

# MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

*Volume XXVIII*

1966



PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

TORONTO, CANADA

67/485

# Notes on the Council and the Consistory of Rheims (1148)

NICHOLAS M. HARING, S.A.C.

## I

### THE PAPAL SUMMONS TO THE COUNCIL

ON 6 October 1147 Pope Eugene III thanked Suger, abbot of Saint-Denis (d. 1151) and administrator of the French kingdom, for offering him "loca regni tibi commissi pro voluntate nostra ad celebrandum concilium".<sup>1</sup> The letter, written at Auxerre, reveals that Eugene had planned the celebration of a council outside the territory administered by Suger during the absence of King Louis VII. The exact location originally contemplated is not quite certain, however.

On 11 October the pope sent a letter, carried by "John, subdeacon of the Roman Church," to Henry, bishop of Olmuetz (1126-1150), ordering him (praecipiendo mandamus) to attend a council to be held at Trier on *Laetare*-Sunday, 21 March 1148. A letter dispatched on the next day to Eberhardt, archbishop of Salzburg, the bishops, and abbots of his province, uses the same firm language of command (praecipiendo mandamus), announces the same date, but names Troyes as the locality where the council was to be convened.<sup>2</sup> But in view of Eugene's reply to Suger and the letter to Bishop Henry the reading *Trecas* (Troyes) is generally regarded as a scribal error.

The papal curia soon left Auxerre and on 30 November 1147 entered Trier preceded by numerous bishops "from every nation under the sky".<sup>3</sup> It seems that when complaints about increasing taxes became louder and louder Eugene decided in February 1148 to convene the council at Rheims<sup>4</sup> on the date fixed: 21 March 1148.

Those called upon to attend were, as we have seen, *ordered* to come:

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* 229; PL 180, 1283CD.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep.* 231 (to Bishop Henry) and *Ep.* 232 (to Archb. Eberhardt); PL 180, 1284BD and 1285C.

<sup>3</sup> *Gesta Alberonis* 23; MGH SS 8, 255.

<sup>4</sup> H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen III*, in: *Beitr. zur mittelalt. und neueren Gesch.* 6 (Jena 1936) 83. Cf. Wibold, *Ep.* 63 (to Card. Jordan) and *Ep.* 64 (to Card. Guido, papal chancellor); ed. Ph. Jaffé, *Bibl. rer. germ.* 1: Mon. Corbeiensia (Berlin 1864) 140-141.

...per apostolica scripta... praecipiendo mandamus.<sup>5</sup> The pope's order included "the archbishops, bishops, and other prelates of churches from divers parts of the world"<sup>6</sup> that with their help and counsel and the assistance of the Holy Spirit he might correct what was amiss, and firmly lay down what had to be decreed. Nothing was to hold them back: *remota omni actione*.

The aging bishop of Olmuetz, Henry Zdik, asked to be excused. In a letter written from Trier on 18 December 1147 Eugene relieves him of his obligation to attend: "...in view of your many pressing duties... we absolve you".<sup>7</sup> But, in general, pressing duties were no sufficient excuse, and the failure to attend was punished with suspension.

At Rheims, as John of Salisbury writes, "the pope suspended the bishop of Winchester and the archbishops of Mainz and Cologne by name *and all those who failed to obey* the summons to the council in general".<sup>8</sup> It is difficult to appraise the extent and effect of this stern procedure.

The chronicler of Cologne notes of his archbishop (Arnold): ... *ab officio suo suspenditur quia se huic concilio subtraxerat*.<sup>9</sup> As administrator on behalf of King Konrad, the archbishop of Mainz may have felt he could not afford a prolonged absence. In September 1148 young Henry, King of the Romans, begged Eugene to excuse the archbishop who was then on his way to ask for the pope's forgiveness. Eugene never removed the suspension.<sup>10</sup>

Abbots were likewise suspended if they failed to obey the papal summons. The annalist of Brauweiler narrates: *Prutes episcopi Galliae et abbates ab Eugenio papa ab officiis suis suspensi sunt quorum unus domnus Amilius abbas noster fuit*.<sup>11</sup> Since the abbot died in 1149 the state of his health may very well have been the reason for his failure to attend the council.

The old archbishop of Trier was carried into Rheims lying on a stretcher mounted between two horses.<sup>12</sup> The bishop of Hereford, Robert of Be-thune, was in feeble health and fell ill on the third day of the council. He died at Rheims<sup>13</sup> on 14 or 16 April 1148. The bishop of Angoulême,

<sup>5</sup> *Epp.* 231 and 232; PL 180, 1284C and 1285C.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>7</sup> *Ep.* 241; PL 180, 1296D: ...*ut pro multis tibi instantibus negotiis vocationem ad concilium quod mediante Quadragesima, auctore Domino, celebrabimus, tibi pietatis gratia relaxemus... fraternitatem a iam dicti concilii vocatione absolvimus.*

<sup>8</sup> *Historia Pontificalis* 4; ed. Reg. L. Poole (Oxford 1927) 11. W. von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 4 (Braunschweig 1877) 315. H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen*, 89.

<sup>9</sup> *Chronica regia* (ad ann. 1149); *Recueil des hist.* 13, 721 D.

<sup>10</sup> (Wibald), *Ep.* 116 (99); ed. Jaffé 190. W. von Giesebrecht, *Geschichte* 4, 348.

<sup>11</sup> *Ann. Brunwilarenses* (ad ann. 1148); MGH SS 16, 707. H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen*, 91.

<sup>12</sup> *Gesta Alberonis* 24; MGH SS 8, 255.

<sup>13</sup> *Dict. Nat. Biogr.* 16 (1909) 1250.

Lambert de Palude, who is known to have attended the council, died on 13 June 1148, less than three months after the council.<sup>14</sup> The threat and fear of suspension is clearly reflected in the totally unfounded report that the bishops of Orleans and Troyes were deposed by Eugene at Rheims.<sup>15</sup>

How many Spanish bishops and abbots were suspended is, of course, also unknown. But we do know that the Spanish king himself pleaded on behalf of those who were struck by the papal penalty. Shortly after the council King Alfonso VII of Spain (1106-1157) asked Pope Eugene to lift the suspension incurred by those Spanish bishops and abbots "who did not come." Writing from Langres on 27 April 1148 Eugene replies: *Quia vero episcopus et abbates regni tui ad vocationem nostram tamquam devotus et humilis filius Remensi interesse concilio voluisti, benevolentiae gratias exhibentes, precum tuarum consideratione devicti eos qui non venerunt a suspensionis sententia relaxamus.*<sup>16</sup> Present at the council was Raymund, Primate of Toledo.<sup>17</sup>

While King Alfonso cooperated with Pope Eugene, King Stephen of England (1133-1189) granted no permission to attend except to the bishops of Hereford, Norwich, and Chichester. We have seen that the bishop of Hereford died at Rheims. The bishop of Norwich, William Turbe (1146-1174), had "the reputation of being a learned and accomplished scholar in an age which had not a few such men".<sup>18</sup> He went to Rheims. The bishop of Chichester, Hilary (1147-1169), did not attend. He incurred the sentence of the pope from which, as we shall see, he obtained absolution<sup>19</sup> in November 1148.

Archbishop Theobald of Canterbury (1139-1161) defied Stephen's restriction. Ralph Diceto writes: *Theobaldus Cantuarensis archiepiscopus Remis venit ad concilium sine licentia regis. Quare bonis suis omnibus spoliatus est.*<sup>20</sup> For his courage Theobald was praised publicly by Eugene at the council.<sup>21</sup> Speaking of Theobald Ralph Diceto adds: "His suffragans were suspended by the pope because they had not come to the coun-

<sup>14</sup> *Call. chr.* 2, 1001.

<sup>15</sup> *Chron. Albrici mon. Trium Fontium* (ad ann. 1148); MGH SS 23, 840. Bishop Hatto of Troyes (1123-1145) resigned in 1140 and was succeeded by the Cistercian Henry (1145-1169). The bishop of Orleans, Manasses de Garlande (1146-1185 ?), is not otherwise known to have been under papal censure.

<sup>16</sup> *Ep.* 297; PL 180, 1346D-1347A.

<sup>17</sup> Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles* V, 823.

<sup>18</sup> *Dict. Nat. Biogr.* 21 (1909) 360.

<sup>19</sup> R. Diceto, *Abbrev. chronic.* (ad ann. 1147); ed. William Stubbs, *Rolls Series* 68, 1 (London 1876) 263. *Dict. Nat. Biogr.* 9 (1908) 831.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibidem*, 262.

<sup>21</sup> Gervase, *Chronica* (ad ann. 1147); ed. William Stubbs, *Rolls Series* 73, 1 (London 1879) 133.

cil."<sup>22</sup> This means that suspension was incurred by the incumbents of Asaph, Bangor, Bath, Chichester, St. David, Ely, Exeter, Lichfield, Lincoln, Llandaf, London, Rochester, Salisbury, Winchester, and Worcester. We know less about the number of English abbots suspended by Eugene. But they, too, incurred the papal sentence, as is clearly implied by John of Salisbury: Theobald "released from suspension all English bishops and abbots with the exception of Henry of Winchester who went to Rome and personally obtained absolution".<sup>23</sup> According to the chronicler Ger vase,<sup>24</sup> Theobald absolved at Faversham on 11 November 1148 the following four bishops: Simon of Worcester (1125-1150), Robert of Bath (1136-1166), Robert of Exeter (1138-1155), and Hilary of Chichester (1147-1169).

Present at the council was the Cistercian Henry Murdac, archbishop of York, whom Eugene had consecrated at Trier on 7 December 1147. Likewise present were the bishops of Hereford and Norwich and two archdeacons of York, Masters Walter and Geoffrey.<sup>25</sup> The future archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Becket, and the future archbishop of York, Roger, also attended the council.<sup>26</sup>

Only one Italian bishop, Crassantius of Mantua, is said to have come to the council. Rather than summon the Italian dignitaries Eugene had decided to celebrate a council at Cremona on 7 July 1148 to promulgate the decrees of Rheims.<sup>27</sup>

In view of the severe penalties attached to any disregard of the papal orders it is quite understandable that the number of attendants was so considerable that according to the chronicler of Cambrai nobody knew the exact number of the bishops and abbots that came "from the remote parts of the Ocean".<sup>28</sup> According to one estimate<sup>29</sup> the number of archbishops, bishops, and abbots was as high as 1100. A more conservative writer in Austria places the "multitude of bishops and abbots" close to "400 and more".<sup>30</sup>

Less understandable in view of the numerous suspensions incurred

<sup>22</sup> R. Diceto, *Abbrev. chronic.*; ed. Stubbs 262. J. Mabillon, *Annales OSB* 79, 12; ed. Lucca 6 (1745) 403.

<sup>23</sup> *Hist. pont.* 40; p. 80.

<sup>24</sup> *Chronica* (ad ann. 1147); ed. Stubbs 138.

<sup>25</sup> N. M. Haring, "Das sogenannte Glaubensbekenntnis des Reimser Konsistoriums von 1148," in: *Scholastik* 40 (1965) 84, n. 170.

<sup>26</sup> *Hist. pont.* 8; p. 18.

<sup>27</sup> *Hist. pont.* 21; p. 50.

<sup>28</sup> *Annales camerac.* (ad ann. 1148); MGH SS 16, 517: ...plures de remotis partibus oceani episcopi et abbates convenerunt pluralitatem quorum nemo perfecte verbo comprehendit.

<sup>29</sup> *Chronicon Albrici* (ad ann. 1149); Recueil des hist. 13, 701C. *Sigeberti contin. Gemblacensis* MGH SS 9, 504.

<sup>30</sup> *Ann. Mellic.* (ad. ann. 1148); MGH SS 9, 504.

by untold bishops and abbots in the four kingdoms is the recent claim that full of enthusiasm and excitement prelates and scholars hurried to Rheims, especially because of Gilbert's trial — which, it may be added, is not even mentioned in Eugene's letters to Bishop Henry of Olmuetz and Archbishop Eberhardt of Salzburg.

S. Gammersbach<sup>31</sup> writes: Der "Fall Gilbert" muss in der damaligen wissenschaftlichen Welt ein ungeheueres Aufsehen erregt haben. Alles was Rang und Namen hatte, war nach Reims geeilt. The sober facts of recorded history do not justify such a cheerful interpretation of the events. We shall see that the interest in Gilbert's trial after the council was so small that Eugene had to hold back a number of dignitaries to bring about a final settlement.

In evaluating the actual number of the ecclesiastics attending the council the involvement of St. Bernard should not be overlooked. In 1148 the number of Cistercian communities was already considerable. Since abbots were included in the pope's summons,<sup>32</sup> a substantial number of Cistercians must have journeyed to Rheims, not to mention Benedictines, Canons Regular, Premonstratensians, the Order of Cluny, and others. The bishops assembled, as Geoffrey puts it, came from the four kingdoms of Gaul, Germany, England, and Spain.<sup>33</sup> And in keeping with the time, they came with their retinues. If their number was too large to be fixed with accuracy, an equal or rather larger number of servants and horses must be included. Rheims was hardly prepared for such an increase of its population.<sup>34</sup> Hence it stands to reason that the council had to be of short duration. We are told that it lasted eleven days.<sup>35</sup> It was probably shorter.

<sup>31</sup> *Gilbert von Poitiers und seine Prozesse im Urteil der Zeitgenossen*, in: *Neue Münstersche Beiträge zur Geschichtsf.* 5 (Cologne 1959) 80.

<sup>32</sup> The summons may have gone out only to abbots of outstanding merits, though no such restriction has come to my attention. The *Chronicon Laureshamense* (Lorsch); MGH SS 21, 440 notes: *Folcnandus abbas ad Remense concilium evocatus hoc ab eo privilegium obtinuit...* In his letters to Bishop Henry (PL 180, 1296D) and to King Alfonso (PL 180, 1346D) Pope Eugene speaks of his summons as a *vocatio*. The *privilegium* referred to by the chronicler was issued on 29 March 1148. This is an indication that the council which opened on 21 March 1148 may have closed before 29 March. The text of the *privilegium* is still extant in Pope Eugene's epistolary, *Ep.* 265; PL 180, 1314C-1316A.

<sup>33</sup> *Libellus* 4; PL 185, 596D.

<sup>34</sup> A vivid description of the impact on prices and the problems of food supplies at the council of Trent is found in H. Jedin, *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient* 1 (Freiburg i.B. 1951) 434-556. Similar conditions must have prevailed at Rheims. The problems were already felt at Trier in January of that year or even earlier, for at the end of the year 1147 Abbot Wibald wrote a letter to Cardinal Guido (the papal chancellor) and a letter to Card. Jordan to explain how much he had done for the "procuratio domni papae". In both letters he speaks of the number of *murmurantes* to which he did not wish to belong. Cf. *Epp.* 63 and 64; ed. Jaffé 140-141.

<sup>35</sup> *Gaufredi chronica* (ad ann. 1148); MGH SS 26, 201.

## II

## THE COUNCIL OF RHEIMS

The solemn opening of the council took place at Notre-Dame Cathedral on *Laetare*-Sunday, 21 March 1148. Eugene and the curia had arrived on or before 9 March. John of Salisbury assures us that passionate arguments about rights of primacy started many days before the official opening.<sup>1</sup> When in one instance words failed, the enraged opponents changed over to bodily assault.<sup>2</sup> Eugene refused to make quick decisions and, as John of Salisbury puts it somewhat sarcastically, "all received the same answer as the archbishop of Lyons"<sup>3</sup> who had apparently been the first to present his jurisdictional claims.

Busily engaged in receiving these prelates, Pope Eugene instructed Cardinals Julius and John Paparo to settle a controversy between Abbots Eustachius of Saint-Pierre (Jumièges) and Robert of Saint-Vincent (Le Mans). The final decision was enacted on 5 April 1148: Actum in capitulo Remensi... Ego Iulius presbiter cardinalis tit. s. Marcelli controversiam istam ex mandato domini papae Eugenii terminavi et ideo ss. (subscripti) et pro sigillo roboravi. Cardinal John made the same declaration.<sup>4</sup> Other records testify to similar activities at Rheims.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. pont.* 1; p. 5. H. Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte der mittelalt. Patriarchate," *Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung f. Rechtsgeschichte, kan. Abt.* 4 (1955) 95-183.

<sup>2</sup> H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen*, 85. *Gesta Alberonis* 24; MGH SS 8, 255.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. pont.* 1; p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> J. Ramackers, "Papsturkunden in Frankreich," NF 5: *Abh. der Akad. der Wissensch. in Göttingen* III, 35 (Göttingen 1935) 155, No. 76.

<sup>5</sup> S. Loewenfeld, *Epistolae Pont. Rom. ineditae* (Leipzig 1885), 106, No. 202: on 12 April 1148 Eugene confirmed at Rheims a settlement arbitrated by Cardinals Julius and Hyacinth. It concerned a litigation between the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre and the Benedictine William, abbot of Aniane. Another instance is recorded by the annalist of Ottobeuren: Remis synodus celebratur ubi ab Apostolico Eugenio privilegium per abbatem Isingrimum loco nostro datur. *Ann. Ottenburani Isingrimi minores* (ad ann. 1148); MGH SS 17, 315. In a letter, dated Tusculum 14 June 1149 and addressed to the archbishop of Tours, Eugene refers to a sentence of excommunication passed on the bishops of Dol and Brioux and confirmed at Rheims: Sententia excommunicationis fuit in eos a te, frater archiepiscopo, promulgata et in Remensi concilio a nobis postmodum confirmata. *Ep.* 353; PL 180, 1393A. A rather amusing forgery found among the letters of Pope Eugene (*Ep.* 591; PL 180, 1609B-1611A) claims to be a *privilegium* granted at Rheims on 23 March 1148 (on the third day of the council) signed by Cardinal Dietwin (who was in Palestine), Cardinals Octavian (of S. Cecilia), Bernard (of S. Clemente), Hubald ("bishop of Ferentino"), and Hyacinth (of "S. Adriano", in reality of S. Maria in Cosmedin): Praesentibus et annitentibus (= annuentibus) episcopis Iohanne Ostiensi, Widone Praenestino, Samsone Remensi, Gisiberto Pictaviensi, Adalberone Trevirensi, Hartberto Utrensi, Bernardo Clarevallis. Datum Remis per manum Rolandi cancellarii X Kal. Aprilis....

Eugene placed two items on the agenda of the council: first, a number of canons which were to be discussed and approved; second, the heretic Eon de Stella, a mental case, who in the words of Otto of Freising was not even worthy of being called a heretic.<sup>6</sup> Most of the canons were not new and had been approved by two previous councils held by Innocent II at Rheims (1131) and Rome (Lateran 1139). They were finally "promulgated with their interpretations and explanations, and approved by general consent with one exception".<sup>7</sup> Reynold of Dassel, later chancellor of Frederick Barbarossa, "and other Germans" protested against a regulation concerning clerical garb as explained in the second canon.<sup>8</sup> Eon de Stella seems to have caused some amusement and was finally handed over to Suger for punishment. He died not long after the council.<sup>9</sup>

### III

#### THE CONSISTORY OF RHEIMS 1148

If the council lasted eleven days, it came to an end on 1 April 1148. Most participants must have been quite anxious to depart.<sup>1</sup> But Eugene told a number of attendants to stay behind in order to bring the investigation into Gilbert's teaching to a final conclusion.

According to Otto of Freising the "more prudent judges" and those from less distant places were detained to close the case: ...*prudentiores et viciniore ad causam episcopi Giliberti terminandam reservantur*.<sup>2</sup> The fact that Eugene retained a number of dignitaries is confirmed by John of Salisbury: ...*commanentibus adhuc diversarum provinciarum archiepiscopis et episcopis ad huius causae decisionem retentis*.<sup>3</sup> The implication is clear: those members of the assembly would have left if they had not been held back by the Pontiff. In other words, they were not interested enough in the trial to stay a day longer than the council required.

It has been claimed that "the French Church" pressed the pope for a

<sup>6</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 57; MGH SS (ad usum schol.) 46, 81. Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des conciles* V, 828.

<sup>7</sup> *Hist. pont.* 3; p. 9. The canons have come down to us in two quite different versions: Mansi 21, 713-719. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire* V, 824-827.

<sup>8</sup> *Hist. pont.* 3; p. 9.

<sup>9</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 57; p. 81

<sup>1</sup> A remark made by Geoffrey, *Ep. ad. Alb.* 13; PL 185, 595A, allows us to conclude that on the day after Gilbert's trial about 15 bishops were still in Rheims. Cf. N. M. Haring, "Das sogenannte Glaubensbekenntnis", 76, n. 123.

<sup>2</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 58; p. 82.

<sup>3</sup> *Hist. pont.* 11; p. 26.

"quick condemnation" and that it seems to have advocated "Gilbert's complete submission".<sup>4</sup> Such claims not only lack historical proof but are also at variance with verifiable historical facts. The "French episcopate" which, as we are told, closed its ranks against the cardinals was in reality *a very small group* of men wise enough to interest St. Bernard in their cause. Needless to say, neither St. Bernard nor Suger could spare the time required to study the teaching of a scholar whom they endeavoured to convict in the presence of a fortunately more impartial arbiter.

The trial lasted two days. If Otto's remark:<sup>5</sup> *Decursa medianae Quadragesimae ebdomada sacroque dominicae passionis tempore inchoante episcopus Pictavinus... rursus ad iudicium trahitur* means the week after *Judica*-Sunday, the trial took place during the week before Palm Sunday (4 April). Assuming that the council ended on Thursday, 1 April, the trial was held on Friday and Saturday (2-3 April). If the council closed earlier, the probable date of the trial was Monday and Tuesday (29-30 March), as indicated by Otto.

To draw a clear line between consistory and council, Pope Eugene transferred the debate to the archbishop's *cubiculum*, as Otto of Freising puts it.<sup>6</sup> The erroneous statement that Gilbert was dealt with in *concilio quod Papa Eugenius Remis celebravit*, was first made by St. Bernard<sup>7</sup> who knew that the council was officially closed before the consistory began. More accurate, though by no means precise, is the statement found in the *Libellus* against Gilbert written by Geoffrey of Auxerre after Gilbert's death on 4 September 1154: *Factaque est inquisitio tercia in urbe Remorum ubi praedictus papa magnum eodem anno concilium celebravit.*<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> S. Gammersbach, *Gilbert von Poitiers* 96-99: An der Bestimmtheit und Feierlichkeit der Erklärung... erkennt man sogleich, dass die französische Kirche fest entschlossen war, auf eine schnelle Verurteilung der Gilbert zur Last gelegten Sätze hinzudrängen. (p. 95): Es lässt sich leicht erraten, dass das Vorgehen Bernhards und der französischen Kirche im Kardinalskollegium mehr als nur überraschte... Wie zuvor der französische Episkopat schlossen jetzt die Kardinäle die Reihen eng zusammen. (p. 99): Die französische Kirche scheint auf eine völlige Unterwerfung Gilberts... hingedrängt zu haben.

<sup>5</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 58; p. 82.

<sup>6</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 58; p. 82.

<sup>7</sup> *Serm. super Cant. cant.* 80, 4, 8; ed. J. Leclercq and C. H. Talbot, *S. Bernardi Opera* 2 (Rome 1958) 283. M. Colker, "The Trial of Gilbert of Poitiers," in: *Med. St.* 27 (1965) 152-183, never mentions the consistory and by his repeated references to the council ignores an important distinction which only Gilbert's opponents had reasons to blur. The council had nothing to do with Gilbert and was formally dissolved before the consistory opened. Yet M. Colker speaks of "the symbolum adopted by the Rheims Council" (p. 183) and claims that at least Gilbert's first Boethian tractate was "a center of contestation at the Council" (p. 165).

<sup>8</sup> *Libellus* 4; PL 185, 596 D.

Rather vague is his later remark: Sic in auribus Romanae ecclesiae et multitudinis episcoporum quos ad *Remense concilium* apostolica convocaverat auctoritas...<sup>9</sup> We may add in passing that the "multitudo episcoporum" of which Geoffrey speaks was no longer in Rheims.

Geoffrey knew, of course, that the trial was held at a consistory. He admits the fact to Cardinal Albinus: "Ingredientibus vero nobis *consistorium*..."<sup>10</sup> It is therefore slightly ludicrous of him to declare: Ibidem dominus papa auctoritate apostolica *de assensu totius ecclesiae* quae convenerat capitula ista damnavit.<sup>11</sup> Even if we admit that "the entire Church" means this particular gathering,<sup>12</sup> it is simply not true that the entire group consented to the alleged condemnation, for there were numerous dissenters among those involved.<sup>13</sup>

While the trial was being held, Bishop Otto was "on the high seas" on his way to Jerusalem after the disastrous attempts to reach the Holy City by land.<sup>14</sup> Present at the trial was John of Salisbury, one of Gilbert's former students, now in the papal service. Like Bishop Otto he seems to be anxious to draw a clear line between the council, whose conclusion was reached with the promulgation of its canons,<sup>15</sup> and the consistory or *curia* at which Gilbert was tried: Evocatus apparebat in *curia* vir aetate nostra litteratissimus magister Gislebertus...<sup>16</sup> Later he writes: Tandem a *curia* digressi...<sup>17</sup> He also uses the word consistory saying: Altera die cum dominus papa sederet in *consistorio*....<sup>18</sup>

He quotes Gilbert's address to the pope in which the words occur: ...in sacro *consistorio* vestro.<sup>19</sup>

The promulgation of the "creed", as recorded by John of Salisbury,<sup>20</sup> was made in the archbishop's residence, the so-called Tau-Palace, "not

<sup>9</sup> *Libellus* 27; PL 185, 605A.

<sup>10</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 4; PL 185, 589C.

<sup>11</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 8; PL 185, 592B.

<sup>12</sup> In twelfth-century usage, a local monastic community could be called *ecclesia* such as *ecclesia cisterciensis, clarevallensis, cluniacensis*, and so on.

<sup>13</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 6; PL 185, 591A: Nec deerant qui pro eo se opponerent, licet parum intelligentes. Without adding this sort of slur he declares later (*Ibid.* 8; PL 185, 592A): ...etsi stare visi fuerant aliqui *pro persona* sed non stabant aliquatenus *pro doctrina*. *Libellus* 5; PL 185, 597A: ...ibi quoque, etsi pauci admodum *pro doctrina* starent sed *plurimi pro persona*. *Libellus* 27; PL 185, 605A: ...heu, inter catholicos profitenti non defuere fautores.

<sup>14</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 57; p. 81.

<sup>15</sup> *Hist. pont.* 3; p. 11.

<sup>16</sup> *Hist. pont.* 8; p. 16.

<sup>17</sup> *Hist. pont.* 10; p. 22.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibidem*; p. 23.

<sup>20</sup> *Hist. pont.* 11; p. 26.

during the council but two weeks after the dissolution of the council".<sup>21</sup> Geoffrey remarks to Cardinal Albinus that the trial took place in the Tau-Palace: *Inde fuit quod in insigni palatio, cui nomen est Thau, ecclesia universa conveniens...*<sup>22</sup>

Even before the debate began it became obvious that Gilbert had instructed his clerics to bring into the hall the books he expected to use in his defence. To show that his teaching was in full accord with the teaching of the Fathers and the Church he did not compile a "patristic collection" of any kind but rather insisted on displaying his evidence in its authentic context.<sup>23</sup> His accusers, on the other hand, entered the hall with "a few *auctoritates* on a single *scedula*".<sup>24</sup>

Otto of Freising was made aware of this difference as he reveals in the statement: *Ille orthodoxorum patrum, quas non in scedulis decisas sed in corpore librorum integras attulerat, legi faciens auctoritates eandem se quam illi fidem tenere asserebat.*<sup>25</sup> When Gilbert's patrons — *fautores illius hominis*, as Geoffrey chooses to word it — did not hesitate to draw the opposition's attention to the difference, Geoffrey denounced their action as slander. His description reflects the tense atmosphere at the opening hour: *Ingredientibus vero nobis consistorium prima die, cum magnorum voluminum corpora per clericos suos Pictaviensis fecisset afferri et nos paucas auctoritates ecclesiae in sola scedula haberemus, occasione accepta calumpniabantur fautores illius hominis quod decurtata testimonia proferremus cum ille codices integros exhiberet ubi posset intelligi quemadmodum verbis propositis praecedentia vel sequentia adhaerent.*<sup>26</sup>

As a result the debate must have had its share of dull moments<sup>27</sup> despite

<sup>21</sup> *Hist. pont.* 11; p. 26. If the council was dissolved on Thursday, 1 April 1148, the promulgation was made about 15 April. The last known papal document issued at Rheims is dated 18 April 1148. *Ep.* 239; PL 180, 128D. A few days earlier (14 or 16 April) the bishop of Hereford died in Rheims.

<sup>22</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 8; PL 185, 592B. See also the *Vita S. Bernardi prima* III, 5, 15, PL 185, 312 C.

<sup>23</sup> This fact has been underestimated by M. Colker, "The Trial" 158ff., who favours the idea that in his defence Gilbert used a compilation of excerpts, though both Otto and Geoffrey clearly agree that Gilbert did *not* use a collection of texts. The purpose of Gilbert's procedure is well described by Geoffrey, *Ep. ad Albinum* 4; PL 185, 589D: *...cum ille (Gilbert) codices integros exhiberet ubi posset intelligi quemadmodum verbis propositis praecedentia vel sequentia adhaerent.* In other words, Gilbert did not believe in separating a text from its context.

<sup>24</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 4; PL 185, 589D.

<sup>25</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 58; p. 82.

<sup>26</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 4; PL 185, 589D.

<sup>27</sup> According to Otto, *Gesta Frid.* I, 58; p. 82, Pope Eugene was "almost bored": *Cum huius-cemodi sermone seu legendi prolixitate dies detineret r, tamquam tedio affectus Romanus inquit*

the fact that the reading of texts was done with such dispatch that Geoffrey complains about the speed.<sup>28</sup>

As soon as the debates of the first day had come to an end, St. Bernard's secretary, Geoffrey of Auxerre, went to the cathedral library to borrow books. One of the volumes he borrowed was St. Augustine's *De Trinitate*.<sup>29</sup> Geoffrey describes the effect of this move: "On the following day we brought so many *codices* to the debate that the bishop's patrons were struck dumb with amazement and had to be told by us: 'Look, we no longer have those sheets of paper'".<sup>30</sup>

At the end of that second day the cardinals declared: "We have heard both sides. We shall now decide how to settle the issue".<sup>31</sup>

#### IV

##### THE PROFESSION OF FAITH AND GEOFFREY'S SCRIPTURA

Since there was not a single cardinal at Rheims who, as John of Salisbury relates,<sup>1</sup> was not "opposed to the abbot in mind, thought, and deed" the cardinals' decision could hardly be expected to culminate in a condemnation of Gilbert. Geoffrey<sup>2</sup> tells us that, faced with this prospect of failure, ten archbishops and quite a number (*plurima multitudo*) of bishops, abbots, and *magistri* met at St. Bernard's residence (*hospicium*) on the following day.<sup>3</sup> Both Otto of Freising<sup>4</sup> and John of Salisbury<sup>5</sup>

antistes: Multa, frater, dicis, multa et ea fortassis quae a nobis non intelliguntur legi facis... Gilbert, too, was tired: diutina collatione fatigatus. M. Colker paints a much livelier picture of the scene: "At this trial Gilbert's learning and nimble thinking, as he rapidly cited authorities, dazzled" (p. 155). He describes it as a "stunning defence" (p. 158), a "brilliant, if also bewildering defence" (pp. 155f.), "as a war in which the opposing factions hurled at each other passages from the Church Fathers as the chief ammunition" (p. 159). A less dramatic description is no doubt closer to the truth.

<sup>28</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 6; PL 185, 591A.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem*, 5; PL 185, 590B.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*, 6; PL 185, 590D.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, 7; PL 185, 591B: ...ut dicerent domini cardinales: Quia ecce audivimus quae proposita sunt. Deinceps iudicabimus qualiter debeant definiri.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. pont.* 9; p. 21. Speaking of the cardinals, Geoffrey, *Ep. ad Albinum* 7; PL 185, 591C declares: ...iudicium sibi solis videbantur reservare quos noverant *ferè omnes* errantis potius quam erroris fautores. Geoffrey never seems to have considered the possibility that in the appraisal of Gilbert's teaching he himself might have been mistaken.

<sup>2</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 7; PL 185, 591C.

<sup>3</sup> According to the *Hist. pont.* 8; p. 18 the meeting took place before the consistory. Both Otto (*Gesta Frid.* I, 84; p. 84) and Geoffrey (*Ep. ad Albinum* 7; PL 185, 591C) describe it as resulting from the debates.

<sup>4</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 58; p. 84: Moxque ad publicum progressus omnes quos poterat convocavit.

state that the meeting was not a spontaneous gathering but called by St. Bernard. Understandably, neither Pope Eugene nor the cardinals were present.

At the meeting St. Bernard proposed a profession of faith whose original form, as recorded by John of Salisbury,<sup>6</sup> was not accepted without protest.<sup>7</sup> Some quick action had to be taken, for there were "not a few" among those present at the meeting who were inclined to let "the council (= the meeting) be dissolved without a definition".<sup>8</sup> The profession of faith was conceived as an answer to the four *capitula* and was dictated *non sine multa deliberatione*.<sup>9</sup> The names of those "present at the council" (= meeting) were added and three dignitaries—the Cistercian Hugh of Mâcon, bishop of Auxerre, the Premonstratensian Milo, bishop of Thérouanne, and the Benedictine Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis—were delegated to submit the *scriptura* to the pope and the cardinals.<sup>10</sup> Geoffrey has recorded the strong message the three delegates were instructed to deliver.<sup>11</sup> At this juncture of the events, the person on trial was no longer Gilbert but Pope Eugene III who was faced with both the determined group led by St. Bernard and an equally determined curia whose spokesman reminded Eugene in no uncertain terms that the time had finally come to forget "old and new friendships," think of the Church Universal, and punish the outrageous audacity of such novel procedure in matters concerning the faith.<sup>12</sup>

Speaking of the *scriptura* delivered by the delegation, Geoffrey, who must have played an important role in the final drafting of this so-called profession of faith,<sup>13</sup> does not say anything about patristic texts contained

According to the author of the *Liber de vera philosophia* the number of those who heeded the call was rather small; cum paucissimis familiaribus suis in ospicio suo.... Cf. P. Fournier, *Études sur Joachim de Flore* (Paris 1909), 67.

<sup>5</sup> *Hist. pont.* 8; p. 18: *Petitione ipsius in eius hospicio convenerunt*. Later (*ibidem* 11; p. 24) John refers to the locality as *camera abbatis*.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist. pont.* 8; p. 19.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. N. M. Haring, "Das sogenannte Glaubensbekenntnis," 65.

<sup>8</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 7; PL 185, 591D: *Sed credebant nonnullos eorum ad hoc tendere ut sine aliqua definitione concilium solveretur*. It should be noted that Geoffrey speaks of "dissolving the council" rather than dissolving the meeting.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>10</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 8; PL 185, 591D.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibidem*. It seems that Gilbert had submitted a statement to the pope. The "fidei symbolum" (591C) was presented to the pontiff as an irrevocable reply to Gilbert's statement.

<sup>12</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 60; pp. 85-86.

<sup>13</sup> *Hist. pont.* 11; p. 25: *Sunt autem in hunc concepta modum, fortassis de conscientia domini papae, a domino G. Autisiodorensi*.

in the document sent to the pope and the curia. This fact weakens the assumption that the text edited by J. Leclercq<sup>14</sup> may be the *scriptura* submitted at Rheims.

The text published by Leclercq is in all likelihood an early attempt, presumably Geoffrey's own, to offer a compilation of patristic texts similar perhaps to the small collection prepared by Abbot Godescalc.<sup>15</sup> While Geoffrey was writing to Cardinal Albinus, a *scriptura* was discovered which, as we are told, Geoffrey had edited ante annos paene quadraginta with a list of ten archbishops, bishops, abbots and masters.<sup>16</sup> This has been interpreted as a reference to Geoffrey's *Libellus*.<sup>17</sup> But, while the *Libellus* has no such list of archbishops, bishops, abbots, and *magistri*, the text edited by Leclercq answers the description of the *scriptura* given by Geoffrey.<sup>18</sup> Hence it is probably something like Geoffrey's first draft or edition of the *Libellus* which contains almost all the patristic excerpts, generally of identical length, found in the document edited by Leclercq.

The approximate date of this document or *scriptura*, as Geoffrey calls it, can be established with the help of Geoffrey's letter to Cardinal Albinus whom he addresses as bishop of Albano and *domini papae vicarius*. Consecrated bishop of Albano between 18 May and 6 June 1189, Cardinal Albinus is known to have acted as *vicarius papae* in July 1191 as recorded in a charter of King Tancred.<sup>19</sup> Augustine, the cardinal's messenger to Geoffrey, could easily supply this information. If we assume that Geoffrey wrote in 1191 or rather 1192, his remark that he composed the *scriptura* "almost forty years ago" would bring the date down to 1152 or 1153. John of Salisbury<sup>20</sup> knew Geoffrey's *Libellus*, for he comments on its elegant style — of which Geoffrey was indeed a master — and adds that it was written after Gilbert's death (4 September 1154). Considering that the

<sup>14</sup> "Textes sur Saint-Bernard et Gilbert de la Porrée," in: *MedSt* 14 (1952) 108-109.

<sup>15</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 3; PL 185, 589A: Qui... notavit capitula et ex libris sanctorum catholicorum Patrum auctoritates pauca manifeste contrarias scripsit in scedula.

<sup>16</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 13; PL 185, 595A: Scriptura... cum ipso symbolo quod domino papae et Romanae ecclesiae ex parte decem archiepiscoporum et omnium episcoporum paene qui in illa adhuc die Remis inventi sunt cum abbatibus... et magistris scholarum et subscriptis nominibus singulorum...

<sup>17</sup> In his preface (p. xxxviii) to the *Historia Pontificalis* Poole identifies the *Libellus* with the *scriptura* just discovered by one of Geoffrey's confrères.

<sup>18</sup> Leclercq (p. 108) points to Geoffrey's description and draws the conclusion: L'écrit dont parle ici Geoffroy est son *Libellus* bien connu. The manner in which Geoffrey describes the *scriptura* (see 2 notes, above) rules out the *Libellus*, since it does not contain the *nomina subscripta singulorum*.

<sup>19</sup> See Poole's preface (p. xxxix) to the *Historia Pontificalis*. V. Pfaff, "Die Kardinäle unter Coelestin III (1191-1198)", in: *Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung f. Rechtsgesch., kan. Abt.* 41 (1955) 84.

<sup>20</sup> *Hist. pont.* 11; p. 26.

*scriptura* is so much shorter than the *Libellus*, we can more readily understand that a copy of the *scriptura* accompanied Geoffrey's letter to the cardinal.

The fact that the *scriptura* contains two excerpts from Theodoret "the Greek" should be sufficient proof that its patristic collection was not compiled in its entirety by Abbot Godescalc. The presence of those two excerpts shows that its author, presumably Geoffrey, had found time to examine at least one of the *magnorum voluminum corpora* which Gilbert's clerics had brought to the consistory. In addition, the *scriptura* edited by Leclercq contains an Augustinian text (*De Trin.* V, 10, 11) which Geoffrey discovered after visiting the cathedral library of Rheims.<sup>21</sup>

## V

### THE SO-CALLED ACTS OF THE TRIAL

When John of Salisbury collected source material for what is known as his *Historia Pontificalis*, he planned to insert the text of the creed that played a role at the end of Gilbert's trial at the consistory of Rheims. This so-called profession of faith was, as we have seen, divided into four parts as a reply to four errors or heresies of which Gilbert was accused. Although those alleged errors are generally called *capitula*, John calls *capitula* the profession of faith.

He offers two versions of this profession of faith. The first of these two versions he probably jotted down at the meeting called by St. Bernard in connection with the trial. The profession of faith proposed by St. Bernard on this occasion was short and concise, but both the wording and the order were changed after the meeting described by John of Salisbury.<sup>1</sup>

After Gilbert's death on 4 September 1154, Geoffrey of Auxerre, then abbot of Igny, composed his *Libellus contra capitula Gisleberti Pictavensis episcopi*<sup>2</sup> in which a much more elaborate version of the profession, called *symbolum fidei*, is found.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Haring, "Das sogenannte Glaubensbekenntnis," 62, n. 41.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. pont.* 8; p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> It was first published in J. Mabillon, *S. Bernardi opera* II, 6 (Paris: Thomas Moette 1690) 1325A-1339C, transcribed for Mabillon from a Longpont manuscript and sent to him by the Prior of Clairvaux, Jean-Baptiste de Noinville, whom he describes in the preface to vol. 5 as: *religiosus ac pius vir D. Iohannes Baptista de Noinville eiusdem loci (Clairvaux) Prior, amicus meus qui et Gaufridi S. Bernardi notarii libellum adversus Gilberti Porretani errores ex codice Longi-Pontis nobis suppeditavit.*

<sup>3</sup> *S. Bernardi opera* II, 6, 1339AC: PL 185, 617B-618B.

It seems that when John of Salisbury became aware of the expanded and revised version he decided to examine the papal records. He reports on the results of his research in the *Historia pontificalis* written in its present form in 1164: "Although I was present when they were published, I have not been able to find those *capitula* either among the acts of the council or in the register (*regestum*) of Pope Eugene." Then he adds: "I found them in Geoffrey's writings".<sup>4</sup>

John had many opportunities to examine the papal archives. During the years 1146-1159 he crossed the Alps ten times. His first journey was to Viterbo late in 1146; the second, after the council of Rheims, to Viterbo and Tusculum; the third, to Ferentino and Benevento, extended from September 1155 to about February 1156.<sup>5</sup>

The register of Pope Eugene was still extant on 18 February 1168-1170 when Pope Alexander III wrote in a letter from Benevento to Gerard, archbishop of Spalato and papal legate: In registro Patris et praedecessoris nostri Eugenii papae annotatum invenimus... Transcriptum autem illius quod in supra scripto registro invenimus tibi praesentibus litteris inclusum transmittimus.<sup>6</sup>

The fact that no official records or acts of the trial at Rheims were kept can also be gathered from the account given by Otto, bishop of Freising, in his *Gesta Friderici* written in 1156-1158. According to this account Pope Eugene declared to his enraged curia that the profession of faith that had been presented to him was not to be looked upon as an official statement of doctrine.<sup>7</sup>

The temperamental author of the *Liber de vera philosophia* concludes: "Hence nothing whatsoever has been defined... For if the pope and the council had decreed anything, it would have been written down just as their other decrees are written down, and its observance would have been ordered *sub poena*".<sup>8</sup> When Jacques Sirmond (1559-1651) and Cesare Baronius (1538-1607) worked on the *Annales ecclesiastici* they did indeed find the canons of the council of Rheims in the Vatican Archives but nothing related to Gilbert's trial: Desiderantur in Vaticano canones fidei spectantes ad damnationem errorum Giliberti quos ex Gallicano (codice) posuimus.<sup>9</sup> The *codex Gallicanus* referred to in this sentence had been sent

<sup>4</sup> *Hist. pont.* 11; p. 24.

<sup>5</sup> See Poole's preface to the *Hist. pontificalis*, p. lxxiii.

<sup>6</sup> *Ep.* 671: PL 200, 633AB.

<sup>7</sup> *Gesta Frid.* I, 60 p. 86.

<sup>8</sup> MS Grenoble, Bibl. de la Ville, 290, f. 90v.

<sup>9</sup> C. Baronius, *Annal. eccl.* (ad ann. 1148); ed. A. Theiner 19 (Bar-le-Duc 1869) 19, No. 9.

to the Vatican by Jacques Amyot, bishop of Auxerre (1571-1593) during the reign of Pope Gregory XIII.<sup>10</sup>

When in 1952 J. Leclercq edited the text discussed in the previous section<sup>11</sup> he interpreted it as the document presented to Pope Eugene and the curia by a delegation of two bishops and Abbot Suger. He surmised that the *Libellus* was a commentary on this document. Speaking of this text Leclercq makes the cautious remark: On aurait là, pour ainsi dire, les 'actes' de cette suite au concile de Reims.<sup>12</sup>

By inserting "pour ainsi dire" Leclercq must have meant to say that, strictly speaking, the text does not constitute the acts of the consistory. If this interpretation of the insertion is correct, Leclercq's view is acceptable for, as we have seen, all historical evidence speaks against the existence of such acts.

Unaware of Leclercq's publication F. Pelster<sup>13</sup> studied the same text and likewise interpreted it as the document submitted to Pope Eugene to enable him and the cardinals to weigh the evidence gathered against Gilbert.<sup>14</sup> Concerning the names, listed in this text, of the archbishops(10), bishops (13), abbots (8), and *magistri* (8) "who were present at the council" (= meeting) Pelster voices the view that it represents the list not of the members of the council but of those who signed the *symbolum*: Es ist die Liste der Unterzeichner des Symbolum.<sup>15</sup>

To substantiate his interpretation Pelster<sup>16</sup> points to Geoffrey's remark: ...subscripta sunt nomina singulorum qui aderant archiescoporum, episcoporum, abbatum et magistrorum de consensu et convenientia universorum.<sup>17</sup> He also notes a similar reference to a *symbolum* presented to the pope: subscriptis nominibus singulorum qui aderant...<sup>18</sup> Since Geoffrey speaks of ten archbishops and since our text actually lists ten archbishops, Pelster's conclusion seemed well founded. We shall see, however, that

<sup>10</sup> Cf. N. M. Haring, "Das sog. Glaubensbekenntnis," 82.

<sup>11</sup> "Textes sur Saint-Bernard et Gilbert de la Porrée," in: *MedSt* 14 (1952) 108-109.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem* 108.

<sup>13</sup> "Petrus Lombardus und die Verhandlungen über die Streitfrage des Gilbertus Porreta in Paris (1147) und Reims (1148)", in: *Miscell. Lombardiana* (Novara 1957) 65-73. Pelster (p. 68) draws attention to Mabillon's use of a document (*codex ottonianus*) which must have been very similar to, if not identical with, the text edited by Leclercq. See *Annales OSB* 75,5; ed. Lucca 6 (1945) 400-401. It was previously mentioned by L. Ott, *Unters. zur theol. Briefliteratur der Früh-scholastik*, in: *Beiträge* 34 (1937) 131.

<sup>14</sup> Petrus Lombardus 68.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*, 70.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibidem* 73, n. 49.

<sup>17</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 7; PL 185, 591D.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem* 13; PL 185, 595B.

there are strong arguments against Pelster's claim that "it is the list of the signatories of the symbolum."

Ignoring Leclercq's cautious qualification (*pour ainsi dire*) S. Gammersbach<sup>19</sup> simply designates the text as the "Reimser Aktenstücke" and, misled by Pelster, describes the list of those "who were present at the council" as the "Unterzeichner des Symbolums",<sup>20</sup> the signatories of the creed.

Since we have seen that the text cannot constitute "the acts" of the trial, the question still remains: did those "who were present at the council" sign the document submitted to the pope? After considering the available evidence we should be prepared to answer in the negative.

To begin with, Geoffrey does not say that those "present at the council" signed the document. He says only that the names of those present were *written under the scriptura* "with everyone's consent and agreement".<sup>21</sup> On a later occasion he declares that the document was presented to Pope Eugene *subscriptis nominibus singulorum qui aderant*.<sup>22</sup>

According to this account *all those present* agreed (*de consensu et convenientia universorum*) that their presence at the meeting<sup>23</sup> be recorded on the document to be submitted to the pope. It does not mean that all those present at the meeting personally signed and thus agreed with the contents of the document. The archdeacon from Châlons-sur-Marne, Master Robert de Bosco, spoke publicly at the meeting against one of the four propositions made by St. Bernard.<sup>24</sup> His name appears among the *magistri* listed in our text as being "present".<sup>25</sup> Thus the fact that he attended the meeting is well attested. However, we have neither evidence to show nor reason to assume that he changed his mind and by signing approved of what he had strongly rejected.

Another indication that we are not confronted with signatures is the

<sup>19</sup> *Gilbert von Poitiers* 80-84; 152. Leclercq's qualification "pour ainsi dire" is also ignored by M. Colker, "The Trial," 157.

<sup>20</sup> *Gilbert von Poitiers* 82; 84.

<sup>21</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 7; PL 185, 591D: *Propter quod eidem scripturae... subscripta sunt nomina singulorum qui aderant... de consensu et convenientia universorum.*

<sup>22</sup> *Ep. ad Albinum* 13; PL 185, 595B.

<sup>23</sup> The introduction of the list reads: *Nomina archiepiscoporum qui interfuerunt concilio* (Leclercq, "Textes" 109). As a general statement this introduction needs no correction, for all those listed can be presumed to have attended the council. But in this particular case we know that the meeting at St. Bernard's residence is meant by the ambiguous term "concilium". Pelster calls it more adroitly *conciliabulum*.

<sup>24</sup> *Hist. pont.* 8; pp. 19-20.

<sup>25</sup> Leclercq, "Textes" 109.

fact that, contrary to common usage,<sup>26</sup> no personal names but the *names of the cities and abbeys* of the attending archbishops, bishops and abbots are provided by the list with the exception of the German Premonstratensian Otto of Kappenberg (d. 1172). The reason for making this exception is not difficult to establish. It could be assumed that Pope Eugene was familiar with the incumbents of the bishoprics and abbeys of France named in the list, for he had spent a number of years in that country. This assumption would hardly apply to the name Kappenberg, and for that reason the incumbent's name Otto was added.

For a similar reason the *magistri* are listed by name, for they could not be sufficiently identified by the name of the city or the school at which they taught.

Worth noting is also the omission of *et alii plures* and *et alii multi* after the sees of the archbishops and bishops. This omission can be interpreted in the sense that the list of ten archbishops and thirteen bishops comprises the total number of the archbishops and bishops attending the meeting at St. Bernard's residence.

On the other hand, the list of the attending abbots is followed by *et alii plures*, while the list of the attending *magistri* ends with *et alii multi*.<sup>27</sup> These additions reveal that the number of abbots and *magistri* attending the meeting was larger than the number of the abbeys and *magistri* actually listed.

We know through John of Salisbury<sup>28</sup> that Gilbert's archdeacon of Brioux, Master Arnold Qui-Non-Ridet, and Master Robert of Melun, later bishop of Hereford (1163-1167), were at Rheims. Of these two, at least Master Arnold must have attended the meeting despite the fact that his name does not occur in the list. If Robert of Melun attended the meeting — and there are reasons to suppose that he did — he was likewise omitted by the compiler of the list. We also know that a cleric in the service of Count Henry I of Champagne (d. 1181), Master Stephen, was in attendance at the trial and on Gilbert's side.<sup>29</sup> If he attended the

<sup>26</sup> The witnesses of papal documents generally wrote *Ego* preceded by a cross-sign and followed by name, rank, titular church (if any) and *ss* (= *subscripti*). The most common formulas used in charters were: *videntibus et audientibus...* or *huius rei testes...* or in *praesentia et audientia...*

<sup>27</sup> Also present at the trial was a *multitudo laicorum* (*Hist. pont.* 10; p. 24). Pope Eugene addressed them in French when he realized that they did not know why a certain book was being torn to pieces. He told them it was not the bishop's work and that the bishop "had been found orthodox in every respect and in harmony with apostolic doctrine".

<sup>28</sup> *Hist. pont.* 8; p. 17.

<sup>29</sup> The fact is stated by the Cistercian Helinand, *Chronicon* (ad ann. 1148); PL 212, 1038BC, who calls him *magister Stephanus de Alinerra*. He was a canon at the cathedral of Beauvais and *exercitissimus in omni genere facetiarum utriusque linguae Latinae et Gallicae, avarissimus*

meeting, he must be included among the *et alii multi*.<sup>30</sup> Definitely present at the meeting was John of Salisbury who was at that time in the papal service and presumably entitled to the magisterial title. He is not mentioned in the list.

It is important in this context to distinguish if possible between those who attended the council, the trial, and the meeting at St. Bernard's residence. In dealing with our list J. Mabillon<sup>31</sup> mentions Folknand, abbot of Lorsch, as present, but it is not clearly established whether Mabillon's list contained the name of the abbey or whether he made use of a different source. The fact that at Rheims on 29 March 1148 Pope Eugene granted his monastery a *privilegium* cosigned by two cardinals and written down by chancellor Guido strongly favours Mabillon's mention of Folknand's presence.<sup>32</sup> But his presence at Rheims does not yet entitle us to assume that he attended the trial or the meeting.

John of Salisbury<sup>33</sup> has recorded the presence at the council of Reynold, then provost of Hildesheim, later (1156) chancellor of Frederick Barbarossa and archbishop of Cologne (1159-1167). We have already noted that "he and other Germans" objected to the prohibition of the use by clerics of multi-coloured fur coats. We do not know whether they stayed over for the trial or attended the meeting. Also present at the council was Reynold's friend Wibald, abbot of Stablo, who often refers to the council but never to the consistory or to Gilbert.<sup>34</sup> This silence is remarkable if we consider that a year later he boasts of having seen with his own eyes Anselm of Laon, William of Paris (Champeaux), Alberic of Rheims, and Hugh of Paris (of Saint-Victor).<sup>35</sup> There is nothing in his letters to suggest that he attended the trial or the meeting.

tamen... (1038C). He died a year after telling Helinand that St. Bernard failed to convict Gilbert. Helinand thinks that Stephen's death was due to this defamation. J. R. William, "The Quest for the Author of the *Moralium Dogma philosophorum*, 1931-1956", in: *Speculum* 32 (1957) 740, n. 40, suggests that he was the grammarian cited as "Stephanus Beluacensis" or "Stephanus Remensis" in R. W. Hunt, "Studies on Priscian in the Twelfth-Century", in: *Medieval and Ren. Studies* 2 (1950) 49.

<sup>30</sup> Leclercq, "Textes" 108, holds that Arnould de Poitiers désigné simplement comme "l'archidiaque" is listed among the *magistri*. But this title belongs to Walter of York who with his bishop, Henry Murdac, and the archdeacon Geoffrey of York attended the council. Cf. N. Haring, "Das sog. Glaubensbekenntnis" 84, n. 170.

<sup>31</sup> *Annales OSB* 79, 5; ed. Lucca 6 (1745) 401.

<sup>32</sup> Eugene, *Ep.* 265; PL 180, 1314C-1316A. Mabillon refers to this *privilegium*.

<sup>33</sup> *Hist. pont.* 3; p. 9: Raginaldus de Hildenesham et alii Teutones reclamaverunt decretum...

<sup>34</sup> See, for instance, *Ep.* 150 (131) to Bernard, bishop of Hildesheim; ed. Jaffé 245: Venimus ad synodum Remensem quae celebrata est mediante Quadragesima ubi dominus papa... sententiam... in verbis et scripto confirmavit.

<sup>35</sup> *Ep.* 167; p. 278.

## VI

## CONCLUSIONS

It has been asserted that the council of Rheims was "the first realization of the idea of papal world domination".<sup>1</sup> The author of this assertion is particularly incensed at the suspension of two German archbishops. It should, however, be admitted that the suspension of two leading German archbishops is in principle hardly less amazing than the suspension of all those English bishops and abbots who were afraid to cross the Channel against the order of their king.

Politically speaking, the basic aim of the council was a very modest one: not world domination but moral reform. But the preparation for its successful launching was so poor that its message was little more than the lifeless repetition of previously promulgated canons. However, to assure its success in a community absorbed and distracted by an enthusiastic devotion to a military undertaking inspired by the same pontiff, Pope Eugene resorted to threats and application of canonical sanctions rather than to gentle persuasion or invitation.

While he was in France, Eugene held two consistories to deal with the accusations made against Gilbert's orthodoxy. At the consistory of Paris in 1147 he realized that Gilbert's critics submitted charges without written evidence, for nobody had apparently thought of obtaining a copy of the controversial commentary on Boethius. The consistory of Rheims in 1148 again failed to convince Pope Eugene that Gilbert's teaching was unorthodox.

Since no official records of the consistory were kept, literary documents related to the consistory can only be of a private nature. The so-called "acts" should be judged accordingly. The text published by Leclercq had better be called Geoffrey's *scriptura*, for it was most likely Geoffrey's first draft of a work against Gilbert. It contains elements that date back to the consistory and, presumably, to Abbot Godescalc's collection. Until the time of the consistory only Abbot Godescalc was actively engaged in preparing the case against Gilbert. When St. Bernard took over, the opposition must have felt certain of Gilbert's defeat, although St. Bernard had even less time than the ailing Abbot Godescalc to familiarize himself with Gilbert's writings.

The so-called creed of Rheims was proposed and formulated when it

<sup>1</sup> H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen 83*.

became evident that the attack on Gilbert had collapsed. The question whether the commonly accepted version of this creed agrees with the text presented to Eugene and the curia is obscured by a comparison of its highly polished form with St. Bernard's more rudimentary statements as recorded by John of Salisbury. In fact, we do not know whether St. Bernard's original formula or the commonly known version or some intermediary form of the creed was submitted to the pope and his curia. In whatever form it was presented, it was never given an official status.

The various text traditions of the *capitula* of which the most primitive form has been recorded by Otto of Freising may have originated at the consistory of Paris. The various traditions agree in substance, though not in words.<sup>2</sup> The version found in the *scriptura* seems to have been more widely known than the other versions. Which version, if any, was submitted to Eugene is another problem for which an answer is not readily available. According to Geoffrey the four errors emerged gradually at Rheims during the debates — and in proper balance: two on the first day and two on the second.<sup>3</sup>

*Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. N. M. Haring, "Das sog. Glaubensbekenntnis" 86-88.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem* 61-62.