

Chapter Title: FORGERIES AND HISTORIES AT SAINT-DENIS

Book Title: Forgeries and Historical Writing in England, France, and Flanders, 900-1200

Book Author(s): Robert F. Berkhofer <suffix>III</suffix>

Published by: Boydell & Brewer, Boydell Press. (2022)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv24tr8rg.11>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Boydell & Brewer, Boydell Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Forgeries and Historical Writing in England, France, and Flanders, 900-1200*

FORGERIES AND HISTORIES AT SAINT-DENIS

THE DOSSIER OF SAINT-DENIS

King Henry I of France died in August 1060 and his eight-year-old son, Philip, associated as king since the previous year, ascended the throne. Of course, a young monarch needed guardians, and Philip's mother, Anne of Kiev, took on this role. She was assisted (especially after her remarriage in 1062) by the king's paternal uncle through marriage, Count Baldwin V of Flanders, until Philip attained his majority in 1066–7.¹ During the guardianship, starting in 1061, a dispute erupted between the monks of Saint-Denis and the bishop of Paris over how free the monastery was from the bishop's control. Philip (and Baldwin) would be the initial arbiters of this dispute. After much wrangling, the monks appealed to Pope Alexander II (1061–1073), who agreed to hear the matter at a synod in Rome in May 1065. Accordingly, the monks of Saint-Denis prepared a dossier of charter copies to support their claims which was taken to Rome. On May 6 in the Lateran palace, Pope Alexander II and at least 35 bishops (among whom were 8 French bishops, including Godfrey, the bishop of Paris) reviewed Saint-Denis' privileges, and the Pope decided in the monks' favor.² Remarkably, this dossier (BnF NAL 326, ff. 1–19v), composed between 1061 and 1065, survives.³ The manuscript containing

¹ Emily J. Ward, "Anne of Kiev (c. 1024–c.1075) and a Reassessment of Maternal Power in the Minority Kingship of Philip I of France," *Historical Research* 89, no. 245 (2016): 435–53, esp. 440–2.

² PUF 9 (2), 116–24, no. 18b (JL 4565); Franz-Joseph Schmale, "Synoden Papst Alexander II. (1061–1073). Anzahl, Termine, Entscheidungen," *Annuario Historiae Conciliorum* 11 (1979): 321–3.

³ Stein 3358; Donatella Nebbiai-Dalla Guarda, *La bibliothèque de l'abbaye de Saint-Denis en France du IXe au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: CNRS, 1985), 309, no. 77; "Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Denis [indéterminé]," *cartulR - Répertoire des cartulaires médiévaux et modernes* (Orléans: Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, 2006), <http://www.cn-telma.fr/cartulR/>.

the dossier lacks a contemporary title and even modern scholars are not consistent in what they call it. The first folio of the manuscript bears a title in a fourteenth-century hand: *Privilegia carte beati Dyonisii in Francia*.⁴ Perhaps the most apt phrase is “cartulaire-dossier” (a collection of copies assembled for a purpose) preferred by recent scholars.⁵ For the sake of clarity, I will use the term “dossier” when referring to the group of charter copies produced before 1065, “cartulary” when referring to the “dossier” plus entries added soon after 1065, and “codex” to refer to the volume as a whole.

The dossier produced for the Lateran Synod of 1065 was a series of royal and papal charters, which offered a story about Saint-Denis’ past from its earliest years to 1065. Although there came to be many layers of history at Saint-Denis, the dossier provides a snapshot of the monks’ view of their past at a particular moment in time for a specific purpose. In general, few charters and manuscripts survive from the eleventh century at Saint-Denis compared with the Carolingian period or the twelfth century.⁶ Furthermore, the monks produced no other cartulary (or at least none survives) before the late twelfth century, so the dossier provides a unique opportunity to examine charters, forgery, and the relationship to historical narratives at early Saint-Denis.⁷ Despite intensive scholarly interest in Saint-Denis, this dossier is not well known to modern historians, so I will tell its tale as a constructed story before analyzing how and why it was composed.

THE STORY OF SAINT-DENIS

Here begins a story told in four parts.

Part 1: In the Time of the Merovingians (627–749)⁸

⁴ BnF NAL 326, fol 1r.

⁵ Proposed by Laurent Morelle, “Moines de Corbie sous influence sandionysienne? Les préparatifs corbéens du synode romain de 1065” in *L’église de France et la papauté (Xe-XIIIe siècle)*, ed. Rolf Grosse (Bonn: Bouvier, 1993), 197–218 at 214–7 and preferred by Rolf Grosse, “Remarques sur les cartulaires de Saint-Denis aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles” in *Les Cartulaires*, ed. Olivier Guyotjeannin et al. (Paris: École des chartes, 1993), 279.

⁶ Thomas Waldman, “Charters and Influences from Saint-Denis, c. 1000–1070,” in *Bury St. Edmunds and the Norman Conquest*, ed. Tom Licence (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2014), 22–30 at 23–25 provided a list of extant texts, 16 charters (authentic and forged) and 4 manuscripts.

⁷ Grosse, “Remarques sur les cartulaires,” 282–4 speculated about a lost mid-twelfth-century cartulary. AN LL 1156-7 (Stein 3359) is otherwise the oldest surviving cartulary, circa 1180/1190.

⁸ BnF NAL 326, ff. 1r–7v.

In ancient times, the illustrious King Dagobert held a general synod in his palace at Clichy with his bishops, abbots, counts and his other faithful men for the good of the church of God. After consulting with them, in order to honor the blessed martyrs of the Church and especially our patron lord Denis (*patroni nostri domni Dyonisii*) and his companions Rusticus and Eleutherius, the king ordered that the following should be observed:

Namely, that any fugitives for whatever misdeeds, who arrive at the bridge of Tricina at the basilica of Saint-Denis while fleeing – either coming from the part of Paris passing by the hill of martyrs (Montmartre) or coming from our palace (of Clichy) along the public road which proceeds by the Louvre – let all who arrive there take refuge, be freed, and be saved there, just as God, through his holy martyrs, freed us from the hands of our enemies and freed our progenitors from divine wrath.⁹

And, as God manifested his divine intercession in that holy place – even through a brute animal, that is a deer – it was deemed fitting that rational men, who had committed crimes against Dagobert, or future kings of the Franks, or against other faithful of the holy church, be pardoned and freed.¹⁰ Dagobert further swore “that the honor and reverence of the holy mother church, where our lord and patron the most holy Denis lies buried, will be preserved in all things, just as the Roman church of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul is known to have obtained through the privilege of the emperor Constantine.”¹¹ And to give it full authority, this privilege was signed by his own hand, in the presence of Landry, Bishop of Paris, and the bishops and worthy men at the synod, on May 26, 627 in his palace at Clichy.

⁹ BnF NAL, f. 1v; MGH DD Merov 1:79, no. 29: “id est ut quiquis fugitevorum pro quolibet scelere ad praefatum basilicam beatorum martyrum fugiens Tricenam pontem advenit, vel ex parte Parisius veniens Montem Marterum praeterierit, sive de palacio nostro [Clichy] egrediens publicam viam, quae pergit ad Luueram, transierit, sicut nos Deus liveravit per ipsos sanctos marteres de manibus inimicorum nostrorum et furore domini genitoris nostri, ita omnes, quicumque ivi confugerint, liverentur et salventur.” Note: I preserve the spelling of the dossier.

¹⁰ BnF NAL f. 1v; MGH DD Merov 1:79, no. 29: “brutum animal, videlicet cervum.” For the deer, see *Gesta Dagoberti I. Regis Francorum*, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SS rer. Merov. 2:403, c. 7.

¹¹ BnF NAL f. 1v–2r; MGH DD Merov 1:80, no. 29: “Contestamur namque et obtestamur omnes successors nostros, reges sive principes, per sanctam et individual Trinitatem et per ad ventum iusti iudicis, ut honor et reverentia sanctae matris ecclesiae, ubi domnus et patronus noster sanctissimus DYONISIUS requiescat, in omnibus conservetur, sicut Romae ecclesia beatorum apostolorum PETRI ET PAULI per privilegiorum Constantini imperatoris obtinere dignoscitur.” Note: capital letters highlight every instance of Saint Denis and most key personal names (kings, abbots, popes) throughout the manuscript; henceforth I only capitalize the first letter.

Five years later (632), King Dagobert, inspired by hope of eternal reward, granted further privileges to the *basilica* where the body of the martyr and our particular patron Denis rested.¹² Previously, Abbot Aigulf beseeched the king at a general assembly (*placitum*) at Compiègne to put the basilica under an immunity (*sub immunitatis*), which the king did before all gathered at a synod in Paris, including the area around that holy place, its people, and possessions, all of which the king deemed worthy of establishing in God's name.¹³ The king conceded and confirmed all of these things, out of reverence for the holy places and for the quiet of monks in the service of God there. And the king further added:

Wherefore through this precept, which we decreed specially and wish to remain in perpetuity, we order and establish that neither us nor our successors, nor any bishop or archbishop, nor anyone gird themselves with power of justice (*iudiciaria potestate*) over the said holy basilica, or its holdings, without the will of its abbots and his monks, nor have any power at all, but let this holy mother church, namely of our special patron and lord the great Denis, be free and free from all invasion or disturbance by all men, of whatever order or power they seem to be.¹⁴

The king extended this immunity to the lands at the basilica of Saint-Denis, and its lands in whatever regions and *pagi* of the kingdom where it could be shown the monastery possessed and ruled part presently, or lands which would be given thenceforth out of fear of God through legitimate written charters (*per legitima cartarum instrumenta*) or would be added or bestowed

¹² BnF NAL 326, f. 2v; MGH DD Merov 1:113, no. 43: "de basilica peculiaris patroni nostri domini Dyonisii martiris...requiescit"

¹³ BnF NAL 326, f. 2r; MGH DD Merov 1:113, no. 43: "Igitur venerabilis Aygulfus abbas de basilica peculiaris patroni nostri domni Dyonisii martiris ubi ipse preciosus domnus in corpore requiescit, clementiam regni nostri supplicavit, ut iuxta hoc, quod ante hos dies in Compendio in nostro generale placito tractavimus, ita nunc in universali nostra synodo Parisius congregata per propriam nostrum auctoritatem sub immunitatis nomine denuo pro rei firmitate circa ipsum sanctum locum vel homines, qui se cum substantia eorum vel rebus ad ipsam sanctam basilecam tradere et devovere voluerint, hoc nos in Dei nomine prestare et confirmare circa ipsum sanctam locum dignaremur."

¹⁴ BnF NAL 326, f. 2v-3r; MGH DD Merov 1:113, no. 43: "Quapropter per hoc preceptum, quod specialius decernimus et in perpetuum volumus esse mansurum, iubemus atque constituimus, ut neque nos neque successors nostril neque quilibet episcopus vel archiepiscopus new quicumque de iudiciaria potestate accinctus in ipsam sanctam basilecam vel inmanentes in ipsam, nisi per voluntatem abbatis et suorum monachorum, ullam umquam habeat potestatem, sed sit hec sancta mater ecclesia, videlicet peculiaris patroni nostri domni et magni Dyonisii, libera et absoluta ab omni invasione vel inquietudine omnium hominum, cuiuscumque ordinis vel potestatis esse videantur."

in future.¹⁵ Also, no one should presume to enter or inquire within the immunity of Saint-Denis to hear cases, or extract oaths, or demand judicial fines or the ban, or take hospitality or victuals, or require any payments at any time, except for collecting the king's fisc. He conceded all of these things under a whole and most firm immunity (*sub integra et firmissima immunitate*) to this holy place thenceforth and confirmed them in perpetuity.¹⁶ And this privilege was witnessed by fifteen bishops, including Landry of Paris.

In the next generation, Bishop Landry of Paris, seeking to do right and what is worthy, listened to a pious request by Clovis II, king of the Franks, to grant a firm and immutable privilege (*securitatis et incommutabilitatis privilegium*) – out of reverence for Saint Denis and his companions – to that church where their bodies lay, which gleamed by virtue of miracles, and where the king's father Dagobert and his mother Nanthildis had their tombs.¹⁷ And furthermore, as the holy council of Carthage held by Boniface of blessed memory did not forbid monks to live under their own privilege nor did the books of Saint Augustine on ecclesiastical ranks, the king asked that the monks there ought to live regularly in quiet, under his law alone, and remain undisturbed from all infestation (*infestatione*) of clerics, lest secular strife trouble those who follow the strict rule of the Lord's service.¹⁸ So, considering that the canons did not prejudge in this matter, and that the request of the king was like an order and hard to resist, and out of reverence for so many martyrs to whose patronage he himself was committed, and because those monks ought to live following holy order, and as much for the good of himself as for all of the brothers praying to God, Bishop

¹⁵ BnF NAL 326, f. 3r; MGH DD Merov 1:113, no. 43: "In curtes vero prefate basilice domni Dyonisii, ubi et ubi in quascumque regions vel pagos in regno Deo propicio nostro, quod a die presente pars ipsius monasterii possidere et dominari videtur, vel quod a Deum timentibus hominibus per legitima cartarum instrumenta ibidem fuit concessum aut inantea erit additum vel delegatum..." Note "ibidem" may be an error for "inde," which the pseudo-original used. If not, replacing "thenceforth" by "there" still makes sense (meaning lands given at Saint-Denis itself).

¹⁶ BnF NAL 326, f. 3r; MGH DD Merov 1:114, no. 43: "omnia et ex omnibus pro mercedis nostre augmento sub integra et firmissima immunitate a die presente concedimus ad ipsum sanctam locum et imperpetuo confirmamus."

¹⁷ BnF NAL 326, f. 3v–5r; ed. from pseudo-original AN K 3 no. 1 by Robert de Lasteyrie, ed., *Cartulaire général de Paris* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1887), 12–15, no. 10.

¹⁸ BnF NAL 326, f. 4r; de Lasteyrie, *Cartulaire de Paris*, 13, no. 10: "doceant monachos sub quiete regulariter viventes, sua singulari lege debere quiescere et ab omni infestatione clericorum intrepidus permanere, ne saecularis strepitus eos ledat quos districta regular servitutis Domini moderator." Presumably referring to Pope Boniface I (418–22) and the Council of Carthage of 419.

Landry conceded this privilege, most willingly (*plena voluntate*) and with the consent of his fellow bishops.¹⁹ He also promised that neither he nor any of his successors would infringe or violate this, and that any priests or clerics who served the church in that circumscribed space (within the *castrum* of Saint-Denis and around it, from the place called the Font of Saint Rémi along the road near the meadow called Formosum up to the church of Saint Quentin, and along the royal road which comes to the enclosure at the head of the Tricina bridge and back to the Font of Saint Rémi) were free and absolved from any debt or renders for any gathering or synod.²⁰ And, if needed, they could take oil and chrism, without charge, from the bishop or his successors. Landry declared that if anyone violated this, or dared to kill or wound these priests or clerics, or in any way injured them, “whatever from all of this which seems to belong to us we concede wholly to the abbot, who rules this holy place, and the other brothers to have and to determine.”²¹ If anyone by greed or cunning prevented this or dared to violate it, or anything included above, they would do three years of penance sequestered with the monks. In order that this privilege remain perpetual and incorrupt, Bishop Landry affirmed it by subscribing with his own hand and had twenty-five of his brother bishops sign it.²² And this was done on July 1, 653.

Out of clemency, princes should hear petitions, especially those which pertain to salvation or are requested out of fear of the divine, and undertake to grant them.²³ So King Clovis II, moved by piety, by love of the blessed martyrs and the miracles which took place at the basilica where

¹⁹ BnF NAL 326, f. 4r-v; de Lasteyrie, *Cartulaire de Paris*, 13, no. 10: “Quod nos considerantes, dum et canonica institutio nos hac de re non prejudicat, vel ideo quia supradicti domni Chlodovii regis petitio quasi nobis jussio est, cui difficilimum est resisti, vel pro reverentia tantorum martirum quorum patrocinio se ipse commisit, seu ut ipsis monachis seacundum sanctam ordinem vivere liceat, et ut tam pro nobis quam pro omnibus nostre ecclesiae fratribus Deum orent, ipsum privilegium, plena voluntate, una cum consensus fratrum meorum, ipsis concessisse visum sum.”

²⁰ For these boundaries and a map, Anne Lombard-Jourdan, “*Montjoie et saint Denis!*” *Le centre de la Gaule aux origines de Paris et de Saint-Denis* (Paris: CNRS, 1989), 75–8.

²¹ BnF NAL 326, f. 4v; de Lasteyrie, *Cartulaire de Paris*, 13, no. 10: “Et si quis eorum presbiterorum vel clericorum forte aut occisus, quod absit, aut vulneratus fuerit, aut ex eis omnibus alicuius injuriae acclamatio surrexerit, quicquid ex his omnibus ad nos attingere videtur, hoc totum abbati, qui in ipso sancto loco prefuerit, ceterisque fratribus, habendum et disponendum concedimus.”

²² BnF NAL 326, f. 5r; de Lasteyrie, *Cartulaire de Paris*, 14, no. 10: “manus nostre subscriptionibus roboravimus.”

²³ BnF NAL 326, f. 5r–7r; ed. from original in ChLA 13, no. 558 and MGH DD Merov 1: 216–220, no. 85.

their bodies lie as do his father Dagobert and mother Nanthildis, and also by the hope of eternal salvation which the intercession of those saints may provide, made petition to Landry, Bishop of Paris, to make and confirm a privilege for that holy place, for the sake of the abbot and brothers there and their future peace, so they could gather there more easily to pray for the kingdom's stability by praising those martyrs.²⁴ This Landry most willingly granted and confirmed with his co-bishops. Then the king, through his own authority, affirmed these privileges: that whatever had been given to that holy place in land, people, or objects by princes or ancestors, or whatever would be given there in future, would belong under the control (*ditatus*) of that place; and that no bishop at present or any successors in the future, nor any priest, nor a person of any order could take anything away from that place or usurp any power from that monastery for himself.²⁵ And the king wished to establish at this holy place the order (of worship) instituted in the time of lord Psallencius through *turmae* just as the monastery of Saint Maurice Agaune held to day and night; thus it would be celebrated in this place.²⁶ So this would be firm and preserved over time, he subscribed the privilege himself, as did more than forty others, both bishops and worthy men, including Landry, Bishop of Paris. And this was done on June 22, 654.

Then, in the year 749, Pope Zachary received a request from Pepin for him to recognize and affirm the privileges of Saint-Denis.²⁷ In particular, Pepin asked for confirmation of the privilege granted by the venerable

²⁴ BnF NAL 326, f. 5v; MGH DD Merov 1: 218, no. 85: "...ut apostolicus Landericus Parisiaci aeclesiae episcopus privilegio ad ipsum sanctam locum, abbati vel fratribus ibidem consistentibus facere vel confirmare pro quiete future deberit, quo facilius congregationi ipsi licerit pro stabilitate regni nostri ad limena martirum ipsorum iugeter exorare."

²⁵ BnF NAL 326, f. 6r; MGH DD Merov 1: 218–9, no. 85: "Nos ergo per hanc seriem autoretatis nostrae, iuxta quod per supradictum privilegium a ponteficebus factum et prestatum est, pro reverencia ipsorum marterum vel nostra confirmanda mercede per hanc autoretatem iobemus, ut si qua ad ipsum locum sanctum in villabus, mancipiis vel quibuscumque rebus adque corporebus a priscis princepsibus seo genertorebus nostris vel a deum timentibus hominebus propter amorem Dei ibidem delegatum aut deinceps fuerit addetum, dum ex munificencia parentum nostrorum, ut dixemus, ipse sanctus locus videtur esse ditatus, nullus episcoporum nec praesentes nec qui future fuerint sucessores aut eorum ordenatores vel qualibet persona possit quoquo ordine de loco ipso alequid auferre aut alequa potestate sibi in ipso monasteri usurpare ..."

²⁶ BnF NAL 326 f. 6v–7r; MGH DD Merov 1: 219, no. 85: "eo scilicet ordine, ut sicut tempore domni et genitoris nostri ibidem Psallencius per turmas fuit instetutus vel sicut ad monasterium sancti Mauricii Agaunis die noctoque tenetur, ita in loco ipso celebretur."

²⁷ BnF NAL 326, f. 7r–7v; PUF 9(2): 61–4, no. 1 (JL 2294).

Bishop Landry of Paris.²⁸ In it, Landry had granted, on behalf of himself and his successor bishops of Paris, that all the priests, deacons, and clerks serving the church of Saint-Denis would be free from their power (*potestate...absoluit*), and also – for the sake of the holy martyr Denis and equally out of love at the request of Clovis II, son of Dagobert, and for the quiet of the monks serving God there – lest they be plagued by clerics (*ne a clericis infesterantur*) and held back in praying, they would be placed under the power and at the disposition of the abbots and monks of that monastery and their successors.²⁹ All of this the Pope ordered to be confirmed in perpetuity. And he granted a further request, namely that the monks might baptize new brothers twice a year, at Easter and Pentecost. And in order that his privilege and that of Landry remain undisturbed, he forbade any person great or small to infringe them. This sanction included any bishop of Paris who dared to interfere in any way with the monks of the monastery in any of these things or presumed to call a council about them.³⁰ And anyone else who presumed to go against this would be anathematized.

Part 2: In the Time of the Carolingians (754–893)³¹

Soon after, Pope Stephen II was in the Frankish realm and he held a council at Saint-Denis (754), where Abbot Fulrad asked him to confirm the properties presently held in various places, or those which might be acquired or given in future.³² And later on, Stephen did this. The Pope also granted Fulrad permission to build his monastery as free under the law of the Roman church (*libera sub iure sancta Romane ecclesiae*), just as the

²⁸ BnF NAL 326, f. 7r; PUF 9(2): 63, no. 1: “Constat enim tua dignissima postulation ad nostrum dilectionem, ut privilegium, quod domnus et venerabilis Landericus Parisiæ urbis episcopus monasterio sancti Dionisii, specialis, ut scripsisti, patroni tui, fecit and una cum consensus venerabilem illius patrie episcoporum rovoravit.”

²⁹ BnF NAL 326, f. 7r–7v; PUF 9(2):63, no. 1: “...in quo, secundum terminus a se dispositos, a sua et omnium suorum successorum, vicelicet Parisiæ urbis episcoporum, potestate commanentes et ecclesiis ibi servientes presbiteros, diacones, clericos omnes absoluit, et pro reverentia sancti martiris Dyonisii pariterque amore et petitione domni Chludouii regis, filii Dagouerti, atque quo quiete fratrum iuibem Deo famulantium, ne a clericis infestarentur et ab oratione retardarentur, abbatis et monachorum ipsius monasterii et successorum eorum potestati et dispositio subdidit.”

³⁰ BnF NAL 326, f. 7v; PUF 9(2):63, no. 1: “Promulgantes etiam sancimus, ne quis Parisiæ urbis episcoporum iamdicti monasterii monachos pro his omnibus, quæ prædicta sunt, quoquo modo interpellare audeat vel ad concilium provocare præsumat.”

³¹ BnF NAL 326, ff. 7v–16v.

³² BnF NAL 326 f. 8r; PUF 9(2):67, no. 2b (JL 2331): “Igitur quia postulasti a nobis, dilectissime noster filii, quatinus in regno Francie ubi et ubi tibi placitum fuerit.

abbot himself was free from the resistance or opposition of other judges.³³ Furthermore Pope Stephen granted Abbot Fulrad and his successors the power and permission to build monasteries wherever they wished in the Frankish kingdom, either on their lands, or on those given by kings or his (the abbot's) relations through just means whenever and wherever.³⁴ He affirmed the privilege of Landry, requested by Dagobert and Clovis II, that all clerics in the monastery's service would be free. Pope Stephen also wrote: "And we also concede to you, through singular privilege, a bishop, who may be elected by the abbot and brothers in your monastery as your own."³⁵ And this bishop could be consecrated by any bishop of the region. If any bishop refused to ordain him, the matter would be settled by the Pope, "as the monastery would remain under apostolic control (*apostolice ditione*), just as that holy place itself had been constituted, and so should everything which pertained to it."³⁶ No bishop, priest, deacon, or any minister of the church could celebrate mass or hold a council at the monastery, unless invited by the abbot. If any disputes arose now or in the future, the abbot and his successors could seek an audience with the Pope.³⁷ If any king, bishop, or person of any secular power contravened apostolic authority, they would be cut off from the fellowship of Christ and anathematized. All this was granted by Pope Stephen on February 26, 757. On that same day, Pope Stephen issued another privilege, moved by love for Saint Denis, granting that the abbot might be accompanied by deacons on feast days – seven or

³³ BnF NAL 326 f. 8r (PUF 9(2):67, no. 2b: "monasteria construendi licentiam tribueremus ipsaque monasteria sicut a te sine refragatione de aliquot iudice vel reclamatore constructa sunt, ita libera sub iure sancta Romane ecclesiae...")

³⁴ BnF NAL 326 f. 8r (PUF 9(2):68, no. 2b: "his igitur...per hanc apostolicam auctoritatem tibi ceterisque successoribus tuis abbatis coenobii sanctorum martirum Dyonisii, Rustici, et Eleutherii licentiam et potestatem concedimus edificandi monasteria, ubicumque in Francie regno volueritis sive in locis proprietatis vestrae sive in his, que per comparationis seriem vel concessionem regum vel parentum vestrorum dono vel undecumque vel ubicumque vobis quolibet iusto modo obvenerint.")

³⁵ BnF NAL 326 f. 8r–8v (PUF 9(2):68, no. 2b: "nos etiam habere vobis episcopum per singulare privilegium concedimus, qui de vobis ab abbate vel a fratribus in monasterio vestro electus...")

³⁶ BnF NAL 326 f. 8v (PUF 9(2):69, no. 2b: "...sed sint reliqua vestra monasteria sub apostolice ditione, sicut et ipse sanctus locus constitutus est, ad quem ipsa omnia predicta monasteria pertinere videntur.")

³⁷ BnF NAL 326 f. 8v (PUF 9(2):69, no. 2b: "Tuas autem et tuorum monasteriorum causas tu atque tui successores per tempora, que ventura sunt, ad nostram et apostolicam audientia habeas et, cum veneris ad nos vel legatos tuos miseris, nullus interea te vel illos videlicet tuos successores condemnare valeat vel res tuas quoquo modo invadere presumat.")

five or three depending on the length of the feast – wearing the dalmatic.³⁸ For this, they would remember the name of Pope Stephen at each mass and receive papal legates on their journeys to Francia.

Later on, Abbot Fulrad requested that the apostolic see renew the privileges granted by Pope Stephen.³⁹ Pope Leo III confirmed those privileges for the abbot and his successors again, and especially that they remain perpetually under the control (*sub ditione*) of the Holy See in Rome. Also, any properties would remain so – whether given by the most excellent king Charles, or other kings, or good men or their relations, either under their lordship now or acquired later, either monastery buildings or villas or *mancipia*, found in any *pagi*, locales or fields whatsoever. Furthermore, he affirmed again all the privileges given by Pope Stephen II in detail, including that the abbot or his successors could bring any cases concerning Saint-Denis to the Holy See. In addition, Pope Leo confirmed all the arrangements of manors or monasteries Abbot Fulrad had made in his testament.⁴⁰ All persons, of whatever rank, were forbidden to interfere with these privileges, lest they be bound by the chains of anathema. And this bull was written on the sixth day before the kalends of June, in the third year of the pope's reign, in the twenty-fifth year since King Charles of the Franks had become king of the Lombards and *patricius* of Rome (May 27, 798).

Previously (on July 1, 786), Pope Hadrian I had written to Abbot Maginar of Saint-Denis to confirm the customs of that venerable place, as the abbot requested, and affirmed the support of Saint Peter, prince of the apostles, for the monastery. In particular, he confirmed that the abbot and monks could elect a bishop to care for the souls of the crowds who flocked to the tombs of the martyrs, as granted by Pope Stephen II.⁴¹ If any bishop refused to consecrate him, the abbot might send a written testimonial to Rome and, further, provincial bishops were forbidden to take anything from the monastery or any of its cells or to summon its priests without permission of the abbot or monks.⁴² If the abbot could not settle a dispute with bishops,

³⁸ BnF NAL 326, f. 9r–9v; PUF 9(2):75–77, no. 5b (JL 2332).

³⁹ BnF NAL f. 9v–10v; PUF 9(2):88–90, no. 9 (JL 2499).

⁴⁰ BnF NAL f. 10v; PUF 9(2):90, no. 9: “Et res ac predia sive monasteria a te constructa et ordinata, sicut in testamento tuo habes ad monasterium sancti Christi martiris Dionisii et monachorum suorum tradita et confirmata, in futuram perseuerunt.”

⁴¹ BnF NAL f. 10v–12r; PUF 9(2):83–8, no. 8b (JL 2454) at 11r: “Quando autem episcopus prefati sancti loci de hoc seculo migraverit et alius ab abbate et monachis dignus electus est, sine qualibet controversia pro longitudine itineris a vicinis episcopis, sicut mos exitit, consecrator.”

⁴² BnF NAL 11v; PUF 9(2): 86, no. 8b: “Et nemo episcoporum provincialium de prefato venerabili monasterio vel de cellis ecclesiarumque titulis ditioni ipsius constitutes, pro quacumque exquisita re distringere vel ad se presbiteros convocare presumat.”

let the matter be brought to an audience in Rome for judgment.⁴³ And these privileges were to remain firm and stable forever, under pain of anathema.

On April 28, 863, Pope Nicholas I granted the written petition (*scripta petitoria*) of King Charles the Bald to confirm the privileges of the monastery of Saint-Denis.⁴⁴ The Pope confirmed in perpetuity the privileges, just as they had been instituted in the time of Charles' father Emperor Louis of pious memory – and formerly by king Dagobert and other kings and including his [Louis'] grandfather, the famous King Pepin, and his father, Emperor Charles of splendid memory – who ordered lands, goods and revenues allotted especially for the monks, for the adornment and lighting of the church, and for the school, hospitality and the poor, which were confirmed by the bishops of the region and written in the precept of King Charles – and the abovementioned kings.⁴⁵ The Pope also forbid any king, bishop, abbot, or anyone of whatever dignity, to change any of the arrangements made by Charles or him and declared that they should remain undisturbed and in quiet permanently. Nicholas had all this written in his bull, so that it might be preserved in perpetuity by this privilege of the apostolic see. If anyone dared to violate it, they would be bound with chains of anathema and damned to eternal fire.

In the previous year (862), Charles the Bald had summoned bishops of diverse provinces and cities to synods, first at Pitres and then at Soissons, to hear any cases about the church.⁴⁶ And there bishops received, with the king's consent, the petition of Abbot Louis and the monks of Saint-Denis asking for their support and protection from the snares of the greedy, lest any perverse disturbance trouble them including even an infestation of clerics (*maxime clericorum infestatione*). The bishops explained:

Thus, asking this, they brought before our eyes in the presence of King Charles, who was much moved to piety by the request of the aforesaid brothers, certain privileges of the most holy popes and also precepts

⁴³ BnF NAL 11v; PUF 9(2): 86, no. 8b: "Quod si abba eiusdem monasterii nullo modo valuerit inter eos ortam contentionem sedare, habeat eos ad maiorem audientiam, videlicet Romanum, invitare, ut ibi fiat discriminatum, utri tortitudinis seu rectitudinis ascribatur iudicium."

⁴⁴ BnF NAL f. 12r–13r; PUF 9(2):95–100, no. 12 (JL 2718).

⁴⁵ BnF NAL f. 12r–v; modifications (in parentheses) from PUF 9(2):98–99, no. 12 interpolations q and a': "quae tempore piae memoriae genitoris sui Hludouici augusti (et Dagoberti quondam regis atque aliorum regum necnon et Pippini incylti regis attau ipsius et Karoli imperatoris dive memorie aui ipsius)" and later on "in praeceptis ipsius filii nostri Karoli (vel supradictorum regum)."

⁴⁶ BnF NAL f. 13r–14v; edited from pseudo-original in Jules Tardif, ed., *Monuments historiques: cartons des rois, 528–1789* (Paris: Archives nationales, 1866, rep. Nedeln: Kraus, 1977), 122–4, no. 188.

of the most illustrious kings about the liberty (*de libertate*) of the said monastery, which had been honorably confirmed by kings of those times, and moreover were corroborated as inviolate by apostolic authority.⁴⁷

Then immediately, the following happened:

And so, the same King Charles, remaining in this universal synod for the love of God, ordered to be recited publicly (*publice recitari iussit*) the precepts and privileges of his predecessors, the confirmations strengthening them by apostolic authority, and even considered the privilege of Landry, holy Bishop of Paris, and what had been done to preserve this regular order inviolately, through the prayers of lord Clovis II, son of glorious king Dagobert, and through the reverent and marvellous supplication of the saints – who to this day glitter with miracles – and what had been handed over to that same church by their confirming hands and had honored it with a privilege of liberty (*libertatis...privilegio*).⁴⁸

When this was done, the bishops gave their assent so that these privileges would remain undisturbed in future, without any appeal by the bishop of Paris or any opposition or contradiction.⁴⁹ Then came the bishop of Paris, who said:

Indeed, I myself, Aeneas, the unworthy bishop of the city of Paris, approve this accord, and I confirm the privilege of lord Landry, my predecessor, wholly agreeing to preserve the way of equity, and I order it remain firm now and in future times, and I forbid all my successors – through

⁴⁷ BnF NAL f. 13v; Tardif, ed., *Monuments historiques*, 122–3, no. 188: “Igitur hoc postulantes optulerunt nostris obtutibus, presente etiam domno Karolo rege, qui petitionibus predictorum fratrum piisimo favebat affect, quaedam privilegia sanctissimorum pontificum, nec non et precepta clarissimorum regum de libertate predicti monasterii, ab eisdem suis temporibus honorifice confirmata, insuper et apostolica auctoritate inviolabiliter corroborata.”

⁴⁸ BnF NAL 326, f. 13v–14r; Tardif, ed., *Monuments historiques*, 123, no. 188: “Ergo residens idem Deo amabilis rex Karolus in ipsa universali sinodo, predecessorum suorum precepta et privilegia seu confirmationes apostolicis auctoritatibus roboratas, maxime autem privilegium domni Landerici, religiosi Parisiorum episcopi, consideratum quod ut hic regularis ordo inviolabiter conservaretur, terribiliter et mirabiliter obtestando obdepredicationem domni Chludovici filii Dagoberti incliti regis factum et sanctorum, qui usque hodie in miraculis coruscant, minibus roboartum ipsi aecclesiae tradidit et libertatis eam privilegio honoravit, publice recitari iussit.”

⁴⁹ BnF NAL 326 f. 14r; Tardif, ed., *Monuments historiques*, 123, no. 188: “Statuentes igitur sancimus omnes videlicet epsicopi, qui praedicae sinodo interfuimus, ut ea omnia, quae in praedictis privilegiis seu preceptis continentur, jamdicti monasterii sanctissimi Dyonisii monachi, tam ipsi quam successors eorum, per ventura tempora, absque cujuslibet Parisiacae urbis episcopi repetitione, seu cujuscumque reclamation vel contradictione, quiete imperpetuum possideant.”

omnipotent God, who created all by his word and formed everything by the breath of his mouth – to dare alter any of these things in any way.⁵⁰

Next, the synod agreed that anyone who tried to subvert their accord either by fraud or force would be anathematized, and the bishops subscribed the agreement in order by ecclesiastical provinces of Reims, Sens, Bourges, Rouen, Tours, and Bourdeaux. The king's notary, Adeligar, recognized this on behalf of his chancellor Guazlenus.

Let us return to the deeds of Pope Nicholas I. The next day (April 29, 863), Pope Nicholas again wrote to King Charles the Bald, since Charles had sent a letter to the Pope asking him to confirm the privileges of Saint-Denis.⁵¹ In his reply, Nicholas acknowledged that Clovis II, the son of Dagobert, with the advice of his bishops, had removed the monastery from the power of the see of Paris and placed it under the abbot. He also acknowledged Charles' request that the synodal privilege granted the previous year at Soissons be confirmed by apostolic authority.⁵² So, Nicholas confirmed all royal precepts and apostolic privileges of Saint-Denis for all time, with no possibility of appeal either by the episcopal seat of Paris, any judicial means, or by any powerful men, so that they would remain fixed in the future just as they had been granted.⁵³ And he anathematized any who would violate these arrangements even more strongly, damning them to the pain of eternal fire with the traitor Judas.

Then in 893 Pope Formosus again confirmed the privileges of Saint-Denis, especially Bishop Landry's from the time of Clovis II, Dagobert's son, and those conferred by his predecessors, Popes Stephen II and Leo III, and the synod at Soissons as witnessed by the king and great lords.⁵⁴ Again, he anathematized those who dared to violate these arrangements.

⁵⁰ BnF NAL 326 f. 14r; Tardif, ed., *Monuments historiques*, 123, no. 188: "Quin etiam ego ipse Eneas, acsi indignus Parisiacae urbis episcopus, hoc consentiens laudavi, privilegium domni Landerici, antecessores mei, omnino aequitatis tramitem servare approbans, corrobavi corroboratumque nunc et futuris temporis mandavi, omnibusque successoribus meis, per omnipotentem Deum, qui verbo suo cuncta creavit et spiritu oris sui universa formavit, interdicto ne quicquam ex his omnibus quolibet modo reppetere audeant umquam."

⁵¹ BnF NAL 326, f. 15r-v; PUF 9(2):100-102, no. 13 (JL 2719). Note: No such letter of Charles exists.

⁵² BnF NAL 326, f. 15r; PUF 9(2):102, no. 13: "a nobis postulate, ut privilegium episcoporum de eodem monasterio factum nostro privilegio immo magis apostolorum principis roboraremus."

⁵³ BnF NAL 326, f. 15r-v; PUF 9(2):102, no. 13: "stabilimus, ut ipse locus regum preceptis et privilegiis apostolicis fultus per omnia tempora sine repetitione cuiuscumque episcopi Parisiace sedis aut alicuius iudicarie potestatis vel cuiuscumque prepotentis hominis, se semper, sicut preoptat et expetit benevolentia, ratus future tempore permaneat."

⁵⁴ BnF NAL 326, f. 15v-16v; PUF 9 (2), no. 15 (JL 3497).

Part 3: In Recent Times (1049–1061)

Several years ago, Abbot Hugh IV asked Pope Leo IX to reaffirm the privileges of Saint-Denis, which the Pope did on October 5, 1049.⁵⁵ He reviewed the privileges of immunity granted by Dagobert, king of the Franks and founder of the place, and by Clovis II his son.⁵⁶ And he reviewed the privilege for Saint-Denis made by Landry, Bishop of Paris – with the consent of his canons and the region's bishops – concerning its liberty (*libertate*), absolving himself and his successors of the power to rule and arrange who served the churches of Saint-Denis, and handing it over to the abbot and brothers.⁵⁷ He also reviewed the privileges of his apostolic predecessors, Popes Zachary, Stephen II, Leo III, Hadrian I, Nicholas I, and Formosus, as well as the synod held by King Charles the Bald. All these Leo IX deemed worthy to confirm in writing with his own privilege. And the Pope wrote:

“We also order these things to be unalterable, lest any bishop of the city of Paris or another church at any time for any reason or any cause, should dare to seek again from the abbot and brothers of the same place anything constituted under their power following the decrees of the aforesaid fathers or whatever in those privileges was confirmed by us.”⁵⁸

No bishop was to deny them the oil, chrism, or altar consecrations, blessings, or ordinations, if the abbot or brothers or their successors requested them, and no Bishop of Paris was to gainsay them once granted.⁵⁹ If any dispute arose concerning the monks' churches, they were permitted to

⁵⁵ BnF NAL 326, f. 16v–18r; PUF 9 (2):107–113, no. 16b (JL –).

⁵⁶ BnF NAL 326, f. 17r; PUF 9(2):110, no. 16b: “privilegia...eorum omnium immunitatum.”

⁵⁷ BnF NAL 326 f. 17r; PUF 9(2):110, no. 16b: “sed et privilegium, quod fecit domnus Landericus Parisiace urbis episcopus una cum consensus suorum canonicorum pariterque illius regionis episcoporum de libertate et emissionem clericorum in suis ordinibus omnibus, quod videlicet secundum metas a se discretas in circumscripto loco ecclesiis servientes a sua et omnium successorum potestate absoluit et abbati et fratribus monachis supradicti monasterii ad regendum et disponendum contradidit.”

⁵⁸ BnF NAL 326, f. 17v; PUF (2):111, no. 16b: “Sancientes etiam promulgamus, ne ullus aliquando Parisiace urbis vel aliarum ecclesiarum episcopus quacumque ratione vel quacumque causa ab abbate vel a fratribus predicti loci vel ab his omnibus, qui sub eorum potestate secundum predictorum patrum decreta sunt constitui, aliquid in ipsis privilegiis a nobis corroboratum audeat utcumque repetere.”

⁵⁹ BnF NAL 326, f. 17v; PUF 9(2):111: “Precipimus quoque, ne quis eorum episcoporum, a quibus ista postulare voluerint, eis oleum, crisma, tabulas, benedictiones, ordines suis temporibus, prout ipse abbas vel fratres vel eorum successores expetierunt, presumat denegare, et ne quis episcoporum Parisiace sedis hec eis denegat vel alium, qui eis contulerint, pro hoc interpellare quoquo tempore temptet, omnino interdicentes prohibemus.”

appeal to an audience with the Pope or his successors, as had been established previously.⁶⁰ If anyone dared to violate these privileges in any way, they would be bound by the chains of anathema, through the power God conceded to Saint Peter and the Popes, and eternally damned, and those who preserved them would enjoy perpetual benediction.

And here follows a list of the names of the monastery of Saint-Denis's own bishops.⁶¹ (The list contains seventeen names.)

Very recently, on April 18, 1061, Pope Nicholas II granted a privilege, having been implored by the brothers of Saint-Denis, concerning a certain priory (*abbatiola*) which fed the monks.⁶² This priory was located in Alsace in the Vosges mountains at a place called Lebraha, which had been Abbot Fulrad's own property presented to him by the unconquered emperor Charlemagne, and which Fulrad handed over to his lord and patron Denis.⁶³ He confirmed the monks' permanent possession of this priory forever by apostolic authority.⁶⁴ The Pope forbid any king, bishop, abbot, or anyone else to disturb this place, or any of its possessions, following the privileges granted by Popes Stephen, Leo, and the other Nicholas, and the precepts granted by Charlemagne, the Emperor Henry, and other emperors and kings.⁶⁵ And

⁶⁰ BnF NAL 326, f 17v; PUF 9(2):111: "Hoc insuper etiam iubemus, ut pro causis et responsis ecclesie sue nostram atque nostrorum successorum audientiam licenter habeant appellare...quod a nostris utique predecessibus eis ante constitutum est."

⁶¹ BnF NAL 326, f. 18r, the rubric is: "Nomina priorum episcoporum monasterii Sancti Dyonisii martyris" and it is followed by seventeen personal names in two columns. This list fills the remainder of fol. 18r after the Leo IX act, allowing the genuine Nicholas I bull to begin at the top of fol. 18v.

⁶² BnF NAL 326, f. 18v; PUF 9(2):114–115, no. 17 (JL 4456): "fratres monasterium venerabilis Christi martyris dyonisii, ubi domnus in corpore requiescit, nostram implo-rasse benivolentiam, ut privilegium apostolicae dignitatis de quadam predicti loci abbatiola eis edere deberemus."

⁶³ BnF NAL 326, f. 18v; PUF 9(2):115, no. 17: "Est autem ipsa abbatiola in pago Alsia-censi in saltu quidem Vosagi sita appellaturque Lebraha, quam Fulradus abbas in suo proprio munificentia domni Karoli impertoris invictissimi condidit atque glori-osisimo patrono suo domno scilicet dyonysio contradidit." This passage refers to Fulrad's testament, see below. Lebraha is modern Leberau/Lièpvre (dépt. Haut-Rhin).

⁶⁴ BnF NAL 326, f. 18v; PUF 9(2):115, no. 17: "...promulgantes sancimus, ut predicta abbatiola apostolica corroboracione subnixa perhenni tempore illibata loco sancti Dyonisii profutura permaneat."

⁶⁵ Grosse, ed., PUF 9(2):113–116 indicates this passage may refer to the act of Pope Stephen II of 757 or lost acts of Stephen IV, Leo III, Nicholas I, and to the surviving genuine acts of Charlemagne of September 14, 744 (MDH DD Karol. 1:120, no. 84) and of Henry III, January 26, 1056 (MGH D H III: 497, no. 365). An act of Charles the Bald for Lebraha from 865/866 also survives, Tessier, ed., *Recueil des actes de*

so this place would be preserved in perpetuity, he anathematized anyone daring to interfere with these arrangements.

Part 4: All Ends Well (1065)

In the end, all was settled at a synod in Rome, where Pope Alexander II confirmed everything again. Alexander wrote to Abbot Rainier of Saint-Denis using the very same words which Pope Leo IX had used in 1049.⁶⁶ Pope Alexander issued this reconfirmation in full formality, with *rota*, *benevalete*, and a bull on May 6, 1065 at the Lateran palace. On that same day, he sent a letter to King Philip I of France and his uncle, Baldwin V, count of Flanders, to notify them of the decision he had taken. In it, the Pope explained that Abbot Rainier had twice sought an audience with him about the attempts of the bishop of Paris to infringe the privileges of the monastery and lay claim to its power for himself.⁶⁷ He explained: “To decide this certainly, we invited both of them to come to the apostolic see, so that there we would put an end (*finiremus*) to this case by canonical litigation before the gathered judges of the church.”⁶⁸ He continued, “Therefore, after a long discussion (*post longam discussionem*) in the holy council by their representatives, and after the various objections of both sides were heard, it became clear that justice favored the monastery.”⁶⁹ And so, Alexander, before the whole council, reconfirmed all the privileges of Saint-Denis. Lastly, he asked the king, following the model and devotion of preceding kings, to defend the liberty (*libertatem*) of that venerable place against the attacks of all adversaries.⁷⁰ On that very same day, Pope Alexander also sent

Charles II le Chauve 3:619, no. 488. From this point, the wording parallels the Nicholas I act of 863 above.

⁶⁶ BnF NAL 326, f. 24r–25r; PUF 9(2):116–24, no. 18a (JL 4565).

⁶⁷ BnF NAL 326, f. 25v; PUF 9(2):126–7, no. 21 (JL 4567): “Nobilitati vestre notum fieri volumus, quod abbas monasterii Sancti Dyonisii martyris apud nostram audientiam super episcopo Parisiacensi semel et secundo fuerit questus, videlicet quod ipse contra ius privilegiorum a sanctis et apostolicis viris salubriter eidem monasterio multotiens concessum contraque Francorum regum et episcoporum ipsius patriae constitutiones subripere sibi que vendicare iamdicti monasterii potestatem attemptaverit.”

⁶⁸ BnF NAL 326, f. 25v; PUF 9(2), 127, no. 21: “Ad quae nimirum dirimenda ad sedem apostolicam utrumque venire invitamus, ut ibi congregates aecclesiarum iudiciis huius causam litigii canonice finiremus.”

⁶⁹ BnF NAL 326, f. 25v; PUF 9(2), 127, no. 21: “His igitur in sancto concilio repraesentatis post longam discussionem, post varias utriusque partis oppositions claruit iustitiam praefato monasterio favere.”

⁷⁰ BnF NAL 326, f. 25v; PUF 9(2), 127, no. 21: “Rogamus itaque prudentiam vestram, ut secundum formam et devotionem praecedentium regum venerabilis loci libertatem ab omni adversariorum impetus defendatis.”

a letter to Gervais, the Archbishop of Reims, notifying him of the same decision in the same words, but adding that he should make sure that if the abbot or brothers of Saint-Denis asked him or his suffragans for the chrism and oil and so on, that they should provide it.⁷¹

CONTEXTS FOR THE DOSSIER AND ITS STORY

During 1061 to 1065 a fierce struggle erupted between the monks of Saint-Denis and the new bishop of Paris, Godfrey of Boulogne (1061–1095), as the monks sought greater freedom from diocesan control. Or at least it was probably fierce, given later descriptions. Information about this dispute is mainly retrospective, coming from letters of Pope Alexander II resolving the matter in 1065 and a charter of King Philip I from 1068 confirming them, in which the king, now governing in his own right rather than through his guardians, provided his own narration of the struggle. As these are genuine documents, it makes sense to begin unpacking the dossier of Saint-Denis using them to explore the immediate political circumstances of the dispute. However, the monks also relied on house traditions created long before 1061. These invented traditions provided a deeper context for the dossier's story.

I concluded my constructed "story" of Saint-Denis with the papal confirmation of 1065 because it was the primary goal of the dossier's composers. Part four also included the two letters notifying the king and archbishop. However, these were not part of the initial dossier. (ff. 1–19r, parts 1–3 above), which ended with the 1061 bull of Nicholas I. Indeed, they were added by a different hand on later folios (ff. 24r–25v). The handwriting in the manuscript was extensively analyzed by Léon Levillain in groundbreaking articles in the 1920s.⁷² His conclusion that the initial dossier (ff. 1–19r) was written by one hand before the Lateran synod of 1065 remains firm.⁷³ Soon after, two hands added to the dossier to create what I call the

⁷¹ Bnf NAL 326, f. 2v; PUF 9(2), 124–126, no. 19. "Itaque rogando fraternitatem tam ammonemus, quatinus, si invitatus fueris ab abbate vel a fratribus eiusdem monasterii, chrisma et oleum et cetera, que episcopali officio videntur necessaria, tribuas atque tuos suffraganeos precipias."

⁷² Léon Levillain, "Études sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis à l'époque mérovingienne," I: "Les source narratives," BEC 86 (1920): 5–116, II: "Les origines de Saint-Denis" BEC 86 (1925): 5–99; III: "Privilegium et immunitates ou Saint-Denis dans l'église et dans l'État" BEC 87 (1926): part 1, 20–96, part 2 245–346; IV: "Les documents d'histoire économique" BEC 91 (1930): 5–65, 264–300; hereafter: Levillain, *Études*.

⁷³ Levillain, *Études* III, part 2, 245–330. Rolf Grosse, "Remarques sur les cartulaires," 279, esp. n2 and n4 for bibliography.

“cartulary”: hand 2 (ff. 19r–20v and 22v–25v) and hand 3 (ff. 20v–22r).⁷⁴ These entries lack the rubrics and colored initials which feature in the dossier proper. The three letters of Alexander II from May 6, 1065 were probably carried back to Saint-Denis by the abbot, where the confirmation was copied in its entirety after the dossier, along with summaries of the two notifications sent to King Philip I and Archbishop Gervais of Reims, which were then sent on to their recipients.⁷⁵ These three letters represented the desired conclusion to the story implicitly narrated by the dossier. Moreover, a genuine single sheet of Alexander’s confirmation survives, which verifies the accuracy of the cartulary copy.⁷⁶ So, there is no reason to doubt Pope Alexander II’s description of the Lateran synod of May 1065.

Collectively, these three papal letters reveal key aspects of the struggle for greater freedom from the bishop. First of all, Pope Alexander not only accepted Leo IX’s privilege, but repeated it word for word – indeed the only changes were the *intitulatio*, the naming of Abbot Rainier as requestor, and the addition of Leo IX to the list of previous grantors.⁷⁷ This was a stunning achievement for the monks and the abbot, since the Leo IX privilege was a blatant forgery (both a pseudo-original and its dossier copy), purporting to have come from the papal chancery just sixteen years earlier.⁷⁸ The letters to the king and archbishop, preserved only by the summaries in the Saint-Denis cartulary, have additional clauses which show that Pope Alexander was seeking to safeguard the monks’ privileges. The letter to Archbishop Gervais added a passage insisting that he and his suffragans provide the chrism and oil and other things needed by the monks. This clause was to forestall any feet-dragging by the bishops. Rolf Grosse discovered references to similar letters sent to Archbishops Richer of Sens and Maurilius of Rouen in much later cartularies, which make sense because Saint Denis had major holdings in these provinces.⁷⁹ The letter to the king included a final passage asking him to defend the liberties of the monks against all adversaries. While this might seem at first glance to be a generic request, it was probably a veiled reference to Bishop Godfrey of Paris. Furthermore, it suggests that the conflict might continue (as it did), even though the Pope insisted that he had put an end (*finiremus*) to the case. Interestingly, this is

⁷⁴ Waldman, “Charters and Influences,” 25 identified these three hands.

⁷⁵ Levillain, *Études* III, part 2: 248 and Grosse’s commentary on PUF 9(2):124–7, nos. 19–21.

⁷⁶ AN K 222, no. 1; PUF 9(2):116–24, no. 18a; the only differences in 18a and 18b (the cartulary copy) are slight spelling variations.

⁷⁷ PUF 9(2):114–124, no. 18a with changes in large print.

⁷⁸ PUF 9(2): 107–13, 16a (JL 4182) and 16b.

⁷⁹ PUF 9(2):126, no. 20 (JL *4568).

the only word changed in the companion letter sent to the archbishop, in which the Pope wrote he had determined the case (*determinaremus*), a verb which evoked judgment from Proverbs 26:10.⁸⁰ Both wordings emphasize how much the Pope (or monastic copyists) desired closure.

Early phases of the dispute can also be gleaned from the retrospective explanation provided in Philip I's confirmation of 1068. This charter narrated the dispute in a long preamble and, fortunately, two original and authentic expeditions of the sealed charter survive.⁸¹ Philip's charter was also accurately copied by the monks into the codex, sometime after the papal letters.⁸² In this charter, Philip confirmed grants of his Merovingian and Carolingian predecessors, naming those in the dossier and others.⁸³ The preamble recounted the dispute as follows:

And since in our days (*in diebus nostris*) a certain contention had arisen between the bishop and clergy of Paris and the abbot and monks of the aforesaid monastery, with the bishops and clergy wishing to usurp for themselves certain customs from the aforementioned monastery of Saint-Denis, contrary to the laws and decrees mentioned above, whereas the abbot and monks, in order to defend themselves, drew upon the authority of the aforementioned kings and bishops. And this dispute was often aired (*sepe ventilate*) by the noblest of our realm in our presence but, because it seemed to pertain more to the ecclesiastical order rather than the common, with our permission it was brought to an audience with Pope Alexander and ended there. And then we, seeking justice and wishing to end this matter, strengthened the decision with our consent.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Vulgate Proverbs 26:10: "Iudicium determinat causas."

⁸¹ AN K 20, no. 4 and AN K 20, no. 4 bis, duplicates in same hand; ed. Prou, *Actes de Philippe I*, 114–7, no. 40.

⁸² BnF NAL 326, f. 73r–v.

⁸³ Both Dagobert forgeries and a lost pseudo-original Childeric III known through antiquarian copies and based on a genuine immunity of Childeric II, AN K 3 no. 17, ed. MGH DD Merov 1, no. 166, ChLA 13, no. 558; Carlrichard Brühl, "Die Dagobert-Fälschungen," 183–5.

⁸⁴ AN K 20, no 4bis; Prou, *Actes de Philippe I*, 116, no. 40: "Et quoniam in diebus nostris inter episcopum clerumque Parisiensem et abbatem prefati monasterii monachosque orta quaedam contentio fuerat, epsicopo et cerlo sibi volentibus in supradicto monasterio sancti Dyonisii, contra leges atque decreta supra memorata, quasdam consuetudines usurpare, et abbate et monachis contra sese defendentibus regum et apostolicorum supradictorum prolate auctoritate, cujus vicelicet contentiones causa coram optimatibus regni nostri et in nostra presentia sepe ventilate, sed, quia magis ordinis aeclesiastici videbantur esse quam popularis, nostra permissione in audientia Romani pontifices Alexandri perlata et finite erat, nos demum iusticiae faventes diffinite causae consensus nostri vigorem prestaremus."

The young king, now ruling in his own right, thus described an ongoing struggle between the abbot and monks of Saint-Denis and their bishop, which had begun “in our days,” that is, after he became king on August 4, 1060.⁸⁵ Moreover, it was a dispute “aired often” (*ventilate sepe*) before the king’s court. This suggests the matter was quite divisive, and likewise the papal bull described the case as requiring long discussion (*post longam discussionem*) for and against the monastery at the papal synod.

Of course, Saint-Denis was an important monastery trying to assert its independence. But Godfrey of Boulogne was an influential bishop. He was brother of Count Eustace II of Boulogne (1047–1089) and on good terms with Count Baldwin V of Flanders, who was involved in Philip’s guardianship until his death in 1067.⁸⁶ From 1075–1077 and again from 1081–1085, he served as chancellor to Philip I.⁸⁷ A young man when he became bishop in 1061 (about 30), Godfrey would remain as bishop until 1095. Philip was therefore probably not exaggerating when he said the “noblest” (*optimatibus*) had debated at his court. Also, if the arguments had been “aired often” at court from 1061 onwards, by the time of the 1065 synod both sides would have had well-rehearsed positions. The dossier was part of the monks’ preparations for the synod; indeed, it may have been written fairly quickly in the months leading up to May 1065, after previous meetings at the royal court had proved fruitless, though the exact chronology remains elusive.⁸⁸ Moreover, because Alexander II’s confirmation of the monks’ privileges was a word-for-word copy of the dossier’s fabricated Leo IX bull (rather than the single-sheet pseudo-original, which contains variations), we know that the dossier itself was taken to the synod and read closely by the papal curia.⁸⁹ Furthermore, the top right corner of the dossier page containing Bishop Landry’s privilege (fol. 4r) has the word “*probatio*” written in a contemporary hand, which suggests the curia reviewed it in particular.⁹⁰

⁸⁵ On “our days,” Rolf Grosse, *Saint-Denis Zwischen Adel und König: Die Zeit vor Suger (1053–1122)* (Stuttgart: Jan Thorbecke, 2002), 64.

⁸⁶ Heather Tanner, *Family, Friends, and Allies: Boulogne and Politics in Northern France, c. 879–1160* (Leiden: Brill, 2004): 103–5.

⁸⁷ Prou, *Actes de Philippe I*, lvi–lvii.

⁸⁸ Waldman, “Charters and Influences,” 25 cautions “Though it is clear that these privileges build on one another it is not easily discernable that they were produced sequentially or at one time. What is certain is that they were in existence by 1065, when they were copied into the cartulary made to defend the abbey’s interests at Rome.” Compare Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 66.

⁸⁹ Grosse, PUF 9(2):117, no. 18a and see apparatus of Alexander II’s letter, PUF 9(2): 107–113, no. 16b.

⁹⁰ Waldman, “Charters and Influences,” 24. Waldman (pers. comm.) suggested the papal curia added this mark.

This struggle had arisen at a dangerous time for the monks of Saint-Denis. Although dominated by early Capetian kings as advocates in the first half of the eleventh century, the monks received few grants from them.⁹¹ In addition, the scriptorium appears to have had restricted output during this time.⁹² The monks also faced competition from the monastery of St. Emmeram in Regensburg, which claimed to have relics of Saint-Denis. In response to this religious threat, the monks exhumed the body of Saint Denis in 1053, and created a new feast, the Detection of Saint Denis, which inspired the creation of new liturgical manuscripts designed to re-assert their special relationship with their patron.⁹³ Then, the dispute with the bishop of Paris arose, which stimulated further writing. The period from 1061 to 1065 was ripe for such a dispute. On August 4, 1060, the old king died, was buried at Saint-Denis, and was replaced by a minor. Then, in late November, the bishop of Paris died, and soon after the young Godfrey (formerly archdeacon at Arras through Count Baldwin V's patronage) was installed.⁹⁴ Moreover, there was a new pope after November 30, 1061, the reformer Alexander II, the first pope elected by cardinals in accord with the decree of 1059, who was seeking to assert his control over the church. Also, around 1060, the old abbot of Saint-Denis, Hugh IV (c. 1053–1060), died, and was succeeded by Abbot Rainier.⁹⁵ This rapidly shifting landscape of authority provided both peril and opportunity. Perhaps the monks were especially threatened by assertions of episcopal authority.⁹⁶ One suspects

⁹¹ Thomas Waldman, "Saint-Denis et les premiers Capétiens," in *Religion et culture autour de l'an Mil: Royaume capétien et Lotharingie*, ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat and Jean-Charles Picard (Paris: Picard, 1990), 191–7; Geoffrey Koziol, "Charles the Simple, Robert of Neustria, and the *Vexilla* of Saint-Denis," *Early Medieval Europe* 14 (2006): 371–90. For Philip I's reengagement after 1077, Matthew Gabriele, "The provenance of the *Descriptio qualiter Karolus Magnus*: Remembering the Carolingians in the Entourage of King Philip I (1060–1108) before the First Crusade," *Viator* 39, no. 2 (2008): 93–118, esp. 109–118.

⁹² Waldman, "Charters and Influences," 25: "Scribal productivity seems to have been limited, and there was little uniformity among the charters and manuscripts. It is difficult to speak of an organized scriptorium before the 1050s."

⁹³ Waldman, "Charters and Influences," 22, 25–7. The liturgical manuscripts consist of a gradual (with list of chants for an antiphoner), Paris Bibl. Mazarine 384, a psalter-hymnal, BnF lat. 103, and an augmented sacramentary, BnF lat. 9436. See Anne Walters Robertson, *Service Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis: Images of Ritual and Music in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 368–91.

⁹⁴ For Godfrey's career, GC 7:49–52.

⁹⁵ Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 61 and 69–70 for death of Hugh (and possibly Rainier, 1060–1065/71), and 20 n7 for sources on Hugh's abbacy.

⁹⁶ Morelle, "Moines de Corbie sous influence sandionysienne?" 218, argued that the dossier was "le fruit d'une conjuncture très particulière. La 'nouvelle donne'

Bishop Godfrey wanted to flex his muscles. As a result, the monks of Saint-Denis shifted from relying on royal influence (weakened by minority and Godfrey's courtly connections) to seeking papal protection, which a reforming pope was eager to assert. This change was a major departure for the monks, who emerged from the royal shadow.

The monks' scribal skills only partly explain their success in 1065. They also had strong house traditions. Their predecessors had already created a usable past on which the mid-eleventh-century forgers relied. Although the dossier did not always refer to this shared past directly, it conformed to its chronological contours. Reviewing these invented traditions helps further contextualize the content and the omissions of the dossier. Even before the 1060s, the monastery of Saint-Denis was a prolific center of forgery in medieval France. Its connections to three royal dynasties (Merovingians, Carolingians, and Capetians) were enhanced by repeated creative rewriting of archival materials and the past. Indeed, there were at least three waves of fabrication at Saint-Denis between 750 and 1050.

During the early Carolingian period, the inventions at Saint-Denis were closely tied to the rise of the dynasty. Abbot Fulrad (750–784) had been instrumental in helping Pepin (751–768) seize the kingship from the failing Merovingians, serving as one of his principal religious advisors, negotiating the pope's intercession on Pepin's behalf, and arranging for the crowning of Pepin as king by Pope Stephen at Saint-Denis in 754.⁹⁷ Additionally, Fulrad had secured Saint-Denis' prosperity in 751 by obtaining numerous "restitutions" of Merovingian estates, just as Pepin was seizing the throne. These early Carolingian grants featured major rewritings of the Merovingian past. Although Pepin issued a genuine charter in the monks' favor, the dispositive had emerged from the *scriptorium* at Saint-Denis and contained a "restoration" of estates which the monks had not held in Merovingian times.⁹⁸ The relationship continued to be close: Fulrad served as the new king's archchaplain and, by virtue of that position, had access to the royal

politique des années 1060–1061, marquée par la minorité du roi Philippe I et l'arrivée d'un nouveau pape, Alexandre II, a pu être mise à profit par certains évêques pour réveiller d'anciens différends contre des abbayes plus ou moins 'exemptes' et proches du pouvoir royal."

⁹⁷ Karl F. Werner, "Saint-Denis et les Carolingiens," in *Un village au temps de Charlemagne*, ed. Jean Cuisenier and Rémy Guadagnin (Paris: Réunion de la musées nationaux, 1988), 40–9.

⁹⁸ AN K 4 no. 6¹, ChLA 15, no. 595; Alain J. Stoclet, "*Evindicatio et petitio*: Le recouvrement de biens monastiques en Neustrie sous les premiers Carolingiens. L'exemple de Saint-Denis," in *La Neustrie: Le pays au nord de la Loire de 650 à 850*, 2 vols., ed. Hartmut Atsma and Karl F. Werner, *Beihefte der Francia* 16, no. 2 (Sigmaringen: J. Thorbecke, 1989) 2:125–50; most were in Lorraine, including around Lebraha.

notaries, who alone could issue official royal acts.⁹⁹ Moreover, Pepin eventually chose Saint-Denis as his burial site, joining the monastery to the new dynasty. In this way, the tradition of royal burial, begun by Dagobert in 639, was continued as the monks reinterpreted their Merovingian past for their new royal patrons' – and their own – benefit.

A second wave of fabrication occurred in the reign of Louis the Pious (814–40) when Abbot Hilduin served as archchaplain and confidante of the ruler. In the 830s, Hilduin cemented the relationship of the monastery to the dynasty using a combination of historical and hagiographic texts, a shrewd form of propaganda that clothed inventions in conventional literary forms. The impetus came from Louis the Pious himself: shortly after regaining power in 834, a grateful Louis wrote to Hilduin asking him to write a book about Saint Denis.¹⁰⁰ This invitation was too tempting to refuse, and Hilduin composed an influential narrative: a life of Saint Denis, *Post beatum et salutiferam*.¹⁰¹ In his *vita*, Hilduin claimed Denis was the follower of Saint Paul (Dionysius of Athens, first century), and the author of the treatise *Celestial Hierarchies* (Pseudo-Dionysius, fifth-sixth century), as well as the missionary to Gaul (Denis of Paris, third century). Thus, he fused the deeds of three historically distinct individuals into one saint.¹⁰² Such an important claim required substantiation and Hilduin and the *scriptorium* of Saint-Denis provided it. Around the same time, two related works were composed: a *miracula* of Saint Denis and the *Gesta Dagoberti Regis*, the deeds of the ancient Merovingian king and the patron of the monastery.¹⁰³ These narratives were also supported by charters: twenty-four Merovingian charters were produced with the *Gesta Dagoberti*, most of them fabrications or featuring heavy interpolation.¹⁰⁴ Most of these inventions were likely penned in 834–835 and the

⁹⁹ Josef Fleckenstein, *Die Hofkapelle der deutschen Könige*, 2 vols. MGH Schriften 16. (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1959) 1:39, 45–8.

¹⁰⁰ MGH Epistolae Karolini Aevi 3:325–7, no. 19 (BHL 2172). J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, "History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar," in R. H. C. Davis and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, eds., *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 43–70.

¹⁰¹ PL 106:23–50 (BHL 2175) and see Hilduin's response to Louis, *Exultavit cor meum*, and his letter prefacing the work, *Cum nos scriptura*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epistolae Karolini Aevi 3:327–337, nos. 20 and 21 (BHL 2173 and 2174).

¹⁰² David Luscombe, "Denis the Pseudo-Areopagite in the Middle Ages from Hilduin to Lorenzo Valla," in *FiM* 1:133–52.

¹⁰³ *Gesta Dagoberti I*, ed. Krusch, 396–425. There is no complete edition of the *miracula*, see BHL 2193–2202 and supplement 2202a for bibliography.

¹⁰⁴ Bruno Krusch, "Über die *Gesta Dagoberti*," *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte* 26 (1886): 161–91; Hartmut Atsma, "Le fonds des chartes mérovingiennes de

composer was probably Hincmar, Hilduin's young protégé and the keeper of the relics and treasures at Saint-Denis at that time, who later became archbishop of Reims.¹⁰⁵ These three narratives, together with fabricated Merovingian charters, reinforced Denis' sanctity and explained Dagobert's (and Louis') special relation to the monastery.

The immediate purpose of these works in the 830s was to secure the place of Saint-Denis as the chief monastery of the Carolingian dynasty. However, these narratives created a convenient political myth on which the monks would rely in later centuries. One of the consequences of the tripartite Saint Denis myth was that in the mid-eleventh century the monks insisted on spelling their patron's name "Dyonisius," after what they thought was the Greek manner to reinforce the supposed connection to Dionysius the Areopagite (and they also substituted "y" for "i" in various words).¹⁰⁶ This Hellenizing style became a telltale sign of the monks' handiwork. Such posturing persisted well into the time of Abbot Suger (1122–51) and beyond.

Conditions shifted again in the late ninth century. After Louis the Pious' death in 840, Abbot Hilduin chose to follow Lothar and so Charles the Bald (840–877) replaced him as abbot with his loyal cousin, Louis. Abbot Louis had been a monk at Saint-Denis, but he had also been archchancellor of Louis the Pious since 835 and, thus, in charge of the royal chancery and its notaries.¹⁰⁷ As a result, the chancery and Saint-Denis' *scriptorium* became more closely connected, giving the monks unrivalled access to the techniques of the royal notaries through their new abbot.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, Charles the Bald valued the monastery and issued numerous diplomas in its favor, with the unintended consequence of providing a vast inventory of models, which the monks could exploit after his death. This surge of forging activity was uncovered by Georges Tessier, who found that almost half of the

Saint-Denis: Rapport sur une recherche en cours," *Paris-et-l'Île-de-France* 32 (1981): 259–72 and his commentary on techniques, ChLA 13–16, *passim*.

¹⁰⁵ Levillain, "Études" I, 5–116; Luscombe, "Denis the Pseudo-Areopagite," 140–3; Otto Gerhard Oexle, *Forschungen zu monastischen und geistlichen Gemeinschaft in west-fränkischen Bereich: Bestandteil des Quellenwerkes Societas et fraternitas* (Munich: Fink, 1989), 32–3.

¹⁰⁶ Waldman, "Charters and Influence," 25: "From the early part of the century, the monks used what they thought were Greek forms of their patron's name ('Dyonisius' for 'Dionysius'), and they also frequently substituted y for i (Greek upsilon for iota), as, for example, in 'hystoria,' 'dyaconos,' etc. This conscious effort reflects the monastery's emphasis on the Greek origins of its patron saint, equated with Denis the Areopagite, whom Paul encountered in Athens (Acts 17:34)."

¹⁰⁷ Janet Nelson, *Charles the Bald* (London: Longman, 1992), 110.

¹⁰⁸ Brühl, "Dagobert-Fälschungen," 200–1 placed many Merovingian forgeries in the middle to late ninth century.

surviving acts attributed to Charles' reign were later forgeries composed by the monks at Saint-Denis, and that many genuine acts were interpolated by the monks.¹⁰⁹

Thus, after 877, a third wave of invention began, as the monks of Saint-Denis exploited their inventory of Carolingian royal documents for all they were worth. Although the monks fabricated new pseudo-originals, they also carefully altered genuine charters, improving or clarifying their terms before submitting them to authorities for reconfirmation. Alteration of older documents followed by reconfirmation became a frequent practice in the tenth century. For example, the monks improved the wording of a charter of Charles III (granted originally in 898) to broaden the scope of their judicial immunity, an act confirmed by subsequent rulers.¹¹⁰ Also, clauses guaranteeing the unalterability of the monks' estates were, ironically, themselves frequently altered. Such clauses had been included in royal acts from the start of Louis the Pious' monastic reforms at Saint-Denis, especially to protect the monks' portion or *mensa conventualis*.¹¹¹ They were later repeated as a matter of practice at Saint-Denis and other monasteries.¹¹² The continual repetition of such clauses suggests that rulers did not observe them, but such difficulties inspired the monks to greater insistence.

After the Capetians took control in the late tenth century, the monks of Saint-Denis eventually rewrote their house traditions to cope with another dynastic change. In the 1060s, they deployed written materials from their Carolingian past very selectively, using only a fraction of what was available. Nonetheless, the process of rewriting transformed their archives. Comprehending the inventories of Benedictine houses in the period from 900 to 1050 is no easy matter. Patrick Geary argues that archival strip-mining of the eleventh (and twelfth) centuries consumed these early archives for new purposes.¹¹³ Furthermore, he argues that no simple "reading" of these archives is sufficient (or even possible), without a knowledge of the processes of remembering and forgetting involved. Laurent Morelle describes such changes as an archival "*mutation*" or transformation, stressing the

¹⁰⁹ Georges Tessier, "Originaux et pseudo-originaux carolingiens du chartrier de Saint-Denis," *BEC* 106 (1945–6): 35–69, esp. 55–8 and see Tessier, ed., *Actes de Charles II*.

¹¹⁰ Philippe Lauer, ed. *Recueil des actes de Charles III le Simple, roi de France (893–923)* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1949), 15–17, no. 10.

¹¹¹ For example, AN K 9 no. 6 (Louis act of 832).

¹¹² Carlrichard Brühl, "Diplomatische Miszellen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden 9. Jahrhunderts," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 3 (1957): 1–19, at 9 n11, identified such clauses at eight monasteries in northern France.

¹¹³ Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance*, 98–103 for Saint-Denis and French Benedictine houses.

importance of rewriting and archive formation over memory.¹¹⁴ On the other hand, it may be that modern historians have exaggerated the level of “forgetting” at Saint-Denis because of medieval monastic rhetoric. As Olivier Guyotjeannin has pointed out, a standard trope in later monastic historical writings (including cartulary prefaces) was the myth of *penuria scriptorium*: an assertion that monks wrote because their predecessors had been negligent or because no records or history existed from earlier times.¹¹⁵ Certainly, there were significant amounts of forging of royal diplomas in the west Frankish kingdom from 840 to 987, which suggests that there were still uses for (and users of) written instruments like charters.¹¹⁶ Indeed, the monks of Saint-Denis were some of the chief perpetrators. Skepticism about monastic archives is appropriate if one seeks to reconstruct what really happened at Saint-Denis from 900 to 1050; but even if there had been much “forgetting” (either deliberate or accidental), the monks of Saint-Denis still had a lot of documents.

Using the dossier and the surviving charters of Saint-Denis, one can see clear patterns in the monks’ archival recycling in the mid-eleventh century. A new polemical discourse shaped their approach after 1050. Around 1000, one of the hottest issues became episcopal control over monasteries. The goal of many eleventh-century monks was to acquire new privileges which freed them from control of their diocesan bishop. Such liberties were innovations ultimately deriving from Cluny’s foundation charter of 910, which placed the Cluniacs directly under the authority of the pope without any intervening ecclesiastical (or lay) authority.¹¹⁷ Eventually, by 1080, Cluny had papal privileges which effectively territorialized an “exemption” from the ordinary bishop’s jurisdiction.¹¹⁸ Their success inspired other monks to try to assert their own freedom. Benedictine houses quickly discovered older documents which looked like, or could be easily made to look like,

¹¹⁴ Laurent Morelle, “Histoire et archives vers l’an mil: Une nouvelle mutation?” *Histoire et archives* 3 (1998): 119–41 at 141: “Au total, il faut insister sur la place grandissante qu’occupent l’écrit et les archives dans la constitution de la mémoire historique et dans la définition de l’identité des communautés. L’inflexion notable n’est pas dans la relation au passé, mais plutôt dans la relation aux archives.”

¹¹⁵ Olivier Guyotjeannin, “*Penuria scriptorium*: Le mythe de l’anarchie documentaire dans la France du nord (Xe-première moitié du XIe siècle),” *Pratiques de l’écrit documentaire au XIe siècle* BEC 155, no. 1 (1997): 11–44.

¹¹⁶ Koziol, *The Politics of Memory and Identity*, 315–99, ch. 7, esp. 315–18.

¹¹⁷ BnF Collection de Bourgogne, vol. 76, no. 5; Hartmut Atsma and Jean Vezin, eds. with assistance of Sébastien Barret, *Monumenta Paleographica Medii Aevi, Series Gallica: Les plus anciens documents de l’abbaye de Cluny*, 3 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997–2002) 1:33–9.

¹¹⁸ Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, 177–80.

monastic “liberties.”¹¹⁹ Although Saint-Denis was dominated by Hugh Capet as advocate, he also supported a “reform” of the house by Odilo of Cluny.¹²⁰ Familiar with the rhetoric of monastic liberty, the monks of Saint-Denis began to assert greater freedom, even if it meant fabricating papal and royal charters.

The threats of the 1060s emboldened the monks to make grand claims. So, the monks produced their dossier, which reads like a legal brief and contains a remarkable sequence of fabrications based on models from their archives. Once successful, the dossier (BnF NAL 326, ff. 1–19r) was then slightly expanded (into what I call the “cartulary”), perhaps during the drive for the royal confirmation between 1065 and 1068 or shortly after (ff. 19r–20v and 22v–25v). This second campaign for a royal confirmation was also successful. But these confirmations only resolved the immediate dispute with Bishop Godfrey, who remained a powerful figure for nearly three more decades. Indeed, the monks wanted even greater freedom from the bishop: a full exemption from his jurisdiction, which these two confirmations approached but did not grant outright. Indeed, they later found it useful to join the “cartulary” to a lengthy legal treatise, a version of the *Collection of 74 Titles*. It is this continuing reuse that helped preserve the surviving codex. Each of these three phases of writing (1061–1065, 1065–1068, and later on) can illuminate the relationship between forgery, archives, and perceptions of the past at Saint-Denis.

REVISITING THE STORY OF SAINT-DENIS

While the circumstances and traditions surrounding the creation of Saint-Denis’ dossier are important, how it was constructed is also significant. Its composers exploited the rich archives of Merovingian and Carolingian charters at Saint-Denis. But few authentic documents served their exact needs, so the vast majority of entries in the dossier were fabricated to a greater or lesser extent. There were two interwoven strands of fabrications: royal immunities and early papal privileges. Each strand was carefully based on archival models. These formed chains of privileges from the foundation of the monastery to the present, asserting various freedoms from episcopal control. Because modern scholarship on each strand is extensive, it is convenient to review it before assessing their collective effect in the dossier.

¹¹⁹ Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, 4–9 esp. 4n5 on the meanings of “*libertas*.”

¹²⁰ Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 33 and PUF 9(2):26. For advocacy, Constance Bouchard, “The Kingdom of the Franks to 1108” in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. 4 (c. 1024–1198), part 2, eds. David Luscombe and Jonathan Riley-Smith (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 132.

The earliest royal acts for Saint-Denis were a focus of the founders of the discipline of diplomatics in the seventeenth century. Subsequently, the royal and imperial acts were edited (and reedited) by the *Monumenta Germaniae Historia*.¹²¹ The archives of Saint-Denis are crucial because they provide a substantial portion of all early acts; for instance, they comprise two-and-a-half of the six volumes of the *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*, covering all charters for France before 800.¹²² Diplomatists scrutinized early royal acts for Saint-Denis intensely with a heavy emphasis on questions of authenticity. As a result, the connection of early royal immunities to later monastic claims, frequently treated, was dominated by methodological concerns. In contrast, papal acts of Saint-Denis did not receive a thorough diplomatic treatment until Rolf Grosse's edition in 1998, which listed 35 known or lost acts before May 1065.¹²³ In consequence, issues of monastic freedom (the focus of the eleventh-century dossier) were often misunderstood, until recently.¹²⁴

Overall, a close reading of the dossier reveals it was composed from many archival parts. Clearly, the pre-1050 archives of Saint-Denis were extensive, though historians only have clues about their organization. The early charters seem to have been kept in coffers or *scrinia* (chests), as implied by dorsal notations added to them in the twelfth century and later.¹²⁵ They were then rearranged in the seventeenth century into 39 *armoires*.¹²⁶ Since coffers and chests were portable and bundles of charters were rearrangeable, such storage may have facilitated the fabricators' work since they could select and create new groupings.

Parts one to three of the dossier's "story" contained copies of charters supposedly granted in earlier ages; however, these charters were pseudo-originals invented contemporaneously. The dossier contained nineteen entries, easily distinguished by their rubrics. These nineteen entries consist of seventeen royal or papal acts, the account of the synod of Pitres/Soissons of 862, and a list of cloister bishops. Most of these were forged or heavily interpolated. Three exceptions were a genuine royal act (Clovis II's confirmation of some now-lost privilege of Bishop Landry) and two largely genuine papal acts

¹²¹ Carlrichard Brühl, "Die Entwicklung der diplomatischen Methode in Zusammenhang mit dem Erkennen von Fälschungen" in *FiM* 3:11–27.

¹²² ChLA 13–15, *passim*.

¹²³ PUF 9(2).

¹²⁴ Rolf Grosse, "Frühe Papsturkunden und Exemption des Klosters Saint-Denis (7.–12. Jahrhundert)," in *Hundert Jahre Papsturkundenforschung. Bilanz-Methoden-Perspektiven*, ed. Rudolf Hiestand (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2003), 167–88 (for previous bibliography on exemption) and Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 61–70.

¹²⁵ Waldman, "Charters and Influences," 23 n6: "In the early twelfth century, the abbey began to organize its ancient muniments, which were endorsed at the same time."

¹²⁶ Grosse, PUF 9(2):28; Nebbiai-Dalla Guarda, *Bibliothèque*, 118–21.

(Pope Nicholas I affirming the *mensa conventualis* – beneficiary redacted in the ninth century and then interpolated in the eleventh century – and Pope Nicholas II on the priory of “Lebraha” from 1061).¹²⁷ Of the fifteen remaining entries, most were based on (though not identical to) pseudo-originals created in 1061 to 1065, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Saint-Denis dossier (BnF NAL 326) and pseudo-originals.

Folios	Grantor and purported date	Pseudo-original (or original)	Date of composition	Sonz.
1v–2r	Dagobert de fugitivis (May 26, 627)	AN K 1, no. 6 (lost)	1061–1065	9+
2r–3v	Dagobert de immunitate (July 29, 632)	AN K 1, no. 7 ²	1061–1065	14+
3v–5r	Bishop Landry of Paris (July 1, 653)	AN K 3, no 1 ¹	1061–1065	37+
5r–7r	Clovis II (June 22, 654)	AN K 2, no. 3	Authentic, subscriptions altered 1061–1065	38
7r–7v	Pope Zachary “Cum Sanctam” (Nov 4, 749)	AN K 4 no. 1 ²	1061–1065	85+
7v–9r	Pope Stephen II “Quoniam Semper” (Feb 26, 757)	AN K 15 no. 3 ² (damaged)	1061–1065	94+
9v–10v	Pope Leo III “Quoniam expetisti” (May 27, 798)	AN K 7, no. 16	1061–1065	148+
10v–12r	Pope Hadrian I “Cum summe” (786)	AN K 7, no, 8 ^a	1061–1065	137a+
12r–13r	Pope Nicholas I “Quando ad ea” (April 28, 863)	AN K 13 no. 10 ⁴	Authentic? Interpolated 1061–1065	224

¹²⁷ Nicholas I: PUF 9(2):95–100, no. 12, which Grosse argued contained some genuine content based on a later *vidimus*, contrary to previous scholars; Tessier, “Originaux et pseudo-originaux,” 62–3, argued for beneficiary redaction and appending of a genuine bull. Nicholas II: PUF 9(2): 114–15, no. 17 for which an original (AN L 222, no. 1) survives which shares language with the Nicholas I bull, suggesting the papal chancery may have seen it; Grosse, “Frühe Papsturkunden,” 172, 178, 180.

13r–14v	Synod of Pitres-Soissons (after Sept 19, 862)	AN K 13 no. 10 ³	1061–1065	222+
15r–15v	Pope Nicholas I “Superne miserationis” (Apr 29, 863)	AN L 220 no. 3 and K 13 no. 10 ⁵	1061–1065	225+
15v–16v	Pope Formosus “Petentium desiderii” (Oct 15, 893)	Lost?	1061–1065	251+
16v–18r	Pope Leo IX (Oct 5, 1049)	AN L 220, no. 7	1061–1065	–
18r	Nomina propriorum episcopum monasterii Sancti Dyonisii martyris		1061–1065	–
18v–19r	Pope Nicholas II “Petitionibus congruis” (Apr 18, 1061)	AN L 221, no. 1.	Authentic	–

“Date of composition” refers to the pseudo-originals. If the dossier entry was an accurate (or mostly accurate) copy of a genuine original, this is indicated by “authentic.” Numbers from Daniel Sonzogni, *Le chartrier de Saint-Denis* provided for convenient access to bibliography.

Many of these pseudo-originals reused authentic Merovingian papyri through a clever process designed to give ancient material basis to the invented text. First, the fabricators wrote on the reverse of a genuine papyrus, imitating the handwriting on the front. Then, they erased the front, which became the “back” of the forgery.¹²⁸ To make this deception less detectable, the fragile papyri were glued onto parchment for “support,” which hid the original front. This process was used for most papal pseudo-originals, the Dagobert immunity charter, and the charter of Bishop Landry, which was written on the back of a Merovingian will.¹²⁹ Thus, the Merovingian and Carolingian “story” of the dossier literally recycled the monastery’s archives for present purposes.

¹²⁸ See Atsma and Vezin’s remarks in ChLA vols. 13–15 for each act; Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance*, 107–113; Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 61.

¹²⁹ Hartmut Atsma and Jean Vezin, “Deux testaments sur papyrus de l’époque mérovingienne: étude paléographique” in *Haut Moyen Age: Culture, éducation et société*, ed. Michel Sot (La Garenne-Colombes: Publidix/Erasmus, 1990), 57–70.

The two strands of fabricated royal and papal acts reinforced Saint-Denis' claims of freedom from the bishop of Paris in different, but complementary, ways. The interweaving of authorities begins in part one of the "story," Merovingian times. Analyzing the purposes of the first entries, attributed to Dagobert, is fairly straightforward, even if the technical details are complex. The two forged charters of Dagobert provided elements for asserting monastic freedom while offering a kind of foundation narrative. The first entry, Dagobert's charter on fugitives, used details from prior foundation legends, such as the reference to the sacred deer. It also emphasized connections of the Merovingians to their patron, Denis, and the idea that Dagobert had granted special privileges to an existing monastery in 529 (namely asylum for criminals). It also carefully delineated the asylum area (using roadways) which was, by implication, a sacred or special space.¹³⁰ Moreover, its language stressed the unalterability of its arrangements. For good measure, it indicated that Bishop Landry (the key actor) had witnessed (and implicitly approved of) the royal act. But monks were likely not present at Saint-Denis so early. Moreover, the description of roadways makes clear that the "basilica" was an urban church and its precincts on the left bank of the Seine, near the royal palace of Clichy. In other words, it was the Merovingian church of Saint-Denis within the city, rather than the rural site (and later location of the monastery) six miles north of Paris along the Seine.¹³¹

The second Dagobert entry insisted that the king had granted immunity from all power of justice (*iudiciaria potestate*) of bishops and kings or anyone else. This immunity supposedly included the church and all of its holdings and people, wherever they were throughout the kingdom, including future donations through legitimate written charters (*per legitima cartarum instrumenta*). All was to be "under a whole and most firm immunity" (*sub integra et firmissima immunitate*) in perpetuity. Such special pleading went far beyond any genuine Merovingian immunity, which only removed lay jurisdiction other than the king's and would have applied only to the urban basilica and its cemetery. The entry's excessive emphasis on "legitimate" written instruments betrays a desire to justify later fabrications. Similar over-emphasis can be found in the long list of actions forbidden to authorities within the immunity of Saint-Denis (no hearing cases, demanding oaths, extracting fines or the ban, taking hospitality, etc.), which suggest

¹³⁰ A synod at Clichy in September 626/7 dealt with asylum, Caroli de Clercq, ed., *Concilia Galliae a. 511–a. 695* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963), 290–7, esp. 293, canon 9.

¹³¹ Michel Wyss, ed., *Atlas historique de Saint-Denis: Des origines au XVIIIe siècle*, Documents d'archéologie française 59 (Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 1996), 187–9.

retrospective grievances. Again, Bishop Landry was listed as a witness and the request of Abbot Aigulf supposedly took place at a general *placitum* and then was allegedly fulfilled in a synod – all details designed to insist as strongly as possible on the publicity of the supposed privileges. Thus, an “immunity” (which meant something quite different by the mid-eleventh century) was written backwards into an idealized Merovingian past.¹³²

Although the origin of Dagobert’s charter on fugitives has been debated, the dossier’s version was concocted especially for the dispute of 1061–1065. Scholarly confusion has been caused by various versions which, at first blush and in isolation, seem to be precursors of the dossier’s entry. For example, Henri Omont, who first edited the charter in 1900, thought it based on an earlier tenth-century copy.¹³³ Léon Levillian, who worked closely on the dossier and Merovingian Saint-Denis for nearly two decades, followed this interpretation.¹³⁴ Chance preservation of the charter’s subscriptions in an early eleventh-century manuscript of Vegetius (BnF ms. lat 7230, f. 1r) seemed to support this view. However, Carlrichard Brühl determined that scholars had mistakenly conflated an earlier version of the Dagobert charter (invented for another purpose) with the dossier’s entry. Instead, Brühl showed that the dossier’s entry was related to a contemporary pseudo-original (now lost), which had once been attached to the back of an act concerning the *mensa conventualis*.¹³⁵ Thus, the dossier’s Dagobert *de fugitivis* charter (and its lost pseudo-original) were fabricated during the dispute with the bishop of Paris, 1061–1065. Together, the dossier’s Dagobert acts vastly over-inflated the privileges of early Saint-Denis, which began as an episcopal cemetery and became a monastery later, and only a royal burial place after Dagobert’s death in 639.¹³⁶ The early basilica was far (both geographically and institutionally) from the perpetually immune monastery the “story” purported it had been.

The Dagobert entries prepared the ground for the most critical forgery in the entire dossier: the privilege of Bishop Landry of Paris forsaking episcopal control over Saint-Denis in 653. This Landry entry was carefully

¹³² Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, 74–96.

¹³³ Henri Omont, “Le *praeceptum Dagoberti de fugitivis* en faveur de l’abbaye de Saint-Denis” BEC 61 (1900): 75–82.

¹³⁴ Levillian, *Études* III, part 1, 88–9.

¹³⁵ Carlrichard Brühl, *Dagobert-Fälschungen*, 200. The lost pseudo-original was AN K 1, no. 6, glued to the back of AN K 8, no. 12³ mentioned in dorsal notes of the remaining charter and recorded in an inventory of Dom Joubert as being “en deficit.” See Sonzogni, *Chartrier de Saint-Denis*, 48–9, no. 9+ and Theo Kölzer’s definitive edition, MGH DD Merov., 78–81, no. 29.

¹³⁶ Joseph Semmler, “Saint-Denis: Von der bischöflichen Coemeterialbasilika zur königlichen Benediktinerabtei” in *La Neustrie*, ed. Atsma and Werner 2:75–87.

crafted to take advantage of a genuine royal act copied immediately afterwards: a 654 confirmation by Clovis II of some other Landry charter. The genuine (and doubtless more restricted) grant by Landry may have existed in the archives, but if so it was conveniently “forgotten” by the eleventh-century monks.¹³⁷ The fabricated Landry entry stressed details essential to the “story” of Saint-Denis’ alleged liberties. First of all, it portrayed Landry as responding to a request by Clovis II to exploit the genuine royal confirmation. It also claimed that Landry was granting a “secure and immutable privilege” (*securitatis et incomutabilitatis privilegium*). In addition, it emphasized that the king’s father and mother had been buried at Saint-Denis, affirming the basilica/monastery as the royal necropolis. Next, came a series of quasi-canonical arguments which seem like special pleading by the eleventh-century composers. The entry referred to the Council of Carthage of 419 and Saint Augustine, indicating that they did not forbid monks from living under their own privilege – essentially an argument for monastic liberty. It next portrayed the king asking that the monks might live “regularly in quiet” (to insist on their regularity) under his law alone (a whiff of the earlier Dagobert immunity) to remain undisturbed “from all infestation of clerics” (*ab omni infestatione clerici*, repeated later several times). This last phrase suggests considerable monastic hostility to secular clergy.

There was additional language to forestall potential rebuttals by the monks’ eleventh-century opponent, Bishop Godfrey. Landry supposedly conceded his privilege fully willingly (*plena voluntate*). Of course, Landry was bishop of Paris and thus Godfrey’s predecessor. Furthermore, Landry supposedly let the monks take oil and chrism freely, a key point of the later dispute because it implied Saint-Denis had control of ordinations and blessings in its lands. Landry was also portrayed as conceding the abbot power to deal with attacks on his clerics, normally reserved to the bishop. Moreover, the concession of episcopal control was total: “whatever from all of this which seems to belong to us we concede wholly to the abbot, who rules this holy place, and the other brothers to have and determine.”¹³⁸ Importantly, all these privileges were to remain inviolate and perpetual. Finally, Landry supposedly had subscribed the privilege with his own hand, as did twenty-five bishops, alleging general approval.

¹³⁷ Grosse, PUF 9(2), 61–2, no. 1, discussed the genuine Landry privilege from 653 (now lost), see also Semmler, *Saint-Denis*, 84–6.

¹³⁸ BnF NAL 326, f. 4v; de Lasteyrie, *Cartulaire de Paris*, 13, no. 10: “quicquid ex his omnibus ad nos attinere videtur, hoc totum abbati, qui in ipso sancto loco prefuert, ceterisque fratribus, habendum et disponendum concedimus.”

The dossier's next move was to show that such an extraordinary episcopal privilege had been confirmed by kings and popes. Having in their archives a genuine confirmation of Clovis II relating to some privilege of Landry (though not the inflated one), the composers simply copied it out since it had been so carefully anticipated. An authentic papyrus of this Clovis II confirmation survives, so it is easy to detect the dossier's modifications – spelling variations and changes to the subscription.¹³⁹ The charter did confirm a privilege of Bishop Landry, but in vaguer and more limited terms than the eleventh-century monks probably wanted (hence the need to make the Landry entry explicit). All Clovis had asked for was peace and quiet at Saint-Denis so that the monks might pray for the kingdom's stability and praise the holy martyrs. Landry and the other bishops agreed, and no further specifics were given.

However, the Clovis II charter also contained useful phrases the fabricators could exploit. Clovis gave Saint-Denis control over (*ditatus*, from *ditio/dicio*, to have “sway” over) its possessions without interference. These clauses insisted that no bishop, priest, or other cleric should take anything or usurp any power from the monastery, phrases picked up and repeated with increasing insistence in later entries since they strongly implied monastic freedom. These were rich semantic wells from which the later monks could draw. As a bonus, the eleventh-century monks were fortunate that the charter made reference to maintaining perpetual prayers as at Saint Maurice Agaune, which suggested (but did not prove) an early and regular monastic observance at Saint-Denis, at least to certain eleventh-century reformers.¹⁴⁰

In order to provide papal confirmation, the eleventh-century composers fabricated the privilege of Pope Zachary for 749. Again, they made a pseudo-original to backstop the dossier entry. This entry offered explicit approval of the sweeping privileges of the pseudo-Landry, which the royal charter did not. It reiterated most of Landry's privilege, while offering further clarification that all priests, deacons, and clerics serving the church would be free from (*absoluit*) the bishop or his successors' power. It also repeated the condemnation of clerical “infestation” as justification for these unusual freedoms. Moreover, the bishop of Paris was forbidden to interfere with these arrangements or to call a council about them. This Zachary entry also appeared in a recension of the *Collection of 74 Titles*, subsequently added to the same codex with the dossier. Both derive from a common

¹³⁹ Original is AN K 2 no. 3; ChLA 13, no. 558 and MGH DD Merov 1:216–220, no. 85. There are dorsal notices from the eighth, tenth, and eleventh centuries. This is the oldest surviving genuine Frankish papyrus.

¹⁴⁰ Semmler, *Saint-Denis*, 82–3.

source: the Pseudo-Isidore decretals.¹⁴¹ Beginning a string of fabricated papal confirmations, the Zachary privilege also offered the first anathema for violators. Furthermore, it stressed that Zachary had received the request for confirmation from Pepin, mayor of the palace, protector of Saint-Denis, and later the first Carolingian king.

Given the strong connection between Saint-Denis and the Carolingians, it is surprising that no Carolingian royal diplomas were fabricated for the dossier. Perhaps the ties had already been so firmly established that limited references sufficed. Another factor might have been the delicate state of relations with the early Capetians. Instead, the dossier portrayed papal acts as arising out of royal requests – just as Pepin had supposedly petitioned Zachary. Papal confirmations were favored in parts two and three of the dossier's story because such precedents were the most useful for obtaining the freedoms the monks wanted in 1065 from Pope Alexander II. Although this motive seems clear, until recently the fabrications have been somewhat misunderstood. The methods the fabricators used are now familiar: they first produced pseudo-originals and then perfected dossier versions for presentation to the pope. Again, the dossier's composers recycled earlier (possibly authentic) grants which may have given Saint-Denis greater autonomy in managing its property and clerics, but which didn't remove it from the greater discipline of the ordinary.¹⁴² Some scholars have mistakenly assumed such freedoms were an exemption, but this was not achieved until much later.

The fabricated papal confirmations in parts two and three of the dossier did assert greater freedom from episcopal control, but in steps. It was these accumulated liberties which the monks sought to have affirmed by Alexander II in 1065. Of course, the freedoms allegedly given by Bishop Landry in part one of the story became cornerstones of an increasingly elaborate edifice. They were affirmed and expanded by the Zachary entry. The entries of Pope Stephen confirmed and enlarged them in various ways.

¹⁴¹ PUF 9 (2):62; John Gilchrist, ed., *Diversorum patrum sententiae sive Collection in LXXIV titulus* (Vatican: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, 1973), 218 and Paul Hinschius, ed., *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni* (Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1863), 611 and 652.

¹⁴² Grosse, "Frühe Papsturkunden," 167–88, esp. 175–81. Eugen Ewig distinguished these as "kleinen Freiheit" and "grossen Freiheit," "Beobachtungen zu den Klosterprivilegien des 7. und frühen 8. Jh." in *Spätantikes und fränkischen Gallien. Gesamtelte Schriften* (1952–1973), 2 vols., ed. Hartmut Atsma, *Beihefte der Francia* 3, no. 2 (Munich: Artemis, 1979) 2:411–26 at 421 and "Markulfs Formular 'De privilegio' und die merowingischen Bischofsprivilegien," in *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken: Festschrift für Raymund Kottje zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hubert Mordek (Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1992), 51–69 at 53, 57.

In particular, the first bull of Stephen granted Abbot Fulrad permission to build his monastery as “free under the authority of the Roman Church” (*libera sub iure sancta Romane ecclesiae*) and granted exceptional personal freedom to the abbot from others’ jurisdiction. Fulrad and his successors were also allowed to build cells elsewhere in the Frankish lands they were given, including at Lebraha in Alsace, as well as permission to appeal to the Pope about various matters.¹⁴³ Even more unusually, it granted the abbot and monks the “singular privilege” (*singulare privilegium*) of electing a cloister bishop. And if any bishop refused to ordain him, then the Pope would decide “as the monastery would remain under apostolic control (*apostolice ditione*), just as the holy place itself had been so constituted, and so should everything which pertained to it.”¹⁴⁴ The abbot and his successors were also allowed to seek papal audiences directly (circumventing the bishop) if disputes rose. Thus, the dossier’s composers demonstrated that Saint-Denis had precociously early papal protection analogous to contemporary liberties enjoyed by Fleury and Cluny.¹⁴⁵

Even though Pope Stephen had visited Saint-Denis in 754 for the crowning of Pepin and certainly favored Abbot Fulrad personally (one of Pepin’s two interlocutors with Rome about deposing the Merovingian king), the dossier’s claims were still enormous. First of all, they anachronistically backdated apostolic control (the key word “*ditio*” appeared again) to the foundation of the monastery. Furthermore, clerics were barred from performing holy offices at the monastery without the abbot’s permission, effectively removing episcopal control over spiritual ministry there. Of course, it stressed the abbot’s right of appeal to the pope, since it would be the means used against Bishop Godfrey in the eleventh century. The second entry of Pope Stephen further reinforced Fulrad’s status by allegedly allowing him to wear the dalmatic and be accompanied by seven, five, or three deacons on feast days, a specifically Roman pontifical rite, which derived from the decretals of the pseudo-Isidore.¹⁴⁶ Fulrad’s abbacy had been a crucial turning point for the monastery, since after 775 the

¹⁴³ Alain Stoclet, *Autour de Fulrad de Saint-Denis* (v. 710–784) (Geneva: Droz, 1993), 437 n1 argued that Stephen granted Fulrad personal permission to found cells, but not Saint-Denis.

¹⁴⁴ BnF NAL 326 f. 8v PUF 9(2):69, no. 2b: “...sed sint reliqua vestra monasteria sub apostolice ditione, sicut et ipse sanctus locus constitutus est, ad quem ipsa omnia predicta monasteria pertinere videntur.”

¹⁴⁵ Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, 168–73.

¹⁴⁶ Hinschius, ed., *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, 70, Pseudo-Anacletus, c. 10. Compare Gilchrist, ed., *Diversorum patrum sententie*, 106, c. 167.

monastery became the favored burial place of the Carolingians.¹⁴⁷ But Fulrad was also important for the dossier's "story," which stressed that an abbot could prevent bishops from meddling in the monastery's affairs.

The subsequent entry of Pope Leo III, dated 798, also made a series of concessions supposedly requested by Fulrad, who had actually died in 784. In this entry, Leo confirmed all previous privileges, and reiterated that all lands of the monastery would remain under papal control (*sub ditione*) in perpetuity, including even future donations. Thus, privileges once confined to the house itself were supposedly expanded throughout all its holdings. Also, it confirmed the arrangements of Fulrad's testament, which had allocated various estates (especially Lebraha) to the monks.¹⁴⁸ Again, these were based on authentic acts the monks possessed but reworked to stress key phrases or properties that mattered most to the eleventh-century composers.

At this point in the dossier, the chronological flow of confirmations reversed, as the next entry reverted to a privilege by Pope Hadrian I for Abbot Maginar from 786. Such inversions of chronological order are sometimes indicators of stages of composition in cartularies, especially additions.¹⁴⁹ This chronological backtracking could be explained several ways. Perhaps the entries were grouped because the previous Leo entry concerned Abbot Fulrad. Or perhaps the fabricators felt constrained to follow their models closely to enhance credibility: an early authentic copy of Hadrian's letter survives, which was much more restricted in scope.¹⁵⁰ While Pope Hadrian actually confirmed a cloister bishop for the pilgrims coming to Saint-Denis's shrines, the eleventh-century fabricators carefully interpolated this grant to augment their privileges.¹⁵¹ The original letter only said that other bishops should not interfere with his pastoral care without the permission of the abbot, who should resolve disputes. Saint-Denis did enjoy a cloister bishop in Fulrad's time, a practice discontinued in the ninth century, which explains the list of Saint-Denis' bishops added near the end of the dossier.¹⁵² However, the fabricated dossier entry reworded the privilege in small, but significant, ways. It was shortened and made into a direct

¹⁴⁷ Stoclet, *Autour de Fulrad*, 417–67.

¹⁴⁸ Stoclet, *Autour de Fulrad*, 122 n2 for bibliography on Lebraha (Lièpvre).

¹⁴⁹ Adam J. Kosto, "The *Liber feudorum maior* of the County of Barcelona: The Cartulary as an Expression of Power," *Journal of Medieval History* 27 (2001): 7–8.

¹⁵⁰ BnF ms. lat. 2777, f. 54, PUF 9(2):82–83, no. 8a. Preserved in a late ninth-century formulary collection, BnF ms. lat. 2777, ff. 43–61, ed. Karl Zeumer, *Formulae collectionis sancti Dyonisii*, MGH Formulae (Hannover: Hahn, 1887), 493–511 and see PUF 9(2), 54–5.

¹⁵¹ Clearly seen in the parallel editions PUF 9(2), 83–8, nos. 8a and 8b.

¹⁵² Grosse, "Frühe Papsturkunden," 178, n53.

concession to Abbot Maginar.¹⁵³ The privilege was also rephrased to insist that “no provincial bishop” (*nemo episcoporum provincialium*) could take anything from the monastery or its cells, and that if the abbot could not settle a dispute, he could have an audience in Rome. The ability to appeal to Rome was another sign of putative monastic independence.¹⁵⁴ Such tweaks allowed the dossier’s composers to portray Pope Stephen’s exceptional grant to Fulrad as held by subsequent generations of abbots. Thus, the privileges were transformed from personal to permanent.

The next cluster of entries were the two Pope Nicholas I privileges from 863 and the account of the 862 Synod of Pîtres-Soissons. In all three entries, the crucial figure was King Charles the Bald, portrayed as the prime mover. This made sense because, along with Dagobert, he was regarded by the eleventh-century (and later) monks as a key patron.¹⁵⁵ So, the first Nicholas I entry indicated that the grant was made because of a “written request” (*scripta petitoria*) of Charles. This entry, often suspected, was based on a genuine confirmation, of which an early partial copy survives.¹⁵⁶ The dossier’s fabricators just interpolated a few phrases to enhance the reference to Charles’ father Louis to include Charlemagne, Pepin, and even Dagobert, which allowed them to assert that Nicholas I was confirming the privileges of “the abovementioned kings” rather than just Charles the Bald. In the authentic act, stress was laid on assuring adequate support for the monks since Charles had imposed a lay abbot (in 867 himself, and later his successors), who could cream off other revenues for themselves. Consequently, the Pope forbid anyone to alter these arrangements, since they were for the maintenance of the monks. This was a limited protection originally, but easily inflated through minor modifications by the dossier’s composers.

Good forgers always layered their fabrications with genuine texts to make them more convincing. The partially authentic Nicholas I entry contextualized two dramatic inventions. These were the declaration of the Synod of Pîtres-Soissons in 862 and a second letter of Nicholas. The account of the synod made quite sweeping claims. It portrayed Abbot Louis (grandson of Charlemagne, d. 867) petitioning the synod to confirm the privileges of Saint-Denis to prevent any disturbance, including by clerics (using familiar wording, *maxime clericorum infestatione*). Then, the story goes, the monks brought out all their papal and royal grants about the “liberty” of the monastery (*de libertate*, a key word deployed very deliberately here). Then, very

¹⁵³ BnF NAL 326, f. 10v; PUF 9(2), 85, no. 8b: “privilegium...vobis concederemus.”

¹⁵⁴ Grosse, “Frühe Papsturkunden,” 177 n46.

¹⁵⁵ Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 22–24, 47–51.

¹⁵⁶ AN K 13 no. 10⁴ and the last three lines in an early tenth-century copy, BnF ms. lat. 7230 f. 1r; ed. PUF 9(2):95–100, no. 12.

remarkably, King Charles ordered that all the privileges of his predecessors be recited publicly (*publice recitari jussit*) in front of the bishops. Of course, Clovis II's earlier confirmation of Bishop Landry's privilege was specifically mentioned and called a "privilege of liberty" (*libertatis...privilegio*). The idea was that Charles the Bald had made Saint-Denis independent of all but papal control, something that the historical Charles would not have done, since he wished to retain it for himself. Furthermore, the bishops then collectively affirmed this privilege in perpetuity. The cherry on top of this confection then appears: Bishop Aeneas of Paris explicitly confirms Landry's privilege, for now and the future, and forbids his successors to alter it, presumably to prevent any repudiation in the eleventh century. Finally, to allege maximum authority, the subscriptions of the archbishops and their suffragans from six provinces were added, as well as the king's notary on behalf of the chancellor. Could any more potent royal and ecclesiastical approval possibly have been claimed?

The second major invention was a necessary follow-up: Pope Nicholas I's supposed confirmation of the decisions at Pitres-Soissons. This privilege was allegedly requested in a letter of Charles the Bald (no such letter survives) and its language closely parallels the previous (largely authentic) entry of the pope. But this confirmation was more explicit, confirming Saint-Denis' privileges and specifying they should remain firm "for all time, with no possibility of taking them back by any bishop of Paris through any power of justice or by any powerful men," a clear strike against the monks' eleventh-century opponents.¹⁵⁷ This entry, not coincidentally, also contained the most extensive and forbidding anathema. A final entry in the Carolingian part of the story was the Formosus letter affirming all the previous arrangements, which may have been included to pile on confirmations and because the monks had good models for it.

The dossier then skipped over the period from 893 to 1049 and proceeded directly to its most daring fabrication: a bull of Leo IX supposedly from 1049, just sixteen years before the Lateran Synod of 1065. Again, the monks produced both a pseudo-original (with moderate claims) and a more strongly phrased dossier version, which united all previous claims and then some. All previous privileges were cited by this Leo IX letter and their key

¹⁵⁷ Bnf NAL 326, f. 15r-v; PUF 9(2):102, no 13: "stabilimus, ut ipse locus regum preceptis et privilegiis apostolicis fultus per omnia tempora sine repetitione cuiuscumque episcopi Parisiace sedis aut alicuius iudicarie potestatis vel cuiuscumque prepotentis hominis, se semper, sicut preoptat et expetit benevolentia, ratur future tempore permaneat." "Repetitio" here might also mean that the issue could not be raised again in court, though this would require a rather legalistic (and perhaps anachronistic) reading.

provisions repeated, to insist that the pope had reviewed all of them. Again, the Landry concession was described as a privilege of “liberty” (*libertate*), a watchword of eleventh-century monastic reformers seeking independence. Interestingly, the pseudo-original omitted reference to Formosus, but the dossier eventually included it, suggesting some revision took place. (Pope Formosus was favored by those using the pseudo-Isidore collection, so perhaps this explains its inclusion.) Overall, the Leo IX privilege went furthest in asserting that prior arrangements could not be altered by the bishop of Paris (or any other bishop), a passage that was strengthened in the dossier version. The Leo IX pseudo-original was a very bold move by the forgers, since they were fabricating an act supposedly issued in 1049, within living memory of people in 1065.

The Saint-Denis monks must have been fairly confident of success, because we know that they shared key phrases with their brethren at Corbie, who were reluctant to employ them. Even before Alexander’s bull was issued in 1065, the monks of Corbie had a draft in their cartulary of the crucial phrases from Saint-Denis’ fabricated Leo IX bull.¹⁵⁸ The monks of Corbie also desired greater freedom from their bishop, and this draft raises the suspicion that they wished to imitate their bolder brothers. However, they did not do so. Why? They had recently been involved in a dispute with the local count, who surely would have noticed newly appearing “ancient” documents. Laurent Morelle emphasized the timidity and prudence of the Corbie monks in contrast to the boldness at Saint-Denis.¹⁵⁹ There are at least two important aspects of this incident. First, there was direct contact between monks preparing forgeries to obtain freedom from their bishops – that is, there was at least some exchange of texts and ideas. Second, even though the monks of Corbie had the motive, means, and opportunity to forge their own pseudo-papal privileges in 1065, they did not do so. Instead, they settled for interpolating a diploma of Hugh Capet from 988, which allowed them to claim a more limited freedom.¹⁶⁰

Perhaps the monks at Saint-Denis had confidence because they had not recently presented documents for confirmation. The large gap between 893 and 1049 in the dossier, corresponding to the end of the Carolingians and their overthrow by the Capetians, is a silence which seems to beg for

¹⁵⁸ BnF ms. lat. 17762, 39v; Morelle, “Moines de Corbie sous influence sandionysienne?” 207–12.

¹⁵⁹ Morelle, “Moines de Corbie sous influence sandionysienne?” 212: “Timidité corbéienne, face à la hardiesse de leurs confrères parisiens sachant élever l’art du faux de l’artisanat à l’industrie! Prudence tactique sûrement: les moines de Corbie n’avaient pas de titres aussi solides que leurs collègues de Saint-Denis.”

¹⁶⁰ Morelle, “Moines de Corbie sous influence sandionysienne?” 212–4.

explanation. The fact that Saint-Denis was dominated during this period by royal lay abbots (such as Hugh Capet) may explain the relative paucity of royal acts.¹⁶¹ So far as we know, the monks also had no genuine papal confirmations from the tenth through the early eleventh century.¹⁶² The earliest genuine papal bull was the Nicholas II bull for Lebraha in 1061, which referred to various prior (dubious) papal and Carolingian acts and also a genuine confirmation of King Henry III of Germany from 1056.¹⁶³ Perhaps their success in obtaining this confirmation emboldened them to forge more aggressively after circumstances changed in 1060–1.

However, the dossier's omissions might also have just been tactical. What the monks were doing in 1061 to 1065 was shifting from relying on royal favor to seeking papal protection.¹⁶⁴ This was a pragmatic shift as they were confronted with an opponent, Bishop Godfrey, who had the ear of Baldwin (and so the king), and presumably the monks were outflanked at royal court. So, they petitioned a different authority. The solution was to go above the bishop's head to the pope, creating a backstory which prominently featured papal "liberties" (always arising out of royal requests) and also permitted direct appeals circumventing the ordinary bishop. The main theme of the dossier was monastic liberty and independence, asserted by tweaking key phrases. The composers could have just as easily fabricated late Carolingian or early Capetian royal acts (as they had done previously for other reasons), but these were not directly pertinent to their purpose in 1065. Instead, they exploited the desire of the reforming popes to assert their control over the church, and thereby achieved a great victory in the Lateran Synod of 1065, despite strong resistance. Ultimately, they received an authentic, contemporary confirmation of their allegedly ancient (and exaggerated) liberties, which freed them from many aspects of episcopal control.

Success in 1065 would not have been possible without careful and creative recycling of Saint-Denis' archives. Several hands helped fabricate the pseudo-originals and the dossier. Despite seemingly low output of the scriptorium in the first half of the eleventh century, clearly by the 1060s the monks had forgers who were highly skilled. Even so, fabricated privileges of liberty required a context, a plausible past, to make them convincing. What

¹⁶¹ Waldman, "Saint-Denis et les premiers Capetiens," 191–7 at 191–3.

¹⁶² See Grosse's chronological list, PUF 9(2):33.

¹⁶³ PUF 9(2):113–5, no. 17; Henry III charter (Jan 26, 1056), ed. Harry Bresslau and Paul Kehr, MGH H III, 497, no. 365.

¹⁶⁴ Bouchard, "Kingdom of the Franks to 1108," 151: "During the course of the eleventh century, monasteries, which had once relied on kings or at least territorial princes to give them grants of immunity, increasingly turned to the pope. This process was well under way even before the Gregorian reform, when it was accelerated."

made the dossier so effective in 1065 was that it built on established (though invented) traditions of earlier brethren, whose creations had passed into the realm of accepted (or acceptable) history. These touchstones included key royal patrons, Dagobert and Charles the Bald, who were commemorated as founder and refounder. These kings, along with Saint Denis himself, were the patrons around whom hagiography, charters, and history had been – and would continue to be – invented. The predominant place of these patrons in the minds of the eleventh-century monks is evident from the dossier, where otherwise great figures (such as Charlemagne and Pepin) were secondary. Archival recycling, forging skill, and previously invented traditions worked in concert to secure sweeping liberties from Pope Alexander II in 1065. Is it any wonder that the abbot and monks sought to build on such striking success?

GAINING ROYAL APPROVAL, 1065–1068

After their victory at the Lateran synod in 1065, the abbot and monks of Saint-Denis continued to press their advantage. Despite the rhetoric of finality evoked in Pope Alexander II in his letters to the archbishop of Reims and King Philip I, there was still something lacking: a royal confirmation. Pope Alexander's letter to the young king in 1065 asked him to follow his predecessors and defend the "liberty" of the monks, which was tantamount to asking him to issue a confirmation. But with the influential Bishop Godfrey at court and closely allied to Count Baldwin, such a royal confirmation would not be immediately forthcoming. Partial copies in a thirteenth-century cartulary of Saint-Denis indicate another exchange of letters between the king and pope about the matter, probably in 1066.¹⁶⁵ One is a letter King Philip (still under guardianship) wrote to the pope, thanking him for affirming the privileges of Saint-Denis the previous year. But then the king made a request: "Therefore we ask, so that what was affirmed by you may remain stable, and if anyone out of envy cries out a false accusation against the abbot (*falsa criminatio super abbate*) or his flock, that you give it very little credence and not account it at all, since they seek to disturb us and violate your decree. And they will trouble you, since much was given, to dissolve it."¹⁶⁶ The meaning of this passage is not clear. What "false accusation against the abbot" did Philip refer to? We do not

¹⁶⁵ AN LL 1156, f. 75r–v; ed. Grosse, PUF 9(2):127–8, nos. 22 and 23. Rolf Grosse, "Ein unbekannter Brief König Philipps I von Frankreich an Papst Alexander II," *Archiv für Diplomatik* 43 (1997): 23–6.

¹⁶⁶ PUF 9(2):128, no. 22: "Rogamus ergo, ut quod a vobis firmatum est stabile consistat et, si cuiusquam invidi falsa criminatio super abbate iamdicto et illius grege effletur, a vobis minime credatur, nulli computetur, quoniam nos sollicitant in eos vestra decreta violare. Sollicitabunt vos etiam, si detur copia, eadem ipsa dissolvere."

know.¹⁶⁷ In any event, Alexander's response once again affirmed the liberty of Saint-Denis granted by his predecessors. The Pope then asked Philip to do likewise: "And because that venerable place, from the beginning of its foundation, has always brought forth patronage and presents for your ancestors, we ask of your kindness that you oppose those seeking to do harm there with the rampart (*munimen*, also possibly 'muniment') of your defense."¹⁶⁸ Again, it seems, Alexander was asking Philip to issue a confirmation. Although this evidence is not contemporary and may reflect later ideas, it is still suggestive. It implies, above all, that the monks needed to mount a second campaign to achieve a royal confirmation which would, literally, seal the deal.

A campaign for a royal confirmation to assert their liberties even more firmly helps explain three entries added between the end of the dossier and the Alexander letters (ff. 19r–23v). Two of these entries (ff. 19r–20v and 22v–23v) were in the same hand as the Alexandrine entries (hand 2), and the third (ff. 20v–22r) was in another (hand 3), though any dating must remain speculative.¹⁶⁹ All three related to the main theme of the dossier: monastic freedom. The first was a letter of Pope Gregory I with the rubric "*Incipit decretum beati Gregorii pape de libertate monachorum*," which had the last four letters of "*libertate*" and the final word squeezed in on the line above, next to the "benevalete" of the Nicholas I letter which ended the original dossier.¹⁷⁰ This entry was a fake drawn from the pseudo-Isidore, popular among mid-eleventh-century monks seeking to assert monastic independence from their diocesan bishop.¹⁷¹ This addition represents a move towards seeking greater independence (even exemption) from the bishop of Paris.

The middle entry, in the third hand, was announced by a rubric also squeezed in and transgressing a line. This entry consisted of two narratives, the only ones in the cartulary, both about Pope Stephen. These narratives supported key political fictions. The first was a long account of a vision Pope Stephen supposedly had when visiting Saint-Denis in 754.¹⁷² This text derived

¹⁶⁷ Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 70.

¹⁶⁸ PUF 9(2):129, no. 23: "Et quia venerabilis locus ille a primordio sue foundationis antecessorum tuorum semper excrevit patrociniis ac muneribus, rogamus caritatem tuam, ut nocentium sibi presumptionibus munimen defensiones tue opponas sicque pro defectu eius provideas, quatinus non solum apud Deum, sed [etiam] apud homines gratiam merearis et laudes."

¹⁶⁹ Hands following Waldman, "Charters and Influences, 25; compare Levillain, *Études III*, 246–7 who argued for a different grouping.

¹⁷⁰ Bnf NAL 326, f. 19r–20v, "Quam sit necessarium" (JL 1366).

¹⁷¹ Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 71 n99, argued it was already known from the pseudo-Isidore, contrary to the arguments of Levillain and Gilchrist. It appears a second time on fol. 53 as the first title of section 4 of the *Collection of 74 Titles* under "monastic liberty," Gilchrist, *Diversorum patrum sententie*, 39.

¹⁷² BnF NAL 326, f. 20v–22r.

from an earlier house tradition, established in the time of Abbot Hilduin and known from a ninth-century manuscript.¹⁷³ In the vision, while Pope Stephen was praying before the altar at the monastery, Saints Peter and Paul, along with Denis, appeared before him. Peter and Paul blessed the martyr and then Saint Denis spoke to Stephen, commanding him to perform mass at the altar and to dedicate it to Peter and Paul, as well as to bless King Pepin. This vision of Stephen was crucial for the mid-eleventh century monks. It demonstrated that the monastery was tied directly to Saint Peter and Rome, another mark of its independence from diocesan authority. This passage concluded with “amen” and a series of dots across the final line, indicating the end of the vision.¹⁷⁴ Next came four paragraphs of narrative, which related Pope Stephen’s deeds (it begins “*Gesta sunt*”) on July 26, 754.¹⁷⁵ This account gave details about how Pope Stephen dedicated the altar to Saints Peter and Paul and gave unction to King Pepin and his two sons, Charlemagne and Carloman. According to the account, in the presence of Bertrada, Pepin’s wife, Stephen also announced that they were the true kings of Francia and, furthermore, that no one should rule in future except from their family and with apostolic consecration.¹⁷⁶ Of course, this story was linked to other texts about Pepin and his son Charlemagne receiving unction from Pope Stephen at Saint-Denis in 754, all of which provided rhetorical support to the budding Carolingian dynasty.¹⁷⁷ However, this second entry also provided the eleventh-century copyists with another example of papal–royal cooperation.

At the top of the next page, a third entry provided another royal connection: a fabricated diploma of Charlemagne. This entry dated 782 was a confirmation of holdings in Alsace, supposedly requested by Abbot Fulrad.¹⁷⁸ In this case, the monks were actually recycling an earlier forgery rather than inventing a wholly new one, since they were rewriting two pseudo-originals which had been created by their late ninth-century predecessors.¹⁷⁹ This entry had at least two purposes. First, and most obviously, it lent credence to Saint-Denis’ control of the valuable complex of lands in Alsace near Lebraha, given in Fulrad’s testament and confirmed by the Nicholas II bull from 1061 at the end of the dossier (which referred to a Charlemagne confirmation).

¹⁷³ Hilduin’s *Revelatio* of Stephen and the dedication, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SS 15:2–3.

¹⁷⁴ BnF NAL 326, f. 21v, line 7.

¹⁷⁵ BnF NAL 326 f. 21v.

¹⁷⁶ BnF NAL 326, f. 21v–22r.

¹⁷⁷ Notably the *Liber Pontificalis* and the “*Clausula de unctione Pippini regis*,” for bibliography: BHL 2176 and Sonzogni 110–1, no. 91.

¹⁷⁸ BnF NAL 326, f. 22v–23v; MGH DD Karol. 1:329–31, no. 238 from pseudo-originals.

¹⁷⁹ AN K 7, no. 7^a and a contemporary copy 7^b, which Tessier, “Originaux et pseudo-originaux” 39 proved were fabricated in the time of Charles the Bald; see Sonzogni, 135–6, no. 136+ for full bibliography.

The Charlemagne pseudo-original, therefore, was the “paper trail” behind the genuine Nicholas II confirmation in 1061 (which contained related phrasing), and so it made sense to include it in the cartulary.¹⁸⁰ Moreover, this entry provided a salient precedent: it showed a pope and king working in concert and a royal confirmation following from a papal privilege – exactly what the monks were hoping for after the synod of 1065.

In any event, it took three years for Philip I to issue the desired royal confirmation. It is interesting that the young king only took this step upon reaching his majority in 1068, once the influence of his uncle Baldwin V (and his ally, Bishop Godfrey) was lessened. 1065 to 1068 were tumultuous years. The monks were not just dealing with the challenge of the bishop of Paris but also with aggressive nobles in the Vexin and the dramatic shifts in fortune following the Norman Conquest of England in 1066.¹⁸¹ Also, there may have been some changes in leadership in the monastery itself. One hint is provided by the royal confirmation issued by Philip I in 1068. In the surviving original, the address to “*noster Raynerius abba*” has signs of contemporary erasure and rewriting of the name.¹⁸² Interestingly, the cartulary copy provides a different abbot’s name: “*noster Vvasco*.”¹⁸³ All later copies refer to Rainier. It is not clear what to make of this evidence, except perhaps this otherwise unknown person might have something to do with King Philip’s reference to false accusations against an abbot.¹⁸⁴ Ultimately, the “story” created by the monks of Saint-Denis was successful and spectacularly so. As a result, their “story” was quickly imitated by others, since its themes were suitable for asserting monastic “liberties.”

SEQUELS AT SAINT-DENIS: THE QUEST FOR EXEMPTION TO 1107

Obtaining confirmations from the pope in 1065 and the king in 1068 were major victories for the monks of Saint-Denis. But even these sweeping privileges could be expanded. The monks still lacked full exemption from the jurisdiction of their ordinary bishop, who could still use spiritual sanctions (such as excommunication) to insist on subordination of the abbot and

¹⁸⁰ Michel Parisse, “Saint-Denis et les biens en Lorraine et Alsace,” *Bulletin philologique et historique* 1 (1969): 233–56 and Stoclet, *Autour de Fulrad*, passim.

¹⁸¹ Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 59–69.

¹⁸² Prou, ed., *Actes de Philippe I*, 1068, no. 40, note a.

¹⁸³ BnF NAL 326, f. 73r.

¹⁸⁴ Levillain, *Études III*, 300–1 believed the originals were copied into the cartulary before the corrections were made in 1068; however, Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 69–70 suggested that Vvasco might have been abbot sometime between 1065 and 1071.

monks. But monastic exemption was controversial, and Bishop Godfrey of Paris certainly opposed this, and he lived until 1095. So, the monks were forced to wait and plan. Some of this planning is evident in the enlarged codex at Saint-Denis. The “dossier” and “cartulary” of Saint-Denis (ff. 1–25) were eventually joined with an early version of the canon law *Collection of 74 Titles*, which was a key text for reformers, both papal and monastic.¹⁸⁵ This collection, further popularizing the influential pseudo-Isidore decretals, became legal bedrock for monastic claims to “liberties.” The connections were both conceptual and textual. Towards the end of the 74 *Titles*, the Saint-Denis monks inserted a copy of the Philip I’s confirmation of 1068 (BnF NAL 326, f. 73r). This charter was copied on a page after two titles of Pope Leo I, under the heading “*de auctoritate privilegiorum*,” about how papal privileges for monasteries and churches, once given, should not be altered, which was the salient point for the late eleventh-century Saint-Denis copyists.¹⁸⁶ However, the collection then continued with other canons and the codex ended with no further “story” in the eleventh century. A coda was added in the late twelfth century, a reconfirmation of the monks’ papal privileges by Pope Eugenius III from 1148 obtained by Abbot Suger, which shows how shifting endpoints can reinterpret stories’ meaning.¹⁸⁷

However, the monks were eventually successful in obtaining a full exemption. By 1100 conditions had changed, after the death of Bishop Godfrey in 1095 and towards the end of Philip I’s tumultuous reign, when the king was excommunicated. Soon, new disputes erupted between Abbot Adam (1098/9–1122) and Bishop Galo of Paris (1104–16). The conflict was ultimately resolved in the monks’ favor. In 1102, Paschal II issued a confirmation of the previous privileges of Zachary, Stephen II, Leo IX, and Alexander II, and added new ones. In total, eight privileges were granted: papal protection; confirmation of the lands, fees, and rights, and free election of the abbot; his consecration by the Pope or a bishop of choice; free choice of a bishop to perform blessings, ordinations, or consecrations; masses or “stations” could not be performed without the abbot’s permission; and for the first time, excommunication, interdict, as well as summons to councils by the bishop were forbidden; and finally the right to appeal to the pope about serious matters (*in gravioribus negotiis*) was assured.¹⁸⁸ By this point, the bishop’s ability to exercise spiritual jurisdiction over the monastery

¹⁸⁵ Mary Stroll, *Popes and Antipopes: The Politics of Eleventh-Century Church Reform* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 89–93.

¹⁸⁶ BnF NAL 326, 72v–73r; Gilchrist, ed., *Diversorum patrum sententiae*, 53–4, c. 25–26.

¹⁸⁷ BnF NAL 326, f. 79r, Eugenius III “Cum omnibus ecclesiis” (JL 8876); a single sheet survives, AN L 228, no. 13; PUF 9(2):163–6, no. 44.

¹⁸⁸ PUF 9(2):131, no. 25. Grosse, “Frühe Papsturkunden,” 187 and *Saint-Denis*, 123–6.

had been reduced to almost nothing. But Bishop Galo, newly appointed in 1104, did not give up without a fight. We learn from Suger, who represented the monks' position personally as Abbot Adam's emissary, that when Pope Paschal II visited France during Easter 1107, he ruled for the monastery and put an end to the bishop's claims.¹⁸⁹ Afterwards, the privileges granted in 1102 would continue to be reconfirmed by popes. The seeds planted by the dossier in 1065 eventually bore fruit in the twelfth century. After 1107, the exemption was a *fait accompli* which Bishop Galo could no longer challenge. This new normal was affirmed in hindsight by an entry in Pope Alexander IV's (1254–61) *Liber Censuum*, which declared: "The monastery of Saint-Denis in France, which has been exempt for a long time."¹⁹⁰ What had begun as forgery had finally become history.

But while the quest for exemption had basically succeeded by 1107, some other features of the dossier's "story" would also have sequels. The success of the dossier/cartulary in 1065–8 had focused attention on Dagobert and Charles the Bald over other possible patrons. The continuing influence of this perspective can be found in Saint-Denis' entry in the memorial roll for Abbot Vitalis of Savigny from 1122–3, which begins by commemorating Kings Dagobert and Charles the Bald before proceeding to the early Capetians, Robert II and Henry I.¹⁹¹ Here one can see that the Merovingian and Carolingian pasts had been distilled to one key royal patron each. Indeed, Abbot Adam had made special effort to promote the anniversary of Dagobert in 1107.¹⁹² Furthermore, a similar strategy was used for the Capetians, as the patronage of Robert II and Henry I became focal points for re-inscribing the relationship of the house to the current dynasty.

In particular, Robert II was hailed as a restorer and re-founder of the monastery. This interpretation drew on an authentic charter of Robert from 1008, in which the saint's name was written in Greek letters and so,

¹⁸⁹ Suger, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. Henri Waquet (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1964), 52, c.10: "Cui consecrationi et nos ipsi infuimus, et contra dominium episcopum Parisiensium Galonem, multis querimonis ecclesiam beati Dyonisii agitantem, in conspectu domini pape viriliter stando, aperta ratione et canonico judico satisfecimus."

¹⁹⁰ Paul Fabre et al., eds., *Le Liber Censuum de l'Église romaine*, 3 vols. (Paris: Fontemoing, 1889–1952) 1:191: "Monasterium sancti Dionysii in Francia, quod a multis temporibus exemptum est."; Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 126.

¹⁹¹ AN L 966 no. 4, Dufour, ed. *Les rouleaux des morts*, 541–2, no. 122: "Anima eius et omnes fideles anime requiescant in Christo pace. Orate pro defunctis nostris: Dagoberto, Carolo Calvo, Rodberto, et Henrico, regibus." Waldman, "Saint-Denis et les premiers Capetiens," 193–4; Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 56, n258.

¹⁹² Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 131–6.

therefore, was almost certainly beneficiary redacted.¹⁹³ Using this charter and a second genuine act alongside one fabricated in Robert's name, the early twelfth-century monks shored up their claims to a royal immunity. King Robert was accorded quasi-hagiographic treatment as a patron, as Dagobert and Charles the Bald had been in the dossier. A sequel was desirable because the turbulent reign of Philip I had ended with the king in disgrace and, most critically for Saint-Denis, buried elsewhere in 1108. The dossier's main purpose had been fulfilled once the exemption was granted, so Abbot Adam and his protégé Suger could turn their attention to (re)affirming the house's status as royal necropolis with the new monarch, Louis VI. From 1108–15, the monks reworked their continuation of the *Historia regum Francorum*, stressing key royal patrons (including Robert “the Pious”), thus linking their house “story” to an emerging history of the kingdom of France. In the 1120s, they were able to make bolder claims, fostering both Capetian dynasticism and the greater recognition of Saint-Denis. In so doing, they rewrote the past yet again and fabricated yet more charters. Such efforts would eventually be codified in separate writing projects, notably Suger's *Life of Louis VI* and *De gestis administratione*, which were built on reinterpretations developed under Abbot Adam (1098/99–1122).¹⁹⁴ Once the dossier's story had overcome resistance, it became possible to compose sequels based upon its accepted view of the past.

The success of the dossier of Saint-Denis is a crucial moment to understand. The decision of the Lateran Synod of 1065 in favor of the monks could be described as a “leading case,” especially for important Benedictine monasteries seeking “liberties” or freedom from their diocesan bishops (not to mention royal protectors). It was as public as any decision could have been in the period and news must have spread quickly among monks. Indeed, almost immediately, the key phrases used in the dossier were shared with other monks. Success clearly bred imitation, and imitation was the mother of fabrication not just at Saint-Denis, but in a wider community of monasteries.

¹⁹³ AN K 18, no. 3. Tardif, ed. *Monuments historiques*, no. 250. William Mendel Newman, ed., *Catalogue des actes de Robert II, roi de France* (Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1937), 39–42, no. 37. Waldman, “Charters and Influences,” 25–6 and plate 2.1.

¹⁹⁴ Grosse, *Saint-Denis*, 137–47 and 231–4, stressed the role of Abbot Adam, 1108–15; Gabrielle Spiegel, *The Chronicle Tradition of Saint-Denis: A Survey* (Brookline: Classical Folia, 1978), stressed Suger more.