who were only to be answerable in justice to the canons (Besly, pp. 438-9) and not oppressed by the Duke's servants. Cf. also Besly (pp. 436-7).

185. The prepositus of Chizé and the forestarii are mentioned together (ref. n.182). Cf. refs. cited nn. 184-5; and the warning against aliquam violentiam ministerialium nostrorum (Gallia II instr. col.370); Appendix II, pp.287.

186. They might for instance have had military functions, but there is no hint of this in the surviving evidence.

APPENDIX I

THE CONVENTIO INTER WILLELMUM DUCEM AQUITANIAE ET HUGONEM CHILIARCHUM.

The Conventio inter ducem Willelmum Aquitaniae et Hugonem Chiliarchum was printed three times during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but only Labbe's edition of 1657 provided any notes on the Mss. from which the text was printed. Since the text is important for the light which it throws on secular events in Aquitaine in the early part of the eleventh century it seems worthwhile to offer an edition based on the surviving Mss.

Manuscripts.

I. Bibliothèque Nationale, ms.latin 5927. An eleventh century Ms. which formerly belonged to de Thou. It is described by Chavanon in his edition of Ademar's chronicle; the Conventio occupies pp. 265r-280v.[1] This is assigned the letter A. in the present edition.

II. Bibliothèque Nationale, ms.latin 9767. A fifteenth century Ms. also mentioned by Chavanon, but not used by him for his edition of Ademar. The Conventio occupies fos 62v-66r. He considered that it derived directly from lat. 5927 and, although in lat. 9767 there is a long omission in the text

---

1. Chronique (introd., pp. xviii-xix). According to J. Porcher the Ms. can be attributed to the middle of the eleventh century (Les manuscrits à peintures en France du VIIe au XIIe siecle, no.323). I have kept the pagination of this Ms., which is noted in the catalogue.

of the Conventio, nothing suggests that this Ms. represents a tradition substantially different from lat. 5927.[2] This is assigned the letter B. in the present edition.

III. Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection Baluze vol. 44 (fos.58-61). This transcript has been disregarded in the present edition, as it was not apparently used for any of the editions, and does not apparently embody a different text.

Editions

I. J.Besly, Histoire des comtes de Poictou et ducs de Guyenne. Paris, 1647. (Preuves, pp. 288-94 bis). This bears no indication of the source used. It is assigned the letter b.

II. P. Labbe, Novae bibliothecae....Collectio. Paris, 1657. (Vol.II, pp.185-88). His edition was taken from a manuscript in de Thou's library which can be identified with ms.latin 5927,[3] and from another belonging to the Collège de Clermont, which may be latin 9767.[4] Variant readings were not noted, however. This is assigned the letter a.

---

2. Chronique (p.xix). ~~Below, p. B).~~

3. The manuscript still bears de Thou's device, and the contents are identical (Chavanon, loc.cit.; cf. Labbe, pp. 151,175,189). Labbe's edition apparently gave the text its title: no heading appears in either Ms.

4. This cannot be proved, however, since Labbe did not note the occasions on which the second ms. differed from de Thou's.

III. M. Bouquet, Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France. (Vol. XI, pp.534-38). The text is taken from the editions of Labbe and Besly. This is assigned the letter c.

Method of the present edition.

The text has been taken from ms.lat. 5927. The scribe of lat. 9767 brought the spelling of the text up to date by consistently writing Hugo for Ugo, Guillelmus for Willelmus, eciam for etiam.[5] I have not noted such differences in spelling; but I have noted other variants apart from differences in the spelling of Christian names.

Paragraphs have been inserted, and the punctuation modernised, as the direct speech is otherwise extremely difficult to read.

* * * * * *

Dating.

The text does not follow a chronological order. For instance, the infeudation of Vivonne (p.242) must have occurred after 1023 since Bishop Isembert of Poitiers took part in the agreement;[6] on the other hand the building of

---

5. The scribe of this ms. consistently wrote beneficium concilie, contencio, conveniencia, credencia, deprecacio, dubitacio, eciam, fiducia, Genciacum, hec, litigacio, ffines, michi, nichil, precepit, que (for quę), racio, set (for sed), tradicio instead of the forms - eg. consilium, contentio etc. generally used in ms.lat.5927.

6. He became Bishop in 1023 - a charter printed among the Chartes de Nouaillè (no.108) corrects the indication of the Gallia, (II, col.1162).

the castle in the march in which Bishop Gerald of Limoges took part must have occurred before 1023.[7] The events mentioned must all have taken place before the death of Count William of Angoulême (mentioned p.47) in March 1028.[8]

It is probable that the account should be attributed to the period before 1025, when Hugh of Lusignan founded a priory for the monastery of Nouaillé, and the Duke procured a royal diploma for him;[9] but this cannot be proved, and the text of the Conventio gives no clear indication of date.

Authorship.

The style of the Conventio is so different from that of Ademar of Chabannes' known works that it cannot possibly be attributed to him, although it has only survived in Mss. which also contain his chronicle.[10] The only thing which

---

7. The Chronique de St.Martial de Limoges (ed. Duplès-Agier, p.45) gives this date for his death. See p.244 below.

8. Ademar (Chronique, p.192).

9. Chartes de Nouaillé nos. 104,106; Richard (Comtes, I, p.166). The identification of "Hugh" in this text with Hugh of Lusignan is provided by the reference quando fuit Ugo ad Liziniaco (below, p.245).

10. Ademar's chronicle does not contain such errors as the wrong case following a preposition (eg. de fiscum, ex meliores &c, below pp.243, 241), nor the compound of habere with the past participle for the past tense. The use of direct speech in the Conventio also provides a contrast to Ademar's style. Cf. the general remarks of the editors of the Recueil des historiens (p. 533).

can be said is that the author was even less educated than the scribes who wrote the documents for the religious establishments of Poitou and the neighbouring counties in the early part of the eleventh century:[11] he was ignorant of the most elementary rules of Latin grammar and construction.[12] It is impossible to identify the author,[13] but he surely lived at the period of the events which are described in the Conventio.

The text itself bears no relation to anything else produced in Aquitaine in the early eleventh century; but this is not surprising considering that secular procedure remained almost exclusively oral in character.[14] Richard supposed that it was drawn up for the purpose of negotiating an agreement between Hugh and the Duke; but the text as it has come down to us contains the final agreement made between

---

11. Cf. for instance the charters of Nouaillé (see n.8), many of which survive in original and cannot therefore have been "improved" by copyists.

12. Above n.9. Numerous other errors could be noted.

13. There is no proof for Painter's speculation that he was a "some monk of Notre-Dame" (de Lusignan) (Speculum, 1957, p.28).

14. LeMarignier (Recherches sur l'hommage en marche, p.93); cf. J. Richard (Les Ducs de Bourgogne, p.xxii). Ganshof noted the record of an act of homage for the year 1076, but the lord was an ecclesiastical one (Quest-ce que la Féodalité ? pp. 100 and 139).

the two.[15] It is true, however, that the events are recorded from Hugh's point of view entirely; and it seems improbable that Duke William the Great, the correspondent of Fulbert of Chartres,[16] would have allowed a record to have been drawn up on his behalf in such rustic Latin.

---

15. Richard (loc.cit).

16. Above, p. 79.

Aquitanorum comes vocitatus Guillelmus conventum habuit cum Hugonem Chiliarchum,[1] ut dum eveniret[2] finis vicecomiti Bosoni[3] honorem eius mitteret ei in commendatui.[4] Roho vero episcopus vidit et audivit osculavitque[5] brachium comiti. Savaricus autem vicecomes tollebat Ugoni terram quam de Willelmo Comite tenebat; et mortuum vicecomite[6] ipso promisit comes Ugoni ut non cum Radulfo fratri supradicto mortuo nullum conventum aut finem ageret, usque-quo terra soluta esset. Haec dixit coram omnibus, sed postea latenter illi eam dedit. Pro terra vero ista, sive pro alia maius vel res alias,[7] habuit conventum Hugoni cum vicecomiti[8] Radulfo ut filiam eius accipere in[9] uxorem. Ut audivit Comes iratus est valde, properavitque ad Hugonem cum humilitate et dixit ei : "Noli accipere Radulfi filiam in uxorem. Ego dabo tibi quocumque[10] petieris mihi, meusque eris amicus super omnes preter filio meo."[11] Fecitque Ugo quod praecipit ei comes, et propter eius amorem fidelitatemque mulierem in occulto dimisit.

Eo tempore accidit ⟨p. 266v⟩ut finiretur de castro Parteniaco Ioscelinus. Dixitque comes ut honorem et mulierem eius Hugoni traderet, vel etiam si haec nollet recipere minime[12] se sideret in eo. Ugo vero pro hac re nil[13] amonuit[14] vel precavit[15] comitem pro se nec pro alio. Considerans ergo se dixit ad comitem : "Omnia faciam quod[16] mihi iusseris". Comes autem agens placitum cum comite Fulconi promisit ei de sua propria beneficia dare illi. Fulco promisit ut haec quod a[17] se

---

1. Hugone Chiliarco - B. 2. exiret - bc. 3. vicecomitis Bosonis - B. 4. commendatu - B, commendam - a. 5. que omitted - a. 6. mortuo vicecomite - B. 7. rem aliam - B. 8. vicecomite. 9. acciperet - B, in omitted - b. 10. quicumque - B, quocumque - a, quodcumque - b. 11. preter filium meum - B. 12. nomine - B. 13. nihil - abc. 14. ammonuit - B. 15. prȩcavit - b. 16. que - B. 17. hec que ad - B, hȩc quod ad - bc.

pertinebat[1] daret Hugoni. In hunc vero conventum mandavit[2] comes pro vicecomite Radulfo, dixitque ei : "Conventum quod nabet tecum Ugo nihil[3] illum faciet quia ego illi prohibeo.[4] Sed etiam ego et Fulco conventum habemus ut demus illi honorem et uxorem Ioscelini. Faciamusque pro tua confusione quia non es mihi fidelis". Ut audivit Radulfus dolens fuit valde, et dixit comiti : "Pro Deo sit tibi[5] non hoc[6] facias". Et comes ait : "Fac mihi fidutiam[7] ut non des illi filiam tuam, nec conventum ei adtendas;[8] similiterque faciam ut honorem nec uxorem Ioscelini possideat". Ita et fecerunt[9] Ugoni ut nec una vel alia. Habiit[10] Radulfus ad Willelmo comite[11] qui in castro Mosteriolo[12] erat, nunciansque Ugoni ut invicem fabularentur. Ita[13] factum est. Dixitque Radulfus Hugoni ⟨p.267R⟩: "Haec in fide tibi pronuntio[14] ut non mihi discooperies.[15] Fiduciam da mihi ut me adiuves contra Willelmo comite;[16] teneoque tibi tuum conventum et tibi iuvabo contra omnes homines". Refutaque[17] omnia Ugo pro amore Guillelmi Comiti.[18] Partiti sunt Ugo et Radulfus tristes. Cepitque[19] Radulfus litigationem cum comite Guillelmo, et Ugo pro amorem[20] comiti cum Radulfo. Recepitque dampnum[21] Ugo valde.

Defuncto ergo Radulfo rogavit comitem Ugo ut terram quam Radulfusei tulerat reddere[22] ei. Comes autem[23] dixit Ugoni : "Ego finem non faciam cum Ioszfreddum[24] vicecomiti qui nepus[25] fuit Radulfo, neque[26] cum hominibus de Toarcinse[27] castro usquequo[28] terram tuam reddam". Et nil hoc factum,[29] sed habiit[30] comes fecitque finem cum vicecomite Ioszfredo et cum hominibus Toarcinse;[31] ninilque[32] finem fecit Hugoni et

---

1.pertinebant - B. 2.Hugoni added - bc. 3.nil - a. 4.prohibebo - B. 5.Domino sit tibi - a,Deo tibi sit - bc. 6.hec - B. 7. fiduciam - abc. 8.attendas - B,bc. 9.fecerant - bc. 10.abiit - abc. 11.Guillelmum comitem - B. 12.Monsteriolo - b. 13.Et ita - B. 14.pronuncio - B,promitto praenuncio - bc. 15.me discooperias - B. 16.Guillelmum comitem - B. 17.Refutataque - B. 18.comitis - B,b. 19.coepit - b. 20.amore - a. 21.damnum - a. 22.tulleret - B, redderet - B,abc. 23.tunc - B. 24.loszfredoni - a, losfredoni - bc. 25.neptus - a. 26.necque - a. 27.Thoarcinse - bc. 28.usque - B. 29.factum est - B. 30.habuit - B, se habuit - b. 31.Toarcinse - B. Toarcense - a, Thoarcinse castro - bc. 32. Sic in Ms - for nihil, which occurs in abc.

sua terra[1] Ugo non habuit. Et[2] pro malifacto quem fecit Ugo pro Comite accepi[3] Ioszfredus contentionem cum Ugoni, et incendit castro Mosolio[4] et cepit caballarios Ugoni[5] et incidit[6] manus illorum. Et satis alio facto[7] Comes vero ninil[8] iuvavit Ugoni nec finem bonam fecit inter eos, sed adhuc suam terram Ugo perditur,[9] et alia terra qua[10] in pace tenebat pro comitte amittit.[11] Et ut vidit Ugo quod non haberet terram cepit[12] de caballarios Toarcinse XLIII ex ⟨p.268v⟩meliores.[13] Potuissetque habere pacem et suas terras firmas et iusticiam[14] de malifacto;[15] et si accipere voluisset redemptionem, potuisset capere solidos xl milia.[16]

Ut autem audivit Comes letus esset[17] debuisset, fuitque tristis et transmisit pro Hugonem,[18] dicens ei : "Redde mihi homines". Respondit ei[19] Hugo : "Mihi haec quare,[20] domine ? Ego ninil[21] perdo nisi per fidelitatem tuam".[22] Comes vero dixit : "Non eos tibi interrogo propter tuum malum, sed etiam per hoc quod meus tu[23] es ad facere meam voluntatem.[24] Et ut omnes sciant per conventum, ergo talem homines recipiam ut[25] tibi finem faciam et terras tuas firmas malique facto emendato, aut homines ipsos reddere[26] tibi. Fac hoc sine dubitatione ad meam creditam fidemque meam, et si deprehenderit tibi male,[27] scire poteris quia ego traditionem tibi factam habeo".[28] Misitque[29] Ugo in Dominum[30] et in illo,[31] redditque[32] homines ipsos comiti per talem conventum. Postea Ugo homines non habuit nec rectum, et terram suam perdit.

Habuerunt inter se conventum comes Pictavorum et praesul[33]

1.suam terram - B. omission from et sua terra to cum Ugoni in bc. 2.et omitted - a. 3.accepit - B,bc. 4.Mosolium - B. 5.Hugonis - B. 6.incendit - B. 7.alia facta - B. 8.Sic in ms (see previous p, n.32). 9.perdit - B. 10.aliam terram quam - B. 11.comite amitit - B, comite - abc. 12.cepit - B,abc. 13.caballariis ... quadraginta tres ex melioribus - B, XL millia - bc. 14.iusticias - B, iustitiam - abc. 15.malefacto - B,a, te malefacto - bc. 16.voluisset...solidos quadraginta - B. 17.laetus esse - a, laetatus esse - bc. 18.per - B. 19. ei omitted - B. 20.interrogas inserted - B. 21.-Sic in Ms. 22.suam - a. 23. hec eciam per hoc quod meus es - B. 24.voluntatem mearm - a. 25.aut - bc. 26.tradere - B,reddam - abc. 27.deprenderit...mali - B. 28.habero - b. 29.que omitted - B. 30.Deum - B,bc. 31.illa-b. 32.suam terram perdidit - B, perdidit - abc. 33. presul - B.

Gislebertus cum Ioscelino avunculo Hugoni.[1] Fuitque de castro vocitato Vicvedoni,[2] ut[3] post discessum Episcopo Gisleberto[4] esset castrum Ioscelini;[5] et in vita sua fecit Episcopus commendare homines de ipso castro ad Ioscelinum, reddiditque ei turrem. Et post mortem amborum fecit comes conventum inter episcopo Ysemberto[6] et Ugoni ut ⟨p.269R⟩ esset pars media de castro Ugoni - medietasque de causa dominicata, et due partes de fevos vassalorum.[7] Propterea fecit Comes commandare[8] Ugonem ad Episcopo Ysemberto,[9] modo vero tollit curtem meliorem ad eos.

Quadam[10] tribunus nomine Aimericus, abstrahens castrum vocitatum Sivriacum Bernardo seniori suo, et hoc castrum rectitudo[11] erat Hugoni sicut fuerat[12] patris suo.[13] Pro ira quam[14] tenebat Guillelmus Comes adversus Aimericum amonuit[15] Ugonem ut fieret homo supradicto Bernardo pro[16] ipsam partem de castro qui fuerat patri suo, et[17] ut ambo acciperent litigationem cum Aimiricum.[18] Fuit autem contrarium Ugoni ut esset homo Bernardi, facere noluit.[19] Hanc istam[20] ammonitionem comes uno anno tenuit, et quod[21] amplius irascebat[22] tanto maius ammonebat[23] Ugoni ut fieret homo Bernardi. Transacto anno,[24] veniens comes ad Ugonem quasi iratus, dixit ei : "Quare non agis conventum cum Bernardo ? Tantum ex me tu es ut si dicerem[25] tibi rusticum facere in seniori,[26] facere debueras. Age quod[27] dico, et si tibi male deprehenderit,[28] require mihi". Credidit eum[29] Ugo, et homo fuit[30] Bernardi propter quartam partem de castro supradicto. Dedit autem Bernardus comitem in plevione[31] Ugoni et iilior[32] hostaticos. Dixit[33] Comes Ugoni : "Commenda mihi hos ostaticos per talem

---

1.Hugoni - B. 2.Vicredoni - bc. 3.et - B. 4.episcopi Gisberti - B,bc. 5.loscelino - B. 6.episcopum Isembertum - B,episcopos Isemberto - a. 7. de fevis - B, duae propter de fevo vassalorum - a, duae partes de te vos vassalorum - b. 8.commendare - B,abc. 9.episcopum Isembertum - B. 10.Quidam - B,abc. 11.utendo - a. 12.erat - B. 13.sui - B. 14.que - B. 15.ammonuit - B. 16.per - B. 17. ne - b. 18.Aimerico - B. 19.voluit - B. 20.istam omitted - B. 21.quando - B. 22.irasscebatur - B. 23.amonebat - b. 24.vero - b. 25.dixerim - b. 26.Seniore - bc. 27.quid - a. 28.comprehenderit - B. 29.ei - B 30. homo omitted - B,fuit homo -abc. 31.plevone - b. 32.et et quatuor - B. 33.Dixit...ostaticos omitted - b.

conventum quod, si Bernardus per fidem non attende ⟨p.270v⟩rit, tibi tuas convenientias, ego eas[1] tibi reddam in captionem et per fidem sim tuus adiutor". Sic etiam fortiter promisit comes Ugoni quantum[2] ipse bene scit.[3] Misitque Ugo in credentia seniori suo, coepitque[4] contentionem validam propter castro supradicto[5] et recepit dampnum[6] valde de suos homines[7] vel de multas res alias.[8] Et incoavit illi comes castrum unum qui vocatur[10] Coacus et ei nihil finivit, sed fuit locutus cum Aimerico, et dimisit castro, nihilque[11] iuvavit Ugoni.

Postea vero contristavit[12] se maius comes[13] cum Aimirico propter castro vocitato Kasiaco,[14] quem adprehenderat[15] Aimericus ; et steterunt insimul Comes et Ugo in contentionem contra eum. Obsedit autem castrum qui[16] vocatur Malavallis[17] pro malifacto[18] quem[19] faciebat ei Aimericus et cepit[20] eum, iuvavitque ei[21] Ugo ut potuit. Antequam separaret[22] Ugo de comite promisit ei Comes, sicut[23] debet Senior promittere[24] suo homini, rationem vel finem vel societatem cum Aimericum[25] non haberet[26] sine Ugonem,[27] et Malavallis factus[28] non fuisset sine suo consilio. Fecitque Comes finem cum Aimirico et permisit[29] ei facere Malavallem sine consilio Ugoni.[30] Quamdiu vixerit[31] Aimericus de res supradictas[32] nihil fuit Ugoni.

Post mortem Aimericum crevit cum filio suo[33] Aimirico et Ugonem magna contentio. Eodem[34] tempore venit Ugo ad comitem, dixit ei[35]: "Male es modo mi, senior meus, quia de fiscum[36] quem fecisti mihi adquirere[37] nihil habeo". Respondit ei Comes[38]: ⟨p.271R⟩"Habeam[39] placitum cum illis ut[40] si obtime[41] fecerint sit bonum, sin autem faciam tibi castrum quem incoav".[42]

1.eas ego-B,eos-b.2.quartum-bc.3.sit-B,a.4.cepitque-B,accepitque,bc.5.castrum supradictum-B.6.damnum-abc.7.suis hominibus-B. 8.alias res-b.9.vocavit-B,inchoavit castrum-b.10.qui vocatus-B, quod vocitatur-abc.11.castrum que.12.contestavit-a.13.magis, comes omitted-B.14.castrum vocatum Casiacum-B.15.quo apprendat-B,quod-abc.16.quod-abc.17.Malavalis-B.18.malefacto-abc.19.quam-B.20.cepit-B, coepit-abc.21.iuvavat Hugo-B.22.se inserted-B. 23.sicud-B.24.promitere-B.25.Aimerico-B.26.habere-bc.27.Hugone-B.28.Malavallem factum-B.29.promisit-a.30.Hugonis-B.31.vixit -B.32.rebus supradictis.33.suo omitted-abc.34.Eo-B.35.et dixit -B.36.meus senior quia de fisco-B.37.acquirere-b.38.Comes ei B,omitted-b.39.habebo-B.40.et-B.41.optime-B,abc.42.Sic in Ms: incoavi-B.

Factumque est castrum per consilium Bernardi qui adhuc adiuvabat Ugoni de contentionem.[1] Homines autem de Sivriaco, ut viderunt[2] oppressionem quam faciebat eis[3] Ugo, non valentes[4] sustinere, fecerunt finem cum Bernardo et reddiderunt[5] ei castrum. Recepitque illum sine consilio Ugoni.[6] Fuerunt ambo Bernardus et Americus in contentionem adversus Hugonem, et ipse solus contra eos. Veniens Ugo ad comitem, dixit ei : "Senior meus, valde[7] mi male quia senior quem feci per[8] tuum consilium modo mi tollit meum fiscum. Precor te et ammoneo[9] per fidem quam senior adiuvari[10] debet homini suo : aut placitum bonum, aut fiscum meum fac mihi habere[11] sicut mi plevisti;[12] aut ostaticos meos[13] quos ego tibi commendavi, redde mihi ; et insuper adiuva me sicut mihi[14] plevisti". Comes autem nihil adiuvavit nec finem non[15] fecit ei, nec ostaticos[16] suos non reddidit, sed absolutos illos reddidit Bernardo. Et post hoc[17] crevit contentio inter Bernardum et Aimericum et Ugonem.

Et quomodo[18] vidit Ugo quod[19] comes nihil adiuvabat, ei perrexit requirere[20] consilium Geraldo episcopo Lemovicas ; Habieruntque[21] ambo in marcha super Bernardum Geraldus et Ugo et aedificaverunt castrum unum. Comes autem qui adiuvare debuerat Ugoni, tulit ei castrum et igne succendit[22] (p.272v.) Precepitque[23] ipse et filius eius a[24] cunctis suis hominibus ut nemo adiuvaret Ugoni nisi voluisset mori. Accepitque consilium Bernardus cum suis hominibus ut[25] malum faceret Ugoni per concilium Comiti,[26] et acceperunt terminum a quindecim dies.[27] In ipsos quindecim dies apprehendit[28] comes dextras inter Bernardum et[29] Ugonem. Infra treubas tres dies vero duxit[30] se cum comes Ugoni in hostem ad Aspremundo castro,

---

1.contencione - B. 2.contentiones inserted - bc. 3.faciebat eis omitted - B. 4.vallentes - B. 5.rediderunt - B. 6.Hugoni - B. 7.est inserted - B. 8.propter - abc. 9.ammoneo - B. 10.adiuvare - b. 11.meum fiscum - abc, abere - B. 12.implevisti - abc. 13.hostaticos - B,abc, suos - B. 14.omitted B. 15.omitted - B. 16.hostaticos - B,abc. 17.hec - B, haec - a. 18.quando - B. 19.quod comes...Geraldus et Ugo, omitted - B. 20.quaerere - bc. 21.abieruntque - abc. 22.sugsendit - B. 23.praecepit - abc. 24.a omitted - B. 25.et - B. 26.comitis - B, Hugoni - b. 27.diebus - B. 28.apprendit - B. 29.et Ugonem...homini suo (see below, p.247), omitted - B. 30.trevas dies vero direxit secum - a, troubas tres vero duxit - bc.

fuitque cicius[1] castro placitatus. Dehinc ambulavit comes ad Blavi ad placitum que habere debebat cum comitem Sanconem, dixitque[2] Ugonem ut isset cum eo. Responditque Ugo : "Domine, quomodo vocas mihi[3] ire tecum ? Tu ipse scis quo in breve sunt dextras quas habeo cum Bernardo, et ipse minat ut mihi faciat mala". Ait ei comes : "Noli hoc timere quamdiu[4] mecum eris ut tibi faciant quicquam". Ad vim et sine voluntatem[5] eius duxit eum secum.

Et dum morarentur ad placitum audierunt homines Ugoni quod Bernardus super eum veniebat, nuntiaverunt[6] Ugoni ut veniret. Ugo vero dixit comiti : "Bernardus super me veni"[7] Et dixit comes : "Nolite timere hoc ut autsi sint super te venire,[8] etiam opus tibi haec fuisset ut venirent ego confunderer[9] eos et tibi auxiliarem". In ipsa autem ora[10] transmisit comes per viros suos, direxitque Ugoni in antea et secutus[11] est eum. Quando fuit Ugo ad Liziniaco, erat Bernardus ad Confolensis cas ⟨p.273R⟩trum et captum habebat burgum et barrium[12] et habebat omnia incensa, accepta spolia et viros captos satisque alio malifacto. Cucurrit nuntius[13] ad Ugonem, dixit ei : "Bernardus obsessam habet uxorem tuam in castro vetulo qui superat ab igne". Veniens Ugo[14] ad comitem, dixit ei : "Meus senior, nunc mihi[15] adiuva, quia obsessa est modo mulier mea". Comes vero nihil ei adiutorium nec consilium dedit. Reversusque est Bernardus, et sui operati sunt malum Ugoni et viris suis quantum nec accipere potest per quinquaginta mil. solid.[16] Et hoc dampnum[17] recepit Ugo infra dextras quas praebuit ei comes ad Blavia.

Post non multum tempus ivit Ugo ad castrum Gentiaco et incendit eum et coepit viros hac[18] mulieres, et duxit secum

---

1.citius - a. 2.duxitque - ac. 3.me - abc. 4.quandiu - a. 5.voluntate - abc. 6.nunciaverunt - abc. 7.Sic in Ms. - venit. abc. 8.ausi sint supervenire - abc. 9.confunderem - abc. 10.hora - abc. 11.mandata et sequutus - bc. 12.berrium - b. 13.nuncius - b. 14.ergo - abc. 15.mihi omitted - b. 16.milia solidorum - abc. 17.damnum - abc. 18.et - abc.

omnia. Pergensque ad comitem, dixit ei : "Domine, da mihi licentiam ut faciam castrum quem succensum habeo". Dixitque ei Comes : "Tu es enim homo Fulconi, quomodo facias castrum ? Ipse enim tibi requirat, et non valebis tenere quo ei non[1] reddas ". Ait Ugo : "Domine, quando ego homo fui Fulconi, dixi illi quod homines sui tollebant rectum meum et si ego valebam[2] ad eos tollere, fecissem ; sed tantum in sua fidelitate tenuissem quod ego sic facere volo. Et Fulco dixit mihi, 'Si tu tollis ad eos, mihi tollere noli' ". Ut audivit comes quod talem conventum habuisset[3] Fulco et Ugo, placuit ei. ⟨p.274v⟩ Dixitque Comes Ugoni : "Fac castrum per tale[4] conventum ut si ego valeo acaptare[5] cum comite Fulconi de pretio meo et de tuo, una pars sit mea et alia tua".

Et fecit Ugo castrum. Requisivit eum Fulco comiti.[6] Respondit ei comes : "Ugoni require". Et Fulco sic fecit. Respondit ei Ugo : "Quando ego fui homo tuus, dixi tibi quia si ego valebam[7] ad inimicos meos tollere castellos,[8] tulissem et tenuissem in tua fidelitate ; et sic volo facere, quia istum castrum quem tu requiris, ad consanguineos meos fuit, et rectum habeo melius quam illi qui tenebant". Et ait Fulco : "Tu qui meus es, quomodo teneas hoc quod ego non dedi tibi extra meo grado ?". Requisivitque Ugo comiti consilium. Comes vero dixit ei : "Si fidutias[9] vult dare tibi, ut inimici tui castrum non habeant, non poteris[10] eum tenere. Sin autem tene eum quia non poterit te accusare". Ugo vero interrogavit hostaticos ut daret ei Fulco ; et nullum dedit ei, sed dixit : "Ego requiram Comiti et ad illum dabo hostaticos, et ipse det tibi de suos". Versusque est placitus in ira. Requisivit Fulco

---

1. non ei - b. 2. volebam - b. 3. habuissent - abc. 4. talem - abc. 5. acceptare - b. 6. Fulco comite - abc - then omission to Respondit. 7. volebam - b. 8. castrum - bc. 9. fiducias - abc. 10. potens - b.

castrum ad comitem Ugoni. "Iam non reddam", ait Ugo, "sine fidentias".[1] Dixit ei Comes : "Ego faciam fidutiam, et dixit mihi[2] quales". Ait Ugo: "Accipe quales volueris ex comite Fulconi, et da mihi hoc quod requiro. Da mihi ⟨p.275R⟩ illum qui custodit turrem ex Metulo, ut si Aimericus habuerit castrum sine meo consilio et malus mihi advenerit, ille homo reddat mihi turrem". Dixit ei comes : "Hoc non faciam, quia non possum". Hugo dixit[3] : "Si de illam non volis[4] facere, fac de Kasiaco per conventum supradictum". Comes autem nec una[5] nec alia facere voluit.

Visum fuit Ugoni et ad suos ut male tractaret ei Comes. Et partiti sunt in iram. Misit Ugo omnia necessaria in castrum, et voluit eum tenere contra omnes si fidutias[6] non darent ei. Exivit Comes extra civitatem, rogavit Ugonem ad se veniret, et mandavit ei pro Guillelmo comite de Engolisma ut mitteret in sua mercede, quia non potebat[7] mutare ut non adiuvaret Fulconi; et timebat perdere aut Fulconem aut Ugonem. Misit se Ugo in credenda[8] et in amicicia[9] comiti senior suo, et[10] fecisset pro eius amore quia ipse erat securus de Fulconem quod male non fuisset[11] ductus. Et ait Comes : "Faciat Ugo pro me et ego portam illi[12] fidem sicut senior portari[13] debet homini suo.[14] Et si male deprehenderit[15] ei, sciat quod ego traditum habeo eum etiam amplius mihi non credat". Et Ugo ait : "De multas res[16] habet mihi dictum senior meus similiter unde habet me seductum". Et non habuit Ugo ullum[17] hominem qui hoc ei consiliaret[18] ut mitteret in ⟨p.276v⟩ credendam comiti.[19] Comes autem rememoravit Ugoni omnia bona que[20] fecerat ei et distringens eum cum sua[21] amore et deprecatione vel coniuratio,[22] dixit ei : "Omnia mittam in tua credentia ; tamen cave te ne

---

1.fidentia - a, fiducias - bc. 2.ei - bc. 3.dixit omitted - bc. 4.velis - abc. 5.tua - a. 6.fiducias - abc. 7.poterat - a, petebat - bc. 8.Hugonem quod misit si Ugo in credentia - bc. 9.amicitia - abc. 10.suo et si male deprehenderit ei sciat fecisset - b. 11.fecisset - bc. 12.illi omitted - abc. 13.portare - abc. 14.Endof omission in B (see p244 n 29). 15.deprehenderint - B. 16.multis rebus - B. 17.illum - B, abc. 18.auxiliaretur - B. 19.comitis - B. 20.que - B, quae, bc. 21.suo - abc. 22.coniuracione - B.

male secas me quia si[1]feceris iam[2]non ero tibi fidelis neque serviam tibi et fidelitatem non te portem.[3] Sed propterea quod ero separatus a te et fidutias[4]non vales mihi dare, volo ut des mihi fevum meum in hostaticum quod iam tibi non serviam, et absolve mihi de illa sacramenta quam[5]tibi habeo facta". Dixitque Comes : "Voluntarius".[6]

Reddidit[7]Ugo castrum Comiti extra voluntatem[8]hominibus suis per[9]talem conventum ut Aimericus eum non haberet sine consilio suo, et malum ei non eveniret. Per istas mescredentias[10] auditas accepit Ugo fevum suum in hostaticum, deditque ei[11] Comes per talem conventum quod si ei male ducebat ei[12] de istum conventum,[13]de Gentiaco nihil servisset[14]ei iam amplius. Et absolvit eum de sacramentos[15]ut iam illi re nulla fecisset propter eos sine[16]ulla malivoléntia. Reddidit Comes Gentiacum sine consilio Ugoni,[17]pecuniamque accepit et terram dominicam.[18] Malum[19]ei evenit de interfectos homines et incensas mansiones, factasque praedas et terras invasas, et mala multa que[20]pro veritate non potest dinumerare.[21] Post istum terminum transactum dedit[22]comes respectum Ugoni et pro-(p.277R)misit ut benefaceret ei,[23]aut de sua rectitudine aut de alia que[24]illi placuisset. Et transactum terminum nihil illi fecit. Sed mandavit illi : "Noli adtendere[25]quia tibi mihil faciam. Et si[26]omnis mundus erat meus tantum quantum tenet digitus meus non te dedissem[27]pro hac re".

Cum autem audivit Ugo hoc, ivit ad curtem[28]comiti[29]et misit eum in ratione de sua rectitudine, et nihil ei profuit. Contristavit se Ugo et defidavit[30]comitem de se, nisi de civitate sua et de corpore suo, audientibus cunctis.[31] Antequam Ugo vel sui homines nullum malum fecissent, adprehenderunt[32] homines comiti benefitium[33] hominibus Ugoni pro

---

1.secaris me quasi-B,feras-abc.2.iam omitted B.3.portabo, Te omitted-B.4.fiducias-abc.5.illis sacramentis que-B.6.Volumptatine-B.7.que ei-b.8.volumptatem-B.9.super-B.10.mecredencias-B.11.ei omitted B, eum-b.12.ei maledicebat-bc.13.isto conventu-B. 14.fecisset-bc.15.sacramentis-B.16.rem nullam feceret propter mala sive eos-B.17.Hugone-B.18.disticam(?)-B.19.male-abc. 20.interfectis hominibus et incensis mansionibus factisque praedis et terris invasis malis multis que-B,quae-abc.21.possuit dinumerari-B.22.que-a.23.ei omission to nihil faciam-B.24.quae-abc.25.attendere-b.26.si omitted-abc.27.tibi-B.Te dissem-a. 28.curtim-bc.29.comitis-B.30.defedavit-b.31.cunctis suis-abc. 32.apprenderunt-B, apprehenderunt-bc.33.beneficium-abc.

nomen[1] de guerra. Ut vidit Ugo,[2] perrexit ad castrum Kassiacum que[3] fuit avunculo suo, quae[4] Petrus tenebat iniuste unde dampnum[5] Ugoni veniebat ; cepit[6] turrem et proiecit[7] homines Petroni. Fecitque Ugo pro[8] hoc quia cogitavit habere rectum, quia fuerat patri suo vel ad alii parentibus suis, quem[9] perdebat. Ut autem audivit hoc comes contristavit[10] se valde et mandavit Ugoni ut redderet ei turrem quam habebat abstultam[11] Petroni. Mandavit Ugo comiti quod redderet[12] honorem patri suo et alia que fuerat[13] parentibus suis ubi ipse rectum habebat, et ipse ei[14] reddidisset turrem et[15] omnia que[16] intus fuerant adprae ⟨p.278v⟩hensa,[17] et totam illam honorem que fuerat Ioszcelino que[18] Comes ei dederat. Consideravit se comes et levaverunt placitum invicem. Dixitque Comes Ugoni : "Non reddam tibi illas honores quas[19] mihi requiris[20]; sed istamhonorem quae[21] fuit avunculo tuo - kastrum,[22] turrem et omnem istam[23] honorem - dabo tibi per talem conventum ut amplius mihi non requiras illam[24] honorem que[25] fuit patri tuo vel ad aliis[26] parentibus tuis, neque alias causas quas per rectum tuum requiris".

Ut autem[27] audivit Ugo dubitavit valde comitem, eo quod per[28] malum ingenium eum in retro habebat in multis[29] deductum. Dixit ad comitem :"Non sum ausus facere hoc, quia timeo ut malum me minasses, sicut habes factum de multas alias res."[30] Dixit comes Ugoni :"Ego faciam tibi tales fidutias[31] ut non amplius me non[32] discredas". Dixit ei Ugo : "Quales?" Dixit comes: "Pro uno servo tibi ostendam ut portet tibi[33] iuditium[34] ut non discredas quod illam finem[35] quam[36] fecerimus inter nos bona et firma sit. Et pro omnibus causas[37] que[38] de retro fuerunt dampnum[39] tibi amplius iam[40] non eveniet, sed finis sit adtenta[41] firma[42] sine ullo mali[43] ingenio". Ut audivit Ugo quod ita

---

1.nom⁹ in Ms.A. 2.Insertion vel sui homines...apprehenderunt homines (p248above)-bc.3.quod-B,quae-abc.4.quod-B,quam-abc. 5.damnum-B,abc.6.coepit-b.7.proicerit-B.8.post-B.9.alios parentes suos quod-B.10.constristavit-B.11.aufertam-B.12.rederet-B. 13.que fuerant-B,quae fuerant-abc.14.ei ipse-B.15.ut-abc.16.quae-abc.17.apprensa-B,adprensa-abc.18.que-B,quae-abc.19.illos honores quos-B.20.requires-abc.21.istum honorem qui-B.22.castrum-abc. 23.istum-B,abc.24.illum-B.25.qui-B,quae-abc.26.quod alüs-B. 27.autem omitted-B.28.in-a.29.in multis omitted-b.30.multis alüs rebus-B.31.fiducias-abc.32.ut amplius non discredas-B, non me-abc.33.michi-B.34.iüdicium-abc.35.fidem-B.36.quem-bc. 37.causis§38.que-B,quae-abc.39.damnum-abc.40.iam plus non-B. 41.attenta-B.42.omitted-b.43.malo-abc.

dicebat Comes, dixit : "Tu es meus senior ; non accipiam de te fiduciam, sed tan ⟨p.279R⟩-tum mitto in misericordiam domino et in tua mercede". Dixit Comes Ugoni : "Relinque mihi omnes querelas de retro quas requirebas, et iura mihi fidelitatem et filio meo, et dabo[1] tibi honorem avunculo tuo,[2] aut contra concampnium tibi valente".[3] Et dixit Ugo : "Senior, precor te per Deum[4] et per istum sanctum crucifixum qui in figura $\overline{XPI}$[5] factus est, ut non mihi facias facere si[6] in antea tu et filius tuus vultis mihi minare per malum[7] ingenium". Dixit Comes : "Ita faciam per fidem ego et filius meus, sine malo ingenio". Dixit Ugo : "Et quomodo habuero iuratam fidelitatem,[8] tu requiras mihi castrum Kassiacum;[9] et si non reddidero[10] tibi, tu dicas quod non est rectum ut tibi vetem castrum que[11] de te habeo; et si tibi reddidero, tu autem et filius tuus tolletis mihi quia vos non habetis mihi fiducia facta nisi[12] de Deo et de vestra mercede". Dixit Comes ; "Non faciemus.[13] Et si nos[14] requisierimus tibi, tu noli nobis reddere".

Per nomen autem de tali conventu ut sicut finis locuta fuit,[15] quod comes et filius suus portassent[16] Ugoni sine malo ingenio, receperunt Ugonem ad hominem in fide et in credentia. Et fecerunt Ugoni relinquere omnia que[17] de retro requirebat. Et iuravit illis fidelitatem, et dederunt illi[18] honorem Ioszcelini avunculo suo, sicut ipse[19] tenebat illam ⟨p.280v⟩uno anno antequam moreretur.

FINIUNT CONVENTI[20] INTER COMITEM ET UGONEM

---

1. dabit - b. 2. avunculi tui - B. 3. Condampnum tibi valentem - B, concamnium - b. 4. Dominum - abc. 5. Christi - abc. 6. set - B. 7. malum omitted - B. 8. fidelitatem iuratam - B. 9. Cassiacum - B, abc. 10. reddiderim - b. 11. que - B, quae - abc. 12. habetis fiduciam factam - B, nisi fiducia facta - b. 13. faciamus - B. 14. non - abc. 15. ut sicut fini, locuta fuerit - a, aut sicut finis loquuta - bc. 16. portasset - a. 17. que - B, quae - abc. 18. illo - B. 19. sicut illam omitted - bc. ille - B. 20. contenti - B, conventus - b.

APPENDIX II

Unpublished documents concerning the Counts of Poitou and Dukes of Aquitaine.

This is an arbitrary selection of documents concerning the Dukes of Aquitaine. Four have been taken from the charters of the ducal foundation of Montierneuf at Poitiers (nos. 6-9); six have been taken from the earlier of the two cartularies of the Bordelais abbey of la Sauve-Majeure (nos. 10-15); five are drawn from various transcripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale. These include two notices from the archives of Marmoutier (nos. 2-3), Hugh of Lusignan's grant of a church to la Chaise-Dieu (no. 4), another document concerning a priory of the same abbey (no. 5), and the only early document, William the Great's grant to the abbey of Ebreuil in the Auvergne (no. 1). The elaborate introductory harangue and phrases of this early eleventh century document should be compared with those of a later date.

Method of Edition.

1. Where there is an original document the variants of copies have not been noted except to supply omissions.
2. Punctuation has been modernised (see the photograph of no. 7).
3. Where a document is undated an approximate date has been established and is given in the heading within brackets.

1 1016.

<u>William Count of Poitou 'totius monarchiae Aquitaniae tenens principatum' for the sake of his parents' souls, the salvation and their mothers' souls, gives to Abbot Emmo and the monastery dedicated to St. Léger and St. Maixent at Ebreuil in the Auvergne, a place in the Saintonge, with all its tithes, and permission to build a church. He also gives the tithes of everything lying within two miles, if the forest is brought into cultivation, and a house in the castle of Surgères.</u>

B.Ms.lat 12765,[1] pp. 208-12. ("ex tabulario Ebroilensi")

Cunctis in propabulo per quadrapartis kosmi climata clarere dignoscitur ob protoplasti nostri insolentiam omnem eius successionis plantationem toxicato infectam esse antidoto in tantum ut etiam propulsi a fulgore divina haereditatis eius incolae fore esse deberent in huius exulationis convallem inermes collocarentur. Quid enim aliud in hac arumnosa caligine huius mortalitatis nati, nisi ipsas peregrinationis nostrae tenebras noverimus; sed inerrabili conditoris nostri clementia nobis nunc et cunctis desiderantibus effugiendi pacisque locus, eleemosinarum videlicet largitione caeteror-umque bonorum actuum imitatione ac pretiosorum christianorum intercessione? Sed quo ad id peragendum, Domino supplicandum nostra minus urget possibilitas quod simus huius mundi directi

---

1. From a series of transcripts "<u>Fragmenta Hist. Aquitanicae</u>". This volume concerns the diocese of Clermont.

curae suffragium eorum qui hanc implere queunt condere et implorare.

Nunc igitur ego, in Dei nomine et Salvatoris I.C., WILLELMUS, divina dispensante clementia comes Pictavorum ac totius monarchiae Aquitaniae tenens principatum, notum fieri volui om̃nium fidelium nostrorum praesentium ac absentium ac praeposteris futurorum quod interpellatus sum a venerabili viro atque abbate EMMONE, qui culmen regiminis tenet cuiusdam loci almi patroni nostri (beati videlicet LEODEGARII martyris Christi atque pontificis beatique MAXENTII) in loco qui vocatur EBROLIENSE cenobium quod situm est in pago Arvernico, dare aliquid de terra mea in loco iam denominato. Annuens ergo eius suorumque precibus concedo atque transfundo quandam terram sitam in Sanctonico pago, pro remedio animae meae, patris matrisque, et pro salute filiorum meorum et animabus matrum earum, et omnium christianorum.

Habet autem ipsa terra fines primitus ab oriente campos cuiusdam villae que vocatur Gelsanz ac deinde proveniens cingitur villae aliae campis quae vocatur Vinolio, a meridie autem fines videtur habere terram quae appellatur Serens, exinde producitur usque ad terram quae fuit Gilberti et est filiorum eius, sicque vadiens habet fines contra solis occasum terram Sanctae Mariae ecclesiae Carenthenaci. Similiter autem terminatur ex uno latere campo Severiaco et in novissimo clauditur sylva praesenti. Omne ergo quidquid

ipsas fines terrae aut arborum cultum et incultum seu aliquid planitiei aut sylvae totum atque integrum praedicto loco beati Leodegarii et monachis inibi Domino famulantibus conferimus atque concedimus, ut construatur ecclesia ibi in honorem Domini nostri Iesu Christi atque beati Leodegarii sicque aedificetur locus ipse ac notus fiat omnibus.

Insuper do eis decimas omnium si quid plus sylvae postea cultum fuerit infra duos millarios ex omni parte huius terrae, et dono eis domum unam in castro quod vocatur Surgerias et in ipso loco unum iunctum de vinea et iVor iunctos de prato.

Praecipimus ergo, ac sub omni detestatione iubemus, ut nullus fidelium nostrorum praesentium ac successorum, praepositorum scilicet aut iudicum, seu aliorum hominum nec ulla aliquis persona, quidquid eis eorumque hominum fuerit nullum iudicium aut districtum facere praesumat; sed neque homines et iumenta aut pecora nulli hominum servire cogantur, praeter his solummodo monachis quibus a Domino et a nobis pro redemptione animarum nostrarum servire dati sunt. Volumus ergo inviolabili immobilique decreto firmari a nobis nostrorumque fidelium quamplurimorum, ut si quis ausu temerario haec iura nostri praecepti in aliquo violare aut contraire voluerit, mille libras auri persolvat, et inficiatur maledictionibus Domini omnibus tam veteris testamenti quam novi inscriptis, et adiiaciatur[2] servituti aeterna subiectus. Iram Dei tremendam cum Iuda traditore et cum Datan et Abiron et Chore

---

2. Thus.

et his qui Dominum negant anathemate feriatur et tradatur ignibus Gehennae cruciandus.

Data anno ab Inc. Domini Nostri I.C. MXVI, indict. XIIII, regnante Rotberto rege.

Signo domni Willelmi comitis qui fieri et firmari rogavit.

S/ Willelmi et Odoni filiorum eius.

S/ Agnetis comitissae

S/ Ebloni

S/ Gislaberti episcopi

S/ Hislonis episcopi

S/ Iosfredi vicecomitis

S/ Kaduloni vicecomitis

S/ Armerici. S/ Uboni. S/ Kateloni. S/ Ademari. S/ Radulphi. S/ Beraudi. S/ Radmundi S/ Ademari.

2. 10 April 1067

Incomplete notice of a plea brought by the monks of Marmoutier before Count William of Poitiers and his mother Agnes concerning exactions made by a certain Ulgerius.

B Collection Anjou-Touraine, no. 708 (from the archives of Marmoutier, "layette de Lourroux. Ce titre dont les...lignes sont coupées commence ainsi").

...Convenimus in curiam Pictavensis comitis Guillelmi cuius quidem et huius homo comitis legitimus erat idem, Ulgerius, nec erat tunc in Andegavo comes per quem idem deduci ad iustitiam posset. Igitur placito super hoc in predicti comitis curia constituto presto fuit supradicta comitissa Agnes, ipsius comitis videlicet Guillelmi mater, testibus qui interfuerant probare legitimis ita integre fecisse nobis Ulgerium dimissionem illam suae calumniationis sine ullius scilicet respectu conventionis pro anima tantum sua suique patris atque Guillelmi comitis sui quondam senioris - huius videlicet Guillelmi qui supra saepe nominatus est fratris - ut hanc repetere nullatenus deberet, etiam si promissionem aliquam sibi, ut dicebat, minus implesset, ad haec illo resistente nec ullo modo acquiescente iustitiae; tandem cum nec militem suum comes predictus vellet amittere, nec postea ut ille nos Ulgerius vexaret iniuste, taliter est complacitata finis ab ipso quidem comite: solidos ducentos a nobis autem accepit Ulgerius, ipse quingentos. Ac sic illius calumniae

dimissionem quam nobis dudum fecerat, perpetuo firmam tota integritate mansuram gratanter annuit, atque in testimonium prestitae huius perpetuae firmitatis in cartula quae de illa dimissione conscripta dudum fuerat signum sanctae crucis propriis manibus effigiavit.

Actum Pictavis civitate, anno ab Incarnatione Domini M.LXVII, mense Aprili, quatuor idus eiusdem mensis, feria quarta, Pascalis ebdomadae, testibus istis:

Isemberto episcopo Pictavensi	Savarico fratre vicecomitis Toarcensis
Comite Hildeberto de Marchia	Kadilone de Talamonte
Renaldo de Monteoserio	Garnerio de Calviniaco
Hugone Adraldi vicecomite de castro	Beraldo de Dunis
Fulcherio fratre eius	Beraldo de Arajone
	Guillelmo Bastardo de Mauusiaco

("3e colonne")[1] Stephano Rufo de Castro Adraldi. Andrea Rupedello. Iohanne de Cainone. Hugone de Sancta Maura. Maingodo legis doctore de Arte. Tetbaldo grammatico.

---

1. In the ms. the names were arranged in this fashion.

3. Undated. (c. 1059-86).[1]

Geoffrey Count of Poitou, Viscount Aimeri of Thouars, Archbishop Goscelin of Bordeaux, Bishop Isembert of Poitiers, were among those present at a gathering at which Stephen archipresbiter of Azenay acknowledged that he did not hold the churches of Azenay or de montibus from the Bishop of Poitiers, but from the monks of Marmoutier. This acknowledgment was made after the Bishop had threatened to remove the churches from Stephen's possession.

B Collection Moreau, vol. 27, fo.49 (copy of a notice on parchment "de 15 pouces de haut sur 7 de large" from the archives of Marmoutier)

Notum sit omnibus quod in quadam collucutione quam congregaverunt Gaufredus comes Pictaviensis, Haimericus vicecomes Thoartensis, Gauscelinus archiepiscopus Burdegalensis et Isembertus episcopus Pictaviensis ad monasteria nova de Massets, recognovit Stephanus archipresbiter Asianensis coram et prefato episcopo et multis aliis, quod ecclesiam Asianensem et illam de Montibus ab eodem episcopo·I·omnino non haberet. Recognitionis huius causa talis extitit. Predictus episcopus ·I· cepit causari eundem archipresbiterum .S. , quia non fecisset absolvi Burgundionem de Sivraio, divinum officium interdicendo eis qui in captionem tenebant - videlicet

---

1. This can only be placed between the appointment of Goscelin as Archbishop of Bordeaux and the death of Duke Guy-Geoffrey (c. 1059-86 - above, pp174 n.45, 178), since there is no means of establishing when Pippin of Talmont was disinherited.

Pipino de Talamonte, tunc exheredato, et Guillelmo Alerici filio. Archipresbitero respondente illos noluisse sibi obedire, iratus episcopus taliter ei comminatus est, dicens: "Quia super hoc iussioni meę non obedisti, ęcclesiam Asianensem et illam de Montibus, quas habes de me, tibi auferam". Qua interminatione archipresbiter iam stomacatus[2] et toto, ut videbatur, felle commotus, omnibus qui aderant audientibus constanter episcopo respondit nichil omnino se ab illo vel tenere vel habere praeter sacros ordines ad quos eum consecrando promoverat. His verbis subiunxit quod praedictas ecclesias ab abbate Maioris Monasterii et monachis eius hoc modo haberet. "Cum enim", inquit,"pater meus R. defunctus fuisset, monachi ecclesias utpote suas solide et quiete tenuerunt. Ego autem, cupiditate ductus, praesumpsi monachos inquietare, calumniari et quasi iure hereditario - licet iniuste - ęcclesiam reclamare ; atque propter hoc monachis et rebus eorum multa quę potui mala machinari atque peragere. Dehinc aliquanto post evoluto tempore, Haimericus vicecomes et Adenordis eius mater abbatem et monachos multum diuque rogantes, ut michi aliquam misericordiam impenderent, vix tandem impetrare potuerunt, ut venienti michi in capitulum Maioris Monasterii partem ęcclesiarum - quantum eis placuit - solummodo in vita mea concederent, ea scilicet ratione ut post mortem meam quilibet meus heres, sive

---

2. stomacabatus, ba expunged.

consanguineus, seu quoque modo michi propinquus, nichil prorsus in eis reclamaret vel calumpniaretur; sed totum ex integro, ut antea fuerat, in potestatem et dominium eorum reverteretur".

Huic autem attestationi sive recognitioni qui aderant non contradixerunt, sed potius omnes assensum dederunt, et suo silentio cum ipso episcopo confirmaverunt. Et ut certius credantur et firmius constent que, hic dicta sunt ab ipsius Stephani archipresbiteri ore universa audierunt, et hoc omnes nosse oportet quod, singulis annis Pictavi quinque solidis de sinodo persolutis, ecclesie, iste immunes et libere, ab omni prorsus exactione existent.

4 Undated. (1073 - c 1078/9).[1] Charroux.

Hugh of Lusignan gives the church of Frontenay with appurtenances to Abbot Durand of la Chaise-Dieu, at the command of the Count of Poitou.

B Ms.lat. 12767,[2] fos.223v-224v ("e schedis Domini...Casadensis ballivi")

Voce divina dicitur: "Facilius esse camelum per foramen acus transire, quam divitem in regnum Dei", et consolando subiunxit: "quae impossibilia sunt hominibus possibilia sunt apud Dominum"; praecepit enim ut thesaurisetur in caelo, ubi omnia redduntur centuplicata. Hoc Abraham, hoc David, hoc alii iusti, fecerunt et faciunt quibus nihil obsunt terrenae opes, quia eas in bonis expendunt, Deum sibi haeredem facientes. Propterea, ego Hugo Liziniacensis, secundum apostolicum dicentem, "divitibus huius saeculi praecipe non superbe sapere, neque sperare incerto divitiarum, sed in Deo vivo";[3] ob salutem animae et parentum meorum, do ecclesiam Frontanam nomine Christi et monasterio nostris temporibus constructo a Roberto beatae memoriae et sanctissimo viro, in quo loco qui

---

1. This can be dated by the subscription of Bishop Guy of Limoges (appointed 1073, above, p.21 n.57) and by the reference to Abbot Durand. He relinquished the abbacy of Chaise-Dieu after his appointment to the bishopric of Clermont, probably c 1078/9 (Gallia II, col. 263).

2. See no. 1, n.1. This volume contains documents from Chaise-Dieu.

3. Quotations are respectively from Mathew XIX, 24; Luke XVIII, 27; I Timothy VI, 17 (Vulgate).

dicitur Caza Dei, unde domnus Durandus est abbas; et unum molendinum cum furno, atque viridarium, necnon decimationem meam panis ac vini caeterorumque redituum. Et quicquid meae ditionis omnes dare voluerint, mea voluntate et mea confirmatione, sicut praedictum locum, ut absque ullius contradictione, teneantur; et testibus idoneis subter adscripti...[4] firmavi:-

S/.Fulchaudi abbatis Karrofensis monasterii, et caeterorum ibi Deo servientium, ubi hoc factum est. S/.Goisfredi comitis Pictavorum. S/.Guidonis praesulis Lemovicensium. S/.Audeberti comitis Marchiae. S/.Aymerici vicecomitis Toarcensium - iussu atque voluntate comitis Pictavorum, in cuius honore sunt mea omnia. Confirmo hoc donationen ut si quis contradixerit, ipse sit deffensor.

---

4. Omission in transcript.

5 Undated (perhaps 1085?)[1]

William Count of Poitou and William Fredelandus give Ste. Gemme and the monks of Chaise-Dieu land between valle Feva, Charnario and Ulmeda, with permission to construct mills and plant vines, without any custom or service.

B Collection Baluze, vol.40, fo 84v (without indication of source)

C Collection Baluze, vol.139, p.406 (analysis)[2]

D Ms.lat. 12778, fo. 199r (analysis)[3]

In nomine Domini nostri Iesu Christi. Ego Willelmus comes Pictavensis, et Willelmus Fredelandus, damus Deo et beatae Mariae et Sancto Rotberto atque Sanctae Gemmae et monachis Casae Dei presentibus et futuris, omnem illam terram quae finitur a valle Feva et Charnairo et Ulmeda; et damus

---

1. The only precise indication of date is "luna XXII". In the year 1085 both epact and paschal cycle corresponded with this number, both of which are calculated on the lunar year (Giry, Manuel de Diplomatique, pp. 148-53, 195). It is possible therefore, that this grant was made in 1085; but there are too many cases of faulty calculations of this type to be certain. It is probable that the Duke was Guy-Geoffrey: William Freheland confirmed the foundation charter of Ste. Gemme some time before c 1078/9. (Besly, p. 379).

2. Guillelmus comes Pictavensis et Willelmus Fredelandus dant Deo et B. Mariae et S. Roberto atque S. Gemmae et monachis Casae Dei, omnem illam terram, quae finitur a valle Feva et Charneo et Ulmeda. Facta est charta hebdomada 2a mensis Iunii, feria VI, luna XXII regnante Philippo rege Francorum. Ramnulfo episcopo Santonensis, Ademaro Engolismensi (No reference to these Bishops occurs in B).

3. This gives an even briefer indication of the contents than C.

paludes et riparias ad molendina construenda, sive ad vinaria, et ad omnia quaecumque ad suam utilitatem ibi aedificare voluerint. Hoc equidem facimus pro salute animarum nostrarum et parentum nostrorum, genitorum et geniturum;[4] ut habeant et possideant in perpetuum absque ulla prorsus consuetudine mala atque servitio, nisi spirituali. Et si quis huic donationi contradixerit, sciat se pro certo iram incurrere nisi se emendaverit, et satisfactionem Deo et monachis fecerit. Huius donationis testes fuerunt isti : Arbertus de Talamun, Stephanus Rupibus, Ranpulphus de Domnio, Roocellus Mosteriolo, Ebo de Partiniaco, Willelmus Achardus, Fulcaldus de Blavia.

Facta est autem karta ista ebdomada secunda mensis Iunii, feria VI, luna XXII, regnante Philippo rege Francorum.

---

4. Thus in copy.

6. Undated. (1076-86)[1]

William Count of Poitou notes that the knight Arraldus de Spal has renounced his claims to the land called "pratus maledictus", which the Count acquired from the benefice of Archbishop Goscelin of Bordeaux to give to the abbey of Montierneuf.

B Archives départementales de la Vienne, fonds Montierneuf (carton 6, no. 6) - contemporary copy[2] 194 x 115 mm.

Notum sit omnibus sanctae matris ecclesiae filiis quod ego Willelmus comes Pictavorum, terram que dicitur prati maledicti, a Ioscelino Burdegalensi archiepiscopo beneficio adquisivi; eamque ad honorem Dei omnipotentis & sanctae eius genitricis MARIAE, necnon sancti Iohannis Evangelistae novo monasterio, quod construitur in suburbio Pictavis, perpetuo permansuram tradidi. Sciendum quoque quod huius nostrae donationis dum quidam miles Arraldus de Spal calumpniator vellet existere; ad extremum cognoscens nullius suae esse utilitatis quod ageret, in presentia mei meorumque concedentibus his qui ab eo in predicta terra aliquid habere

---

1. This can be placed between the foundation of Montierneuf in 1076 (cf. Prou, Recueil des Actes...Philippe Ier, no. 84 and p. 218, with Chartes de Cluny IV, no. 3495) and the death of Archbishop Goscelin of Bordeaux in 1086 (above, p. 178). It therefore almost certainly concerns the Duke Guy-Geoffrey, not his son.

2. This is a tentative classification: the parchment bears no marks of authentification, such as characterise the following document as an "original".

videbantur, Deo et loco supradicto omnem in pace dimisit calumpniam. Et ut quod fecerat firmum maneret, ipse idem sub invocatione nominis Dei promisit fidem suam, quod nec ipse nec homo aliquis per se amplius calumpniator esset; et si quisquam hoc facere vellet ipse fideli animo ab hac calumnia conpesceret. Hoc in sua fide promisit, et ut fides salvasit, vicecomitem de Castel Arraut fidei suŏ tutorem supposuit. Quicumque hoc donum calumniatus fuerit decem libras auri componat. Signum Willelmi comitis. S/.Hugonis de Lezinian. S/.Hugonis prepositi. S/.Oddonis fratris sui.

In nomine sce & ind[ui]duae trin[itat]is Ego G.

pictauensis comes & Agenor dux cogitans de ultimo die magni iudicii

& de[tri]a p[re]mia[tio]ne & p[re]destinac[i]one animae meae. de patrimonii mei

portione monasterio nouo in honore sce dei genitricis. marie & beati

Hilarii confessoris. & omnium aplorum. sub urbe pictauensi decernendo. quandam

silua. ad p[re]dictam fabricanda. scilicet int[er] pontem labeau. & pontem

& malam villa. sua. concedente. & adfirmante guillelmo filio suo

ante dixerit sua uoluntate. in sua spontanea relinqt uoluntate.

sine omnib; quos dirimus. & ulla petitione. spectantib. patrib. meis de

re[bu]s. quos nomina subscribuntur. Mauricius. fulco normand. & Vgo picauensis. ppositi

eccl[es]ie dei genitr[ic]is. & Arnulfus turgerii ap[p]ositus. Hemericus Lemouicensis ppositus. & G. archidiaconus





MONTIERNEUF CHARTER Appendix 2. No 7A See p. 267 opp.

7. Undated. (1076-86)[1]

<u>G.Count of Poitou and Duke of Aquitaine gives a wood to the monks of Montierneuf for reclamation. William Freheland freely grants his rights there.</u>

A. Original, Archives Départementales de la Vienne, fonds Montierneuf (carton 7, no.13) 180 x 250 mm, on irregularly cut parchment.

B. Poitiers, Bibliothèque municipale Mss. Fonteneau vol. 19, p.81 (from A).

IN NOMINE SANCTAE & INDIVIDUAE TRINITATIS Ego. G. pictavensis comes & Aquitanorum dux, cogitans de ultimo die magni iuditii & aeterna remuneratione, pro redemptione animae meae ac parentum meorum, concedo monasterio novo in honore sanctae dei genitricis (virginis) Mariae[2] & beati Iohannis Aev v- angelistae & omnium apostolorum sub urbe Pictavensi aedif- icato, quandam silvam ad revestituram faciendam - scilicet inter Pontem Labeium, et Rometam et Butiraut & Malam Villam sitam - concedente et adfirmante Guillelmo Frehelando. Et quod iam ante dixerat suis viris pertinere mihi sua spontanea relinquit voluntate, sine omnibus quos dupnis[4] et ulla

---

1. This has been dated in the same way as the previous document because, although it cannot be proved that the Duke is Guy-Geoffrey, this identification seems probable because (i) Senioratus, prepositus of Saintes is not known from any documents after Guy-Geoffrey's death (above, p.228) (ii) Hugh, prepositus of Poitiers is also most frequently found before 1086, although he continued in office after Guy-Geoffrey's death (above, p.229)
2. Interlineation.
4. For costumis, or calumpniis?

peticione, spectantibus proceribus meis ac test (an) tibus[2] quorum nomina subscribuntur: videlicet. Fulco normandus. et Ugo Pictavensis praepositus. et Odo clericus frater eius. et Airaudus Surgeriarum praepositus. et Senioratus Santonensis praepositus. & Garinus ademarus.

Signum praedicti ducis. +

Signum Guillelmi frehelandi. +

8. 1106

Ioscelin de Lezay sells all that he has in the villa Bennac to the monks of Montierneuf for 100 lbs. of Poitevin money, on the condition that he or his son may buy it back after four years if they wish. Duke William of Aquitaine gives his consent, and the fees of two knights are excepted from the sale. He also freely gives his third part of wool to the monks.

A. Original, Archives Départementales de la Vienne, fonds Montierneuf (carton 7, no. 18) 250 x 310 mm. (top torn)

B. Poitiers Bibliothèque Municipale: Mss. Fonteneau, vol. 19, p.119 - (from A).

Anno incarnationis domini nostri [Ihesu Xpi m][1] ill. C.VI, indictione XIIII.[2] Ego Ioscelinus de Leziaco, volente et concedente domino meo Gillelmo Aquitanorum duce cum comitissa uxore ac filio eius Gillelmo, necnon collaudantibus et concedentibus uxore ac filio meo, dono & vendo Deo et Sancto Iohanni evangeliste novi monasterii omnia que in villa Bennaci seu in (castellania)[3] eius habebam, tam in decimis quam in vineis & terris seu in aliis omnino consuetudinibus vel

---

1. Supplied from B. missing from the torn part of A.

2. The indiction is correct for the year 1106.

3. Written over an erasure in A, in a cramped - and apparently later hand - than A.

rebus, preter casamentum duorum militum - Petri videlicet de Niorht et Helei rufi. Proque hac venditione & dono centum libras pictavensis monete a monachis novi monasterii recipio, eo tenore ut a festivitate omnium sanctorum post iiii^{or} annos liceat mihi vel filio meo hanc ipsam venditionem pro centum libris pictavensis similis ponderis & valitudinis que nunc currit monete, si voluero, emere. Quod si noluero monasterium hoc semper habeat et possideat. Si vero ego aut filius meus vel uxor mea supradicto precio non emerit, nullus alius ultra emendi licentiam seu potestatem habeat. Dono quoque gratis pro redemptione anime mee omniumque parentum meorum terciam partem lanarum, ut sive emam sicut supradixi cetera sive non, novum monasterium semper illam habeat et sine ulla inquietudine vel calumpnia mei meorumque in perpetuum teneat et possideat. Si autem monachi novi monasterii pro hac venditione seu dono ab aliquo calumpniam inferendo aliquod dampnum perpessi fuerint vel perdiderint, ego sicut fide promisi omnia pacificando reddam. Ideo enim donum quod nunc facio competit novo monasterio, quia quod in manu domini mei Guillelmi Pictavorum comitis ago, iam olim in manu patris eius felicis memorie Gaufredi promiseram et feceram. Facta est hec venditio vel donum collaudante et concedente Hugone de Boeto domino Benaci in manu domni Marci novi monasterii abbatis ac monachorum eius:- Duranni videlicet prioris Sancti Nicholai. Petri crispelli. Alonis. Arvei. Martini

& aliorum monachorum. Atque huius rei testes sunt milites: Buchardus de Cadurcis. Gualterius Amanerius. Guillelmus de Mota. Gavazo. Guillelmus de Camera, tunc praepositus. Rotgerius capellanus. Launo pistor, & alii plures. Quicumque hoc donum seu venditionem calumpniare vel annullare temptaverit centum auri libras componat, et quod temptaverit irritum fiat.

Facta sunt hęc Philippo rege francorum, Guillelmo duce Aquitanorum, Petro episcopo Pictavorum.

9

Undated. (1120 ?)[1]

<u>William Duke of Aquitaine gives the monks of Montierneuf the customs which he has at Migné and Paché.</u>

A Original, Archives départementales de la Vienne, fonds Montierneuf (carton 7, no.7) 240 x 140 mm.

B Poitiers, Bibliothèque municipale, Mss. Fonteneau vol. 19, p.153 (from A)

IN $\overline{XPI}$ NOMINE EGO WILLELMUS DUX AQUITANIE, NOTUM FIERI volo tam presentibus quam futuris quod monachi novi monasterii quod est constructum in honore beate Marie et sanctorum apostolorum Iohannis & Andree deprecati sunt me, ut concederem eis consuetudines quas habebam ego apud Magnecum. Quod et feci. Concessi autem eis omnes consuetudines vel quicquid habebam ego, aut servientes mei per me habebant, apud villam Magnecum & ad Pachiacum & in toto fevo Stephani de Magniaco quod prefati monachi, me volente et concedente, dudum adquisierant apud dicto Stephano seu a filiis eius. Huius doni testes sunt : Alo papot (monacus).[2] Willelmus capellanus. Symon de Talnia comiles. Radulfus de creva cor.

---

1. This document must be later than 1106 when Stephen of Migné made a grant to Montierneuf, which is mentioned in the text of this: "<u>in toto fevo Stephani</u>...&c"(see Champollion-Figeac, <u>Docs.Inédits</u> II, ii pp. 3-4). The year 1120 is suggested by the note on the reverse of the parchment referring to the Duke's departure to Spain. William the Troubadour led an expedition in 1120 (above, p.154), although it is possible that one of his later visits (for which there is less evidence, p.155) was involved.

2. Interlineations.

Marinus prepositus Pictavç. Fulco mar(ati).[2]

Tales vero aunt consuetudines : Exercitus, cavalcheia & biannum, Talleia in hominibus quantum capers voluerint. Leges, bella & Pac....[3]a ex quo in curia monasterii ventum fuisset, comitis et servientibus sibi erat. Si victus ab...[3] isset, sexaginta solidos in victo habebat. Dominationem talem serviens comitis in homines.....[3]bat, ut nullus pro serviente Stephani sine iussione avocatus movere se a facie eius auderet. Si aliquis reclamaret iusticiam, faciebat cliens comitis, si prius clamatum clienti Stephani fuisset. Omne furtum clientibus comitis erat. Consuetudinem manducandi in hominibus: si aliquis vetasset prandium gatgiam debat. Ab unoquoque homine mestivam sextariam frumenti singulis annis. Si quis intraret noviter, balliam accipiebat a singulis hominibus secundum quod poterat quisque dare - ii sol, vel iii, aut iiii. Helguinus autem qui praerat ballie tempore quo comes istas consuetudines, novo monasterio dedit, easdem consuetudines sicut hic scripte sunt scribere fecit. Eodem tempore praepositus erat Petrus de magnac medie terre unius, & Aymericus Rainaldus demidie terre alterius, & Aimarus rufus & exor Aimerici airaut, filiique sui vizities erant. Homines predictam terram habit-

---

3. Even in Fonteneau's time these words could not be read.

antes predicto tempore hi isti : Arnaldus aucher, Hugo c...[3] Bertrannus, Stephanus de Magniaci, Goffridus de Pachec, Girardus Bezer, Bernardus Audiant & frater eius, Airaldus Groles & fratres eius, Ingelaid et filius eius Iohannis, uxor Gunberti & Magnens.

(Endorsement) Carta consuetudinum de Magnec quas concessit filius comitis, rogante domno Alone papot (monacho),[4] in aula episcopi Pictavis ipsa die qua comes perrexit Hispaniam.

---

4. Interlineation.

10. 1075, 1 December. Bordeaux.

Duke William of Aquitaine gave land in Bordeaux to Aichelmus Sancii a canon of the chapter of St. Andrew.

B Bordeaux Bibliothèque municipale : ms. 769, (cartulary of la Sauve-Majeure) p.111.

C Bordeaux Bibliothèque municipale : ms. 770, (second cartulary of la Sauve) p.30 (from B).

(Rubric) DE BURDEGALA - de dono Willelmi ducis Aquitanie a porta iudea usque ad aulam sancti Amandi.

Anno ab incarnatione Domini M.L.XXV, Gregorii papae septimi. III, Willelmus Aquitanie dux gratia Dei et sui, Aichelmo sancii (Canonico S.Andree),[1] dedit in allodem, sive (ad dandum, sive)[1] ad vendendum, vel commutandum secundum sui placitum terram illam que est in suburbio civitatis Burdegale a porta iudea usque ad aulam sancti Amandi; et est terra illa longitudinis. XX.IIII. perticarum, latitudinis a muro usque ad aquam. VII.

Dedit equidem usuali lege Burdegalensium cum corrigia in qua medium nodum fecit, alterum vero Seguinus de Castello novo, tercium Willelmus Raimundi. Illi dico nodatores secundum mandatum supradicti ducis videntes et audientes quomodo Giraldus de Cabanac, qui terram illam feudaliter adquisierat, voluntarie dimisit donationemque deprecando collaudavit,

---

1. Interlineations in B.

astante Bosone Sanctonensi episcopo et Bernardo de Baslada in camera sua Burdegale. K̃l. Decemb.

11. Undated (1079-1086)[1]

Count William of Poitou grants to Abbot Gerald of la Sauve an annual fair, the free grant of land to the abbey from his fee, exemption from 'comitalis ius'. He also promises hospitality to the Abbot whenever he visits the Count of Poitou.

S. Bordeaux Bibliothèque municipale : ms. 769, (cartulary of la Sauve-Majeure) p.10.

(Rubric) de donatione comitis Willelmi

Notum sůt omnibus quod ego Willelmus Pictavensium comes cum quadam die ad aecclesiam sancte MARIE de silva maiore venissem, rogatus a domno Geraldo primo eiusdem loci abbate, concessi eidem aecclesie ut annuale mercatum quod feriam vocant amplius ibidem in festivitate sanctorum apostolorum Simonis et Iude foret, ad quod quicumque venerit in tota terra ubi ego dominatum habeo eundo et redeundo securus sit. Concedo etiam ut quicumque de me fevum tenuerit et eidem ecclesie dare voluerit, licentiam faciat quod ipsa aecclesia semper allodialiter possideat. Sed et hoc concedo ut in omnibus quecumque hec ecclesia possederit nullus comes,

---

1. The exact date of the foundation of la Sauve-Majeure is unknown. The first dated document connected with this house is the grant made by the Duke on 10 June 1079 (Mabillon, De Re Diplomatica, pp. 586-7; the Gallia II, instrum. col. 274 gives a slightly different text). I have therefore placed this document between 1079 and the Duke Guy-Geoffrey's death (cf. his son's confirmation, no. 13) in 1086.

nullaque comitalis persona, ullam iusticiam aut quicquam iuris habeat; sed omnia ad comitale ius pertinentia semper ipsa aecclesia possideat. Preterea hoc semper abbati silve maioris dono ut quocumque ad comitem Pictavensem venerit, et quamdiu apud eum manserit, necessarium stipendium prorsus ab eo accipiat:- id est - panes, vinum, pisces, carnem ad famulos et socios, herbam et annonam ad bestias. Hec itaque data nobilium sunt virorum testimonio roborata: Guillelmi amanei. Stephani de Chalmonte. Bernardi de Baslada. Bosonis de Montremblant. Radulfi prepositi. & aliorum multorum.

12. Undated. (1079-86)[1]

Abbot Gerald of la Sauve-Majeure lays down that a weekly mass will be sung for Duke William of Aquitaine in return for his grant of liberty.

B Bordeaux, Bibliothèque Municipale : Ms. 769, (cartulary of la Sauve-Majeure) p.13.

(Rubric) De beneficio quod statuit domnus Geraldus abbas pro comite Willelmo

In nomine Sancte et Individue Trinitatis. Notum fieri volumus cunctis sancte aecclesie fidelibus tam posteris quam praesentibus quod domnus Willelmus venerabilis Aquitanie dux quicquid habebat in territorio quod Silva Maior nuncupatur sancte, MARIE tradidit, atque omni libertate donavit. Ego itaque Geraldus providentia Dei ipsius loci abbas primus cum omni fratrum collegio decrevimus, decretumque in congregatione statuimus, ut pro hoc aliisque beneficiis que plurima erga nos ipse dux operatur, in nostre semper orationis memoria habeatur - quatenus a Domino remunerationem mereatur. Hoc quoque constituimus ut pro eo singulis ebdomadis specialis missa canatur, atque quanta singulis fratribus tanta ei quotidie decernatur praebenda pro eo pauperibus eroganda. Quod ita definitum est ut sicut hoc in vita ipsius agitur, non minori studio post mortem - quamdiu steterit aecclesia- agatur. Necessarium ergo duximus ut hoc memorie cartisque

---

1. This can be dated in the same way as the preceding document.

mandetur ne futurorum negligentia privetur. Scripte sunt itaque due similes cartule ut praefatus dux habeat unam, altera vero sit apud aecclesiam. Quod forte quisquam huic decreto contraire praesumpserit, anathematis periculo reus erit donec satisfactioni obedierit. Ad confirmandum ergo huius rei testimonium subscripsimus nomina eorum qui huic decreto interfuerunt. S/.Rotberti de Burgundia. S/.Willelmi Eligii Burdegalensis. S/.Petri vicecomitis de Castellione. S/.Amanei de Marcha. S/. Rodulfi de sancto Elegio ·,·

1087

13.

Notice of the grants made by Guy Count of Poitou and Duke of Aquitaine to the abbey of la Sauve-Majeure.[1] After his death his son confirmed his father's grants.

B Bordeaux, Bibliothèque municipale; Ms. 769,(cartulary of la Sauve), pp. 11-13.

Qui in terra thesaurizant ipsi se decipiunt; dum quod amant cito perdunt, mox et ipsi pereunt solas suas secum culpas in infernum defeurnt pro quibus perhennes pene non eis deficiunt. At suavis redemptoris vox clammat quotidie. "O,qui vultis veras opes, pompas mundi spernite. Sed thesauros leti vestros in celis recondite, ut mecum frui queatis eterna dulcedine."[2] Istam vocem audiebat et implebat opere Guido comes Pictavensis dux et Aquitanie : Guido dictus in baptismo, Willelmus cognomine, potens armis, clarus gestis et regalis[3] genere. Iste vir late per orbem fama celeberrimus. Licet esset occupatus in terrenis actibus, atque bellis insudaret nimium frequentibus, numquam tamen desis tebat a piis operibus. Defensor aecclesiarum plures ipse condidit ubi cetus monachorum sub abbate posuit; aliis possessiones et honores addidit; etiam silve maiori multa dona contulit. Silva Maior lucus[3] erat

---

1. This is a résumé of the grants made in no 11 .
2. This is not an identifiable biblical quotation, although it has the appearance of being one.
3. Thus in MS.

altus et densissimus quo venit domnus Geraldus abbas cum sodalibus, vana mundi fugiendo Gallie de partibus, ut posset lucrari X̄po multos ex mortalibus. In hac ergo per divinam silva providentiam non parvam praedictus abbas incepit aecclesiam ubi multi, deserentes terrenam stulticiam, ad celestem semet ipsos exercent militiam. Ergo dux praefatus sue pro salute anime huic loco multa bona curavit impendere; et, ut eius donum firmum semper sit et stabile, commendari litterali precepit memorie. In hoc igitur Silve Maioris loco ubi domnus Geraldus cum sociis suis remansit fertur antiquitus fuisse castellum, Altus Villaris appellatum. Cuius castellaris allodium multos possessores habebat; sed iusticia proprie ad ipsum comitem pertinebat. Cum itaque omnes possessores singuli suas partes praefato abbati concessissent, ipse comes eorum donationem fimavit, suamque iusticiam et quicquid inde debebat habere donavit; omnique prorsus laicali potestate locum ipsum et populum, quandoque ibi habitaturum, absolvit. Non solum autem in ipso allodio, sed in omnibus quecumque Silve Maioris monachi in toto suo ducatu forent possessuri, comitale ius et iusticiam, ipsis in perpetuum tribuit. Sed et quicumque huic loco ex comitali fevo aliquid voluerit conferre, concessit ipse comes ecclesie Silve Maioris illud semper allodialiter possidere.

Preterea, consilio et laudatione nobilium ipsius regionis

---

5. Thus in Ms.

virorum, praefato allodio iam beate semper virginis MARIE eiusque aecclesie pertinenti talem dedit securitatem et salvitatem, ut intra terminos eius nemo umquam aliquam contumeliam cuiquam facere praesumat; etiam si mortalis inimicicia existat, quatinus ut scriptum est : "hoc unum sit miseris asilum (hoc omnibus)[4] utile refugium"; et quicumque ad orationem vel ad mercatum, aut rogatus ab abbate vel monachis, illuc venerit, in tota via eundo et redeundo securus sit. Hoc salvamentum etiam vicecomes de Gavarreto et Guillelmus Amanei et omnes principes et nobiles regionis concesserunt, et ut semper stabile foret donatione sua firmaverunt. Quod quisquis aliqua temeritate violaverit .dcccc tos solidos ipsi aecclesie emendabit; insuper excommunicatus est ab omnibus sacerdotibus qui fuerunt in Burdegalensi concilio quod, eo tempore quo hec gesta sunt fuit, donec ad congruam satisfactionem et emendationem venerit. Quam securitatem ipse comes donavit etiam territorio quod dicitur Traiectum quod est prope urbem Burdegalam ultra fluvium, quod territorium ecclesie Silve Maioris erat donatum. Pretera idem dux monachis Silve Maioris perhenni dedit stabilitate; per Burdegalensem portum decem modios salis quo libuerit singulis annis transvehere sine aliquo censu vel redditione. Quibus quoque quandam curtem Broia nominat(am)[4] donavit, &

---

4. Interlineation.

Achelmum Guillelmi de Blancaforti ac Willelmum Seguini quicquid ibi habebant donare fecit. Concessit etiam loco Silve Maioris septimanale mercatum[5] atque annuale quod feria dicitur, ac per totam suam terram dedit securitatem mercatoribus illuc venientibus. Sed et hoc perpetua stabilitate donavit abbati Silve Maioris ut, quocumque ad ꝑictavensem comitem veniret, et quamdiu cum eo morari vellet, omnes sibi suisque necessarios sumptus ab eo acciperet. Hec itaque sunt a praefato duce aecclesie Silve Maioris inperpetuum donata, ac nobilium virorum qui subscripti sunt testimonio roborata: Gocelini Burdegalensis archiepiscopi, Achelmi archidiaconi, Centulfi de Biarno, Almerici vicecomitis, Odoni nepotis comitis, Balduini de Dun, Balduini de Centuiano, Guillelmi fortis de ornone, Bernardi de Baslada, Radulfi de Sancto ꝑlerio. Et ne quid horum irritum sit in perpetuum in Burdegalensi concilio ab omnibus episcopis, abbatibus & clero est excommunicatum. Postquam autem iste egregius dux hac vita terminata decessit, filius eius puer nomine Guillelmus comitatum patris atque ducatum optinuit. Qui, cum ad urbem Burdegalam venisset, domnus Geraldus abbas ad eum accessit eumque pro ꝯcclesia sua rogavit. Itaque omnia que a patre fuerant donata ꝯcclesie silve maioris filius concessit sua quoque donatione confirmavit.

---

5. Guy-Geoffrey only gave an annual fair in no. 11 above. No record of a grant of a weekly market survives.

Acta est igitur hec donationis renovatio, anno ab incarnatione Domini. M.L XXX^{mo}. VII^{o}, Indictione X, Rege Francorum Phillippo. S/.Guillelmi Fredelanni. S/.Hugonis de Liziniano. S/.Bosonis de la marcha.

1) Granted in the monks' chapter at la Sauve
14. 1089, 2) Confirmed in the city of Bordeaux

Count William of Poitou exempts the house belonging to the monks of la Sauve-Majeure in Bordeaux from comital impositions, and lays down the procedure to be followed if one of their servants commits a crime.

B Bordeaux Bibliothèque municipale: Ms. 769, (cartulary of la Sauve) pp. 14-15.

(Rubric) Ut libera & ab omni conditione absoluta sit domus sancte Marie apud Burdegalam.

In nomine Domini, ego Guillelmus comes Pictavensis in puericia mea Aquitanie ducatum deo donante adeptus, pro anima patris mei et mea, concedo aecclesie Sancte Marie de Silva Maiore quicquid pater meus - domnus videlicet Guillelmus dux nominatissimus-ipsi ecclesie donavit et concessit. Facio autem mansionem monachorum ipsius aecclesie, quam habent in Burdegala urbe, liberam et quietam, omnique comitali ditione absolutam, ut nullus in ea aliquam iniuriam vel vim faciat, vel eorum servienti qui in ea manserit. Sed si ipse serviens aliquam forisfactionem fecerit, ministri comitis clament ad monachos silve maioris ut ipsi de eo rectum faciant. Quod si tanta forisfactio, aut homicidii, aut alicuius magne rei fuerit ut ne fugiat timeatur, sine iniuria et damno capiatur et teneatur donec monachi veniant quibus reddatur, qui de ipso aut rectum faciant aut concordiam. Preterea praecipio

praepositis et ministris meis ut ubicumque res ecclesie ipsius fuerint, salve et defense sint, ut nec ipsi illis iniuriam vel aliquam violentiam faciant, et ab aliis fieri prohibeant.

Actum est hoc in capitolio Sancte Marie Silve Maioris ab ipso comite coram domno Geraldo abbate et omnibus monachis, et postea confirmatum in Burdegalensi urbe coram nobilibus viris quorum nomina subscripta sunt. Anno ab incarnatione Domini M°. LXXX^mo. VIIII°. S/.Centulfi comitis Bigorensis. S/.Bosonis de Marca comitis. S/.Petri de Gavarreto vicecomitis. S/.Aimerici vicecomitis Toarcensis. S/.Hugonis de Lizinnano. S/.Guillelmi Fredelanni de Blavia. S/.Guillelmi ducis. S/.Willelmi Amanei de Benalgis.

15. Undated. (1087-1103)[1]

William Duke of Aquitaine and Count of Poitou defines the terms of the "salvitas" which his father had granted and he confirmed to the abbey of la Sauve-Majeure.

B Bordeaux, Bibliothèque municipale: ms. 769 (cartulary of la Sauve) pp. 13-14.

(Rubric) De salvitate Silve Maioris

In nomine Domini Ego Willelmus gratia Dei Aquitanie dux Pictavensis comes, concedens aecclesie Sancte Dei genetricis Marie que est in silva maiore quicquid pater meus illi donavit, concedo et confirmo salvitatem eidem loco, ut omnes peregrini et qui ad orationem illuc venerint in tota via eundo et redeundo securi sint; similiter et mercatores qui ad feriam vel ad mercatum illuc venerint. Intra terminos autem ipsius salvitatis securi sint, sive milites, sive rustici, sive mercatores; omnesque homines, praeter fures publicatos et qui latrones vocantur, qui rustici debent naturaliter esse terrasque colere, et hoc dimittentes, arma capiunt et malefactores vel guerrarii efficiuntur. Qui tamen ibi capti antequam aliud dampnum accipiant, ante abbatem vel fratres loci adducantur, et nisi se de tali latrocinio salvare

---

1. This can only be placed between Duke William's confirmation in 1087, and the death of Count Aimeri 'Fort' of Fézensac (see subscriptions) in 1103. The year of his death is given in the Annales Auscienses (HGL, II col. 22); cf. de Jaurgain (La Vasconie II, p.139 n.1) for his nickname.

poterint; qui eos cepit extra salvitatem ducat, et quod voluerit de eis faciat. Milites autem qui ibi venerint stare, suos qualescumque servientes ibi salvos habeant; sed inde guerram non faciant nec cum malefacto illuc revertantur. Similiter & domne ibi volentes habitare. Si consuetudinarii principum vel militum qui ibi manserint iusticiam dominis suis facere noluerint, post clamorem ad abbatem vel priorem octo dies induciarum habebunt, et nisi emendaverint, salvitate carebunt. Si quis miserit inde espiam et aliquis per illam captus fuerit, qui eam misit salvitatem infregit, et nisi se purgare hinc poterit, salvitatem ibi non habebit. Omnes autem burgenses qui in eodem burgo manserint securitatem habeant ubicumque fuerint. S/.Willelmi ducis et comitis † quod in quadam carta manu sua fecit, et pro eo ac pro omnibus ad eum pertinentibus. Galliardus praepositus Burdegalensis hanc salvitatem fidefirmavit et plunuit.[2] Similiter et principes castella tenentes pro se et pro suis eam plunerunt,[3] et multi alii ipsius regionis nobiles et milites ex quibus aliqui subscripti sunt. Primus igitur eam plunuit Guillelmus amanei ipsius regionis princeps, deinde Raimundus de Gentiaco, Forto comes de Fedentiaco, Petrus vicecomes de Guaverreto Guillelmus Fredelanni de Blaia, Helias Aicardi de Sotiag, Guillelmus de Montelauno, Galterius de Fossato, Arnaldus

---

2. Thus in Ms. Perhaps for pliviit?

3. Thus in Ms. Perhaps for plivierunt?

Bernardi de Taurinniag, Arsius de Cabannag, Autgerius de Rionz, Bernardus de Rionz, Vidianus frater eius, Iterius de Bannials, Bernardus de la Mota, Raimundus de Lignano, Guillelmus Hugueti.

BISHOPRICS AND PRINCIPAL RELIGIOUS HOUSES MENTIONED IN THE TEXT

AGEN Bishoprics and Archbishoprics

--- Boundaries of Provinces

Nouaillé Carolingian royal houses later controlled by the Counts of Poitou

Maillezais Houses founded by the Counts of Poitou.

ANGERS
NANTES
TOURS
Bourgueil
S Florent de Saumur
NOIRMOUTIER
Fontevrault
S Jouin
BOURGES
Issoudun
Déols
La Chaize le Vicomte
Talmont
S. Michel en-l'Herm
Maillezais
S Maixent
Parthenay
S Hilaire
S Nicholas
Montierneuf
POITIERS
Fontaine le Comte
Nouaillé
S Savin sur Gartempe
ILE DE RÉ
Souvigny
Chauvigny
ILE D'OLERON
S. Jean d'Angely
S Gemme
SAINTES
St Amant de Boixe
S. Eutrope
N. Dame
Vaux
ANGOULÊME
(S Cybard)
St Junien
LIMOGES
S Martial
Solignac
S Léonard
Ebreuil
CLERMONT FERRAND
Broude
La Chaise Dieu
PERIGUEUX
Uzerche
Brive
Tulle
Beaulieu
LE PUY
BORDEAUX
Ste Croix
S. Severin
La Sauve Majeure
La Réole
BAZAS
CAHORS
MENDE
RODEZ
AGEN
Moissac
Condom
LECTOURE
ALBI
DAX
S Sever
AIRE
S Jean de Sorde
AUCH
TOULOUSE
[St. Sernin]
BAYONNE
OLORON
TARBES
CARCASSONNE
NARBONNE
PAMPLONA
JACA

SCALE
KMS 10 20 30 40 50 60 70
MILES 10 20 30 40

GENEALOGICAL TABLE OF THE COUNTS OF POITOU, DUKES OF AQUITAINE

(1) See L. Levillain, 'Adémar de Chabannes, généalogiste', p. 240 n. 3.

(2) Later married secondly Ct. Geoffrey Martel of Anjou - divorced before 1052.

(3) See Chronique de St. Maixent, p. 419.

— Dukes of Aquitaine

RANNULF I = ? Bilichildis, dau. Ct. (3)
(†866) Rorgo of Le Mans

RANNULF II (†890)

Ebles Abbot of St. Hilaire & St Germain des Prés Chancellor of K. Odo

Gauzbert

EBLES 'MANZER' (†c. 934/5)

WILLIAM 'TÊTE D'ÉTOUPE' = Adela of Normandy
(†963)

Ebles, Bp. of Limoges Treasure of St. Hilaire Abbot of St. Maixent

WILLIAM 'FIER-A-BRAS' = Emma, dau. of Ct. Theobald of Chartres
(†c. 995)

Adela = Hugh Capet, K. of France
↓
Capetian kings of France

WILLIAM 'THE GREAT' = (1) Almodis, widow of Ct. Adalbert of la Marche
(†c. 36) (2) Prisca of Gascony
(3) Agnes, dau. of Otto-William of Burgundy (2)

(1) WILLIAM 'THE FAT' = Eustachia
(†c. 1058

(2) Odo, Ct. of Gascony

(4) Theobald

(3) PETER-WILLIAM 'AIGRET' = Ermesendis
(†1058)

(3) GUY-GEOFFREY-WILLIAM = (1) dau. of Ct. Périgord
(†1086) (2) Mathilda
(3) Aldearis dau. of Duke of Burgundy

(3) Agnes = Emperor Henry III
↓
Salian Emperors

(2) Agnes = K. Alfonso VI of Castille

(3) WILLIAM 'THE TROUBADOUR' = Philippa, dau. of Ct. William of Toulouse
(†1126)

(3) Agnes = (1) K. Peter I of Aragon
(2) Ct. Hélie of Maine

WILLIAM = Eleanor, dau. of Viscount of Châtellerault
(†1137)

Raymond = Constance of Antioch
↓
Princes of Antioch

Agnes = K. Ramire of Aragon

Agnes = Viscount Aimeri of Thouars
↓
Viscounts of Thouars

Agnes, Abbess of N-D de Saintes

dau (3)

dau (3)

ELEANOR = (1) K. Louis VII of France
↓ (2) Henry II Plantagenet, K. of England
Ks. of England

Alais = Ct. Ralf of Vermandois

Petronilla = (Ct. Raymond) IV of Barcelona
↓
House of Barcelona-Aragon

PRINCIPAL CASTLES MENTIONED IN TEXT

Pons — Castles known to have been held by or from the Count of Poitou before 1030

Chizé — Additional castles known to have been held by or from the Count of Poitou 1030 – 1137.

---- Indicates castles controlled by the Counts of Anjou or Angoulême

Known areas of comital forest (approx)

✝ Viscounties

AGEN Archbishoprics and Bishoprics

Counties are only indicated where there was no homonymous comital city eg: LA MARCHE.

ANGERS
NANTES
Loire
TOURS
Loire
NOIRMOUTIER
Saumur
Vienne
Indre
Passavant
Montreuil-Bellay
Loudun
Thouars
Faye-la-Vineuse
Tiffauges
Maulévrier
Sèvre Nantaise
Moncontour
Bressuire
Pouzauges
Mirebeau
Châtellerault
Déols
Châteauroux
La Chaize-le-Vicomte
Vouvant
Thouet
Parthenay
Talmont
Mervent
Fontenay
Vendée
Lay
Autize
POITIERS
Montreuil-Bonnin
Vivonne
Lusignan
Mortemer
Chauvigny
Argenton-sur-Creuse
Montmorillon
Chateau-Larcher
Lussac
Brosse
ILE DE RÉ
Niort
Sèvre Niortaise
Couhé
Gençay
Clain
Chizé
Melle
Mauzé
Benon
Surgères
Aulnay
Ruffec
Charente
LA MARCHE
Gartempe
Creuse
Bellac
Confolens
Chabanais
Rochefort
Tonnay-Charente
Boutonne
Taillebourg
SAINTES
Cognac
Jarnac
Charente
Didonne
Seugne
Pons
ANGOULÊME
Roche-Chouart
LIMOGES
Aixe-sur-Vienne
Pierre-buffière
Vienne
Arthiac
Bouteville
Barbezieux
Montauzier
Mortagne
Gironde
Blaye
Dronne
Tulle
Ventadour
CLERMONT FERRAND
AUVERGNE
Périgueux
Isle
Vézère
Turenne
Dordogne
Blanquefort
BORDEAUX
Fronsac
Dordogne
LE PUY
Garonne
S. Macaire
BAZAS
Lot
CAHORS
MENDE
RODEZ
AGEN
LECTOURE
Garonne
ALBI
AIRE
FEZENSAC
ARMAGNAC
AUCH
TOULOUSE
DAX
BAYONNE
BÉARN
SOULE
OLORON
TARBES
NAVARRE
PAMPLONA
ARAGON
JACA
BIGORRE
COMMINGES
Garonne
CARCASSONNE
NARBONNE

SCALE
KMS 10 20 30 40 50 60 70
MILES 10 20 30 40