

The
AMERICAN
HISTORICAL
REVIEW

X 217-4

zen2a
031170

Board of Editors

GRAY C. BOYCE	FREDERICK C. DIETZ
LAWRENCE H. GIPSON	ROBERT J. KERNER
J. A. O. LARSEN	CURTIS P. NETTELS

Managing Editor

GUY STANTON FORD

Assistant Editor

CATHARINE SEYBOLD

VOLUME LIV
OCTOBER, 1948, TO JULY, 1949

**MONUMENTA GERMANIAE
HISTORICA
Bibliothek**

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

1949

(K)

Archbishop Manasses I of Rheims and Pope Gregory VII

JOHN R. WILLIAMS

THE pontificate of Gregory VII (1073-1085) marked the high tide of the eleventh century movement to reform the western church. Throughout Europe the steps taken by Gregory to impose celibacy upon the clergy, to eradicate simony and lay investiture, and to centralize papal administration evoked loud and angry protests. The effective strength of the opposition to the papal program varied greatly, however, from one part of Europe to another. In the empire, the enemies of reform were sufficiently formidable to involve the papacy in a conflict of epic proportions. In Capetian France, on the other hand, they were able to do little more than carry on a series of desultory skirmishes against the pope and his legates.

The relatively mild character of the French conflict may in part be attributed to Gregory himself, who seems to have been more temperate and conciliatory in dealing with the weak Capetian monarchy than with the powerful Franconian empire. In greater measure, however, the unspectacular nature of the French struggle must be attributed to the weakness and disunity of the opponents of the papal program. Chief of these was the monarch, Philip I (1060-1108). Obviously Philip had every reason to fear Gregory's plans. They threatened both his prestige and his power. Presumably he was conscious of the danger and did all he could to resist. He possessed, however, too few advantages of character or of natural resources to permit him to play the part of a vigorous and aggressive national leader.¹

As a consequence of royal weakness the French bishops often found themselves called on to face alone the formidable pope and his equally formidable legates. Even so, had they but possessed some degree of unity they might have caused Gregory considerable embarrassment. The French pre-

¹ Brief accounts of the relations of Gregory and Philip are given by: Jacques Flach, *Les origines de l'ancienne France*, III (Paris, 1904), 303-308; Achille Luchaire in Ernest Lavisse's *Histoire de France depuis les origines jusqu'à la Révolution*, II (Paris, 1901), 172-73, 210-18; Louis Halphen, in *Cambridge Medieval History*, III (Cambridge, 1922), 110-15; Z. N. Brooke, in *ibid.*, V (Cambridge, 1926), 81-83. For more detailed treatment, consult the numerous works of Augustin Fliche, especially, *Le Règne de Philippe Ier, roi de France* (Paris, 1912), pp. 389-423; *La Réforme grégorienne*, II (*Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Etudes et Documents*, Fasc. 9 [Louvain, 1925]), chaps. VI and VII; *Réforme grégorienne et reconquête chrétienne* (vol. VIII of Augustin Fliche and Victor Martin, *Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris, 1946), pp. 122-23.

lates were, however, hopelessly divided on the issue of reform. Most of them, moreover, lacked all capacity for taking a broad view of the situation which confronted them. Even in the face of common danger they could think only in narrowly personal or local terms. Though on rare occasions bishop might support bishop, steady and systematic opposition was out of the question. Thus on most occasions the papal forces had the advantage of being able to deal with the French prelates individually.

This is well illustrated by Gregory's relations with the leading ecclesiastic of the Capetian realm, Archbishop Manasses I. Thanks to the preservation of the papal registers, the main course of these relations has long been known to scholars.² The evidence which they provide is supplemented by the chroniclers and annalists of the time. Since all these sources are sympathetic to reform, a somewhat distorted picture has inevitably resulted. Manasses proved to be a crafty and resourceful antagonist. Naturally reformers came to regard him as an incorrigible villain, and their estimate of him has persisted to the present. "Of Manasses himself," remarks Max Manitius, "little good is known."³ To this others who have had occasion to mention the archbishop have simply said "amen."

It is not the purpose of the writer to exonerate Manasses of the many evil deeds of which he was undoubtedly guilty. He does believe, however, that the archbishop had his virtues as well as his vices, and that a re-examination of his relations with Gregory is desirable.⁴

Although Archbishop Gervais of Rheims died on July 4, 1067, his successor, Manasses, does not appear to have been consecrated until early in 1070.⁵ His career before this date is totally unknown. He had probably been a canon of Rheims, but it is impossible to prove this.⁶ Our sources agree in

² The most detailed study is that of Max Wiedemann, *Gregor VII. und Erzbischof Manasses I. von Reims* (dissertation, Leipzig, 1884). Other accounts are: Guillaume Marlot, *Metropolis Remensis Historia*, II (Rheims, 1679), 165 ff.; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, VIII, 648 ff.; *Gallia Christiana*, IX, 70 ff.; Odon Jean Marie Delarc, *Saint Grégoire VII et la réforme de l'Église au XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1889), III, 340-56, 493-508; Fliche, *Ph. Ier*, pp. 417 ff., *Réf. grég.*, II, 222 ff., and *Réf. grég. et recon. chrét.*, pp. 100-101.

³ Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, III (Munich, 1931), 837.

⁴ After this article had been accepted for publication by the *American Historical Review*, Professor Gray C. Boyce of Northwestern University called my attention to the work of the German scholar, Heinrich Gaul, *Manasses I. Erzbischof von Reims*, I Teil: *Der unbekannt Manasses der ersten Jahre (1069 bis Frühjahr 1077)*, Bonn, Kath.-theol. Diss. (Essen, 1940). I am greatly indebted to Professor Boyce. I am equally indebted to Professor Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy of Dartmouth College, to Professor Peter Rasso of the University of Cologne, and to the author himself for making it possible for me to secure a copy of this work.

⁵ See *Gal. Chr.*, IX, 70, and the "Annales Remenses et Colonienses," *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, XVI, 732, but especially, Gaul, pp. 119-23.

⁶ The Manasses, canon of Rheims, who figures in the correspondence of Alexander II with Archbishop Gervais, could have been Manasses of Châtillon, who later became provost of the chapter, and, in 1096, archbishop of Rheims. See Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CXLVI, 1319 and 1322.

describing him as "well-educated"⁷ and "noble,"⁸ yet they fail to give the name of the family to which he belonged. A remark of his own indicates that it was affiliated in some way with the houses of Bar-sur-Seine and Tonnerre.⁹

The circumstances which raised this obscure individual to the most important post in the French hierarchy have until recently been misunderstood. For this there has been a very good reason. Certain reputable writers of the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries have provided a simple and plausible explanation of the mystery. Manasses, they charge, bought the position. Thus, Guibert of Nogent writes: "After the death of the most celebrated Archbishop Gervais, a certain Manasses intruded himself *through simony* into the government of the aforesaid city."¹⁰ Hugh of Flavigny has the same story to tell. In his account of the Council of Autun (September, 1077), he notes: "In the same council, Manasses, usurper of the Church of Rheims *through simony* was accused by the clerks of Rheims."¹¹ Little wonder that to the present time Manasses' rise to power has been attributed to simony!

It would be difficult to prove that Guibert and Hugh are entirely in error in this matter. Simony, in one form or another, was omnipresent in the eleventh century. Yet it is a remarkable fact that in the papal correspondence simony nowhere appears among the numerous complaints against Manasses. The reason for this becomes clear only when we examine the situation more closely.

Certain evidence bearing on Manasses' rise has been overlooked. This is found in the letter which he himself wrote to Gregory in 1077, after he had been excommunicated and suspended from office by the Council of Autun.¹²

⁷ "Benzonis Episcopi Albensis ad Heinricum IV Imperatorem Libri VII," *M.G.H., Scrip.*, XI, 657; "Vita Theoderici Abbatis Andaginensis," *ibid.*, XII, 49. The latter, to be sure, is speaking of "Gervasius Remorum archiepiscopus." Specific and detailed references to grants made to St. Hubert indicate, however, that the author intended Manasses, not Gervais. See *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 576, and *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, XIV, 65, n. b.

⁸ "Dedicatio Ecclesiae S. Quintini Bellovacensis," *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 29; Guibert de Nogent, *De vita sua (Histoire de sa vie)*, ed. by Georges Bourgin in *Collection de textes pour servir à l'étude et à l'enseignement de l'histoire*, Paris, 1907), lib. I, cap. XI, p. 30.

⁹ In a letter to Gregory VII he calls Hugh Rainard, bishop of Langres (1065-1085), "*noster consanguineus*." Hans Sudendorf, *Registrum oder merkwürdige Urkunden für die deutsche Geschichte*, I (Jena, 1849), 13. On the authority of a MS. preserved at Rheims in the seventeenth century, the *Gallia Christiana* (IX, 71) calls him Manasses of Gournai. An epitaph written for Manasses' mother, Adelaide, by Fulcoius of Beauvais survives in fragmentary form, published by Henri Omont, "Epitaphes métriques en l'honneur de différents personnages du XI^e siècle composées par Fulcoie de Beauvais, archidiacre de Meaux," *Mélanges Julien Havet* (Paris, 1895), p. 234. A brother, Hugh, is mentioned in the charters of Philip I. See Maurice Prou, *Recueil des actes de Philippe I^{er}, roi de France* (Paris, 1908), pp. 132 and 134. Gaul, pp. 116 ff., argues plausibly that Manasses belonged to the house of Rethel.

¹⁰ *De vita sua*, lib. I, cap. xi, p. 30.

¹¹ "Chronicle," *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 415.

¹² Sudendorf, I, 13-16. Wilhelm Mevs, *Zur Legation des Bischofs Hugo von Die unter*

Here he insists that the decision of the council was due to the machinations of his enemies. Prominent among these is Bishop Helinand of Laon, "whose hatred remains . . . *because of the episcopal office which he lost in the presence of your dignity, and I obtained through the intercession of your paternity.*"¹³ This can only mean that Helinand and Manasses had been rival candidates for the see of Rheims. The dispute had been carried to Rome, where, thanks to no less a person than Archdeacon Hildebrand himself, it had been settled in favor of Manasses.¹⁴

Evidence that Helinand of Laon had aspired to become archbishop of Rheims is provided by Guibert of Nogent. In his account of this ambitious prelate's career Guibert notes that on one occasion he purchased the vacant see of Rheims from Philip I, who had been shamelessly exploiting it in his own interest for two years. He did not, however, become archbishop because the pope told him that "anyone having a wife [the see of Laon] could under no circumstances marry another [the see of Rheims]."¹⁵ Guibert unfortunately fails to indicate the time when this incident took place. Modern writers have assumed that it must have been *after* the expulsion of Manasses from Rheims in 1081.¹⁶ In the light of Manasses' own statement to Gregory it seems more probable that it occurred after the death of Gervais in 1067.

It may perhaps be asked whether Manasses' words are to be trusted. He was not noted for honesty. Yet in this instance he is above suspicion. He would hardly have ventured to lie to Gregory, who was fully cognizant of the facts. That they were substantially as represented here is proved by the pope's own words in a letter to Manasses of March 14, 1074. In reminding the archbishop of his obligations, Gregory remarks: "Especially did we so highly approve of your advancement that we cannot escape grave responsibility if you do anything that would bring dishonor upon your rank or would be unbecoming to your dignity."¹⁷ Thus it would appear that Manasses was the choice of the curia itself. At the time he was presumably regarded as sympathetic to the program of reform. Indeed his occupation of the key position in the French church may well have seemed a significant triumph for

Gregor VII. (dissertation, Greifswald, 1887), pp. 31-42, questions the authenticity of this letter. His arguments are far from convincing.

¹³ Sudendorf, I, 13.

¹⁴ I find fantastic the interpretation given to Manasses' words by Delarc, III, 353. For the interference of the papacy in contested episcopal elections in this period, see Fliche, *Ph. I^{er}*, pp. 402 ff.

¹⁵ *De vita sua*, lib. III, cap. xi, p. 131.

¹⁶ *Rec. des hist.*, XIII, 685, n. c; Fliche, *Réf. grég.*, II, 253; Erich Caspar, "Das Register Gregors VII.," *M.G.H., Epistolae Selectae*, II (Berlin, 1920-23), 543, n. 2.

¹⁷ Caspar, lib. I, no. 52, 78-79: "*praesertim nos adeo tuae promotioni favimus et consensimus, ut nequamvis vitare grave periculum, si ea feceris quae tuum ordinem dehonorent aut tuam non deceant dignitatem.*"

the reformers. The charge of simony seems, then, largely to have been a part of the propaganda against him after he had failed to live up to expectations.¹⁸

Cordial relations between Rome and Rheims continued for some years after Manasses became archbishop. This is indicated by the surviving poems of Fulcoius of Beauvais. As has been noted, Manasses was a well-educated man. He seems to have had a genuine appreciation of Latin verse and was the friend and patron of poets. One of these was Fulcoius,¹⁹ who on occasion seems to have been employed as an intermediary between the archbishop and the curia. Thus we find one of his poems addressed to Pope Alexander II.²⁰ A second is directed to Alexander and Archdeacon Hildebrand.²¹ It is of especial interest. Fulcoius salutes Alexander as a new Cato; Hildebrand as a new Caesar. He announces that he brings them a gift, a poem composed at the suggestion of Manasses. The poem in question is Fulcoius' chef d'oeuvre, the *Uterque*, the Old and New Testaments done into verse.²² It is clear that Fulcoius was at Rome on business for his patron.²³

Yet even before Alexander II passed away in 1073 relations between the curia and the archbishop of Rheims were becoming strained. The cause of this was Manasses' delay in installing a successor to Abbot Herimar of St. Remi, who had died in 1071.²⁴ On June 30, 1073, the new pope, Gregory VII, wrote him a courteous but firm note of remonstrance. He censures him for disregarding the commands of Alexander in this matter. He must not divert the property of St. Remi to his own uses. He must not abuse the monks. He must see that a suitable successor to Herimar is installed at once and ac-

¹⁸ It may be noted that Karl-Joseph von Hefele was suspicious of the charge of simony against Manasses. See *Histoire des Conciles* (French translation of the German work by Henri Leclercq), V (Paris, 1912), 221, n. 3. It was gratifying to discover that Gaul had come to exactly the same conclusions that I had as to Manasses' elevation to the see of Rheims. See Gaul, pp. 123-37.

¹⁹ On the career of this little-known poet, see Omont, "Épithètes métriques," *loc. cit.*, and André Boutemy and Fernand Vercauteren, "Fulcoie de Beauvais et l'intérêt pour l'archéologie antique au XI^e et au XII^e siècle," *Latomus*, I (1937), 173 ff.

²⁰ Beauvais MS. 11 (XII century), 140^v, for the description of this interesting MS. see *Catalogue générale des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, III, 317 ff. I examined the MS. while in France in 1939.

²¹ Bib. Nat., MS. Lat. 16701 (XII century), 4^v-5^r. Published by Jean Lebeuf, *Dissertations sur l'histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Paris*, II (Paris, 1741), 243-44.

²² The work is also called *De Nuptiis Christi et Ecclesiae*. It contains around 3,800 verses. It is found in three MSS.: Beauvais 11, 2^{ff.}; Bib. Nat., MS. Lat. 16701, 5^{ff.}; Bib. Nat., MS. Lat. 5305 (XII century), 67^{ff.}

²³ Bib. Nat., MS. Lat. 16701, 4^v.

*Hos uacua vidisse manu cum non sit honestum,
Romanis placuisse deis, quia carmina novi,
Carmina deporto, tantis optanda patronis
Temporibus docti pape dignique ministri,
Instinctu manase condigni carminis amantis.*

That Hildebrand had a taste for Latin poetry is indicated by Peter Damian, Migne, CXLV, 560C.

²⁴ *Gal. Chr.*, IX, 229.

ording to the rule. Failure to obey will lead to serious consequences.²⁵

Manasses deferred to the papal wishes. He had Walo, already abbot of St. Arnulph of Metz, installed as abbot of St. Remi.²⁶ A good man Walo was, but he soon found life at Rheims most uncomfortable. In considerable agitation he appealed to Gregory for permission to resign.²⁷ His appeal was not in vain. On March 14, 1074, Gregory again wrote Manasses. He commends him for selecting so excellent a man to fill the vacancy at St. Remi. He begs, however, that he place no obstacle in Walo's way should he decide to resign.²⁸ Once more Manasses deferred to Gregory.

The cause for Walo's unhappiness as abbot of St. Remi is revealed in two curious letters which he wrote to Manasses upon his resignation.²⁹ The first of these is dignified and restrained, though the writer's words are frequently tinged with irony. He denies that he has retained the staff of office, which the archbishop has ordered him to surrender. He deplores Manasses' use of menacing words and advises him to control his tongue.

The second letter is almost hysterical. Presumably Walo was now a safe distance from Rheims! He bitterly addresses Manasses as "oppressor of the church of Rheims." He dwells upon his patience with the archbishop and speaks of his vain prayers for his reform. Becoming more specific, he enumerates the indignities to which he has been subject. Manasses was always making threats. On the feast of St. Remi he publicly called him "a fool"! He attempted to lay hand on the money Walo had put aside for a trip to Rome. He surrounded him with his minions. He wrote derogatory letters about him. He told the pope that Walo was unsuited to the French, because he was "a peaceful, humble, quiet man, always intent on reading." This, notes Walo with satisfaction, caused both laughter and consternation in the curia.

The portrait of his tormentor is completed in a third letter which Walo wrote to an unidentified Abbot H.³⁰ After insisting on his altruistic intentions in accepting the post at St. Remi, its ex-abbot paints the following lurid picture of the archbishop of Rheims: "I beheld in him [a man with] stiff, erect neck, eyes full of rage glancing hither and yon, nostrils breathing contempt, discourse uneven and incoherent; [a man] restrained by no consequence and no reason, with vainglorious shoulders, unsteady feet, un-

²⁵ Caspar, lib. I, no. 13, 21-22. See also Gregory's letter of the same day to Hugh of Cluny, *ibid.*, no. 14, 22-23.

²⁶ On Walo see: *Hist. lit.*, VIII, 305 ff.; Manitius, *Gesch. d. lat. Lit. d. Mittelalters*, II (Munich, 1923), 724 f.; Julius Pflugk-Hartung, *Neues Archiv*, VII (1882), 222, n. 1. Gaul, p. 31, finds reason to believe that Walo had already become abbot of St. Remi before June 30, 1073.

²⁷ Jean Mabillon, *Vetera Analecta* (Paris, 1723), p. 455.

²⁸ Caspar, lib. I, no. 52, 79.

²⁹ Mabillon, pp. 455-57.

³⁰ *ibid.*

even gait; [a man] disordered, unsightly, with violent hands ready for slaughter or injury to those nearest to him." When Walo marked these symptoms of a "poisoned mind," he bitterly regretted that he had ever come to Rheims. He assures Abbot H. that in future he will be "more foreseeing, more free of blame, more cautious."

Walo, there is reason to believe, was a highly emotional and temperamental individual.³¹ Nevertheless, his impressions of Manasses as a man of violent temper with a proclivity for laying hands on the property of an antagonist are borne out by many other sources. It will occasion no surprise, therefore, to find him at odds with the clergy of his cathedral. This feud was to lead to his ultimate undoing.

The genesis of the controversy is obscure. By 1076, however, the chapter had been split into two factions. One, bitterly hostile to the archbishop, was led by a relative of Count Ebalus of Roucy, Manasses of Châtillon, who had just attained the provostship, the highest office in the chapter.³² The provost was vigorously supported by the chancellor and schoolmaster, Bruno,³³ and a certain Pontius.³⁴ The other group, loyal to the archbishop, was led by Archdeacon Wido,³⁵ and included Godfrey, who succeeded Bruno both as chancellor and as schoolmaster.³⁶ To it we may add Fulcoius, though there is no evidence that he was a member of the chapter.

Whatever the cause, the feud was conducted with acrimony on both sides. Manasses appears to have treated the canons in the rough and ready way he had treated Walo. They, on their part, sought the support of Hugh of Die, the new papal legate, who tells us that Manasses of Châtillon and Bruno were among those present at the council which he convened at Clermont-Ferrand in August, 1076.³⁷ Presumably they filled the legate's ears

³¹ This is suggested by his later behavior. In 1085 he allowed the supporters of Henry IV to make him bishop of Metz in the place of Hermann, who had been driven from the city. Overcome with remorse, however, he made his peace with Hermann and did public penance. See the "Gesta Abbatum Trudonensium," *M.G.H., Scrip.* X, 240, and Hugh of Flavigny, *ibid.*, VIII, 471.

³² See *Gal. Chr.*, IX, 77 ff. In his letter to Gregory (Sudendorf, I, 13-14) Manasses accuses him of gross immorality. Hugh of Die reports that he became provost through simony, but surrendered his office to him at the Council of Clermont in 1076. Apparently he was reinstated. See Hugh's letter to Gregory, Migne, CXLVIII, 745.

³³ Bruno later founded the Carthusian Order. The most complete account of him is that of Hermann Löbbel, *Der Stifter des Carthäuser-Ordens, der heilige Bruno aus Köln (Kirchengeschichtliche Studien, V, Heft 1; Münster i. W., 1899)*.

³⁴ Manasses mentions him in his letter to Hugh of Die, *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 783.

³⁵ Manasses was represented at the Council of Autun by "Archdeacon W." (Sudendorf, I, 14). The two archdeacons of Rheims at this time were Warinus and Wido. There is good reason to believe, however, that "Archdeacon W." was Wido, to whom Fulcoius addressed one of his poems, and whose epitaph was composed by Godfrey of Rheims, another protégé of Manasses. See below, n. 95.

³⁶ See my article, "Godfrey of Rheims, a Humanist of the Eleventh Century," *Speculum*, XXII (1947), 29 ff.

³⁷ Migne, CXLVIII, 745. Hugh may have known the provost before this, as he refers to him as "amicum in Christo." On the date, see Wiedemann, pp. 22-23, 73-77.

with their tribulations. These no doubt were duly transmitted to Gregory, whose patience with the archbishop of Rheims was already sorely tried.

On March 4, 1075, the pope had given vent to his rising irritation with Manasses because of his failure to depose Bishop Roger of Châlons, who had persistently disregarded papal instructions.³⁸ On the following day he had sent off a second letter, of routine character, instructing Manasses to investigate a controversy between the bishops of Noyon and Utrecht.³⁹

With this letter of March 5 the sequence of Gregory's correspondence with Manasses is broken by a gap lasting until August 27, 1078. Presumably the pope's own experience with the archbishop together with the complaints of the canons of Rheims were convincing Gregory that Manasses was utterly unreliable. He does not, however, appear to have contemplated drastic measures against him. His first move was to bring indirect pressure to bear on the recalcitrant. He accordingly sought to ignore the archbishop of Rheims. Tasks which needed doing in the province of Rheims were entrusted to others. This is illustrated by the remarkable letter he dispatched on March 25, 1077, to Godfrey, bishop of Paris.⁴⁰

Godfrey is instructed to review with Manasses the excommunication of a certain Walter of Douai by the latter. If he is convinced of the man's innocence, or of his sincere repentance, he shall order Manasses to raise the excommunication. If he refuses, the bishop of Paris shall raise it himself. Gregory further orders Godfrey to examine the case of two monks of St. Remi. These have complained that Manasses, despite their appeal to the pope, has excommunicated them and blinded a lay brother for refusing to live under a new abbot, chosen, they insist, by bribery and contrary to the rule.⁴¹ Godfrey shall admonish Manasses to raise this excommunication too. If he refuses, Godfrey shall again do it himself.

That Gregory had gone thus far indicates the degree of his irritation with Manasses. The subordination of an archbishop of Rheims to a mere bishop of Paris is an interesting illustration of his faith in the absolute character of the papal power. There is, however, nothing to indicate that he intended at this time to take further punitive action against Manasses. In a letter of May 12, 1077, he instructs Hugh of Die to summon the archbishop of Rheims and as many of the French clergy as possible to a council to be convened

³⁸ Caspar, lib. II, no. 56, 209-10.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, lib. II, no. 58, 211-12.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, lib. IV, no. 20, 326-29. Gaul believes that Gregory was more interested in making a good impression on the king by entrusting important missions to the bishop of Paris, than he was in humiliating the archbishop of Rheims (pp. 96 ff.).

⁴¹ The new abbot was Henry, already abbot of Homblières. Guibert of Nogent speaks very highly of him, *De vita sua*, lib. II, cap. 11, pp. 107-108. See also *Gal. Chr.*, IX, 230.

in the province of Rheims, if practical, and otherwise at Langres.⁴² The letter in no way implies that Manasses is to be summoned to stand trial. He is to be summoned as the superior of the bishop of Cambrai, the validity of whose election is to be examined by the council, and as a great French prelate.

The council in question met on September 10, 1077, at Autun, not at Langres.⁴³ Manasses and most of the French prelates failed to attend, thus providing Hugh of Die with a most serious charge against them. They had defied the authority of a papal legate! More pro-papal than the pope himself, Hugh was no man to flinch from drastic penalties.⁴⁴ As a consequence, sentences of utmost severity were imposed on the archbishops of Sens, Bourges, and Bordeaux. The archbishop of Rheims was excommunicated and suspended from his office.

It was at Autun, according to Hugh of Flavigny, that certain clerks of Rheims accused Manasses of simony. He adds that the latter sought to take revenge by laying an ambush for them on the road back to Rheims. This the clerks escaped, but the infuriated archbishop destroyed their houses, sold their prebends, and scattered their goods.⁴⁵

Manasses lost no time in protesting to Gregory against the sentence imposed upon him at Autun.⁴⁶ His letter opens with denunciations of his enemies, Hugh Rainard, bishop of Langres, Helinand, bishop of Laon, Count Ebalus of Roucy, and Manasses of Châtillon. The influence of these men over Hugh of Die was responsible for his condemnation. He reminds the pope that while he did not attend the council, he did not completely disregard it. He sent to Autun a delegation of his "best clerks" with Archdeacon W. (Wido) as spokesman. He appears to quote verbatim from the address which the archdeacon delivered to the assembly.

This is of very great interest. Wido insists that Manasses has stayed away from fear of his enemies. He points out that the archbishop is expecting a personal interview with Gregory himself.⁴⁷ Manasses cannot believe that his absence can embarrass the council, as two bishops and more from his province are in attendance. Moreover, declares Wido, Manasses has not been summoned to attend for any fault or crime he has committed. Nor has the

⁴² Caspar, lib. IV, no. 22, 330-34.

⁴³ On the Council of Autun, see Hefele, V, 220-26, and Wiedemann, pp. 24-35 and 73-74.

⁴⁴ On Hugh of Die, see, in addition to Mevs, (above, n. 12), Wilhelm Lühe, *Hugo von Die und Lyon, Legat von Gallien* (dissertation, Strassburg, 1898); Abbé Rony, "Hugues de Romans, Légat Pontifical," *Revue des questions historiques*, CVII (1927), 287-303, and "La politique française de Grégoire VII," CIX (1928), 5-34; Theodor Schieffer, *Die päpstlichen Legaten in Frankreich* (*Historische Studien*, No. 203, Berlin, 1935), pp. 88 ff.

⁴⁵ *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 415.

⁴⁶ Sudendorf, I, 13-16.

⁴⁷ After Canossa (Jan. 25-28, 1077) Gregory VII continued to talk of crossing the Alps: A. J. Macdonald, *Hildebrand* (London, 1932), pp. 185-90.

king ordered him to attend. Hence he begs the assembly to overlook his absence. "But if either the prayer of justice or the manifestation of the law, as we see it and feel it, cannot profit us and him, and if anyone motivated by prejudice, cupidity, or hatred desires to harm him, we appeal in his behalf to the Lord Pope, who placed him in the see of Rheims."⁴⁸

Despite this appeal, continues Manasses to Gregory, Hugh of Die, completely under the influence of the bishop of Langres, declared him excommunicated and suspended from office. He urges the pope to disavow this rash action of his legate, and cites precedents for so doing.⁴⁹ He insists on his loyalty to Gregory, and mentions as proof his refusal to consecrate Gerard, bishop of Cambrai, the appointee of Henry IV.⁵⁰ In conclusion he implores Gregory to summon him to Rome, and, in the meantime, to relieve him of an excommunication "unheard of in our time."

It was, no doubt, at this point that Fulcoius of Beauvais entered the lists on his patron's behalf. In a metrical letter addressed to Hugh of Die, he praises the legate's zeal but ventures to proffer him some sound advice. Hugh, he insists, is making a bad mistake in his treatment of Manasses.

With such hatreds you do not please Rome, I assure you.
You weaken the body from which you sever the arms.
Choose a strong partner, as the Commonwealth desires.
Unaccompanied virtue perishes under an elated mind;
Victory seldom yields to a single man, though he be skilled.
Any general about to take the field goes more securely,
When he sees strong cohorts around him,
And he entrusts the flank [to another], if there be one tried in arms,
And he does not envy and drive away him who excels.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Sudendorf, I, 14. Note especially Wido's words: "*qui cum in sede Remensi constituit.*"

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 15. He cites the repudiation of the acts of the bishop of Thessalonica by Leo the Great, and also the example of Pope Hilarus. As in a later letter he will make extensive use of the *False Decretals*, they were probably his source here. Cf. Paul Hinschius, *Decretales pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni* (Leipzig, 1863), pp. 618-20, 630. He also cites the repudiation of the acts of Rotoaldus and Zacharias by Nicholas I. See the letters of Nicholas, Migne, CXIX, 850 ff.

⁵⁰ On the case of Gerard of Cambrai, see Gregory's letter to Hugh of Die, Caspar, lib. IV, no. 22, 330-34.

⁵¹ The poem is found in Beauvais MS. 11, 133^v-135^r. The verses quoted are 36-44 (134^r-134^v):

*His odiis romam non diligis, ut tibi promam.
Corporis emollis robur, cui brachia tollis.
Elige consortem quod vult republica fortem.
Mente sub elata virtus perit incomitata;
Soli, vel gnaro, cedit victoria raro.
It mage securus dux omnis congregiturus,
Si secum fortes circumspicit ire cohortes,
Commendatque latus, si quis sit ad arma probatus,
Et qui precellit non invidet atque repellit.*

Fulcoius continues in similar vein, citing illustrations from the Old Testament. Piety is all very well, but it must not ignore justice. He concludes with apologies for preaching to a man of Hugh's wisdom.

Fulcoius likewise sent verses to Gregory himself.⁵² In these he ventures to predict that Rome will never have another bishop equal to Gregory. Nor will Rheims ever see the peer of Manasses! Those who disparage the latter are deceived and are deceiving others. Fulcoius is not deceived, nor is he deceiving Rome in assuring her that Manasses can be a friend and not a foe. He begs the pope to loose, to prove that he can also bind, an allusion, no doubt, to the excommunication of Manasses. Obviously Fulcoius was doing all that lay within a poet's power to restore his patron to grace.

Others were equally inclined to be critical of the work of the Council of Autun. Thus, certain clerks of Noyon, in a letter to the clergy of Cambrai, expressed the opinion that Manasses' excommunication had been pronounced "rather through hatred than through justice."⁵³ Finally, Gregory himself seems to have entertained serious misgivings as to the course his legate had chosen. As a result, at the Lenten synod of 1078 (February 25 to March 3), he reversed at Rome nearly all that Hugh had done at Autun. The archbishops of Rheims, Sens, and Bourges, and the bishop of Chartres were restored to their sees.⁵⁴

We know that Manasses himself journeyed to Rome to attend this synod.⁵⁵ He claims to have waited there eleven weeks for the arrival of Hugh of Die, but the legate never put in an appearance.⁵⁶ Count Ebalus of Roucy and Pontius were in Rome, however, and it was probably they who presented the charges against Manasses.⁵⁷ Judging from the results of the proceedings, the archbishop had the better of his accusers. The pope withdrew the excommunication and restored him to office. Yet this was done only after Manasses had taken the following solemn oath over the body of St. Peter:

I, Manasses, archbishop of Rheims, did not out of pride fail to attend the synods

⁵² Beauvais MS. 11, 133^v-133^v. Two verses (29-30) were published by Jean Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, I, 2 (Paris, 1724), 118. The important verses are 39-41 (133^v):

*Papa, liga, sed solve pius pede firmus utroque,
Utque ligare potes, monstra quod solvere possis.
Qui tibi levitate scribis, scribo tibi pape.*

⁵³ *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 781.

⁵⁴ On this synod see Hefele, V, 232 ff. Hugh of Flavigny claims that Hugh of Die summoned Manasses to attend the Council of Poitiers, Jan. 15, 1078, *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 422. In the light of his excommunication at Autun and his appeal to Rome this seems highly improbable.

⁵⁵ Caspar, lib. V, no. 17, 378-80, and Manasses' letter to Gregory, *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 419-20, and to Hugh of Die, *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 781 ff.

⁵⁶ Manasses to Hugh of Die, *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 782. On Hugh's failure to attend the synod, see Lühe, p. 58, n. 3, and Rony, "Politique française de Grégoire VII," *loc. cit.*, 14-22.

⁵⁷ The presence of Ebalus is proved by Manasses' letter to Gregory, *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 420; of Pontius, by his letter to Hugh of Die, *Rec. des Hist.*, XIV, 783.

[synod?] of Autun to which the bishop of Die summoned me. If called by a messenger or letters of the apostolic see, through no wicked device nor fraud shall I absent myself, but coming, I shall faithfully obey the decision and judgment of this church. But if it pleases the Lord Pope Gregory, or his successor, that I answer to charges before his legate, I shall do so in all things. Moreover I shall faithfully administer the treasures, ornaments, and estates of the church of Rheims committed to me for the honor of that church, and I shall not alienate them for the resisting of justice.⁵⁸

This oath apparently disposed of the more serious charges against Manasses. Gregory states, however, that he has been accused "in many things." In his letters of the spring and summer of 1078 it is assumed that it had been agreed at Rome that the archbishop should clear himself of these at a later council.⁵⁹ The exact nature of these remaining charges is not indicated, but presumably they had to do with Manasses' cavalier treatment of the persons and goods of the provost and Bruno.

Gregory was anxious to have Manasses appear before a new council as soon as possible. His oath must be put to the test! The archbishop was just as anxious to avoid this. In the summer of 1078 he wrote Gregory an astonishing letter.⁶⁰ He begins by posing as the faithful servant of the pope, recounting the details of various missions he has performed at Gregory's request. He then complains of the doings of the archbishop of Vienne, of the bishops of Laon and Soissons, of Ebalus of Roucy, of the provost Manasses, and of Hugh of Die. The real point of the letter is, however, a request that Gregory confirm the privileges of the archbishops of Rheims, especially the privilege by which Gregory at Rome had made Manasses responsible to the supreme pontiff alone and to "Roman legates, not to ultramontanes, who, associated with the Roman, seek only their own advantage."

This astonishing interpretation of the meaning of *Roman legates* must have annoyed Gregory. Nevertheless his reply of August 22, 1078, was friendly though firm.⁶¹ He allows that he did indeed make Manasses responsible only to himself or to a Roman legate. Manasses must understand, however, that such a legate is not necessarily a person associated in some way with the city of Rome itself. He may be anyone, of any nationality, to whom the Roman pontiff entrusts a mission or to whom he delegates the power of acting for himself. Gregory illustrates from the history of the church. He reminds Manasses that it was agreed at Rome that he should clear himself of all charges before Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny. He

⁵⁸ Gregory's letter of Mar. 9, 1078, Caspar, lib. V, no. 17, 379.

⁵⁹ To Hubert and Teuzo, *ibid.*, lib. V, no. 22, 386; to Manasses, *ibid.*, lib. VI, no. 2, 391-94.

⁶⁰ Given by Hugh of Flavigny, *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 419-20. As to date, see Wiedemann, p. 43, n. 3.

⁶¹ Caspar, lib. VI, no. 2, 391-94.

promises that his legates will investigate Manasses' complaints. This he instructed the two Hughs to do that very day.⁶² His letter to the legates shows that Gregory, despite his conciliatory tone in addressing Manasses, was thoroughly suspicious of his intentions. "He is seeking delay as a means of escape," he confides to the two Hughs.

If indeed delay was his objective, Manasses was reasonably successful in attaining it. The above letters were dispatched on August 22, 1078. Not until early in 1080 was Hugh of Die able to convene the council to consider the charges against Manasses. In the meantime there was a good deal of sparring on both sides.

We may first note a move by the archbishop. In the middle of April, 1079, he himself presided over a provincial council at Soissons.⁶³ Its decrees are of considerable interest. They deal especially with infractions of the Truce of God, but they also confirm the papal prohibitions of clerical marriage and the holding of churches by laymen. In addition they denounce usury, deny the secular power the right to tax the clergy, and forbid clerks to bear arms.

The striking feature of these decrees is their decidedly reformist complexion. One wonders what motives led Manasses to convene the council which promulgated them. Was he trying to placate Gregory by furthering reform in his province? Did he hope to convince him that reform could progress more effectively under the aegis of the hierarchy than under that of the papal legates? Was the council, convened without the blessing of a papal legate, intended to be an assertion of independence or an act of defiance? Unfortunately it is impossible to answer these questions.

At any rate, the Council of Soissons appears to have made no impression on Gregory. On April 20, 1079, he made the archbishop of Lyons primate over the provinces of Lyons, Sens, Rouen, and Tours.⁶⁴ This was primarily an affront to King Philip and to Richer, archbishop of Sens, but it must have increased the apprehensions of Manasses. Yet the following summer was to provide him occasion for momentary elation.

The papal legates were hard at work on plans for a new council. At first they selected Troyes as a satisfactory site for the gathering. Further consid-

⁶² *Ibid.*, lib. VI, no. 3, 394-96.

⁶³ Reference to this council is made in the confirmation of a royal charter of January, 1079 (Prou, No. XCIV). The acts of the council, discovered in a MS. of the Bib. Nat., were published by Léopold Delisle in his *Littérature latine et histoire du moyen âge (Instructions adressées par le Comité des Travaux historiques et scientifiques aux correspondants du Ministère de l'Instruction publique et des beaux arts, Paris, 1890)*, pp. 23-25. Manasses had presided over an earlier council at Rheims in 1074. See the charter printed in *Gal. Chr.*, X, 156-57. Nothing is known of the deliberations of this council.

⁶⁴ Caspar, lib. VI, nos. 34 and 35. The significance of the move is made clear by Fliche, *Ph. I*, pp. 347 ff., and "La Primatie des Gaules," *Revue historique*, CLXXIII (1934), 337 ff.

eration changed their minds, however, and they canceled the summonses which had been sent out. Manasses was, no doubt, aware of the change in plan. Despite this fact he and his clergy journeyed to Troyes at the scheduled time.⁶⁵ Thus he was able to boast that he had scrupulously observed the terms of the oath he had sworn at Rome.

These futile maneuvers could not continue indefinitely. Hugh of Die at last fixed on Lyons as the place and late January or early February, 1080, as the time for the long delayed gathering.⁶⁶ The legate sent Manasses two official summonses.⁶⁷ The second, containing supplementary instructions received from the pope, was dispatched three weeks after the first.⁶⁸ Neither has been preserved, but the contents are made clear by Manasses' detailed reply to Hugh. This is a wordy, repetitious document, but one of great interest.⁶⁹

The archbishop admits that he promised the pope to heed a summons to attend a council *in Gaul*, provided, of course, that he did not have a canonical excuse for absenting himself.⁷⁰ In conformity with this promise he and his clergy had traveled to Troyes in the previous summer. As for a council at Lyons, there are numerous canonical excuses to justify him in not attending. In the first place, the summons does not include the name of Hugh of Cluny. Manasses lays great stress on this point. At Rome, he insists, the pope had agreed that he should be under the authority of the abbot of Cluny, not under that of Hugh of Die. Secondly, the council is not to be held in Gaul but in imperial territory.⁷¹ Thirdly, the state of war which prevails in the vicinity of Lyons makes it extremely hazardous for a French prelate to approach that city. Fourthly, the council is to be held in the same ecclesiastical province and to be directed by the same people as was the Council of Autun. Rome itself has recognized that Manasses was unjustly treated there! Finally, Lyons is a journey of fifteen days from Rheims, a circumstance which will make it difficult to obtain witnesses.

⁶⁵ Manasses tells us about this in his letter to Hugh of Die, *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 782. He does not pretend ignorance of the change of plan. He merely says that the oath taken at Rome included nothing about countermanding, and that he had never received Hugh's letter canceling the council. Lühe puts the date of the projected council at the end of August or beginning of September (p. 149).

⁶⁶ The exact dates of the Council of Lyons are unknown. Wiedemann, pp. 87-88, argues for early January, but Lühe, p. 147, proves that it could not possibly have met before the latter part of the month.

⁶⁷ Manasses to Hugh of Die, *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 783. Wiedemann, pp. 87-88, concludes that Manasses' letter to Hugh was written late in November. Lühe, p. 148, proves, however, that it could not have been written until after Christmas, 1079.

⁶⁸ Gregory's instructions to Hugh are not found in the register, but they are given by Hugh of Flavigny, *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 421.

⁶⁹ *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 781 ff.

⁷⁰ These limitations do not appear in Manasses' oath as given by Gregory.

⁷¹ Manasses argues that "Gaul" can only mean the kingdom of France, *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 784-85.

This is not all. Manasses has received from Hugh two quite different sets of instructions. In the first he was told he was to face the charges of the provost Manasses and his confederates. As a matter of fact, he has made peace with these, with the exception of Bruno and Pontius. The former is a foreigner, a German. The latter has been discredited by the lies in which he was caught at Rome. Manasses feels neither moral nor legal obligation to answer their charges.

Hugh's second instructions were entirely different. They ordered him in default of accusers, to be prepared to clear himself by the oaths of six bishops of unassailable repute. Why should he need to clear himself at all, if there are no accusers? As for the six bishops, how can he assemble them in the twenty days allowed him? And as for unassailable reputations, Sts. Remi, Martin, Julian, Germannus, Hilary, and Denis will have to rise from their graves, if he is to meet that specification!

In concluding, Manasses makes a proposal of his own. Let Hugh hold his council at Rheims, Soissons, Compiègne, or Senlis! He promises the legate a cordial reception and every consideration. The advantage of the church lies in conciliating France, not in antagonizing her. If Hugh disregards this proposal, Manasses assures him that he will disregard any action taken at Lyons.

Most historians have dismissed this letter as a piece of sheer casuistry. In the light of Manasses' oath as reported by Gregory they are, perhaps, justified in so doing. Yet there are certain points worthy of note. In the first place the correspondence of the controversy does indeed suggest that the oath had been qualified by certain antecedent verbal understandings. Thus Manasses insists that it had been agreed that he was to be under the legatine authority of Hugh of Cluny but not under that of Hugh of Die. Gregory nowhere admits that this is true, yet his letters do betray a certain uneasiness of conscience on this point.⁷² In the second place, certain of Manasses' legal arguments are not without cogency. Particularly interesting is their extensive documentation. He cites from the Old Testament,⁷³ the Fathers of the Church,⁷⁴ the *False Decretals*,⁷⁵ and even from the Code of Justinian.⁷⁶

⁷² Gregory seems at least to have assured Manasses that Hugh of Cluny would act together with Hugh of Die. See his letter to Hubert and Teuzo (May 22, 1078, Caspar, lib. V, no. 22, 386); to Manasses (Aug. 22, 1078, *ibid.*, lib. VI, no. 2, 393). Note also that Gregory "hopes" the abbot of Cluny will be at Lyons (to Manasses, Jan. 3, 1080, *ibid.*, lib. VII, no. 12, 476). Also his last letter to Manasses, Apr. 17, 1080 (*ibid.*, lib. VII, no. 20, 496). Because of strained relations, Gregory could not count on the co-operation of Hugh of Cluny during this period. See Lucy Smith, *Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (London, 1930), pp. 74 ff.

⁷³ For example, *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 786; "Ezekiel," XIII, 19.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, Gregory, "Homilia," XXVI, Migne, LXXXVI, 1200; Augustine, Sermo LXXXII, "De verbis Evangelii Matthaei," cap. xviii, Migne, XXXVIII, 509; Leo the Great, "Sermo de anniversario suo," Migne, LIV, 151.

⁷⁵ *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 784. For example, he cites a letter of Pope Evaristus (*cf.* Hinschius,

Perhaps his logic is not always impeccable, but his familiarity with canon and civil law is impressive. Finally, it must be admitted that Manasses was undoubtedly correct in feeling his case prejudged. Lyons had been chosen for the convenience and security of his enemies, and from them he could expect little mercy.

Some weeks before Manasses had written to Hugh of Die he had written to Gregory. The letter is no longer extant, but we have the pope's reply of January 3, 1080.⁷⁷ Gregory expresses astonishment that Manasses should go to such lengths to remain under a bad reputation. He reminds him that he is under legatine authority. He must not despise that authority. He must, therefore, go to Lyons. He will be perfectly safe and will receive every consideration. Gregory hopes that the bishop of Albano and Hugh of Cluny will be there. In any case, Manasses must attend. If he refuses, the pope will confirm any sentence the council may pronounce.

The papal admonitions fell on deaf ears. Manasses did not go to Lyons, where the sessions of the council began late in January or early in February.⁷⁸ Whether his accusers were present we are not told. Hugh of Flavigny relates that Manasses made an attempt to bribe Hugh of Die to allow him to clear himself by the oath of six bishops, or, better still, by his own unsupported oath.⁷⁹ It is impossible to disprove this charge, but in the light of the antecedent correspondence the details of the story sound fantastic.

The Council of Lyons declared Manasses deposed.⁸⁰ Ostensibly the Gregorian papacy had scored an impressive triumph over a formidable antagonist. Actually the triumph would have been more substantial, had the formidable antagonist been induced to humiliate himself before the legatine authority at Lyons. Gregory VII was by no means unaware of the hollow character of the victory achieved.

On April 17, 1080, the pope announced to Manasses that the sentence pronounced at Lyons had been confirmed by a synod at Rome.⁸¹ Nevertheless, "contrary to the custom of the Roman Church," Gregory, moved by pity, will give him one more chance. He may have until the feast of St. Michael (September 29) to clear himself by the oath of six bishops under

p. 92), and one of Pope Euticianus (*ibid.*, p. 212). Particularly striking are Manasses' words: "Quid? quod Judam Dominus Jurem esse sciebat, et quia non est accusatus, ideo non est ejectus, sed permansit in apostalatu." This is taken verbatim from a decretal of Eleutherius (*ibid.*, p. 126).

⁷⁶ *Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 782. For this passage see Paul Krueger, *Corpus Juris Civilis* (Berlin, 1906), II, Code, lib. II, III, 13.

⁷⁷ Caspar, lib. VII, no. 12, 475-77. Lühe, p. 148, shows conclusively that Manasses' letter to Gregory must have been written some time before that to Hugh of Die.

⁷⁸ See note 66, above.

⁷⁹ *M.G.H., Scrip.*, VIII, 421-22.

⁸⁰ Caspar, lib. VII, no. 20, 496.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 495-96.

the following conditions. Having restored all he has taken from the Provost Manasses, Bruno, and his other accusers, and having permitted them to return to Rheims, he must go either to Cluny or to La Chaise-Dieu. He may take with him one clerk and two laymen. Because of the difficulties of a trip to Rome, the oath of purgation may be taken in the presence of Hugh of Die and Hugh of Cluny, or in the absence of the latter, Amatus of Oleron.

If Manasses is willing to accept these conditions, he is to notify Hugh of Die and swear to him that he will take nothing from the church of Rheims except what may be necessary for himself and his attendants at Cluny or La Chaise-Dieu. If he refuses this offer, the sentence of Lyons will stand, nor will Gregory ever grant him audience. Clearly the pope was making exceptional efforts in behalf of the legatine authority.

They were, however, in vain. There is no indication that Manasses paid the slightest heed to this final concession. As 1080 drew to a close it was obvious that the sentence of Lyons would have to be enforced. On December 27 Gregory at last dispatched similar letters to the clergy and people of Rheims, to Count Ebalus of Roucy, to the suffragans of Rheims, and to King Philip.⁸² All are forbidden to obey Manasses longer, or to associate with him. They are enjoined to co-operate in the speedy and canonical election of a new metropolitan.

It is a tribute to the power of the Gregorian papacy that these instructions were, in the main, executed. Guibert of Nogent informs us that the people of Rheims drove Manasses from their city and that he fled to the court of Emperor Henry IV.⁸³ Certain it is that he was in Henry's camp before Rome on May 23, 1081.⁸⁴ After this he disappears from view.⁸⁵

It is frequently claimed that Manasses went on pilgrimage to the Holy Land and was among certain prisoners delivered from the Saracens in 1099.⁸⁶ This is highly improbable. Guibert of Nogent fails to mention such a pilgrimage. According to him, after joining Henry IV, Manasses "wandered here and there until he died without the last communion of the Church."⁸⁷

⁸² *Ibid.*, lib. VIII, nos. 17, 18, 19, and 20, 538-43.

⁸³ *De vita sua*, lib. I, cap. XI, pp. 31-32.

⁸⁴ "Benzonis Episcopi Albensis ad Heinricum IV Imperatorem Libri VII," *M.G.H., Scrip.*, XI, 657.

⁸⁵ Manasses confirmed a charter at Braux, on the Meuse, on September 26, "anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo octogesimo primo, indictione tertia." See Gustave Saige and Henri Lacaille, *Trésor des chartes du comté de Rethel* (Monaco, 1902), I, 2. If 1081 is correct, our knowledge of Manasses' movements is extended by a few months. It is probable, however, that 1081 is a mistake for 1080. The year of the indiction is correct for the latter date, but wrong for the former. Moreover it is improbable that Manasses' confirmation would have been sought after he had been driven from Rheims.

⁸⁶ See for example, *Hist. lit.*, VIII, 255-56; Wiedemann, p. 65. The source is "Tudebodus Imitatus et Continuatus," *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Hist. oc.*, III, 213. This simply says that an archbishop of Rheims was among the liberated.

⁸⁷ *De vita sua*, lib. I, cap. XI, p. 32.

It may be noted further that Baudri of Bourgueil, writing in the 1080's to the poet, Godfrey of Rheims, distinctly implies that Manasses is dead.⁸⁸ It seems probable, therefore, that he did not survive his expulsion from Rheims by many years.

Manasses has been unfortunate in that writers sympathetic to the Gregorian reform have had the most to say about him. Walo of St. Arnulph, Hugh of Flavigny, Guibert of Nogent, Hugh of Die, and the disillusioned Gregory VII have provided the components of the conventional portrait of him. Undoubtedly Guibert's characterization has been most frequently cited. He was, says Guibert, "indeed a man of noble birth, but having absolutely none of the composure which first of all becomes good birth, for he had conceived so great arrogance from his new position, that he seemed to imitate the royal majesties of foreign peoples. . . . He, then, since he imitated especially the warriors and neglected the clergy is once said to have remarked: 'The Archbishopric of Rheims would be good, were it not for the need of saying mass for it.'"⁸⁹

There is every reason to believe that Manasses was indeed turbulent and arrogant, both in word and in deed. His manners were those of the war-like feudal aristocracy into which he was born.⁹⁰ That he was also avaricious and unscrupulously rapacious there can be no doubt. Walo, the provost Manasses, Bruno, and the church of Rheims were the victims of his greed. Little can be said in his defense here, except that such vices were characteristic of the society of the eleventh century. Manasses must be judged by the standards of his day. He is to be compared or contrasted with such contemporaries as Renier, bishop of Orleans, or Lambert, bishop of Théroutanne.⁹¹ Even the greatest of medieval rulers were capable of similar ferocity and rapacity.

There is fragmentary evidence, never before mustered in his behalf, that there was a less forbidding side to this archbishop of Rheims. He was not always "that singular wild beast" which terrified Walo.⁹² On occasion he must have been a man of considerable personal charm. Thus he apparently made an excellent impression on Archdeacon Hildebrand and Pope Alexander II. Nor does the impression on the former appear to have been entirely obliterated by the controversies of the late 1070's. In his final letter to Manasses Gregory's

⁸⁸ Phyllis Abrahams, ed., *Les oeuvres poétiques de Baudri de Bourgueil* (Paris, 1926), no. CLXI, verses 109-10. On the date of the poem see my article, "Godfrey of Rheims," *loc. cit.*, p. 29, n. 3.

⁸⁹ *De vita sua*, lib. I, cap. XI, pp. 30-31.

⁹⁰ It is hard to agree, however, with Professor Prosper Boissonade, who sees in Manasses the historical prototype of Archbishop Turpin in the *Chanson de Roland*. See *Du nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland* (Paris, 1923), pp. 326-27. Nothing in all the material examined above suggests that Manasses took the field in the manner of an Odo of Bayeux.

⁹¹ See Fliche, *Réf. Grég.*, II, 245 ff., and 255 ff.

⁹² Mabillon, *Vet. an.*, p. 455.

concluding threat is never to grant him another audience.⁹³ One senses an uneasy feeling on the part of the pope that he cannot entirely trust his own resolution in a personal interview with his antagonist.

It is, moreover, a mistake to assume that all good and upright men were enemies of Manasses. The saintly Thierry, abbot of St. Hubert in the Ardennes, was his friend and received many tokens of his esteem.⁹⁴ Archdeacon Wido, who defended him at Autun, was a man of blameless character and ended his life as a monk in Apulia, if we are to trust the poets.⁹⁵ These especially held Manasses in high esteem. Baudri of Bourgueil speaks of him with respect,⁹⁶ and Godfrey of Rheims composed many poems in his praise.⁹⁷ All of these, unfortunately, have disappeared. As already noted, however, a great deal of the verse of Fulcoius of Beauvais has survived.

In this we find nothing but praise for Manasses.⁹⁸ Nor can it be charged that Fulcoius was an irreligious man who was completely under the influence of the pagan authors. Despite his admiration for the ancients, he remained a pious Christian. This is illustrated by his *Uterque*, a metrical version of the Old and New Testaments, by his numerous lives of local saints, and by his preoccupation with the idea of becoming a monk.⁹⁹ It is to be remarked too, that his devotion to his patron was sincere. It was not merely a matter of a fat pension. When Manasses went into exile, Fulcoius accompanied him.¹⁰⁰ Obviously certain of the archbishop's contemporaries saw in him virtues not revealed to Walo or Hugh of Die.

⁹³ Caspar, lib. VII, no. 20, 496.

⁹⁴ "Life of St. Thierry," *M.G.H., Scrip.*, XII, 49; "Chronicle of St. Hubert," *ibid.*, VIII, 575-76, 590.

⁹⁵ Fulcoius directs a poem of praise to Wido in Beauvais MS. 11, 151v. Godfrey of Rheims composed his epitaph, published by Wilhelm Wattenbach, "Lateinische Gedichte aus Frankreich," *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1891), I, 111-12.

⁹⁶ Abrahams, no. CLXI, verses 105-10.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ Some of the praise is too extravagant for modern taste. For example, these verses from the dedicatory part of the *Uterque* in Bib. Nat. MS. Lat. 16701, 4^r:

*Pectus, Lingua, Manus, Gressum moneo preparate,
Donec diva caro, Manases, hoc extat in orbe.
Vita viris brevis est. Quia vivit strenuus, ibit
Ocius, in mundo per secula non reparandus.
Solutus homo, solus princeps, migrabis ab orbe,
Optime vir Manases, sed non migrabis ab ore!
Tempora nostra vident non visum tempore longo,
Dignum vate virum, condignum principe vatem.
Romam cesaribus nostris fortuna diebus
Quod si privavit? Te, nos meliore beavit.
Remis, Roma, pares; Manases, Gregorius idem.*

⁹⁹ A. Wilmart, "Deux Lettres concernant Raoul le Verd, l'Ami de Saint Bruno," *Revue bénédictine*, LI (1939), 264.

¹⁰⁰ This is indicated by his poem addressed to Emperor Henry IV, published in *Rec. des hist.*, XI, 195, n. b.

It may be added that remiss as Manasses may have been in his other pastoral duties, he did not neglect the school of his cathedral. This had already attained a considerable reputation under his predecessor, Gervais. Under Manasses it occupied a position somewhat similar to that it had held in the days of Gerbert. It is true that, after 1075, the archbishop was the enemy of its most distinguished master, Bruno. On the other hand, it was he who gave the headship of the school to another celebrated master, Godfrey of Rheims.¹⁰¹ Thus whatever be thought of Manasses' role in the political and ecclesiastical affairs of his day, his position in the cultural history of the eleventh century is a highly respectable one.

In concluding we may well ask what, specifically, were the fundamental issues in this contest between the revitalized papacy and the archbishop of Rheims? It is customary to describe Manasses as "the enemy of reform." In the light of what has been said, it is obvious that the description requires qualification. Two of the prime objectives of the reformers, the enforcement of clerical celibacy and the abolition of lay investiture, do not figure at all in the struggle with the archbishop of Rheims. Nor does simony prove to be the important issue that Guibert of Nogent and Hugh of Flavigny make it to appear.

On the other hand, the reformers naturally wished to see ecclesiastical offices honestly and justly administered. Here they had a genuine grievance against Manasses. Much more important, however, was the question of the legatine authority. This was the truly vital issue. There could be no centralized papal monarchy as long as great ecclesiastics, like Manasses, could defy with impunity the instructions of the legates. The archbishop of Rheims was made an example to terrify any who might seek to follow in his footsteps.

Politically speaking, Manasses' defects lay in the realm of vision and leadership. His outlook was too narrowly provincial and selfish. Questions of broad principle or general policy found little place in his thinking. Even his opposition to the legatine authority does not appear to have been based on any principle. In his oath to Gregory and on other occasions he was willing enough to accept the principle. It was only its application to himself that he resisted. As a result he had to fight alone. Neither King Philip nor the feudal aristocracy gave him any substantial support.¹⁰² He never seems to have

¹⁰¹ See Abrahams, no. CLXI, verses 91 ff., and my article, "Godfrey of Rheims," *loc. cit.*, pp. 29-30.

¹⁰² Manasses' relations with Philip are very obscure. As Helinand of Laon was the king's candidate for the see of Rheims (*De vita sua*, lib. III, cap. 11, p. 131), Manasses' success in becoming archbishop could hardly have pleased him. There is, however, no evidence of strained relations between them. Manasses was frequently with the king. See Prou, nos. XXXIX, XLIII,

considered the possibility of organizing the French clergy, or even the clergy of his own province, to resist the papal pretensions. He went down to defeat with neck unbowed, but this did not alter the fact that the Gregorians had scored a relatively easy victory in the ecclesiastical citadel of the Capetian monarchy.

Dartmouth College

XLVIII, XLIX, LX, LXI, LXII, LXXVIII, LXXX, LXXXII, LXXXVI, XCI, XCIV. In his letters Manasses mentions the king twice only. In his first letter to Gregory, he reports Archdeacon W. as saying: "*nec magistratus suus, cui post deum subditus est, in manu vestra eum esse praecepit*" (Sudendorf, I, 14). In his letter to Hugh of Die, he invites the legate, in the king's name as well as in his own, to convene a council at Rheims, Soissons, Compiègne, or Senlis (*Rec. des hist.*, XIV, 786), Benzo (*M.G.H., Scrip.*, XI, 657) describes Manasses in 1081 as "*Philippi regis Franciae venerabilis legatus*." This may indicate that Philip had paid less attention to Gregory's letter of December 27, 1080, than is usually assumed.

Economic and Social Factors in the Prussian Rhineland in 1848

OSCAR J. HAMMEN

ECONOMIC and social factors helped to precipitate and to determine the course of the German Revolution of 1848. Yet, aside from a number of special studies by German historians, the standard accounts of the Revolution of 1848 place an almost exclusive emphasis upon the political aspects of the movement and upon the constitutional and national strivings of the liberal middle class. Generally ignored are the economic and social considerations which made the masses ripe for revolution. The "common man," in the final analysis, provided the revolutionary impulses and did the street fighting.

This article will consider merely a fragment of the problem, in that attention will be concentrated on Prussia, with specific stress on the Rhineland. It will be evident that economic and social factors may have provided the preponderant force which thrust a Prussia, reputed for good government, tranquillity, and order, into the maelstrom of revolution. An emphasis on the Rhineland is pertinent, since Rhineland liberal politicians and the Rhenish platform of reforms dominated the early course of the Revolution of 1848 in Prussia.

The status of the Rhineland deserves brief consideration. Assigned to Prussia in 1815, the Rhineland originally showed a coolness toward Prussian hegemony. Thereafter, an oppositionist tendency, stemming from religious differences, contrasting legal codes, and the generally more advanced political character of the Rhenish populace, continued to prevail into 1848. Economic prosperity and the over-all incorruptibility and good will of Prussian officialdom, however, had been effective in winning the steadfast loyalty of some Rhinelanders and the passive acquiescence of most others in Prussian rule.

Furthermore, it must be noted that, almost up to 1848, Prussia seems to have enjoyed the position of being the land of opportunity in the German world. Immigration from neighboring German states into Prussia until 1847 always greatly exceeded the numbers which Prussia lost through emigration to the New World or to other destinations.¹ Contemporary observers frequently commented on the relative prosperity of the Rhineland and on

¹ Paul Mombert, *Studien zur Bevölkerungsbewegung in Deutschland* (Karlsruhe, 1907), pp. 107-108.