

Pope Leo IX and the (Quasi-)Canonization of St Deodatus (1049). Hagiography, Papal Politics, and Local Competition at the Collegiate Chapter of Saint-Dié*

Steven Vanderputten

When Pope Leo IX (1049–54) held his first major synod in Rome between the 9th and 15th of April 1049, all of those who attended quickly realized that the meeting was designed to set the tone for the energetic prelate's tenure. More than a dozen points were raised, several of which were the stuff of controversy. Leo had sweeping plans to annul all benedictions by simoniac clerics, forbid married priests from holding divine office, and strictly impose tithes. These met with resistance from the attending Roman clergy, who feared that the measures would deprive many churches in the city of divine service. Faced with this resistance Leo compromised for now, simply renewing Pope Clement II's (1046–47) decision to impose a forty-day penance on offenders. In addition he decreed that the wives of Roman priests were to be employed as chaste 'virgins' in the Lateran.¹ Besides these issues, further sensitive matters pertaining to local Churches were discussed. The question of who would have the rights over the church of San Bartolomeo all'Isola in Rome pitted Leo's confidant Humbert of Silva Candida against his fellow cardinal John I of Porto. And when the pope announced that he was going to bestow on the archbishop of Trier the title of primate of *Gallia Belgica*, Archdeacon Hildebrand (later Pope Gregory VII) protested, fearing that it would negatively affect the position of the head of the neighbouring archdiocese of Cologne.²

* This paper was written in the context of the research project 'The Quest for Otherness. Uncovering Narratives of Religious Distinction in the Long Tenth Century', which is sponsored by the Research-Foundation Flanders (FWO). I should like to thank François Devriendt of the Bollandist Society and Mireille François of Nancy's Bibliothèque Stanislas for their assistance with tracking down some of the primary evidence for this study, and Melissa Provijn for her comments on the draft version.

¹ D. JASPER, *Die Konzilien Deutschlands und Reichsitaliens 1023-1059*, Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2010, p. 207-20 and J. F. BÖHMER and K. A. FRECH, *Regesta imperii III. Salisches Haus 1024-1125. Fünfte abteilung. Papstregesten 1024-1058. 2. 1046-1058*, Cologne, Böhlau, 2011 (henceforth BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*), p. 146-55. An overview of known attendees of the synod is in JASPER, *Die Konzilien*, p. 217-18 and 220, and BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 149.

² For the background of the latter conflict, refer among other studies to E. BOSHOFF, 'Köln, Mainz, Trier - Die Auseinandersetzung um die Spitzenstellung im deutschen Episkopat in ottonisch-salischer Zeit', *Jahrbuch des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins*, 49 (1978), 19-48.

At one point in these fraught proceedings (so an added note at the end of the 1040s *Life of Deodatus* states) an entirely different matter was tabled. After someone had submitted a copy of the hagiography to the Holy See, it was decided that this should be read aloud to the synod, to all the attending bishops, abbots, clerics, and laymen. And when the reading had finished and Pope Leo had endorsed the contents of the *Life*, it was decreed that ‘these deeds (a)re to be read and firmly observed in the Church of God, to the praise and glory of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the honour of our most blessed patron Deodatus, and to the edification of the many in all eternity.’³ Here, one is immediately struck by the echo of papal canonizations as they are documented from end of the 10th century onwards. Until that point the act of proclaiming someone a saint had been strictly the prerogative of local Church leaders, mostly bishops, and had usually taken place in the context of the solemn elevation of that individual’s remains. And although this practice remained common for another two centuries,⁴ beginning with Pope John XV’s canonization of Bishop Ulrich of Augsburg in

³ *Vita Deodati* (BHL 2131), ed. in *Beatissimi Deodati episcopi vita*, Saint-Nicolas-de-Port, Désiré Guillaume, 1560, p. 27: ‘Anno ab incarnatione domini nostri Iesu Christi millesimo quadragesimo nono, indictione secunda, concurrente sexto, epacta quartadecima, regnante Heinricho filio Chuonradi imperatoris anno decimo, ac imperante tertio, haec gesta quae de pia memoriae pontifice Deodato scripta sunt, ad summum apostolice sedis apicem delata sunt, atque in provinciali synodo ejusdem sanctae Romanae ecclesiae est constitutum, ut in praesentia episcoporum, abbatum, clericorum et laicorum recitarentur. Et cum recitata fuissent, data auctoritate ab ipso summo Papa Leone, primo anno sui apostolatus, decretum est, quatinus in ecclesia Dei legerentur et firmissime servarentur; ad laudem et gloriam Domini nostri Iesu Christi, et honorem ipsius beatissimi patroni nostri Deodati, et ad edificationem multorum per cuncta saecula saeculorum’ (my punctuation). Another version with a number of spelling variants (e.g. *Henrico* and *Conradi*) and an added ‘nono’ after ‘Leone’ was published in Saint-Dié *grand provost* François DE RIGUET’s *Mémoires historiques et chronologiques pour la vie de S. Dié Evesque de Nevers et fondateur de l’Insigne Eglise collegiale de St-Dié en Lorraine*, Nancy, Charles et Nicolas Charlot, 1680, p. 45. Nearly identical is that by the Bollandist Daniel PAPEBROCHIIUS in *Acta Sanctorum* (henceforth AASS) *Junii* 3, Antwerp, Vidua Henrici Thieullier, 1701, p. 872-83 (p. 883). The latter edition was the exemplar for MIGNE’s version in PL 151, col. 634, which JASPER then used to re-edit the passage in *Die Konzilien*, p. 214. Presumably de Rigueu or someone before him had revised the orthography of the 1560 edition or the manuscript exemplar on which this was based; also see further, note 15.

⁴ The bibliography on the canonization procedure in the later Middle Ages is vast; see by way of introduction A. VAUCHEZ, *La sainteté en occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Âge d’après les procès de canonisation et les documents hagiographiques*, Rome, Ecole française de Rome, 1981; G. KLANICZAY, ed., *Procès de canonisation au Moyen Âge: Aspects juridiques et religieux*, Rome, Ecole française de Rome, 2004; and O. KRAFFT, *Papsttutkunde und Heiligsprechung. Die päpstlichen Kanonisationen bis zur Reformation. Ein Handbuch*, Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna, Böhlau, 2005.

993 the papacy became increasingly involved. On that occasion John also issued a bull, which described a procedure of three steps that were to be undertaken before a synod: namely, (a) a *petitio*, in which a local Church leader submitted a *libellus* with the saint's life and miracles; (b) an *informatio*, in which the contents were read aloud and discussed by the pope and the assembly; and (c) the *publicatio* or formal proclamation of the subject's sainthood.⁵ After John's death this procedure fell into disuse,⁶ but more than four decades later it was brought back for the canonization of up to three saints: Simeon of Trier by Benedict IX in 1035–39;⁷ (possibly) Wiborada of St Gall by Clemens II in early 1047;⁸ and Bishop Gerard of Toul by Leo IX on 2 May 1050.⁹

The similarities between these procedures and the added note at the end of the *Life* might give us the impression that Pope Leo had also declared Deodatus a saint. But specialists who looked at the circumstances and scope of the Rome synod have expressed strong reservations about the passage's authenticity. They have found it difficult to believe that the pope had interrupted the high-stakes proceedings of the Rome synod for a reading of an unremarkable hagiography of the 7th-century founder of the abbey of Saint-Dié, a collegial chapter in the wooded Vosges region of current-day eastern France. Likewise, they found it hard to imagine that the contents of Deodatus's *Life* had been submitted specifically to an audience that consisted mostly of ecclesiastical leaders and laymen from the Rome region, very few of whom would even have heard of the man. These misgivings led Monique Gouillet and Detlev Jasper to suspect that the added note was the product of

⁵ F. X. BISCHOF, 'Die Kanonisation Bischof Ulrichs auf der Lateransynode des Jahres 993', *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Augsburger Bistumsgeschichte*, 26/27 (1993), 197-222 and KRAFFT, *Papsturkunde*, p. 19-25. Dismissive of the bull as a forgery is G. G. WOLF, 'Die Kanonisationsbulle von 993 für den Hl. Oudalrich von Augsburg und Vergleichbares', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Kanonistische Abteilung*, 91 (2005), 742-57.

⁶ When Benedict VIII (1012-24) agreed to declare the sainthood of Simeon of Polirone, and when his successor John XIX (1024-32) did the same for Adalhard of Corbie, Bononius of Vercelli, and Romuald of Camaldoli, both Church leaders simply sent a letter to the local bishop or archbishop in which they gave permission to carry out an elevation or translation of the saint's remains; KRAFFT, *Papsturkunde*, p. 26-27.

⁷ A. HEINTZ, 'Der heilige Simeon von Trier. Seine Kanonisation und seine Reliquien', in *Festschrift für Alois Thomas. Archäologische, kirchen- und kunsthistorische Beiträge zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres*, Trier, Bistumsarchiv, 1967, p. 163-73 (p. 163-65) and KRAFFT, *Papsturkunde*, p. 28-44.

⁸ KRAFFT, *Papsturkunde*, p. 44 (with references to the older literature).

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 45-53; JASPER, *Die Konzilien*, p. 286-9; and BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 202-03, 263-64, and 493-96. During Leo's second journey as pope north of the Alps, on 21 and 22 October he carried out a translation of Gerard's body at Toul's cathedral and solemnly led all the ceremonies; BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 377-78.

a local forger at Saint-Dié who had mimicked an authentic canonization procedure in order to falsely inflate Deodatus's significance in the hagiographic and cultic traditions of the Catholic Church.¹⁰ Projecting a fictitious endorsement of the narrative specifically onto the papacy of Leo IX would have been an obvious choice for such an intervention. The canons of Saint-Dié nurtured a local tradition that the pope's ancestors had been major patrons of their institution in the early years of the 11th century,¹¹ and that Leo had been the chapter's high provost before becoming bishop of Toul (as Bruno, 1026–52).¹² This same tradition also claimed that Leo/Bruno had composed a responsory in honour of St Deodatus at some point after his promotion to bishop.¹³ Furthermore, the abbey archives contained two late 11th-century forgeries purporting to be bulls issued by Leo that exempted their institution from lay and clerical interference and directly subjected it to the Holy See.¹⁴ Goullet also implied that the note about the events at the Rome synod was probably added much later than the 11th century, by pointing out that it features in none of the surviving medieval copies of the *Life*,¹⁵

¹⁰ M. GOULLET 'Les saints du diocèse de Toul', in M. HEINZELMANN, ed., *L'hagiographie du Haut Moyen Âge en Gaule du Nord. Manuscrits, textes et centres de production*, Stuttgart, Thorbecke Verlag, 2001, p. 11-89 (p. 86-87) and JASPER, *Die Konzilien*, 208-09. Other commentators have expressed more nuanced views on the authenticity of the passage, its presumed exemplar, and its contents; see below, note 19.

¹¹ See further in this paper, at notes 64-65.

¹² P. BOUDET, 'Le chapitre de Saint-Dié en Lorraine des origines au seizième siècle', *Annales de la Société d'émulation du Département des Vosges*, 98 (1914-21), i-xxx and 1-109 and 99 (1922), 110-274 (p. 63) and BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 268. In the early modern period the abbatial church of Saint-Dié preserved several liturgical objects that (the canons claimed) had been owned by the pope. It also featured a wall painting that depicted the pope's donation of the 1049 privilege; M. BARTH, 'Der Kult Leos IX. in der Gesamtkirche', in L. SITTLER and P. STINZL, eds., *Saint Léon IX, le pape alsacien*, Colmar, Alsatia, 1950, p. 141-219 (p. 213) and D. PARMENTIER, *Eglise et société en Lorraine médiévale: Le chapitre et la collégiale de Saint-Dié*, Paris, Messene, 1997, p. 32 (facing) and 57.

¹³ H. HOESCH, *Die kanonischen Quellen im Werk Humberts von Moyenmoutier. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der vorgregorianischen Reform*, Cologne and Vienna, Böhlau Verlag, 1970, p. 24-25 and BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 95-96.

¹⁴ See the discussion at notes 19, 84, and 95.

¹⁵ Unless the editor of the 1560 edition forged the final paragraph himself (which in my opinion is the least likely of several possible scenarios), we must assume that he found it either in a separate document that was kept in Saint-Dié's archives or that it was already added to one or several manuscript copies of the *Life of Deodatus* in the chapter's library. Unfortunately no such documents or manuscripts have survived. The Saint-Dié canon Jean RUYR in 1594 reported that the chapter library still held an old legendary with a version of the *Life* that was divided into lections (*La vie et histoire de saint Dié, eveque de Nevers*, Troyes, Jean Oudot, 1594, referenced in AASS Junii 3, p. 870). Nearly a century later François DE RIGUET noted that the legendary was still

and that none of the medieval and (very) early modern authors who wrote about the collegial chapter's past and about Deodatus' cult prior refers to it.¹⁶ Indeed, its earliest known appearance is in the *editio princeps* of the *Vita Deodati* from 1560.¹⁷

at the collegial chapter and that it was more than five hundred years old (handwritten annotation in a copy of his own *Memoires*, p. 27, now in Nancy, Bibliothèque Stanislas, 17b; on de Rigueur's research see A. DIGOT, 'Eloge historique de François de Rigueur, grand-prévôt de l'église collégiale de Saint-Dié', *Mémoires de la Société royale des sciences, lettres et arts de Nancy* (1844), 93-154). This legendary was probably the same 12th-century manuscript in which the late eighteenth-century archivist François-Claude VUILLEMIN found the prologue of the *Life of Deodatus* (ed. by J.-B. L'HÔTE, 'Praefatio in Vitam S. Deodati Nivernensis episcopi', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 6 (1887), 151-60 (p. 157-60)) and which GOULLET tentatively identifies as the now incomplete codex Saint-Dié, Médiathèque Victor Hugo, 2 or 4 ('Les saints', p. 88-89, note 127). Presumably it did not contain the note on account of the fact that its version of BHL 2131 was an abridged one for liturgical use. A handful of extant manuscripts that were made for other institutions tell us nothing about when and how it was added to the original text either. A 15th-century legendary from Toul cathedral contains a copy of the *Life* that is missing the first three chapters and everything after the middle of chapter twenty-seven (Nancy, Bibliothèque Stanislas, 1732, fol. 17-24v, a 1624 copy of which is now preserved as Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Lat. 12862). Two late 15th-century legendaries, one of unknown origin and the other from the diocese of Utrecht (resp. Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 390, fol. 57v-62 and Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Theol. Lat. Fol. 730, fol. 80-84v), contain an abridged version of the *Vita* that omits the prologue and ends in the middle of chapter twenty-one (BHL 2132). An even more drastically abridged version in six lections (BHL vacat) appears in a number of late medieval liturgical manuscripts and legendaries from cathedral centres and monastic houses in the Lorraine, Vosges, and Alsace regions; T. BAUER, *Lotharingen als historischer Raum. Raumbildung und Raumbewusstsein im Mittelalter*, Cologne, Böhlau, 1997, p. 278-79, note 999. In his 1701 edition of the *Life* in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Papebrochius notes that the Bollandists own a copy of Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 390, fol. 57v-62, another one based on a manuscript from the library of the Friars Minor Capuchin in Paderborn, and yet another (again incomplete) that derives from a legendary owned by the regular canons of Böödeken in Paderborn (AASS *Junii* 3, p. 870). All three of these copies and the exemplars of the latter two are now presumed lost.

¹⁶ The most significant of these works are RICHER OF SENONES' c. 1260 *Gesta Senonensis ecclesiae*, ed. by G. WAITZ, MGH SS 25, Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1880, p. 253-345 (esp. the synopsis of St Deodatus's hagiography at p. 259-62, BHL 2133); Jean DE BAYON's 1326 *Chronicon Mediani in Monte Vosago monasterii*, ed. by A. CALMET, *Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Lorraine*, 4 vols, Nancy, Jean-Baptiste Cusson, 1728, 2, Preuves, cols lxii-xc; and JEAN HENQUEL's 1540s *Historia de antiquitatibus Vallis-Galileae*, ed. by Charles-Louis HUGO, *Sacrae antiquitatis monumenta historia, dogmatica, diplomatica*, vol. 1, Etival, Jean Martin Heller, 1725, p. 171-214.

¹⁷ *Beatissimi Deodati episcopi vita*, p. 27. Regarding the editorial history of the *Vita*, see GOULLET, 'Les saints', p. 83 and especially C. PFISTER, 'Les légendes de saint Dié et de saint Hidulphe', *Annales de l'Est*, 3 (1889), 377-408

On first sight the case against the authenticity of the added note in the *Life of Deodatus* seems overwhelming. And yet we should keep in mind that our understanding of the agenda of the Rome synod is extremely limited owing to the lack of an official record or any other comprehensive account of its proceedings. Then there is the problem that the note does not actually state that the procedure had included a *publicatio*. If the author's purpose truly was to show that Leo had proclaimed Deodatus a saint, this absence would have made it a curiously ineffective forgery of a canonization record. And finally, we also have reliable evidence that Deodatus's reputation and a version of his hagiography did actually penetrate into the Italian peninsula at this point or shortly afterwards. In a 1059–61 letter to Pope Nicolas II, Peter Damian gave a brief assessment of the man's life and virtues and referred to his 'truthful' biography.¹⁸ These three reasons compel us to at least allow for the possibility that the *Life* was discussed on the Rome synod and that Leo solemnly endorsed its contents, even if we were to find that the note derives from a formal-looking document that was produced after the fact by a local scribe at Saint-Dié.¹⁹ And as I hope to show in this paper, so does a bottom-up look at the circumstances in which the *Life* was conceived. In the first of four parts I discuss the emergence of a hagiographical memory of the saint and the way in which the 1040s creation of the *Life* has so far been interpreted. I then move on to a reconstruction of Saint-Dié's status in the 10th and early 11th centuries and the intense competition for control over its symbolic and economic resources by a range of lay and clerical stakeholders. In the third part we turn to the chapter's Provost Waldradus (fl. 1033–51), to consider how he and his canons responded to this struggle for control, and how the creation of the *Life* nearly two decades later is a fit with that response. And in the final part of the discussion, I consider Waldradus's reasons for submitting the text to the pope, and the latter's possible motives for promoting the hagiographical memory of Deodatus in an Italian context.

In doing all these things, this paper aims to contribute new arguments to the debate about the truth value of the added note in the *Life of Deodatus*. But in addition, it also hopes to contribute

and 536-588 (p. 551-52, note 1). Note however that neither scholar mentions the 1560 edition, which was reprinted in 1618 by the Nancy bookseller Jacques Garnich.

¹⁸ *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. by K. REINDEL, 4 vols (*Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (henceforth MGH) *Die Briefe der Deutschen Kaiserzeit* 4), Munich, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 1988), 2, no. 72, p. 351.

¹⁹ BÖHMER and FRECH suggest that the added note derives from a formal-looking document that might have originated during a late 11th- and early 12th-century campaign of diplomatic forgery at Saint-Dié; *Regesta imperii*, p. 153 and (on the forgery campaign) further in this paper, at notes 91-98. Note however that in contrast with GOULLET and JASPER (on whose views see note 10 above) neither these authors or (before them) PAPEBROCHIUS and PFISTER think that this is sufficient ground to assume that the events reported in the note did not take place; *AASS Junii* 3, p. 870-71 and 872 and 'Les légendes', p. 552-53.

to a trend in historical scholarship that aims to give collegiate chapters and the agency of their members greater prominence in discussions of religious life in the high Middle Ages. The last three decades have seen major advances in the study of communities of secular canons,²⁰ thanks largely to a number of ground-breaking regional case studies.²¹ However for the period up to the middle

²⁰ See the synthetic discussions in G. P. MARCHAL, 'Was war das weltliche Kanonikerinstitut im Mittelalter? Dom- und Kollegiatstifte: eine Einführung und eine neue Perspektive', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 94 (1999), 761-807 and 95 (2000), 7-53; P. MORAW, 'Stiftskirchen im deutschen Sprachraum: Forschungsstand und Forschungshoffnungen', in D. R. BAUER, S. ALBUS, L. SÖNKE, and O. AUGÉ, eds., *Die Stiftskirche in Südwestdeutschland: Aufgaben und Perspektiven der Forschung*, Leinfelden-Echterdingen, DRW Verlag, 2003, p. 55-71; B. MEIJNS, 'Les chanoines séculiers: Histoire et fonctions dans la société (IXe-XIIe siècle)', in C. ANDRAULT-SCHMITT and Ph. DEPREUX, eds., *Les chapitres séculiers et leur culture. Vie canoniale, art et musique à Saint-Yrieix (VIe-XIIIe siècle). Actes du colloque tenu à Limoges, Saint-Yrieix et Poitiers du 18 au 20 juin 2009*, Limoges: Presses Universitaires de Limoges, 2014, p. 15-30; and (by the same) 'Changing Perspectives on the History of Secular Canons in the Early and High Middle Ages: State of the Art and Areas of Further Research', in B. MEIJNS and M. CARNIER, eds., *De canonicis qui seculares dicuntur: Treize siècles de chapitres séculiers dans les anciens Pays-Bas*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2018, p. 15-36.

²¹ See among other studies those by F.-J. HEYEN, 'Das bischöfliche Kollegiatstift ausserhalb der Bischofsstadt im frühen und hohen Mittelalter am Beispiel der Erzdiözese Trier', in I. CRUSIUS, ed., *Studien zum weltlichen Kollegiatstift in Deutschland*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1995, p. 35-61; B. MEIJNS, 'L'ordre canonial dans le comté de Flandre depuis l'époque mérovingienne jusqu'à 1155. Typologie, chronologie et constantes de fondations et de réforme', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 97 (2002), 5-58; Ch. MÉRIAUX, 'Communautés de clercs et communautés de chanoines dans les diocèses d'Arras, Cambrai, Tournai et Thérouanne (VIIe - XIe siècles)', in L. SÖNKE and T. SOTZ, eds., *Frühformen von Stiftskirchen in Europa: Funktion und Wandel religiöser Gemeinschaften vom 6. bis zum Ende des 11. Jahrhunderts*, Leinfelden-Echterdingen, DRW Verlag, 2005, p. 251-86; A. MASSONI, 'Un nouvel instrument de travail pour la communauté scientifique: Le répertoire des collégiales séculières de France à l'époque médiévale', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 102 (2007), 915-39; R. LE BOURGEOIS-VIRON, A. MASSONI, and P. MONTAUBIN, eds., *Les collégiales et la ville dans la province ecclésiastique de Reims (IXe-XVIe siècles)*, Amiens, CAHMER. Centre d'archéologie et d'histoire médiévales des établissements religieux, 2010; H. CHOPIN, 'Les collégiales séculières de l'ancien diocèse de Lyon, du IXe siècle à la première moitié du XVIe siècle', in N. REVEYRON and C. GAILLARD, eds., *Architecture, décor, organisation de l'espace: Les enjeux de l'archéologie médiévale: mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art du Moyen Âge offerts à Jean-François Reynaud*, Lyon, Alpara, 2013, p. 123-30; J. S. BARROW, *The Clergy in the Medieval World: Secular Clerics, Their Families and Careers in North-Western Europe, c. 800-c. 1200*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2015, p. 269-309; A. MASSONI, 'Chanoines et chapitres séculiers dans la France médiévale', 3 vols (unpublished Habilitation à diriger des recherches, Université Jean Monnet, Saint-Etienne, 2015, summarized in (the same), 'Chanoines et chapitres séculiers dans la France médiévale', *Revue Mabillon*, NS 27 (2016), 348-52); E. KURDZIEL, 'Chanoines et institutions canoniales dans les villes du royaume

decades of the 11th century, most attention has traditionally gone to cathedral chapters, while the focus of research for the next period shifts to canonical reform and the emergence of a cohort of regular canons.²² In comparison, collegiate chapters remain under-represented in the current state of research. Furthermore, few studies have looked at the leadership strategies of the heads of such communities, or more generally at the positioning of their members in the social environment, their self-understanding as a religious cohort, or, finally, at their cultic and written practices.²³ While the absence of research into the former two areas reflects scholarly hesitance, the latter relates to the nature of the primary evidence, which seldom allows us to take an inner view of these places. For this reason, the Saint-Dié canons' well-documented efforts to position themselves literally and metaphorically in a hotly contested social and religious landscape deserve our close attention.

Deodatus and the Abbey of Vallis Galileae in Diplomatic and Hagiographical Memory

Both the biography of Deodatus (d. 679 according to tradition) and the specifics of his monastic foundation in a part of the Meurthe valley that was known as Galilea Valley (*Vallis Galileae*) are poorly documented. The 711–31 *Life* of Wilfrid of York refers to an *episcopus* named Deodatus who in 678 was part of the entourage of Merovingian King Dagobert II, and more than likely this is the same individual who is mentioned in the records of two councils held in Rome in 679/80.²⁴ Purporting to date roughly from the same years is a high medieval forgery of a privilege by Bishop Numerianus of Trier (646/47–before 697/98), which is addressed to Deodatus and describes the nature, properties, and privileges of the latter's monastic establishment.²⁵ While the extent to which

d'Italie, du milieu du IX^e au milieu du XI^e siècle' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université de Paris, 2015); and A. TRUMBORE JONES, "'The Most Blessed Hilary Held an Estate': Property, Reform, and the Canonical Life in Tenth-Century Aquitaine', *Church History*, 85 (2016), 1-39. Much older but still relevant for the focus of this study is Jean-François Lemarignier, 'Aspects politiques des fondations de collégiales dans le royaume de France au XI^e siècle', in *La vita comune del clero nei secoli XI e XII*, 2 vols, Milan, Vita et Pensiero, 1962, 1:19-40.

²² MEIJNS, 'Changing Perspectives', p. 31-32.

²³ See however A. TRUMBORE JONES, "'Customs Confirmed by Reason and Authority": The Function and Status of Houses of Canons in Tenth-Century Aquitaine', in M. FRASSETTO, M. GABRIELE, and J. D. HOSLER, eds., *Where Heaven and Earth Meet: Essays on Medieval Europe in Honor of Daniel F. Callahan*, Leiden, Brill, 2014, p. 101-21 (p. 117-20) and BARROW, *The Clergy*, p. 284-307.

²⁴ N. GAUTHIER, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle. La province romaine de première Belgique entre Antiquité et Moyen-Age (IIIe-VIIIe siècles)*, Paris, De Boccard, 1980, p. 303-04.

²⁵ BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 203-06. The palaeography of the pseudo-original points at a creation of the document (but not necessarily the text it contains) in the early 12th century; P. RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde des Basler

that document preserves elements of a late 7th-century original is hotly debated, it nevertheless allows us to establish the beginnings of the abbey as a small 660s-70s foundation that was dedicated to the Holy Virgin, Sts Peter and Paul, and the saintly bishops of Trier Eucharius, Valerius, Maternus, and Maximinus, and that soon also featured a church dedicated to the Theban martyr St Maurice.²⁶ The assumed origins of its estate as a former royal fisc also corresponds with a known strategy by 7th-century Merovingian rulers to hand over large royal properties in the western part of the Vosges region to recently founded monastic institutions (Senones, Etival, Moyeumontier, and Saint-Dié) and to assign to these places the task of cultivating the upper basin of the Meurthe River.²⁷ Also plausible are the claims from local tradition at Saint-Dié that a clerical ruler (either Numerianus or more likely Bishop Ebroinus of Toul)²⁸ granted the monks protection of their estate, the free election of abbots, liberty from the local bishop's jurisdiction and fiscal exactions, and the right to appeal to a bishop of their choice to consecrate churches, ordain priests, and arbitrate between the abbot and his monks.²⁹ Finally, given the abbey's proximity to major centres of 'Irish' or Columbanian monasticism it is possible (but far from certain) that the earliest members' observance was simultaneously influenced by the Benedictine and Columbanian monastic traditions.³⁰

Bischofs Rudolf für das Chorherrenstift Saint-Dié vom 27. Februar 1122', *Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde*, 74 (1974), 81-98 (p. 88).

²⁶ PFISTER, 'Les légendes', p. 379-95; E. EWIG, 'Beobachtungen zu den Klosterprivilegien des 7. und frühen 8. Jahrhunderts', in H. ATSMÄ, ed., *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien. Gesammelte Schriften*, 2 vols., Munich, Artemis, 1976-79, 1, p. 411-26; (by the same) 'Das Formular von Rebais und die Bischofsprivilegien der Merowingerzeit', *Ibid.*, 2, p. 456-84; GAUTHIER, *L'évangélisation*, p. 299-303; and BAUER, *Lotharingen*, p. 279. On the cult of St Maurice and the geographical distribution of early medieval sanctuaries dedicated to his name, see A. WAGNER, *Le culte des martyrs de la Légion thébaine dans l'Empire ottonien*, in N. BROCARD, F. VANNOTTE, and A. WAGNER, ed., *Autour de Saint Maurice. Actes du Colloque Politique, Société et Construction Identitaire: Autour de Saint Maurice, 29 septembre - 2 octobre 2009, Besançon (France), Saint-Maurice (Suisse)*, Saint-Maurice, Fondation des Archives Historiques de l'abbaye de Saint-Maurice, 2012, p. 405-17.

²⁷ F. PRINZ, *Frühes Mönchtum in Frankenreich. Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert)*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988 (2nd edition), p. 181-82 and RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 88.

²⁸ C.-E. PERRIN, *Recherches sur la seigneurie rurale en Lorraine d'après les plus anciens censiers (IXe-XIIe siècles)*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1935, p. 269, note 1.

²⁹ EWIG, 'Beobachtungen'; (by the same) 'Das Formular'; and GOULLET, 'Les saints', p. 85.

³⁰ As argued in M. GAILLARD, *D'une réforme à l'autre (816-934): Les communautés religieuses en Lorraine à l'époque Carolingienne*, Paris, Publications de la Sorbonne, 2006, p. 68 and Y. FOX, *Power and Religion in Merovingian Gaul: Columbanian Monasticism and the Frankish Elites*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2014, p. 97 and 166.

At some point in the early 8th century *Vallis Galileae* became a royal institution. King Pippin might have given the abbey to Bishop Jacob of Toul (756-67).³¹ And a charter by Charlemagne credibly states that he transferred the abbey as a personal gift to Abbot Falrad of Saint-Denis near Paris in 769; but afterwards it quickly regained its status as a royal property and is listed as such in the 870 Treaty of Meerssen.³² The treaty, which refers to the abbey by the vocable *sancti Deodati*, also tells us that Deodatus by that time had become the subject of a saint's cult.³³ However, we have no indications of any attempt from that period to draft an account of his life and legacy. He is briefly mentioned in the mid 10th-century *First Life* of St Hidulfus (the founder of the abbey of Moyenmoutier, also situated in the Galilea Valley) as an ex-bishop of Nevers, a spiritual associate of Hidulfus's, and a monastic founder.³⁴ The same passage also features in the *Third Life*, a *réécriture* of the *First Life* that was written probably in the early 1030s and that ended with a fiery sermon on the principal vices of that age.³⁵ Roughly a decade later, probably between 1039–47, the author of the *Third Life* issued a slightly redacted version, dropped the sermon, and appended to the new redaction another of his works, the *Libellus de successoribus sancti Hidulphi*, an abbey chronicle of Moyenmoutier that covers the years 703–1016.³⁶ Shortly afterwards the same or another monk of Moyenmoutier wrote the *Life of Deodatus*, a text of about 6500 words that massively amplifies the narrative tradition about the saint's biography and his monastic foundation.³⁷ In the prologue the

³¹ GAILLARD, *D'une réforme à l'autre*, p. 68-69.

³² M. PARISSÉ, 'Saint-Denis et ses biens en Lorraine et en Alsace', *Bulletin philologique et historique* (1967), 233-56 (p. 248-49) and A. J. STOCLET, *Autour de Fulrad de Saint-Denis* (v. 710-784), Genève, Droz, 1993, p. 93-97.

³³ Ed. by G. H. PERTZ, *MGH Leges 1*, Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1835, p. 517.

³⁴ *Vita prima sancti Hidulphi* (BHL 3945), ed. in *AASS Julii 3*, Antwerp, Jacobus du Moulin, 1723, p. 221-24 (p. 222), with commentary in GOULLET, 'Les saints', 70-75.

³⁵ *Vita tertia sancti Hidulphi* (BHL 3948-48b, first version, and BHL 3947, revised version), ed. in *AASS Julii 3*, Antwerp, Jacobus du Moulin, 1723, p. 228-38 (p. 232), with commentary in GOULLET, 'Les saints', p. 76-81.

³⁶ *Libellus de successoribus sancti Hidulphi* (BHL 3949), ed. by G. WAITZ, *MGH SS 4*, Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1841, p. 87-92 and J. THÉRY, 'Le libellus des successeurs de St Hidulphe' (unpublished master's thesis, Université de Paris I, 1994).

³⁷ *Vita sancti Deodati* (BHL 2131), ed. by L'HÔTE, 'Praefatio', p. 157-60 (prologue) and *AASS Junii 3*, p. 872-83 (main text). The former attribution of the *Third Life*, *Libellus*, and *Life of Deodatus* to Humbert of Moyenmoutier or to a mysterious monk named Valcandus is debunked in H.-G. KRAUSE, 'Über den Verfasser der Vita Leonis IX papae', *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 32 (1976), 49-85 (p. 56-58) and GOULLET, 'Les saints', p. 79-80 and 86.

author dedicates the work to Provost Waldradus of Saint-Dié and states that he composed it while he was hosted by the canons during the pentecostal season.³⁸

As a work of hagiography the *Life of Deodatus* is very much of its time.³⁹ The first part echoes the fascination that late 10th- and early 11th-century hagiographers had for the eremitical life, adult conversion, and the ability of monastic founders to interact in a mutually beneficial way with clerical and lay rulers. It recounts how the nobleman Deodatus became bishop of Nevers on account of his virtues, subsequently resigned from his office, and withdrew to the Vosges woods along with a few companions. Because of the resistance of local peasants he then crossed into the Alsace region, where he gained the support of nobleman Hunno and his spouse Hunna and was given the church of Hunawihr to support his eremitical initiative. Further resistance by locals made Deodatus move on once again to a riverside cave in the Vosges. With the help of a local nobleman he established a cell dedicated to St Martin, after which he received the estate of *Vallis Galileae* from the Merovingian King Childeric and built a monastery and a sanctuary on the site. After having placed in this church the relics he had received from the Trier Archbishop Hidulfus and having dedicated it to the Virgin Mary and the earliest archbishops of Trier, he subsequently governed the abbey from his hermitage. The *Life* then abruptly transitions into the second part, in which the author adopts another then-common approach to articulate contemporary concerns about the legal foundations of the abbey's estate and about the administration of its institutions, projecting these onto an early medieval past. After a brief discussion of Numerianus's privilege (which is attributed here to Hidulfus) and of privileges the abbey allegedly received from two Merovingian rulers, the author recounts how Hidulfus and Deodatus established a spiritual connection. This happened after Hidulfus had resigned his episcopacy, leaving the clerical state to found the nearby abbey of Moyenmoutier. Hidulfus and Deodatus agreed to hold yearly meetings of their respective communities, and established a confraternity between the two houses. After Deodatus died on 19 June 679, the author continues, Hidulfus led the two monasteries for another twenty-eight years; when the latter died, the two communities agreed to perpetuate their confraternity link. With that remark the original text of the *Life* ends.

So far there has been just one attempt to explain why the *Life* originated at this point in Saint-Dié's existence and to reconstruct the message it was meant to communicate. In a 2001 study

³⁸ L'HÔTE, 'Praefatio', p. 157-58. See also the discussion of the prologue in GOULLET, 'Les saints', p. 88-89.

³⁹ Notable commentaries on the text are those by PFISTER, 'Les légendes', p. 551-72; GAUTHIER, *L'évangélisation*, p. 304-06; GOULLET, 'Les saints', p. 81-89; and G. PHILIPPART and A. WAGNER, 'Hagiographie Lorraine (950-1130). Les diocèses de Metz, Toul et Verdun', in G. PHILIPPART, ed., *Hagiographies* 4, Turnhout, Brepols, 2006, p. 676-78.

the above-mentioned hagiologist Monique Goullet considered the author's insistence on the abbey's origins as a monastic institution, the close association between the two monastic founders and between their institutions, and Hidulfus's role as the second abbot of Saint-Dié. She suggested that this emphasis probably alludes to a joint plan at the time by Bishop Bruno of Toul (whom we already saw later became Pope Leo) and the Moyenmoutier Abbot Lambert (1039–62) to subject the collegiate chapter of Saint-Dié to a Benedictine reform, or possibly even to turn it into a priory of Moyenmoutier.⁴⁰ If her hypothesis were to be proven correct, it would mean that the plans of the two prelates either failed or were aborted, for we have no indication that the chapter was reformed, let alone turned into a dependent priory. However, a closer look at the *Life* and at the circumstances of its creation yields no substantial elements that would help us to corroborate Goullet's hypothesis. Indeed, as the work of a monastic outsider who was hinting at plans for a sweeping reform of the chapter's institutional and spiritual identity, the text fails to convince. Although it describes the earliest community of Saint-Dié as a monastic one, it contains none of the tell-tale references to a need for a restoration or renewal of convent life as we commonly find them in texts of the period.

Furthermore the relationship between the Moyenmoutier monks and Bruno/Leo appears to us as distant at best. Lambert arranged to have the newly built abbatial church dedicated by the bishop in June 1041.⁴¹ And when Bruno travelled through the region as pope-elect on his way to Rome in late 1048, he stopped at Moyenmoutier to dedicate a new chapel to John the Baptist.⁴² But apart from these actions we have no evidence of interventions by the prelate in the abbey's favour or of any visits to it following Leo's election, despite his known association with former Moyenmoutier monk Humbert and his well-documented involvement in the region's other religious institutions, both as bishop and as pope.⁴³ A plausible explanation for this may be found in the *Libellus*, which tells us that the monks held a grudge against Bruno's predecessor Berthold (995–1018) for deposing their Abbot Hardulf (1011–16). No such sentiments are documented with regard to Bruno, even though he deposed Hardulf a second time in 1026 (Hardulf had returned to power in 1019) and appointed as his replacement the Saint-Evre and Saint-Mansuy abbot, Widric.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ GOULLET, 'Les saints', p. 87.

⁴¹ Generally on Lambert's tenure, see L. JÉRÔME, 'L'abbaye de Moyenmoutier du IXe au XVIe siècle', *Bulletin de la Société philomatique vosgienne*, 24 (1898/99), 175–264 (p. 192–203).

⁴² *Gesta Senonensis ecclesiae*, ed. by G. WAITZ, MGH SS 25, Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1880, p. 249–345 (p. 280).

⁴³ J. OBERSTE, 'Papst Leo IX und das Reformmönchtum', in G. BISCHOFF and B.-M. TOCK, ed., *Léon IX et son temps: Actes du colloque international organisé par l'Institut Historique Médiévale de l'Université Marc-Bloch, Dagsbourg-Eguisheim, 20–22 juin 2002*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2006, p. 405–33.

⁴⁴ N. BULST, *Studien zu den Klosterreformen Wilhelms von Dijon (962–1031)*, Bonn, Röhrscheid, 1973, p. 103–04.

Conceivably the monks had felt similarly upset by this drastic intervention. But as we shall see further, it might also have been Abbot Lambert's own leadership style and actions (some of which went directly against the Toul bishops' involvement in his institution) that had cooled the relationship with Bruno/Leo.

Fortunately the *Life of Deodatus* contains several clues for an alternative, more tenable interpretation of the hagiographer's comments, one that gives the Saint-Dié canons more credit for shaping its discourse. Key among these clues is the reference in the text to the historical and then-ongoing relationship between Saint-Dié and Moyenmoutier as one of equal partners. At the time of writing the *Life* many such agreements, which originally focussed on mutual acts of commemoration and ritual collaboration, were retooled in order to facilitate exchange of personnel, resources, and leadership know-how.⁴⁵ More than likely the passage in Deodatus's biography was designed to indicate that Provost Waldradus and Abbot Lambert had recently struck a new confraternity agreement, or had revised an existing one with that purpose in mind.⁴⁶ But in order to understand why they had good reasons to foster such an alliance, we must first look at the way the destinies of the two institutions had been interlinked since the middle decades of the 10th century.

Competition and Deal-Making in the Late 10th and Early 11th Centuries

Moyenmoutier and Saint-Dié's status in the middle of the 11th century was shaped by long-term trends in the relationship between religious institutions in the diocese of Toul and their lay and clerical stakeholders. Complex political wrangling drove forward these trends, which began as early as the first decades of the 9th century and entailed the gradual insertion of monastic and clerical institutions into the episcopal *dominium*.⁴⁷ Depending on the context, that process of insertion generated considerable pushback by aristocratic agents, including by a bishop of Toul, Emperor Otto I, and Duke Frederic I of Upper Lotharingia. For instance, on their monastery's foundation by Bishop Gozelin of Toul in 938 the women religious of Bouxières received far-reaching protection from

⁴⁵ See by way of example H.E.J. COWDREY, 'Unions and Confraternity with Cluny', *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 16 (1965), 152-62 and S. LECOUEUX, 'La lettre du prieur R. de la Trinité de Fécamp au prieur Dominique de Saint-Bénigne de Dijon: Un témoin d'échanges multiformes au sein des réseaux de confraternité', *Revue bénédictine*, 127 (2017), 348-63.

⁴⁶ Until the middle of the 17th century the two communities met each year shortly after Pentecost near the chapel of Béchamp on a small hill overlooking the Meurthe River. There they deposited the remains of their respective founders and jointly attended mass; PFISTER, 'Légendes', p. 568-69 and BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 85.

⁴⁷ J. CHOUX, *L'épiscopat de Pibon (1069-1107). Recherches sur le diocèse de Toul au temps de la réforme grégorienne*, Nancy, Société d'archéologie lorraine, 1952, p. 25 and BAUER, *Lotharingien*, p. 266-81.

episcopal interference, as well as the right to freely elect an abbot, with a view to protecting Bouxières' intended status as a personal sanctuary for himself.⁴⁸ Another example concerns the abbeys of Moyenmoutier and Saint-Dié. In 959 Emperor Otto I transferred the two Galilea Valley institutions as a benefice to newly appointed Duke Frederic of Upper Lotharingia; five years earlier Frederic had actually obtained the two institutions from Count Hugo the Great as part of the dowry of his wife Beatrix, who was Hugo's sister.⁴⁹ In a then-common move to anchor one's lordship over a religious institution, in the early 960s Frederic brought in a monk from the abbey of Gorze named Adalbert, and told him to reform the resident community of clerics at Moyenmoutier into a Benedictine congregation.⁵⁰ According to the 13th-century chronicler Richer of Senones Frederic also intervened at the monastery of Saint-Dié, where Adalbert deputized a Moyenmoutier monk named Encherbert to be the new abbot. That latter project apparently ended in failure, allegedly due to Encherbert's mismanagement of resources. This prompted the duke to evict the incumbent abbot and all of his monks and establish a collegiate chapter.⁵¹ Pope Gregory V (996-997) subsequently confirmed the abbey's new status and established the function of provost and several dignities.⁵²

Despite these obstacles, Bishop Gerard of Toul (963–94) successfully drew these and other religious institutions within his sphere of influence. In the course of a process that took more than a decade around the 970s and early 980s, Gerard brought Moyenmoutier and Saint-Dié under his control. The story behind this is complex and dates back to the early 950s, when Frederic had established a fortress at nearby Bar to defend his territories against incursions from the Champagne

⁴⁸ Klaus OSCEMA, 'Zur Gründung des Benediktinerinnenklosters Notre-Dame de Bouxières. Eine wiedergefundene Urkunde des 10. Jahrhunderts', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 110 (2002), 182-90 (p. 188-90).

⁴⁹ Two decades earlier Hugo had claimed these and other properties in Lotharingia from the abbey of Saint-Denis; G. POUILL, *La maison souveraine et ducale de Bar*, Nancy, Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1994, p. 7-8.

⁵⁰ *Libellus de successoribus s. Hidulphi*, ed. by WAITZ, p. 89.

⁵¹ Richer of Senones, *Gesta Senonensis ecclesiae*, ed. WAITZ, p. 274-75; on this episode see the commentary by BULST, *Studien*, p. 103; M. PARISSE, 'Noblesse et monastères en Lotharinge du IX^e au XI^e siècle', in R. KOTTJE and H. MAURER, ed., *Monastische Reformen im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, Sigmaringen, Thorbeke, 1989, p. 166-99 (p. 186); and RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 88-89. On Richer's chronicle and its historical value see in first place D. DANTAND, *La Chronique de Richer de Senones. Présentation, édition et traduction* (unpublished PhD dissertation, Université de Nancy II, 1996).

⁵² *Papsturkunden in Frankreich. Neue Folge. 1. Champagne und Lothringen*, ed. by H. Meinert, Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1933, p. 177, no. 2. Discussed in Jean RUYR, *Recherche des saintes antiquitez de la Vosge, province de Lorraine*, Nancy, Jacques Marlier, 1625 (re-edition Epinal, Ambroise, 1634), p. 253 and PARMENTIER, *Eglise*, p. 57.

region. In the process, he had also taken several villages that belonged to the cathedral chapter of Toul. About two decades later Gerard successfully appealed to Otto I to receive justice for these usurpations. In response, the ruler apparently brokered a settlement in which Frederic agreed to compensate the bishop by giving him several properties and institutions, including the two abbeys.⁵³ Two authentic (but possibly interpolated) privileges document the transfer.⁵⁴ The first is dated 973 and recognizes the bishop's *dominium* over Moyenmoutier, which it asserts had been acquired by Gerard's predecessor Gozelin from Emperor Otto I 'in order to relieve the Church of Toul from its poverty'.⁵⁵ And in the second, from 974, the ruler states that the collegiate chapter of Saint-Dié had belonged to the bishopric ever since it had been given to it by King Pippin but had been lost due to the fraudulent usurpation by the 9th-century ruler Lothar I.⁵⁶

While the two charters make it look like Gerard had triumphed over his lay competitors, in reality his victory was delayed by the war-torn circumstances of the later 970s and ultimately came at a significant price. A 984 privilege by Otto III confirmed that Saint-Dié was now an episcopal institution. But it also stipulated that the now-dowager Duchess Beatrix and her son Theoderic, the new duke of Upper Lotharingia, would retain their income from, and the ducal *dominium* over, the two abbeys for life: in time the *dominium* evolved into a lay advocacy. Meanwhile Gerard only gained direct possession of the monastic buildings, ten *mansi* of each abbey, the tithe of a local silver mine, and the altar (and its associated income) of St Deodatus.⁵⁷ One scholar has suggested that the arrangement resulted from Beatrix's eagerness to retain control over her dowry.⁵⁸ While that might have been part of the reason, other and less personal motives surely had a greater impact. Analogously to what was happening in many other polities, in late 10th- and 11th-century Upper Lotharingia the dukes intended to either control or at the very least retain a major stake in secular chapters that were important pilgrimage sites, that served parish churches, and more generally speaking that staffed sanctuaries that were situated in places whose significance strategically or

⁵³ POULL, *La maison*, p. 11.

⁵⁴ E. BOSHOF, 'Kloster und Bischof in Lotharingien', in KOTTJE and MAURER, ed., *Monastische Reformen*, p. 197-245 (p. 228).

⁵⁵ *Die Urkunden der Deutschen Könige und Kaiser 2/1. Die Urkunden Otto des II. (MGH Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae)*, Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1888, no. 62, p. 71-73.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 99, p. 112-14.

⁵⁷ *Die Urkunden der Deutschen Könige und Kaiser 2/2. Die Urkunden Otto des III. (MGH Diplomatum regum et imperatorum Germaniae)*, Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1893, no. 2, p. 395-96, with commentary in PARISSE, 'Noblesse', p. 177-78 and POULL, *La maison*, p. 13.

⁵⁸ PARISSE, 'Saint-Denis', p. 250.

commercially was growing at the time.⁵⁹ Saint-Dié definitely fitted that description. Not only was it the most well endowed of the four Meurthe abbeys,⁶⁰ its location in the Galilea Valley also made it a site of high strategic importance. Furthermore it had a growing significance as a proto-urban centre and rural parish, and an expanding local economy based among other things on trade (a witness of which is the mention of a mint in Otto's 984 privilege) and copper and silver mining. All this made the abbey and its immediate surroundings a coveted asset, politically, economically, and symbolically.⁶¹

Unsurprisingly the 984 deal did not put an end to the efforts of the duchess and her son to regain their influence over the site and the resident community of canons. Richer of Senones reports an incident where Beatrix in 1003 came to Saint-Dié and announced that she would occupy the abbey and its estate if the canons and lay inhabitants refused to carry out an elevation of the body of Deodatus. On realizing they had no choice but to comply, they duly carried out the ritual, taking the saint's body from his grave in the abbatial church and placing it in a newly made shrine. This apparently mollified the dowager duchess, who subsequently worked with a count named Louis and several of her associates to enlarge and renew (*innovare*) the abbey.⁶² In 1326 the Moyanmoutier monk and chronicler Jean de Bayon added to this version, stating that Louis was in fact Count Louis of Dagsburg-Egisheim (the future Pope Leo's maternal grandfather) and that following the elevation ceremony he and Beatrix had patronized the abbey at the suggestion of Gerard's successor Berthold (995–1018).⁶³ And in the early 17th century, yet another local chronicler named Jean Ruyr further

⁵⁹ BARROW, *The Clergy*, p. 276-77. Between the end of the 10th century and the 1060s the bishops of Toul established two collegial chapters, one at Toul itself and another at Etival; CHOUX, *L'épiscopat*, p. 115-16 and G. BÖNNEN, *Die Bischofsstadt Toul und ihr Umland während des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, Trier, Trierer Historische Forschungen, 1995, p. 151-60. Generally on the foundation by bishops of such institutions, BARROW, *The Clergy*, p. 275-76.

⁶⁰ RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 89.

⁶¹ There is some debate over the question if Saint-Dié served as a mint for Bishop Robert of Toul (996) and Dukes Thierry I (978-1027) and Gerard (1048-70); J.-L. FRAY, *Villes et bourgs de Lorraine: réseaux urbains et centralité au Moyen Âge*, Clermont-Ferrand, Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal, 2006, esp. p. 392-93.

⁶² Richer of Senones, *Gesta Senonensis ecclesiae*, ed. by WAITZ, p. 276-77. In later centuries the elevation was remembered each year on 17 June; RUYR, *Recherche*, p. 286.

⁶³ Jean de Bayon, *Chronicon Mediani in Monte Vosago monasterii*, ed. CALMET, col. lxiv. On the author and his chronicle, see F.-R. DUPEUX, 'Notice critique sur Jean de Bayon', *Mémoire de la Société d'archéologie Lorraine*, 3rd s./7 (1879), 164-203 and 9 (1881), 182-196 and (on Bayon's testimony about the period that concerns us here) JÉRÔME, 'L'abbaye', p. 192-203. Jérôme indicates that Jean de Bayon conscientiously used his sources, but that his account of Moyanmoutier's past and that of the abbey's general region is lacunary due to the fact that he sought to insert its history and that of the Vosges region into a universal chronicle.

added that Berthold also persuaded Leo's parents, Hugo of Nordgau and his wife Hedwige of Dabo, to sponsor the restoration of the abbey church.⁶⁴

Richer's account is not backed up by any 11th-century evidence. And it may well have been amplified by the two later commentators to imply a personal relationship between Pope Leo and Saint-Dié.⁶⁵ Nonetheless, the event as reported in these texts matches a common pattern for the period in which the stakeholders in religious institutions relied on episodes of controlled violence and symbolic aggression in order to either assert their lordship or adjust their relationship to other stakeholders.⁶⁶ The *Libellus* reports a similar incident to that of 1003 at Saint-Dié, describing how Bishop Berthold in late 1010 came to Moyenmoutier in order to assert his *dominium* by taking away the relics that were enclosed in the abbey's old altar of St Peter. And about a decade later he also tried to take those of Sts Aza and Lazarus, whose remains were allegedly discovered at Moyenmoutier in 1014 by Bruno/Leo's mother Helwide.⁶⁷ Interventions of this type were often designed to trigger a process of negotiation and deal-making. Thus the reference to a collaboration between Beatrix, Louis, and Berthold to 'renew' the abbey may well be based on authentic memories of a negotiated deal in the wake of Beatrix's action. Another such deal is hinted at in the *Deeds of the Bishops of Toul* (written around 1100), which reports that Bishop Berthold acquired from Duke Theoderic some of the properties the bishopric had lost in Gerard's trade with Theoderic's father Frederic.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ RUYR, *Recherche*, p. 286-89. Generally on Leo's ancestors, F. LEGL, 'Die Herkunft von Papst Leo IX.', in BISCHOFF and TOCK, *Léon IX*, p. 61-76. Ruyr probably did not know about Jean de Bayon's chronicle and certainly did not use it for his own work. On his legacy as a researcher of Saint-Dié's past and the cult of St Deodatus and the reliability of his testimony about medieval sources that are now lost, refer to the discussion in Ch. CHAPELIER, 'Jean Ruyr, sa biographie et ses oeuvres', *Bulletin de la Société philomatique Vosgienne*, 16 (1890-91), 183-236 and BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 229.

⁶⁵ The plausibility of Beatrix's intervention is briefly argued in J.-N. MATHIEU, 'La lignée maternelle du pape Léon IX et ses relations avec les premiers Montbéliard', in BISCHOFF and TOCK, *Léon IX*, p. 77-110 (p. 80, note 17).

⁶⁶ Refer among many other studies to the classic paper by P. J. GEARY, 'Vivre en conflit dans une France sans Etat. Typologie des mécanismes de règlement de conflits (1050-1200)', *Annales*, 41 (1986), 1107-33.

⁶⁷ Helwide of Dagsburg had fled to Moyenmoutier in 1012 to escape from hostilities between Henry II and Bishop Thierry of Metz; JÉRÔME, 'L'abbaye', p. 181-84.

⁶⁸ *Gesta episcoporum Tullensium*, ed. by G. WAITZ, in *MGH SS* 8, Hanover, Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1848, p. 632-48 (p. 642).

This or another arrangement in turn made it possible for Berthold to intervene unhindered at Moyenmoutier, where (as we already saw) he deposed the incumbent Abbot Hardulf in 1016.⁶⁹ The same passage in the *Deeds* also suggests that the deal allowed Berthold to intervene at the former female house, now community of clerics, Bonmoutier, and also at Saint-Dié. But the details of these actions are sketchier than they are for Moyenmoutier.⁷⁰ The trade-off for Duke Theoderic, be it of this deal or any of the others in the early-to-mid 1010s, was double. On the one hand he was able to consolidate his control over the fortress at Bar. A 1022 charter describes how, in the late 10th century, one of his father's vassals, a man named Hezeb, had brought in the relics of St Mesme of Chinon, presumably in an attempt to launch a local cult and also to establish the newly founded church there as a site of pilgrimage. By the late 1010s Theoderic had installed a collegial chapter to serve the church, and shortly before the charter was drafted, Berthold agreed to come to the fortress and dedicate the sanctuary.⁷¹ Berthold's involvement undoubtedly signalled his acknowledgement that the dukes were to remain in control of the site and that they were now firmly in charge of a collegial chapter. And on the other hand, the bishop also acknowledged that the duke could henceforth legitimately claim the title of lay advocate of Saint-Dié, which is a state of affairs that was already inscribed in Otto's 984 privilege.⁷²

Considered together, these testimonies convey an image of a continuous cycle of controlled conflict, negotiations, and deal-making that spanned half a century between the 970s to early 1020s. Due to the fragmented nature of the evidence many elements in that story elude us, including the response of the canons of Saint-Dié. But beginning in the early 1030s, they abruptly emerge from documentary silence as active participants in the ongoing competition for control over their institution.

⁶⁹ JÉRÔME, 'L'abbaye', p. 178. The fact that Bishop Berthold sent Abbot Hardulf to the abbey of Saint-Evre to become the schoolmaster there suggests that the prelate's intervention was less about Hardulf's misconduct than about controlling Moyenmoutier's administration.

⁷⁰ *Gesta episcoporum Tullensium*, ed. by WAITZ, p. 643. On Bonmoutier's situation see M. GAILLARD, 'Aux origines de Saint-Sauveur: Le monastère de Bonmoutier du VII^e siècle au début du XI^e siècle', in C. GUYON and C. ANDRIOT, eds., *L'abbaye Saint-Sauveur-en-Vosges, mille ans d'histoire*, Nancy, Association d'historiens de l'Est, 2010, p. 31-36 (p. 36).

⁷¹ The charter is discussed and edited in A. CALMET, *Histoire de Lorraine*, 7 vols, Nancy: A. Leseure, 1745-57, 2, cols 123-24 and Preuves, cols ccl-llii; also see G. RENARD, 'Le château de Bar, autrefois et aujourd'hui', *Mémoires de la Société des lettres sciences et arts de Bar-le-Duc* Series, 3/5 (1896), 1-307 (p. 156-57) and POUILL, *La maison*, p. 19-20.

⁷² BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 30-31.

A range of post-1050 testimones give us a fairly good picture of the stakes at play in the canons' campaign. To begin with, we can tell that they were looking for ways to prevent appointed office-holders from claiming or siphoning off income that was earmarked to sustain the community and divine service at Saint-Dié. In his chronicle, Richer of Senones tells us that following the reform in the 960s, Abbot Encherbert (appointed by Abbot Adalbert and Duke Frederic) dispersed the abbey's properties, with the result that there was not sufficient left to feed the local monks. When the duke expressed his anger at this course of events, the chronicler continues, Encherbert tried to buy him off by dismantling the church treasure, ripping the precious metal from crosses and the gold thread from vestments and silken embroidery.⁷³ While the authenticity of this anecdote cannot be verified, its relevance to the canons' focus at the time of writing is confirmed in an 11th- or early 12th-century document that is known to scholars as the *Littera antiqua rectitudinum*. It decrees that the provost is entitled to a separate *mensa* but has no right to usurp or disperse any properties from the canons' table.⁷⁴ And the same restrictions are also imposed on 'anyone who controls the canons' prebend', by which is meant the bishop or his representative.⁷⁵

A second focus for the canons at Saint-Dié was on claiming back the rights and parts of the abbey's estate that were controlled by the lay advocate and the Toul bishop, and on keeping the rest strictly separated from their jurisdiction and the canons' table. Beginning with a 1092 bull by Clemens III, several charters for the abbey refer in general terms to properties it owns in Alsace, none of which are mentioned in any earlier charters.⁷⁶ These references become much more specific in documents that were issued in the wake of an 1115–23 agreement between Duke Simon of Lorraine and Provost Rambaud of Saint-Dié over their respective income and jurisdiction in the Galilea Valley.⁷⁷ From that time onwards several episcopal and papal charters granted Saint-Dié several rights in Alsace, including among other things a fourth of the tithes levied in the villages of

⁷³ Richer of Senones, *Gesta Senonensis ecclesiae*, ed. by WAITZ, p. 275.

⁷⁴ Beginning in the middle of the 12th century the dukes (who had controlled the abbey from 1135 onwards) often appointed a son or relative as the chapter's provost; BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 41 and 92 and Parmentier, *Eglise*, p. 20.

⁷⁵ Edited in C. PFISTER, 'Les revenus de la collégiale de Saint-Dié à la fin du Xe siècle', *Annales de l'Est*, 2 (1888), 514-42 (p. 515-18), with corrections in (the same), 'Les légendes', p. 407-08 and discussion in PERRIN, *Recherches*, p. 269-317 and RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 91.

⁷⁶ Edited in BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 213 and commented on in RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 89-90.

⁷⁷ Edited by CALMET, *Histoire de Lorraine*, 5, Preuves, cols cxxxiii-iv; also refer to the discussion in BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 36-38.

Hunawihr, Mittelwihr, and Ingersheim.⁷⁸ According to Charles-Edmond Perrin this indicates that the dukes had claimed all of the abbey's properties in that region as part of the deals done in the 970s or 980s.⁷⁹ And presumably this also means that the agreement between Simon and Provost Rambaud extended further than is described in the charter, or that another agreement about more distant estates was struck shortly afterwards. While these documents seemingly tell us nothing about the canons' position during Provost Waldradus's lifetime, as we shall see below they provide information that is essential to understand the focus of the *Life of Deodatus*.

And the same is true for the canons' third major focus in their campaign for control of their institution: Saint-Dié's cultic identity. Up to the middle of the 11th century the abbatial church was still dedicated to St Maurice, whose cult had become strongly associated with Ottonian and early Salian rule.⁸⁰ Richer's above-mentioned report of their response to the dowager Beatrix's demand that they elevate the body of St Deodatus likely refers to authentic memories about how the Saint-Dié canons and members of the local lay community had resisted attempts to turn Saint-Dié into a representative site of dynastic power. Presumably they had realized that Beatrix was looking to force a change of patronym in order to mark a symbolic shift in the site's lordship, and for that reason were reluctant to comply with her demands. And possibly they were also concerned about a possible action such as that by Bishop Berthold at Moyenmoutier, and about their ability over the long term to retain Deodatus's cult at Saint-Dié and to control the narrative tradition about his institutional and spiritual legacy. Such concerns explain why Waldradus in the middle of the century took steps to organize Deodatus's elevation as patron of his institution and to consolidate his hagiographic memory in a version that suited the canons' interests.

How Waldradus pursued these objectives and what circumstances enabled him to do so can be inferred from circumstantial evidence. Conceivably the 1010s deal between Bishop Berthold of Toul and Duke Theoderic had created the momentum for the subsequent appointment of an energetic leader from the bishop's own circle or that of his successor Bruno. Waldradus's collaboration with Bruno allows us to tentatively assume that the two had previously worked

⁷⁸ RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 91-96.

⁷⁹ PERRIN, *Recherches*, p. 304-05.

⁸⁰ G. SAVE and C. SCHULER, 'L'église de Saint-Dié. Première partie. Notice historique jusqu'au XIII^e siècle et monographie de l'église Notre-Dame', *Bulletin de la Société philomatique Vosgienne*, 8 (1882-83), 31-114 (p. 44). Already in the late 17th century François DE RIGUET noted that some of the high medieval evidence (notably a forgery of a 1049 privilege by Leo IX, on which see further at note 84) still refers to the abbey not by its vocable Saint-Dié but by its old name *Vallis Galilea*; *Mémoires historiques et chronologiques pour l'insigne église de Saint-Diey en Lorraine*, ed. by A. CONTAL in a supplementary issue of *Bulletin de la Société philomatique vosgienne* 58 (1932), Saint-Dié, C. Cuny, 1932, p. 96.

together, for instance while the former was a cleric at Toul cathedral. Whatever the true circumstances of his coming to power at Saint-Dié, there is no question that the new provost soon came up with a plan to confront the community's lay and clerical stakeholders. Contingency determined the timing of his actions, which was long obscured due to the problematic transmission of the charter evidence but was eventually established thanks to the work of Charles-Edmond Perrin. In 1033 Waldradus and his canons saw an opportunity in the death of Duke Frederic III and the impending dynastic switch on the ducal throne of Upper Lotharingia to plead their case with the incumbent Toul bishop. Waldradus travelled to the imperial court, where he obtained a charter issued by Bishop Bruno that confirmed the community's control over its properties and its serfs and that described in detail the rights and incomes to which the lay advocate was entitled.⁸¹ And a decade-and-a-half later, possibly in December 1048 but certainly no later than 1054, he travelled again to the emperor's court to complain to the ruler about the exactions of the current lay advocate, Duke Gerard of Lotharingia.⁸² The emperor's sentence acknowledged the canons' plight and once again outlined the lay advocate's duties and rights.⁸³ The fact that he had arranged for Bruno's election as the new pope (and that the initial decision fell precisely in December 1048) surely played a role in the timing and nature of Waldradus's request. And so did Bruno's own new status as the leader of the Catholic Church, which is surely what subsequently triggered Waldradus to request a papal privilege. That latter document, only a later forgery of which survives, was allegedly issued on 16 November 1049 and recognized Gerard of Alsace as the abbey's advocate, granted the abbey full exemption from episcopal control, and subjected it directly to the Holy See.⁸⁴ The same circumstances also provide us with the context for Waldradus's endeavour to elevate Deodatus as patron of his institution and to once and for all claim the saint's cult on behalf of the canons of Saint-Dié.

The late 1040s redaction of the main text of the hagiography is a good fit with Waldradus's approach at the time, which consisted of discreetly planning his moves and then judiciously waiting for the right moment to act. Even though it seems unremarkable at first sight, several clues tell us

⁸¹ The text of the original charter was worked into a later forgery of a 1051 bull by Pope Leo; edited in BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 206-12 and discussed in PERRIN, *Recherches*, p. 280-84; RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 93; and BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 404-05. On a spurious local tradition that claims that Bruno had been a provost of Saint-Dié prior to being elected as bishop of Toul, see among others RUYR, *Recherche*, p. 254-55 and DE RIGUET, *Mémoires*, p. 92-94.

⁸² This document was also worked into the 1051 forgery; see the above note.

⁸³ BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 32-34.

⁸⁴ Edited Ibid., p. 206-08 and discussed in PERRIN, *Recherches*, p. 285-86 and especially BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 266-68.

that the author was subtly hinting at key aspects of the provost's policies. For instance, the passage about Deodatus's Alsace patrons Hunno and Hunna, and their donation of the church of Hunawihr in Alsace, arguably alludes to the canons' plans to claim back these and other lost properties.⁸⁵ It also refers to Hunna as a 'saintly spouse' (*conjunx sancta*), which suggests that the canons were not simply looking to recuperate the estate. Indeed, it is possible that they were also out to establish the local church (where she was buried) as a focus of pilgrimage and possibly even planned to one day create a subsidiary institution of Saint-Dié there.⁸⁶ Another key passage mentions Bishop Numerianus/Ebroinus's 7th-century privilege, which on the one hand refers to the canons' ambition to keep the local bishop at bay, but on the other avoids controversy by attributing the document not to Leo's predecessor at Toul but to that prelate's superior in Trier.⁸⁷ And the third and by far most explicit hinted reference to Waldradus's policies is the passage concerning confraternity with Moyennmoutier. As we already saw, Waldradus and Lambert's agreement points at a desire to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between the two institutions and exchange expertise on how to establish these places as more independent entities.

Only one outcome of the association between Saint-Dié and Moyennmoutier, the authorship by a Moyennmoutier monk of the *Life of Deodatus*, is known to us. But we can learn more by looking at how Waldradus and Lambert's contemporaries and institutional neighbours, Abbess Oda of Remiremont (before 1045–65/70) and Abbot Gerard of Luxeuil and Lure, joined forces in the late 1040s and early 1050s. Gerard benefited from the link with Oda as it helped him to gain access to the pope and obtain exemption privileges for his two institutions. For her part, Oda relied on the expertise at Luxeuil and Lure to successfully lobby for an exemption privilege for her own institution and launch a campaign of diplomatic forgery. In addition she launched a plan promoting the sainthood of her institution's founders, and commissioned at least three hagiographical narratives that reflected her ambitions in all of these respects.⁸⁸ This collaboration between Gerard and Oda in turn sheds light on how Waldradus might have looked on Lambert's leadership at Moyennmoutier. Among other things, Lambert carried out a translation of Sts Aza, Lazarus, and the Theban martyr

⁸⁵ A.-M. BURG, 'Sainte Hune: Sa légende, son historicité et son culte', *Archives de l'église d'Alsace*, 1 (1946), 27-74 (p. 38-43).

⁸⁶ *Vita Deodati*, ed. in AASS Junii 3, p. 875. An unpublished 1758 manuscript reports that Leo in 1050 carried out an elevation of St Hunna at the abbey of Ebersmunster and subsequently gave the canons an arm relic of the saint and another relic of Bishop Gerard; SAVE and SCHULER, 'L'église', p. 44-45.

⁸⁷ *Vita Deodati*, ed. in AASS Junii 3, p. 876.

⁸⁸ See now the reconstruction of the two leaders' collaboration and of Oda's tenure in S. VANDERPUTTEN, "'Against the Custom". Hagiographical Rewriting and Female Abbatial Leadership at Mid-Eleventh-Century Remiremont', *The Journal of Medieval Monastic Studies*, 10 (2021), 44-66.

Bonifatius and was able to regain control over a significant portion of the monastic estate. Furthermore he fostered intellectual life at the abbey: its active authors included Humbert of Moyenmoutier (who apparently composed poetry in honour of several saints, including Deodatus) and the anonymous writer or writers who composed the revised *Third Life of Hidulfus*, the *Libellus*, and the *Life of Deodatus*.⁸⁹ Waldradus would have been keen to learn more about how Lambert went about doing all these things. And for his part, Lambert must have been glad to work with an institutional ally who shared his focus on having religious communities stand their ground in the ferocious competition for control over the politically, economically, and symbolically valuable Galilea valley. And Lambert might also have relied on Waldradus as a proxy to establish a kind of beneficial relationship with a prelate who may well have been reluctant to deal directly with the Moyenmoutier monks. Reports of a possible canonization of St Hidulphus in late 1049 (discussed further in this paper) might speak to this interpretation, which reminds us of how Gerard probably relied on Oda to obtain Leo's favours.

It would have made eminent sense for Waldradus to seek Pope Leo's implied endorsement of all the objectives that are referenced in the *Life of Deodatus*. If some of these were not met within his lifetime, then it was because the other competitors over his institution's material and symbolic resources were far from willing to cede their place. This is why, beginning in later decades of the 11th century, the canons turned to the weapon of diplomatic forgery. Spurred on perhaps by a fire in 1065 that reduced much of the abbey to ashes⁹⁰ or by an authentic bull by Pope Clemens III from 1092 (which awarded them papal protection and generally confirmed their possessions),⁹¹ the canons created a series of documents that suited their goals.⁹² Two of these originated in the context of a campaign by the bishops of Toul to disenfranchise their institution.⁹³ In the first they took Ebroinus's charter (which we saw awards freedom to elect a provost; exemption from fiscal and juridical interference by the bishop; and freedom to pick a bishop for ordinations and consecrations)

⁸⁹ JÉRÔME, 'L'abbaye', p. 192 and 195-98.

⁹⁰ GUINOT, 'Les saints', p. 199.

⁹¹ Edited in BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 213-15 and discussed in CHOUX, *L'épiscopat*, p. 146.

⁹² RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 92-94. For comparison, see E. KURDZIEL, 'Au prisme des faux. Clergé, compétition pour les ressources et falsification en Italie du Nord et du Centre (XIe-XIIe siècles)', in G. BÜHRER-THIERRY, R. LE JAN, and V. LORÉ, eds., *Acquérir, prélever, contrôler: Les ressources en compétition (400-1100)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2017, p. 249-80 and more generally L. ROACH, *Forgery and Memory at the End of the First Millennium*, Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2021.

⁹³ RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 96. A forgery of a 1051 bull by Leo lists the abbey among the episcopal monasteries of Toul; it is edited in J. CHOUX, 'Les bulles de Léon IX pour l'Eglise de Toul', in H. COLLIN, ed., *Lotharingia 2: Archives lorraines d'archéologie, d'art et d'histoire*, Nancy, Société Thierry Alix, 1990, p. 17-19.

and produced a version which they ascribed to Bishop Numerianus of Trier.⁹⁴ And in the second they bolstered this document's claims by issuing an interpolated copy or forgery of Leo's above-mentioned bull from November 1049.⁹⁵ Besides the abovementioned circumstances these documents may have originated in the context of efforts to obtain several papal privileges in the 1120s and early 1130s that (besides confirming the abbey's properties) progressively extended the abbey's freedom from episcopal fiscality and juridical interventions.⁹⁶ Two further forgeries addressed the difficulties with the abbey's lay advocate. One collated the key contents of the 1033 and 1048–52 charters (discussed above) into a forgery of a papal bull by Leo, dated 25 January 1051.⁹⁷ The other, purporting to be by Emperor Henry IV and dated 1092, rehearsed the intention in these earlier documents to keep the abbey's lay advocate in check.⁹⁸ The scope and ambition of these forgery campaigns are certainly impressive. Conceivably the added note in the *Life of Deodatus*, or the composition of a separate document with an official-looking report of the pope's endorsement, emerged during one such campaign. And as R. Aubert suggested, it is even possible that some of the abovementioned significant passages in the main text of the *Life* were interpolated at this point in the original mid-eleventh-century text.⁹⁹ But even if either of these hypotheses were to

⁹⁴ BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 71-72. Compare with the comments on Luxeuil's 7th-century exemption privilege in L. MORELLE, 'La liberté de Luxeuil et son expression diplomatique. À propos d'une charte épiscopale absente et d'un privilège pontifical encombrant (Jean IV, 640-642)', in S. BULLY, A. DUBREUCQ, and A. BULLY, eds., *Colomban et son influence: Moines et monastères du haut Moyen Âge en Europe*, Rennes, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2018, p. 239-49, and those on forgery at 11th-century Luxeuil in S. VANDERPUTTEN, "'Columbanus wore a single cowl, not a double one". The *Vita Deicoli* and the Legacy of Columbanian Monasticism at the Turn of the First Millennium', *Traditio*, 75 (2021), 157-82.

⁹⁵ Edited in BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 206-08 and discussed in PERRIN, *Recherches*, p. 285-86 and BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 266-68.

⁹⁶ BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 71-72 and 77. From 1126 the canons each year paid a gold denarius to the pope as a token of their direct submission to the Holy See; Parmentier, *Eglise*, p. 20.

⁹⁷ Edited in BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 206-12 and discussed in PERRIN, *Recherches*, p. 280-84; RÜCK, 'Die Urkunde', p. 93; and BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, p. 404-05. Note that the 1051 forgery contradicts the full exemption from episcopal interference that Leo had granted according to the 1049 forgery.

⁹⁸ Edited in *Die Urkunden der Deutschen Könige und Kaiser 6. Die Urkunden Heinrichs IV. 2*, ed. by D. VON GLADISS and A. GAWLIK, Weimar, Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1959, no. 428, p. 573-75 and discussed in BOUDET, 'Le chapitre', p. 34-35; PERRIN, *Recherches*, p. 280-281; and BAUER, *Lotharingien*, p. 281.

⁹⁹ R. AUBERT, 'Art. Dié', in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, vol. 14, Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1960, cols 435-36 (col. 436, where he claims that the extant version of the *Life of Deodatus* is a heavily interpolated version of an original early eleventh-century text). I share Gouillet's view that the references to the confraternity with Moyennoutier and the properties in Alsace and Lorraine match the context of a redaction in

be proven correct, the assumption that Provost Waldradus sought Leo's endorsement of the *Life of Deodatus* remains likely, for two reasons. The first was because of the Saint-Dié chapter's self-understanding; the second was the community's ambition to gain control over the institutional and spiritual legacy of their alleged founder.

Leo IX's Endorsement of the Life

Based on the above observations we can formulate the following reconstruction. In the late 1040s (possibly in the Spring of 1048), Waldradus benefited from the alliance with Moyenmoutier and the hagiographical expertise available there, by having someone draft an account of the life of founder Deodatus. The resulting text claimed the saint's cultic and institutional legacy for the incumbent community of canons, and also hinted at the provost's key policies in securing the chapter's independent status and financial security. Soon after Bruno was elected as the new pope, Waldradus sent him the *Life* and presumably also other materials (for instance about the monks' alienated properties) to make his case. Leo responded by publicly endorsing the text in April 1049 and by issuing a now-lost bull on his first visit back to the Toul diocese on 16 November. According to a local tradition from Saint-Dié (first reported by Jean Ruyr in the early 17th century), on that day he also visited the abbey and blessed several altars in the new church, which had been under construction since the early years of the 11th century. And at the request of Humbert of Moyenmoutier and Provost Waldradus of Saint-Dié, he also carried out an elevation of Sts Deodatus and Hidulfus.¹⁰⁰ Leo had previously used this same canonization procedure (albeit without a previous discussion at a synod in Rome) for Bishop Remigius of Reims on 1 October of that year and Empress Richardis at

the late 1040s; 'Les saints', p. 87.

¹⁰⁰ RUYR, *Recherche*, p. 255: 'Lequel (Deodatus) il canoniza de mesme voye avec S. Hydulphe, par l'instruction de l'Abbé Humbert, et Valdradus Grand Prevost'. The absence of any reference to an elevation ceremony at the end of the *Life of Deodatus* or in any hagiographic works about Hidulphus casts doubt on Ruyr's statement. But on the other hand, the indications of tensions between Moyenmoutier's leadership and Leo do make the claim about a canonization of Hidulphus at Saint-Dié instead of at Moyenmoutier (which Leo definitely did not visit) at least somewhat credible. And further in this paper we shall see that there are indications that Hidulphus's hagiographical memory was also recognized in reformist circles around Leo in Rome alongside that of Deodatus, which lends credence to the notion of a joint promotion of the cults of the two saints and arguably even that of a joint canonization.

Andlau on 10 November, and would do so again for Bishops Erhard and Wolfgang of Regensburg in October 1052.¹⁰¹

No doubt the canons viewed Leo's actions as expressing his approval not just of the saint's hagiography, but also of the particular direction Provost Waldradus was planning to take in his leadership of Saint-Dié. Furthermore we may reasonably suspect that Leo intended it to be understood in that way. An analogous case emerges from the contemporary 'canonization' of three saints at Abbess Oda's institution of Remiremont. According to the 16th-century chronicler Sébastien Valdenaire, Oda visited Pope Leo when he was at Toul in early fall 1049 and obtained his permission to organize a solemn translation of Sts Amatus, Romaric, and Adelphius. She also ordered at least three new hagiographies, which a recent study argued were made prior to the elevation ceremony on 11 November 1049 and which might have been submitted to Leo for approval.¹⁰² The pope did not attend the ceremony (despite being in the region of Remiremont), instead deputizing the archbishop of Besançon Hugo of Salins and *primicerius* Udo of Toul.¹⁰³ And we do not know if he actually ever saw Remiremont's new hagiographies. However, his support of Oda's promoting of the three saints' cult definitely did signal his endorsement of her as a religious leader who was ambitious to set the administration of their institution on a more independent footing. The fact that her ambitions are hinted at in these new texts is telling in this respect.¹⁰⁴

Similarly Leo would surely have been aware of the implied agenda of the *Life* of Deodatus, which (we saw earlier) besides being created as part of a general attempt to establish the canons' control over the saint's cult also made several veiled references to Provost Waldradus's governance strategies and goals. However, this reconstruction leaves one question unanswered. What inspired the newly installed pope to table Deodatus's hagiography at a synod in Rome if he did not intend to declare him a saint (as he presumably did for Bishop Gerard of Toul) on that same occasion? The question becomes even more pertinent in light of a local tradition that we have seen claims that he carried out an elevation of the saint's remains in November 1049. Had Leo been looking for an opportunity to broadcast the *Life's* message to the entire Catholic Church, a message about the

¹⁰¹ G. SCHWAIGER, Die Kanonisation Bischof Wolfgangs von Regensburg (1052), *Beiträge zur altbayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, 27 (1977), 225-33 (p. 230-32); Krafft, *Papsturkunden*, 44; and BÖHMER and FRECH, *Regesta imperii*, 202-3, 263-64, and 493-96.

¹⁰² *Registre des choses mémorables de l'église de Remiremont*, Nancy, Bibliothèque Municipale, 358, fols 188r-v. On Oda's leadership approach and the relevance of Valdenaire's testimony, see now VANDERPUTTEN, 'Against the Custom'.

¹⁰³ J. BRIDOT, ed., *Chartes de l'abbaye de Remiremont des origines à 1231*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1997 (2nd edition), no. 18, p. 58-59.

¹⁰⁴ VANDERPUTTEN, 'Against the Custom'.

canons' campaign for greater independence? But if that were the case, was this message not too implicit to have much of an impact? Was Leo instead looking to organize a dress rehearsal of sorts for the next year's canonization of Bishop Gerard at another Rome synod (on 2 May 1050) and the saint's subsequent elevation later that year? Or should we rather look to the *Life*'s idealized portrayal of a cleric who chooses a life of ascetic withdrawal and ultimately becomes a monastic founder and be linking this to the synod's controversial agenda? While all these things sound plausible and may well have simultaneously influenced Leo's decision, there is yet another way in which the *Life* was meaningful to him at this early stage of his papal tenure.

To understand this further motivation, we must return to Peter Damian's letter to Pope Nicholas II, mentioned at the beginning of this paper. In the section that precedes his praise of Deodatus Peter likewise lauds St Hidulphus, and at much greater length. From this we can infer that the transfer across the Alps of Deodatus's hagiography had likely occurred in tandem with the contemporary and much more inflammatory *Third Life* of St Hildulfus.¹⁰⁵ This text, which contains a number of trenchantly critical passages on married and simoniac clerics, directly addressed a number of concerns that were central to Leo and his inner circle of reformers.¹⁰⁶ And the earlier of two versions of the *Third Life* notoriously ended with a sermon *Contra depravatos saeculi mores*, a lengthy argument about the evils of simony, the crimes of disgruntled subordinates, and the need to venerate the saints not with drunken roars but with self-abnegation.¹⁰⁷ It is certainly possible, given all that we have seen above, that the *Life* of Deodatus travelled to Rome as part of a set of documents with those other texts, the contents of which would surely have been eagerly consumed and promoted by reform-minded agents. Jean Ruys's report about a joint 'canonization' of Deodatus and Hidulfus in late 1049 gives added strength to this hypothesis. And so does the *Life of Deodatus*'s emphasis on a close collaboration between Waldradus and Lambert, which might have given the latter the opportunity to obtain favours from a pope who (for reasons discussed above) might otherwise have been unwilling to support Moyenmoutier. Conceivably, they were brought to the pope's attention by Humbert of Moyenmoutier, who for obvious reasons could have easily procured a copy of all three texts. Or maybe Waldradus made the arrangements, acting on his own and Lambert's behalf with the support of Humbert.

Were the *Third Life* and the sermon also read aloud and discussed at the Rome synod, and did the pope laud Hidulfus's hagiographic memory as he did Deodatus's? Or were the *Third Life* and

¹⁰⁵ *Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. by REINDEL, 2, no. 72, p. 350-51.

¹⁰⁶ *Vita tertia sancti Hidulfi*, ed. in *AASS Julii* 3, p. 229 (c. 4) and especially p. 230 (c. 8).

¹⁰⁷ A. MICHEL, 'Die Invectio Humberts an seine Mitmönche (1044)', *Orientalia christiana periodica*, 21 (1955), 284-90.

sermon merely a part of a set of letters, treatises, and other documents that were circulated in circles linked to the papal court, and was only the *Life* of Deodatus tabled because Leo specifically wanted to support Waldradus's campaign? The state of the evidence allows us to answer none of these questions. But Ruyr's claim that Leo declared Hidulphus and Deodatus saints in tandem; Peter's letter; the institutional and chronological links between the Moyenmoutier texts and the *Life*; and the context in which Waldradus directed his request to the pope for support of Saint-Dié's hagiographic endeavour: all these things help us at least get a sense of the complex reasons why the 7th-century founder of a collegiate chapter in the Vosges spent a fleeting few moments in the spotlight of the Roman Church.

Conclusions

In this paper I adopted a bottom-up perspective on the creation of the late 1040s *Life of Deodatus* to explain and contextualize the added statement at the end of the narrative that it had been read at a Rome synod and subsequently endorsed by Pope Leo. While some scholars suspect that this later addition is a forgery, the note emerges from the analysis in these pages as a hitherto unsuspected testimony of how the then-incumbent leader of the collegial chapter of Saint-Dié rolled out a strategy of self-defence against its lay and clerical stakeholders, and sought the emperor and pope's endorsement of that strategy in a variety of ways. Short-term aims were addressed in major privileges; and long-term ones were discreetly embedded in the *Life*. Pope Leo's response to this request for endorsement undoubtedly reveals his sympathies for the canons' objectives, but it may also have something to do with the broader ideological context in which the text emerged and subsequently circulated in reformist circles.

Steven Vanderputten

Vakgroep Geschiedenis – Universiteit Gent

Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 35 – 9000 Gent – Belgique

Steven.Vanderputten@ugent.be