

## Was there a Gregorian Reform Movement in the Eleventh Century?

by John GILCHRIST

*Part I – The Gregorian Reform Movement in History and with the  
Historians<sup>1</sup>*

If movements were simply a matter of counting heads, then the Gregorian Reform Movement would emerge unscathed. I simply draw your attention to the existence of the series known as the *Studi Gregoriani* 7 vols. (1947-1960). Under the editorship of the late G. B. Borino, this series published some 100 articles by almost the same number of contributors. Today the work is being revived under the editorship of Alfons Stickler, so we can expect the momentum to be maintained.

Among medieval accounts of the Pope, the main trend is towards eulogy. The trend is well summed up in the following lines from the *Gesta Roberti Wiscardi* of William of Apulia: –

At this time there died at Salerno, the beloved Pope Gregory, whom neither love of gold nor power of rank did ever bend; he ever served to maintain unswerving justice... Comfort of the afflicted, path of light, teacher of the worthy he put down the mighty by laws, and exalted the humble. Scourge of evildoers, he was the shield of upright men. By sowing the seed of the work of salvation, he never ceased to recall the faithful from their wrongs to the path of righteousness that leads to heaven.<sup>2</sup>

But not all accounts were favourable. At the other extreme is the scurrilous diatribe of Benzo of Albi who saw Gregory VII as *Prandellus, Manicheus, Merdiprandus, Sarabaita Scariotheus, Sarabaita cinedus, collega Scariothei, facciosissimus monachus Prandellus, falsa cuculla, diabolus cucullatus, falsissimus atque diabolicus monachellus, stercorentius* – the terms need not be translated.<sup>3</sup> The truth about Gregory's character probably lies somewhere between the two extremes. But it seems to me that two of the charges commonly brought against Gregory VII by the Imperialists have never been satisfactorily answered.

---

<sup>1</sup> O. Capitani, "Esiste un 'Età Gregoriana'? Considerazioni sulle tendenze di una storiografica medievistica," *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa* I (1965), 454-481.

<sup>2</sup> *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores* (=MGH SS), IX, 295-6, Bk. 5, lines 255-267.

<sup>3</sup> *Benzonis Episcopi Albensis ad Heinricum IV Imperatorem Libri VIII*, ed. K. Pertz, MGH SS, XI, 664.27 (= Bk. VI, cap. 5), and 593 where Pertz brings together the various terms used to describe Gregory VII.

The first charge is that his election in 1073 was illicit by ecclesiastical law, and the second is that he plunged Germany into civil strife.<sup>4</sup> These views persisted into the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Of course, the favourable writers attributed this to a conflict between the partisans of truth (=Gregory and his party) and those of anti-Christ (=Henry IV and his party), so that the explanation of the split becomes a matter of political ideology and not of fact.<sup>5</sup> Later historians have generally preferred the arguments of the Gregorians.<sup>6</sup>

To the objection that Gregory had truth on his side, one could reply that, in terms of the law as it existed, the Imperialists, as well as men like William I, had custom on their side when they resisted many of the changes that were emanating from Rome. In that age *consuetudo* was a most powerful weapon. This is probably the reason why a new "law" found its way into the canonical collections: "If perhaps you propose 'custom' as an argument, then take account of what Our Lord said, 'I am the truth.' He did not say, 'I am the custom', but the 'truth'. And so any custom, however venerable and widespread, must always give way to the truth, and usage that is contrary to truth must be done away with."<sup>7</sup> This law, whose author was possibly Gregory, set the truth over custom at all times. In Gregory's case the centralising or Roman party has been in the ascendant among later historians. From Baronius (1598) onwards the following phraseology has typified their attitude:

Through Gregory investitures of churches were clearly emancipated from the hands of rulers, free election by resumption of rights of the Roman pontiffs was restored, church discipline that had so completely collapsed was made good, and numerous other benefits brought about.<sup>8</sup>

Writers such as Platyna stressed Gregory's defence of the Roman Church and his stand against the German King as well as his protection of the *res ecclesiasticae*.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See *Ekkehardi Chronicon Universale*, an. 1074, MGH SS, VI, 201.3-6; cited by the *Annales Magdeburgenses*, an. 1074, MGH SS, XVI, 175.22-27.

<sup>5</sup> Petrus Pisanus, *Gregorii VII Vita*, an. 1084, "Sed quid diabolus et antichristus Romae et in omnibus eius finibus est operatus, longum est narrare," Watterich I, 306.

<sup>6</sup> See *Annales Sancti Disibodi*, MGH SS, XVII, 7.13-21.

<sup>7</sup> See G. B. Ladner, "Two Gregorian Letters: on the Sources and Nature of Gregory VII Reform Ideology," *S. Greg. 5* (1956), 221-242, here 225-242.

<sup>8</sup> *Annales Ecclesiastici* (Rome 1598-1607), vol. 17 (1046-1093), ed. A. Theiner (Angers 1869), 531.

<sup>9</sup> *Historia de Vitae pontificum* (Venice 1504), p. lxxiii. <sup>5</sup>, translated into English by Sir Paul Rychaut (2nd edition, London 1688) in which see p. 215. where Gregory is described as "the only Champion of the Church against Hereticks and wicked Princes, who strove to make themselves Masters of the Churches patrimony by violence." The Platyna text is also cited by the *Vitae et*

For this defence, Gregory is singled out for praise,<sup>10</sup> and I suggest that what in effect was happening was that the equation of Roman Church = Papacy = Christ was in process of being historicized, and that the attempt by Gregory VII to enhance the Roman Church was regarded as Christ's own mission. Today, with our increased knowledge of the extent to which the Roman Church was influenced by the secular Roman Law and by the ancient Imperialist Idea, we cannot as historians be so confident that the hierarchical structure erected by Gregory VII and his successors, which has survived down to the present day, is what Christ did intend, hence we cannot be so certain that the opposition to the Gregorians was as much in the wrong as it has been made out to be.<sup>11</sup> However, I must point out that support for Gregory comes from most unexpected quarters. Edward Gibbon could speak of the "austere and more dangerous virtues of Gregory the Seventh and his successors" obliterating the scandals of the previous century.<sup>12</sup> Stubbs contrasted Henry IV's dissipated habits with "the wholesome tonic" of Gregory's policy, and towards the end of the nineteenth century there began to emerge the present day phraseology that associates eleventh-century history with Gregorian Reform as though this constituted the underlying force in Society.<sup>13</sup> Duchesne spoke of "la renaissance grégorienne" and then of "la réforme grégorienne" which became the classical phrase.<sup>14</sup> Some historians of that period were even more lyrical: thus, Rohrbacher saw Gregory as the author of designs that were not his but those of Christ and hence they could not fail; he was the defender of Christendom against the anti-Christ who was the Emperor. For other historians Gregory appeared as the "saviour of society" and the greatest of all the popes.<sup>15</sup>

But the dissenting voice was never absent from the debate. Henry Charles Lea represented the minority view summed up in his conclusion that when the pope had passed away he left to his successors "the legacy of inextinguishable hate and

---

*Res Gestae Pontificum Romanorum et S.R.E. Cardinalium ... auctoribus A. C. Biacensi, F. C. Morali, A. V. Bassanensi* (Rome 1630), 421-422.

<sup>10</sup> See P. F. Orlandus, *Orbis Sacer et Profanus Illustratus*, Pars Secunda, *Europam Complectens*, vol I (Florence 1731), 560. See below, n. 25.

<sup>11</sup> For the Roman idea, see Ullmann, *Principles of Government*, 36-39, and *passim*.

<sup>12</sup> *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (6 vols., 1776-1788; Everyman Edition 1962), 6.465.

<sup>13</sup> W. Stubbs, *Germany in the Early Middle Ages 476-1250*, ed. A. Hassall (1908; New York 1969), 164-165.

<sup>14</sup> L. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis* (Paris 1892), II, p. xxi, 21.

<sup>15</sup> Abbé Rohrbacher, *Histoire Universelle de L'Eglise Catholique* (Nouv. édit, Paris 1901), 7.292: Also L. Marion, *Histoire de L'Eglise* (1907; Paris 1928), 353: "le plus grand de tous les Papes ... le sauveur de la société."

unattained ambition.”<sup>16</sup> Catholic authors did not subscribe to that opinion, but they recognized in Gregory certain contradictions that had to be explained. Take, for example, the document known as the *Dictatus pape*.<sup>17</sup> Commonly, this document is cited as the declaration of the programme of Gregory VII.<sup>18</sup> It contains such items as 1) The Roman Church was founded by (our) Lord alone, and 2) Only the Roman pontiff can lawfully be called universal. But certain of the claims, e.g. Cap. 8, “He alone may use the imperial insignia,” and 9, “The Pope is the only man whose feet all rulers kiss,” stand uneasily alongside the more practical claims of Cap. 12, “He can depose emperors,” and 13, “If necessary he can move bishops from one see to another.” If such is the programme of the Gregorian Reform Movement, then it bears little relation either to the testimony of the chroniclers or to the evidence of the canonical collections which emphasize the “programme” of abolishing the triple abuse of clerical marriage, lay investiture and simony – none of which are mentioned in the *Dictatus pape*.<sup>19</sup>

The consequence of the extremism of the *Dictatus pape* is interesting to observe. Several historians denied the authorship of Gregory because they found the document inconsistent with their view of what a papal reformer should be.<sup>20</sup> Others found the very novelty of the claims a challenge to their ingenuity in demonstrating the historical and legal precedents on which they were based.<sup>21</sup> But what we tend to forget is that some of Gregory’s contemporaries did not see the precedents in that way and they challenged the Gregorians to make good their claims.<sup>22</sup>

By the 1920’s, however, the pattern of historical explanation was becoming

---

<sup>16</sup> *A History of Sacerdotal Celibacy* (3rd edition revised, London 1907), 287.

<sup>17</sup> For the text, see E. Caspar, *Dos Register Gregors VII* in MGH Epp. Sel. ii, Berlin 1955 (reprint of the 1920 edition) = Reg. 2.55a, 201f. Also Gilchrist, “Canon Law Aspects,” JEH, 13.25.

<sup>18</sup> See B. Tierney, *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300* (Prentice Hall 1964), 46 “... there seems to be no doubt that the *Dictatus* presents the considered opinions of Gregory VII at the outset of his reign.”

<sup>19</sup> J. B. Morrall, *Political Thought in Medieval Times* (London 1958; 2nd edition, 1960), 32 comments on the indiscriminate juxtaposition of maxims in the D.P.

<sup>20</sup> See P. Albers and R. Hedde, *Manuel d’Histoire Ecclésiastique* (1908; Paris 1923), 432; H. K. Mann, *The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages, VII, The Popes of the Gregorian Renaissance* (2nd edition, London, 1925), 215-217.

<sup>21</sup> See Gilchrist, “Canon Law Aspects,” JEH, 13.26. Also F. Gontard, *The Chair of Peter*, tr. from German by A. J. and E. F. Peeler (New York 1964), 235, who describes the theses as “like the booming of a great gong in the history of the Roman Church.”

<sup>22</sup> See the commentary of the author of the *De Unitate Ecclesiae Conservanda*, cap. 4, On Matth. 16.18, 19 (MGH *Lib. de lite* 2.188.40 - 190.25).

fixed. The appearance of Fliche's work set Gregory apart from his predecessors and argued that, whatever had been the efforts of popes like Leo IX, only in Gregory VII was centralisation finally achieved and the various strands of halfbegun and barely completed reforms brought together in his person. So that he truly challenged the abuses that threatened the Western Church.<sup>23</sup> In other words, centralisation = unity = progress was located in Gregory and his circle, which justified calling the movement the Gregorian Reform Movement. Twenty years later Don Borino gave the culminating accolade to this synthesis. In his preface to volume I of *Studi Gregoriani* he writes of the motives that inspired him to commence the work, and he speaks of the tasks set the contributors in terms that showed the Movement as the thing most important in European development in the eleventh century.

Mi venne in mente, non molti mesi or sono, di invitare gli studiosi a ricordarlo con una raccolta di scritti su di lui e in genere sulla Riforma che da lui prende giustamente il nome. Nella storia della chiesa, Gregorio VII come è il più grande così è il Papa più studiato. La Riforma Gregoriana è un fatto complesso, di grandissima portata europea, oltre che di rinnovata vita religiosa nella Chiesa.<sup>24</sup>

Among the replies was the following, and we must remember that this was written in the immediate post-war years: –

E un omaggio al grande Papa, che ha saputo far intendere al mondo che gli Stati e i Singoli devono sottomettersi alle leggi della morale e alla giustizia: lezione opportuna in tutti i tempi e oggi più che mai.<sup>25</sup>

With such views the pope passes out of history and becomes part of a myth.

If one may summarize all these concepts of the period – whether pro or anti-Gregory – one could say that they all subscribe to a view of history in which the world view, the unity view, the concept of history as moving from the many to the few, disorganization to organization, localism to centralism, is stressed.<sup>26</sup> Fortunately, other historians reacted to this approach, men like Villante, who urged the unstructured nature of historical “patterns” in the eleventh century and the presence of forces – socio-economic – that were obstacles to the continued acceptance of the politico-religious structuralism propounded by historians from Baronius down to Borino.<sup>27</sup> But old views die hard, and you need only read the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967) articles on the Papacy and Gregory VII to realize the difficulty of the historian today; thus J. Gaudement writes: –

Gregory VII, who has been made the patron of this movement, was neither its

---

<sup>23</sup> See Capitani, *art cit.*, RSLR, 1.454-455

<sup>24</sup> P. xiii.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 457, 460, 462.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 478.

initiator nor its final consummator. Yet the importance of his reign ... [justifies] in large measure, the application of the adjective Gregorian to the reforming movement.<sup>28</sup>

We must ask whether there was such a thing as a *programme* of reform. Hugh of Flavigny spoke of Gregory as being moved by the apostolic authority and by the truth of the fathers “to eliminate the heresy of simony and to enforce clerical chastity.” But admitting these were desirable aims, why call them a programme and why attribute it to Gregory? For example, the chronicler writes of Leo IX that “from him came a complete renewal of the church and its aims, and a new light was seen to come forth in the world.”<sup>29</sup> And were not previous events equally decisive? For example, in the epochal Decree of 1059 on Papal Elections or the correspondence of Leo IX and Humbert of Silva-Candida in 1053/54 concerning the Greek Church, which demonstrated a papal ideology as forthright and precise as any that is found in Gregory.<sup>30</sup>

Papal registers as an extant and continuous series do not begin until the period of Innocent.<sup>31</sup> Thus Gregory’s register is a unique document, and I want to suggest that it is this uniqueness that makes his pontificate unique. If the registers of his predecessors had survived, then we would again have Gregory in perspective. Borino himself gave several arguments, e.g. omission of extant letters, letters lost and not cited in the register, and foreign pieces such as 1.19, 1.29a, which prove that Gregory’s collection cannot have been an official register of the Chancery.<sup>32</sup> More recent thinking tends to see it as “an extract from a lost chancery register, extracted for political purposes at a critical juncture under Gregory VII’s personal direction.”<sup>33</sup> The *Dictatus pape* finds few echoes in canonical literature, the deposition of Henry IV is more often referred to simply as an excommunication, which it was, in any case, and the famous Canossa incident is sometimes overlooked in a surprising way, e.g. Hugh of Cluny’s biographers make no reference to it at all.<sup>34</sup> The later *Chronica minor auctoritate minorita Erphodiensi* hints at a darker and more superstitious and brutal age when its author writes that “this pope rigorously prohibited auguries, sorceries, incantations and magical

---

<sup>28</sup> Vol. 6, p. 761.

<sup>29</sup> *Desiderii Dialogi de Miraculis Sancti Benedicti*, III, an. 1049-1054, MGH SS, XXX, 1143.10-19.

<sup>30</sup> See J. Gilchrist, “Cardinal Humbert of Silva-Candida (d. 1061),” *Annale Medicevale* 3 (1962), 29.42, espec. 34-36.

<sup>31</sup> J. Gilchrist, “Papal Registers,” NCE, 10.977-978.

<sup>32</sup> G. B. Borino, “Note Gregoriane ... 12. Puo it Reg. Vat. 2 ... essere il Registro della cancellaria?” *S. Greg.* 6 (1959-1961), 363-366 (also Nos. 13-16 = pp. 366-390), here 366, 369-380.

<sup>33</sup> C. R. Cheney, *The Study of the Medieval Papal Chancery* (Glasgow 1966), 26-27, who cites Santifaller and Morghen.

<sup>34</sup> Hunt, *Cluny*, 145.

arts” as part of his work.<sup>35</sup>

*Part II - Gregory VII and the Canonical Collections 1073-1141*

The Gregorian period has been singled out by historians for its stress upon the recovery of law, so that we speak of the beginnings of the science of canon law, the process that led finally to the Decretum of Gratian in 1141.<sup>36</sup> Most of this “recovery” has been forced into the same hierarchical mould as the rest of the phenomena surrounding Gregory VII, and we can therefore assume that, if there was such a thing as a Gregorian programme, that is, something that appealed to his supporters and gave cohesion to the so-called movement that spread throughout Europe, then it ought to be found in the many collections of canon law that appeared in the period c. 1073 onwards. Despite all the emphasis upon the reform and the law, however, almost nothing has been done to make the collections available. The few published editions are notoriously unreliable. Some indication of the extent to which the texts are lacking is that Anselm’s collection, which Thaner edited (1906-1915) as far as Bk. 11, cap. 15, is still incomplete.

Three questions. If the collections are a product of a movement that was tied up with Gregory VII, then might we not expect substantial differences in form and content from earlier collections? Some historians think not. Thus, Mor in his study of the *Anselmo dedicata*, which was fairly widespread in North Italy at the beginning of the eleventh century – in other words, long before the reform period – states that it affirms the preeminent authority of the Holy See, the episcopal hierarchy, respect for monasteries and monastic autonomy, and insistence that secular law is part of the canon law.<sup>37</sup> These concepts are very much like those commonly attributed to the Gregorian programme in the wide sense of the phrase. Again, if the famous collection of Burchard of Worms, compiled c. 1012, was unsuitable for the reform, how do we explain the development in the late eleventh century of a type of collection that combined Burchard (the old) with the Collection in Seventy-four Titles (the new)?<sup>38</sup> Of course, it is easy to call these non-reform collections, or the collections of the *epigoni*, or anti-Gregorian, but the fact remains that such collections did exist and that canonists thought them worthwhile making.<sup>39</sup> Perhaps we should forget about the so-called differences

---

<sup>35</sup> MGH SS, XXIV, 190.41-42

<sup>36</sup> A. M. Stickler, *Historia Iuris Canonici Latini I Historio Fontium* (Turin 1950), 177 and *passim*.

<sup>37</sup> C. G. Mor, “La reazione al ‘Decretum Burchardi’ in Italia avanti la riforma Gregoriana,” *S. Greg. I* (1947), 197-206, here 200-201.

<sup>38</sup> E.g. the Collection in Eight Parts (post 1100) of MS Assisi 227, the *Liber Sententiarum* (1119-1124) of MS Florence, Laurenziana (Bibl. Graddiana) Pluteus 89, sup. cod. 32, and the Collection in Seven Books (1085-1090) of MS Bordeaux 11.

<sup>39</sup> Mor, *S. Greg.*, 1.206.

and see more continuity and unity among the pre-Gratian collections than we have been prepared to do. A third question concerns specific texts. Why do historians spend so much time in discussing the deposition of Henry IV which does not find its way into many collections, instead of concentrating upon such texts as the Ps. Wido (= *Epistola Pascasii pape*) which is one of the most widespread of all eleventh-century canonical *capitula* and clearly had a great influence?<sup>40</sup> The reason may be that these texts create difficulties for the conventional world picture interpretation, so that it is better if they are left alone!

I have examined 26 collections from Italy, France, Germany, England and Spain. All but 8 are still unpublished, and this may account for the previous neglect of a vital factor in any discussion of the influence of Gregory VII and his circle.<sup>41</sup> Here I want only to discuss the main trends. The total number of texts

---

<sup>40</sup> The text has already received considerable treatment; cf. A. Michel, "Die antisimonistischen Reordinationen und eine neue Humbert-Schrift," *Romische Quartalschrift* 46 (1938), 19-56, and subsequent authors (Autenrieth, Benson, Hoffmann, Miccoli, etc.) have referred to it. But a measure of the need for a new study is that the existing printed edition by Thaner (MGH, *Libelli de Lite* 1.5-7) is based on five manuscripts, whereas the text exists in at least another sixteen MSS.

<sup>41</sup> The following collections are examined:

I – ITALIAN COLLECTIONS IN THE TIME OF GREGORY VII (1073-1085) –

i) Collection in 74 Titles – *Diversorum patrum sententie* (1073-75) EMS Monte Cassino 522:] Stickler 167-70, ii) Anselmo of Lucca, *Collectio Canonum* (1083) (ed. F. Thaner, Innsbruck 1906-1915; Scientia Verlag, Aalen 1965 – for Bk. I – XI cap. 15: MS Paris, BN 12519 for the remaining as yet unpublished part) Stickler 170-172, iii) *Collectio Canonum* of Cardinal Deusdedit (c. 1083-86) (ed. V. Wolf von Glanvell, Paderborn 1905; Scientia Verlag, Aalen 1967) Stickler 172.174, iv) The so-called Collection in Two Books (c. 1085) of MS Vat. lat. 3832 (ed. J. Bernhard, *La collection en deux livres* (Cod. Vat. lat. 3832) I (Strasbourg 1962) 1: Stickler 175, A Garcia y Garcia, *Historia del Derecho Canonico I El Primer Milenio* (Salamanca 1967) 314, v) The *Collectio Canonum* (c. 1085) of MS Florence Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana Ashburnham 1554: Stickler 175, Garcia y Garcia 316, vi) Collection of Vat. lat. 4977 (c. 1100): see P. Fournier, « Un groupe de recueils canoniques italiens des X<sup>e</sup> et XI<sup>e</sup> siècles », *Mémoires de l'Institut National de France* 40 (1916), 95-212, here 206-208.

II – ITALIAN COLLECTIONS AFTER 1085 – i) Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber de vita christiana* (c. 1089.95) (ed. E. Perels, Berlin 1930): Stickler 174-175, Garcia y Garcia 314-315, ii) The Collection in Seven Books (c. 1100) of MS Turin Bibl. Nazionale D IV 33: Stickler 187, Garcia y Garcia 322. iii) The *Polycarpus* (1109-1113) in MS Paris, BN 3881: Stickler 178-179, Garcia y Garcia 318, iv) The Collection in Three Books (c. 1112) of MS Vat. lat. 3831: Stickler 179, Garcia y Garcia 318, v) The Collection of Vat. lat. 3829 (1118-1119): Stickler 188.

III – NON-ITALIAN COLLECTIONS A. COLLECTIONS INDEPENDENT

having their source in the work of Gregory VII is about 185, a minute number compared to the sum of the *capitula* in all the collections. But the figures are even less promising than this when we examine the distribution of the *capitula* as follows: –

nine collections	nil texts
nine collections	between 1 and 9 capp.
six collections	between 10 and 19 capp.
two collections	between 20 and 29 capp.

Finally, there is a solitary collection possessing 36 *capitula* from Gregory VII.<sup>42</sup> This unequal distribution means one thing: Gregory's influence was not generally expressed in canonical collections, at least not directly.

Another thing to notice about these texts is that the actual letters of Gregory

---

OF IVO OF CHARTRES i) The *Collectio Lanfranci* of Cambridge, Trinity College B 16.44 (1070-1089): Stickler 95, ii) The Collection (c. 1085) of MS Paris BN. nouv. acq. lat. 326: Fournier-Le Bras II, 14, note 2, mistakenly lists it as one of the MSS of the Collection in 74 Titles, iii) The Collection in Four Books (c. 1085) compiled in France (MS Canterbury Cathedral Library B VII) : Stickler 176, iv) The Collection in Three Books of MS Celle Oberlandesgericht C.8 (c. 1100): S. Kuttner, *Traditio 14* (1958) 509, v) The Collection in Seven Books of the *Liber Tarraconensis* (1085-1090) compiled in South-west France (MS Tarragona, Bibl. prov. 26): Stickler 176, Garcia y Garcia 316, vi) The Collection in Seven Books (1085-1090) of MS Bordeaux 11: Stickler 176, Garcia y Garcia 317, vii) The Collection in Thirteen Books (1090-1100) from France (Poitou) of MS Berlin, Savigny 3: Fournier-Le Bras II, 251-259, cf. J. Joseph Ryan, "The Legatine Excommunication of Patriarch Michael Cerularius (1054) and a new Document from the First Crusade Epoch," *Studia Gratiana* 14 (1967), 15-49, here 23-24, viii) The Collection in Nine Books (c. 1110) of MS Paris Arsenal 721: Stickler 187, ix) The *Liber Canonum* of MS Rome, Bibl. Vallicelliana B 89.

B THE COLLECTIONS OF IVO OF CHARTRES i) *Decretum* (1094): PL 161.47-1022 and MS Cambridge Corpus Christi 19: Stickler 181-182, ii) *Panormia* (c. 1094-1095) (PL 161.1041-1344): Stickler 182-183, iii) *Tripartite* (1093-1095) (MS Paris BN lat. 3858B): Stickler 180-181, Garcia y Garcia 319.

C COLLECTIONS DEPENDENT ON IVO OF CHARTRES i) *Collectio Caesaraugustana* (1110-1120) probably compiled in North Spain, Aquitaine or Burgundy (MS Vat. Barb. lat. 897) : Stickler 184-185, Garcia y Garcia 351, ii) *Liber de misericordia et justitia* (c. 1094-1095) of Alger of Liège (PL 180.857-968) : Stickler 192-193.

IV – *Decretum* of Gratian (c. 1141) (ed. Friedberg, Leipzig 1879): Stickler 200-216.

<sup>42</sup> The Collection of Cardinal Deusdedit.

VII are rarely cited, apart from the letter to Hermann of Metz in 1081.<sup>43</sup> The *Dictatus pape* appears in only two collections. The majority of the texts are, in fact, synodal decrees taken from the three councils held at Rome in Lent and Autumn 1078, and Lent 1080. What it really comes to is this: the most significant influence Gregory seems to have had was through the decrees of the Autumn Synod of 1078 (= *Reg.* 6.5b). The decrees most cited are *cap.* 7 laity to restore tithes to Church (nine *capitula*); *cap.* 3 prohibition of lay investiture, and 13) every Christian must make an offering at the mass (each in eight *capp.*); *cap.* 1 prohibition of holding ecclesiastical estates without consent, 4) and 5) sale of prebends and ordinations declared illicit and 9) no abbot to receive tithes without papal or episcopal consent (each in seven *Capp.*); *cap.* 6 On False penitence, 8) Sabbath observance, and 12) suspension of bishops who do not punish clerical fornication (each in six *capp.*); *cap.* 10 no bishop to impose burdens on clergy and religious (five *capp.*). From other synods the most frequently cited decrees are the Lent Synod of 1078 (*Reg.* 5.14a), *cap.* 15 absolving subjects of excommunicated persons from their oaths, and 10) allowing certain classes of people to deal with excommunicates. From the Lent Synod of 1080 (*Reg.* 7.14a), *capp.* 1 and 2 prohibiting lay investitures are the most cited. In a very concrete sense, this must be termed the Gregorian reform programme. As the figures show, the total number of citations was small and no one canonical collection was consistent in the adoption of Gregorian texts.

One could find a reform programme in the eleventh century – every bit as powerful as the one attributed to Gregory VII – without reference to that pope at all. The collection is that found in MS Vat. lat. 3829 which cites decretals chronologically under the popes. Under Pope Nicholas I (with some texts from Nicholas II interpolated) some 26 rubrics occur:<sup>44</sup> these rubrics stress papal authority, e.g. *cap.* 1 Without the consent of the Roman bishop there can be neither churches nor congregations, (2) No one may judge the Roman bishop, and (4) A bishop cannot be deposed without the consent of the apostolic see. They emphasize obedience to the Roman Church (*cap.* 5), method of electing popes (*capp.* 6 and 7 = Nicholas II), obedience of rulers, e.g. *cap.* 10 The Emperor is subject to the Roman pontiff in all things. They order the election of bishops to be held by bishops and clergy only (*cap.* 15); attendance of councils is made compulsory unless for illness (*cap.* 18). The rubrics lay down penalties for sorcery (21, 22), abortion (23), homicide (24), bigamy (25), and bestiality (26). By contrast, the same collection cites Gregory only five times dealing with excommunication of rulers who act unjustly, non-fidelity to excommunicates, expulsion of bishops who do so communicate, and prohibition of lay investiture. What it all points to is a movement towards reform but less ecclesiological, less definite, and certainly not as Gregorian-oriented as formerly assumed.

---

<sup>43</sup> *Reg.* 8.21 By contrast, the first letter *Reg.* 4.2 (Caspar 293-297) does not occur in any of the collections.

<sup>44</sup> Fols. 257<sup>v</sup>-265<sup>v</sup>.