

A Historian and His Craft:  
Sigebert of Gembloux *De Tempore Moderno*

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Minnesota  
by

Brian A. Toye

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

May 2011



## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my thanks to all of my professors for all of the advice, guidance and help that they have given me. I would also like to thank my family and friends for their love and support, without which I could not have finished this thesis.

For Allison

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	<i>Vita Sigeberti</i>	8
III.	Analysis from Gregory VII (1073) to 1094	20
IV.	Analysis from the Council of Clermont (1095) to 1104	50
V.	Analysis from 1105 to the <i>Pravilege</i> (1111)	66
VI.	Conclusion	87
	Bibliography	90
	Appendix I – Text and Translation of the <i>Chronica</i>	98
	Appendix II – Index of Proper Names	180
	Appendix III – Index of Places	189

## Introduction

On 5 October 1112, a monk died in the monastery of Gembloux, in the diocese of Liège, in what is today Belgium. This monk, Sigebert by name, had not been the abbot, but had been a teacher for many years. Yet, in his lifetime, he had corresponded with emperors and archbishops, and had often been consulted by the clergy to formulate a response to papal decrees. He was also a prolific author, writing a number of hagiographies and scholarly works following in the tradition of Jerome and Bede. Sigebert's most extensive work is a continuation of the *Chronica* of Eusebius and Jerome, which attempts to weave together the events that take place in the known world. Sigebert's continuation of this chronicle begins in 381 and continues through 1111, the year before his death.

This *Chronica* enjoyed a significant *Nachleben* in the Middle Ages: it survives in 63 manuscripts and was directly continued by no less than 21 authors.<sup>1</sup> In the past two centuries, however, the *Chronica* has been all but discarded as a source. Sigebert has been criticized both for having a positive bias towards the Roman Emperors and for copying wholesale from other sources.<sup>2</sup> Only two monographs have been published in the past two hundred years that utilize Sigebert's *Chronica* to any significant extent: Mireille Chazan's *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-*

---

<sup>1</sup> Ludwig Bethmann. *Prolegomena*. In *Patrologia Latina* [Henceforth, *PL*] vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Freres, 1880, col. 25-26 and 39 A.

<sup>2</sup> On Sigebert's heavy, and often *verbatim*, use of other sources, see Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena*, in *PL* vol. 160, col. 21-22 and Mireille Chazan. *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XXI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1999, p. 125-147. On Sigebert's bias, see Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena* in *PL* vol. 160, col. 23. For an alternate, but over-corrected, view of the *Chronica* as non-partisan, see Denys Hay. *Annalists & Historians: Western Historiography from the VIIIth to the XVIIIth Century*. London: Methuen & Co., 1977, p. 46-47.

Victor (1999) and Siegfried Hirsch's *De Vita et Scriptis Sigiberti Monachi Gemblacensis* (1841).<sup>3</sup>

I would maintain, however, that, rather than disqualifying Sigebert's *Chronica* as a source, his partisanship makes it useful to historians on at least three levels. Admittedly, the *Chronica's* narrative cannot be taken at face value, and, in many places, the narrative is drawn from other extant sources. Yet, during the Middle Ages, many authors saw fit to use Sigebert's *Chronica* as the basis for their own chronicles. The *Chronica* may not have been as closely scrutinized for factuality during this period as it is in the present; however, its acceptance and popularity implies that some, at least, of Sigebert's view of events may have been propagated in later years. Despite some of the events in the *Chronica* being contrary to historical fact, these very events may have been accepted by Sigebert's readers as the truth about their past. If, rather than disregarding Sigebert out of hand, we analyze which events in Sigebert's *Chronica* are fabricated or presented in a biased way, future studies may be able to trace the propagation of these 'facts' through the works of later writers.

Second, it is my contention that Sigebert's use of sources is, in fact, carefully considered, rather than simply the wholesale copying which it may seem to be at first glance. Having taught the arts of the *trivium* for many years at monasteries both in Gembloux and Metz, Sigebert was well aware of the power and methods of rhetoric and argumentation. This is apparent in a close analysis of Sigebert's use of his sources: he

---

<sup>3</sup> Other works have made use of Sigebert's writings, but have focused solely on Sigebert's polemical writings. See, for example, H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998, p. 657-658 and I. S. Robinson. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1978, p. 175-182.

carefully chooses which sources he includes in the *Chronica* and may alter them to better aid his argument. Although Sigebert's bias is readily apparent today, Sigebert nevertheless attempted to maintain the pretense of unbiased authorship. He writes: "Thence, O Reader, I ask that both here and elsewhere, if some dissonance of names or years or of the times of the popes should offend you, do not impute it to me, who did not see it, but who writes either what is heard or read."<sup>4</sup> Sigebert, thus, had to tread a careful line in his use of sources, choosing those which would support his argument while maintaining the guise of an unbiased reporter.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps even Sigebert's extensive use of sources is a technique to strengthen his authorial credibility on the basis of the authoritative nature of his sources, as well as his own erudition. As Sigebert's bias is clear and many of his sources are extant, careful analysis can show the methods which Sigebert used to craft his argument, providing historians a glimpse at the tools used by chroniclers of the eleventh century.

Finally, a close analysis of the *Chronica* will show that it need not be disregarded by historians *in toto*. Clearly, despite being biased, the *Chronica* was not entirely fabricated, and, indeed, is based on historical sources and historical events. A thorough analysis of the *Chronica*, by showing where Sigebert modified historical events, will also show which kernels of fact remain, giving historians of this period more data with which

---

<sup>4</sup> "Unde lector queso, ut et hic et alibi, si qua dissonantia te offenderit de nominibus, vel annis, vel temporibus paparum, non mihi imputes, qui non visa, sed audita vel lecta scribe." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. In *PL* vol. 160, 197 C.

<sup>5</sup> Note, for example, Bachrach's discussion of the reception of Latin literature by a lay audience, and the necessity for rhetorical plausibility in these texts. Bernard S. Bachrach. "Writing Latin History for a Lay Audience c. 1000: Dudo of Saint Quentin at the Norman Court." *The Haskins Society Journal: Studies in Medieval History*. Vol. 20: 2008, p. 67-68. See also Lake's discussion of *narratio probabilis* in Justin C. Lake. "Truth, Plausibility, and the Virtues of Narrative at the Millennium." *Journal of Medieval History*. Vol. 35: 2009, p. 226-232.

to work. Sigebert is particularly important in this respect because of his pro-Imperial position. At the time of Sigebert's death, the *pravilege* had just taken place, making Sigebert believe that the Investiture Contest had ended on a triumphant note.<sup>6</sup>

In the years after Sigebert's death, however, the Investiture Contest was rekindled, eventually ending in a much less favorable position for the empire. This narrative, ending abruptly in what we now see as the middle of the Investiture Contest serves as a pointed reminder to historians that the way that events played out was far from inevitable, as seen in 1111, and that history written after the fact may look very different from what those living through events saw. Sigebert's imperial partisanship may have caused him to include valuable data which pro-papal authors may have omitted. Most importantly, though, an analysis of the *Chronica* does not only demonstrate Sigebert's argument as an author, but also his personal views of his own time.

This thesis will offer an analysis and commentary of the later years chronicled by Sigebert. As it would be impossible to give any but the most cursory analysis of the whole of the *Chronica* in the scope given by a master's thesis, I have chosen to begin this analysis with the entry for the year 1073, with the election of Gregory VII [r. 1073-1085] as pope. This year forms a suitable point from which to begin for a number of reasons. First, it takes place at a shift in Sigebert's narrative which he himself marks out with a discussion of the completion of Great Years.<sup>7</sup> The period from 1073 to 1111 encompasses

---

<sup>6</sup> *Pravilege*, a combination of *pravus*, 'bad' with *privilegium* refers to the privileges forced from Pope Paschal II in 1111 while he was a hostage, granting Henry V full rights of investiture.

<sup>7</sup> A Great Year consists of 532 solar years, the product of a 19 year lunar cycle and a 28 year solar cycle. In year  $n+532$ , the sun and the moon would seem to follow the same paths that they had in year  $n$ . See Duncan Steel. *Marking Time: The Epic Quest to Invent the Perfect Calendar*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2000, p. 105.

Sigebert's discussion of the Gregorian Reform and the Investiture Contest. Second, as will be discussed in the next section, by 1073 Sigebert would certainly have returned from Metz to Gembloux, where he would remain for the rest of his life. Thus, a variable is removed from the analysis of the *Chronica*, as changes in the text will not, then, be attributed to changes in Sigebert's physical location. This temporal limitation also ensures that the years analyzed will be from the years of Sigebert's maturity, so that the events that he chronicles will not only come from written sources, but possibly from firsthand reports of various types.

The material at hand will also be subdivided further into three sections, based on the content and style of Sigebert's narrative. The first section will cover 1073 through 1094, i.e., from Gregory VII's ascension to the Papal See to the year before the Council of Clermont. In the second section, which stretches from 1095 to 1104, Sigebert focuses on the events of the First Crusade, to the exclusion of almost all European affairs. Therefore, this section merits discussion as an individual unit. The third and final section covers the years 1105 through the *pravilege* and end of the *Chronica* in 1111. Sigebert's narrative style changes in the entry for 1105, possibly intentionally, possibly from a lack of time to revise his account before his death, and includes many lengthy passages from imperial correspondence. Thus, this section should be analyzed not with the first section, but on its own, as Sigebert uses different narrative techniques in this final section.

As each of these three sections has a distinct literary character, so too do they each have their own rhetorical and argumentative character. The focus of the analysis of each section will, therefore, be primarily upon the rhetorical tools and arguments unique

to that particular grouping of passages, though the continuation of argumentation and authorial manipulation of the *Chronica* from previous sections will be discussed as well. Passages that demand a thorough multivalent analysis will be included for ease of reference in the section in which they are discussed. The text of the *Chronica*, from 1073 through 1111, appears in the first appendix in parallel Latin and English. The use of such a parallel translation is necessitated by the level of rhetorical analysis involved in parsing Sigebert's bias, which often involves choice of Latin words with specific levels and shades of meaning, the full impact of which would be lost if a translation were to be printed without the original text. Also included are two indices, one of place names mentioned in the *Chronica* and another of personal names. The indices are organized alphabetically in English. As the Latin terms vary between adverbial and nominal forms, and because actors are often referred to by title, the Latin is not included in the index, but can be found in consultation with the parallel translation. Location within the *Chronica* is signified by the column number and letter identifier, as printed in the *Patrologia Latina* (e.g., 224 B), rather than by year. For ease of use, the column number and letter identifier appear between the Latin and English texts in the translation of the *Chronica*. Where multiple names or titles are used of a single person, as with Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII, the location of mentions within the *Chronica* will follow the name beginning with the earliest letter in the alphabet, with the entries for other titles referring back to the consolidated first entry. In the index of places, note is made of the type of each place (e.g., city, river, duchy) as well as of the region in which each place is located. In the

index of people, brief prosopographical entries, as well as references to other useful works are included.

## Chapter II

### *Vita Sigeberti*

#### Life

The details of the life of Sigebert of Gembloux are largely opaque: his works are our main avenue for uncovering his life and personality. We are not, however, limited to analyzing the topics of Sigebert's work for some clues as to his background. From time to time in his works he inserts some of his biographical information. The most extensive of these passages occurs in Sigebert's continuation of Jerome and Gennadius' *De Viris Illustribus*, which goes under the title of *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In this work, he adds one hundred seventy one short biographies of authors to those already composed by Jerome and Gennadius. The final biographical sketch that he includes is his own. Although his biographical sketch consists primarily of descriptions of his works, this entry contains a number of details about Sigebert's life, and can also elucidate Sigebert's views of his authorial program.

Information about the earliest portion of Sigebert's life, however, must be gleaned from chance mentions in the *Chronica*: the entry in the *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* begins with Sigebert's teaching career. "Sigebert, monk of Gembloux, who wrote many little works, was placed at an early age in Metz in the church of Saint Vincent to instruct children."<sup>1</sup> This opening elides the events from his birth and through his profession of monasticism at the monastery of Gembloux, near Liège in what is today Belgium. The few scholars who have focused on Sigebert have scoured his other works

---

<sup>1</sup> "Sigebertus, Gemblacensis monachus, multa scripsit opuscula Metis positus in prima aetate in ecclesia Sancti Vincentii, ad instruendos pueros." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. Ed. Johann Fabricius. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Freres, 1880, 587 A.

for clues of his origins. Siegfried Hirsch writes that Sigebert thought of himself as a Gaul, citing his use of “*nostrae*” in a description of that region in the *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*.<sup>2</sup> However, he notes that Sigebert sometimes uses the term “*Gallia*” loosely, using it rather than “*Germania*” in 1020 and 1094 in the *Chronica*.<sup>3</sup> Hirsch also casts doubt on Sigebert’s Gallic origins by detailing how his works focus much more on German affairs than Gallic affairs and by mentioning that one of Sigebert’s continuators, when speaking of Sigebert wrote of “*suos Teutones*.”<sup>4</sup> Mireille Chazan, however, cites a passage which Hirsch overlooked in the *Chronica*, where Sigebert writes of “*gentis nostrae . . . Francorum*.”<sup>5</sup> Combining Sigebert’s adoption of Gallic identity with his use of a Frankish identity, she argues that, at the time of Sigebert’s writing, the use of both “*Gallus*” and “*Francus*” implies a Lotharingian origin for him.<sup>6</sup> This would be consonant with Sigebert first professing the *vita monastica* at Gembloux, closer to his native region, and only later being transferred to Metz.

The approximate date of Sigebert’s birth is significantly more difficult to calculate than his region of birth. The main datum which scholars have for this calculation is Sigebert’s own statement that he left for Metz while still “*in prima aetate*.”<sup>7</sup> Additionally, Sigebert, in his *Deeds of the Abbots of Gembloux*, first makes remarks which imply personal knowledge of Abbot Olbert, who was Abbot of Gembloux between

---

<sup>2</sup> Siegfried Hirsch. *De Vita et Scriptis Sigiberti Monachi Gemblacensis Commentatio Historico-Litteraria*. Berlin: Reimerianis, 1841, p. 6 and Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena*, col. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Siegfried Hirsch. *De Vita et Scriptis Sigiberti Monachi Gemblacensis Commentatio Historico-Litteraria*, 6.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L’Empire et l’histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 34, also Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena*, col. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L’Empire et l’histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 34.

<sup>7</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 587 A.

1012 and 1048.<sup>8</sup> Thus, Olbert's death becomes a *terminus ante quem* for Sigebert's entry into the monastery of Gembloux. Using this information, Hirsch argues that Sigebert was born between 1030 and 1040, which would allow him to profess at Gembloux and yet still leave for Metz after the death of Abbot Olbert while still *in prima aetate*.<sup>9</sup> Ludwig Bethmann, the editor of the *Patrologia Latina* edition of the *Chronica*, notes simply that Sigebert was born "around the year 1030."<sup>10</sup>

Mireille Chazan performs a significantly more nuanced calculation of Sigebert's date of birth. In determining Sigebert's age, Chazan begins with Sigebert's age of 44 years on writing the *Passio Sanctorum Thebeorum*, which, as he notes in his biographical entry which was translated above, was the first work he wrote after returning from Metz to Gembloux.<sup>11</sup> She notes that Sigebert had certainly returned to Gembloux before 1075, as the *Apologia Contra Eos Qui Calumniantur Missas Conjugatorum Sacerdotum* was written there in either 1074 or 1075.<sup>12</sup> Establishing a *terminus post quem* for Sigebert's departure from Metz proves to be more difficult. Chazan claims that Sigebert's final work in Metz was his poem in praise of that city, in which the college of Saint-Saveur was founded slightly before Sigebert wrote.<sup>13</sup> However, the authenticity of the documents surrounding that foundation is questionable; nevertheless, Chazan places this

---

<sup>8</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 35.

<sup>9</sup> Siegfried Hirsch, *De Vita et Scriptis Sigiberti Monachi Gemblacensis Commentatio Historico-Litteraria*, p. 6-7.

<sup>10</sup> Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena*. In *PL* vol. 160, 9 A

<sup>11</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 34.

<sup>12</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 35.

<sup>13</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 34.

work in the early 1060s.<sup>14</sup> She then argues for Sigebert departing Metz between 1065 and 1070, which would make his birth be around 1026.<sup>15</sup> Chazan also uses Sigebert's mention of leaving for Metz "*in prima aetate*" to attempt to calculate the year in which he left. She uses Isidore of Seville's definition of the ages of life to argue that "*prima aetas*" lasts until approximately age 28.<sup>16</sup> Chazan further argues that the minimum age for a schoolmaster was 25, though immediately recanting and allowing that Sigebert might have bypassed these age requirements, and claims that Sigebert could have arrived in Metz at any time between 1047 and 1051 (that is, between the age of 21 and 25, according to her calculations of Sigebert's birth).<sup>17</sup>

Chazan's calculations, however, rely heavily on likelihoods, have many possible exceptions, and utilize an erroneous definition of *prima aetas*. For the purpose of this study, it is not necessary to deduce Sigebert's exact year of birth. Only an approximation is required so that the regions in which Sigebert lived and the people by whom Sigebert was influenced may be generally deduced. Thus, it is much more important to know that Sigebert spent a number of years as a teacher in Metz during his early adulthood, after having professed monasticism at Gembloux, before returning to Gembloux in the late 1060s or early 1070s, where he remained for the rest of his life. Sigebert's first continuator, Anselm of Gembloux, writes that Sigebert died on "*3 Non. Octobris*," or 5

---

<sup>14</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 35.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 40. Chazan errs, however: for Isidore, the *prima aetas* is infancy and lasts until age seven. The *tertia aetas* is adolescence, which lasts until age 28. Isidore of Seville. *Etymologiae*. Ed. W. M. Lindsay. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911, XI.II, 1-4.

<sup>17</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 40.

October, 1112.<sup>18</sup> Thus, the section of the *Chronica* (1073-1111) which will be analyzed in this work would have been composed after Sigebert's return to the monastery of Gembloux, so that any shifts in the narrative style would not be due to Sigebert's transition from Metz to Gembloux.

## Works

Beginning with his time in Metz, Sigebert was a prolific author. In his entry in the *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, Sigebert lists approximately twenty works, both prose and poetry, which he wrote. These works can most easily be divided into three categories: hagiographical works, academic works, and polemical works. There is, of course, a degree of overlap between these three categories: a hagiographical work may focus on a proponent of a specific idea, or an academic work may contain hagiographical or polemic passages. However, the primary factor in the categorization of each work lies in its self-presentation. For example, although the *Chronica* contains both hagiography and polemic, it is presented as a supposedly unbiased work, and will thus be categorized among the academic works. The following sections will list each of Sigebert's works within its proper category, noting whether or not the work is extant as well as briefly summarizing the contents of the work.

## Hagiographical Works

Sigebert wrote a number of works in praise of local figures while he was a teacher in Metz.

---

<sup>18</sup>Anselm of Gembloux. *Continuatio*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Freres, 1880, 240 B.

I wrote a *Life of Bishop Theodoric*,<sup>19</sup> the founder of the church and monastery<sup>20</sup> itself, in which, in a digression, I proclaimed the praise of that city in heroic meter. I wrote the *Passion of Saint Lucy*, who rests there, in Alcaic meter.<sup>21</sup> For, when some were blaming the prophecy of Saint Lucy, that “I announce to you that peace is given to the Church of God,” she was cast out by Diocletian from his kingdom, and with Maximian being dead at that point, I responded diligently with the considered reasoning of the times, and with the truth of matters. Additionally, I wrote a sermon in praise of this virgin, in which I laid out in chronological order her movements from Sicily to Corfinium, a town in Italy, and from Corfinium to Metz, a city of Gaul.<sup>22</sup> I wrote the *Life of King Sigebert*,<sup>23</sup> founder of the church and monastery of Saint Martin, situated outside the city of Metz.<sup>24</sup>

After he left Metz and returned to Gembloux, Sigebert continued to write hagiographical works about local figures.

---

<sup>19</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Vita Deodorigi*. Ed. Georg Pertz. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, 692-726. D. *circa* 985.

<sup>20</sup> I.e., the monastery of Saint Vincent, where Sigebert was teaching.

<sup>21</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Passio Sanctae Luciae et Passio Sanctorum Thebeorum*. Ed. Ernst Dümmler. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin*. Klasse I, 1893, 1-125. D. *circa* 304.

<sup>22</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Sermo de Sancta Lucia*. Ed. Martin Meurisse. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, 811-814.

<sup>23</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Vita Sancti Sigeberti Regis*. Ed. Jean Bolland. In *PL* vol. 87. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1863, 303-314. R. *circa* 561 – *circa* 575.

<sup>24</sup> “*Scrpsi Vitam Theoderici episcopi, conditoris ipsius ecclesiae et abbatiae, in qua etiam per digressionem laudem ipsius urbis heroico metro declamavi. Scrpsi Passionem sanctae Luciae, quae ibi requiescat, alcaico metro. Quibusdam etiam reprehendentibus illam sanctae Luciae prophetiam, “Annuntio vobis pacem Ecclesiae Dei datam,” Diocletiano ejecto de regno suo, et Maximiano hodie mortuo, respondi diligenter considerata temporum ratione, et rerum veritate. Scrpsi nihilominus sermonem in laudem ipsius virginis, in quo translationes ipsius a Sicilia in Corfinium, civitatem Italiae, et a Corfino in Metim, urbem Galliae, ordinata temporum consequentia, digessi. Scrpsi Vitam Sigeberti regis, conditoris ecclesiae et abbatiae Sancti Martini, extra civitatem Metensem sitae.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 587 A – 587 B.

I wrote the *Passion of the Theban Legion*, our [the Monastery of Gembloux's] patrons, in heroic meter, in a poem.<sup>25</sup> I wrote the *Life of Saint Guibert the Confessor*, the founder of our church of Gembloux. . . .<sup>26</sup> I also wrote the *Deeds of the Abbots of Gembloux*;<sup>27</sup> I tidied up the *Lives of the Saints Maclovius and Theodard* with a more urbane pen.<sup>28</sup> I also tidied up the *Life of Saint Lantbert*.<sup>29</sup>

## Scholarly Works

The work which will be dealt with in this thesis is Sigebert's continuation of Jerome-Eusebius' Chronicle. "I imitated Eusebius Pamphilus, who was the first among the Greeks to set forth a Chronicle from the time of Abraham. I, myself, continued it from the year in which he stopped until the year 1111, covering all of the following times and deeds done, as much as I was able to with a restrained pen."<sup>30</sup> The *Chronica* had a significant *Nachleben*: it was used by such authors as Orderic Vitalis, Matthew Paris, and others, even as far away as Iceland (Sigebert was a source for the *Annales*

<sup>25</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Passio Sanctae Luciae et Passio Sanctorum Thebeorum*, 1-125. D. 286.

<sup>26</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Vita Wicberti*. Ed. Jacques Paul Migne. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, 661-690. Founded the monastery *circa* 945.

<sup>27</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Gesta Abbatum Gemblacensium*. Ed. Georg Pertz. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* [Hereafter, MGH] *Scriptores* [Hereafter, *SS*]. Vol. VIII. Hannover, Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1848, p. 520-542.

<sup>28</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Vita Sancti Maclovi*. Ed. Laurentius Surius. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, 729-746. And Sigebert of Gembloux. *Vita Sancti Theodardi*. Ed. Jean Bolland. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, 747-754. Maclovius d. *circa* 621. Theodard d. *circa* 670.

<sup>29</sup> Sigebert wrote two separate *Lives of Saint Lantbert*. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Vita Sancti Lamberti*. Ed. Jean Bolland. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, 759-810. D. *circa* 701. "*Scripti Passionem Thebaeorum, patronorum nostrorum, heroico, carmine. Scripti Vitam sancti Guiberti confessoris, fundatoris ecclesiae nostrae Gemblacensis. . . . Scripti et Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium; Vitas sanctorum Maclovi et Theodardi urbaniore stylo melioravi. Vitam quoque sancti Lantberti . . . meliorassem.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 587 B – 587 C.

<sup>30</sup> "*Imitatus Eusebium Pamphili, qui primus apud Graecos Chronica tempore Abrahae digessit, ipse quoque a loco intermissionis ejus usque ad annum 1111 omnem consequentiam temporum, et rerum gestarum, quanta potui styli temperantia, ordinavi.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 588 A.

*Islandici*).<sup>31</sup> The *Chronica* was directly continued by no less than twenty one extant authors, the most extensive of which was carried out by Robert of Torigny (Robert de Monte), who carried the *Chronica* to 1186.<sup>32</sup> Due to Sigebert's lack of popularity among modern scholars, the most recent edition of the *Chronica* is the 1880 printing of it in the *Patrologia Latina*. The text contained therein was edited by Ludwig Conrad Bethmann. At the time of his writing, 63 manuscripts of the *Chronica* were known to have existed, but 19 had been lost. Bethmann used 33 of the remaining manuscripts.<sup>33</sup> Sigebert's autograph of the text survives, and thus this text is based primarily upon that manuscript: interpolations from the remaining manuscripts were only made when the text of the autograph appeared to be corrupt.<sup>34</sup>

The work which Sigebert devotes the most time to describing in his entry in the *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* is his *Liber Decennalis*.<sup>35</sup>

When I closely reread Bede's *De Temporibus*, and there saw the cycle, aware of the irony, that was inflicted on the writer by Dionysius, because it had ill set forth the years of the Passion of the Lord, it seemed to go against the Gospel of John, in terms of the Paschal dates, in all respects, it seemed to me to be fitting to, seeking on high, move the entire cloud of error, and, indeed, to pour forth the light of truth on those who had regard for it. . . . I, moreover, considering that the advocates of Dionysius, if quenched only once, would not lightly come to knowledge, thus

---

<sup>31</sup> Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena*. In *PL* vol. 160, 25-26.

<sup>32</sup> Robert of Torigny. *Roberti De Monte Chronica*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, 411-546.

<sup>33</sup> Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena*. In *PL* vol. 160, 39 A.

<sup>34</sup> Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena*. In *PL* vol. 160, 57 C.

<sup>35</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber Decennalis*. Ed. Joachim Wiesenbach. In MGH, *Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters* XII. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1986.

freed my little talent from caution and the level plate, so that I, advancing on the middle of them, should collect all of the years that had passed from the origin of the world, or that would pass in the future and write them up according to the Hebraic truth: namely, through lunar cycles, which have nineteen years, and through solar cycles, which are completed in 28 years, and through the two multiplied together they make a Great Cycle of 532 years: line by line they are distinguished from the time of Adam, with intercalary days running alongside the Paschal boundaries, with the days of the Lord's Passover, following that in the same manner as Dionysius, but not in his same footsteps, which the diligent reader will easily find, if he were curious. And because ten Great Cycles, which each consist of 532 years, have taken place in that whole work, I gave the work that name, so that it is called *Decenovenalis*.<sup>36</sup>

It is made clear in the text of the *Chronica* that this debate about time and the calculation of years is one of Sigebert's passions, as it appears regularly and is used as a narrative technique by Sigebert. This will be further discussed in Chapter 3.

The source in which we find most of our information about Sigebert's life and works is his *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. "I also imitated Jerome and

---

<sup>36</sup> "Cum diligenter Bedam De temporibus relegerem, et ab eo notam ironiae Dionysio cyclorum scriptori infligi viderem, quia male dispositis annis Dominicae passionis, in terminis paschalibus contraire per omnia videretur Evangelio Joannis, dignum mihi visum est, altius repetendo, omnem dimovere nubem erroris, et verum diligentibus infundere lumen veritatis. . . . Ego autem, considerans fautores Dionysii semel imbibita non leviter descire, ita cautelam ingenioli mei aequa lance libravi, ut medius horum incedens omnes annos aborigine mundi decursos, vel in futurum decursos, inscripta ratione juxta Hebraicam veritatem, colligerem: scilicet per cyclos lunares, qui novemdecim annis, et per cyclos solares, qui XXVIII annis clauduntur, et per alterum multiplicati magnum cyclum quingentorum triginta duorum annorum conficiunt: lineatim distinctis hinc inde annis Adae, epactis concurrentibus terminis paschalibus, diebus Dominicis Paschae, eadem via incedens qua Dionysius, sed non eisdem vestigiis. Quod diligens lector facile inveniet, si curiosus fuerit. Et quia decem magnis cyclis, qui singuli quingentis XXXII annis constant, opus omne distinxi ipsum librum hoc titulo praenotavi, ut Decemnovennalis vocetur." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 588A – 588 C.

Gennadius: I wrote, last, this little book *On Illustrious Men*, as much as I was able to find information on the topics of my inquiry.”<sup>37</sup> In this work, he wrote brief *Lives* of 171 writers on ecclesiastical matters.

As well, Sigebert composed a metrical commentary on Ecclesiastes, which is no longer extant.<sup>38</sup>

### Polemic Letters

The first polemic letter which Sigebert mentions in his own *Vita* is a letter in support of royal power. “At the request of [Henry of Liège], I responded with strong arguments from the Church Fathers to the letter of Pope Hildebrand, which he wrote in calumny against the power of the king to Hermann, Bishop of Metz [r. 1073-1090].”<sup>39</sup>

This letter is not extant.

Sigebert’s next polemic letter is not in support of King Henry, but addressed directly to him. Sigebert describes the *Apologia Contra Eos Qui Calumniantur Missas Conjugatorum Sacerdotum* thus: “I wrote to Henry himself an apology against those who cast calumny on the Masses held by married priests.”<sup>40</sup> This letter is generally thought to be a response to the Gregorian decrees of either 1074 or 1075 against nicolaitism, or clerical unchastity.<sup>41</sup> In this letter, Sigebert sidesteps the issue of clerical chastity and

---

<sup>37</sup> “*Imitatus etiam Hieronymum et Gennadium, scripsi ultimum hunc libellum De illustribus viris, quantum notitia meae investigationis exquirere potui.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol 160, 588 D.

<sup>38</sup> “*Descripsi heroico metro Ecclesiasten, quem opere stromateo tripliciter digessi, ad litteram, allegorice, mythologice.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 588 A.

<sup>39</sup> “*Rogatu etiam praedicti viri, validis Patrum argumentis respondi epistolae Hildebrandi papae, quam scripsit ad Hermanum Metensem episcopum, in potestatis regiae calumniam.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 587 C.

<sup>40</sup> “*Scripsi ad ipsum Henricum apologiam, contra eos qui calumniantur missas conjugatorum sacerdotum.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 587 C.

<sup>41</sup> See I. S. Robinson, *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest*, 176.

directs his arguments against Hildebrand, accusing him of Donatist tendencies, as well as of attempting to increase his own power.<sup>42</sup>

Sigebert's third polemic letter is directed against Pope Paschal's [r. 1099-1118] authorization of the use of military force against Cambrai and Liège. Sigebert notes: "I responded to the letter of Pope Paschal [II], who had ordered Robert, Count of Flanders to destroy the church of Liège, as well as that of Cambrai."<sup>43</sup> This letter dates to 1102, which is when Paschal had ordered this attack for the loyalty of these two cities to the imperial, rather than the papal, cause.<sup>44</sup> In this letter, Sigebert responds to each of the arguments in Paschal's own letter, arguing against the very institution of papally sanctioned violence.<sup>45</sup>

Sigebert's fourth polemic letter is less of a direct attack against the papacy than his other letters. In it, he instead debates the timing of specific days to fast. He describes the *Epistola Duplex* thus: "I responded to the men of Trier regarding the Fasts of the Four Seasons, who observed the rules of a certain Berno, which, allegorically, they

---

<sup>42</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Apologia Contra Eos Qui Calumniantur Missas Conjugatorum Sacerdotum*. Ed. Ernst Sackur. In MGH *Libelli de Lite* vol. II. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1892, 436-448.

<sup>43</sup> "Respondi epistolae Paschalis papae, qui Leodiensium ecclesiam, aequae ut Cameracensem, a Roberto Flandrensium comite jubebat perditum iri." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 587 C.

<sup>44</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 86.

<sup>45</sup> See Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 86-92. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Epistola Adversus Paschalem Papam*. Ed. Ernst Sackur. In MGH *Libelli de Lite* vol. II. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1892, 449-464.

believed to have correctly observed, and which differed from the customs of Liège.”<sup>46</sup>

Chazan dates this work to 1101.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> “*Respondi Treverensibus de jejuniis Quatuor Temporum, qui regulas cujusdam Bernonis, secundum allegoriam, ut sibi videtur, bene concinnatas, observant, et a consuetudine Leodiensium discordant.*”  
Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 587 D – 588 A.

<sup>47</sup> Mireille Chazan, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 94. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Epistola Duplex*. In *PL* vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1880, 813-830.

## Chapter III

### Analysis from Gregory VII (1073) to 1094

Although Sigebert, as will be shown in detail in the following sections, often infuses rhetorical flourishes into his text or fabricates events *ex nihilo*, he does not – and cannot – fabricate the entirety of his narrative. Despite not being bound by the same authorial strictures as modern historians, Sigebert is constrained by the genre of chronicles to maintain at least the pretense of verisimilitude; without this, the text would appear as a *fabula* rather than a *chronica* continuing the Jerome-Eusebius tradition. In the *Chronica*, Sigebert claims specifically to be a conduit of facts, either from eyewitnesses or from texts. After mentioning the accusations of necromancy that were leveled at Pope Sylvester II [r. 999-1003], Sigebert writes an aside to his reader:

Thence, O Reader, I ask that both here and elsewhere, if some dissonance of names or years or of the times of the popes should offend you, do not impute it to me, who did not see it, but who writes either what is heard or read.<sup>1</sup>

While this sentence specifically references Sigebert's information on the papacy, it is revelatory of the methods that Sigebert claims to use as an author. He wishes to appear as more of a reporter, copying down what others have said or written, rather than as an active participant in the historical record. This claim on Sigebert's part is demonstrably false on close analysis; nevertheless, it informs his authorship of the

---

<sup>1</sup> “Unde lector queso, ut et hic et alibi, si qua dissonantia te offenderit de nominibus, vel annis, vel temporibus paparum, non mihi imputes, qui non visa, sed audita vel lecta scribe.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 197 C.

*Chronica*, as he must, to some extent, keep up this pretense, which limits the degree to which Sigebert can intervene in the historical record.<sup>2</sup>

It must be admitted that, from time to time, Sigebert includes passages in the *Chronica* that are explicitly critical of those whom he strenuously defends in other sections.<sup>3</sup> Some historians, such as Bethmann, have used the presence of these passages to argue that Sigebert was not, in fact, a partisan writer, but was even-handed in his treatment of both sides: “[Sigebert] censures the emperor no less than he does the pope.”<sup>4</sup> This is not the case. Sigebert’s inclusion of events that reflect poorly upon those whom he supports is, in fact, a result of his need, as an author, for an appearance of verisimilitude. Events, especially those which played a role in the events which Sigebert would later discuss and were contemporary with him, such as the Saxon Wars (beginning 1073), could not easily be overlooked without a possible loss of credibility for Sigebert. If Sigebert were to act as even-handedly as Bethmann suggests, he would not have skewed the presentation of some events that reflected poorly on the emperor, such as the walk to Canossa, as much as he did, as will later be discussed.

---

<sup>2</sup> See also Justin C. Lake, “Truth, Plausibility, and the Virtues of Narrative at the Millennium.” especially p. 226-232 on the *narratio probabilis*. Sigebert would have been keenly aware of what made a statement *probabilis* rather than *improbabilis*, as he had been a teacher, whose curriculum would have included rhetoric, since early in his adult life.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Henry IV’s oppression of the Saxons at 217 A: “*Saxones enim multis et magnis injuriis et injustitiis ab imperatore affecti . . .*” [For the Saxons, having been afflicted by many and great injuries and injustices by the emperor . . .] For Sigebert’s support of Henry in other passages, see the analysis of the *Chronica* throughout this chapter.

<sup>4</sup> “*In imperatore non minus vituperat quam in papa.*” Ludwig Bethmann, *Prolegomena*, In *PL* vol. 160, 23 B.

## The Dionysian Calendar

In this portion of the *Chronica*, Sigebert presents three main arguments. First, he argues that the calendrical system proposed by Dionysius Exiguus is flawed.<sup>5</sup> His second argument, which is also borne out in the remainder of his work, consists of attacks on the validity of the actions of Pope Gregory VII, especially those against Henry IV [r. 1056-1106]. Sigebert's third argument in this section, which is in some ways an extension of his second argument, is against the validity and actions of Pope Urban II [r. 1088-1099].

The errors of the Dionysian calendar form a topic which Sigebert, as a scholar, is not averse to discuss for its own sake, as one may deduce from his *Liber Decennalis* as well as to the detailed discussion of Dionysius Exiguus' errors in Sigebert's autobiographical entry in the *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*.<sup>6</sup> However, in the *Chronica*, discussions of time do not appear only so that Sigebert can have another arena in which to attack Dionysius Exiguus: time, in its passage and its cycles, plays an important role in the rhetorical program of the *Chronica*. Sigebert begins the *Chronica* with these words: "We will say something regarding the contemporaneity of kingdoms, with God's aid."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> For background on Dionysius Exiguus, see Duncan Steel, *Marking Time*, 106-115. See also Dionysius Exiguus. *Cyclus Paschalis*. Ed. Benjamin Hoffman. In *PL* vol. 67. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1865, 453-520.

<sup>6</sup> See Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* in *PL* vol. 160, 588 A and 588 B. See also the *Liber Decennalis*.

<sup>7</sup> "Dicturi aliquid iuvante Deo de contemporaneitate regnorum." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 57 D.

This idea of contemporaneity is central to Sigebert's perception of history.<sup>8</sup> The contemporaneity of kingdoms is reinforced in each of the entries in the *Chronica*, as they are headed with a rubric containing the year in the *Anno Domini* dating system as well as the regnal years of the kings of the largest kingdoms of the time.<sup>9</sup> It is perhaps telling that the regnal years of the popes are never included in this rubric, despite Sigebert naming each newcomer to the papal throne in a similar manner to his naming of new kings. However, the formula differs slightly, with Sigebert using "*N., qui et Y., Romanae aecclisiae Z.us presidet*" for the papacy, whereas in the case of Germany, England, France, and the Holy Land, Sigebert tends to use "*N. in regno/principatu succedit.*"<sup>10</sup> The combination of these two factors betrays Sigebert's perception of the papacy: while it is an important institution, it is not (or should not be) a secular power, and the position of the pope is closer to that of *primus inter pares* within the Church than comparable to the position of *imperator*.

As well, since the *Chronica* follows in the tradition of Jerome-Eusebius' chronicle, the events in Sigebert's time are inextricably linked with events reaching back to the Garden of Eden and forward to the Day of Judgment. Sigebert shows an intense

---

<sup>8</sup> See Hans-Werner Goetz. "The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and the Twelfth Centuries." In *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography*. Althoff et al. eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 151-153.

<sup>9</sup> See Sigebert's description of his numbering system at the beginning of the *Chronica*: "*Dicturi aliquid iuvante Deo de contemporalitate regnorum. . . . Ponemus in prima linea regnum Romanorum, in secunda Persarum, in tertia Francorum, in quarta Wandalorum, in quinta Anglorum, in sexta Langobardorum, in septima Wisigotharum, in octava Ostrogotharum, in nona Hunorum.*" [We will say something regarding the contemporaneity of kingdoms, with God's aid. . . . We will put in the first line the kingdom of the Romans, in the second that of the Persians, in the third that of the Franks, in the fourth that of the Vandals, in the fifth that of the Angles, in the sixth that of the Lombards, in the seventh that of the Visigoths, in the eighth that of the Ostrogoths, in the ninth that of the Huns.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 57 D, 58 D, 59 A. See also Hans-Werner Goetz. "The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and the Twelfth Centuries," p. 151.

<sup>10</sup> For papal successions, see Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 216 C, 228 B. For royal successions, see Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 228 B (for England and Jerusalem).

awareness of and interest in time and chronology in his other works, particularly in the *Liber Decennalis* and the *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. There is no reason why a passage reflecting on chronology from such an author, particularly in a work where time is so central, should be considered peripheral to the narrative and argumentation of the work. Indeed, in what he sees as pivotal events in history, Sigebert often refers to earlier parallels. For example, after Jerusalem is recaptured, Sigebert notes how long it had been since it was lost.<sup>11</sup> During his description of the *pravilege*, Sigebert often refers to privileges given to previous emperors by popes.<sup>12</sup> Sigebert's three lengthy discussions of the Dionysian calendrical system in this section of the *Chronica* play an important role in signaling shifts in Sigebert's tone and argumentation.

The first such passage appears at the beginning of the entry for the year 1073. Here Sigebert notes the passage of two Great Years from the fifteenth regnal year of Tiberius Caesar [r. 14-37], which was the year of Jesus' baptism and of His fasting in the desert. The Great Year is 532 years, or the product of the number of years in a solar cycle with the number of years in a lunar cycle.<sup>13</sup> The Great Year is particularly important to Sigebert, and forms the basis of his *Liber Decennalis*; this is likely because of a Great Year's perceived cyclical nature. The sun and the moon would travel the same paths in a given year as they did 532 solar years, or a single Great Year before that date, causing dates that are calculated using the lunar calendar (e.g., Easter) to occur on the

---

<sup>11</sup> “*Capta est autem Hierusalem post annos circiter 460, ex quo sub Eraclio imperatore secunda vice capta, possessa est a Saracenis.*” [Also, Jerusalem was captured after around 460 years of being held by the Saracens, after it was captured for the second time under Emperor Heraclius.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 228 A.

<sup>12</sup> See Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 236 A, 237 D.

<sup>13</sup> See Sigebert's entry on himself in the *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, *PL* vol. 160, 558 B and C, as well as Hans-Werner Goetz. “The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and the Twelfth Centuries,” p. 145.

same day of the solar year that they did at a given point in the past. For this reason, even though Sigebert does not explicitly mention the Dionysian cycle in this passage, this temporal discussion should be classed with Sigebert's other extended descriptions of past time, and as implicitly critical of the calendar of Dionysius Exiguus.

For Sigebert, the baptism of Christ, and its anniversary in future Great Years, would have been significantly spiritually charged. Baptism marks a dramatic shift in a person's life: they are held to be spiritually 'reborn' after their baptism. Thus, Sigebert's mention of the completion of the second Great Year since Christ's baptism can be taken to mark major shifts in the fabric of history. This passage sets the stage for two major events which Sigebert discusses in this entry: the kindling of the Saxon Wars, which were a recurring problem during Henry's reign, and the rise of Pope Gregory VII.

Sigebert chose to end his discussion of Biblical time with Jesus' temptation in the desert.<sup>14</sup> The use of this passage to transition to contemporary time reflects the impression which Sigebert wishes to give to his readers of the events that he relates in this entry, presenting a dichotomy of different sorts of temptation. King Henry IV, while the Saxon War is beginning, is offered the opportunity to add Russia to his domains as a vassal kingdom.<sup>15</sup> This dilemma closely parallels the third temptation of Jesus, where he is offered temporal dominion if he were to worship Satan.<sup>16</sup> Henry, Sigebert implies,

---

<sup>14</sup> Matthew 4:1-11, Mark 1:12-13, Luke 4:1-13.

<sup>15</sup> "*Interpellat Heinricum imperatorem, se et regnum Russorum ei submittens, si ejus auxilio regno restitueretur. Sed id frustra fuit; quia gravissima in imperio Romano orta dissensio monebat magis sua tueri, quam aliena adquirere.*" [[Yaropolk] petitioned Emperor Henry, submitting himself and the kingdom of the Russians to him, if he returned the kingdom with his aid. But it was in vain; he advised that he should rather watch over his own things, as the gravest of dissensions had arisen in the Roman Empire, than to obtain the goods of another.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 217 A.

<sup>16</sup> Matthew 4:8-9 "*Iterum adsumit eum diabolus in montem excelsum valde et ostendit ei omnia regna mundi et gloriam eorum et dixit illi haec tibi omnia dabo si cadens adoraveris me.*" [Again, the devil took

does not succumb to temptation and instead, as a good king, looks to the integrity of his kingdom “rather than to seek that belonging to another.”<sup>17</sup>

If King Henry bears up well to temptation, what does Sigebert imply of this year’s other major event? Sigebert only describes Gregory VII’s accession to the papal throne briefly and in a formulaic manner: “*Hildebrandus archidiaconus Romanorum, qui et Gregorius, Romanae aecclesiae 153us presidet.*”<sup>18</sup> It must be remembered, however, that Sigebert was not writing of these events as they happened, but well after the fact. These entries may have come into their final form only a short time before the *Chronica* was finished in 1111, well after Gregory VII’s death in 1085, and even longer after Sigebert had built up his personal ire against papal policies. Thus, the placement of this short passage may be intended by Sigebert to serve as an introduction to the character of Hildebrand, one of the enemies of the power of the Roman Empire. “*Hildebrandus*” is the first word of the first sentence to follow the discussion of Jesus’ temptation. In comparison with Sigebert’s descriptions of other successions, this seems to be deliberate: normally, the deaths of multiple bishops as well as the deaths of kings and princes are placed at the very end of annual entries.<sup>19</sup> If, then, Sigebert intentionally placed Hildebrand’s name in juxtaposition to Jesus’ temptation, what impression did he wish to

---

him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor; and he said to him, “All these I will give you, if you will fall down and worship me.”]. Also, Luke 4:5-7 “*Et duxit illum diabolus et ostendit illi omnia regna orbis terrae in momento temporis et ait ei tibi dabo potestatem hanc universam et gloriam illorum quia mihi tradita sunt et cui volo do illa tu ergo si adoraveris coram me erunt tua omnia.*” [Then the devil led him up and showed him in an instant all the kingdoms of the world. And the devil said to him, “To you I will give their glory and all this authority; for it has been given over to me, and I give it to anyone I please. If you, then, will worship me, it will all be yours.”]

<sup>17</sup> “*Magis . . . quam aliena acquirere.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 217 A.

<sup>18</sup> “Hildebrand, archdeacon of the Romans, who is also called Gregory, became the 153<sup>rd</sup> pope.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 216 C.

<sup>19</sup> For Theoduin of Liège and Anno of Cologne, see Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 218 C. For Henry of Liège, see 225 A. For William I of England and Godfrey I of Jerusalem, see 228 B.

give his readers? Although the case of King Henry shows that someone can be compared positively to Christ in this situation, for Hildebrand this likely was not Sigebert's intention. Throughout the *Chronica*, Gregory VII appears as a force opposing King Henry, attempting to diminish his power and to increase the power of the Church. As a result, while Henry decides to settle the affairs of his kingdom rather than succumbing to the temptation of annexing new territory, Gregory attempts to expand the temporal power of the Church over an increasingly large area. In the context of this Biblical passage, this action would likely be seen as a failure to avoid temptation on Gregory's part, which is consistent with Sigebert's attacks on Gregory's papal policies in the remainder of the *Chronica*.<sup>20</sup>

Sigebert's second lengthy excursus on chronology in this section of the *Chronica* occurs in the entry for the year 1076, beginning in section 219 A. This passage includes several lengthy attacks on Dionysius Exiguus' chronological errors. Sigebert also notes that this year falls two Great Years after Jesus' Passion. As well as using this passage for its readily-apparent surface meaning, namely attacking the Dionysian cycle, Sigebert uses this passage to increase the stature of Emperor Henry IV and to ignore significant blows to his position at this time. As will be discussed in greater detail later, in 1076, Henry was excommunicated by Gregory VII, and in 1077, he walked to Canossa to beg for papal absolution.<sup>21</sup> Sigebert plays down the importance of these events in a number of ways, including through the use of his excursus on the Dionysian calendar. In Sigebert's narrative, the pope excommunicated Henry (in 1077, rather than early 1076) as a reaction

---

<sup>20</sup> Matthew 4:1-11, Mark 1:12-13, Luke 4:1-13.

<sup>21</sup> See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 153-167.

to a council which decreed against him, in order to stir up rebellion.<sup>22</sup> The pope then comes to meet the emperor, rather than *vice versa*, with the pope “rushing to the emperor.”<sup>23</sup> Sigebert changes the events of 1076 to include only an attack by Gregory against Henry, which was able to undermine the loyalty of many of Henry’s subjects: “Pope Gregory wholeheartedly attacked Emperor Henry, and he turned whosoever he could away from him through these speeches and writings; he even alienated his own mother, Agnes, from him.”<sup>24</sup>

Sigebert slips this passage in before his diatribe against the Dionysian cycle, with the effect of separating it by a significant distance from Henry’s excommunication. Combined with Sigebert’s altering of the order of events, as discussed above, the relative positions of these passages must be deliberate, with the intended result of dissociating the events from one another. Thus, rather than being excommunicated for almost a year before his absolution, King Henry seems to have sought forgiveness almost immediately, only a few months after he had become excommunicate.<sup>25</sup>

As with the previously discussed chronological excursus, Sigebert may be creating a Biblical parallel in order to shore up the status of King Henry. While previously Henry was compared with Jesus in his resistance to temptation, in this passage

---

<sup>22</sup> “*Hildibrandus econtra imperatorem Heinricum Romae excommunicat, sub hoc optentu, ut primates regni quasi justa ex causa excommunicatio regi contradicant.*” [Hildebrand, in return, excommunicated Emperor Henry from Rome, in the hope that the leading men of the kingdom would contest him, as though with a just cause, while the king was excommunicated.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 C.

<sup>23</sup> “*Occurrens imperatori.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 C.

<sup>24</sup> “*Gregorius papa totus in Heinricum imperatorem invehitur, et quoscunque potest ab eo verbis et scriptis avertit; animum etiam Agnetis matris ipsius ab eo alienat.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 A.

<sup>25</sup> In fact, the Walk to Canossa occurred on 25 January 1077, while Henry had known of his excommunication since the previous Easter. See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, 142-156.

Sigebert may be creating a parallel between Henry and the events of Jesus' Passion. Sigebert repeats variations on the phrase "*annus dominicae passionis*" on four separate occasions in this passage, ensuring that it will stand out in his readers' minds.<sup>26</sup> In this context, Pope Gregory VII's attacks on King Henry take on a much more sinister light. Here, Gregory, as a religious leader, may stand in for the Pharisees and chief priests who conspired against Jesus.<sup>27</sup> Henry thus appears to be unjustly accused and wrongly suffering, with his own people turning against him, while Gregory VII becomes associated with figures who are often reviled in the New Testament.

The third and final long temporal digression in this section of the *Chronica* occurs in the entry for the year 1082, in section 221 A. Here, Sigebert includes a passage in praise of Marianus Scotus<sup>28</sup> chronicle that is very similar to that which he includes in his autobiographical entry in the *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*.<sup>29</sup> Unlike the previous two entries, no Biblical parallels are included in this digression. However, despite Sigebert's clear admiration for the work of Marianus Scotus, this section serves a larger

---

<sup>26</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 A and B.

<sup>27</sup> See Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22, John 18.

<sup>28</sup> Marianus Scotus' Chronicle is, through 1082, a major source of Sigebert's narrative. Marianus (1028-1082) wrote his Chronicle at Mainz, where he spent the last years of his life. The most complete edition of his Chronicle appears in MGH *SS* vol. V, 481-562. (See Hans-Werner Goetz. "The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and the Twelfth Centuries," 142 for the lack of other editions). The Chronicle begins with a discussion of the *computus* and a book of calculations before beginning yearly accounts of events. Marianus suggested that Jesus' birth occurred 22 years before the date suggested by Dionysius Exiguus.

<sup>29</sup> "*Marianus Scottus chronicam suam a Christi nativitate inchoatam usque ad hunc annum perduxit, qui erat aetatis suae annus 56, multum laborans corrigere errorem de annis Domini, qui invenitur in ciclo Dionisii; quod facile est videre, hinc positus ab eo annis Domini secundum ciclum Dionisii, altrinsecus autem secundum veritatem evangelii.*" [Marianus Scotus brought his chronicle, which began at the birth of Christ, up to this year. He was fifty six years of age and labored much to correct the error in the calculation of the years of the Lord which is found in the Dionysian cycle. This error is easy to see with the years of the Lord according to the Dionysian cycle placed on one side, and on the other side, however, those according to the truth of the evangelists.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 221 A and B. Compare with the *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* in *Ibid.*, 588 B.

narrative purpose as well as eulogizing a fellow scholar and author. This passage allows Sigebert to undertake a transition from the tone which he used in the entry for 1081 to the tone which he uses in the entries for 1083 and 1084. In 1081, Sigebert seems to be disappointed with the lengths to which the emperor has gone, even marching on Rome.

There was a large earthquake with a great rumbling of earth on 27 March in the first hour of the night, portending great imminent evil, which resounded about the whole world, and from which the earth was hurt and as yet still hurts. For Henry, the emperor, invaded Italy in order to subdue pope Hildebrand; the pope fortified cities and castles against him, and he prepared himself to rebel. This did not stop him from advancing on Rome militarily.<sup>30</sup>

However, after the break inserted by his digression on Marianus Scotus, Sigebert appears to shift the blame for this occurrence to Pope Gregory VII, noting that the people of Rome rose up against him, and calling him a “dissimulating pope.”<sup>31</sup> Henry is no longer accused of any untoward actions. The tone of the entry for 1084 becomes almost triumphant, with Henry’s candidate for the papacy being enthroned and Henry himself being named *patricius* and anointed as emperor.<sup>32</sup> Without the narrative pause gained by inserting the discussion of Marianus Scotus’ work, the transition from Henry being one of the causes of the world crying out in pain to a blameless and triumphant ruler would have been excessively jarring. Sigebert seems to have used this discussion of Marianus Scotus

---

<sup>30</sup> “*Magnus terraemotus cum gravi terrae mugitu factus est 6 Kal. Aprilis prima hora noctis, portendens forte imminens malum, quod in toto orbe insonuit, et unde terra doluit et dolet. Heinricus enim imperator ad debellandum papam Hildibrandum Italiam petit; contra quem papa urbibus et castellis munitis, se ad rebellandum accingit, eumque Romam hostiliter adeuntem non recipit.*” *PL* vol. 160, 220 C, 221 A.

<sup>31</sup> “*Papa dissimulante.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 221 B.

<sup>32</sup> Namely, anti-pope Clement III. The respective enthronements occurred on 24 and 31 March. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 222 A.

to aid his ability to portray Henry in a positive light. Thus, as with the other passages on chronographical matters, Sigebert does not merely indulge his fascination with time, but uses these passages to reinforce the points of his argument subtly.

### Attacks on Gregory VII

Sigebert's second main thread of argumentation in this section consists of attacks on Gregory VII and on the Gregorian Reform's policies. Some instances of this have been discussed above, as in the negative comparisons of Gregory VII with certain Biblical figures, as well as through the use of chronographical digressions in order to refocus the narrative. In this section, the techniques which Sigebert uses to attack Gregory VII will be analyzed, with a particularly focused discussion of Sigebert's extended polemics.

The first of these attacks that has not been touched upon already occurs in Sigebert's entry for the year 1074. Each part of Sigebert's attacks in the entry for this year will be separately analyzed in the following passages.

Pope Gregory anathematized simoniacs in a celebrated synod, and removed married priests from celebrating the divine office, and interdicted the lay people who heard masses from them, setting a new precedent. And, as it seemed to many, with inconsiderate prejudice against the works of the Holy Fathers, who wrote what the sacraments of the Church are, namely, baptism, anointing, the body and blood of Christ, and, of these sacraments, they said that they were effected through the Holy Spirit, operating secretly, whether they were dispensed in the Church of God through good men or through bad, nevertheless because the

Holy Spirit mystically gives them life, neither are they made greater through the merits of good dispensers, nor are they lessened by the sins of evil men. Thence it is: “This is he who baptizes.”

Out of this matter arose such a grave scandal, that at the time of no heresy was the Holy Church more cut apart with a graver schism, with these men working for justice, and those men working against justice; with some men not straying into simony, and with others cloaking known avarice with an honest name, while they boast that this, which they give for free, they sell under the name of Charity. And as Eusebius said of the Montanists, “they accept, craftily, bribes under the name of “oblation””; still, with few holding on to continence, with some pretending to it only for the sake of complaining or boastfulness, there were many accumulating incontinence through perjury or more multiplex adultery.<sup>33</sup>

In this passage, Sigebert argues against Gregory VII’s policies that are intended to increase the enforcement of clerical chastity, as part of the Gregorian Reform.<sup>34</sup> In order to convince his readers that Gregory VII is in the wrong, Sigebert attempts to counter

---

<sup>33</sup> “*Gregorius papa celebrata synodo symoniacos anathematizavit, et uxoratos sacerdotes a divino officio removit, et laicis missam eorum audire interdixit, novo exemplo, et ut multis visum est inconsiderato prejudicio, contra sanctorum patrum sententiam, qui scripserunt, quod sacramenta quae in aecclesia fiunt, baptismus scilicet, crisma, corpus et sanguis Christi, Spiritu sancto latenter operante eorundem sacramentorum effectum, seu per bonos, seu per malos intra Dei aecclesiam dispensentur, tamen quia Spiritus sanctus mystice illa vivificat, nec bonorum meritis dispensatorum amplificantur, nec malorum peccatis attenuantur. Unde est: “Hic est qui baptizat.”*

*Ex qua re tam grave oritur scandalum, ut nullius heresis tempore sancta aecclesia graviori scismate discisa sit, his pro justitia, illis contra justitiam agentibus; aliis a symonia non declinantibus, aliis notam avaritiae honesto nomine pretextentibus dum hoc quod se gratis dare jactant, sub caritatis nomine vendunt, et ut de Montanis dicit Eusebius, sub nomine oblationum artificiosius munera accipiunt; porro continentiam paucis tenentibus, aliquibus eam modo causa questus ac jactantiae simulantibus, multis incontinentiam perjurio aut multipliciori adulterio cumulantibus.”* Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 217 A - 218 A.

<sup>34</sup> For the Gregorian Reform, see Cowdrey’s extensive discussion in H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*.

Gregory's arguments with those of a number of authorities, as well as to associate him with undesirable groups, such as Donatists and Montanists, and actions, such as the desecration of the Eucharist.

Sigebert attempts to prove that Gregory VII's arguments go against past authorities. At the beginning and end of this passage, Sigebert writes of a "*novum exemplum*" and "*profanis novitatibus*," claiming that Gregory VII has no historical basis for his decrees. Sigebert supports this argument with examples from authors of the Patristic Period, who he notes both as a group ("*sanctorum patrum sententiam*") and individually, by quoting the works of Augustine and Eusebius.

Sigebert even directly quotes the Gospel of John in support of his argument, which is rare in the *Chronica*.<sup>35</sup> This passage is also used by Saint Augustine in his arguments against Donatism.<sup>36</sup> Thus, Gregory VII seems to be arguing against not only the words of John the Baptist, via the Gospel, but to be ignorant of the teachings of Saint Augustine. Additionally, Sigebert draws upon the support of Eusebius of Caesarea: "and, as Eusebius said of the Montanists, they accept bribes, craftily, under the name of 'oblation.'"<sup>37</sup> Although this citation does not attack Gregory VII directly, but rather his followers and the corrupt among the hierarchy of the Church, it rhetorically places Pope

---

<sup>35</sup> Specifically, John 1:33, "*Hic est qui baptizat in Spiritu Sancto.*"

<sup>36</sup> Augustine, "*De Baptismo Contra Donatistas*," In *Augustin: The Writings Against the Manichaeans, and Against the Donatists*. Ed. Philip Schaff. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 4. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999, p. 438. Augustine. *Traité anti-Donatistes II*. Ed. Martine Dulaey and Jean-Marie Salamito. In *Bibliothèque Augustinienne*. Vol. 29. Turnhout: Brepols, 1964, III.IV.

<sup>37</sup> "*Et ut de Montanis dicit Eusebius, sub nomine oblationum artificiosius munera accipiunt.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 217 C. See also Eusebius of Caesarea. *Eusebius: Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999, p. 235, V.XVIII.2. For the Latin and Greek parallel text, see *Die Kirchengeschichte*. Ed. Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903-1909.

Gregory, along with his camp, in opposition to another of the Fathers of the Church. As Sigebert's work is a continuation of Eusebius' chronicle, he may even see himself as taking up Eusebius' mantle in this respect as well, and fighting heresy in his place.

In conjunction with his placing Gregory VII against a number of the Church Fathers, Sigebert associates Gregory's position with the doctrines of a number of heresies. The Donatist heresy takes the foremost position in Sigebert's argument, both here and in the *Apologia Contra Eos Qui Calumniantur Missas Coniugatorum Sacerdotum*.<sup>38</sup> In some respects, Sigebert here has a valid theological argument, as the invalidation of Masses held by unchaste priests may imply that the validity of a sacrament stems from the moral status of its mortal bestower.

In the *Apologia Contra Eos Qui Calumniantur Missas Coniugatorum Sacerdotum*, Sigebert steps beyond this argument and uses it to direct attention away from the topic of clerical chastity, refocusing the entirety of the debate around Donatism, a battle that, luckily for Sigebert, had been fought and won by many of the Church Fathers more than six centuries earlier.<sup>39</sup> Sigebert channels the argument similarly in this passage in the *Chronica*, accusing Gregory VII's followers of the evils of Montanism, which was not otherwise related to the reforms promoted by Gregory VII's papacy.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Apologia Contra Eos Qui Calumniantur Missas Coniugatorum Sacerdotum*. In MGH *Libelli de Lite* II, 436-448.

<sup>39</sup> See, for example, Augustine's many works against Donatism, in Augustine. *Augustine: The Writings Against the Manichaeans, and Against the Donatists*. See also Frend's discussion of Augustine and the Donatists. W. H. C. Frend. *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952, p. 227-243.

<sup>40</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 217 C. Montanism's belief system was related to the idea of a new revelation being granted to Montanus and his followers; Sigebert's quote of Eusebius focuses on simoniac tendencies and corruption more than anything integrally related to the Montanist faith. See John D. Zizioulas. "The Early Christian Community." In *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth*

Sigebert goes even further when he writes that “Out of this matter arose such a grave scandal, that at the time of no heresy was the Holy Church more cut apart with a graver schism.”<sup>41</sup> In doing so, Sigebert not only associates Gregory’s reforms with all heresies and schisms, but claims that it dwarfs them all in terms of the damage that it had done to the fabric of the Church.

The letters of Gregory VII and the decrees of his predecessors do not claim that the sacraments given by simoniac or unchaste priests are invalid.<sup>42</sup> While they urge that these priests no longer celebrate or assist in celebrating the Mass, this is couched in terms of fitness of priests as examples to the Christian Church, rather than effectiveness of sacraments, and should likely be viewed as penitential rather than indicative of Donatist theology. These decrees do urge the common people to boycott the Masses said by these priests, but, again, these requests are not phrased in such a way to indicate that the souls of those who attend these Masses are endangered, or that the sacraments celebrated by these priests are ineffective. Rather, the popes’ intent seems to be to tap into popular or grassroots support for clerical reforms. A boycott of Masses would, among other things, undercut the financial support of unchaste priests, without the *populus* granting them tithes. Thus, the intent of these decrees was likely to pressure unchaste or simoniac priests toward reform both from above and below. Gregory VII and his predecessors were not explicitly threatening the people who attended Masses said by married priests with excommunication, nor were they displaying Donatist theological tendencies,

---

*Century*. Ed. McGinn, Meyendorff and Leclercq. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1985, p. 39-41.

<sup>41</sup> “*Ex qua re tam grave oritur scandalum, ut nullius heresis tempore sancta aecclesia graviori scismate discisa sit.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 217 B.

<sup>42</sup> H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 286-7.

claiming sacramental invalidity. Did Sigebert of Gembloux misapprehend the implications of the papal letters and claims about clerical chastity? Sigebert's works show this to be unlikely, as they demonstrate a high degree of sophistication in various genres. Sigebert would thus have likely been able to discern that the papal letters did not express Donatist theology, only feigning this misapprehension for its rhetorical possibilities.

The next section of Sigebert's argumentation is concerned with the impact of Gregory's arguments on the laity and the fabric of the Church.

For this reason, the lay people rose up against the Holy Orders at this point, and cast themselves out from subjection to the entire church. The lay defiled sacred mysteries and disputed about them; they baptized infants, using the foul humor of the ears in the place of sacred oil and chrism; they paid little attention to accepting the viaticum of the Lord at the end of life and the customary burial services of the Church from married priests; the tithe assigned to the priests they burnt with fire; and, as one thing outweighing the rest, the lay people often trampled underfoot the consecrated body of the Lord given by married priests, and poured out the blood of the Lord voluntarily, and many other deeds against Law and Right were done in the Church; and on this occasion many false teachers rose up in the Church, turning the common people from ecclesiastic discipline to profane newnesses.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> “*Ad hoc hac oportunitate laicis insurgentibus contra sacros ordines, et se ab omni aecclesiastica subjectione excutientibus. Laici sacra misteria temerant et de his disputant; infantes baptizant, sordido humore aurium pro sacro oleo et crismate utentes; in extremo vitae viaticum dominicum et usitatum aecclesiae obsequium sepulturae a presbiteris conjugatis accipere parvipendunt; decimas presbiteris*

Sigebert gives a number of graphic examples of the harm caused by these ‘reforms’ on the laity, from avoidance of sacraments and baptism with earwax – an inversion of the purification of baptism to putrification – to the burning of tithes and trampling of the Eucharist.<sup>44</sup> Although Sigebert does not explicitly blame Gregory for these results, the fault for the loss of the flock implicitly lies in the errors of the shepherd. Thus, Gregory VII and his reforms, Sigebert argues, are responsible for the potential loss of many souls.

Sigebert’s argumentation in this passage is exaggerated in a number of cases. In the case of the reaction of the laity to Gregory VII’s decrees, although we cannot judge the extent to which attacks on sacraments bestowed by unchaste priests occurred, it does seem that Sigebert increased the geographical extent of lay rebellions against the priesthood.

We can gain some insight by comparing Sigebert’s descriptions of the uprisings of 1074 with those of other contemporary chroniclers, like that of Lampert of Hersfeld, who describes an uprising in 1074 where the Archbishop of Cologne is expelled from his city.<sup>45</sup> Thus, it seems likely that Sigebert is, in fact, describing the uprising that took place in Cologne, while making it seem as though it took place all across Christendom.

Sigebert of Gembloux goes about portraying the uprising at Cologne in an interesting

---

*deputatas igni cremant; et ut in uno cetera perpendas, laici corpus Domini a presbiteris conjugatis consecratum sepe pedibus et conculcaverunt, et sanguinem Domini voluntarie effuderunt, et multa alia contra jus et fas gesta sunt in aecclesia; et hac occasione multi pseudomagistri exurgentes in aecclesia, profanis novitatibus plebem ab aecclesiastica disciplina avertunt.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 218 A – 218 B.

<sup>44</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 218 A and B.

<sup>45</sup> See Lampert of Hersfeld. *Annales* Ed. Oswaldus Holder-Egger. In *MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum*. Vol. 38. Hannover and Leipzig: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1894, 185-189.

way: he remains silent on the location of these events, and, instead, focuses on their gravity and purported causes. This is itself significant, as, in other revolts which he describes in the *Chronica*, Sigebert makes a point of mentioning the city in which it takes place.<sup>46</sup>

Since naming Cologne would provide Sigebert with a concrete example of the problems with the Gregorian Reform, why does he not do so? First, the anonymity of the actors in Sigebert's narrative allows him to project the uprising onto a much larger scale than just Cologne, where one might, as Lampert does, argue that an urban uprising could result from causes other than religious fervor. However, a second reason for generalizing this account appears in Sigebert's entry for the following year: "Anno, Archbishop of Cologne, died. He had enlarged his parish both in goods and in the monasteries which he founded, among which the monastery of Sigeberg was preeminent."<sup>47</sup> If Sigebert had associated Archbishop Anno with the reform movement, which Sigebert rails against at length, and the uprisings against it in his entry for 1074, he could hardly have eulogized Anno in the following year.

Sigebert also exaggerates the extent to which Gregory VII's decrees occur as a "*novo exemplo*."<sup>48</sup> Popes Leo IX [r. 1049-1054], Nicholas II [r. 1059-1061], and Alexander II [r. 1061-1073] forbid that Mass be said by unchaste priests.<sup>49</sup> Nicholas II's

---

<sup>46</sup> See, for example, the entry for 1077, where Sigebert writes "*et facta a Moguntinis seditione contra eos, Rodulfus cum archiepiscopo nocto aufugit*." [There was a plot against them by the residents of Mainz and Rudolph, with the archbishop, fled at night.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 220 A.

<sup>47</sup> "*Anno archiepiscopus Coloniensis obit, quia parochiam suam rebus et monasteriis a se fundatis ampliavit, inter quae preminet cenobium Sigebergense*." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 218 B and C.

<sup>48</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 217 B.

<sup>49</sup> In 1049, 1059, and 1063, respectively. H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 269-270.

decree, in 1059, forbade the laity from attending Masses performed by unchaste priests, and threatened the priests with excommunication if they said Mass while unchaste.<sup>50</sup>

It is, however, more difficult to discern the timeline of Gregory VII's actions on this issue. The major source for his pontificate is the Register of his correspondence; however, it leaves a number of gaps. It is likely that Gregory issued orders on clerical chastity during the Lenten synods of either 1074 or 1075, as there is an increased focus on clerical chastity in Gregory's letters in the following months.<sup>51</sup> Unfortunately, there is no record of the proceedings of the 1074 synod in the Register, and the record of the 1075 synod is brief, listing those who were excommunicated, but not any decisions pertaining to policy.

However, in the *Epistolae Vagantes*, Gregory refers to the actions of the 1075 synod against both simony and clerical unchastity.<sup>52</sup> The letters in the Register following the 1075 synod, moreover, refer to this synod as when decrees against unchastity were promulgated.<sup>53</sup> H. E. J. Cowdrey notes that, in this period, Gregory particularly focused on the Roman Empire, sending a number of letters to German archbishops which instructed them to enforce clerical chastity.<sup>54</sup> The *Epistolae Vagantes* also record an open letter to “*omnibus clericis et laicis in regno Teutonicorum*,” in which he urges

---

<sup>50</sup>Uta-Renate Blumenthal. “Pope Gregory VII and the Prohibition of Nicolaitism.” In *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform*. Ed. Michael Frassetto. New York: Garland Pub., 1998, p. 242.

<sup>51</sup>H. E. J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 274 and 272.

<sup>52</sup>Gregory VII. *The Epistolae Vagantes of Pope Gregory VII*. Trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972, no. 9, p. 18-23.

<sup>53</sup>E.g., Gregory VII. *The Register of Pope Gregory VII 1073-1085: An English Translation*. Trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 2.62 and 2.67.

<sup>54</sup>H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, 271-277.

disobedience to all unchaste priests and the bishops who support them.<sup>55</sup> Cowdrey also notes that Gregory VII's arguments for clerical chastity did not rely upon Scripture nor upon the earliest Church Fathers, but on the writings of Pope Leo the Great [r. 440-461] and Pope Gregory the Great [r. 590-604].<sup>56</sup> Gregory VII argued that unchaste priests were ritually impure, and that chastity, as it was a virtue, should be cultivated by the clergy.<sup>57</sup>

Another attack against Gregory VII occurs in Sigebert's portrayal – or lack thereof – of the “Walk to Canossa.” Sigebert's manipulation of the timing of events, as well as his inclusion of an attack on the Dionysian calendar in order to minimize the severity of the blow to King Henry's reputation have been discussed above. In brief, Sigebert delayed Henry's excommunication from 1076 to 1077, so that Henry's absolution would appear to have occurred only months after his excommunication, rather than a year.

Sigebert undermines Gregory VII's actions in this year in a number of additional ways. Gregory's excommunication of Henry is made to appear as a politically opportunistic action, rather than having any religious basis, done more to attack an enemy and save his own position than for anything else. “Hildebrand, in return, excommunicated Emperor Henry from Rome, in the hope that the leading men of the kingdom would contest him, as though with a just cause, while the king was

---

<sup>55</sup> Gregory VII. *Epistolae Vagantes*, no. 11, p. 26-27.

<sup>56</sup> H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 286.

<sup>57</sup> H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 286-287.

excommunicated.”<sup>58</sup> Sigebert sharpens his criticism of Gregory VII’s actions with his inclusion of the phrase “*quasi justa ex causa*,” with the implication that the cause for rebellion would not, in fact, be just. Sigebert, thus, implies that the renewed rebellion of the Saxons, “*instinctu Hildibrandi papae*,” who were under terms of surrender and had been paroled, was a betrayal.<sup>59</sup>

The meeting of Gregory VII and King Henry at Canossa is depicted with their roles almost reversed. No mention is made of Henry appealing as a humble penitent. In fact, according to Sigebert, Gregory rushes to meet Henry, rather than waiting in Canossa, hoping that he would go away rather than having to grant him absolution.<sup>60</sup> The meeting itself is described as occurring under a false peace, and, given Gregory’s rushing to meet Henry and the subsequent crowning of Rudolph of Rheinfelden as the German anti-King, the implication is that the blame for the false peace lies with Gregory, rather than with Henry.<sup>61</sup> In the wake of Canossa, Gregory VII is also seen to abuse his power, absolving “all the enemies of the emperor . . . from their faithlessness and perjury.”<sup>62</sup> Sigebert’s feelings about this action are made clear by his use of the terms *infidelitate* and *perjurio* for the actions of the emperor’s enemies, associating them with the false peace under which Gregory VII met with King Henry.

Sigebert further attacks Gregory VII’s credibility in the entry for the year 1080.

In this year, Gregory VII claims to have had a prophetic revelation of the death of the

---

<sup>58</sup> “*Hildibrandus econtra imperatorem Heinricum Romae excommunicat, sub hoc optentu, ut primates regni quasi justa ex causa excommunicatio regi contradicant.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 C.

<sup>59</sup> “At the instigation of Pope Hildebrand” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 C.

<sup>60</sup> “*Occurrens imperatori.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 C.

<sup>61</sup> “*Sub falsa cum pace.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 C.

<sup>62</sup> “*Omnes adversantes imperatori . . . ab infidelitate et perjurio.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 220 A.

false king, by which he meant Henry. However, Rudolph, Gregory's candidate for the kingship, in fact died in this year.

Pope Hildebrand predicted, as though it was divinely revealed to him, that in this year the false king would die. And, indeed, he did predict it correctly, but he was incorrect in his conjecture about the false king, thinking that it should be interpreted as about King Henry, according to his wishes. For King Henry engaged the Saxons in a great battle, and in the clash the false king Rudolph, along with many of the leaders of Saxony, was killed.<sup>63</sup>

Sigebert explicates these happenings to his readers with gusto, as they both damage Gregory's secular position as well as portraying him as a false prophet. Despite Gregory VII's interpretation of the prophecy proving to be incorrect, in one sense it did come true, with the "false king" (in Sigebert's opinion, at the very least) meeting with his demise. As this downfall is connected with a prophecy, it may have been connected, in Sigebert's readers' minds, with either divine intervention or revelation. As such, the fall of Rudolph and the victory of Henry IV takes its place in a long line of defeats of false kings, going all the way back to David's replacement of Saul.

Sigebert's narrative of the year 1081 has been briefly discussed, as it is in this year that Sigebert, with his discussion of the work of Marianus Scotus, attempts to hide Henry's blame in the invasion of Italy, and instead to apportion it all to Gregory VII. At first, both Henry and Gregory were actors in the cataclysm "from which the earth was

---

<sup>63</sup> "Hildibrandus papa quasi divinitus revelatum sibi predixit, hoc anno falsum regem esse moriturum. Et verum quidem predixit, sed fefellit eum de falso rege conjectura secundum suum velle super Heinricho rege interpretata. Rex enim Heinrichus Saxonibus gravi prelio concreditur, et in congressu falsus rex Rodulfus cum multis Saxoniae principibus extinguitur." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 220 B and 220 C.

hurt and yet still hurts.”<sup>64</sup> After the passage that focuses on Marianus Scotus, however, the blame rests on Gregory VII. Even before this passage, Sigebert’s word choice prepares for this shift in tone, implying that Henry is merely subduing a rebel. Henry is described as attacking Italy “to subdue Pope Hildebrand,” whereas Gregory prepares himself “to rebel.”<sup>65</sup>

Sigebert’s choice of related words to describe these two opponents is intentional, placing one actor in the right and the other in the wrong. *Debellare* has a sense of rightly defeating someone who is part of an uprising, and reasserting the correct order.

*Rebellare*, however, has a sense of fighting against legitimate authority. In the end, when the Romans turn on Gregory, Sigebert argues that this happening does not occur because of the German army surrounding Rome, but because the Romans had tired of having a “dissimulating pope.”<sup>66</sup> After Gregory VII has fled the city, Sigebert makes note of the arguments made both for and against Gregory’s papacy. While the Anti-Gregorian arguments are well received, Sigebert discredits the Pro-Gregorian faction, noting that “and the rest [of the arguments] were of that sort.”<sup>67</sup>

Sigebert includes one additional attack against Gregory VII with the inclusion of a forged letter supposedly written by Gregory on his deathbed.<sup>68</sup> In this letter, Gregory supposedly repents his attacks against Henry IV and wishes to reconcile with him,

---

<sup>64</sup> “*Unde terra doluit et dolet.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 220 C.

<sup>65</sup> “*Ad debellandum papam Hildibrandum,*” and “*ad rebellandum.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 220 C and 221 A.

<sup>66</sup> “*Dissimulante papa.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 221 B.

<sup>67</sup> “*Et cetera id genus.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 222 A.

<sup>68</sup> Bethmann notes that this letter need not have been forged by Sigebert, but that it may have been based on rumors that had been circulating at the time, and is found in Hugh of Flavigny and other manuscripts. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 221. See also H. E. J. Cowdrey. *The Age of Abbot Desiderius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983, p. 250.

seemingly recognizing the errors of his ways while in exile and dying. This letter also undermines the entirety of the Church Reform movement, as it is both disavowed by one of its strongest proponents and described as a grab for power.

We wish you who care for the Church, to know that our apostolic lord, Hildebrand, now *in extremis* calls to himself one of the 12 cardinals, whom he loves much, more than the others, and he is confessed to God and Saint Peter and the whole Church, that he has gravely sinned in his pastoral duty, which he had undertaken in order to reign, and with the devil persuading him, had stirred up hatred and wrath against the human race, afterwards, truly, the feeling which was brought upon the globe of the earth, he said that he had done for the growth of Christianity. Only then did he send his aforesaid confessor to the emperor, and to the whole Church, so that he might beg their forgiveness, because he saw that the end of his life was near. And so, quickly, he dressed himself in angelic robes, and abandoned and dissolved the chains of all of his edicts against the emperor and all Christian people, living and dead, clerics and laity; and he bids his own men to depart from the house of Theodoric<sup>69</sup> and rise up as friends of the emperor.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Castel Sant' Angelo. H. E. J. Cowdrey. *The Age of Abbot Desiderius*, 250.

<sup>70</sup> “*Volumus vos scire, qui aecclesiasticae curae solliciti estis, quod dominus apostolicus Hildibrandus nunc in extremis suis ad se vocavit unum de 12 cardinalibus, quem multum diligebat pre ceteris, et confessus est Deo et sancto Petro et toti aecclesiae, se valde peccasse in pastoralis cura, quae ei ad regendum commissa erat, et suadente diabolo contra humanum genus odium et iram concitasse, postea vero sententiam quae in orbe terrarum effusa est, pro augmento christianitatis cepisse dicebat. Tunc demum misit predictum confessorem suum ad imperatorem, et ad totam aecclesiam, ut optaret illi indulgentiam, quia finem vitae suae aspiciebat. Et tam cito induebat se angelicam vestem, et dimisit ac dissolvit vincula omnium bannorum suorum imperatori et omni populo christiano, vivis et defunctis, clericis et laicis; et iussit suos abire de domo Deoderici, et amicos imperatoris ascendere.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 222 B – 223 A.

Thus, in this deathbed repudiation of his actions, even Gregory VII, who is portrayed as the archenemy of the Empire and of Henry IV, seems to see the light and to wish to correct his ‘reforms.’ This letter appears in stark contrast to Gregory VII’s more authentic last words: “*Dilexi iustitiam et odivi iniquitatem, propterea morior in exilio.*”<sup>71</sup> With this supposed shift in Gregory’s attitude towards reform on his deathbed, Sigebert is able to further undermine all of his past actions with regard to church reform.

### Attacks on Urban II

Pope Victor III’s reign, from 1086 to 1087, was too brief for Sigebert to mount any major programmatic attacks against him. Sigebert returns to the offensive with the reign of Pope Urban II. Sigebert’s treatment of Pope Urban II in his entry for the year 1088 follows a similar pattern to his undermining of Urban’s predecessor, Gregory VII, albeit in a condensed format.

Odo, a Cluniac monk, the Bishop of Ostia became pope, against the emperor and Guibert, and was named Urban. Henceforth, scandals in the Church and in the kingdom increased discord, while one dissented from the other, while the kingdom and the priesthood differed, while one excommunicated the other, the other despised the one’s excommunication, either for its grounds or out of prejudice for the excommunicator; and while one wished for greater authority for excommunicating the other at his whim, which he wasted out of respect for justice. His authority, which gave the power of binding and loosing, was altogether despised. Without doubt, so that I might have spoken with respect of all good men, this newness alone, I shall not say heresy, had not yet emerged into the

---

<sup>71</sup> H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 680.

world, so that his priests, who say “apostate” to the king and who make a hypocrite reign because of the sins of the people, teach the people that they owe no fealty to bad kings, and that it is permitted to them to swear an oath of faithfulness, nevertheless that they owe no fidelity, nor are they to be called perjurers, who plot against the king; in the contrary, those who obey to the king are held to be excommunicated, and those who act against the king are absolved from the harm of injustice and perjury.<sup>72</sup>

Although Sigebert attacks both the kingdom and the papacy for their actions in this period of the Investiture Contest, the papacy bears the brunt of the attacks. The kingdom is primarily mentioned as an actor at the beginning of this passage, but it is always paired with the Church, thus there are “scandals both in the Church and the kingdom . . . while the kingdom and the priesthood differed, while one excommunicated the other, the other despised the one’s excommunication, either for its grounds or out of prejudice for the excommunicator.”<sup>73</sup> The remainder of this passage attacks the papacy and its allies, with the kingdom suffering at their hands. Sigebert makes clear that, in this

---

<sup>72</sup> “*Odo ex monacho Cluniacensi episcopus Ostiensis, contra imperatorem et Guicbertum fit papa, et Urbanus nominatur. Hinc in aeclesia scandala et in regno augescunt discidia, dum alter ab altero dissidet, dum regnum et sacerdotium dissentit, dum alter alterum excommunicat, alter alterius excommunicationem aut ex causae aut ex personae prejudicio despicit; et dum alter in alterum excommunicandi auctoritate magis ex suo libitu, quam ex justitiae respectu abutitur, auctoritas illius, qui dedit potestatem ligandi ac solvendi, omnino despicitur. Nimirum, ut pace omnium bonorum dixerim, haec sola novitas, ne dicam heresis, necdum in mundo emergerat, ut sacerdotes illius, qui dicit regi apostata, et qui regnare facit ypocritam propter peccata populi, doceant populum, quod malis regibus nullam debeant subjectionem, et licet ei sacramentum fidelitatis fecerint, nullam tamen fidelitatem debeant, nec perjuri dicantur, qui contra regem senserint; imo qui regi paruerit pro excommunicato habeatur, qui contra regem fecerit, a noxa injustitiae et perjurii absolvatur.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 223 D – 224 B.

<sup>73</sup> “*In aeclesia scandala et in regno . . . dum regnum et sacerdotium dissentit, dum alter alterum excommunicat, alter alterius excommunicationem aut ex causae aut ex personae prejudicio despicit.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 223 D, 224 A.

struggle, the papacy exceeds its authority in excommunicating, as Urban desires the power to excommunicate “at his whim.”<sup>74</sup>

Sigebert also implies popular distaste for the actions of the papacy and contempt for its power, saying that its power “was altogether despised.”<sup>75</sup> Sigebert then returns to the theme of *novitas*, or unprecedented action, of which he accused Gregory VII in the entry for 1074, reminding his readers of his previous attacks. Sigebert also manages to imply that Urban II indulges in some brand of heresy through the classical rhetorical technique of *praeteritio*, claiming “I shall not say anything of heresy,” which in fact can only bring the concept to his readers’ minds.<sup>76</sup> Sigebert depicts Urban II and his supporters as fomenters of rebellion and oathbreaking, by absolving all of those who side against King Henry.<sup>77</sup> Sigebert’s rhetoric in this passage is found foremost in his shaping of clear oxymorons, such as “Nor are they to be called perjurers, who plot against the king.”<sup>78</sup>

Sigebert creates a number of such contrasts with the result that the position and organization of the papacy appear as clearly corrupt. Although Urban II is not mentioned as frequently in this section as Gregory VII was in the previous section, this does not represent a softening of Sigebert’s argumentation against the papacy, but, rather, the first

---

<sup>74</sup> “*Ex suo libitu.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 224 A.

<sup>75</sup> “*Omnino despicitur.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 224 A.

<sup>76</sup> “*Ne dicam heresis.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 224 A.

<sup>77</sup> “*Doceant populum, quod malis regibus nullam debeant subjectionem, et licet ei sacramentum fidelitatis fecerint, nullam tamen fidelitatem debeant, nec perjuri dicantur, qui contra regem senserint; imo qui regi paruerit pro excommunicato habeatur, qui contra regem fecerit, a noxa injustitiae et perjurii absolvatur.*” [They teach the people that they owe no fealty to bad kings, and that it is permitted to them to swear an oath of faithfulness, nevertheless that they owe no fidelity, nor are they to be called perjurers, who plot against the king; on the contrary, those who obey the king are held to be excommunicated, and those who act against the king are absolved from the harm of injustice and perjury.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 224 A and B.

<sup>78</sup> “*Nec perjuri dicantur, qui contra regem senserint.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 224 A.

traces of Sigebert's adoption of a new rhetorical tactic in order to diminish the apparent position and power of the papacy. This tactic is fully developed and readily apparent in the section of the *Chronica* that concerns the First Crusade.

## Conclusion

In this section of the *Chronica*, from 1073 to 1094, Sigebert shows that his claims of authorial neutrality are merely formalities, or even a smoke screen created in order to inspire greater trust in his claims. He regularly advocates a consistent agenda in this portion of his work, both through outright attacks and more subtle rhetorical stylings. Sigebert's main attacks in this section fall into three categories. First, Sigebert repeatedly attacks the calendrical system of Dionysius Exiguus. This debate is one of Sigebert's passions, as he wrote a work devoted solely to that purpose, and, in his autobiographical entry in the *Liber De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, devotes more space to this topic than to any of his other works. However, these passages in the *Chronica* have secondary purposes as well. In alluding to specific moments in Jesus' life, Sigebert is able to craft comparisons between Jesus, Henry IV and Gregory VII that reflect positively on Henry and negatively on Gregory. As well, these discussions serve as pauses in the narrative, allowing Sigebert to affect a shift in his tone without creating the cognitive dissonance that would arise without such a pause.

Sigebert's other major attacks in this section focus on the Gregorian Reform, particularly under Gregory VII and Urban II. Sigebert includes lengthy polemic passages into the otherwise generally laconic *Chronica* attacking the policies and goals of both Gregory and Urban. In these passages, Sigebert accuses the Reform Papacy of

intentionally stirring up discord in Christendom. He also consciously misinterprets the decrees of the Reform Papacy in order to sidestep the issues of investiture, simony, and nicolaitism, and instead, through these misinterpretations, accuses the reformers of espousing heretical views, including that of Donatism.

## Chapter IV

### Analysis from the Council of Clermont (1095) to 1104

The second section of the *Chronica* that will be analyzed here extends from the Council of Clermont in 1095 to the capture of Acre by the Crusaders in 1104. The narrative of this decade marks an abrupt shift from Sigebert's previous Euro-centric discussion of events. In prior sections, Sigebert demonstrated a high degree of focus and rhetorical crafting in his arguments against the so-called "reforms" of the Gregorian Papacy. In this section, however, the actions of the participants in the First Crusade form the main body of the narrative, nearly eclipsing European events, including any negative actions on the part of the Papacy.

Sigebert's primary source for his description of the First Crusade was a letter sent from Duke Godfrey of Lotharingia, Count Raymond of Saint Gilles and Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa to Pope Paschal II [r. 1099-1118]. This letter was sent from Outremer in late 1099 and arrived in Paschal's hands in 1100.<sup>1</sup> Although Sigebert shows himself to have connections at the archepiscopal and imperial level, it would likely have taken him some time to secure a copy of this letter and to compose his narrative of the First Crusade. In 1101, Robert of Flanders had, at Paschal's instigation, attacked the city of Liège, the clergy of which had been excommunicated. The next year, Sigebert wrote a

---

<sup>1</sup> See Edward Peters, Ed. *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971, p. 292. See also Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, col. 226 note 329 and *Epistula (Dagoberti) Pisani archiepiscopi et Godefridi ducis et Raimundi de S. Aegidii et uniuersi exercitus in terra Israel ad papam et omnes Christi fideles*. In *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer. Innsbruck: Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchdruckerei, 1901, p. 167-174.

polemic against Paschal II because of this action.<sup>2</sup> Sigebert would have been composing his narrative of the First Crusade around this time, when his anti-papal feelings would have been running high. This can be shown through examination of the changes Sigebert introduced into the information provided in his sources for this period.

Sigebert's reliance on this letter as the source for much of his crusading narrative does not prevent him from rhetorically shaping the text of the *Chronica*. In fact, he both manipulates the text of the letter, and the non-European focus of the letter, itself, in order to continue his arguments against the "reforms" of Gregory VII's successors as pope. When Sigebert returns to focus on European affairs, near the end of this section, he once again attempts to bolster the status of Henry IV of Germany.

#### Authorial Preparation for the Crusade Narrative

Sigebert attempts to prepare his readers for the shift that takes place in his narrative during the time of the First Crusade, and thus seeks to prepare his readers for this shift. Although omens and portents appear regularly throughout the narrative of the *Chronica*, in the entries for 1095 and 1096 the concentration of these events comes to a peak.<sup>3</sup> Five separate omens – with many of them being significantly larger than the omens that normally appear in Sigebert's work (with the appearance of comets or stars in the sky being more common omens for Sigebert) – appear in the entry for 1095.<sup>4</sup> Sigebert begins ominously by noting that it was a "most calamitous year."<sup>5</sup> The

---

<sup>2</sup> Mireille Chazan. *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 86.

<sup>3</sup> See Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 219 C, 220 C, and 224 B for a few examples of omens in the *Chronica*.

<sup>4</sup> See *supra* and 235 B for standard omens used in the *Chronica*.

<sup>5</sup> "Annus calamitosus" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 C.

circumstances which make it so, including a large famine, were “long in the making,” increasing the perception that these catastrophes were taking place on the scale of all of Christendom.<sup>6</sup> The social order is disrupted as well, with lower classes stealing from and burning the property of the upper classes. Sigebert makes clear, however, that this is not for political reasons, but out of hunger-spawned desperation.<sup>7</sup> As well, omens simultaneously occurred in the lower air and on the earth, with an earthquake and a tornado both striking on 10 September.<sup>8</sup> This unlikely confluence of events increases the perception that these catastrophes occurred not as a part of the normal order of things, but because of a shift in the fabric of the world, possibly Divinely inspired. The penultimate omen of 1095 increases the reach of events from the lower air to the *aether* and the heavens.

In many parts of the earth, on 4 April around dawn a great many stars were seen to fall from the heavens to the earth at the same time; the biggest one of these dropped to the earth in France, which astounded a certain person, and the place where it fell was seen, and marked out, and, since water poured into that place, that person was astounded even more at the smoke that exited this place with the sound of boiling.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Or possibly “overdue.” “*Fames diu concepta validissime ingravatur.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 B.

<sup>7</sup> “*Multis fame laborantibus et pauperibus per furta et incendia ditiores graviter vexantibus.*” [With many laborers and paupers heavily vexing the richer men through theft and fire because of their hunger. (Emphasis mine)] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 C.

<sup>8</sup> “*Cum valido ventorum turbine etiam terraemotus factus est media nocte, 4 Idus Septembris.*” [Along with a strong tornado, there was also an earthquake in the middle of the night on 10 September.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 C.

<sup>9</sup> “*In multa terrarum parte pridie Nonas Aprilis circa diluculum stellae perplures simul de coelo in terram cecidisse visae sunt; inter quas unam maximam labi in terra cum quidam in Francia stuperet, et notato*

While even a single star falling from heaven may be taken as an omen, what Sigebert describes is many times larger, with “*perplures*” falling and, not in sequence, but “*simul*.” The narrative then moves from the cosmic level to the personal level, with descriptions of what individuals saw at the impact site. The final omen of this year occurs at the most personal level of all of these omens. “In the county of Namur, we saw bread baked under the ashes stained as though with blood”<sup>10</sup> Sigebert rarely speaks in the first person or includes his own experiences in the *Chronica*. This omen brings this series of five omens full circle, as it begins with the corruption or loss of food as it grows, and it now ends with the corruption of food as it is processed for consumption.

The entry for the year 1096 begins with a pair of omens in the form of lunar eclipses. Eclipses may signify darkness, both physical and metaphorical; thus, as the next sentence begins with the “Western Peoples, grieving . . .” the world may thought to have been cast into darkness along with their minds, and, as will be discussed later, react to that darkness and grief.<sup>11</sup> The only other earth- and air-related omens to occur in this section of the text appear at the beginning of the entry for 1097, just as the Crusaders reach the outskirts of the Holy Land. “Comets appeared in the West for the entire first week of October. Because of widespread flooding, the autumnal sowing was impeded, and sterility of the fruits of the earth followed.”<sup>12</sup> Thus, with this vast array of omens, Sigebert prepares his readers for the changes which will occur, both in the narrative and

---

*loco ubi labi visa est, cum aquam ibi fudisset, fumum cum fervoris sono inde exire magis stupuit.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 C.

<sup>10</sup> “*In comitatu Namucensi panem subcinericium quasi sanguine infectum vidimus.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 C.

<sup>11</sup> “*Occidentes populi dolentes,*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 A.

<sup>12</sup> “*Cometes in occidente apparuit tota prima ebdomada Octobris. Nimia aquarum inundatione autumnalis satio impeditur, et sterilitas frugum terrae sequitur.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 C.

in the world in the following entries in the *Chronica*. This also prepares the reader for shifts in Sigebert's argumentative techniques, as we shall see in further detail.

### The Council of Clermont, 1095

Modern accounts of the First Crusade often begin with a discussion of Urban II's preaching of the cross at the Council of Clermont in 1095, which speech has come to us in numerous versions, including the *Chronicle* of Fulcher of Chartres, the *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*, and the *Historia Quae Dicitur Gesta Dei per Francos* of Guibert of Nogent.<sup>13</sup> Sigebert, however, divides the events of this council into two parts, only one of which he associates with Pope Urban II. He ends his account of the year, after the omens discussed above, with this description of Urban's acts: "Urban, in councils held throughout Burgundy and France, renewed and confirmed the decrees of Hildebrand; Philip, king of the Franks, who, while his wife yet lived, married the wife of another man who was yet alive, he excommunicated."<sup>14</sup>

Sigebert pointedly casts Urban II as a successor of Gregory VII, both in his office and in his policies. He also inherits the mantle of distaste that Sigebert has woven for Hildebrand. Urban's primary concern seems to be for the reform of the Church and the obedience of the clergy and the laity. Any ambitions toward the recapture of the Holy Land are not evident in this passage. The possible exception to this may be the list of portents and signs that Sigebert includes, although, as Sigebert does not interpret them,

---

<sup>13</sup> Edward Peters, Ed. *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, p. 25-37. Urban II, *Sermons of Clermont*. Ed. *Varii*. In *PL* vol. 151. Paris: Garnier Freres, 1881, col. 565-582. For a full discussion of the Council of Clermont, see Dana Carleton Munro. "The Speech of Pope Urban II. At Clermont, 1095." *The American Historical Review*. 11:2 (1906), p. 231-242.

<sup>14</sup> "Urbanus per Burgundiam et Franciam habitis conciliis, Hildibrandi decreta renovat et confirmat; Philippum regem Francorum, qui vivente uxore sua superduserat alterius viventis uxorem, excommunicat." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 D.

they may simply be taken as signs of changes and upheavals that are to come, rather than of any policy formulated by Urban II.

The more widely-known aspect of Urban II's councils, the call to take up the cross, appears not in the entry for 1095, but in that for 1096, with no mention of Urban and scarcely any mention of the institutional Church at all.

The Western Peoples, grieving that the holy places of Jerusalem were profaned by gentiles, and that, furthermore, the Turks had already invaded the borders of the Christians on many sides, innumerable men were moved with one desire, and many signs presented themselves, some were roused by others, dukes, counts, powerful men, noble and ignoble, rich men and paupers, free men and serfs, bishops, clerics, monks, old men and young men, even boys and girls, all of one mind, none under any compulsion, gathered in from every direction, from Spain, from Provence, from Aquitaine, from Brittany, from Scotland, from England, from Normandy, from France, from Lotharingia, from Burgundy, from Germany, from Lombardy, from Apulia and from other kingdoms.<sup>15</sup>

The hierarchy of the Church goes almost unmentioned: bishops only appear in the list of juxtapositions of the high and low of all orders who joined the Crusade. Neither bishops, nor clerics, nor monks seem to have any pride of place in this list. They are granted neither the distinction of being listed first nor last, but are instead in the middle of this

---

<sup>15</sup> “*Occidentales populi, dolentes loca sancta Hierosolymis a gentilibus profanari, et Turcos etiam terminos christianorum jam multa ex parte invasisse, innumerabiles una aspiratione moti, et multis signis sibi ostensis, alii ab aliis animati, duces, comites, potentes, nobiles ac ignobiles, divites et pauperes, liberi et servi, episcopi, clerici, monachi, senes et juvenes etiam pueri et puellae, omnes uno animo, nullum ullo angariante, undique concurrunt, ab Hispania, a Provincia, ab Aquitania, a Britannia, a Scottia, ab Anglia, a Normannia, a Francia, a Lotharingia, a Burgundia, a Germania, a Langobardia, ab Apulia et ab aliis regnis.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 A-226 B.

list, between “free and servile” and “old and young.”<sup>16</sup> If the clergy were to be placed alongside a group, surely a position near the “dukes, counts, powerful men, [and] nobles” would have a higher status.<sup>17</sup> While Sigebert notes that none were compelled to do this, while its surface meaning is that this was not an army of conscripts, it also carries the implication that there was no single, driving force, in the form of the papacy, to spur on this Crusade.<sup>18</sup> The original impetus that led to the Crusade is also depicted as popular, rather than being imposed from the top down by the Church: it is the “Western People” who are grieving, not the “Western Clerics,” and the participants of the Crusade were “moved with one hope,” not “moved by a single leader.”<sup>19</sup>

This description is a conscious fashioning of the historical record on Sigebert’s part, rather than a slavish copying of the sources. The Annals of Liège, one of Sigebert’s sources for the Council of Clermont, describes the happenings of the council thus:

1095. A famine, long in coming, gained in strength. The Western Christians, indignant that the holy place of Jerusalem was occupied by pagans, set out against them with one plan. Urban, who is also called Odo, against Pope Guibert, renewed the decrees of Hildebrand.<sup>20</sup>

Although Sigebert’s source places the beginning of the Crusading movement in 1095 at the Council of Clermont, clearly seeks to dissociate the movement from the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and especially the papacy. The modifications which Sigebert

---

<sup>16</sup> “*Liberi et servi*” and “*senes et juvenes*.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 A.

<sup>17</sup> “*Duces, comites, potentes, nobiles*.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 A.

<sup>18</sup> “*Nullum ullo angariante*.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 A.

<sup>19</sup> “*una aspiratione moti*.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 A.

<sup>20</sup> “Error! Main Document Only.1095. *Fames diu concepta invalescit. Occidentales christiani, indignantes loca sancta Hierosolimis a paganis occupari, una conspiratione contra eos proficiscuntur. Urbanus, qui et Odardus, Guiberto papae aversus; Hildebrandi decreta renovat.*” Annals of Liège. Ed. Georg Pertz. In *MGH SS* vol. IV. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1841, p. 29.

makes to his source demonstrate both his methods and his aims. His goal is to separate Urban II, subtly, from the Crusade as much as possible. Thus, Sigebert's description of the taking of the cross also removes the ecclesiastical hierarchy from the process of the anointing of the Crusaders as pilgrims. Sigebert uses a noun phrase to obscure the actor, leaving the reader with only the result of the Crusaders being "signed and armed both with virtue and the sign of the holy cross."<sup>21</sup> Sigebert's conclusion of his entry for the year 1096 reinforces his argument that the Crusade was not a Church-driven movement:

Godfrey, duke of Lotharingia, and his brothers Eustace and Baldwin, Baldwin, count of Mons, Robert, count of Flanders, Stephen, count of Blois, Hugh, the brother of the king of the Franks, Robert, count of Normandy, Raymond, count of Saint Gilles, and Bohemond, duke of Apulia were prominent in this host of God."<sup>22</sup>

Sigebert lists many of the leaders of the Crusade, many of whom have royal ties and secular lordships. There is, however, a blatant lack of anyone with ecclesiastical office in this list, although a number of clergymen are known to have taken part in this Crusade.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>"*Et virtute et signo sanctae crucis signati et armati.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 A.

<sup>22</sup>"*Eminebant in hoc Dei hostico dux Lotharingiae Godefridus et fratres ejus Eustatius et Balduinus, Balduinus comes Montensis, Robertus comes Flandrensis, Stephanus comes Blesensis, Hugo frater regis Francorum, Rotbertus comes Normanniae, Reimundus comes de Sancti Egidii, Bojamundus dux Apuliae.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 B and C.

<sup>23</sup>Including Bishop Ademar of Le Puy, the papal legate. Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 2006, p. 60. Sigebert would certainly have been aware of Daimbert of Pisa's role in the Crusade as well, as he was a co-author of the letter which Sigebert used as a source for his narrative of the First Crusade. See *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p. 167-168.

## The Crusade Narrative and the Use of Names

One of Sigebert's major tools for influencing the perceived roles and importance of individuals during the Crusade is the use of names and titles to emphasize and de-emphasize certain actors. Sigebert does not only remove papal influence from the beginning of the First Crusade, but from its entirety. Although Sigebert describes a number of papal actions in the years surrounding the events of the First Crusade, the papacy is not mentioned from 1096 until 1100, despite Urban II's ongoing contention with an anti-pope.<sup>24</sup> This is all despite Sigebert's primary source for the First Crusade being directed to a pope and containing many passages in favor of papal authority.<sup>25</sup>

The first change which Sigebert makes to the letter of the Crusaders which he uses as a source may seem to be relatively minor: Sigebert altered only a single word: *Babyloniorum*. However, with this change, he removes an allegory that redounded to the power of the Church. In the letter to Pope Paschal II, the leader of the Muslims who attack Jerusalem is given the title of *rex Babyloniorum*.<sup>26</sup> The so-named *rex*

---

<sup>24</sup> For the reappearance of the papacy after the Crusade narrative with the death of Urban, see Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 228 B.

<sup>25</sup> For example: “*Igitur ad tam mirabilem fratrum vestrorum fortitudinis devotionem, ad tam gloriosam et concupiscibilem omnipotentis retributionem, ad tam exoptandam omnium peccatorum nostrorum per Dei gratiam remissionem, et Christi catholicae Ecclesiae, et totius gentis Latinae invitamus vos exultationem, et omnes episcopos, et bonae vitae clericos monachosque, et omnes laicos, ut ille vos ad dextram Dei considerare faciat, qui vivit et regnat Deus per omnia saecula saeculorum.*” [Therefore, we call upon you of the catholic church of Christ and of the whole Latin church to exult in the so admirable bravery and devotion of your brethren, in the so glorious and very desirable retribution of the omnipotent God, and in the so devoutly hoped-for remission of all our sins through the grace of God. And we pray that He may make you—namely, all bishops, clerks and monks who are leading devout lives, and all the laity—to sit at the right hand of God, who liveth and reigneth God for ever and ever.] *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p. 173. Trans. Edward Peters. *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*, p. 237.

<sup>26</sup> *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p. 171. See also *exercitum Babyloniorum* on p. 171 and *regis Babyloniae* on p. 172.

*Babyloniorum* is said to plan to lead the Franks “into captivity.”<sup>27</sup> The Crusaders clearly wish to make their story a retelling of the Babylonian Captivity with a different result, where Jerusalem is not conquered and its inhabitants are not taken to Babylon. This, however, places a great deal of emphasis on the religious aspect of the Crusade.

In his retelling of the story, Sigebert calls the leader of the Muslims the *rex Saracenorum*, removing the parallel with the Babylonian Captivity.<sup>28</sup> Through this change, Sigebert strips this victory of the Crusaders of a parallel with the Jewish Temple state, which could easily serve as an analogy for the papacy. One might argue that Sigebert changed this term because he believed that the term *rex Saracenorum* would be more appropriate than *rex Babyloniorum*, as, given his knowledge of history, Sigebert would have known that the Babylonian Empire had long since fallen. However, all of Sigebert’s sources refer to this man as *rex Babyloniorum*: the *Annals of Liège* refer to him in this way as well.<sup>29</sup> In light of the changes that Sigebert makes and does not make to his sources, the argument that Sigebert changed *Babyloniorum* to *Saracenorum* for accuracy’s sake alone seems far-fetched. Sigebert, as has been discussed and will be further discussed, makes a habit of using names for subtle rhetorical results. It stands to reason, then, that Sigebert might have continued to do so in this case. Also, when Sigebert uses this letter as a source for his Crusade narrative, he often includes excerpts from the original text, even if they are logistically improbable: he copies all of the

---

<sup>27</sup>“*Ducturus Francos qui Hierosolymis erant in captivitate, et expugnaturus Antiochiam.*” *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100.* Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p. 171.

<sup>28</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica.* In *PL* vol. 160, 227 C.

<sup>29</sup> *Annals of Liège.* In *MGH SSIV*, p. 29.

passages in his source which relate to numbers of casualties, troops, and horses.<sup>30</sup> Even when the numbers given by his source are unrealistically high, Sigebert tends to retain these numbers rather than to guess at what the real numbers were.<sup>31</sup> If Sigebert kept the Crusaders' estimate of the numbers of troops and casualties, why would he not accept the Crusaders' identification of their opponent? Occam's Razor thus suggests that the change in names is a purposeful argumentative technique on Sigebert's part.

Sigebert's pro-imperial bias leads readers to question how he chose his sources: was the letter to Paschal II from Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa, Godfrey, duke of Lotharingia, and Raymond, count of Saint Gilles the only source of information that Sigebert had about the First Crusade? Might he have had other sources, even other letters from Crusaders? In September of 1098, a number of Crusaders sent a letter to Pope Urban II from Antioch. Among the signatories are most of the men who Sigebert had

---

<sup>30</sup> “*Plus quam CCC millia*” [More than three hundred thousand] (*Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p. 168.) “*In toto exercitu vix C equi boni reperirentur*,” [In the entire army, hardly a hundred good horses could be found] (Ibid., p. 169.) “*Non plus quam V millia militum, et XV millia peditum fuissent, et in exercitu hostium C millia equitum, et CCC millia peditum esse potuissent*” [There were not more than five thousand knights, and fifteen thousand footsoldiers, and in the army of the enemies there could have been a hundred thousand horsemen and four hundred thousand footsoldiers] (Ibid., p. 172.) “*Ceciderunt ibi plus quam C millia Maurorum gladio. Timor autem eorum tantus erat, ut in porta civitatis ad II millia suffocati sint. De his vero qui in mari interierunt, non est numerus. Spineta etiam ex ipsis multos obtinuerunt.*” [There fell there by the sword more than a hundred thousand Moors. Moreover, their fear was so great that in the gate of the city nearly two thousand were suffocated. Of those, indeed, who perished in the sea, there is no count. Moreover, the thorns took many of their number.] (Ibid.). Compare with Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 C, 226D, 227 C, 227 D, and 228 A, respectively.

<sup>31</sup> E.g., *CCC millia, C millia equitum, et CCC millia peditum*. *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p. 168, 172, all appear in Sigebert as well. See Jonathan Riley-Smith. “Casualties and the Number of Knights on the First Crusade.” In *Crusades*. Ed. Kedar, Riley-Smith and Nicholson. Vol. 1. (2002), p. 13-28 for a discussion of various estimates of the size of the Crusading army.

named as those who “*eminebant in hoc Dei hostico.*”<sup>32</sup> In contrast, only Duke Godfrey and Count Raymond of Saint Egidius are signatories to the letter which Sigebert used for most of his narrative of the First Crusade. Though Sigebert may have gotten the names which he listed elsewhere, the degree of correspondence with this first letter is striking and suggestive.<sup>33</sup>

If Sigebert did, indeed, have this first letter, why might he have not used it in his narrative of the First Crusade? He may, indeed, have chosen the second letter because it narrated the Fall of Jerusalem, and may have not incorporated the first letter so as to use as few sources as possible, as he tends to use only a single source to describe any given event. However, this letter does mention the pacification of Romania, which Sigebert notes.<sup>34</sup> It also describes the Capture of Antioch in considerably more military detail than the letter to Paschal II does: why, then would Sigebert, if he had access to this letter, not use it as a source in the *Chronica*? The answer may lie in this letter’s view of the pope. While the letter to Paschal II does praise the pope, in comparison to the letter to Urban II it is subdued. It speaks of bringing the “Faith of Rome” to the cities of the East.<sup>35</sup> It also repeatedly claims the pope as “Spiritual Father” and the “Father and head of the Christian

---

<sup>32</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 226 B. The men who are present in both texts are Bohemond; Raymond, Count of Saint Egidius; Godfrey, Duke of Lotharingia; Robert, Count of Normandy; Robert, Count of Flanders; and Eustace, Count of Boulogne and brother of Godfrey. Only Baldwin, brother of Godfrey; Baldwin, Count of Mons; Stephen of Blois; and Hugo, brother of the king of the Franks are present in Sigebert’s list but not in the letter.

<sup>33</sup> It is likely that letters of this sort would not only be kept within the papacy, but made public to some extent, as they glorify both the Crusade and the papacy. As well, if Sigebert had managed to acquire a copy of the letter to Paschal II, it is not implausible that he would have encountered the letter to Urban II as well.

<sup>34</sup> *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p. 162. “*Acquisita et pacificata tota Romania.*” [All of Romania was acquired and pacified.] cf. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 227 A.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 164. “*Et ita Dominus noster Jesus Christus totam civitatem Antiochenam Romanae religioni et fidei mancipavit.*” [And so our Lord Jesus Christ freed the entire city of Antioch for the Roman religion and faith.]

religion.”<sup>36</sup> As well, this letter describes how all of “Romania, Cilicia, Asia, and Syria” will be brought under Urban’s sway.<sup>37</sup> Sigebert may have found these parts of the letter not to his liking and, because of that, chosen to ignore it as much as possible.

Sigebert adds a passage that is not in his sources to the end of the year 1099, after the capture of Jerusalem. In it, he notes that “Jerusalem was captured after about 460 years of being held by the Saracens, after it was captured for the second time under the Emperor Heraclius [r. 610-641].”<sup>38</sup> In the context of the absence of a papal role in the Crusade, this mention of an emperor is extremely significant. The removal of a papal role from the Crusade leaves a void: if the reconquest of Jerusalem is not about its return to Christian hands, what, then, is it about? Sigebert’s mention of Emperor Heraclius is the key to this problem: he could just as easily have said “Jerusalem was captured after about 460 years of being held by the Saracens.” By bringing the emperor into his narrative, Sigebert makes clear that the conquest of Jerusalem is about the regaining of a lost part of the Roman Empire, the current head of which is the Roman Emperor, Henry IV, not Paschal II.

One might object that this conclusion is too farfetched, and that Sigebert wanted to mark solemnly when a new kingdom began. Sigebert did, after all, begin to count the regnal years of the Principality of Jerusalem beginning in 1100. However, by comparing this narrative with that of his discussion of the Norman Conquest of England in 1066,

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 161. “*spirituali Patri nostro.*” [to our spiritual Father.] Also p. 164. “*Pater et caput Christianae religionis.*” [Father and head of the Christian religion.]

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 165. “*Decet enim ut nos Dei auxilio tuisque sanctis precibus acquiretores totius Romaniae, Ciliciae, Asiae, Syriae, te habeamus post Deum adiutorem et subvenientem.*” [For it is fitting that we, with the help of God and your holy prayers, will be the acquirers of all Romania, Cilicia, Asia and Syria, as we have you, after God, as our helper and coming to our aid.]

<sup>38</sup> “*Capta est autem Hierusalem post annos circiter 460, ex quo sub Eraclio imperatore secunda vice capta, possessa est a Saracenis.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica.* In *PL* vol. 160, 228 A.

which also occurred during Sigebert's lifetime, it becomes clear that Sigebert is doing more than only marking the beginning of a new kingdom.<sup>39</sup>

Removing titles or using different names (or none at all) in a narrative is an effective way to promote a certain bias without opening oneself to charges of partisanship, something which Sigebert was keen to avoid.<sup>40</sup> As noted above, Sigebert removes the influence of the papacy from the entirety of the First Crusade. However, he also makes a number of smaller changes to the names and titles of those who are present in his narrative. Sigebert often reveals his feelings about a person by the way in which he addresses them. Popes are rarely referred to as *papa [nomen]*: the term *papa* or *papatu* primarily appears in discussions of the papal succession: in contrast, most secular leaders are referred to with their title, or by both name and title.<sup>41</sup> By doing this, Sigebert separates those with secular power from the popes, creating a subtext where he can express his disapproval of growing papal power.<sup>42</sup> At times, Sigebert even refuses to use the regnal names of popes: though Gregory VII only appears once in Sigebert's Crusade narrative, he is called, as Sigebert almost always names him elsewhere, Hildebrand,

---

<sup>39</sup> Under the Anglo-Saxon kings of England, Sigebert did not take note of the regnal years of the *Reges Anglorum*. In his entry for the year 1066, Sigebert writes: "*Interim Guillelmus comes Nortmannorum cum Francis Angliam intrat, et conserto cum Anglis prelio, Araldum, cum multis milibus perimit, et regnat in Anglia annis 26.*" [Meanwhile, William, Count of the Normans, entered England with Franks, and, after a pitched battle with the Angles, he killed Harold, with many thousands, and reigned in England for 26 years.] The entry for 1066 ends, not with a description of how many years it had been since the Saxons had conquered England, but with the death of Saint Tietbald. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 214 C and 215 A.

<sup>40</sup> See Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 197 C, and previous discussions of that passage.

<sup>41</sup> For example, in the entry for 1102, Sigebert mentions "*Roberto Flandrensium comite*" as well as "*Heinricus imperator*." This pattern is followed in most years, with very few exceptions. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 228 C.

<sup>42</sup> To the possible counter-argument that Sigebert did not apply the title *papa* to popes because they would have been so well known there exists the following objection: emperors and kings are usually referred to by either both name and title or by title alone, rather than solely by name.

rather than Gregory.<sup>43</sup> In doing this to Gregory VII and other popes, Sigebert attempts to strip some of the pomp of the papal office from them, reducing their implicit power by denying them their regnal title.

Sigebert does not only modify the titles of popes. In the letter sent by the Crusaders to Paschal II, Godfrey, Duke of Lotharingia, describes his new position as the leader of those who remain in Jerusalem as “by the grace of God now Advocate of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher.”<sup>44</sup> This title appears nowhere in Sigebert’s *Chronica*: the title that he gives to the Christian leaders of Jerusalem is “Prince of the Jerusalemites.”<sup>45</sup> This change of title is consonant with Sigebert’s removal of papal power from his Crusade narrative: the title “Advocate of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher” contains clear ecclesiastical overtones.<sup>46</sup> Without changing Godfrey’s title to “Prince of the Jerusalemites,” Sigebert would have had difficulties in making the victory of the Crusade redound to the empire, rather than the Church.

## Conclusion

In this section of the *Chronica*, from 1095 to 1104, Sigebert’s narrative undergoes a definite shift, as he nearly forsakes describing events that happen in Europe in favor of focusing almost completely on the First Crusade. Sigebert, as an accomplished author, is aware of and consciously controls this shift in his narrative. He is able to continue his

---

<sup>43</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 D, “*Hildibrandi*.”

<sup>44</sup> “*Gratia Dei Ecclesiae S. Sepulcri nunc advocatus*.” *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p. 168.

<sup>45</sup> “*Princeps Hierosolimitanorum*.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 228 B. While the title *princeps Hierosolimitanorum* may appear in other texts, it is important to note Sigebert’s deviation from the only title given in the letter to Paschal II: Sigebert consciously chose to disregard the title *advocatus Ecclesiae S. Sepulcri*.

<sup>46</sup> It also implies the validity of a military arm of the Church, either through the institution of Crusading or through the Crusader states, which would give the papacy more secular power.

pro-Imperial anti-Reform Papacy argumentation throughout this section of the *Chronica*. Sigebert divides the events of the Council of Clermont over two different years, focusing on the actions of Pope Urban II in the first of these years, and ignoring him in the second year, in which Sigebert's discussion of the Crusade movement appears. In this description of the formation of the Crusading army, Sigebert repeatedly makes note of popular and non-ecclesiastical aspects of the movement, minimizing the Church's apparent influence in the Crusade.

Within the narrative of the Crusade itself, Sigebert shows an acute awareness of the rhetorical power of names and titles. In a thorough examination of Sigebert's sources for the First Crusade, it becomes clear that Sigebert changed the titles both of the Crusaders' enemies (e.g., *rex Babyloniorum* becomes *rex Saracenorum*), and of members of the Crusade itself (*Advocatus Ecclesiae S. Sepulcri* becomes *princeps Hierosolimitanorum*), removing parallels with the Babylonian captivity and making the Crusaders' role seem less like a function of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Additionally, Sigebert excises the presence of ecclesiastical figures, including the papal legate, from the narrative of the Crusade. Urban II also disappears from the narrative for the period beginning with the Council of Clermont (1095) and ending with his own death (1099, placed by Sigebert in 1100). Through these manipulations of the narrative, Sigebert is able to remove almost all aspects of the institutional Church from an event that might otherwise have significantly bolstered its status in his narrative, as well as validating the use of military force by the Church, which Sigebert would later argue against in his *Epistola Adversus Paschalem Papam*.

## Chapter V

### Analysis from 1105 to the *Pravilege* (1111)

This final section of the *Chronica*, reaching from the year 1105 to 1111, is unique in the work both for the length and detail of the entries and for Sigebert's extensive quotation from letters. The use of direct and acknowledged quotations, from time to time, creates narrative difficulties for Sigebert, as his sources do not always fit within his larger argumentative structure. Despite these authorial difficulties, Sigebert is able to manipulate the letters that he uses as sources in order to set the stage for the *pravilege*, the ceding of numerous rights by Paschal II to Henry V [r. 1106-1125] under duress, which serves as the final resolution, in Sigebert's view, to decades of papal overreaching and interference in secular politics. As such, Sigebert reincorporates arguments and attacks which he had used against the papacy of Gregory VII into a final salvo directed at Paschal II and Urban II, along with Gregory VII, bringing his argument full circle.

#### 1105: Rebellions Against Henry IV and the Rise of Sylvester IV

Sigebert's entry for the year 1105 in his *Chronica* is complex and requires close analysis, as, on first glance, it seems to be internally contradictory as well as to work against Sigebert's larger pro-Imperial, anti-Reform Papacy argumentation. In the first section of the entry, rebellion against the emperor on the side of the papacy is couched in positive terms: "the son of Emperor Henry . . . under the hope of bettering the state and restoring the Church, rebelled against him."<sup>1</sup> This tacit approval of rebellion against the emperor is very unusual in the *Chronica*: the rebellion of another of Henry's sons,

---

<sup>1</sup> This unnamed son is in fact the future Henry V. "*Filius imperatoris Heinrici . . . sub optentu meliorandae rei publicae et restaurandae aecclesiae, in eum insurgit.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 228 D and 229 A.

Conrad, from 1093 to 1101, is described with no positive terms. “Conrad, the son of Emperor Henry took himself to Italy to the enemies of his father.”<sup>2</sup> Sigebert otherwise remains tacit on Conrad’s actions until his death: “Conrad, the son of Emperor Henry, died in Italy while still a rebel against his father.”<sup>3</sup> Even if Henry IV’s younger son’s actions were incorrect, which Sigebert does not directly imply, he does claim that they were well-intentioned, being not for personal gain but for the improvement of the Church and the State.

Sigebert’s reaction to the election of anti-Pope Sylvester IV [1105-1111] differs significantly from his reactions to other anti-popes. Anti-Pope Clement III [1080-1100], who was enthroned in a very similar way to Sylvester IV, is described in this way: “the Romans received the Emperor, Henry, into the city; and at their judgment Pope Hildebrand was renounced, and Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, was enthroned in the apostolic seat, and was named Clement.”<sup>4</sup> Although Sigebert does not explicitly approve of the legitimacy of anti-Popes, Clement, as was discussed in the analysis of this passage regarding the years 1073 to 1094, is made to seem to have some claim to the papal throne. At the very least, Sigebert portrays the claimants to the papacy as “contending,” which allows him to undermine the status of the Gregorian popes.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> “*Conradus filius imperatoris Heinrici in Italia se ad patris sui adversarios contulit.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 225 A and B.

<sup>3</sup> “*Conradus filius Heinrici imperatoris, adhuc patri rebellis, in Italia moritur.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 228 B.

<sup>4</sup> “*Romani imperatorem Heinricum urbe recipiunt; et eorum iudicio Hildibrandus papa abdicatur, et Guibertus Ravennarum archiepiscopus in sedem apostolicam intronizatus Clemens nominatur.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 221 B.

<sup>5</sup> “*Contendens.*” See, for example, the death of Urban II and Clement III, in Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 228 B.

In the main narrative of this entry, however, Sigebert is decidedly hostile to the papal aspirations of Sylvester IV, calling the charge of simony directed against Paschal II to be “unjustly leveled,” implying that Paschal is, without doubt, the legitimate pope.<sup>6</sup> This appears in strange opposition to Sigebert’s normal attacks on the Gregorian popes, including Paschal II himself. One such attack appears in the entry for the year 1111:

“The discord which was between the kingdom and the priesthood; which was begun by Pope Gregory, the ninth [sic] of his name, who was named Hildebrand, and which was stirred up by the successors of Gregory, namely Victor and Urban, and above all others by Pascal, because of which there was a great scandal in the whole world.”<sup>7</sup>

Sigebert also openly condemns Sylvester IV, accusing him, with legal terminology, of being “guilty of usurpation” and, with the final phrase of this entry, erases him from the historical record.<sup>8</sup>

This portrayal of Paschal II and Sylvester IV is the diametric opposite of that advanced in the letter which Sigebert inserts into the narrative of this year. The text of this letter is only extant in the *Chronica*, though neither Bethmann nor Hirsch challenge its authenticity. The letter first posits a number of instances of simony in which Paschal II was a major player.

---

<sup>6</sup> “*Injuste injecta.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 A.

<sup>7</sup> “*Discordiam quae erat inter regnum et sacerdotium; quae cepta a Gregorio nono [sic] hujus nominis papa, qui Hildebrandus nominatus est, et exagitata a successoribus Gregorii, Victore et Urbano, et pre omnibus a Pascali, magno scandalo erat toti mundo.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 235 C and 236 A.

<sup>8</sup> “*Invasionis reus.*” Also, “*Maginolfus . . . reprobatur a Romanis, et fama nominis ejus evanuit.*” [Maginolfus . . . was rejected by the Romans, and the fame of his name vanished.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 A.

The primary cause of [the clerics' defection] was because they held Pope Rainerus to be polluted by the simoniac heresy, which they had ascertained without a doubt. Indeed, Rainerus, himself, was defamed publicly because while he was abbot of Saint Lawrence, he had sold the priory of that same church for 20 solidi to a certain monk; he himself could not deny it. He was also defamed, that, after Odo, in soliciting the papacy, he had promised in a sworn bargain to Gregory, the count of Tusculum, and to his son Theodolus and to Peter of Colonna, he had promised that he would give them one hundred pounds of denarii of Pavia and the twelfth part of the confession and three courts of the Church of Rome, namely Nympha, Zibera, and Arithia, if they would agree to his election; and when he was so elected, he would give in payment of the sum, a golden chalice of the Church and a purple mantle; indeed, Peter of Lyons and Albert son of Stephen would pay off the remainder of the sum for him; furthermore, he would give the weight of gold out of the treasury.<sup>9</sup>

Upon being confronted with these accusations, Paschal acts tyrannically against the Romans and is then expelled from the city and the papacy.

On account of this, the Romans, withdrawing themselves from association with him, in meetings between themselves and bishops and cardinals, and advised him

---

<sup>9</sup> “*Hujus rei maxima causa fuit, quia Rainerum papam pollutum esse symoniaca heresi pro certo compertum habebant. Infamabatur enim publice ipse Rainerus, quod dum fuisset abbas Sancti Laurentii, prioratum ejusdem aecclesiae vendiderit cuidam monacho 20 solidis; quod ipse diffiteri non potuit. Infamabatur etiam, quod post Odardum ambiens papatum, promiserit pacto et sacramento Gregorio comiti Tusculanensi et filio ejus Theodolo et Petro de Columna, se daturum eis centum libras denariorum Papiensium, et unciam confessionis, et tres Romanae aecclesiae curias, scilicet Nimpham, Ziberam, Arithiam, si assentirentur ejus electioni; et ita electus, dederit in hac summa solvenda calicem aureum aecclesiae et purpuream planetam; reliquum vero summae solverit pro eo Petrus Leonis et Albertus Stephani; libram etiam auri dederit scriniario.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 229 A-B.

to cleanse himself of such great infamy voluntarily. While Rainerus bore this shamefully, and aroused himself more to furor than to amends, and threatened torment and death for his accusers, the Romans, rightly protesting him as a heretic and schismatic, brought forward against him a sentence of just damnation.<sup>10</sup>

Sigebert's handling of this event diverges greatly from his description of similar events under Gregory VII, as noted above and described in the chapter analyzing the events of Gregory VII's papacy. Whereas, at Gregory VII's death, Sigebert introduced a forged letter into the narrative in which Gregory recants the policies of his papacy, here, Sigebert explicitly defends Paschal II against an anti-pope.

These contradictions, both within the entry for the year 1105 and with the *Chronica* as a whole raise the question of why Sigebert may have changed his behavior and argumentation for the entry for this year.<sup>11</sup> A number of possible reasons for Sigebert's actions may be proposed. The unnamed "son of Emperor Henry" of the beginning of this entry is in fact the future Emperor Henry V (r. 1106-1125); this fact, in and of itself, may be the reason for Sigebert treating this rebellion differently from the previous one led by Henry's other son, Conrad. As Henry V would succeed to the Imperial office and become, in 1111, the hero of the *Chronica*, Sigebert may have not wanted to attack him overly much, lest he undermine his future regime. However, in the

---

<sup>10</sup> "Ob hoc Romani se subtrahentes ab ejus communione, factis inter se conciliis cum episcopis et cardinalibus, monebant eum, ut de tanta infamia se sponte purgaret. Quod dum Rainerus ferret indigne, et se magis ad furorem quam ad satisfactionem accenderet, et accusatoribus tormenta et mortem intentaret, Romani eum vere hereticum et scismaticum protestantes, protulerunt in eum sententiam justae damnationis." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol 160, 229 B-C.

<sup>11</sup> Chazan believes Sigebert to be honest in his repudiation of Sylvester IV, taking his brief aside at the end of the entry for 1105 to represent his personal feelings, rather than as potentially a rhetorical device, as will be advanced in the following section of this chapter. See Mireille Chazan. *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 143 for her argumentation regarding this letter.

entry for 1106, Sigebert roundly attacks Henry V, saying “Henry, the son of the emperor, rebelling against his father against the laws of nature and man,” so a desire not to attack the future emperor cannot be the entire cause of Sigebert’s change of tack in this passage.<sup>12</sup>

Additionally, Henry V plays only a minor role in this entry, one that is made even more minor by Sigebert’s omission of his name. As was made clear in the discussion of the previous section of the *Chronica*, the presence and absence of names can be a powerful focalizing device in Sigebert’s hands. Sigebert’s conscious use of this rhetorical tool, both in this passage and elsewhere, is made plain by the focus on names at the conclusion of this entry: “the fame of his name vanished.”<sup>13</sup> Thus, although Henry V is portrayed in a somewhat positive light in this passage, this praise is diminished somewhat by Sigebert’s withholding of Henry’s name. By doing so, Sigebert is able to conceal the abrupt about-face which takes place in his entry for 1106, where he accuses Henry V of acting against “the laws of nature and man.”<sup>14</sup>

### Conflicting Treatments of Paschal II

Especially with Sigebert’s hiding of Henry V’s name in this entry, it becomes clear that Sigebert’s main focus here is on the papacy. What reasons might Sigebert have for supporting the papacy of Paschal II over that of Sylvester IV? One possibility might be to curry favor with the future Henry V, as in this year he fought on Paschal’s side

---

<sup>12</sup> “*Heinricus filius imperatoris, contra jus naturae et fas legum in patrem insurgens.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 A and B.

<sup>13</sup> “*Fama nominis ejus evanuit.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 A.

<sup>14</sup> “*Jus naturae et fas legum.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 B.

“under the hope of bettering the State and restoring the Church.”<sup>15</sup> Thus, if Paschal’s papacy were invalid, Henry V would appear, at best, to have been duped. However, as Sigebert openly attacks Henry V in the entry for 1106, Sigebert must have had some motivation other than appeasing Henry V.<sup>16</sup>

Another possible reason for this narrative shift may relate to Sigebert’s self-fashioning as an author. Sigebert noted earlier in the *Chronica* that he would be an unbiased reporter of events: “[the author] writes not what is seen, but what is heard and read.”<sup>17</sup> While this has been shown to be more of a rhetorical device than a reality, Sigebert may well have wished to preserve the fiction of his neutrality. Thus, by including accusations that challenge the legitimacy of Paschal II in a letter, and yet refuting them in the main body of the narrative, Sigebert is able to plant the seeds of doubt in Paschal’s regime without destroying his own status as a perceived neutral reporter.

This theory, however, does not explain adequately why Sigebert would not attack Paschal II to the same degree that he had attacked Gregory VII. In taking a larger view of the narrative, however, a reason for Sigebert’s defense of Paschal II may be found. The year 1111 sees the triumphant culmination of the *Chronica* with Henry V being crowned emperor of the Roman Empire by Paschal II and being granted numerous privileges in the so-called *privilege*.<sup>18</sup> If Paschal II’s legitimacy were to be called into

---

<sup>15</sup>“*Sub optentu meliorandae rei publicae et restaurandae aecclesiae.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 229 A.

<sup>16</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 A and B.

<sup>17</sup> “*Qui non visa, sed audita vel lecta scribe.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 197 C.

<sup>18</sup> See Alfred Haverkamp. *Medieval Germany, 1056-1273*. Trans. Helga Braun and Richard Mortimer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, p. 130 for the kidnapping of Paschal II by Henry V.

question, so too would the validity of the terms of the *pravilege*. As Sigebert saw the *pravilege* as a triumphant end to the Investiture Contest, he would have wished to portray it in the strongest way possible, even going to the extent of supporting the legitimacy of a pope who had ordered military attacks on the city of Liège, and whose program he attacks elsewhere in the *Chronica*.<sup>19</sup>

Why, then, if Sigebert is attempting to support the legitimacy of Paschal II's papacy, does he include the letter in this entry at all? There are two possible reasons for this, which are not mutually exclusive. First, as mentioned above, Sigebert may have included the letter in order to attack Paschal II in a voice other than his own. Although it befits the program of the *Chronica* for Sigebert to support Paschal's legitimacy, it is quite possible that Sigebert had retained some personal *animus* against him from the attacks that he had ordered Robert of Flanders to make on Liège two years earlier. Sigebert also had attacked these actions virulently in a polemic letter, *Adversus Paschalem Papam*, where he condemned Paschal's use of the material sword, rather than the spiritual sword.<sup>20</sup> The timing of the *pravilege* may also have influenced Sigebert's inclusion of this letter. As the *pravilege* only occurred in 1111, a year prior to Sigebert's death, he would not have been aware of the importance of supporting Paschal's legitimacy until, to his eyes, the triumphant end of the Investiture Contest occurred, along with Henry V's repudiation of Sylvester IV in the same year.<sup>21</sup> It is, therefore, quite possible that the

---

<sup>19</sup> See MGH *Libelli de Lite* II, 436-448 for the *Adversus Paschalem Papam*, as well as Mireille Chazan's discussion of it in *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 86-92.

<sup>20</sup> I. S. Robinson. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century*, 179.

<sup>21</sup> I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 309.

letter had already been included in the text of the *Chronica* before Sigebert had news of the *pravilege*. Rather than striking the text of the letter from the *Chronica* altogether, Sigebert may have decided to append a repudiation of the letter's arguments to the entry for that year. The theory that the final section of this entry, which absolves Paschal, might have been a late addition to the text is supported by the repudiation of Sylvester IV which ends the entry, as Sylvester was not formally repudiated by Henry V until the *pravilege* itself took place.

### 1106 and the Fall of Henry IV

The entry for the year 1106, which includes a letter from Emperor Henry IV,<sup>22</sup> is one of the longest in the *Chronica*, and contains a number of shifts in Sigebert's grand narrative. This year is perhaps particularly important to Sigebert because it concludes the half-century reign of Henry IV, who had ruled Germany for the vast majority of Sigebert's life and had played a major role both in the *Chronica* and in Sigebert's polemic letters. Sigebert's tone, in the narrative surrounding this letter, turns sharply against Henry V, accusing him of acting "against the laws of nature and men."<sup>23</sup> After the conclusion of the letter, with Henry V's assumption of power in Germany, Sigebert grants him the appellation of "*aequivocus*."<sup>24</sup> Although, as will be discussed in detail later, although Sigebert must spend some of the final years of the *Chronica* in rehabilitating Henry V's image after the attacks on him in this year, there are a number of reasons for Sigebert's shift in view of Henry V from the narrative of 1105 to 1106.

---

<sup>22</sup> This letter is extant in other sources; see, for example, *Monumenta Bambergensia*. Ed. Philippe Jaffe. In *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*, Vol. 5. Berlin: Weidmann, 1879, p. 241-246.

<sup>23</sup> "*Contra jus naturae et fas legum*." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 B.

<sup>24</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 234 B.

Part of Sigebert's accusatory tone against Henry V in these passages can be attributed to his own personal feelings and outrage. As Henry IV had been king for most of Sigebert's adult life, and moreover, because he was a figure that Sigebert had defended both in the *Chronica* and in his polemic letters, as well as addressing him directly in some of these letters, it is not unreasonable that Sigebert might have formed some sort of emotional connection to Henry IV. Additionally, Henry's circumstances, both leading up to, and in, his death may have merited an emotional response from Sigebert. One of the things that Henry IV most bemoans in his letter is being denied the sacraments, especially on Christmas.

For, so that I might be silent about the scandal, the injuries, the threats, and swords that had been exerted against my neck, unless I do all that was ordered; also that I would be silent about the hunger and thirst which I also bore, and from those who it was an injury to see or hear; also so that I might be silent about that which is worse, that I had once been happy enough: that I might never forget, and never cease to complain to all Christians, that I was incarcerated on those holiest of days without any Christian communion.<sup>25</sup>

This may have struck a chord with Sigebert, as, earlier in the *Chronica*, he had used the denial of sacraments to the laity to evoke rage against the actions of Gregory VII.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> “*Nam ut taceam obpropria, injurias, minas, gladios in cervicem meam exertos, nisi omnia imperata facerem; famem etiam, et sitim quam ferebam, et ab illis quos injuria erat videre et audire; ut etiam taceam, quod est gravius, me olim satis felicem fuisse: illud nunquam obliviscar, nunquam desinam omnibus christianis conqueri, quod illis sanctissimis diebus sine omni christiana communione in illo carcere fui.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 232 B.

<sup>26</sup> “*Laici sacra misteria temerant et de his disputant; infantes baptizant, sordido humore aurium pro sacro oleo et crismate utentes; in extremo vitae viaticum dominicum et usitatum aecclesiae obsequium sepulturae a presbiteris conjugatis accipere parvipendunt; decimas presbiteris deputatas igni cremant; et ut in uno cetera perpendas, laici corpus Domini a presbiteris conjugatis consecratum sepe pedibus et*

Henry IV died in Liège, quite near the monastery of Gembloux. From Sigebert's other works, we know that he maintained close connections with Liège, and the cathedral clergy there in particular.<sup>27</sup> It is, therefore, not unlikely that Sigebert may have even received emotionally charged firsthand accounts of the happenings of this year, which could have influenced his portrayal of events.

Although he may have been emotionally affected by the circumstances leading up to the death of Henry IV, Sigebert was also able to put Henry's letter, which he includes in the *Chronica*, to rhetorical use, continuing a dichotomy that he had previously constructed. During the era of Gregory VII, Sigebert often included a Biblical reference in the *Chronica* that reflected both on Gregory and on Henry IV, though more positively on the latter than on the former.<sup>28</sup> In including this letter from Henry IV, Sigebert creates yet another comparison between Gregory VII and Henry IV. In 1085, the year of Gregory's death, Sigebert's entry in the *Chronica* included a forged confessional letter from Gregory, some aspects of which were discussed in Chapter 3.

We wish you to know, who care for the Church, that our apostolic lord,  
Hildebrand, now *in extremis* calls to himself one of the 12 cardinals, whom he  
loves much, more than the others, and he is confessed to God and Saint Peter and

---

*conculcaverunt, et sanguinem Domini voluntarie effuderunt.*" [The lay defiled sacred mysteries and disputed about them; they baptized infants, using the foul humor of the ears in the place of sacred oil and chrism; they paid little attention to accepting the viaticum of the Lord at the end of life and the customary burial services of the Church from married priests; the tithe assigned to the priests they burnt with fire; and, as one thing outweighing the rest, the lay people often trampled underfoot the consecrated body of the Lord given by married priests, and poured out the blood of the Lord voluntarily.] Sigebert of Gembloux.

*Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 218 A.

<sup>27</sup> A number of Sigebert's works were commissioned by or written to the clergy of Liège. See also Sigebert's autobiographical entry in Sigebert of Gembloux. *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. In *PL* vol. 160, 587-588.

<sup>28</sup> See the discussion in Chapter 3. For example, Sigebert initiates a comparison of Gregory VII and Henry IV to Jesus during his temptation.

the whole Church, that he has gravely sinned in his pastoral duty, which he had undertaken in order to reign, and with the devil persuading him, had stirred up hatred and wrath against the human race, afterwards, truly, the feeling which was brought upon the globe of the earth, he said that he had done for the growth of Christianity. Only then did he send his aforesaid confessor to the emperor, and to the whole Church, so that he might beg their forgiveness, because he saw that the end of his life was near. And so, quickly, he dressed himself in angelic robes, and abandoned and dissolved the chains of all of his edicts against the emperor and all Christian people, living and dead, clerics and laity; and he bids his own men to depart from the house of Theodoric and rise up as friends of the emperor.<sup>29</sup>

A number of factors about this letter should be noted: it is directed to a secular leader, namely Henry IV; in it Gregory VII recants his actions; and, finally, he asks forgiveness before his death. Parallels between the two letters may legitimately be drawn, despite Gregory VII's letter being a forgery: as Sigebert consciously included both of these letters in the *Chronica*, he would have been able to see and to draw parallels between them.

The letter of Henry IV which Sigebert includes in the entry for 1106 is very similar in form to that of Gregory VII. It is directed to a secular head of state, in this case

---

<sup>29</sup> “*Volumus vos scire, qui aecclesiasticae curae solliciti estis, quod dominus apostolicus Hildibrandus nunc in extremis suis ad se vocavit unum de 12 cardinalibus, quem multum diligebat pre ceteris, et confessus est Deo et sancto Petro et toti aecclesiae, se valde peccasse in pastoralis cura, quae ei ad regendum commissa erat, et suadente diabolo contra humanum genus odium et iram concitasse, postea vero sententiam quae in orbe terrarum effusa est, pro augmento christianitatis cepisse dicebat. Tunc demum misit predictum confessorem suum ad imperatorem, et ad totam aecclesiam, ut optaret illi indulgentiam, quia finem vitae suae aspiciebat. Et tam cito induebat se angelicam vestem, et dimisit ac dissolvit vincula omnium bannorum suorum imperatori et omni populo christiano, vivis et defunctis, clericis et laicis; et iussit suos abire de domo Deoderici, et amicos imperatoris ascendere.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 222 B – 223 A.

Phillip I of France [r. 1060-1108]. Henry also makes confession and asks forgiveness for his actions in multiple passages. Henry IV repeatedly attempts to reconcile with his son. He also attempts to receive the sacrament of reconciliation from the papal legate, but is rebuffed.

Then I prostrated myself with the greatest spiritual contrition, and began to pray to God, for his justice, that he might give to me the place and time, where in the presence of all of the princes, that I might be unharmed until then, and that I should cleanse myself through his judgement, and that I would give whatever hostages they wanted from the princes of the realm and from my faithful men. But the legate himself denied the day and the place to me, saying, either that it ought to be determined there, completely, or that there was no hope of my escape.<sup>30</sup>

It is at this point, with Henry's petitions for forgiveness, that the two letters move out of parallel, and instead shift to portray Henry's enemies in a negative light. After Gregory's letter, Sigebert implies that Gregory's confession was accepted, noting that he wore "angelic robes," which would be symbolic of his newfound purity.<sup>31</sup> Henry's confessions and requests for forgiveness, however, are spurned and he is ill-treated. Henry's son betrays him three times, reminiscent of Saint Peter's three betrayals of Jesus.<sup>32</sup> As noted above, the papal legate refuses to give Henry absolution; additionally, Henry's ill

---

<sup>30</sup> "Tunc cum maxima animi contritione humi prostratus, coepi per Deum, per ipsam justitiam orare, ut locus et tempus michi daretur, ubi in presentia omnium principum, unde innocens essem, et iudicio me purgarem, et inde de principibus regni, de fidelibus meis, quoscumque obsides vellent, darem. At ille idem legatus diem et locum michi abnegavit, dicens, aut ibi totum debere determinari, aut nulla spes michi esset evadendi." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 233 A.

<sup>31</sup> "Angelicam vestem." Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 223 A.

<sup>32</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 D, 231 C, 232 A.

treatment at the hands of his son and of the other members of the papal party redounds to the detriment of the papacy.

With these allusions to the Gregorian part of the *Chronica*, as well as with the lists of misdeeds on the part of the papal faction, Sigebert is able to imply to his readers that the papacy is just as guilty of overstepping its bounds under Paschal II as it was during Gregory VII's papacy. By doing this, despite his arguments for the legitimacy of Paschal II in the previous entry, Sigebert is able to undermine the papacy's aspirations for secular power, without placing the terms of the *privilege* in jeopardy.

Through the use of this letter, Sigebert is also able to utilize a *pathos*-evoking narrative style that he, as an 'impartial narrator,' has been unable to use in other parts of the *Chronica*. Thus, references to Absalom and exclamations like "thus despoiled and desolate" are able to find their way into the narrative, and are made even more poignant through the first person narrative as well as their lack of use in the remainder of the *Chronica*.<sup>33</sup>

#### Henry V Before 1111

After the death of Henry IV in August 1106 and the subsequent accession of Henry V to the throne, Sigebert's narrative style appears to shift back to what it had been for the majority of the *Chronica*: relatively short, telegraphic entries. On closer examination, however, it appears that Sigebert remains a *narrator equivocus* of Henry IV's *filius equivocus*. Sigebert, as an author, seems to be torn between his personal negative feelings toward Henry V and his larger narrative program, which will require

---

<sup>33</sup> "*Sic spoliatum et desolatum*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 D, 233 B.

Henry V to appear as a hero in 1111, at the Empire's 'triumph' in the Investiture Contest with the *pravilege*.

Although Sigebert does not attack Henry V quite as virulently in the later years of the *Chronica* as he did in 1106, he does not wholeheartedly embrace Henry's regime. The few references to Henry V between 1107 and 1110 demonstrate Sigebert's thinly-veiled negative attitude towards him. In 1108, Sigebert describes an altercation between Henry and Robert of Flanders. "Emperor Henry attacked Robert of Flanders, and with a peace set down by both sides more as a feint than in good faith, nearly returned ineffectively."<sup>34</sup> Henry's style of fighting is depicted as consisting more of subterfuge than of open warfare. Additionally, the concept that a peace may be made specifically to be broken might remind Sigebert's readers of the earlier faithlessness of Henry V towards his father.

This sort of description of the two sides in this struggle is particularly odd on Sigebert's part, especially considering that Henry's opponent is Robert of Flanders. It was Robert of Flanders who, under the orders of Paschal II, had attacked Liège in 1102, spurring Sigebert to write the *Adversus Paschalem Papam*. One might have expected a significantly more glowing discussion of Robert's defeat than "he nearly returned ineffectively," seeing as it would have given Sigebert an opportunity to attack the Reform Papacy as well as to promote his own polemic letters, as he does in the entry for 1074. The absence of this sort of discussion of Robert's defeat implies that Sigebert is willing

---

<sup>34</sup> "*Heinricus imperator contra Rotbertum Flandrensem vadit, et pacto pacis magis utrinque simulato quam composito, pene inefficax redit.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 235 A.

to pass over an opportunity to attack the papacy in order to slight Henry V by making him appear duplicitous and militarily unexceptional.

The second description of Henry V's military exploits is similarly lackluster. "Emperor Henry attacked the Hungarians; but once a peace was made, he returned."<sup>35</sup> As Sigebert does not describe what sort of treaty was made between Henry V and the Hungarians, only that Henry abandoned his attack as soon as he was able to make a treaty, the general impression that Sigebert's readers would get of Henry in this passage would be one verging on cowardice. Without either battles or advantageous terms of the treaty described, Henry's attack is made to appear almost as only a token attack, feigned like his peace with Robert of Flanders.

Although Sigebert seems to attack Henry V in these entries in the *Chronica*, he also gives Henry a degree of respect. Sigebert regularly refers to Henry as '*imperator Heinricus*' or '*rex Heinricus*,' supporting his legitimate title to the royal and imperial thrones.<sup>36</sup> Even Sigebert's relative silence on Henry's actions in the years between 1106 and 1111 can rhetorically reflect favorably upon him. Given the repeated attacks on Henry's reputation and character in the entry for 1106, a sudden embrace of the new emperor in 1107 would appear as a jarring about-face on Sigebert's part. A period of relative silence, with few lengthy descriptions of Henry V, may have seemed to Sigebert to be a much better way to lead up to the praise of Henry V that appears in the entry for 1111 than to shift abruptly from condemnation to praise.

### 1111 and the *Pravilege*

---

<sup>35</sup> "*Imperator Heinricus contra Ungaros vadit; sed facto pacto redit.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 235 B.

<sup>36</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 235 A, 235 B

The term *pravilege* is a punning derivation of *privilegium*, combined with *pravus* –*a*–*um* (bad, perverse) or *pravo*, *pravare* (to misrule, to be corrupt), implying a bad or illicitly gained privilege. In this case, it refers to the rights extorted from Paschal II while he was a hostage of Henry V in 1111. On 4 February, Paschal and Henry’s negotiators agreed on a plan which would have stripped the German bishoprics and monasteries of a large portion of their property, which would devolve upon the king.<sup>37</sup> On 12 February, however, the bishops reacted violently against this agreement, preventing it from being sealed and preventing the imperial coronation.<sup>38</sup> Henry V responded by taking Paschal and a number of other clergymen prisoner, and, on 11 April, while still a captive, Paschal anointed Henry as emperor and gave him the right of investiture.<sup>39</sup> After this, as Henry had achieved his political goals from Paschal II’s papacy, the anti-papacy of Sylvester IV would no longer have been necessary.

Despite Sigebert’s thinly veiled distaste for Henry V, the section of the *Chronica* between Henry’s accession to the throne and the *pravilege* shows some hints of Sigebert’s narrative preparations for the *pravilege*. In comparison with earlier portions of the *Chronica*, the papacy is conspicuously absent from the narrative at this time. However, unlike the section of the *Chronica* concerning the First Crusade, this is not to diminish the perceived influence of the papacy. Instead, it serves to bolster the perceived unity of the papacy. As noted above, anti-Pope Sylvester IV did not leave the political

---

<sup>37</sup> Alfred Haverkamp. *Medieval Germany, 1056-1273*, p. 129. See also Sigebert’s account. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 236 B and C.

<sup>38</sup> Alfred Haverkamp. *Medieval Germany, 1056-1273*, p. 130. See also Sigebert’s description. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 237 B.

<sup>39</sup> Alfred Haverkamp. *Medieval Germany, 1056-1273*, p. 130. See also Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 238 A – 240 A.

scene until after the *pravilege*. Despite this, Sigebert conceals the fact of his existence, making his prophecy of “the fame of his name vanished” come true, at least for the history contained within the *Chronica*.<sup>40</sup> If the papacy is absent from these years, so, too, is any contention against it, including the anti-papacy. This omission allows the papacy of Paschal II to appear strong in the description of the *pravilege* in 1111.

Sigebert’s description of the *pravilege* in the entry for 1111 serves as the triumphant culmination of the argument which Sigebert has woven into his narrative since the rise of Gregory VII. As such, this entry contains many allusions to Gregory VII and the rhetoric that Sigebert used for that period that bring the narrative full circle. The theme of discord and scandal in the Church and State returns in such a way that Henry V can be portrayed as the hero, as his invasion of Rome is not to overthrow the Church, but “to settle the discord.”<sup>41</sup> The Gregorian popes are clearly portrayed as the villains of this narrative, as the discord “was begun by Pope Gregory, the ninth [sic] of his name, who was named Hildebrand, and was stirred up by the successors of Gregory, Victor and Urban, and, above all by Paschal, and there was a great scandal throughout the whole world.”<sup>42</sup>

Sigebert also revisits the ideas of precedence which he earlier raised in conjunction with Gregory VII’s attacks on clerical unchastity.<sup>43</sup> In this case, however, rather than relying on the Church Fathers, Sigebert uses the historical powers of the

---

<sup>40</sup> “*Fama nominis ejus evanuit*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 230 A.

<sup>41</sup> “*Propter sedandam discordiam*.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 235 C.

<sup>42</sup> “*Cepta a Gregorio nono [sic] hujus nominis papa, qui Hildebrandus nominatus est, et exagitata a successoribus Gregorii, Victore et Urbano, et pre omnibus a Pascali, magno scandalo erat toti mundo*.” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 235 C, 236 A. The concept of a great scandal arising in the Church also appears in the entries for 1074 and 1088, under Gregory VII and Urban II.

<sup>43</sup> In 1074, Sigebert repeatedly attacks the idea of “*novitates*” in the Church’s policies. Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 217 B, 218 B. See also the analysis of that entry in Chapter 3.

Roman Emperors to support his argument, claiming that Henry V's privileges stem from Charlemagne and his successors.<sup>44</sup> Sigebert then renews his argument against the *novitates* instituted by the papacy, claiming that they fought "against this more ancient authority."<sup>45</sup>

Sigebert's portrayal of Henry V changes significantly in this entry from the years leading up to 1111. Earlier, Henry's military actions were decidedly lackluster, with him either almost failing or returning quickly from his campaigns.<sup>46</sup> However, in this year, Sigebert uses the word "*protirebat*," 'crushed underfoot' to describe Henry's victorious battles.<sup>47</sup> The use of this term is indicative of the more positive view of Henry that Sigebert portrays in this section. Once Henry has entered Rome, the pope's men assassinate some of his guards. "He had hardly entered the gates of the city, when, with his soldiers wandering untroubled inside the walls of the city, some were wounded, others were slain, and all were, indeed, nearly captured or despoiled."<sup>48</sup> Henry, however, shows remarkable equipoise, and acts as though nothing had happened, so important to him was the settling of the affairs of the Church and State. "The king nevertheless was unmoved, as though it were a small thing, and came with a tranquil mind up to the doors

---

<sup>44</sup> "*Rex uti volens auctoritate et consuetudine et auctoribus privilegiis imperatorum, qui a Karolo magno, qui primus de regibus Francorum imperavit Romanis, jam per trecentos et amplius annos imperaverant sub sexaginta tribus apostolicis, dabat licite episcopatus et abbatias per anulum et per virgam.*" [The king wished to use the authority and custom and authoritative privileges of the emperors, who, from Charles the Great, who was the first of the kings of the Franks to rule the Romans, now for 300 and more years had ruled under 63 popes, and had bestowed the episcopate and abbacy lawfully, through the ring and the staff.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 236 A.

<sup>45</sup> "*Contra hanc majorum auctoritatem.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 236 A.

<sup>46</sup> See Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 235 A and B.

<sup>47</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 236 B.

<sup>48</sup> "*Vix civitatis portas ingressus erat, cum militibus ejus intra civitatis moenia secure vagantibus, alii vulnerati, alii occisi, omnes vero pene capti aut spoliati sunt.*" Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 237 B.

of the church of blessed Peter, the apostle, with the procession.”<sup>49</sup> Henry V’s steadfastness causes Paschal II’s fickleness and betrayals to appear more sharply, just as Henry IV and Gregory VII were compared to Biblical passages, with Gregory being found wanting.<sup>50</sup>

Additionally, Sigebert returns to the theme of authorial impartiality in this section. Although there are many different versions of these events circulating, Sigebert uses an eyewitness and a participant in this event as his source, which allows him both to include elaborate descriptions of the *privilege* and to bolster his authority with that of the new and, to Sigebert, newly respectable emperor. “What was agreed between the pope and the king, and how, although much has been said by many men on this subject, only so much will be said by us as we read in letters written by the king himself.”<sup>51</sup>

Sigebert’s focus on time and cycles returns during his account of the oaths given during the *privilege* itself. He notes, in multiple passages, how the privileges accorded to the emperor at this time have belonged to the Roman emperors since the time of Charlemagne.<sup>52</sup> Through the use of this claim, the papal arguments in the Investiture Contest are reduced to *novitates*. The importance of this event, in Sigebert’s eyes, is

---

<sup>49</sup> “*Rex tamen, quasi pro levi causa non motus, tranquilla mente usque ad januas aecclesiae beati Petri apostoli cum rocessione pervenit.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 237 B.

<sup>50</sup> Paschal is assumed to be behind this assault, and, earlier, makes false promises. The pope’s proposals are described as things that “*scirent hoc nullo modo posse fieri.*” [They knew could in no way happen.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 237 A. For earlier comparisons of Gregory VII and Henry IV, see Chapter 3.

<sup>51</sup> “*Quid vel quomodo inter papam et regem convenerit, cum multa a multis dicantur, hoc tantum a nobis dicetur, quod in epistola ab ipso rege scripta legimus.*” Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 236 B.

<sup>52</sup> Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 236 A, 237 D, 238 A.

punctuated by the use, in the work's final sentence, of the indiction dating system for the first time when describing historical events in the *Chronica*.<sup>53</sup>

## Conclusion

The final section of the *Chronica*, from 1105 to 1111, is characterized by heavy use, on Sigebert's part, of letters as sources as well as lengthy narratives atypical of the *Chronica* in general. This use of letters does not, however, impede Sigebert from continuing his authorial program. Indeed, due to the complex situations that occurred in this period, such as the elevation of an anti-pope that subsequently had to be disavowed and the rebellion of Henry V against his father as part of the papal camp, followed by a *volte face* after he gained power, these letters become a very useful tool in Sigebert's narrative. Through the inclusion of these letters, Sigebert is able to attack Paschal II and Henry V in one part of his narrative, while supporting their legitimacy in another. This is possible because of the separate authorial voice which appears in the narrative when Sigebert directly quotes from letters. Upon his reentry to the narrative, Sigebert can, and does, disavow the claims made in these letters. Thus, Sigebert can, in one passage, attack Henry V for violating the laws of men and of nature and, in a later passage, portray him as the hero of the Empire's struggle against the Reform Papacy. It is, therefore, clear that, although Sigebert used lengthy direct quotes in this final section of the *Chronica*, he carefully considered the impact that each of these quotes would have on his narrative and used them to continue his authorial program.

---

<sup>53</sup> The indiction dating system appears in one other passage in the *Chronica*, where Sigebert describes the researches of the scholar Chilperic. For this reference, see the entry for A. D. 1005. The *Chronica* ends thus: "*Datum est Id. Aprilis, indictione 4.*" [This is given on 13 April, in the fourth year of the indiction.] Sigebert of Gembloux. *Chronica*. In *PL* vol. 160, 240 A.

## Conclusion

The *Chronica* of Sigebert of Gembloux is not written passively and without bias, despite its author's protestations to the contrary. While the *Chronica* is not as openly polemical as Sigebert's letters on various aspects of the Investiture Contest, it nevertheless has an agenda, regularly attacking the proponents of the Gregorian Reform while magnifying the emperors. In the pursuit of this agenda, Sigebert moves to discredit his enemies through outright attacks, unfavorable Biblical and Patristic analogies, temporal manipulation, and outright removal from the historical record.

In the section covering the years 1073 to 1094, Sigebert combines two different rhetorical strategies. In a number of passages, he attacks Gregory VII and his successors directly, accusing them of self-aggrandizement and consciously misinterpreting their attempts at reforming the Church so that he can portray the theories that underlie these reforms as heretical. In other passages, Sigebert attacks the Reform Papacy only obliquely. This often occurs when Sigebert attacks the chronological system created by Dionysius Exiguus. In these passages, Sigebert refers to events that took place during Jesus' life. The juxtaposition with those past events with the more recent events that Sigebert records creates an implicit comparison between Jesus and the main actors in Sigebert's narrative. In these comparisons, Gregory VII is generally found wanting, while Henry IV compares favorably with Jesus.

In the section covering the years 1095 to 1104, Sigebert utilizes fewer direct attacks, instead relying on absence as a rhetorical tool. Beginning with his description of the Council of Clermont, in 1095, Sigebert methodically removes the papal role from the

First Crusade, splitting the events of the Council of Clermont into two different years.

This removal of the papacy and other ecclesiastical figures from the narrative continues in Sigebert's description of the First Crusade. Ecclesiastical figures rarely, if ever, appear, despite their prominence in the sources which Sigebert worked from.

Additionally, Sigebert modifies the titles of lay figures which had strong religious connotations, such as *Advocatus Ecclesiae S. Sepulcri*, into more secular forms.

The final section of the *Chronica*, from 1105 to 1111, demonstrates a third subset of Sigebert's rhetorical tactics. In this period, Sigebert makes heavy use of direct quotations from letters. Through this strategy and the use of other authorial voices, he is able to introduce a degree of *pathos* which is not in evidence in other parts of the *Chronica*. The use of letters also allows Sigebert to present conflicting points of view while retaining narrative cohesiveness. Thus, through Henry IV's voice, he can attack Henry V in 1106 and still laud Henry V in the entry for 1111.

It is clear that the *Chronica* is a work with an agenda and a narrative bias. However, this should not cause it to lie fallow and be neglected by historians as it has in recent years. The *Chronica* was used as a source and imitated by many authors throughout the Middle Ages. The views which Sigebert disseminated in it and the narrative techniques which he used in its composition would have thus gained a relatively wide exposure. Additionally, the *Chronica* is worthy of study in its own right, and not just as a tool to better understand the authors whom it influenced. It is the work of a scholar and teacher who had composed works in many genres for the greater part of a century. Although the *Chronica* may seem, at first glance, to be composed in large part

of other sources stitched together, closer analysis can show that the selection of those sources and the way that they are woven together are indicative of careful and complex handiwork.

## Bibliography<sup>1</sup>

### Primary Sources

Annals of Liège. Ed. Georg Pertz. In MGH *Scriptorum* IV. Hannover: Impensis

Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1841, p. 9-30.

Anselm of Gembloux. *Continuatio*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol.

160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 239-258.

Anselm of Lucca. *Collectio Canonica*. Ed. Angelo Mai. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol.

149. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1882, col. 485-534.

Augustine. *Augustin: The Writings Against the Manichaeans, and Against the Donatists*.

Ed. Philip Schaff. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 4. Peabody, MA:

Hendrickson, 1999.

---. *Traité anti-Donatistes II*. Ed. Martine Dulaey and Jean-Marie Salamito. In

*Bibliothèque Augustinienne*. Vol. 29. Turnhout: Brepols, 1964.

Bede. *Opera De Temporibus*. Ed. Charles Williams Jones. Cambridge, MA: The

Mediaeval Academy of America, 1943.

Dionysius Exiguus. *Cyclus Paschalis*. Ed. Benjamin Hoffman. In *Patrologia Latina*.

Vol. 67. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1865, col. 453-520.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Eusebius: Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and*

*Oration in Praise of Constantine*. Ed. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. In *Nicene*

*and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.

---. *Die Kirchengeschichte*. Ed. Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen. Leipzig: J.

---

<sup>1</sup> All Latin Biblical citations come from the *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* eds. Weber and Gryson, 5<sup>th</sup> edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007. All Biblical quotes in English come from the NRSV, ed. Attridge. New York: Harper Collins, 2006.

- C. Hinrichs, 1903-1909.
- Eusebius of Caesarea and Jerome. *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*. Ed. Rudolf Helm. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1984.
- Gregory VII. *The Epistolae Vagantes of Pope Gregory VII*. Trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- . *The Register of Pope Gregory VII 1073-1085: An English Translation*. Trans. H. E. J. Cowdrey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Guibert de Nogent. *The Deeds of God through the Franks: A Translation of Guibert de Nogent's Gesta Dei per Francos*. Trans. Robert Levine. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1997.
- Hagenmeyer, Heinrich, Ed. *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Innsbruck: Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchdruckerei, 1901.
- Henry V. *Epistolae et Leges Heinrici V*. Ed. Ludwig Weiland. In MGH *Leges. Constitutiones et Acta Publica Imperatorum et Regum*. Vol. 1. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1893, p. 134-151.
- Isidore of Seville. *Etymologiae*. Ed. W. M. Lindsay. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911.
- Jerome. *Commentarius in Ecclesiasten*. Ed. Jacques Paul Migne. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 23. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1883, col. 1009-1116.
- . *Liber de Viris Illustribus*. Ed. Jacques Paul Migne. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 23.

- Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1883, col. 631-764.
- Lampert of Hersfeld. *Annales*. Ed. Oswaldus Holder-Egger. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usus Scholarum*. Vol. 38. Hannover and Leipzig: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1894.
- Marianus Scotus. *Chronica*. Ed. Georg Pertz. In *MGH SS V*. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1844, p. 481-568.
- Monumenta Bambergensia*. Ed. Philippe Jaffe. In *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*. Vol. 5 Berlin: Weidmann, 1879.
- Peters, Edward, Ed. *The First Crusade: The Chronicle of Fulcher of Chartres and Other Source Materials*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1971.
- Robert of Torigny. *Robertus de Monte Chronica*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 411-546.
- Robert the Monk. *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Iherosolimitana*. Trans. Carol Sweetenham. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005.
- Sigebert of Gembloux. *Apologia Contra Eos Qui Calumniantur Missas Conjugatorum Sacerdotum*. Ed. Ernst Sackur. In *MGH Libelli de Lite II*, Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1892, p. 436-448.
- . *Chronica*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 57-240.
- . *Epistola Adversus Paschalem Papam*. Ed. Ernst Sackur. In *MGH Libelli de Lite II*. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1892, p. 449-464.

- . *Epistola Duplex*. Ed. Ludwig Bethmann. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 813-830.
- . *Gesta Abbatum Gemblacensium*. Ed. Georg Pertz. In *MGH SS VIII*. Hannover, Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1848, p. 520-542.
- . *Liber Decennalis*. Ed. Joachim Wiesenbach. In *MGH, Quellen zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters XII*. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1986.
- . *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. Ed. Johann Fabricius. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 547-592.
- . *Passio Sanctae Luciae et Passio Sanctorum Thebeorum*. Ed. Ernst Dümmler. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin*. Klasse I, 1893, 1-125. [BHL 4995 (Saint Lucy) and 3446 (Theban Legion)]
- . *Sermo de Sancta Lucia*. Ed. Martin Meurisse. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 811-814. [BHL 4999]
- . *Vita Deodorici*. Ed. Georg Pertz. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 692-726. [BHL 8055]
- . *Vita Sancti Lamberti*. Ed. Jean Bolland. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 759 – 810. [BHL 4686 and 4687]
- . *Vita Sancti Maclovi*. Ed. Laurentius Surius. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 729-746. [BHL 5119]
- . *Vita Sancti Sigeberti Regis*. Ed. Jean Bolland. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 87. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1863, 303-314. [BHL 7711-7714]

- . *Vita Sancti Theodardi*. Ed. Jean Bolland. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 747-758. [BHL 8049]
- . *Vita Wicberti*. Ed. Jacques Paul Migne. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 661-690. [BHL 8882]
- Urban II. *Sermons of Clermont*. Ed. *Varii*. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 151. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1881, col. 565-582.

### Scholarly Literature

- Bachrach, Bernard S. "Writing Latin History for a Lay Audience c. 1000: Dudo of Saint Quentin at the Norman Court." *The Haskins Society Journal: Studies in Medieval History*. Vol. 20: 2008, p. 58-77.
- Backman, Clifford R. *The Worlds of Medieval Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Barlow, Frank. *William Rufus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Bethmann, Ludwig. *Prolegomena*. In *Patrologia Latina*. Vol. 160. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1880, col. 1-58.
- Blumenthal, Uta-Renate. "Pope Gregory VII and the Prohibition of Nicolaitism." In *Medieval Purity and Piety: Essays on Medieval Clerical Celibacy and Religious Reform*. Ed. Michael Frassetto. New York: Garland Pub., 1998, p. 239-268.
- Chazan, Mireille. *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XI<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1999.
- Cowdrey, H. E. J. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- . *The Age of Abbot Desiderius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

- Douglas, David Charles. *William the Conqueror: The Norman Impact Upon England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.
- Espenak, Fred and Meeus, Jean. "Five Millennium Catalog of Lunar Eclipses." At <http://eclipse.gsfc.nasa.gov/LEcat5/LE1001-1100.html> . Accessed 4/6/2011.
- Frend, W. H. C. *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.
- Goetz, Hans-Werner. "The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and the Twelfth Centuries." In *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory, Historiography*. Althoff et al. eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 139-165.
- Grässe, Johann Georg Theodor. *Orbis Latinus: Lexikon lateinischer geographischer Namen des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*. Berlin: Richard Carl Schmidt & Co, 1909.
- Haverkamp, Alfred. *Medieval Germany, 1056-1273*. Trans. Helga Braun and Richard Mortimer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Hay, Denys. *Annalists & Historians: Western Historiography from the VIIIth to the XVIIIth Century*. London: Methuen & Co., 1977.
- Hetherington, Barry. *A Chronicle of Pre-Telescopic Astronomy*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons, 1996.
- Hirsch, Siegfried. *De Vita et Scriptis Sigiberti Monachi Gemblacensis Commentatio Historico-Litteraria*. Berlin: Reimerianis, 1841.
- Hollister, C. Warren. *Henry I*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

- Huffman, Joseph P. *The Social Politics of Medieval Diplomacy: Anglo-German Relations (1066-1307)*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.
- Jones, Charles W. *Saint Nicholas of Myra, Bari, and Manhattan: Biography of a Legend*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Kedar, Benjamin. "The Forcible Baptisms of 1096: History and Historiography." In *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Landesgeschichte. Peter Herde zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen dargebracht*. Ed. Karl Borchardt and Enno Bünz, 2 vols. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1998. Vol. 1, 187-200.
- Kronk, Gary W. *Cometography: A Catalog of Comets*. Volume 1: Ancient – 1799. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- . *Comets: A Descriptive Catalog*. Aldershot, UK: Enslow Publishers, 1984.
- Kupper, Jean-Louis. *Liège et l'église impériale, XI<sup>e</sup>-XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 1981.
- Lake, Justin C. "Truth, Plausibility, and the Virtues of Narrative at the Millennium." *Journal of Medieval History*. Vol. 35 (2009), 221-238.
- Mayer, Hans Eberhard. *The Crusades*. Second Edition. Trans. John Gillingham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- McKitterick, Rosamond. *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Munro, Dana Carleton. "The Speech of Pope Urban II. At Clermont, 1095." *The American Historical Review*. 11:2 (1906), p. 231-242.
- Niermeyer, J. F. and Van De Kieft, C. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Leiden: Brill,

2002.

Noble, Thomas F. X. *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680-825*.

Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984.

Riley-Smith, Jonathan. "Casualties and the Number of Knights on the First Crusade." In

*Crusades*. Ed. Kedar, Riley-Smith and Nicholson. Vol. 1. (2002), p. 13-28.

Robinson, I. S. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical*

*Literature of the Late Eleventh Century*. Manchester: Manchester University

Press, 1978.

---. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Steel, Duncan. *Marking Time: The Epic Quest to Invent the Perfect Calendar*. New

York: John Wiley & Sons, 2000.

Tyerman, Christopher. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*. Cambridge: The

Belknap Press, 2006.

Zizioulas, John D. "The Early Christian Community." In *Christian Spirituality: Origins*

*to the Twelfth Century*. Ed. McGinn, Meyendorff and Leclercq. New York:

Crossroad Publishing Company, 1985, p. 23-43.

## Appendix I

### Text and Translation of the *Chronica*

This section contains, in the left-hand column, the text of Sigebert of Gembloux's *Chronica*, as it appears in Ludwig Bethmann's edition in the *Patrologia Latina* volume 160. This edition is based primarily upon the autograph manuscript of the *Chronica*, with interpolations appearing only where the autograph was corrupt. The central column denotes the column number and section of the text in the left-hand column as it appears in the *Patrologia Latina*. Due to the nature of translations from Latin into English, the translation, which appears in the right-hand column, will not correspond exactly to the section numbers as presented in the central column.

A series of numbers appear at the beginning of each annual entry. The first of these numbers denotes the year in the *Anno Domini* system. The subsequent numbers denote the regnal years of the rulers of various kingdoms, which will periodically appear in the following abbreviated form: R[omanorum], F[rancorum], A[nglorum], and, beginning in 1100, H[ierosolymitanorum].

1073	R. 17	F. 13	A. 7	216 C	1073	R. 17	F. 13	A. 7
(MAR.) <sup>1</sup>	In hoc anno duobus magnis				In this year two Great Years <sup>2</sup> were			
annis a 15 anno Tyberii cesaris					completed from the 15 <sup>th</sup> year of the			
revolutis, omnia secundum cursum					reign of Tiberius Caesar, and			
solis et lunae concordant illi anno,					everything related to the course of the			

---

<sup>1</sup> (MAR) signifies that the *Chronica* of Marianus Scotus is Sigebert's source.

<sup>2</sup> A 'Great Year', in Sigebert's terminology, is 532 solar years, or the product of the 19 years of a lunar cycle and the 28 years of a solar cycle.

quo baptizatus est Jesus Christus; id est 8 Idus Januar., die dominico epiphaniae, initium jejunii ejus in secunda feria, temptatio ejus 15 Kal. Mart. in 6 feria.

(Ib.) Hildibrandus archidiaconus Romanorum, qui et Gregorius, Romanae aeclesiae 153 us presidet. Herimannus Leodicensis fit Mettensium episcopus. Duobus fratribus Russorum regibus de regno contententibus, alter eorum a consortio regni pulsus, interpellat Heinricum imperatorem, se et regnum Russorum ei submittere, si ejus auxilio regno restitueretur. Sed id

sun and the moon matched with that year in which Jesus Christ was baptized; that is, on 6 January, on the day of the Lord's Epiphany; the beginning of his fast was on the second day of the week; his temptation was on 15 February on the sixth day of the week.

Hildebrand, archdeacon of the Romans, who is also called Gregory, became the 153<sup>rd</sup> pope.<sup>3</sup> Hermann of Liège became the bishop of Metz.<sup>4</sup> While two brother kings of the Russians were contending for the kingship, one of them was expelled from the kingdom through a conspiracy, and petitioned Emperor Henry, submitting himself and the kingdom of the Russians to him, if he

217 A

---

<sup>3</sup> Gregory was consecrated pope on 29 June.

<sup>4</sup> R. 1073-1090.

frustra fuit; quia gravissima in  
imperio Romano orta dissensio  
monebat magis sua tueri, quam aliena  
acquirere. Saxones enim multis et  
magnis injuriis et injustitiis ab  
imperatore affecti, contra eum  
rebellant; ad quos debellandos  
imperator instanter intendit.

1074 R. 18 F. 14 A. 8  
(Cf. Sig. ep. De presb. conjug. ex  
Marino.)<sup>6</sup> Gregorius papa celebrata  
synodo symoniacos anathematizavit,  
et uxoratos sacerdotes a divino officio  
removit, et laicis missam eorum  
audire interdixit, novo exemplo, et ut

returned the kingdom with his aid.<sup>5</sup>  
But it was in vain; he admonished  
him that he should rather watch over  
his own things, as the gravest of  
dissensions had arisen in the Roman  
Empire, than to obtain the goods of  
another. For the Saxons, having been  
afflicted by many and great injuries  
and injustices by the emperor,  
rebelled against him; the emperor  
violently campaigned against them, to  
subdue them.

1074 R. 18 F. 14 A. 8  
Pope Gregory anathematized  
simoniacs in a celebrated synod,<sup>10</sup>  
and removed married priests from  
celebrating the divine office, and  
interdicted the lay people who heard  
masses from them, setting a new

---

<sup>5</sup> Isjaslav had originally been a co-ruler of Kiev with his brothers Svjatoslav and Vsévolod, but was driven out by them. After Henry IV refused to help him, Isjaslav petitioned Gregory VII for help, who named him as 'King of the Russians.' See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 452-453.

<sup>6</sup> Sigebert here draws from his own polemic letter, the *Apologia Contra Eos Qui Calumniantur Missas Coniugatorum Sacerdotum*.

<sup>10</sup> See the discussion in Chapter 3; the timing of each of Gregory VII's actions against simony and nicolaitism is generally open to debate, due to Gregory's synods not being fully recorded in the *Registrum*.

multis visum est inconsiderato  
preiudicio, contra sanctorum patrum  
sententiam, qui scripserunt, quod  
sacramenta quae in ecclesia fiunt,  
baptismus scilicet, crisma, corpus et  
sanguis Christi, Spiritu sancto latenter  
operante eorundem sacramentorum  
effectum, seu per bonos, seu per  
malos intra Dei ecclesiam  
dispensentur, tamen quia Spiritus  
sanctus mystice illa vivificat, nec  
bonorum meritis dispensatorum  
amplificantur, nec malorum peccatis  
attenuantur.<sup>7</sup> Unde est: “Hic est qui  
baptizat.”<sup>8</sup>

Ex qua re tam grave oritur scandalum,

precedent. And as it seemed to many,  
with inconsiderate prejudice against  
the works of the Holy Fathers, who  
wrote what the sacraments of the  
Church are, namely, baptism,  
anointing, the body and blood of  
Christ, and, of these sacraments, they  
said that they were effected through  
the Holy Spirit, operating secretly,  
whether they were dispensed in the  
Church of God through good men or  
through bad, nevertheless because the  
Holy Spirit mystically gives them  
life, neither are they made greater  
through the merits of good  
dispensers, nor are they lessened by  
the sins of evil men. Thence it is:  
“This is he who baptizes.”<sup>11</sup>

Out of this matter arose such a grave

---

<sup>7</sup> From Augustine’s *De Baptismo Contra Donatistas*. See *Augustin: The Writings Against the Manichaeans and Against the Donatists* as well as *Traité anti-Donatistes II*.

<sup>8</sup> John 1:33. The verse concludes “*in Spiritu Sancto*.”

<sup>11</sup> Here Sigebert accuses the Gregorians of the heresy of Donatism, wherein those who are thought to be sinners cannot bestow valid sacraments. For a thorough discussion of Donatism, see W. H. C. Frend. *The Donatist Church: A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa, passim*.

ut nullius heresis tempore sancta  
 aecclesia graviori scismate discisa sit,  
 his pro justitia, illis contra justitiam  
 agentibus; aliis a symonia non  
 declinantibus, aliis notam avaritiae  
 honesto nomine pretextentibus dum  
 hoc quod se gratis dare jactant, sub  
 caritatis nomine vendunt, et ut de  
 Montanis dicit Eusebius, *sub nomine*  
*oblationum artificiosius munera*  
*accipiunt*<sup>9</sup>; porro continentiam paucis  
 tenentibus, aliquibus eam modo causa  
 questus ac jactantiae simulantibus,  
 multis incontinentiam perjurio aut  
 multipliciori adulterio cumulantibus;  
 ad hoc hac oportunitate laicis  
 insurgentibus contra sacros ordines,  
 et se ab omni aecclesiastica  
 subjectione excutientibus.

217 C

218 A

scandal, that at the time of no heresy  
 was the Holy Church more cut apart  
 with a graver schism, with these men  
 working for justice, and those men  
 working against justice; with some  
 men not straying into simony, and  
 with others cloaking known avarice  
 with an honest name, while they  
 boast that this, which they give for  
 free, they sell under the name of  
 Charity.<sup>12</sup> And as Eusebius said of the  
 Montanists, “they accept, craftily,  
 bribes under the name of “oblation””;  
 still, with few holding on to  
 continence, with some pretending to  
 it only for the sake of complaining or  
 boastfulness, there were many  
 accumulating incontinence through  
 perjury or more multiplex adultery.

<sup>9</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. In *Eusebius: Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*. V.XVIII.2., p. 235. See also the parallel Latin and Greek text in Eusebius. *Die Kirchengeschichte*. Ed. Eduard Schwartz and Theodor Mommsen. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903-1909.

<sup>12</sup> Sigebert here seems to be combining Eusebius’ quote on Montanism with simony, attempting to tar the Gregorians with one of the evils that they were seeking to reform.

Laici sacra misteria temerant et de his  
disputant; infantes baptizant, sordido  
humore aurium pro sacro oleo et  
crismate utentes; in extremo vitae  
viaticum dominicum et usitatum  
aecclesiae obsequium sepulturae a  
presbiteris conjugatis accipere  
parvipendunt; decimas presbiteris  
deputatas igni cremant; et ut in uno  
cetera perpendas, laici corpus Domini  
a presbiteris conjugatis consecratum  
sepe pedibus et conculcaverunt, et  
sanguinem Domini voluntarie  
effuderunt, et multa alia contra jus et  
fas gesta sunt in aecclesia; et hac  
occasione multi pseudomagistri

For this reason, the lay people rose up  
against the Holy Orders at this point,  
and cast themselves out from  
subjection to the entire church.

The lay defiled sacred mysteries and  
disputed about them; they baptized  
infants, using the foul humor of the  
ears in the place of sacred oil and  
chrism;<sup>13</sup> they paid little attention to  
accepting the viaticum of the Lord at  
the end of life and the customary  
burial services of the Church from  
married priests; the tithe assigned to  
the priests they burnt with fire; and,  
as one thing outweighing the rest, the  
lay people often trampled underfoot  
the consecrated body of the Lord  
given by married priests, and poured  
out the blood of the Lord voluntarily,  
and many other deeds against Law

218 B

---

<sup>13</sup> This is a particularly interesting and vivid reversal of the rite of baptism. Whereas sins were typically washed away through clean water and blessed oil, here both physical and spiritual dirtiness are increased through the application of earwax.

exurgentes in aecclesia, profanis  
novitatibus plebem ab aecclesiastica  
disciplina avertunt.

1075 19 15 9

(A. Leod.)<sup>14</sup> Heinricus imperator  
Saxones gravissimo prelio vincit,  
eosque iterata expeditione perurgens,  
cunctos eorum principes, episcopos,  
duces, comites ceterosque potentes,  
ad deditionem coegit. Ungari contra  
imperatorem rebellant, regemque  
suum Salomonem regno deturbatum,  
sub diutina custodia excruciant.

and Right were done in the Church;  
and on this occasion many false  
teachers rose up in the Church,  
turning the common people from  
ecclesiastic discipline to profane  
newnesses.

1075 19 15 9

Emperor Henry conquered the Saxons  
in a very great battle,<sup>15</sup> and pressing  
onward against them, with another  
advance, forced all of their leading  
men, bishops, dukes, counts, and  
other potentates to surrender. The  
Hungarians rebelled against the  
emperor, and their king, Solomon  
was removed from power.<sup>16</sup> During  
his lengthy imprisonment they [the  
Hungarians] tortured him.

---

<sup>14</sup> (A. Leod.) signifies that the Annals of Liège are Sigebert's source in a given section.

<sup>15</sup> On 9 June, near the River Saale.

<sup>16</sup> Solomon remained a political factor until 1083. See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, 443-444.

(Ib.) Deoduinus episcopus  
Leodicensium obit, cui Hienricus vita  
et genere nobilis succedit. (MAR.)  
Anno archiepiscopus Coloniensis  
obit, quia parochiam suam rebus et  
monasteriis a se fundatis ampliavit,  
inter quae preminet cenobium  
Sigebergense.

1076 R. 20 F. 16 A. 10

Gregorius papa totus in Heinricum  
imperatorem invehitur, et quoscunque  
potest ab eo verbis et scriptis avertit;  
animum etiam Agnetis matris ipsius  
ab eo alienat. (A. Leod.) Sicarius in  
Fresonia Godefridum ducem perimit.

Hoc anno, qui est 13 annus primi

Theoduin, bishop of Liége died.<sup>17</sup>

Henry, a man noble in life and  
lineage succeeded him.<sup>18</sup> Anno, the  
archbishop of Cologne died.<sup>19</sup> He had  
enriched his parish both in goods and  
in the monasteries that he had  
founded, among which the monastery  
of Sigeberg was preeminent.<sup>20</sup>

218 C 1076 R.20 F.16 A.10

Pope Gregory wholeheartedly  
attacked Emperor Henry, and he  
turned whosoever he could away  
from him through his speeches and  
writings;<sup>21</sup> he even alienated his own  
mother, Agnes, from him.<sup>22</sup> A  
murderer killed Duke Godfrey in  
Frisia.<sup>23</sup>

In this year [1076], which is the 13<sup>th</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> R. 1048-1075.

<sup>18</sup> R. 1075-1091.

<sup>19</sup> On 4 December. R. 1056-1075.

<sup>20</sup> This monastery was the location of his death as well as the location of his shrine after he was canonized.

<sup>21</sup> There are no extant polemic works as such from Gregory VII, though Sigebert may here be referring to decrees of excommunication levelled at Henry.

<sup>22</sup> Agnes had been in Rome since 1065 and was close to reformers such as Peter Damian. I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 125.

<sup>23</sup> On 22 February.

decennovennalis cicli in repetito  
 magno anno Dionisii, duobus magnis  
 annis a passione Domini revolutis,  
 omnia quae ad cursum solis et lunae  
 spectant, anno dominicae passionis  
 concordant. Unde apparet, quod  
 Dionisius non recte annos Domini  
 ciclo suo annexuit. Quia enim ab  
 anno Domini 532 ciclum suum  
 orditus est, nimirum intendit,  
 Christum fuisse natum anno secundo  
 prioris magni anni; ac per hoc hic  
 annus anno dominicae passionis  
 concordans, debuisset esse magni  
 cicli annus non 13, sed 33, quia is fuit  
 annus passionis Domini. Et per hanc  
 consequentiam solaris et lunaris  
 cursus, concordantem evangelicae  
 veritati, Dionisius posuit nativitatem  
 Christi viginti uno annis tardius quam  
 debuit. (Ib.) Gelu magnum a Kalendis

year of the first decenovenal cycle in  
 the repetition of the Great Year of the  
 Dionysian calendar, two Great Years  
 after the Passion of the Lord, they  
 observed all things pertaining to the  
 course of the sun and the moon, and  
 they matched with the year of the  
 Passion of the Lord. Therefore, it  
 appears that Dionysius did not  
 correctly calculate the years of the  
 Lord in his system.<sup>24</sup> For, since the  
 cycle was ordered from the 532<sup>nd</sup> year  
 of the Lord, without doubt it is held  
 that Christ was born in the second  
 year of the previous Great Year; and  
 through this fact, namely, that this  
 year matched that year of the Lord's  
 Passion, it must have been not the  
 13<sup>th</sup> year of the Great Cycle, but the  
 33<sup>rd</sup>, because that was the year of the  
 Passion of the Lord. And through this

219 B

---

<sup>24</sup> See Hans-Werner Goetz. "The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," 145 on the error of the Dionysian Cycle.

Novembris usque ad aequinoctium  
vernale.

1077 21 17 11

(MAR.) Heinricus imperator coacto  
Wormaciae concilio 24 episcoporum  
et multorum primatum regni decerni  
jubet, omnia decreta et facta  
Hildibrandi papae irrita esse debere;  
ibique omnes preter paucos  
Hildibrandum abjurant, eumque  
papatu abdicandum esse judicant.

(Ib.) Hildibrandus econtra  
imperatorem Heinricum Romae  
excommunicat, sub hoc optentu, ut  
primates regni quasi justa ex causa

conclusion, the course of the sun and  
of the moon, matching with the truth  
of the evangelist, Dionysius placed  
the birth of Christ at twenty-one years  
later than he ought to have. There was  
a great freeze from 1 November until  
the vernal equinox.<sup>25</sup>

1077 21 17 11

Emperor Henry, having convened a  
council at Worms<sup>26</sup> of 24 bishops and  
of many leading men, bid that the  
succession of the kingdom be  
decided, that all decrees and deeds of  
Hildebrand the pope should be  
declared invalid; and all there except  
for a few repudiated Hildebrand, and  
judged that he must abdicate the  
papacy. From Rome, Hildebrand, in  
return, excommunicated Emperor  
Henry,<sup>27</sup> in the hope that the leading

---

<sup>25</sup> 14 March.

<sup>26</sup> On 24 January of 1076, not 1077.

<sup>27</sup> In February of 1076, not 1077.

excommunicato regi contradicant.  
  
Dominica palmarum circa horam  
sextam sereno celo stella apparuit.  
Principibus Saxonum, qui in  
deditione imperatoris erant, relaxatis  
per eos quibus commissi erant,  
Saxones rebellant instinctu  
Hildibrandi papae. Ipse papa  
occurrrens imperatori in Langobardia,  
sub falsa cum pace absolvit. Omnes  
enim qui prius Hildibrandum  
abjuraverant, perjurio perjurium  
cumulantes, imperatorem abjurant, et  
Rodulfum ducem Burgundionum  
super se regem statuunt; corona ei a  
papa missa, cui erat inscriptum: Petra  
dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodulfo.

men of the kingdom would oppose  
him, as though with a just cause,  
while the king was excommunicated.  
On Palm Sunday<sup>28</sup>, around the sixth  
hour, a star appeared in the serene  
sky.<sup>29</sup> The leaders of the Saxons, who  
had been under terms of surrender to  
the emperor, and were released on  
account of their deeds, rebelled at the  
instigation of Pope Hildebrand. The  
pope himself, meeting the emperor in  
Lombardy, absolved him under a  
false peace.<sup>30</sup> For all who had earlier  
repudiated Hildebrand, adding  
perjury to perjury, repudiated the  
emperor, and placed Rudolph, Duke  
of Burgundy, above themselves as a  
king.<sup>31</sup> The crown was sent to him by  
the pope, to whom he had inscribed

---

<sup>28</sup> 9 April.

<sup>29</sup> The hours of the day were calculated from sunrise. The sixth hour of the day is approximately noon. Hetherington accepts Sigebert's report of this 'star' as valid, but does not cite a further source as confirmation. Barry Hetherington. *A Chronicle of Pre-Telescopic Astronomy*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons, 1996, p. 127.

<sup>30</sup> On 28 January.

<sup>31</sup> On 15 March.

(MAR.) Hunc Sigifridus  
archiepiscopus Moguntiae in regem  
benedixit; et facta a Moguntinis  
seditione contra eos, Rodulfus cum  
archiepiscopo noctu aufugit.  
Hildibrandus papa omnes adversantes  
imperatori absolvit ab infidelitate et  
perjurio.

Imperator, Alpium aditibus contra se  
ubique munitis, omnes eorum insidias  
frustratus, statim per Aquileiam venit  
Radisponam, et Rodulfum adortus,  
eum fugere compulit, et iterata  
expeditione Sueviam depopulatur.

1078 22 18 12

(MAR.) Heinricus imperator Sueviam  
pervagatus, castella frangit, et omnia

220 A on it: "The rock gave to Peter, Peter  
gives a diadem to Rudolph."  
Siegfried, archbishop of Mainz,  
anointed this man as king.<sup>32</sup> There  
was a plot against them by the  
residents of Mainz and Rudolph, with  
the archbishop, fled at night. Pope  
Hildebrand absolved all of the  
enemies of the emperor for their  
faithlessness and perjury.

The emperor, since the passes  
through the Alps were everywhere  
fortified against him, frustrated all of  
their plots and at once came to  
Regensburg by way of Aalen, and  
attacked Rudolph, compelled him to  
flee, and in a new expedition, laid  
waste to Swabia.<sup>33</sup>

1078 22 18 12

Emperor Henry traveled through  
Swabia, broke down castles, and,

---

<sup>32</sup> On 26 March.

<sup>33</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 172-173 for this expedition.

depopulando, inimicis suis  
formidinem, amicis addit  
fortitudinem, et multos, qui ex  
desperatione rerum a se defecerant,  
ad se retrahit. Herimannus episcopus,  
Hildibrando papae ad animam  
confederatus ac per hoc imperatori  
rebellis, Mettensi urbe pellitur.

1079 23 19 13

(MAR.) Hoc tempore in oriente Turci  
super Arabes et Saracenos  
invaluerant, et Armeniam et Siriam  
incursantes, multas urbes et ipsam  
Antiochiam capiunt.

(Ib.) Heinricus imperator in  
pentecoste conventu habito  
Moguntiae, decernit Hildibrandum a  
papatu esse deponendum; et  
Langobardiam petens, Guicbertum

laying waste to everything, he  
inspired dread in his enemies and  
bravery in his friends. He brought  
back to his side many who had  
defected from him out of desperation  
for their situation. Bishop Hermann  
[of Metz], a close ally of Pope  
Hildebrand, and, thus, a rebel against  
the emperor, was expelled from the  
city of Metz.

1079 23 19 13

At this time in the East, the Turks had  
grown stronger than the Arabs and  
the Saracens, and, invading both  
Armenia and Syria, captured many  
cities, including Antioch itself.

Emperor Henry at the Pentecostal  
court held at Mainz, decreed that  
Hildebrand should be deposed from  
the papacy.<sup>34</sup> Also, while attacking  
Lombardy, he chose Guicbert,

---

<sup>34</sup> On 12 May.

Ravennae archiepiscopum pro  
Hildibrando papam designat.

1080 24 20 14

Hildibrandus papa quasi divinitus  
revelatum sibi predixit, hoc anno  
falsum regem esse moriturum. Et  
verum quidem predixit, sed fefellit  
eum de falso rege conjectura  
secundum suum velle super Heinrico  
rege interpretata. (A. Leod.) Rex  
enim Heinricus Saxonibus gravi  
prelio congreditur, et in congressu  
falsus rex Rodulfus cum multis  
Saxoniae principibus extinguitur.  
(MAR.) Moguncia magnum  
terraemotum persensit Kalendis  
Decembris.

1081 25 21 15

(Ib.) Moguncia ex maxima parte  
incendio conflagravit. Magnus

archbishop of Ravenna, as the  
successor for Pope Hildebrand.<sup>35</sup>

1080 24 20 14

Pope Hildebrand predicted, as though  
it was divinely revealed to him, that  
in this year the false king would die.<sup>36</sup>

And, indeed, he did predict it  
correctly, but he was incorrect in his  
conjecture about the false king,  
thinking that it should be interpreted  
as about King Henry, according to his  
wishes. For King Henry engaged the  
Saxons in a great battle, and in the  
clash the false king, Rudolph, along  
with many of the leaders of Saxony,  
was killed.<sup>37</sup> In Mainz, a strong  
earthquake was felt on 1 December.

1081 25 21 15

The greater part of Mainz was set  
afire. There was a large earthquake

---

<sup>35</sup> At Brixen, on 25 June 1080.

<sup>36</sup> I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 204-205.

<sup>37</sup> On 15 October.

terraemotus cum gravi terrae mugitu  
factus est 6 Kal. Aprilis (A. Leod.)  
prima hora noctis, portendens forte  
imminens malum, quod in toto orbe  
insonuit, et unde terra doluit et dolet.  
(Ib.) Heinricus enim imperator ad  
debellandum papam Hildibrandum  
Italiam petit; contra quem papa  
urbibus et castellis munitis, se ad  
rebellandum accingit, eumque  
Romam hostiliter adeuntem non  
recipit.

1082 R. 26 F. 22 A. 16

Heinricus imperator expugnatis  
urbibus et castellis, quae contra se pro  
Hildibrando erant, Romam  
Leonianam obsidet. (Ib.) In Gallia  
Herimannus, miles Herimanni  
episcopi, corona sibi imposita, post  
Rodulfum in Saxonia tyrannidem

with a great rumbling of earth on 27  
March in the first hour of the night,<sup>38</sup>  
portending great imminent evil,  
which resounded about the whole  
world, and from which the earth was  
hurt and, as yet, still hurts. For  
Henry, the emperor, invaded Italy in  
order to subdue Pope Hildebrand; the  
221 A pope fortified cities and castles  
against him, and he prepared himself  
to rebel.<sup>39</sup> This did not stop him from  
advancing on Rome militarily.

1082 R. 26 F. 22 A. 16

Emperor Henry stormed the cities and  
castles which were against him and  
for Hildebrand and besieged Leonine  
Rome. In Gaul, Hermann, a soldier of  
archbishop Hermann, placed a crown  
on himself, after Rudolph had acted  
as a tyrant in Saxony.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Sigebert here draws upon the Annals of Liège, in MGH SS IV, p. 29.

<sup>39</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 211-235 for this expedition.

<sup>40</sup> At Goslar on 26 December of 1081; he was elected on 9 August.

exercet.

Marianus Scottus chronicam suam a Christi nativitate inchoatam usque ad hunc annum perduxit, qui erat aetatis suae annus 56, multum laborans corrigere errorem de annis Domini, qui invenitur in ciclo Dionisii; quod facile est videre, hinc positus ab eo annis Domini secundum ciclum Dionisii, altrinsecus autem secundum veritatem evangelii.

1083 27 23 17

(Ib.) Heinricus imperator Roma Leoniana capta, Romam obsidet. Conducta inter imperatorem et papam die ad causam inter eos discernendam, cum pax dissimulante papa inter eos non conveniret,

Marianus Scotus brought his chronicle, which began at the birth of Christ up to this year.<sup>41</sup> He was fifty six years of age and labored much to correct the error in the calculation of the years of the Lord which is found in the Dionysian cycle.<sup>42</sup> This error is easy to see with the years of the Lord according to the Dionysian cycle placed on one side, and on the other side, however, those according to the truth of the evangelists.

1083 27 23 17

After Emperor Henry had captured Leonine Rome, he besieged Rome itself. On a day agreed upon between the emperor and the pope for the sake of deciding the matter between themselves, since a peace between

---

<sup>41</sup> See Marianus Scotus. *Chronica*. Ed. Georg Pertz. In *MGH SS V*. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1844, p. 481-562.

<sup>42</sup> See the discussion in Chapter 3, as well as at Hans-Werner Goetz. "The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and the Twelfth Centuries," p. 145.

Romani et multi Italiae episcopi a  
papa desciscunt; qui fugiens ad  
Nortmannos se contulit.

1084 28 24 18

(Ib.) Romani imperatorem Heinricum  
urbe recipiunt; et eorum iudicio  
Hildibrandus papa abdicatur, et  
Guicbertus Ravennarum  
archiepiscopus in sedem apostolicam  
intronizatus Clemens nominatur; his  
qui pro imperatore erant,  
contententibus, iuste Hildibrandum  
esse depositum tanquam majestatis  
reum, qui contra imperatorem alium  
regem ordinaverit, et rebellandi  
audaciam adsumpserit; his autem qui  
contra sentiebant, reclamantibus,  
universalem papam non universali  
concilio, paucorum iudicio, laicali

them, with a dissimulating pope, did  
not suit them, the Romans and many  
Italian bishops broke with the pope;  
who, fleeing, went to the Normans.<sup>43</sup>

1084 28 24 18

The Romans received the emperor,  
Henry, into the city;<sup>44</sup> and at their  
judgment Pope Hildebrand was  
renounced, and Guicbert, archbishop  
of Ravenna, was enthroned in the  
apostolic seat, and was named  
Clement.<sup>45</sup> Those who were for the  
emperor contended that Hildebrand  
was justly deposed as he was guilty  
of treason, since he ordained another  
king against the emperor and had the  
audacity to rebel. Those who thought  
otherwise cried out in protest that the  
universal pope could not be removed  
from his pontificate through a council

---

<sup>43</sup> By January, Gregory was in Benevento. See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 221 ff.

<sup>44</sup> On 21 March.

<sup>45</sup> On 24 March.

censura, imperiali potentia, non posse  
a pontificatu amoveri; et quod gravius  
est, in loco viventis episcopi aliquem  
suffectum contra canonicam  
auctoritatem agere; et cetera id genus.  
Heinricus rex patricius Romanorum  
constituitur, (A. Leod.) et a Clemente  
in imperatorem benedicitur.

1085 29 25 19

Heinricus imperator Mogunciae regali  
et synodali conventu coacto, exigit ab  
omnibus, ut Hildibrandi depositionem  
et Guicberti ordinationem subscripto  
approbent. Cui aliqui manu et ore  
faventes, corde tamen Hildibrando  
adherebant.

Herimannus Mettensis, sibi absentis

---

<sup>46</sup> On 31 March.

<sup>47</sup> On 4 May.

222 A that was not universal, through the  
judgement of the few, the censure of  
the lay, and imperial power. And,  
what is worse, in the place of a living  
bishop was appointed against  
canonical authority; and the rest of  
the arguments were of that sort. King  
Henry was made a Patrician of the  
Romans and was anointed emperor  
by Clement.<sup>46</sup>

1085 29 25 19

Emperor Henry at a royal and synodal  
council that he had called at Mainz,<sup>47</sup>  
asked of everyone whether they  
approved of the deposition of  
Hildebrand and the ordination of the  
Guicbert named below. Some favored  
him with their hands and mouths, but  
in their hearts, they still were loyal to  
Hildebrand.

222 B Hermann of Metz, since he was

abjudicato episcopatu, iterum urbe  
pellitur. Imperator in episcopatu  
Mettensi unum et alterum  
mercennarium supposuit, sed oves  
Christi non audierunt vocem  
alienorum. (Ib.)

Imperator Saxones aggreditur; illi  
pacem petunt et impetrant, pacti ut  
omnibus pro hac rebellione  
proscriptis sua restituantur. Quod  
quia factum non est, iterum rebellant;  
incentore pre cunctis Egberto comite,  
imperatoris consanguineo.

Gualcherus ex clero sancti Lantberti  
in Anglia episcopus, Anglorum odiis  
innocens impetitur, et in celebrando  
missam ab eis quasi alter Stephanus

deprived of his bishopric in his  
absence, again assaulted the city. The  
emperor placed the episcopate of  
Metz under one and then another  
hireling, but the sheep of Christ  
would not listen to the voice of  
another.

The emperor attacked the Saxons;<sup>48</sup>  
they sought peace and obtained it, it  
having been settled that all who,  
because of this rebellion, were  
proscribed would have their goods  
restored to them. Because this was  
not done, they rebelled again, with  
Count Egbert [of Brunswick], a  
relative of the emperor, inciting them  
above all others.<sup>49</sup>

Gualcherus from the clergy of Saint  
Lantbert, a bishop in England, was  
attacked through the hatred of the  
English, though he was innocent, and,

---

<sup>48</sup> In July.

<sup>49</sup> In September.

papa martirizatur.

Hildibrandus papa apud Salernum  
exulans, moritur. De hoc ita scriptum  
repperi: *Volumus vos scire, qui  
aecclesiasticae curae solliciti estis,  
quod dominus apostolicus  
Hildibrandus nunc in extremis suis ad  
se vocavit unum de 12 cardinalibus,  
quem multum diligebat pre ceteris, et  
confessus est Deo et sancto Petro et  
toti aecclesiae, se valde peccasse in  
pastorali cura, quae ei ad regendum  
commissa erat, et suadente diabolo  
contra humanum genus odium et iram  
concitasse, postea vero sententiam  
quae in orbe terrarum effusa est, pro  
augmento christianitatis cepisse  
dicebat. Tunc demum misit predictum*

while celebrating the Mass, he was  
martyred by them, as though he was  
another Pope Stephen.<sup>50</sup>

Pope Hildebrand, in exile at Salerno,  
died.<sup>51</sup> About this man, it was found  
written:<sup>52</sup> “We wish you to know,  
who care for the Church, that our  
apostolic lord, Hildebrand, now *in  
extremis* calls to himself one of the 12  
cardinals, whom he loves much, more  
than the others, and he is confessed to  
God and Saint Peter and the whole  
Church, that he has gravely sinned in  
his pastoral duty, which he had  
undertaken in order to reign, and with  
the devil persuading him, had stirred  
up hatred and wrath against the  
human race, afterwards, truly, the  
feeling which was brought upon the  
globe of the earth, he said that he had

---

<sup>50</sup> Pope Stephen I was reportedly murdered while holding Mass in Rome.

<sup>51</sup> On 25 May.

<sup>52</sup> Bethmann notes that this letter is a forgery, although Sigebert may not have been the originator of the document, as it appears in the work of Hugh of Flavigny as well. *PL* vol. 160, 221 D.

*confessorem suum ad imperatorem, et  
ad totam aecclesiam, ut optaret illi  
indulgentiam, quia finem vitae suae  
aspiciebat. Et tam cito induebat se  
angelicam vestem, et dimisit ac  
dissolvit vincula omnium bannorum  
suorum imperatori et omni populo  
christiano, vivis et defunctis, clericis  
et laicis; et jussit suos abire de domo  
Deoderici, et amicos imperatoris  
ascendere.*

1086 R. 30 F. 26 A. 20

Saxones urbem Wirziburch  
obsidentes, ut episcopum ipsius  
Alberonem a civibus expulsam  
restituant sedi suae, Heinricus  
imperator aggreditur. Sed exercitus  
ejus divinitus exterritus cessit, et

done for the growth of Christianity.  
Only then did he send his aforesaid  
confessor to the emperor, and to the  
whole Church, so that he might beg  
their forgiveness, because he saw that  
the end of his life was near. And so,  
quickly, he dressed himself in angelic  
robes, and abandoned and dissolved  
the chains of all of his edicts against  
the emperor and all Christian people,  
living and dead, clerics and laity; and  
he bids his own men to depart from  
the house of Theodoric<sup>53</sup> and rise up  
as friends of the emperor.”

1086 R.30 F.26 A.20

While the Saxons were besieging the  
city of Würzburg,<sup>54</sup> so that they could  
restore the bishop, Albero, who was  
expelled by the citizens, to his seat,  
Henry, the emperor, attacked them  
but a divine terror stopped his army,

---

<sup>53</sup> H. E. J. Cowdrey. *The Age of Abbot Desiderius*, p. 250 notes that this refers to the Castel Sant' Angelo.

<sup>54</sup> On 11 August.

ceciderunt ex eis plus quam 4 milia, a parte Saxonum 14 tantum occisis.

Nimia aquarum inundatio multis in locis damno et periculo fuit. In Italia tanta diluvies fuit, ut rupes liquore aquarum dissolutae, plures villas ruina sua exterminarent.

Casinensium abbas Desiderius, qui et Victor, contra Clementem fit papa, sed dissenteria dissolutus, non multo post moritur. Anselmus Lucensis episcopus, Hildibrandi papae cooperator indefessus, apud Mantuam exulans moritur; qui in Hieremiam et in Psalmos tractatus edidit, et doctrinam Hildibrandi libro luculento confirmavit; cujus sanctitas miraculis declarata est. Domesticae aves,

and more than 4 thousand of them fell; on the part of the Saxons only 14 died.

An excessive inundation of waters in many places caused peril and destruction. In Italy, there were such great floods that cliffs were dissolved in water, many villages were destroyed.<sup>55</sup>

Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, named Victor, became pope against Clement, but was laid low by dysentery, and he died not long after.<sup>56</sup> Anselm, bishop of Lucca, an indefatigable partisan of Pope Hildebrand, died in exile at Mantua.<sup>57</sup> He had published a tract on Jeremiah and on Psalms, and confirmed the doctrine of Hildebrand in that splendid book; his sanctity was

---

<sup>55</sup> Sigebert's source for these floods is unclear.

<sup>56</sup> He was elected on 24 May 1086 and died on 16 September 1087.

<sup>57</sup> On 19 March.

pavones, gallinae et aucae, a domibus  
se extraneantes, fiunt silvaticae.

1087 31 27 21

Inter imperatorem et Saxones vario  
eventu plus vice simplici pugnatur.

(Transl. S. Nic.) In Italia Venetianis

meditantibus auferre corpus sancti

Nicholai a Myrea Lyciae a Turcis

desolata, preoccupaverunt eos

Varenses cives numero 47, et ab

Antiochia Myream venientes, a 4

monachis tantum ibi inventis

extorserunt sibi ostendi tumbam

sancti; qua effracta, ossa sancti in olei

liquore natantia integro numero

extraxerunt, et Varim cum gloria

attulerunt. Facta est haec translatio

anno 745 a depositione sancti

Nicholai. Pisces in aquis moriuntur.

declared by miracles.<sup>58</sup> Tame birds,  
peacocks, hens and small birds,

exiting their homes, became wild.

1087 31 27 21

There was fighting between the

emperor and the Saxons at various

times, more than a single exchange.<sup>59</sup>

In Italy, the Venetians having thought

to move the body of Saint Nicholas

from Myra in Lycia, which had been

emptied by the Turks, 47 citizens of

Bari anticipated their actions, and

coming from Antioch to Myra, they

tore away from four monks, the only

ones to be found there, the tomb of

the saint, which was revealed to

them; when they broke into it, they

removed the bones of the saint, which

were submerged, complete in

number, in an oily liquid, and they

---

<sup>58</sup> His surviving works appear in the *Patrologia Latina*, volume 149. Anselm of Lucca. *Collectio Canonica*. Ed. Angelo Mai. *PL* vol. 149. Paris: Garnier Fratres, 1882, 485-534.

<sup>59</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 258-259 for this expedition.

1088 32 28 22

In Hyspania rex Galliciae Amful  
Saracenos fortiter debellat, et  
Toletum, maximam eorum urbem, per  
aliquot annos obsessam tandem  
expugnat, et cultum christianitatis in  
ea dilatat.

Odo ex monacho Cluniacensi 223 D  
episcopus Ostiensis, contra  
imperatorem et Guicbertum fit papa,  
et Urbanus nominatur. Hinc in  
aecclesia scandala et in regno  
augescunt discidia, dum alter ab  
altero dissidet, dum regnum et

brought them to Bari with glory. This  
translation occurred in the 745<sup>th</sup> year  
after the burial of Saint Nicholas.<sup>60</sup>

Fish died in the water.

1088 32 28 22

In Spain, the king of Galicia,  
Alfonso, bravely vanquished the  
Saracens. He finally conquered  
Toledo, their biggest city, which had  
been under siege for some years, and  
he increased the practice of  
Christianity there.<sup>61</sup>

Odo, a Cluniac monk, the Bishop of  
Ostia became pope, against the  
emperor and Guicbert, and was  
named Urban.<sup>62</sup> Henceforth, scandals  
in the Church and in the kingdom  
increased discord, while one  
dissented from the other, while the

---

<sup>60</sup> See Charles W. Jones. *Saint Nicholas of Myra, Bari, and Manhattan: Biography of a Legend*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978, p. 94 and 176-193 for the translation of Saint Nicholas.

<sup>61</sup> See Clifford R. Backman. *The Worlds of Medieval Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003, p. 198 for the impact of the conquest of Toledo.

<sup>62</sup>On 12 March.

sacerdotium dissentit, dum alter  
alterum excommunicat, alter alterius  
excommunicationem aut ex causae  
aut ex personae prejudicio despicit; et  
dum alter in alterum excommunicandi  
auctoritate magis ex suo libitu, quam  
ex justitiae respectu abutitur,  
auctoritas illius, qui dedit potestatem  
ligandi ac solvendi, omnino  
despicitur (cf. Ep. Sig.). Nimirum, ut  
pace omnium bonorum dixerim, haec  
sola novitas, ne dicam heresis,  
necdum in mundo emererat, ut  
sacerdotes illius, qui dicit regi  
apostata, et qui regnare facit  
ypocritam propter peccata populi,  
doceant populum, quod malis regibus  
nullam debeant subjectionem, et licet  
ei sacramentum fidelitatis fecerint,  
nullam tamen fidelitatem debeant, nec  
perjuri dicantur, qui contra regem  
senserint; imo qui regi paruerit pro

kingdom and the priesthood differed,  
while one excommunicated the other,  
the other despised the one's  
excommunication, either for its  
grounds or out of prejudice for the  
excommunicator; and while one  
wished for greater authority for  
excommunicating the other at his  
whim, which he wasted out of respect  
for justice. His authority, which gave  
the power of binding and loosing,  
was altogether rejected. Without  
doubt, so that I might have spoken  
with respect of all good men, this  
newness alone, I shall not say heresy,  
had not yet emerged into the world,  
so that his priests, who say "apostate"  
to the king and who make a hypocrite  
reign because of the sins of the  
people, teach the people that they owe  
no fealty to bad kings, and that it is  
permitted to them to swear an oath of

224 B

excommunicato habeatur, qui contra regem fecerit, a noxa injustitiae et perjurii absolvatur.

1089 33 29 23

(A. Leod.) Coloniae post Siguinum Herimannus ordinatur archiepiscopus. Godefrido, Godefridi Gimbosi ex sorore nepoti, tandem datur ducatus Lotharingiae. (Ib.) Annus pestilens, maxime in occidentali parte Lotharingiae; ubi multi, sacro igni interiora consumente computrescentes, exesis menbris instar carbonum nigrescentibus, aut miserabiliter moriuntur, aut manibus et pedibus putrefactis truncati,

faithfulness, nevertheless that they owe no fidelity, nor are they to be called perjurers, who plot against the king; on the contrary, those who obey the king are held to be excommunicated, and those who act against the king are absolved from the harm of injustice and perjury.

1089 33 29 23

Hermann was ordained archbishop of Cologne after Siguinus.<sup>63</sup> Godfrey, the nephew of Godfrey Gimbosus by his sister, was finally given the dukedom of Lotharingia.<sup>64</sup> It was a pestilent year, especially in the western part of Lotharignia, where many, rotting, accursed with a consuming inner fire, in the likeness of charcoal, with their eaten-away limbs blackening, either died miserably, or, having cut off the

---

<sup>63</sup> On 25 July.

<sup>64</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 148 for the debate over Godfrey's inheritance.

miserabiliori vitae reservantur, multi  
vero nervorum contractione distorti  
tormentantur.

1090 34 30 24

Heinricus imperator ad debellandos  
adversantes sibi Italiam reppetit.

Herimannus tyrannus a Saxonia  
Lotharingiam repetens, ad  
concitandos regni motus laborat. Qui  
dum muro castelli cujusdam incaute  
approximat, jacto de turri saxo in  
capite percutitur, et moritur.

Mettis corpus sancti Clementis, primi  
episcopi ab apostolis illic ordinati,  
inventum levatur. Herimannus  
episcopus permissu imperatoris a  
Mettensibus urbe receptus, dum post  
prandium liberaliter celebratum in  
lecto se reclinasset, mortuus  
invenitur.

rotten hands and feet, were spared for  
a miserable life: indeed, many were  
tormented and distorted through the  
contraction of their sinews.

224 C 1090 34 30 24

Emperor Henry returned to Italy to  
subdue his enemies.<sup>65</sup> Hermann, the  
tyrant, returning to Lotharingia from  
Saxony, labored to stir up a rebellion  
in the kingdom. When he came close  
to the wall of a certain castle  
incautiously, a rock thrown from a  
tower stuck his head, and he died.<sup>66</sup>

In Metz, the body of Saint Clement,  
the first bishop ordained there by the  
apostles, having been found, was  
raised. Hermann, the bishop, at the  
permission of the emperor, was  
accepted into the city of Metz, where,  
after a liberally celebrated lunch, he  
reclined on his couch, and was found

---

<sup>65</sup> In March.

<sup>66</sup> In September 1088 at Cochem.

In Saxonia Egbertus comes, dum  
fideles imperatoris bello insequitur, et  
ipse perimitur. Sterilitas frugum  
terrae augescit, et fames paulatim  
irrepat.

1091 35 31 25

(Ib.) Heinricus imperator in Italia  
castella et munitiones adversantium  
sibi expugnat, Mantuam quoque  
obsidet et capit. Bonae memoriae  
Heinricus Leodicensium episcopus,  
amator pacis et religionis obit, eique  
Otbertus ex clero ejusdem aeccliesiae  
succedit.

1092 R. 36 F. 32 A. 26

Guilelmus rex Anglorum, vir  
singularis censurae et severitatis, obit.

dead.<sup>67</sup>

In Saxony, Egbert, the count, while  
he fought those faithful to the  
emperor in battle also perished.  
Sterility of the fruits of the earth  
increased, and famine crept onward,  
little by little.<sup>68</sup>

224 D 1091 35 31 25

Emperor Henry conquered castles and  
fortifications that were against him in  
Italy, and he also besieged and  
captured Mantua.<sup>69</sup> Henry, bishop of  
Liège, of happy memory, a lover of  
peace and religion died.<sup>70</sup> Olbert,  
from the clergy of that same church,  
succeeded him.<sup>71</sup>

1092 R. 36 F. 32 A. 26

William, king of the English, a man  
of singular censoriousness and

---

<sup>67</sup> On 4 May.

<sup>68</sup> This famine may be related to the one which Sigebert claims in 1095 to have been “long in coming.”

<sup>69</sup> On 10 April.

<sup>70</sup> On 31 May.

<sup>71</sup> R. 1091-1119.

Guilelmus filius ejus succedit.  
Incentoribus Saxonici belli omnibus  
pene peremptis, Saxones pertesi  
malorum, composita inter se pace  
quiescunt ab omni motu bellorum.  
Westfali Fresoniam aggressi, omnes  
pene a Fresonibus perimuntur.

1093 37 33 1

Conradus filius imperatoris Heinrici  
in Italia se ad patris sui adversarios  
contulit; et multis se a patre ad filium  
vertentibus, haec res priores patris  
victorias multum offuscat, et vires  
ejus attenuat. Jaculum ignitum a  
meridie ad aquilonem per caelum  
ferri visum est Kalendis Augusti,  
prima hora noctis.

severity, died.<sup>72</sup> William, his son,  
succeeded him.<sup>73</sup> With the inciters of  
the Saxon war nearly all killed, the  
Saxons, wearied of evils, agreed  
among themselves to peace and to  
rest from all movements of war. The  
Westphalians attacked Frisia, and  
nearly all of the Frisians were  
killed.<sup>74</sup>

1093 37 33 1

Conrad, son of Emperor Henry, went  
to Italy to the enemies of his father;  
and many turned themselves from the  
father to the son.<sup>75</sup> This matter  
darkened many of his father's prior  
victories and diminished his strength.  
A burning javelin was seen in the sky  
from midday in the North on 1  
August to the first hour of the night.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> On 9 September of 1087.

<sup>73</sup> R. 1087-1100.

<sup>74</sup> On 21 July.

<sup>75</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 286-288.

<sup>76</sup> Hetherington quotes Sigebert as to the validity of this event. Two other astronomical events are reported to have occurred on the same day. An anonymous account, also from Liège, notes a comet in the North, traveling from East to West, whereas Hetherington interprets Sigebert's entry as referring to a comet

1094 38 34 2

(A. Leod.) In Gallia et Germania  
gravis hominum mortalitas facta est.  
In Italia illi, qui se ad imperatorem ab  
hostibus ejus transtulerant, eo ad  
Galliam reverso, omnes pene ad  
hostes ejus rursus transeunt, et  
munitiones ab eo expugnatas contra  
eum muniunt.

1095 R. 39 F. 35 A. 3

(Ib.) Fames diu concepta validissime  
ingravatur, et fit annus calamitosus, 225 C  
multis fame laborantibus et  
pauperibus per furta et incendia  
ditiores graviter vexantibus. Cum  
valido ventorum turbine etiam  
terraemotus factus est media nocte, 4  
Idus septembris. Rex Anglorum a  
fratribus suis bello sollicitatur in

1094 38 34 2

In Gaul and Germany, a great many  
men died. In Italy those who had  
joined the emperor from his enemies,  
having turned back toward Gaul,  
nearly all crossed to his enemies  
again, and fortifications conquered by  
him were fortified against him.<sup>77</sup>

1095 R. 39 F. 35 A. 3

A famine, long in coming, was made  
greatly worse, and it became a most  
calamitous year, with many laborers  
and paupers heavily vexing the richer  
men through theft and fire because of  
their hunger. Along with a strong  
tornado, there was also an earthquake  
at midnight on 10 September. The  
king of the English was roused into

---

traveling from the South to the North (*ad aquilonem*). Additionally, Matthew Paris records an aurora on that same night. Barry Hetherington. *A Chronicle of Pre-Telescopic Astronomy*, 128.

<sup>77</sup> Robinson notes that in this period of Henry's life there is little record of his location; however, it is in this year that Henry's wife joined the rebellion against him. See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 289-290.

Normannia et Anglia.

In multa terrarum parte pridie Nonas  
Aprilis circa diluculum stellae  
perplures simul de coelo in terram  
cecidisse visae sunt; inter quas unam  
maximam labi in terra cum quidam in  
Francia stuperet, et notato loco ubi  
labi visa est, cum aquam ibi fudisset,  
fumum cum fervoris sono inde exire  
magis stupuit.

Heinricus comes Lovaniensis  
perimitur. In comitatu Namucensi  
panem subcinericium quasi sanguine  
infectum vidimus. Rex Ungarorum

battle by his brothers in Normandy  
and England.<sup>78</sup>

In many parts of the earth, on 4 April  
around dawn a great many stars were  
seen to fall from the heavens to the  
earth at the same time;<sup>79</sup> the biggest  
one of these dropped to the earth in  
France, which astounded a certain  
person, and the place where it fell  
was seen, and marked out, and, since  
water poured into that place, that  
person was astounded even more at  
the smoke that exited this place with  
the sound of boiling.

Count Henry of Louvain was killed.  
In the county of Namur, we saw  
bread baked under the ashes stained  
as though with blood. The king of the

---

<sup>78</sup> Sigebert may have mistaken the date of this invasion of Normandy by one year. Barlow writes that William Rufus invaded Normandy against his brother, Robert Curthose, during the campaigning season of 1094, beginning on 19 March of that year. Barlow, Frank. *William Rufus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983, p. 331-336.

<sup>79</sup> Hetherington notes that on the Eve of St. Ambrose (the night of 3 April) in England, France, and Italy this event was witnessed. St. Ambrose's feast day is, in fact, 7 December; however, the anniversary of his death may have been celebrated on 4 April as well. Barry Hetherington. *A Chronicle of Pre-Telescopic Astronomy*, p. 129.

<p>moritur. (Ib.)</p> <p>Urbanus per Burgundiam et Franciam habitis conciliis, Hildibrandi decreta renovat et confirmat; Philippum regem Francorum, qui vivente uxore sua superduxerat alterius viventis uxorem, excommunicat.</p>	<p>225 D</p>	<p>Hungarians died.<sup>80</sup></p> <p>Urban, in councils held throughout Burgundy and France, renewed and confirmed the decrees of Hildebrand;<sup>81</sup> Philip, king of the Franks, who, while his wife yet lived, married the wife of another man who was yet alive, he excommunicated.</p>
<p>1096 40 36 4</p> <p>Eclipsis lunae facta est 3 Idus Februarii. Rursus 7 Idus Augusti eclipsis lunae facta est. (Ib.)</p> <p>Occidentales populi, dolentes loca sancta Hierosolymis a gentilibus profanari, et Turcos etiam terminos christianorum jam multa ex parte invasisse, innumerabiles una aspiratione moti, et multis signis sibi ostensis, alii ab aliis animati, duces,</p>	<p>226 A</p>	<p>1096 40 36 4</p> <p>There was an eclipse of the moon on 11 February.<sup>82</sup> There was an eclipse of the moon again on 7 August.<sup>83</sup> The western peoples, grieving that the holy places of Jerusalem were profaned by gentiles, and that, furthermore, the Turks had already invaded the borders of the Christians on many sides, innumerable men were moved with one desire, and</p>

<sup>80</sup> Ladislaus, R. 1077-1095.

<sup>81</sup> See Dana Carleton Munro, "The Speech of Pope Urban II. At Clermont, 1095," p. 231-242.

<sup>82</sup> NASA's catalog of lunar eclipses confirms the date of this eclipse. Eclipse Predictions by Fred Espenak and Jean Meeus (NASA's GSFC).

<sup>83</sup> NASA's catalog of lunar eclipses confirms this eclipse, but suggests a date of 6 August. The eclipse occurred during the night of 6 August, which may account for Sigebert placing it in the following day.

comites, potentes, nobiles ac  
ignobiles, divites et pauperes, liberi et  
servi, episcopi, clerici, monachi,  
senes et juvenes etiam pueri et  
puellae, omnes uno animo, nullum  
ullo angariante, undique concurrunt,  
ab Hispania, a Provincia, ab  
Aquitania, a Britannia, a Scottia, ab  
Anglia, a Normannia, a Francia, a  
Lotharingia, a Burgundia, a  
Germania, a Langobardia, ab Apulia  
et ab aliis regnis; et virtute et signo  
sanctae crucis signati et armati, ultum  
ire parant injurias Dei in hostes  
christiani nominis.

Et quanto quisque hactenus ad

many signs presented themselves,  
some were roused by others, dukes,  
counts, powerful men, noble and  
ignoble, rich men and paupers, free  
men and serfs, bishops, clerics,  
monks, old men and young men, even  
boys and girls, all of one mind, none  
under any compulsion, gathered in  
from every direction, from Spain,  
from Provence, from Aquitaine, from  
Brittany, from Scotland, from  
England, from Normandy, from  
France, from Lotharingia, from  
Burgundy, from Germany, from  
Lombardy, from Apulia and from  
other kingdoms; and they were  
marked and armed both with virtue  
and the sign of the Holy Cross, they  
prepared to take vengeance for the  
injuries to God on the enemies of the  
Christian name.

And however much hitherto everyone

exercendam mundi militiam erat  
pronior, tanto nunc ad exercendam  
ultra Dei militiam fit promptior.  
Firmissima pace interim ubique  
composita, et primo Judeos in  
urbibus, in quibus erant, aggressi, eos  
ad credendum Christo compellunt,  
credere nolentes bonis privant,  
trucidant, aut urbibus eliminant.  
Aliqui post ad Iudaismum  
revolvuntur. Eminebant in hoc Dei  
hostico dux Lotharingiae Godefridus  
et fratres ejus Eustatius et Balduinus,  
Balduinus comes Montensis,  
Robertus comes Flandrensis,  
Stephanus comes Blesensis, Hugo  
frater regis Francorum, Rotbertus  
comes Normanniae, Reimundus  
comes de Sancti Egidii, Bojamundus

226 C

had been disposed to campaign for  
worldly matters, now they went  
beyond that in their willingness to  
campaign for God. At the same time,  
the firmest *pax* was established  
everywhere, and first they assailed  
the Jews in the cities that they were  
in, and forced them to believe in  
Christ, they deprived those unwilling  
to believe of their goods, and they  
slaughtered them, or forced them  
from the cities.<sup>84</sup> Some of them  
afterwards returned to Judaism.<sup>85</sup>  
Godfrey, duke of Lotharingia and his  
brothers Eustace and Baldwin,  
Baldwin, count of Mons, Robert,  
count of Flanders, Stephen, count of  
Blois, Hugh, the brother of the king  
of the Franks, Robert, count of

---

<sup>84</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 100-106.

<sup>85</sup> Henry IV allowed the forcibly baptized Jews to return to Judaism. See Benjamin Kedar. "The Forcible Baptisms of 1096: History and Historiography." In *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Landesgeschichte. Peter Herde zum 65. Geburtstag von Freunden, Schülern und Kollegen dargebracht*. Ed. Karl Borchardt and Enno Bünz. Vol. 1. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1998, p. 197, as well as *passim* for the historiography of this event.

dux Apuliae.

1097 41 37 5

(Ib.) Cometes in occidente apparuit  
tota prima ebdomada Octobris. Nimia  
aquarum inundatione autumnalis satio  
impeditur, et sterilitas frugum terrae  
sequitur.

Exercitus Dei aggressus terminos  
paganorum, viriliter agit; primumque  
eis fuit bellum ad pontem Pharphar  
fluminis, 9 Kal. Martii, ubi multi  
Turcorum occisi sunt. Secundum eis  
fuit bellum apud Niceam, 3 Nonas  
Martii, in quo etiam pagani victi sunt.  
(Ep. crucif.)<sup>86</sup>

Normandy, Raymond, count of Saint  
Giles, and Bohemond, duke of Apulia  
were prominent in this host of God.

1097 41 37 5

A comet appeared in the west for the  
entire first week of October.<sup>87</sup>

Because of widespread flooding, the  
autumnal sowing was impeded, and  
sterility of the fruits of the earth  
followed.

The army of God assaulted the  
borders of the pagans, it drove  
forward vigorously; their first battle  
was at the bridge of the Pharphar  
River, on 21 February, where many  
Turks were slain.<sup>88</sup> Their second  
battle was at Nicaea on 5 March, in  
which the pagans were also

---

<sup>86</sup> (Ep. crucif.) signifies that Sigebert's main source for these events is the letter of Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa, Godfrey of Bullion and Raymond Count of Saint Egidius to Paschal II, in *Epistulae et Chartae ad Historiam Primi Belli Sacri Spectantes Quae Supersunt Aevo Aequales ac Genuinae: Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100*. Ed. Heinrich Hagenmeyer, p.167-174.

<sup>87</sup> Kronk notes that this comet was reportedly seen from 6 October to 25 October, between Alpha and Gamma Librae. Gary W. Kronk. *Comets: A Descriptive Catalog*. Aldershot, UK: Enslow Publishers, 1984, p. 3.

<sup>88</sup> Ludwig Bethmann notes that this battle is false. See also, Siegfried Hirsch. *De Vita et Scriptis Sigiberti Monachi Gemblacensis Commentatio Historico-Litteraria*, p. 130.

Capta ergo Nicea, capta etiam  
Laodicia, cum essent plus quam  
trecenta milia armatorum in exercitu  
christianorum, tanta eis omnium  
rerum suppetebat copia, ut aries uno  
nummo, bos vix 12 nummis  
venderetur.

1098 42 38 6  
(Ib.) Obsessa Antiochia in tantum  
attenuati sunt christiani propter  
omnium rerum penuriam, ut in toto  
exercitu vix centum boni equi  
invenirentur. Et tamen quamvis ex  
desperatione rerum multi se  
subtraxerint, multi etiam  
repatriaverint, nono obsidionis mense  
capta Antiochia, christiani a paganis  
versa vice obsessi, tanta fame afflicti

defeated.<sup>89</sup>

Therefore, Nicaea was captured, and  
Laodicea was captured.<sup>90</sup> Although  
there were more than 300,000 armed  
men in the army of the Christians,  
such great supplies were at hand for  
all matters, that a ram was hardly sold  
for one coin, and an ox was hardly  
sold for 12 coins.

226 D 1098 42 38 6  
When Antioch was besieged,<sup>91</sup> the  
Christians were so greatly weakened  
because of their need for all things,  
that in the entire army, hardly one  
hundred good horses could be found.  
And nevertheless, although many had  
deserted because of the desperation of  
matters, many also returned to their  
homelands, in the ninth month of the  
siege, Antioch was captured, and the

---

<sup>89</sup> Ludwig Bethmann notes that this battle took place in May, not March.

<sup>90</sup> In June. Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 121.

<sup>91</sup> October 1097-June 1098. See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 32-148.

sunt, ut vix aliqui ab humanis  
carnibus se abstinerent. Sed confortati  
a Deo per inventam ipsius lanceam, a  
tempore apostolorum non visam, ipsa  
lancea eos precedente, obsessi  
obsessoribus concurrerunt 4 Kal.  
Julii, et hoc tertio bello victoriam  
adepti sunt. Quartum bellum fuit eis  
in Romania Kalendis Julii, et ibi  
Turci victi sunt.

Commissa Antiochia duci  
Bojamundo, christiani propter  
vitandum tedium et famem et maxime  
propter discordias principum,  
proficiscuntur in Syriam, et  
expugnatis Marra et Barra urbibus

Christians, with circumstances  
reversed, were besieged by the  
pagans, and they were afflicted by  
such great hunger, that some could  
hardly abstain from human flesh. But  
strengthened by God, through the  
finding of his Lance, which had not  
been seen since the time of the  
Apostles, the besieged engaged the  
besiegers, with the Lance itself  
preceding them on 28 June, and  
obtained victory in this third battle.  
Their fourth battle was in Romania on  
1 July, and there the Turks were  
conquered.<sup>92</sup>

Antioch was entrusted to Duke  
Bohemond, and the Christians, in  
order to evade illness and hunger,  
and, foremost, because of  
disagreements between the leaders,  
set out for Syria, and after taking al-

---

<sup>92</sup> Ludwig Bethmann notes that this battle is also an addition of Sigebert's.

Saracenorum et multis regionum  
castellis, tanta ibi rursus fame afflicti  
sunt, ut corpora Saracenorum jam  
fetentia comedere compulsi sint.

(A. Leod.) Cuonradus Vultrajectensis 227 B  
episcopus feria 4 pascae post missam  
a se celebratam a quodam suorum in  
domo sua perimitur. Multis in locis 5  
Kal. Octobris coelum quasi ardere  
visum est nocturno tempore, et secuta  
est gravis animalium pestilentia, et  
segetes nimio imbri et aurugine  
corruptae sunt.

1099 R. 43 F. 39 A. 7

(A. Leod.) Coloniae post  
Herimannum Fredericus ordinatur

Bara and Ma'arrat, cities of the  
Saracens, and many castles of the  
region, but they were again afflicted  
with such great hunger there that they  
were compelled to eat the already  
stinking bodies of the Saracens.

Conrad, Bishop of Utrecht, on the  
fourth day of Easter, after he had  
celebrated Mass, was killed in his  
own house by one of his own men.<sup>93</sup>

In many places on 27 September, the  
sky seemed to almost be on fire in the  
hours of the night.<sup>94</sup> There followed a  
grave pestilence among animals, and  
crop fields were rotten through  
excessive rain and mildew.

1099 R. 43 F. 39 A. 7

Friedrich was ordained archbishop of  
Cologne after Hermann.<sup>95</sup> The army

---

<sup>93</sup> On 13 April 1099.

<sup>94</sup> Hetherington notes that the Aurora Borealis was seen throughout Europe on 27 September, and that reports of it at this time even survive from Antioch. Barry Hetherington. *A Chronicle of Pre-Telescopic Astronomy*, p. 130.

<sup>95</sup> On 23 August.

archiepiscopus. (Ep. crucif.)  
Exercitus Dei divino monitu in  
interiora Syriae profectus, larga Dei  
manu refocillatus est, quia cives et  
castellani illius regionis legatos cum  
multis donariis premittebant, parati  
etiam opida vel urbes eis tradere. A  
quibus christiani securitate accepta et 227 C  
indicto urbibus tributo, interim etiam  
multis eorum, qui se subtraxerant, ad  
eos apud Tyrum recurrentibus,  
tandem perveniunt Hierusalem.  
Eaque obsessa, cum laborarent pre  
victus et maxime pre aquae inopia,  
omnes ex communi decreto nudis  
pedibus cotidie orando circuibant  
urbem. Octavo ergo talis  
humiliationis die, obsidionis autem  
die 39, capta est Hierusalem, Id. Julii  
in 6 feria; et in templo Salomonis et  
in porticu ejus christiani cum paganis  
quinto bello conserto, tanta in eis

of God left for the interior of Syria on  
Divine advice, and was revived by  
the bountiful hand of God, because  
the citizens and castle-dwellers of this  
region sent ahead legates with many  
offerings, and they were prepared to  
surrender their towns or cities to  
them. The Christians, having  
accepted the guarantees of these men  
and having established taxes in the  
cities, at the same time as many of  
them who had deserted them,  
returning to those who were at Tyre,  
at length came to Jerusalem. And  
when they besieged it, since they  
labored lacking food and especially  
lacking water, all of them, by  
common decree, daily circled the city  
with bare feet, praying. Then, on the  
eighth day of such humiliation, which  
was also the 39<sup>th</sup> day of the siege,  
Jerusalem was captured, on 15 July,

cede debaccati sunt, ut in sanguine  
occisorum equitarent usque ad genua  
equorum.

Cum ordinatum esset, qui Hierusalem  
deberent retinere, principibus jam de  
patriando agentibus, ecce rex  
Saracenorum ad debellandos eos  
venit Ascalonam, cum centum  
milibus equitum et quadragentis  
milibus peditum. Quibus cum  
occurrisset exercitus Domini, in quo  
non plus quam 5 milia equitum et 15  
milia peditum erant, Deo pro servis  
suis ad se clamantibus pugnante, et  
nube eos ab estu solis defendente,  
Saraceni solo christianorum inpetu  
territi, omnes projectis armis

on the 6<sup>th</sup> day of the week; and in the  
temple of Solomon and on its portico  
the Christians engaged in the fifth  
battle with the pagans, they raged  
uncontrollably in such a great amount  
of slaughter, that they rode in the  
blood of the slain up to the knees of  
the horses.

While it was being decided who  
ought to hold Jerusalem, since the  
227 D leaders were already preparing to  
return home, behold, the king of the  
Saracens came to Ascalon to subdue  
them, with one hundred thousand  
horsemen and four hundred thousand  
foot soldiers. When the army of the  
228 A Lord, in which there were no more  
than 5 thousand cavalry and 15  
thousand foot soldiers, came against  
them, with God fighting for his  
servants who were shouting out to  
him, and defending them with a cloud

fugerunt. Et in hoc sexto bello 4 Kal. Augusti facto caesa sunt centum milia paganorum; in porta vero Ascalonae suffocati sunt ad duo milia; ad eorum qui in mari perierunt, et qui inter spineta silvarum consumpti sunt, numerus nescitur.

Duce Godefrido electo ad principandum remanentibus in Hierusalem, ceteri principes repatriant. Capta est autem Hierusalem post annos circiter 460, ex quo sub Eraclio imperatore secunda vice capta, possessa est a Saracenis.

from the heat of the sun. The Saracens were terrified at the charge of the Christians alone, all of them threw down their arms and fled. And in this sixth battle, which took place on 29 July,<sup>96</sup> 100,000 of the pagans were killed; indeed, in the gate of Ascalon, nearly two thousand were suffocated; but of those who perished in the sea, and who were consumed among the thickets of the woods, the number is not known.

With Duke Godfrey elected to the leadership of those remaining in Jerusalem, the rest of the leaders returned home.<sup>97</sup> Also, Jerusalem was captured after around 460 years of being held by the Saracens, after it was captured for the second time under the Emperor Heraclius.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Rather, 12 August.

<sup>97</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 159-160.

<sup>98</sup> In 637.

Sanctus Guibertus in cenobio  
Gemmelacensi a se fundato ad  
sepulchrum suum magnis clarescit  
miraculis.

1100 R. 44 F. 40 A. 8 H. 1 228 B

Guibertus et Urbanus, qui de papatu  
Romano contendebant, moriendo  
finem faciunt suae contentionis.

Ragnerus, qui et Paschalis, Romanae  
aecclesiae 158 us presidet. Guilelmus  
rex Anglorum moritur, eique succedit  
in regno frater ejus Heinricus.

Godefridus dux Lothariensium et  
princeps Hierosolimitanorum moritur.  
Balduinus frater ejus in principatu ei  
succedit.

1101 45 41 1 1

Conradus filius Heinrici imperatoris  
adhuc patri rebellis, in Italia moritur.

Saint Guibert was made famous by  
the great miracles done at his  
sepulcher in the monastery of  
Gembloux, which he had founded.

1100 R. 44 F. 40 A. 8 H. 1

At the deaths of both Guibert and  
Urban, their contention for the  
Roman Papacy ceased.<sup>99</sup> Rainerius,  
who was also called Paschal, became  
the 158<sup>th</sup> pope.<sup>100</sup> William, king of the  
English, died; his brother, Henry,  
succeeded him in royal power.<sup>101</sup>

Godfrey, the Duke of Lotharingia and  
Prince of Jerusalem died. Baldwin,  
his brother, succeeded him in the  
Principate.<sup>102</sup>

1101 45 41 1 1

Conrad, son of Henry, the emperor,  
died in Italy while still a rebel against

---

<sup>99</sup> Sigebert makes the deaths of Guibert and Urban appear closer than they were in reality. Urban died in July of 1099, and Guibert died in September of 1100.

<sup>100</sup> He was elected on 13 August 1099.

<sup>101</sup> R. 1100-1135.

<sup>102</sup> On 15 July.

Heinricus imperator Heinricum  
Lamburgensem adversantem sibi  
debellat, et expugnatis ejus castellis,  
eum ad deditionem cogit. Sed  
imperator ei multa summa gratiam  
suam redimenti, etiam ducatum  
Lotharingiae donat.

1102 46 42 2 2

Roberto Flandrensi comite  
inquietante urbem Cameracum,  
Heinricus imperator contra eum pro-  
ficiscitur; et aliquibus ejus castellis  
expugnatis, asperitate instantis hiemis  
redire compellitur.

1103 47 43 3 3

Heinricus imperator sedatis Saxonum  
motibus. pacem in quadriennium  
constituit. Leggiae generali conventu

his father.<sup>103</sup> Emperor Henry subdued  
Henry of Lanslebourg, his enemy,  
and, taking his castles, forced him to  
surrender.<sup>104</sup> But the emperor,  
recovering his favor to the highest  
degree, also bestowed the dukedom  
of all Lotharingia on him.

1102 46 42 2 2

Since Robert, count of Flanders, was  
troubling the city of Cambrai,  
Emperor Henry set out against him,<sup>105</sup>  
and after taking some of his castles,  
he was compelled to return because  
of the harshness of the approaching  
winter.

1103 47 43 3 3

Emperor Henry, having settled the  
disturbances of the Saxons,  
established a four-year peace.<sup>106</sup> A

---

<sup>103</sup> In July 1102.

<sup>104</sup> R. 1101-1106.

<sup>105</sup> Siebert writes about these events more extensively, with particular focus on their triggering by Paschal II in the *Epistola Adversus Paschalem Papam*.

<sup>106</sup> At Mainz on 6 January.

habito, Robertus comes Flandrensis  
in gratiam imperatoris recipitur.

1104 48 44 4 4

Hierosolimitae Accaron urbem  
capiunt.

1105 49 45 5 5

Hierosolimitae innumerabilem  
paganorum multitudinem gloriosa  
victoria conterunt. Filius imperatoris  
Heinrici a patre aversus, quosquos  
potest ab eo avertit, et sub optentu  
meliorandae rei publicae et  
restaurandae aecclesiae, in eum  
insurgit.

Excerptum epistolae directae  
Heinrico imperatori a Guarnero

general assembly was held in Liège,  
where Robert, count of Flanders, was  
taken back into the emperor's  
favor.<sup>107</sup>

1104 48 44 4 4

The Jerusalemites captured the city of  
Acre.<sup>108</sup>

228 D 1105 49 45 5 5

The Jerusalemites crushed an  
innumerable multitude of pagans in  
their glorious victory. The son of  
Emperor Henry<sup>109</sup>, having turned  
against his father, and turning  
everyone he could away from him, in  
the hope of bettering the state and  
restoring the church, rose up against  
him.<sup>110</sup>

229 A

An excerpt of the letter directed to  
Emperor Henry from Guarnero,

---

<sup>107</sup> On 29 January.

<sup>108</sup> In May. See Hans Eberhard Mayer. *The Crusades*. Second Edition. Trans. John Gillingham. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972, p. 69.

<sup>109</sup> I.e., the soon-to-be Henry V.

<sup>110</sup> On 12 December 1104.

principe Anchonitano: *Quidam Romanae aecclesiae clerici, qui pro religiosis et sapientibus habebantur, qui etiam Hildibrando papae, Odardo et Rainero familiariter adheserant, relicta illorum secta, quam erroneam esse tandem intellexerant, ad satisfactionem sanctae aecclesiae venerunt.*

*Hujus rei maxima causa fuit, quia Rainerum papam pollutum esse symoniaca heresi pro certo compertum habebant. Infamabatur enim publice ipse Rainerus, quod dum fuisset abbas Sancti Laurentii, prioratum ejusdem aecclesiae vendiderit cuidam monacho 20 solidis; quod ipse diffiteri non potuit. Infamabatur etiam, quod post*

Anconan prince:<sup>111</sup> *Certain clerics of the Church of Rome who are thought to be on the side of the religious and wise men, who also were attached to Pope Hildebrand, Odo, and Rainerus<sup>112</sup> on friendly terms, the remains of their faction, which they at last realized was erroneous, have come to make amends to the Holy Church.*

*The primary cause of this was because they held Pope Rainerus to be polluted by the simoniac heresy, which they had ascertained without a doubt. Indeed, Rainerus, himself, was defamed publicly because while he was abbot of Saint Lawrence, he had sold the priory of that same church for 20 solidi to a certain monk; he himself could not deny it. He was*

229 B

---

<sup>111</sup> Neither Bethmann, Hirsch, nor Chazan note any other extant versions of this letter. See Mireille Chazan. *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XII<sup>e</sup>-XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle)*, p. 143.

<sup>112</sup> Gregory VII, Urban II, and Paschal II.

*Odardum ambiens papatum,  
promiserit pacto et sacramento  
Gregorio comiti Tusculanensi et filio  
ejus Theodolo et Petro de Columna,  
se daturum eis centum libras  
denariorum Papiensium, et unciam  
confessionis, et tres Romanae  
aecclesiae curias, scilicet Nimpham,  
Ziberam, Arithiam, si assentirentur  
ejus electioni; et ita electus, dederit  
in hac summa solvenda calicem  
aureum aecclesiae et purpuream  
planetam; reliquum vero summae  
solverit pro eo Petrus Leonis et  
Albertus Stephani; libram etiam auri  
dederit scriniario.*

*Ob hoc Romani se subtrahentes ab*

*also defamed that, after Odo, in  
soliciting the papacy, he had  
promised in a sworn bargain to  
Gregory the count of Tusculum, and  
to his son Theodolus and to Peter of  
Colonna, he had promised that he  
would give them one hundred pounds  
of denarii minted at Pavia and the  
twelfth part of the confession<sup>113</sup> and  
three estates of the Church of Rome,  
namely Nympha, Zibera, and Arithia,  
if they would agree to his election;  
and when he was so elected, he would  
give in payment of the sum, a golden  
chalice of the Church and a purple  
mantle; indeed, Peter of Lyons and  
Albert son of Stephen would pay off  
the remainder of the sum for him;  
furthermore, he would give the weight  
of gold out of the treasury.*

*On account of this, the Romans,*

---

<sup>113</sup> Likely the income from it.

*ejus communione, factis inter se  
conciliis cum episcopis et  
cardinalibus, monebant eum, ut de  
tanta infamia se sponte purgaret.*

*Quod dum Rainerus ferret indigne, et 229 C  
se magis ad furorem quam ad  
satisfactionem accenderet, et  
accusatoribus tormenta et mortem  
intentaret, Romani eum vere  
hereticum et scismaticum  
protestantes, protulerunt in eum  
sententiam justae damnationis.*

*Preminebat inter Romanos quidam  
Maginolfus archipresbiter, qui quia  
erat laudabilis vitae, et in utraque  
scientia adprime eruditus, longo  
tempore prelatus Romano clero,  
diligebatur a cuncto Romano populo,  
tamquam pater a filiis. Cum etiam hic  
zelo Dei accensus contestaretur*

*withdrawing themselves from  
association with him, in meetings  
between themselves and bishops and  
cardinals, and advised him to cleanse  
himself of such great infamy  
voluntarily. While Rainerus bore this  
shamefully, and aroused himself more  
to furor than to amends, and  
threatened torment and death for his  
accusers, the Romans, rightly  
protesting him as a heretic and  
schismatic, brought forward against  
him a sentence of just damnation.*

*A certain archpriest, Maginolfus, was  
preeminent among the Romans, who  
because of the praiseworthiness of his  
life, and because he was erudite in  
both sciences to the highest degree,<sup>114</sup>  
and had been a prelate in the Roman  
clergy for a long time, he was loved  
by the entire Roman people, as a*

---

<sup>114</sup> Either the *trivium* and the *quadrivium* or the physical sciences and theology.

*publice, Rainerum esse hereticum,  
tunc vero omnes fere Romani  
conclamabant, Rainerum ut  
symoniacum esse deponendum,  
Maginolfum vero ut veritatis testem  
esse substituendum in sede  
apostolica. At Maginolfus, et insidias  
hominum et onus apostolici honoris  
fugiens, in munitissimum locum se  
contulit.*

*Berto vero, caput et rector Romanae  
militiae, quasi causa audiendi verbi  
vitae ad eum accedens cum  
expeditione cleri et populi, eum inde  
extraxit, et ad Warnerum principem  
Anconae in Tiburtinam urbem  
adduxit; et sic electus, 4 Non.*

*father is loved by his children. When  
even this man, set afire with the  
fervor of God called the public to  
witness that Rainerus was a heretic,  
then, indeed, nearly all the Romans  
shouted out that Rainerus was to be  
deposed as a simoniac, and, indeed,  
that Maginolfus, as a witness of the  
truth should be placed in the  
apostolic seat. But Maginolfus fleeing  
both from the plots of men and the  
burden of apostolic honor, brought  
himself to a very well defended place.*

229 D *Berto, indeed, the head and  
commander of the Roman soldiery,<sup>115</sup>  
approaching him, as though to hear  
the plea of the Word of Life, with an  
army of clerics and people, extracted  
him from that place and led him to  
230 A the city and to Guarniero, prince of*

---

<sup>115</sup> The most likely position for this Berto to have held is that of *superista*, which Thomas F. X. Noble describes as the “chief military officer in the Lateran and the head of a body of men called the *familia sancti Petri*.” Thomas F. X. Noble. *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680-825*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1984, p. 248.

*Novembris in sedem apostolicam  
promotus et Silvester quartus  
appellatus est.*

Pascalis papa interim transiens ad  
Gallias, exercet synodales causas, et  
non apparente nota simoniae a  
Romanis sibi injuste injecta,  
honoratur apostolica dignitate. At  
Maginolfus invasionis reus, non  
multo post reprobatur a Romanis, et  
fama nominis ejus evanuit.

1106 R. 50 F. 46 A. 6 H. 6  
4 Non. Februarii stella per diem visa  
est in coelo, ab hora tertia usque ad  
horam nonam, quasi cubito distans a

*Ancona on the Tiburtina; and, thus,  
he was elected on 2 November,<sup>116</sup> and  
he was promoted to the apostolic seat  
and called Sylvester the Fourth.*

Pope Paschal, meanwhile, was  
passing through the Gauls to hold  
synods, and, since the unjust charge  
of simony alleged against him by the  
Romans did not appear to be known,  
he was honored with apostolic  
dignity. But Maginolfus, guilty of  
usurpation, was rejected by the  
Romans not long after, and the fame  
of his name vanished.<sup>117</sup>

1106 R. 50 F. 46 A. 6 H. 6  
On 2 February during the day, a star  
was seen in the sky, from the third  
hour to the ninth hour, about a cubit

---

<sup>116</sup> Of 1100.

<sup>117</sup> Sylvester remained a political force until the *privilege* in 1111. See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 309.

sole. 2 Idus Februarii apud Barum  
Italiae stellae visae sunt in coelo per  
diem, nunc quasi inter se  
concurrentes, nunc quasi in terram  
cadentes. Toto pene mense Februario  
cometes apparuit.

Heinricus filius imperatoris, contra  
jus naturae et fas legum in patrem 230 B  
insurgens, quam indigne eum  
tractaverit, declarat epistola ex ore  
ipsius patris scripta ad Philippum  
regem Francorum: *Princeps  
clarissime, et omnium, in quibus post  
Deum speramus, amicorum  
nostrorum fidelissime, primum et  
precipuum inter omnes vos excepti,  
cui conqueri et deplorare calamitates*

away from the sun.<sup>118</sup> On 12 February  
at Bari in Italy, stars were seen in the  
sky through the day, now as though  
battling amongst themselves, now as  
though falling to the earth. For nearly  
the entire month of February, a comet  
appeared.<sup>119</sup>

Henry, the son of the emperor,  
rebelled against his father contrary to  
the laws of nature and men. A letter  
dictated by his father's own mouth,  
written to Philip, king of the Franks,  
declares how unworthily his son  
treated him:<sup>120</sup> *Most illustrious  
prince, and of all of our friends, on  
whom, after God, we rely, most  
faithful, I have chosen you, first and  
foremost among everyone, to whom I*

---

<sup>118</sup> Kronk notes that this 'star' was a comet that first appeared to be stationary, approximately two degrees from the sun, and was visible for nearly all of 4 February (though this may be a mistranslation of 4 Non. Februarii on his part). The 'star' then faded, but the other comet sightings in this month are actually the same comet. Gary W. Kronk. *Comets: A Descriptive Catalog*, p. 3.

<sup>119</sup> See the above note on the appearance of a 'star' near the sun on 2 February. See also Gary W. Kronk. *Cometography: A Catalog of Comets*. Volume 1: Ancient – 1799. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 188-193.

<sup>120</sup> This letter is extant in other sources; see, for example, *Monumenta Bambergensia*, p. 241-246.

*et omnes misérias meas necessarium  
dixi, etiam genibus vestris advolvi, si  
liceret salva majestate imperii.*

*Primum quidem est, quod non solum  
nobis, sed etiam totius christianae  
professionis omnibus gravissimum et  
intolerabile arbitramur, quod de illa  
apostolica sede, unde usque ad  
memoriam nostri temporis salutifer  
fructus consolationis, dulcedinis et  
salvationis animarum oriebatur,  
modo persecutionis,  
excommunicationis et omne  
perditionis flagellum in nos emittitur, 230 C  
nec ponunt ullum modum sententiae,  
tantum ut satisfiat voluntati  
indiscretae. Hujus voluntatis suae  
intemperantia adeo usque nunc abusi  
sunt in me, ut nec Deum, nec quid aut*

*considered it necessary to complain  
and deplore all of my calamities and  
miseries, for I have prostrated myself  
before your knees, if it is permitted to  
do so with my sovereignty remaining  
intact.*

*First, indeed, because it is not only  
for us, but we also judge it to be the  
gravest and most intolerable thing for  
all of the Christian faith, because it  
relates to the Apostolic seat, where  
up to the farthest reach of memory of  
our time the fruit of consolation,  
sweetness, and salvation of souls has  
arisen, but now it emits only the  
scourge of persecution,  
excommunication, and perdition  
against us, nor do they describe in  
any way how to satisfy so great an  
indiscriminate will. Up to now, and  
still continuing, they abuse me  
through the intemperance of his will,*

*quantum mali inde proveniat  
pensantes, per se et per suos  
omnimodis invehuntur in me, cum  
obedientiam et omnem debitam  
subjectionem sepe obtulerim  
apostolicae sedi, si tamen reverentia  
et honor debitus, sicut antecessoribus  
meis, ab apostolica sede exhiberetur  
et mihi. Quid autem intendant,  
oportunius ipse significabo vobis, si  
quando optati colloquii copiam Deus  
dederit nobis.*

*In hac igitur persecutionis et odii  
inflammatione cum parum viderent se  
proficere, contra ipsum jus naturae  
laborantes, quod sine maximo cordis  
dolore, sine multis lacrimis dicere  
non valeo, et quia dicitur vehementer  
contremisco, filium meum, meum  
inquam Absalon dilectissimum, non*

*so that not God, nor anything or any  
amount of evil which they ponder  
measuring out through him and  
through his men are used to attack  
me in all ways, since I have often  
offered the obedience and all  
subjection that is owed to the  
Apostolic seat, if reverence and honor  
is owed, as it was to my predecessors,  
to be exhibited by the Apostolic seat  
to me. I will advantageously signify to  
you what they intend, if God ever  
gives us the help of this  
conversation's hope.*

*In this inflammation of persecution  
and hate, therefore, since they see it  
equal to do those things, laboring  
against the law of nature itself,  
because I am not strong enough to  
say it without the greatest pain of  
heart, without many tears, and I  
tremble vehemently because it is said,*

230 D

*solum contra me animaverunt, sed  
etiam tanto furore armaverunt, ut in  
primis contra fidem et sacramentum,  
quod ut miles domino juraverat,  
regnum meum invaderet, episcopos et  
abbates meos deponeret, inimicos et  
persecutores meos substitueret, ad  
ultimum, quod maxime vellem taceri,  
aut si taceri non potest, vellem non  
credi, omnem naturae affectum  
abjiciens, in salutem et animam  
meam intenderet, nec pensi quicquam  
haberet, quocumque modo vel vi vel  
fraude ad hanc periculi et ignominiae  
suae summam aspiraret.*

*In hac tanta mali sui machinatione,  
cum essem in pace et in aliqua salutis  
meae securitate, in ipsis dominici*

*that my son, my most beloved  
Absalom, I say, not only turned  
against me, but they also armed him  
with such furor, so that in the  
beginning, against the oath and  
sacrament, which he had sworn, as a  
soldier, to his lord, he invaded my  
kingdom, deposed my bishops and  
abbots, substituted my enemies and  
persecutors for them, and at the last,  
which I most wish to keep silent  
about, but if it is not possible to be  
silent, I wish not to believe,  
abandoning all natural feeling,  
exerted himself against my health and  
life, not anything has weight, but he  
aspires in whatsoever way, either  
with force or with deceit to this  
highest of peril and ignominy.*

*In this such great machination of his  
evil, when I was in peace and in some  
security of my health, came on those*

*adventus sanctissimis diebus in locum  
qui Confluentia dicitur, ad  
colloquium evocavit me, quasi de  
communi salute et honore filius  
tractaturus cum patre. Quem ut vidi,  
ilico ex paterno affectu tactus  
intrinsic dolore cordis mei ad  
pedes suos procidi, admonens et  
obtestans per Deum, per fidem, per  
salutem animae, ut si pro peccatis  
meis flagellandus eram a Deo, de me  
ipse nullam maculam conquireret  
animae, honori et nomini suo; quia  
culpa patris vindicem filium esse  
nulla divinae legis unquam constituit  
sanctio.*

*At ille jam pulchre, immo miserrime  
institutus ad malitiam, quasi  
abominabile et execrabile scelus  
coepit detestari; procidens et ipse ad*

*most holy days of the Lord in the  
place which is called Koblenz<sup>121</sup>,  
called me out for conversation, as  
though a son coming to treat of the  
common well-being and honor with  
his father. As I saw him, immediately,  
internally touched with paternal  
affection through the pain of my  
heart, I fell at his feet, urging and  
imploing him by God, by faith, and  
for the health of his soul, that if I was  
to be scourged for my sins by God,  
that he should seek out no stain for  
his spirit, honor, or name on my  
account; because no divine law ever  
gave sanction for a son to punish the  
fault of his father.*

*But he, though already wonderfully—  
nay, wretchedly—accustomed to  
evildoing, began to detest the crime  
as abominable and execrable; and he,*

---

<sup>121</sup> 21 December 1105. See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 334.

*pedes meos, de preteritis coepit  
veniam precari, in reliquum ut miles  
domino, ut patri filius, cum fide et  
veritate per omnia se michi  
obauditurum cum lacrimis  
promittere, si solummodo sedi  
apostolicae vellem reconciliari. Quod  
cum promptissime annuissem, et  
deliberationi suae et consilio  
principum in hoc totum me  
mancipandum promisissem: in  
presenti nativitate se perducturum me  
Moguntiam, et ibi de honore et  
reconciliatione mea quam fidelius  
posset se acturum, et inde in pacem et  
securitatem me reducendum promisit,  
in ea veritate et fide, qua patrem a  
filio honorari et filium a patre  
precipit Deus diligi.*

*Hac promissione, quae etiam gentili  
observanda est, securus, illorsum*

*falling before my feet, began to beg  
pardon for the past, and in the future,  
he promised, tearfully, that he would  
obey me, as a soldier to his lord, as a  
son to his father, with faith and truth  
in all things, if only I would wish to  
be reconciled with the apostolic seat.  
Then I most promptly assented, and  
promised that I would transfer him to  
be first in deliberation and counsel in  
all of this matter: for the upcoming  
Christmas celebration he would lead  
me to Mainz, and there he would  
work for my honor and reconciliation  
as faithfully as possible, and then he  
promised that he would lead me back  
in peace and security, in that truth  
and faithfulness, which God instructs  
a father to be honored by his son, and  
a son to be loved by his father.*

*With this promise made, which was  
also observed by the people, secure, I*

231 C

*ibam, et filius meus aliquantulum  
precesserat me; cum quidam fideles  
mei occurrentes, verissime  
affirmabant, me deceptum et  
proditum sub falsa pacis et fidei  
sponsione. Revocatus autem filius  
meus, et iterum instantissime a me  
admonitus, sub ejusdem fidei et  
sacramenti obtestatione animam  
suam pro anima mea fore promisit  
jam secunda vice. Cum ergo ad  
locum qui Binga dicitur  
pervenissemus, jam existente die  
Veneris ante nativitatem, numerus  
armatorum suorum jam satis  
augebatur, jam fraus ipsa detegi  
videbatur.*

*Et filius ad me <<Pater,>> inquit,  
<<nobis cedendum est in vicinum  
castellum; quia nec episcopus*

*went thither, and my son for some  
little time preceded me. Then certain  
men faithful to me ran to meet me,  
and affirmed most truthfully that I  
had been deceived and betrayed  
under a false oath of peace and faith.  
My son was called back and once  
again was urged by me most  
insistently to promise by that same  
faith and sacrament, with earnest  
entreaty, now for a second time, that  
his life would be for my life. Then,  
when we arrived at last at the place  
which is called Bingen, this being the  
Friday before Christmas<sup>122</sup>, the  
number of his armed men was now  
enlarged sufficiently, and now his  
crime seemed to be uncovered.*

*And my son said to me: "Father, the  
neighboring castle must be given to  
us; because the bishop of Mainz<sup>123</sup>*

---

<sup>122</sup> I.e., 22 December 1105.

<sup>123</sup> Rudhart.

*Moguntinus in civitatem suam  
admittet vos, quamdiu in banno eritis,  
nec vos inpacatum et inreconciliatum  
audeo ingerere inimicis vestris. Illic  
nativitatem cum Dei honore et pace  
agetis; quoscunque placuerit vobis,  
vobiscum habeatis. Ego interim  
quanto instantius, quanto fidelius  
potero, pro nobis utrisque laborabo,  
quia causam vestram esse meam  
estimo.>>*

*At ego <<Mi,>> inquam, <<fili,  
testis et iudex sermonum et fidei adsit  
inter nos hodie Deus, qui quomodo te  
in virum perfectum et heredem meum  
produxerim, quantis laboribus et  
tribulationibus meis honori tuo  
inservierim, quot et quantas  
inimicitias pro te habuerim et  
habeam, solus est conscius.>>*

*Ille autem iterum jam tertio, sub*

*will not admit you into his city as  
long as you are under edict, nor do I  
dare to thrust you upon your enemies  
while unpacified and unreconciled.*

*There you can celebrate the nativity  
with honor and peace of God:*

*whatsoever is pleasing to you, you  
shall have it. I meanwhile, however  
insistently, however faithfully I can,  
will labor for both of us, because I  
esteem your cause to be my own.”*

*But I said: “My son, God is the  
witness and judge of the conversation  
and faith between us today, who just  
as I have produced in you a perfect  
man and my heir, with however great  
labors and tribulations of mine I  
served the interests of your honor,  
however many and however great  
enmity I might have had and have  
against you, only He knows.”*

*He, however, again, now for the third*

*ejusdem fidei et sacramenti  
obtestatione, si ingrueret occasio  
periculi, caput suum pro capite meo  
fore promisit michi.*

*Sic postquam clausit me in eodem  
castello, quia omnia in corde et corde  
erat locutus, manifeste ostendit rei  
eventus. Ex omnibus meis ego quartus  
sum inclusus; nec admitti potuit  
quilibet alius. Custodes deputati, qui  
vitae meae erant atrociores inimici.*

*Benedictus per omnia Deus, exaltandi 232 B  
et humiliandi quemcunque voluerit  
rex potentissimus. Cum igitur ipso  
sacratissimo die nativitatis suae,  
omnibus redemptis suis ille sanctus  
sanctorum puer fuisset natus, michi  
soli filius ille non est datus. Nam ut  
taceam obpropria, injurias, minas,*

*time, under supplication of the same  
faith and sacrament, if it should  
happen that danger befell, he  
promised me that he would exchange  
his head for my own.*

*Thus, afterwards he closed me in that  
same castle, because he had spoken  
all that was in his heart, what befell  
made that manifest. I am locked up,  
away from all of my men, for the  
fourth time; nor is anyone at all  
permitted in. The guards who are  
assigned are savage enemies of my  
life.*

*Blessed be God above all, the most  
powerful king, who, as he wishes,  
exalts and humbles any man. When,  
therefore, it was his most sacred day  
of Nativity, when that boy, holy of  
holies, was born for the salvation of  
all his people, that son was not born  
for me alone. For, so that I might be*

*gladios in cervicem meam exertos,  
nisi omnia imperata facerem; famem  
etiam, et sitim quam ferebam, et ab  
illis quos injuria erat videre et  
audire; ut etiam taceam, quod est  
gravius, me olim satis felicem fuisse:  
illud nunquam obliviscar, nunquam  
desinam omnibus christianis  
conqueri, quod illis sanctissimis  
diebus sine omni christiana  
communione in illo carcere fui. In  
illis poenitentiae et tribulationis meae  
diebus, a filio meo missus venit ad me  
quidam principum Wicbertus, dicens  
nullum vitae meae esse consilium,  
nisi sine ulla contradictione etiam  
regni insignia redderem, ex voluntate  
et imperio principum.*

*At ego, et si omnis terra, quantum*

*silent about the scandal, the injuries,  
the threats, and swords that had been  
exerted against my neck, unless I do  
all that was ordered; also that I  
would be silent about the hunger and  
thirst which I also bore, and from  
those who it was an injury to see or  
hear; also so that I might be silent  
about that which is worse, that I had  
once been happy enough: that I might  
never forget, and never cease to  
complain to all Christians, that I was  
incarcerated on those holiest of days  
without any Christian communion.  
In those days of my penance and  
tribulation, someone sent by my son  
came to me, a certain prince,  
Wicbert, saying that there was no plot  
against my life, as long as I returned  
the regal insignia without objection,  
at the will and order of the princes.  
But I, and if the whole earth, however*

232 C

*inhabatur, regni mei esset terminus,  
volens vitam regno commutare; quia  
vellem nollem sic agendum et sic  
definitum intellegebam, coronam,  
cruceam, lanceam, gladium misi  
Moguntiam.*

*Tunc communicato consilio cum  
inimicis meis filius meus egrediens,  
relictis ibidem fidelibus et amicis  
nostris, quasi me eo adducturus, sub  
multa frequentia et custodia  
armatorum me eductum, ad villam  
quae Ingelhem vocatur, fecit me ad se  
adduci.*

*Ubi maximam inimicorum  
multitudinem collectam inveni, nec  
ipsum filium caeteris meliorem michi  
repperi. Et quia firmiter et stabilius  
eis videbatur esse, si propria manu  
cogerent me regnum et omnia regalia* 232 D

*much is inhabited, should be the  
limits of my kingdom, wishing to  
exchange life for the kingdom;  
because I wished that it not be done  
thus, and I realized that it was thus  
ordained, I sent the crown, the cross,  
the lance, and the sword to Mainz.*

*Then, when the plan was  
communicated, while my son was  
marching out with my enemies, with  
the remnants of our faithful men and  
friends, as though to lead me there,  
under a great crowd and in the  
custody of armed men, led me out, to  
the villa which is called Ingelheim,  
and made me to be led to him.*

*There I found a great multitude of  
enemies gathered together. I did not  
discover my son to be better than the  
others. And because it seemed to be  
firmer and more stable, if they forced  
me to hand over the scepter, the*

*exfestucare: simili modo et ipsi omnes minabantur, nisi omnia imperata facerem, nullum vitae meae consilium fieri posse.*

*Tum ego <<Quia,>> inquam, <<de solo vita agitur, qua nichil pretiosius habeo: ut saltem vivens penitentiam exhibeam Deo, quicquid imperatis, ecce facio.>>*

*Cumque inquirerem, si saltem sic de vita certus et securus esse deberem? ejusdem apostolicae sedis legatus, qui ibidem aderat, non dico qui haec omnia ordinaverat, respondit, me nullo modo eripi posse, nisi publice confiterer, me injuste Hildibrandum persecutum esse, Wicbertum injuste et superposuisse, et injustam persecutionem in apostolicam sedem et omnem aecclesiam hactenus exercuisse. Tunc cum maxima animi*

*kingdom, and all of the regalia with my own hand: they all threatened in a similar way, unless I did all that I was commanded, there would be no hope for my life.*

*Then I said: "Because it deals with life alone, than which I hold nothing more precious: while I live, at least I can exhibit penance to God; look, I will do whatever you command."*

*And why accuse them, if at least thus I ought to be certain and secure of my life, at least? The legate of that same apostolic seat, who had just arrived - I do not say that it was he who organized everything - responded it could in no way be taken from me, unless I publicly confessed that I had unjustly persecuted Hildebrand, and unjustly replaced him with Guicbert. Also, that I had unjustly persecuted the apostolic seat and the entire*

233 A

*contritione humi prostratus, coepi per Deum, per ipsam justitiam orare, ut locus et tempus michi daretur, ubi in presentia omnium principum, unde innocens essem, et iudicio me purgarem, et inde de principibus regni, de fidelibus meis, quoscumque obsides vellent, darem.*

*At ille idem legatus diem et locum michi abnegavit, dicens, aut ibi totum debere determinari, aut nulla spes michi esset evadendi. In tantae tribulationis articulo cum interrogarem, si confiterer omnia quae imperabantur, an confessio mea, ut justum est, veniam et absolutionem consequeretur? idem legatus respondit, non esse juris sui*

*Church up to this time. Then I prostrated myself with the greatest spiritual contrition, and began to pray to God, for his justice, that he might give to me the place and time, where in the presence of all of the princes, that I might be unharmed until then, and that I should cleanse myself through his judgment, and that I would give whatever hostages they wanted from the princes of the realm and from my faithful men.*

*But the legate himself denied the day and the place to me, saying, either that it ought to be determined there, completely, or that there was no hope of my escape. When I asked, in that moment of such great tribulation, if I were to confess all that they ordered, whether my confession, as is just, would be followed with forgiveness and absolution? The same legate*

*me absolvere. Et cum ego ad haec dicerem: <<Quicumque confitentem audet recipere, confessum debet absolvere>>, si vellem, inquit, absolvi, Romam irem satisfacere apostolicae sedi.*

*Sic spoliatum et desolatum--nam et castella et patrimonia et quicquid in regno adquisieram, eadem vi et arte sua extorserant a me--in eadem villa reliquerunt me. In qua cum aliquo tempore moratus essem, et filius meus ex eodem fraudis suae consilio demandasset, ut eum expectarem: superveniens quorundam fidelium meorum legatio premonuit, ut siquidem ad momentum ibi remanerem, aut inde in perpetuam captivitatem raperer, aut in eodem loco decollarer. Quo nuntio satis*

233 B *responded that it was not within his power to absolve me. And when I said to him: "Whosoever dares to receive someone's confession, ought to absolve the confessed," he said that, if I wished to be absolved, I should go to Rome to make satisfaction to the apostolic seat.*

*Thus despoiled and desolate – for I had sought for castles and patrimony and everything in my kingdom, as they had extorted the same things from me through force and trickery – they left me in that same village. I delayed for some time there, and my son demanded out of the same counsel of his deceit, that I await him: an arriving legate, of a certain one of my faithful men, warned that, if, indeed, I remained there at that time, either I would be seized for perpetual captivity, or that I should*

<p><i>etiam tunc vitae diffusus, ilico</i></p> <p><i>aufugiens, fugiendo veni Coloniā, et</i></p> <p><i>inibi aliquot diebus commoratus,</i></p> <p><i>postea Leodium veni, in quibus locis</i></p> <p><i>viros fideles inveni.</i></p>	<p>233 C</p> <p>234 A</p>	<p><i>be beheaded in that place. With that</i></p> <p><i>news, despairing even of my life,</i></p> <p><i>immediately I fled that place, I came</i></p> <p><i>to Cologne in my flight, and in that</i></p> <p><i>place I spent some number of days,</i></p> <p><i>afterward I came to Liège, in which</i></p> <p><i>places I found faithful men.</i></p>
---	---------------------------	---

Imperatore Heinrico morante Leodii,  
 filius ejus Aquasgrani venit; et volens  
 venire Leodium contra patrem suum  
 5. feria dominicae coenae, premisit  
 suos preoccupare pontem apud  
 Wisatum, ne quis sibi venienti  
 obstaret. Sed militibus patris  
 concurrentibus ad exoccupandum  
 pontem, milites filii a ponte  
 repelluntur, aliis eorum captis, aliis in  
 Mosam demersis, aliis occisis; inter  
 quos etiam Bruno comes occisus est.  
 Sic filius contra patrem veniens, rediit  
 inglorius.

While Emperor Henry was delaying  
 at Liège, his son came to Aachen,  
 and, wishing to come to Liège against  
 his father on the fifth day of the  
 Lord's Supper<sup>124</sup>, he sent his men  
 ahead to preemptively seize the  
 bridge at Visé, lest anyone hinder him  
 by coming [to my aid]. But when the  
 soldiers of his father came to seize the  
 bridge, the soldiers of the son were  
 driven away from the bridge, some of  
 them were captured, others drowned  
 in the Meuse, and still others were  
 slaughtered; among whom also Count

---

<sup>124</sup> 22 March. See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 339.

Coloniensibus fidem imperatori  
servantibus, at eorum archiepiscopo  
filium imperatoris contra patrem  
suum animante, Colonia obsessa  
oppugnatur, nec tamen expugnatur.  
Interim Henricus imperator Leodii  
moritur, eique succedit filius  
aequivocus ejus.  
Dux Henricus, qui ab imperatore ad  
filium ejus animo transiens, eum  
contra patrem suum consilio suo  
armavit, et a filio ad patrem rediens,  
partes filii debellavit, mortuo  
imperatore se ut reum majestatis filio  
regis dedit, et ab eo captus  
custodiae traditur; de qua ipse per  
industriam suam evasit. Ducatus ejus  
datur Godefrido comiti Lovaniensi.

Bruno was slain. Thus, the son  
coming against his father, returned  
without glory.

Although the people of Cologne  
remained faithful to the emperor,  
their archbishop was rousing the son  
of the emperor against his father, and  
Cologne was besieged, but it was  
nevertheless not taken. Meanwhile,  
Emperor Henry died in Liège, and his  
equivocal son succeeded him.<sup>125</sup>

Duke Henry [of Lanslebourg],  
turning his will from the emperor to  
his son, armed him with his counsel  
against his father, and returning from  
the son to the father, subdued the  
faction of the son, and when the  
emperor died, surrendered, as guilty  
of treason, to the son of the king, and  
by him was captured, and handed  
over to custody; from which he

---

<sup>125</sup> D. 7 August 1106.

1107 R. 1 F. 47 A. 7 H. 7

Heinricus exdux affectans repetere  
ducatum, occupat oppidum

Aquasgrani contra Godefridum

ducem. Sed hoc non ferens dux

Godefridus, oppidum Aquense

violenter inrupit, oppidanos a favore

Heinrici exterruit, aliquos comites et

multos potentes et nobiles cepit. Ipse

Heinricus cum filiis suis vix fuga

evasit; uxorem ejus capere dux

indignum duxit. Comites et

honoratiores eorum quos ceperat, per

conditionem sub se militandi sibi

conciliatos ad fidelitatem suam

adduxit.

himself escaped through his industry.

His dukedom was given to Godfrey,  
count of Louvain.<sup>126</sup>

1107 R. 1 F. 47 A. 7 H. 7

The ex-duke Henry, trying to regain  
his dukedom, occupied the town of

Aachen against Duke Godfrey. But

Duke Godfrey would not bear this,

234 C and violently broke into the town of

Aachen, frightening the townsfolk

235 A away from the support of Henry, and

captured some counts and many

powerful men and nobles. Henry

himself with his sons hardly escaped

in flight; The duke took his wife,

unworthily, as a captive. The counts

and more honorable men among

those whom he captured, he

persuaded to be faithful to him and

reconciled with them, on the

condition that they fight under him.

---

<sup>126</sup> R. 1106-1129.

1108 R. 2 F. 48 A. 8 H. 8  
Heinricus imperator contra  
Rotbertum Flandrensem vadit, et  
pacto pacis magis utrinque simulato  
quam composito, pene inefficax redit.

Bojamundus dux Apuliae, contracto  
undeunde exercitu, accingitur ad  
invadendum Constantinopolitanum  
imperium.

1109 3 49 9 9

In parrochia Legiensi porca enixa est  
porcellum habentem faciem hominis. 235 B  
Natus est etiam pullus gallinae  
quadrupes.

Imperator Heinricus contra Ungaros  
vadit; sed facto pacto redit. Philippus  
rex Francorum obiit. Ludowicus filius  
ejus post eum regnat.

1108 R. 2 F. 48 A. 8 H. 8  
Emperor Henry attacked Robert of  
Flanders, and with a peace set down  
by both sides more as a feint than in  
good faith, nearly returned  
ineffectively.<sup>127</sup>

Bohemond, duke of Apulia, having  
united an army from everywhere, was  
prepared to invade the empire of  
Constantinople.

1109 3 49 9 9

In the parish of Liège, a sow gave  
birth to a piglet having the face of a  
man. A four-footed chick was also  
born to a chicken.

Emperor Henry attacked the  
Hungarians; but, once an agreement  
was made, he returned.<sup>128</sup> Philip king  
of the Franks died. Louis, his son,  
reigned after him.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> From October 1107 to January 1108.

<sup>128</sup> He campaigned from September to November.

<sup>129</sup> On 29 July 1108.

1110 4 1 10 10

In mense Junio cometes apparuit,  
radios dirigens ad austrum, multis  
conitientibus hoc signo portendi  
futuram regis Heinrici quinti  
expeditionem Italiam versus.  
Sanctus Wibertus, fundator  
Gemmelacensis cenobii, ubi et  
sepultus requiescit, quem Deus multis  
et magnis miraculorum signis per  
annos 12 longe lateque clarificaverat,  
auctoritate venerabilis Frederici  
Coloniensium archiepiscopi et  
assensu generalis synodi, a domno  
Obberto Legiensi episcopo elevatur. 235 C  
Quae elevatio innumerabili concursu  
et mirabili gaudio populorum  
celebrata est 9. Kal. Octobris.

1110 4 1 10 10

In the month of June, a comet  
appeared, directing rays to the south,  
with many striving to interpret this  
sign as portending the expedition of  
King Henry the Fifth against Italy.<sup>130</sup>  
Saint Guicbert, founder of the  
monastery of Gembloux, where his  
grave lies, whom God had glorified  
with many and great signs of miracles  
through 12 years far and wide, by the  
authority of the venerable Frederic,  
archbishop of Cologne and at the  
assent of a general synod, was made a  
saint by master Olbert, bishop of  
Liège.<sup>131</sup> This canonization was  
celebrated with a great gathering and  
wondrous joy of people on 23  
October.

---

<sup>130</sup> See Gary W. Kronk. *Cometography: A Catalog of Comets*, p. 193-195 for a description of this comet. Although Kronk reports this comet as being visible solely in June, Hetherington notes reports of this comet as early as 29 May, though with the comet remaining visible into June. Barry Hetherington. *A Chronicle of Pre-Telescopic Astronomy*, p. 132.

<sup>131</sup> According to Kupper, 23 September. Jean-Louis Kupper. *Liège et l'église impériale, XI<sup>e</sup>-XI<sup>e</sup> siècles*. Liège: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 1981, p. 402.

1111 5 2 11 11

Heinricus quintus hujus nominis rex  
Romam vadit, propter sedandam  
discordiam quae erat inter regnum et  
sacerdotium; quae cepta a Gregorio  
nono hujus nominis papa, qui  
Hildebrandus nominatus est, et  
exagitata a successoribus Gregorii,  
Victore et Urbano, et pre omnibus a  
Pascali, magno scandalo erat toti  
mundo.

(Ep. Heinr.) Rex uti volens  
auctoritate et consuetudine et  
auctoralibus privilegiis imperatorum,  
qui a Karolo magno, qui primus de  
regibus Francorum imperavit  
Romanis, jam per trecentos et  
amplius annos imperaverant sub  
sexaginta tribus apostolicis, dabat

1111 5 2 11 11

King Henry, the fifth of his name,  
attacked Rome, in order to settle the  
discord which was between the  
kingdom and the priesthood; which  
was begun by Pope Gregory, the  
ninth<sup>132</sup> of his name, who was named  
Hildebrand, and which was stirred up  
by the successors of Gregory, namely  
Victor and Urban, and above all  
others by Pascal, because of which  
there was a great scandal in the whole  
world.

The king wished to use the authority  
and custom and authoritative  
privileges of the emperors, who, from  
Charles the Great, who was the first  
of the kings of the Franks to rule the  
Romans, now for 300 and more years  
had ruled under 63 popes, had  
bestowed the episcopate and abbacy

236 A

---

<sup>132</sup> [*sic*] Sigebert ought to have referred to Gregory VII, not Gregory IX.

licite episcopatus et abbatias et per  
anulum et per virgam.

Contra hanc majorum auctoritatem  
censebant papae synodali iudicio, nec  
posse nec debere dari per virgam vel  
per anulum episcopatum aut aliquam  
aecclesiasticam investituram a laicali  
manu; et quicumque ita episcopatum  
aut aliam aecclesiastici juris  
investituram accipiebant,  
excommunicabantur. Propter hanc  
precipue causam rex Romam  
tendebat; et si qui Langobardorum  
quoquo modo ei resistere volebant,  
potenter eos proterebat.

Quid vel quomodo inter papam et  
regem convenerit, cum multa a multis  
dicantur, hoc tantum a nobis dicetur,  
quod in epistola ab ipso rege scripta  
legimus. (Ep. Heinr.) Instabat

lawfully, through the ring and staff.

Against this more ancient authority,  
the popes had decreed, through the  
judgement of a synod, that neither the  
episcopate nor any ecclesiastical  
investiture could be or ought to be  
given by a lay hand, either through  
ring or staff; and whoever should so  
accept such an episcopacy or other  
investiture of ecclesiastical right, was  
excommunicated. On account of this  
reason particularly, the king moved  
toward Rome; and if anyone of the  
Lombards in whatsoever way wished  
to resist him, he powerfully crushed  
them underfoot.

What was agreed between the pope  
and the king, and how, although  
much has been said by many men on  
this subject, only so much will be said  
by us, as we read in letters written by

236 B

omnimodis papa, ut averteret regem a  
potestate dandi episcopatus vel  
abbatias, nec per anulum nec per  
virgam. Regi quaerenti per  
internuntios a papa, his omnibus sibi  
ablatis quomodo constaret regnum,  
quoniam fere omnia regalia  
antecessores sui concesserant et  
tradiderant aecclesiis?

Respondit: *Sacerdotes decimis  
aecclesiae et oblationibus contenti  
sint, rex vero omnia predia et regalia,* 236 C  
*quae a regibus collata sunt aecclesiis,  
recipiat, et detineat sibi et  
successoribus suis.*

Rege per internuntios respondente se  
nolle violentiam et injustitiam inferre

the king himself.<sup>133</sup> The pope  
threatened in every way, so that he  
could take the king from the power of  
giving episcopates and abbacies,  
either through the ring or the rod. The  
king, inquiring of the pope by  
intermediaries, asked how his  
kingdom would stand with all of  
these rights taken away, since his  
predecessors had conceded and  
bequeathed nearly all of the regalia to  
the churches.

He responded: *Let the priests be  
content with the ecclesiastical tithe  
and offerings, let the king, indeed,  
receive all estates and regalia, which  
were bestowed on the churches by the  
kings, and let him and his successors  
retain them.*

The king responded through  
intermediaries that he did not wish to

---

<sup>133</sup> Henry V. *Epistolae et Leges Heinrici V.* Ed. Ludwig Weiland. In MGH *Leges. Constitutiones et Acta Publica Imperatorum et Regum.* Vol. 1. Hannover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1893, p. 134-151.

aeclesiis, promisit papa, et suis pro  
se jurantibus affirmavit, se dominica  
instantis quinquagesimae omnia  
regalia cum justitia et auctoritate  
apostolica ab episcopis et aeclesiis  
auferre et regno reddere, id est  
civitates, ducatus, marchias,  
comitatus, monetas, thelonea,  
advocantias, omnia jura centurionum  
vel villicorum, curtes et villas, cum  
omnibus pertinentiis suis, quae regni  
erant, militiam et castra.

Hanc conventionem in karta  
descriptam regi dedit, hoc addens,  
quod ipse regem et regnum ulterius  
non inquietaret, et privilegio sub  
anathemate confirmaret, ne posteris sui

bring violence and injustice against  
the churches, and the pope promised  
and affirmed with his oaths on his  
own behalf, on the approaching  
Quinquagesima Sunday,<sup>134</sup> that all of  
the regalia, with justice and apostolic  
authority, would be taken from the  
bishops and churches and returned to  
the kingdom, that is, the cities,  
dukedom, marches, counties, mints,  
toll-stations, legal advocacies, all  
rights over centuries<sup>135</sup> and estates,  
*curtes* and villages, with all that  
pertains to them which were the  
kingdom's, and soldiery and  
fortifications.

He gave this agreement which  
was described in a charter to the king,  
adding this, that he would not cause  
the king or kingdom any further  
trouble, and that he would support

---

<sup>134</sup> 12 February.

<sup>135</sup> 100-man units of land.

237 A

eum inquietare praesumant; regem  
benigne et honorifice susciperet,  
eumque in imperatorem coronaret, et  
ad tenendum imperium auxilio officii  
sui adjuvaret. Pro his omnibus  
implendis papa regi obsides dedit.  
Internuntii regis, quamvis scirent hoc  
nullo modo posse fieri, affirmaverunt,  
si papa haec compleret, regem  
quoque investituras aecclesiarum, uti  
quaerebat, refutaturum.

(Ib.) Hac spe promissionum regi  
Romam tendendi, Pascalis papa  
primo per suos, postea ipse cum  
primoribus Romanorum extra urbem  
occurrit, nullamque causam resistendi  
ostenderunt. Vix civitatis portas  
ingressus erat, cum militibus ejus

this privilege under pain of anathema,  
lest his successors presume to disturb  
him; that he would support the king  
benignly and honorifically, and that  
he would crown him emperor, and  
that he would help him to hold the  
empire with the aid of his office. The  
pope gave hostages to the king to  
ensure that all of these promises were  
fulfilled. The king's intermediaries,  
although they knew that this could in  
no way happen, affirmed that, if the  
pope did these things, the king would  
also cease the ecclesiastical  
investitures, as he asked.

With this hope, that the promise of  
the king would be given at Rome,  
Pope Pascal, at first with his men, and  
then himself with the leading men of  
the Romans rode outside the city, and  
they presented no cause for  
resistance. He had hardly entered the

237 B

intra civitatis moenia secure  
vagrantibus, alii vulnerati, alii occisi,  
omnes vero pene capti aut spoliati  
sunt.

Rex tamen, quasi pro levi causa non  
motus, tranquilla mente usque ad  
januas aecclesiae beati Petri apostoli  
cum processione pervenit. Ubi volens  
ostendere nullam aecclesiarum Dei  
disturbationem ex suo velle  
procedere, in oculis et auribus  
omnium astantium hoc decretum  
promulgavit: *Ego Henricus imperator  
augustus affirmo Deo et sancto Petro 237 C  
et omnibus episcopis et abbatibus et  
omnibus aecclesiis: omnia quae  
antecessores mei reges vel  
imperatores concesserunt, vel quoquo  
modo tradiderunt Deo, ego nullo  
modo subtrahere volo.*

gates of the city, when, with his  
soldiers wandering untroubled inside  
the walls of the city, some were  
wounded, others were slain, and all  
were, indeed, nearly captured or  
despoiled.

The king nevertheless was unmoved,  
as though it were a small thing, and  
came with a tranquil mind up to the  
doors of the church of blessed Peter,  
the apostle, with his procession.

Then, wishing to present no  
disturbance at the church of God and  
to proceed on his own, he  
promulgated this decree to the eyes  
and ears of all present: *I, Emperor  
Henry, Augustus, affirmed by God  
and Saint Peter, and all bishops and  
abbots and all churches: I wish in no  
way to detract from all of the things  
which my predecessors, kings or  
emperors, relinquished or which they*

Hoc decreto lecto et subscripto, petiit a papa ut adimpleret ei quod in karta conditionis scriptum erat. Ipse etiam rex conventionem suam ad papam firmavit, jurantibus quatuor comitibus, quod proxima quarta vel quinta feria rex principes suos amicitiam jurare faceret, et obsides daret, eo tenore, si papa proximo dominico die adimpleret regi per omnia, quod in karta conventionis ejus scriptum erat.

Cum ergo rex insisteret, ut papa cum justitia et auctoritate promissam sibi conventionem de reddendis sibi regalibus confirmaret: universis tam suis quam nostris, scilicet episcopis, abbatibus, et universis aecclisiae filiis in faciem ei resistentibus, et decreto suo plenam heresim

*surrendered to God in any way.*

When this decree was read and signed, he asked the pope to fulfill the conditions which were written on the charter. The king, himself, confirmed his agreement to the pope, with four counts swearing, that the next 4 or 5 days the king would make pacts of amity with his princes, and give hostages, in due course, if the pope, on the next Sunday fulfilled all of the things which were written in the charter of the agreement with the king.

Therefore, when the king insisted, the pope thus affirmed with justice and authority the promised agreement of giving royal property back to him: as much for the whole world as for us, namely bishops, abbots, and all of the sons of the church resisting him, and reviling his decree that was full of

237 D

inclamantibus, voluit papa, si salva  
pace aecclesiae potuisset, hoc  
privilegium proferre: Ne sacerdotes,  
abbates aut clerici saecularibus  
occupentur, neve ad comitatum  
accedant, nisi pro damnatis eruendis,  
neve militiam exercean, quae vix aut  
nullo modo sine rapinis, sacrilegiis,  
incendiis et homicidiis exhibentur,  
neve ministri altaris fiant ministri  
curiae, neve accipiant a regibus ad  
regnum pertinentia. Regi autem sive  
imperatori censuit esse dimittenda  
omnia ad regnum pertinentia a  
tempore Karoli Magni et ceterorum  
imperatorum; interdicens sub  
anathemate, ne quisquam  
episcoporum invadat ad regnum  
pertinentia. Interdixit etiam sub  
anathemate, ne illi, qui post eum in  
apostolica sede sessuri sunt, audeant  
regem aut regnum ejus inquietare

heresy, the pope wished, if it was  
possible, while keeping the peace of  
the Church intact, to bring forth this  
privilege: that priests, abbots or  
clergy should not be seized by secular  
men, nor should they ascend to the  
countship, unless to destroy the  
damned, nor should they exercise  
military office, which can hardly or in  
no way take place without rapine,  
sacrilege, arson and homicide, nor  
should ministers of the altar become  
ministers of the court, nor should they  
accept the things pertaining to  
rulership from kings. However, he  
judged that all things that pertained to  
the kingdom from the time of Charles  
the Great and the rest of the emperors  
should be returned to the king or  
emperor; he forbid under pain of  
anathema that any bishop should take  
possession of anything that pertained

238 A

super hoc negotio.

In reconciliatione autem, quae facta est inter papam et imperatorem, qui ipsum papam cum episcopis et cardinalibus coeperat, hoc fuit juramentum regis: *Ego Heinricus rex 4. vel 5. feria proxima liberos dimittam dominum papam et episcopos et cardinales et omnes captivos et obsides; et papae et fidelibus ejus et Romanis pacem et securitatem servabo, tam per me quam per meos, et in personis et in rebus, eique oboediam, salvo honore regni vel imperii.*

to the kingdom. He also forbid under pain of anathema that those, who after him would sit in the apostolic seat, should dare to disturb the king or his kingdom about this business.

In the reconciliation, however, which took place between the pope and the emperor, which the pope himself began with his bishops and cardinals, this was the oath of the king: *I, King Henry, in the next 4 or 5 days will send my children to the lord Pope and bishops and cardinals and everyone as captives and hostages; and I will preserve peace and security with the pope, the Romans, and his faithful men, both through me and my men, and both in person and in possessions, and I shall obey him, with the honor of the kingdom or empire remaining intact.*

Hoc juramentum juraverunt etiam  
episcopi et principes circiter 14.  
Juramentum ex parte papae hoc fuit:  
*Dominus papa Pascalis non  
inquietabit dominum regem nec  
regnum ejus de investitura  
episcopatum vel abbatiarum, neque  
de injuria sibi et suis illata in  
personis, in bonis; neque aliquod  
malum reddet sibi vel alicui personae  
pro hac causa; et penitus in  
personam regis Henrici nunquam  
anathema mittet; nec remanebit in  
domino papa quin coronet eum, et  
regnum et imperium auxilio officii sui  
eum tenere adjuvabit pro posse suo.  
Et hoc adimplebit papa sine fraude et  
malo ingenio.* Hoc juramentum papae  
confirmaverunt jurando episcopi et  
cardinales numero 15 Henrico regi in  
imperatorem coronato.

About 14 bishops and princes also  
swore this oath. This was the oath on  
the part of the pope: *The lord Pope  
Pascal will not disturb the lord king,  
nor his kingdom on the matter of the  
investiture of bishops or of abbots,  
nor on the matter of injuries against  
him or against his men's persons or  
goods; nor will he return any ill to  
him or to any person for this reason;  
and he will never at all send any  
anathema against the person of King  
Henry; nor will the pope remain in  
his lordship unless he crowns him,  
and helps him, with his own power, to  
hold the kingdom and empire,  
through the help of his office. And  
this the pope will carry out without  
deceit or any trickery.* Bishops and  
cardinals, 15 in number, confirmed  
the swearing of this oath by the pope,  
and King Henry was crowned

Post lectum evangelium tradidit ei  
papa ante altare apostolorum Petri et  
Pauli in oculis omnium principum  
hoc privilegium de investitura  
episcopatum vel abbatiarum, tam  
per anulum quam per virgam:

*Pascalis episcopus servus servorum  
Dei karissimo in Christo filio Henrico  
Teutonicorum regi, et per Dei  
omnipotentis gratiam Romanorum  
imperatori augusto, salutem et  
apostolicam benedictionem. Regnum  
vestrum sanctae Romanae ecclesiae  
singulariter cohaerere dispositio  
divina constituit. Praedecessores  
vestri probitatis et prudentiae  
amplioris gratia Romanae urbis  
coronam et imperium consecuti sunt.  
Ad cujus videlicet coronae et imperii  
dignitatem tuam quoque personam,  
fili karissime Henrice, per nostri*

emperor.

After the gospel reading, the pope  
handed over to him, before the altar  
of the apostles Peter and Paul, in the  
eyes of all the princes, this privilege  
of investing bishops or abbots, as  
much through the ring as through the  
staff: *Pascal, bishop, servant of the  
servants of God, to his dearest son in  
Christ, Henry, King of the Teutons,  
and, through the grace of all-  
powerful God, emperor of the  
Romans, Augustus, health and  
apostolic benediction. The Divine  
Plan has set your kingdom, in  
particular, to adhere to the Holy  
Roman Church. Your predecessors  
obtained the crown and rule over the  
Roman city thanks to their probity  
and great prudence. Divine Majesty,  
through our ministry of priesthood,  
dearest son Henry, carries their*

238 C

*ministerium sacerdotii majestas  
divina provexit. Illam igitur dignitatis  
praerogativam, quam praedecessores  
nostri vestris praedecessoribus  
catholicis imperatoribus concesserunt  
et privilegiorum paginis  
confirmaverunt, nos quoque dilectioni  
tuae concedimus, et praesentis  
privilegii pagina confirmamus, ut  
regni tui episcopis vel abbatibus  
libere praeter violentiam et symoniam  
electis investituram virgae et anuli  
conferas.*

*Post investitionem vero kanonice  
consecrationem accipiat ab episcopo  
ad quem pertinuerit. Si quis autem a  
clero et populo praeter tuum  
assensum electus fuerit, nisi a te  
investiatur, a nemine consecretur.  
Sane episcopi et archiepiscopi  
libertatem habeant, a te investitos  
episcopos vel abbates kanonice*

238 D

*dignity of the crown and rulership to  
your person as well. That prerogative  
of dignity, which our predecessors  
conceded to your predecessors, the  
Catholic emperors, and confirmed on  
the pages of the privileges, we also  
concede to your good will, and on the  
page of this present privilege we  
confirm that you may confer freely in  
your kingdom the investiture of rod  
and ring on bishops and abbots,  
excepting those elected through  
violence and simony.*

*After this investiture, he will accept  
consecration canonically from the  
bishop to whom this duty pertains. If  
anyone either was elected by clergy  
or people without your assent, unless  
he was invested by you, he will be  
consecrated by noone. Certainly,  
bishops and archbishops have the  
authority to consecrate canonically*

*consecrandi.  
Praedecessores enim vestri  
aecclesias regni sui tantis regalium  
suorum beneficiis ampliaverunt, ut  
regnum ipsum episcoporum vel  
abbatum maxime praesidiis oporteat  
communiri, et populares  
dissensiones, quae in electionibus  
saepe contingunt, regali oporteat  
majestate compesci. Quamobrem  
prudenter et potestati tuae cura  
debet sollicitius imminere, ut  
Romanae aecclesiae magnitudo et  
caeterarum salus praestante Domino  
beneficiis tuis et servitiis conservetur.*

*Si qua igitur aecclesiastica  
secularisve persona, hanc nostrae  
concessionis paginam sciens, contra  
eam temerario ausu venire  
temptaverit, anathematis vinculo, nisi*

*bishops and abbots invested by you.  
For your predecessors enlarged the  
churches in your kingdom with such  
great benefices of your royal land  
that it is necessary that the kingdom  
itself be reinforced, especially with  
the help of bishops and abbots, and  
popular dissensions, which often  
happen in elections, ought to be  
restrained by royal majesty. On  
account of which, care ought to be  
taken anxiously with regards to your  
prudence and power, so that the  
greatness of the Roman Church and  
the health of the rest, especially your  
benefices and servants, should be  
conserved for the Lord.*

*If, therefore, any ecclesiastical or  
secular person, knowing this  
document of our concession, tries to  
come against it with rash foolishness,  
he shall be knotted up with the chain*

239 A

*resipuerit, innodetur, honorisque ac dignitatis suae periculum patiatur.*

*Observantes autem misericordia divina custodiat, et personam potestatemque tuam, ad honorem suum et gloriam, feliciter imperare concedat.*

Confirmatio pacis inter apostolicum et imperatorem, dum in celebratione missae traderet ei corpus et sanguinem domini nostri Jesu Christi:

*Domine imperator, hoc corpus Domini, natum ex Maria virgine, passum in cruce pro nobis, sicut sancta et catholica tenet aecclesia, damus tibi in confirmatione verae pacis et concordiae inter me et te. Datum est Id. Aprilis, indictione 4.*

*of anathema, unless he comes to his senses, and he shall suffer peril of his honor and dignity.*

240 A *Moreover, may Divine mercy protect all present and your person and power, and may it be permitted to you to reign well, for its honor and glory.*

As a confirmation of peace between the pope and the emperor, during the celebration of the Mass, he brought forth the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and said: *Lord Emperor, this is the body of the Lord, born of the Virgin Mary, who suffered on the cross for us, just as the Holy and Catholic Church holds, which we give to you in confirmation of true peace and concord between me and you.*

*This is given on 13 April, in the fourth year of the Indiction.*

## Appendix II

### Index of Proper Names

- Agnes, Mother of Henry IV - 219 A. Widow of Henry III of Germany, daughter of the duke of Aquitaine and Poitou. Regent during Henry IV's minority. Left Henry's side for the papal faction in 1076. D. 1077.<sup>1</sup>
- Albero, Bishop of Würzburg - 223 A. A member of the papal faction. Protested the deposition of Gregory VII in 1076. R. 1045-1090.<sup>2</sup>
- Albert, son of Stephen - 229 B. Implicated in simony with Paschal II.
- Alfonso VI, King of Galicia - 223 C. Conquered Toledo, 1085. R. 1071-1109.
- Anselm, Bishop of Lucca - 223 B. A member of the papal faction. Refused investiture from Henry IV in 1073. In 1080, expelled from Lucca. R. 1073-1086.<sup>3</sup>
- Anno, Archbishop of Cologne - 218 B. Former regent of Henry IV. Expelled by the inhabitants of Cologne in 1074. R. 1056-1075.<sup>4</sup>
- Baldwin I, Brother of Duke Godfrey; Prince of the Jerusalemites - 226 B, 228 B. Count of Edessa before succeeding his brother Godfrey. R. 1100-1118.<sup>5</sup>
- Baldwin, Count of Mons; Count of Hainaut - 226 B. A member of the crusading army. D. 1098.<sup>6</sup>
- Berto, Head of Roman Soldiery - 229 D. Described as one of those who took part in the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Alfred Haverkamp. *Medieval Germany, 1056-173*, p. 102-103 and I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 27-37 and 148-149.

<sup>2</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 145, 170, 282.

<sup>3</sup> See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 275-276, 305-306.

<sup>4</sup> See Joseph P. Huffman. *The Social Politics of Medieval Diplomacy: Anglo-German Relations (1066-1307)*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000, p. 29-35.

<sup>5</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 131-134, 185-186.

<sup>6</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 63.

coronation of the anti-pope Sylvester IV in 1105. His position was likely that of *superista*, chief military officer of the Lateran.<sup>7</sup>

Bohemond, Duke of Apulia, Ruler of Antioch - 226 B, 227 A, 235 A. A member of the crusading army. Made ruler of Antioch in 1098. After the crusade, became involved in wars with Byzantium. D. 1111.<sup>8</sup>

Bruno, Count - 234 A. Slain near Visé in the battle between Henry IV and Henry V in 1106.

Charlemagne - 236 A, 237 D. Emperor 800-814.<sup>9</sup>

Clement III, Anti-Pope - 220 B, 221 B, 222 A, 223 B, 223 D, 228 B, 232 D. Appointed after Gregory VII was deposed at the Synod of Brixen (1080). Crowned in 1084, died 1100.<sup>10</sup>

Clement of Metz, Saint - 224 C. First bishop of Metz.

Conrad, Bishop of Utrecht - 227 B. A member of the Imperial faction. Assassinated at Utrecht. R. 1076-1099.<sup>11</sup>

Conrad, Son of Henry IV - 225 A, 228 B. Eldest son of Henry IV. Became a papal partisan in 1093. 1074-1101.<sup>12</sup>

Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Cassino - 223 B, 236 A. Abbot of Monte Cassino, later Pope Victor III. Died after only a year as pope. R. 1086-1087.<sup>13</sup>

Dionysius Exiguus - 219 A, 219 B, 221 A. Creator of what is now the *Anno Domini*

---

<sup>7</sup> See Thomas F. X. Noble. *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680-825*, p. 248.

<sup>8</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 110-114, 261-263.

<sup>9</sup> See Rosamond McKitterick. *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

<sup>10</sup> See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 202-206, 227-229.

<sup>11</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 257, 273.

<sup>12</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 279, 286-288.

<sup>13</sup> See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *The Age of Abbot Desiderius*.

system. 6<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>14</sup>

Egbert, Count of Brunswick - 222 B, 224 C. An opponent of Henry IV, died in battle against Henry's forces in 1090. R. 1068-1090.<sup>15</sup>

Eusebius of Caesarea - 217 C. 4<sup>th</sup> century ecclesiastical writer, bishop of Caesarea around A. D. 314. Author of the *Ecclesiastical History* and original author of the *Chronica*.<sup>16</sup>

Eustace III, Brother of Duke Godfrey - 226 B. Count of Boulogne. Member of the crusading army. R. 1087-1125<sup>17</sup>

Friedrich, Archbishop of Cologne - 227 B, 234 A, 235 B. A partisan of Henry V. R. 1100-1131.

Godfrey IV, Duke of Lotharingia - 219 A, 224 B. Assassinated in 1076. R. 1069-1076.

Godfrey, Duke of Lotharingia, Prince of the Jerusalemites - 224 B, 226 B, 228 A, 228 B. Nephew of Godfrey IV. A member of the crusading army, and elected to rule over Jerusalem. R. 1099-1100.<sup>18</sup>

Godfrey, Count of Louvain, Duke of Lotharingia - 234 B, 235 A. A partisan of Henry V. R. 1106-1129.

Gregory VII, Pope - 216 D, 219 A, 219 B, 219 C, 220 A, 220 B, 220 C, 221 A, 221 B, 221 C, 222 A, 222 B, 223 B, 225 D, 229 A, 232 D, 235 C, 236 A. One of the major forces behind the so-named 'Gregorian Reform.' R. 1073-1085.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> See Duncan Steel. *Marking Time*, p. 106-115.

<sup>15</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 256-258.

<sup>16</sup> For an in-depth biography of Eusebius, see *Eusebius: Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine*. Ed. Schaff and Wace, p. 1-72.

<sup>17</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 59, 108-109.

<sup>18</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 59, 108-111, 113-115.

Gregory, Count of Tusculum - 229 B. Implicated in simony with Paschal II. R. 1058-1108.

Gualcherus, Bishop - 222 B. Originally from the clergy of St. Lambert, a bishop in England. Assassinated in 1085.

Guarniero, Prince of Ancona - 229 A, 229 D. Margrave of Ancona. Supporter of anti-Pope Sylvester IV. R. 1093-1119.

Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna - see Clement III, Anti-Pope

Guibert, Saint - 228 A, 235 B, 235 C. Founder of the monastery of Gembloux. Officially made a saint in 1110. Sigebert composed a *Vita Wicberti*.<sup>20</sup>

Henry, Bishop of Liège - 225 A. ‘Henry of Verdun.’ An imperial partisan. R. 1075-1091.<sup>21</sup>

Henry I, King of the English - 225 C, 228 B. Brother of and successor to William II. R. 1100-1135.<sup>22</sup>

Henry IV, King of the Germans, Roman Emperor - 217 A, 218 B, 219 A, 219 B, 219 C, 220 A, 220 B, 220 C, 221 A, 221 B, 221 C, 222 A, 222 B, 222 C, 223 A, 223 B, 224 C, 224 D, 225 A, 225 B, 228 B, 228 C, 228 D, 229 A, 230 B, 230 C, 230 D, 231 A, 231 B, 231 C, 231 D, 232 A, 232 B, 232 C, 232 D, 233 A, 233 B, 234 A, 234 B. Ruler of Germany for most of Sigebert’s life and one of the main figures in the *Chronica*. R. 1056-1106. Anointed emperor in 1084.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*.

<sup>20</sup> See *Vita Wicberti* by Sigebert of Gembloux. In *PL* vol. 160, 661-690.

<sup>21</sup> See Jean-Louis Kupper. *Liège et l'église impériale, XI<sup>e</sup>-XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, p. 139-140, 282-283, 294-295.

<sup>22</sup> See Warren C. Hollister. *Henry I*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.

<sup>23</sup> See the biography by I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*.

Henry V, King of the Germans, Roman Emperor – 228 B, 230 A, 230 D, 231 A, 231 B, 231 C, 231 D, 232 A, 234 B, 235 A, 235 B, 235 C, 236 A, 236 B, 236 C, 237 A, 237 B, 237 C, 238 A, 238 B, 238 C, 240 A. In 1105 a rebel against his father, Henry IV, as a member of the papal faction. After his father's death in 1106, became the ruler of Germany. In 1111, marched on Rome and took Paschal II hostage, and was granted the series of privileges known as the *privilege*. R. 1106-1125.<sup>24</sup>

Henry of Lanslebourg, Duke of Lotharingia - 228 B, 228 C, 234 B, 234 C, 235 A. In 1101 was defeated by Henry IV, but was granted Lotharingia in that year. Was captured by Henry V after Henry IV's death, but escaped and attacked Aachen ineffectively. R. 1101-1106.

Henry III of Louvain, Count - 225 C. D. 1095.<sup>25</sup>

Heraclius, Emperor - 228 A. Byzantine Emperor 610-641.

Hermann, Anti-King of Germany - 221 A, 224 C. Count of Salm. Elected as anti-king in 1081, died 1088.

Hermann III, Archbishop of Cologne - 224 B, 227 B. Archbishop of Cologne from 1089-1099.

Hermann of Liège, Bishop of Metz - 217 A, 220 A, 221 A, 222 A, 224 C. A member of the papal faction. Expelled from Metz in 1078 and 1085. R. 1073-1090.

Hildebrand, Archdeacon - see Gregory VII, Pope

Hugh, Brother of the King of the Franks - 226 B. A member of the crusading army. D.

---

<sup>24</sup> See Alfred Haverkamp. *Medieval Germany, 1056-1173*, p. 123-163.

<sup>25</sup> See Jean-Louis Kupper. *Liège et l'église impériale, XI<sup>e</sup>-XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, p. 459, 468.

1101.<sup>26</sup>

Ladislaus, King of Hungary - 225 C. Died 1095.

Louis VI, King of the Franks - 235 B. R. 1108-1137.

Marianus Scotus - 221 A. Composed a *Chronicon* that was used as a source by Sigebert and pointed out the errors of the Dionysian calendrical system. D. 1082.

Maginolfus, Archpriest - 229 C, 230 A. Antipope from 1105 to 1111, with the support of Guarniero of Ancona.

Nicholas, Saint - 223 B, C. Nicholas of Myra. 4<sup>th</sup> century saint whose relics were translated to Bari in 1087.<sup>27</sup>

Odo, Bishop of Ostia - 223 C, 223 D, 225 C, 228 B, 229 A, 229 B, 236 A. Pope Urban II. Preached the First Crusade at the Council of Clermont in 1095. R. 1088-1099.<sup>28</sup>

Olbert, Bishop of Liège - 225 A, 235 B. A supporter of Henry IV. R. 1091-1119.<sup>29</sup>

Papal Legate - 232 D, 233 A

Paschal II, Pope - 228 B, 229 A, 229 B, 230 A, 236 A, 236 B, 236 C, 237 A, 237 C, 237 D, 238 A, 238 B, 238 C, 240 A. One of the major players in the later years of the *Chronica*. Kidnapped in 1111 and gave the *pravilege* under duress. R. 1099-1118.<sup>30</sup>

Peter of Colonna - 229 B. Implicated in simony with Paschal II.

---

<sup>26</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 107-109.

<sup>27</sup> See Charles W. Jones. *Saint Nicholas of Myra, Bari, and Manhattan: Biography of a Legend*.

<sup>28</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century*, p. 105-109 and Dana Carleton Munro. "The Speech of Pope Urban II. At Clermont, 1095."

<sup>29</sup> See Jean-Louis Kupper. *Liège et l'église impériale, XI<sup>e</sup>-XII<sup>e</sup> siècles, passim*.

<sup>30</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Authority and Resistance in the Investiture Contest: The Polemical Literature of the Late Eleventh Century*, p. 176, 179, 181-182.

Peter of Lyons - 229 B . Implicated in simony with Paschal II.

Philip I, King of the Franks - 225 D, 230 B, 235 B. Excommunicated for adultery at the Council of Clermont by Urban II. Addressed by Henry IV in his letter included in the *Chronica* in the entry for 1106. R. 1060-1108.

Rainerus, Abbot of Saint Lawrence - see Paschal II, Pope

Raymond IV, Count of Saint Egidius; of Saint Gilles; of Toulouse - 226 B. One of the leaders of the First Crusade. D. 1105.<sup>31</sup>

Robert of Flanders, Count - 226 B, 228 C, 235 A. Part of the army of the First Crusade. Under orders from Paschal II, attacked Liège and Cambrai in 1102.<sup>32</sup>

Robert, Count of Normandy – 225 C, 226 B. Son of William I the Conqueror, Brother of Willaim II Rufus. A member of the crusading army. D. 1134.

Rudhart, Archbishop of Mainz – 231 D. Attempted to prevent the pogrom at Mainz before the First Crusade. A member of the papal faction. R. 1089-1109.<sup>33</sup>

Rudolph of Rheinfelden, Duke of Burgundy, Anti-King of Germany - 219 C, 220 A, 220 C, 221 A. Anti-king from 1077 to 1080.<sup>34</sup>

Russians, Brother-Kings of [Isjaslav, Svjatoslav, and Vsévolod] - 217 A. Originally co-rulers of Kiev, Isjaslav was expelled by the others in 1075 and sought help first from Henry IV and then from Gregory VII.<sup>35</sup>

Saracens, King of the [al-Afdal] - 227 C. Vizier of Egypt. Attacked the Crusaders after

---

<sup>31</sup>See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 111-116, 120-121.

<sup>32</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 114-119 and Sigebert's *Adversus Paschalem Papam*.

<sup>33</sup> See Benjamin Kedar. "The Forcible Baptisms of 1096: History and Historiography" for the happenings of 1096.

<sup>34</sup> See I. S. Robinson. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*, p. 168-209.

<sup>35</sup> See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 452-453.

they had captured Jerusalem at the Battle of Ascalon, 1099.<sup>36</sup>

Siegfried, Archbishop of Mainz - 219 C. Crowned Rudolph as anti-king in 1077. R. 1060-1084.

Siguinus, Archbishop of Cologne - 224 B. R. 1078-1089.<sup>37</sup>

Solomon I, King of the Hungarians - 218 B. Married to Henry IV's sister, Judith. Expelled from the kingship, and disappears from the historical record in 1083. R. 1063-1074.<sup>38</sup>

Stephen II, Count of Blois - 226 B. One of the members of the First Crusade, but turned back during the siege of Antioch. R. 1089-1102.<sup>39</sup>

Stephen, Pope - 222 B. Pope from 254 to 257. Murdered while holding Mass.

Sylvester IV, Antipope - see Maginolfus, Archpriest

Theodolus, Son of Count Gregory - 229 B. Implicated in simony with Paschal II.

Theoduin, Bishop of Liège – 218 B. R. 1048-1075.<sup>40</sup>

Tiberius Caesar - 216 D. Second Julio-Claudian Emperor. R. A.D. 14 – 37.

Urban II, Pope - see Odo, Bishop of Ostia

Victor III, Pope - see Desiderius, Abbot of Monte Cassino

Wicbert - 232 B. A partisan of Henry V in 1106.

William I, King of the English - 225 A. Conquered England after the Battle of Hastings in 1066. D. 1087.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 128-129, 141, 152, 155, 156, 160.

<sup>37</sup> Joseph P. Huffman. *The Social Politics of Medieval Diplomacy: Anglo-German Relations (1066-1307)*, p. 325.

<sup>38</sup> See H. E. J. Cowdrey. *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085*, p. 443-444.

<sup>39</sup> See Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*, p. 114-118.

<sup>40</sup> See Jean-Louis Kupper. *Liège et l'église impériale, XI<sup>e</sup>-XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, p. 134-137.

William II, King of the English - 225 A, 225 C, 228 B. William II Rufus, son of William I and elder brother of Henry I. R. 1087-1100.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> See David Charles Douglas. *William the Conqueror: The Norman Impact Upon England*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.

<sup>42</sup> See Frank Barlow. *William Rufus*.

### Appendix III – Index of Places<sup>1</sup>

- Aachen - 234 A, 234 B, 234 C. City, Germany.
- Aalen - 220 A. City, Germany.
- Acre - 228 C. City, Palestine.
- Al-Bara - 227 A. City, Syria.
- Alps - 220 A. Mountain Range.
- Ancona - 229 A, 229 D. City, Italy.
- Antioch - 220 B, 223 C, 226 D, 227 A. City, Syria.
- Apulia - 226 A, 226 B, 235 A. City, Italy.
- Aquitaine - 226 A. Duchy, France.
- Arithia - 229 B. Possession of the Church.
- Armenia - 220 B. Region, Asia Minor.
- Ascalon - 227 C. City, Palestine.
- Ascalon, Gate of - 228 A. Battle Site, Palestine.
- Bari - 223 C, 230 A. City, Italy.
- Bingen - 231 C. City, Germany.
- Blois - 226 B. County, France.
- Brittany - 226 A. Region, France.
- Burgundy - 219 C, 225 D, 226 A. Duchy, France.
- Cambrai - 228 C. City, Flanders.

---

<sup>1</sup> All translations of place names are drawn from either Johann Georg Theodor Grässe. *Orbis Latinus: Lexikon lateinischer geographischer Namen des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*. Berlin: Richard Carl Schmidt & Co., 1909 or, in the case of Eastern locales that are not included therein, from Christopher Tyerman. *God's War: A New History of the Crusades*.

Cologne - 218 B, 224 B, 227 B, 233 C, 234 A, 235 C. City, Germany.

Colonna - 229 B. Commune, Italy.

Constantinople - 235 A. City, Byzantine Empire.

England - 222 B, 225 C, 226 A, 228 B. Kingdom.

Flanders - 226 B, 228 C, 235 A. County, Germany.

France - 225 C, 225 D, 226 A, 226 B. Kingdom.

Frisia - 219 A, 225 A. Region, Germany.

Galicia - 223 C. Kingdom.

Gaul - 221 A, 225 B, 230 A. Region.

Gembloux - 228 A, 235 B. Monastery, Flanders.

Germany - 225 B, 226 A. Kingdom.

Hainaut - 226 B. County, Germany.

Italy - 220 C, 223 A, 223 B, 224 C, 224 D, 225 A, 225 B, 228 B, 230 A, 235 B.  
Region/Kingdom.

Jerusalem - 226 A, 227 C, 228 A, 228 B. City, Palestine.

Koblenz - 231 A. City, Germany.

Lanslebourg - 228 B. Town, France.

Laodicea - 226 C. City, Asia Minor.

Leonine Rome - 221 A, 221 B. City, Italy.

Liège - 217 A, 225 A, 228 C, 234 A, 234 B, 235 A, 235 B. City, Flanders.

Lombardy - 219 C, 220 B, 226 A. Region, Italy.

Lotharingia - 224 B, 224 C, 226 A, 226 B, 228 B, 228 C. Duchy, Germany.

Louvain - 225 C, 234 B. City, Flanders.

Lucca - 223 B. City, Italy.

Lycia - 223 C. Region, Asia Minor.

Lyons - 229 B. City, France.

Ma 'arrat - 227 A. City, Syria.

Mainz - 220 A, 220 B, 220 C, 222 A, 231 C, 231 D, 232 C. City, Germany.

Mantua - 223 B, 224 D. City, Italy.

Metz - 217 A, 220 B, 224 C. City, Germany.

Meuse - 234 A. River.

Mons - see Hainaut

Monte Cassino - 223 B. Monastery, Italy.

Myra - 223 C. City, Asia Minor.

Namur - 225 C. Province, Flanders.

Nicaea - 226 C. City, Asia Minor.

Normandy - 225 C, 226 A, 226 B. Duchy.

Nympha - 229 B. Possession of the Church.

Pavia - 229 B. City, Italy.

Pharphar - 226 C. River.

Provence - 226 A. Region, France.

Regensburg - 220 A. City, Germany.

Roman Empire - 217 A. Empire.

Romania - 227 A. Region, Asia Minor.

Rome - 219 C, 221 A, 221 B, 233 B, 235 C, 236 B, 237 B, 238 C. City, Italy.

Russians, Kingdom of - 217 A. Kingdom.

Saint Egidius - 226 B. County, Flanders.

Saint Gilles - see Saint Egidius

Saint Lantbert - 222 B. Church.

Saint Lawrence - 229 A. Abbey.

Salerno - 222 B. City, Italy.

Saxony - 221 A, 224 C. Duchy, Germany.

Scotland - 226 A. Kingdom.

Sigeberg - 218 C. Monastery.

Spain - 223 C, 226 A. Region.

Swabia - 220 A. Duchy, Germany.

Syria - 220 B, 227 A, 227 B. Region, Near East.

Taura, River - see Pharphar

Temple of Solomon - 227 C. In Jerusalem.

Tiburina - 229 D. Roman Road.

Toledo - 223 C. City, Spain.

Toulouse - see Saint Egidius

Tusculum - 229 B. City, Italy.

Tyre - 227 C. City, Palestine.

Utrecht - 227 B. City, Germany.

Visé - 234 A. Battle Site; Bridge, Flanders.

Worms - 219 B. City, Germany.

Würzburg - 223 A. City, Germany.

Zibera - 229 B. Possession of the Church.