

Chapter 1

IVO OF CHARTRES – ‘LIFE AND LETTERS’?

‘SCRIPSIT AD DIVERSOS AMICOS UTILES
 VALDE EPISTOLAS’: A CONTEMPORARY VIEW

Early in the twelfth century, in the abbey of Gembloux, a monk called Sigebert assembled a catalogue of Christian writers from biblical times to his own era.¹ Such lists of ecclesiastical authors had been drawn up since patristic times; the most illustrious example was the one compiled by St Jerome in 393, in which he famously included an article on his own works as the last entry.² In the early Middle Ages, Jerome’s catalogue and similar literary histories were copied frequently, yet for centuries, medieval authors had refrained from adding more recent authors to these lists.³ Indeed, Sigebert of Gembloux (d. 1112) was the first literary historian to include a small share of living authors. Yet even Sigebert, who boldly followed the model of St Jerome in devoting the last entry to himself, listed only very few living authors.⁴ This lends special weight to his entry on the bishop–scholar Ivo of Chartres (d. 1115):⁵

Ivo, bishop of Chartres, wrote to Hugh, archbishop of Lyon and apostolic legate, a letter not of great length but abundant with canonical and catholic proof

¹ *Catalogus Sigeberti Gemblacensis monachi de viris illustribus*, ed. R. Witte (Bern: Lang, 1974). On Sigebert, see also T. Licht, *Untersuchungen zum biographischen Werk Sigeberts von Gembloux* (Heidelberg: Mattes, 2005) (with further references).

² Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, on which see R. Blum, ‘Die Literaturverzeichnung im Altertum und Mittelalter: Versuch einer Geschichte der Bibliographie von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit’, *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens*, 24 (1983), 1–256, 98–113.

³ *Ibid.*, 137–9.

⁴ Apart from Sigebert himself, the only authors listed in the *Catalogus* who were certainly alive in 1111 are Marbod of Rennes and Ivo of Chartres. We do not know exactly when Sigebert began his work, and some authors he listed may have been alive when Sigebert composed the respective entries, e.g. on Anselm of Canterbury. In other cases, the exact death date is uncertain.

⁵ *Catalogus*, c. 167 (ed. Witte, 101–2): ‘Iuo, Carnotensis episcopus, scripsit ad Hugonem, Lugdunensem archiepiscopum et apostolice ecclesie legatum, epistolam non multum prolixam, sed multum

Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres

texts, on the discord of *regnum* and *sacerdotium* and unwonted decrees of the Roman church. He also wrote very useful letters to different friends, and further compiled a great volume of canons.

Ivo was bishop of Chartres from 1090, and had soon become widely known well beyond his diocese, especially after his public conflicts with Archbishop Richer of Sens, with King Philip I and with the papal legate Archbishop Hugh of Lyon. After these and other struggles, during which his office and his personal security were repeatedly at risk, in the second half of the 1090s Ivo had firmly secured his position as bishop of one of the most important sees in the kingdom of France, and was regarded as a moral and intellectual authority by many prelates in northern Europe.

By the time Sigebert wrote his account, several of Ivo's works were already circulating widely, yet the only one Sigebert described in detail was his letter-tract to Hugh of Lyon (d. 1106), number 60 in the modern editions of Ivo's letters.⁶ Indeed, this letter on the 'discord of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*' is perhaps the one letter Ivo was, and is, best known for. It belongs among the most important writings of the conflict known to modern readers as the Investiture Contest, and many contemporaries could have been familiar with this text, which was being copied and cited in France, Normandy, England, Italy and the Empire long before Ivo's death.⁷

Many twelfth-century readers would also know the addressee of Ivo's letter, Archbishop Hugh of Lyon, as a powerful prelate and zealous Gregorian.⁸ Even Gregory VII himself, who had made him his standing legate and confirmed the Lyonnais primacy over 'all of Gaul', thought Hugh's heavy-handed implementation of 'reform' sometimes too radical. Indeed, within a decade Hugh had deposed or suspended no less than thirty-four bishops, most of them French (including the archbishop of

canonicis et catholicis testimoniis auctorizatum, pro discidio regni et sacerdotii, et pro inusitatis Romane ecclesie decretis. Scripsit et ad diuersos amicos utiles ualde epistolas; composuit etiam insigne uolumen canonum.'

⁶ For the sake of convenience, I retain the numbers found in the Migne edition (PL 161), although I employ the text of better editions wherever they are available. Ivo's letter 60 has been edited several times e.g. by E. Sackur (MGH. Libelli de lite, ii, 642–7), J. Leclercq, 238–54 and also by myself: C. Rolker, 'Canon law and the letters of Ivo of Chartres' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2006), here at 311–17.

⁷ Ivo's letter 60, which was soon known to the pope (see Ivo, ep. 61), was quoted by the *Norman Anonymous*, Sigebert of Gembloux, Geoffrey of Vendôme and others; for references, see Chapter 4, note 11.

⁸ On Hugh, see I. S. Robinson, *The papacy 1073–1198: continuity and innovation* (Cambridge Medieval Textbooks, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 150–5 and U.-R. Blumenthal, 'Hugh of Die and Lyon, primate and papal legate', in D. Walz (ed.), *Scripturus vitam. Lateinische Biographie von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart: Festgabe für Walter Berschin zum 65. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg: Mattes, 2002), 487–95.

Ivo of Chartres – ‘life and letters’?

Reims), and excommunicated eighteen prelates.⁹ Having lost his legatine status under Victor III, in 1094 Hugh was re-appointed legate by Pope Urban II, and in the following years sought to enforce the primacy of the church of Lyon over the provinces of northern France.

Claiming these primacy rights, around 1095 Hugh intervened in several episcopal elections in northern France, especially those at Nevers, Orléans and Sens; in the context of these elections, he also became involved in a prolonged dispute with Ivo of Chartres. From late 1095 onwards, after the suspension of his metropolitan, Archbishop Richer of Sens, from office, and especially after Richer's death, Ivo was acting on behalf not only of the church of Chartres but of the whole province of Sens. In this function, he had an interest in warding off outside interference, and very soon clashed with Hugh of Lyon. The letter Sigebert mentions is only the most spectacular of the heated letters these two opponents exchanged.

What Sigebert and presumably most medieval readers were interested in was not so much the outcome of the disputed successions that had provoked the initial conflict. Rather, the letters of Ivo and Hugh touched on issues that were seen as fundamentally important by contemporaries. In Sigebert's terms, it was the ‘discord of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*’ and the question of the ‘unwonted decrees of the Roman church’, two themes that were indeed of pivotal importance to many ecclesiastics in the period.

To judge both from Sigebert's comment and from the reception of Ivo's letter, contemporaries valued in particular the numerous ‘canonical and catholic proof texts’ Ivo employed to defend his position. These ‘proof texts’ – quotations taken from patristic authors and a very broad range of legal sources – were taken up by other polemicists, and the authorities Ivo had introduced into the debate can be traced in the polemic writings of Sigebert himself, and also of Geoffrey of Vendôme and the Norman Anonymous, to quote only the most prominent examples.¹⁰

Ivo's other ‘letters to different friends’ were also read widely and sometimes exploited by later authors. The sheer number of extant manuscripts leaves little doubt that many medieval readers, especially in the twelfth century, agreed with Sigebert that these letters were ‘very useful’. Even in his lifetime, many of Ivo's letters circulated either independently or

⁹ R. Hiestand, ‘Les légats pontificaux en France du milieu du XI^e à la fin du XII^e siècle’, in R. Große (ed.), *L'Église de France et la papauté (X^e–XIII^e siècle) / Die französische Kirche und das Papsttum (10.–13. Jahrhundert): actes du XXVI^e Colloque franco-allemand organisé en coopération avec l'École nationale des Chartes par l'Institut historique allemand de Paris (Paris, 17–19 octobre 1990)* (Studien und Dokumente zur Gallia Pontificia 1, Bonn: Bouvier, 1993), 54–80, 57.

¹⁰ See Chapter 4, note 11.

Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres

in the form of various small collections; soon after his death, a set of almost three hundred letters was assembled in a large collection which was soon dispersed widely in north-western Europe. More than 120 copies are still extant today – far more than survive for such well-known collections as those of Anselm of Canterbury, Peter the Venerable or Peter of Blois. Its success must reflect the wide variety of purposes for which it could be read and exploited; yet there is good evidence that for many readers its usefulness was precisely the dogmatic content and the abundance of canonical texts highlighted by Sigebert for Ivo's letter-tract sent to Hugh of Lyon. The joint transmission of these letters with other dogmatic material such as his own sermons, marriage tracts and canonical collections, and also the topical arrangement found in several manuscripts, supports this explanation of such enthusiasm for Ivo's correspondence.¹¹ As with other texts, later scribes would sometimes abbreviate personal names and place names, or omit whole passages of the letters, yet they faithfully preserved the proof texts Ivo had assembled, and the marginal notes against them give a clear sense that the effort Ivo had spent in supporting his arguments with solid authority was not lost on his medieval readers.

This brings us to the last work of Ivo mentioned in our source, his 'great volume of canons'. Clearly, Sigebert saw this part of Ivo's work as related to the 'very useful' letters Ivo wrote. As will be argued in the course of this book, there is indeed an intimate relation between Ivo's correspondence and his canonical compilation. Not only did he quote from his own collection; this work itself was stimulated and shaped by the process of composing his various letter-tracts. In the preparation of these complex treatises, Ivo compiled small dossiers containing suitable material drawn from very divergent sources – patristic writings, synodal and papal legislation, Roman law, and other material, known to him either directly or via earlier canonical collections. It is very likely that Ivo's own canonical collection gradually grew from such dossiers of theological, legal and sometimes also historical excerpts which were later reworked with material from various sources.

Medieval readers, in any case, knew Ivo as a competent scholar in the field later known as canon law, and his collection was soon copied and read in many places. The fact that Ivo's name was later attached to several other canonical collections does not have to bother us, at least not for the moment. Questions of authorship will be discussed later on; for the time

¹¹ See Chapter 4. An updated version of the manuscript list I compiled for my PhD (Rolker, 'Canon law', 284–95) can be found online: <http://project.knowledgeforged.net/ivo> (accessed 20 July 2009).

Ivo of Chartres – ‘life and letters’?

being, we should see these attributions as evidence for the high esteem in which Ivo was held.

The present book is a study of Ivo, his ‘letters to different friends’ and his ‘great volume of canons’. Sigebert’s *Catalogue* is not only one of the earliest sources on Ivo’s oeuvre, it can be taken as representative of a large medieval audience that continued to copy and read Ivo’s writings. Of course, the few lines Sigebert devoted to Ivo are not in any sense complete – Ivo’s sermons, for example, are not even mentioned – and obviously it is rather general in character. Nonetheless, even this short account turns out to reflect many facets of Ivo’s works and can be said to contain in a nutshell the medieval image of Ivo as a fount of canonical wisdom. All the different aspects touched upon here in summary fashion will be discussed in greater detail in due course, but first we need an outline of the career of this famous scholar–bishop, and of the sources available for assessing his role in the intellectual history of medieval Europe.

IVO AS ABBOT AND BISHOP

Writing a biography in the modern sense of most medieval figures, even prominent ones, is an impossibility. Commonly, the dearth of sources makes any continuous narrative a hopeless task. In the case of Ivo, the problem is somewhat different, for there is a relative abundance of sources. Not only is there a significant body of narrative and diplomatic sources documenting his life and actions; as indicated above, Ivo has also left a very large body of canonical material, a considerable number of sermons, and almost three hundred letters.

For centuries, Ivo’s letter collection has served as a convenient starting point for anyone interested in his biography – even more so as the standard form of the compilation, covering his complete twenty-five-year pontificate, is by and large arranged in chronological order. In a sense, this form of the letter collection is in itself a biography of Ivo, or at least can be read in this way. Whatever the intentions of the compiler were, his work should be subjected to the same critical assessment as any other literary source. First of all, it is important to keep in mind that the collection, voluminous as it is, is clearly selective; what the letter collection does not contain is as interesting as what it does.¹² In addition, the collection tells its story from Ivo’s point of view; it reveals very little about the views held by other parties. As a result, the standard form of

¹² E.g. the telling silence on King Philip and Bertrade after 1104; see Chapter 6.

Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres

the letter collection presents a constructed image of Ivo. In its selectivity, it highlights the many conflicts with powerful secular and ecclesiastical opponents Ivo was involved in, and certainly conveys a strong sense of Ivo as a courageous and upright fighter for his principles. The collection forms something of a biography of Ivo and should be approached with close critical attention.

Ivo's early career (c. 1040–1090)

Copious as the letter collection is for Ivo's episcopate, the sources for Ivo's life before he became bishop are much less helpful than those for his later career. The standard collection includes only one letter written before 1090, and that in the appendix, and other sources are equally fragmentary. The lack of early letters by Ivo may well have to do with a conscious selection by the compilers of his letter collection; in any case, we are forced to take other sources into account to study Ivo's family background, youth and early career. Apart from the scattered references in his later correspondence, most information has to be derived from charter evidence.¹³

Ivo was probably born in or near Chartres around 1040; his family was neither noble nor very rich, and some of his relatives can be traced holding rather modest positions in Chartres itself.¹⁴ In the high Middle Ages, such a background was not common for a bishop, and certainly not for the bishops of an important church such as Chartres. Ivo's predecessor Geoffrey, for example, was born to the family of the counts of Boulogne and frequently relied on the support of his relatives, including his two uncles, Eustace III of Boulogne and Bishop Geoffrey of Paris. Ivo's immediate successors, Geoffrey and Goslin of Lèves, if not of such exalted birth, did belong to the local nobility.¹⁵

Unlike most other contemporary bishops, then, Ivo could not rely on the secular power of his family.¹⁶ Instead, the special trust both king and pope had in him was of paramount importance for his standing. The

¹³ For the sources and much of the following, see R. Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres und seine Stellung in der Kirchengeschichte* (Pariser historische Studien 1, Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1962), 5–8.

¹⁴ Little is known about Ivo's parents apart from his mother's name; as Sprandel (*ibid.*) has demonstrated. His mother Hilemburgis cannot be identical to Hilemburgis, the wife of Hugh of Auteuil (as Fronteau thought). This confusion is the only basis for the often repeated claim that Ivo was of noble birth and originally from the Beauvais.

¹⁵ On Geoffrey II of Chartres, see L. Grant, 'Geoffrey of Lèves, bishop of Chartres: "Famous wheeler and dealer in secular business"', in R. Große (ed.), *Suger en question: regards croisés sur Saint-Denis* (Pariser historische Studien 68, Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004), 45–56.

¹⁶ In his extensive correspondence and the extant charters from his pontificate, there is no single reference to any of his relatives.

Ivo of Chartres – ‘life and letters’?

way he earned this trust initially is largely obscure, as the evidence for his life before 1090 is relatively meagre. It seems that Ivo entered religious life early and went north for more than two decades before eventually returning to Chartres at a mature age. His first benefice in Nesle in Picardy is one of the few stations of his early career which is attested with certainty.¹⁷ Ivo is often said to have been taught by Lanfranc at Le Bec, but the evidence for this claim is not decisive.¹⁸ If Ivo was a pupil of Lanfranc, this left no major trace in his later works.¹⁹ It is sometimes claimed that Ivo studied in Paris,²⁰ but apart from Ivo’s familiarity with the customs of St Martin des Champs,²¹ there is no evidence that would support the idea that Ivo lived in Paris, let alone that he studied there. Equally, while there is a textual tradition that links Ivo to the school of Laon, there is no evidence that he ever taught or even studied there.²² These attempts to link Ivo to other known scholars or centres of learning tell perhaps more about the modern demand for a coherent narrative than about Ivo’s early years – an observation that I will come back to in other contexts.²³

We reach more certain ground with Ivo’s move from Nesle to Beauvais. In 1067, the local bishop, Guy, had founded the monastery of St Quentin on the outskirts of his episcopal city, and consecrated the church two years later. Ivo was appointed the first abbot, and stayed there for more than twenty years.²⁴ Here for the first time we can see Ivo becoming

¹⁷ Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 8.

¹⁸ M. T. Gibson, *Lanfranc of Bec* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 36–7.

¹⁹ See Chapter 3 for a discussion of the textual links between Lanfranc and Ivo.

²⁰ *Gallia Christiana* viii (1744), 1126; this also seems to be the source for S. Violi, *Il Prologo di Ivo di Chartres: paradigmi e prospettive per la teologia e l’interpretazione del Diritto canonico* (Biblioteca Teologia. Sezione Canonistica 3, Lugano: EUPRESS, 2006), 36 who claimed that Ivo ‘studiò lettere e filosofia a Parigi’.

²¹ The customs of St Quentin mention that Ivo brought with him a copy of the customs of St Martin des Champs (see below).

²² This was suggested by R. W. Southern, *Scholastic humanism and the unification of Europe*, 2 vols. (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1995–2001), i, 252–4.

²³ The idea that Ivo was preparing for the scholastic development of the twelfth century is crucial to the modern historiography on the Ivonian collections, on which see below.

²⁴ Following a reference of the *Auctarium Bellocense* (MGH. SS 6, 461–2), Ivo is often said to have come to St Quentin in 1078 only. However, Ivo is clearly referred to as first abbot of St Quentin in the twelfth-century customary (see below), and from 1072 onwards is mentioned in charters as abbot of St Quentin. See D. Lohrmann, *Papsturkunden in Frankreich: Neue Folge 7. Band: Nördliche Ile-de-France und Vermandois* (Göttinger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-hist. Klasse, Abhandlungen, 3. Folge 95, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1976), 42–4 and D. Lohrmann, *Kirchengut im nördlichen Frankreich: Besitz, Verfassung und Wirtschaft im Spiegel der Papstprivilegien des 11.–12. Jahrhunderts* (Pariser historische Studien 20, Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1983), 160–2 for references on the church, and O. Guyotjeannin, *Episcopus et comes: affirmation et déclin de la seigneurie épiscopale au nord du royaume de France (Beauvais-Noyon, X^e – début XIII^e siècle)* (Geneva: Droz, 1987), 70–2 on Bishop Guy. I have not seen Céline Dumont’s 1991 thesis on

Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres

involved in the greater issues of the period, namely the reform of the clergy.²⁵ With the support of Bishop Guy (and King Philip), St Quentin acquired considerable wealth, and Ivo was able to implement his ideas of communal life. Using the customs of St Martin des Champs as a model, he compiled a rule, today known only from indirect references in a later rule compiled in the twelfth century.²⁶ By then, Ivo's regime was remembered as rather lenient.²⁷ Compared to contemporary and later reform foundations like Springiersbach, Ivo's rule was mild indeed; it decreed neither manual work nor a severe diet. Nonetheless, his rule was strict concerning the basic norms of obedience, *stabilitas loci*, chastity and common property.²⁸ This conforms well with the views Ivo expressed in his later life. As can be seen from his letters, he was in general sceptical about excessive forms of devotion and always stressed the importance of moderation (*moderatio*) in religious practice.²⁹ As abbot of a 'reform community' that became something of a model for other communities,³⁰ Ivo did not neglect the more secular aspects of 'reform', either; he secured considerable endowments, negotiated with third parties like the Beauvais chapter and travelled far in the service of his community.³¹ In addition, Ivo was teaching 'sacra scriptura' at St Quentin,³² and began to gather material for his canonical activities. As will be discussed in a later

St Quentin, only the following abstract: C. Dumont, 'L'abbaye de Saint-Quentin de Beauvais (XI^e–XIII^e siècles)', *Positions des thèses de l'École des Chartes*, (1991), 55–61. After having become bishop of Chartres, Ivo retained his office at St Quentin for two or three years: Ivo, ep. 31 (ed. Leclercq, 128); see also epp. 17 and 32.

²⁵ On the canonical reform of the twelfth century, see now J. Führer, *König Ludwig VI. von Frankreich und die Kanonikerreform* (Frankfurt: Lang, 2008).

²⁶ See H. Labande, 'Le cartulaire de Saint-Quentin de Beauvais: No 7,404 de la Bibliothèque de Sir Thomas Phillips à Cheltenham', *Mémoires de la Société académique de l'Oise*, 14 (1891), 665–76, 666 and 671–3 for the edition of the foundation charter. The earliest extant rule is from the early twelfth century; the actual manuscript was written after the death of Abbot Raoul in 1136. See C. Dereine, 'Les coutumiers de Saint-Quentin de Beauvais et de Springiersbach', *RHE*, 43 (1948), 411–42, at 433–7, and L. Milis, 'Le coutumier de Saint-Quentin de Beauvais', *Sacris erudiri*, 21 (1972–3), 435–81, at 444–72 for an edition.

²⁷ 'Legifer igitur noster, uir moderate religionis et precipue discretionis malens leniter lac emungere quam durius premendo sanguinem elicere (cf. Prov. xxx, 33), bis tondere quam semel interficere, rudes homines conuersionis gratia ad eius magisterium undique confluentes non magnopere curauit multiplicibus asperitatum seu austeritatum sarcinis opprimere quatenus, corde dilato et amplo, uiam mandatorum Dei alacriter possent percurrere' (ed. Dereine, 'Coutumiers', 436 = ed. Milis, 448).

²⁸ 'Districte et immutabiliter observanda decrevit' (ed. Dereine, 'Coutumiers', 435 = ed. Milis, 449).

²⁹ Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 140–3. Ivo's high esteem for the common life as bishop also seems to reflect his experiences at St Quentin.

³⁰ See now Führer, *Kanonikerreform* (with ample references).

³¹ Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 8; Lohrmann, *Papsturkunden*, 42–4.

³² Among his pupils was John, later bishop of Thérouanne: *Vita Iohannis episcopi Teruanensis* (MGH. SS 15, ii, 1140–1).

Ivo of Chartres – ‘life and letters’?

chapter, parts of his *Decretum* can be shown to have been compiled at St Quentin.³³ Very few of the works Ivo wrote before 1090 are extant, but the Eucharist tract known as letter 287 shows something of his theological interests at this time.³⁴

The sources do not allow us to reconstruct Ivo's activities at St Quentin in great detail. However, although Ivo is mainly remembered as a learned bishop of an important church, one should never forget that he had spent most of his life in religious communities before he returned to Chartres in 1090. In addition, Ivo as bishop remained in contact with his old community, the local bishop and those he had met at Beauvais. Manifestly, he still felt responsible for the well-being of St Quentin.³⁵ In his first years as bishop, he continued to act as abbot until a suitable successor, his pupil Galo, was found.³⁶ Between 1100 and 1104, Ivo supported Galo as an unsuccessful candidate for the bishopric of Beauvais and later, successfully, in Paris.³⁷ In 1105, after Galo's promotion, Ivo insisted that the bishop of Beauvais could not confirm the abbot of St Quentin without his consent, and prevented a certain Odo from being appointed.³⁸ Ivo's intervention was successful, and he was present when his own candidate Ralph became the new abbot.³⁹ As these episodes show, long after his departure Ivo continued to intervene at St Quentin to promote his friends and pupils.⁴⁰ Repeatedly, he also used his authority as bishop of Chartres to safeguard the privileges of his old community.⁴¹ Fairly late in his life, perhaps twenty years after his departure, Ivo intervened in a marriage case involving a woman whose brother he knew from his time at St Quentin.⁴² Evidently, Ivo retained close ties both to the convent and to individual canons, just as the community cherished his memory after he had left.⁴³

³³ See Chapter 4.

³⁴ On ep. 287 see C. Rolker, 'The earliest work of Ivo of Chartres: the case of Ivo's Eucharist florilegium and the canon law collections attributed to him', *ZRG KA*, 124 (2007), 109–27 (with a provisional edition at 123–7).

³⁵ See Ivo, epp. 17, 31–2, 42, 151, 193, 252, 257 and 259.

³⁶ See Ivo, ep. 17 (PL 162, 31) and 31 (*ibid.*, 43).

³⁷ See Chapter 5 on Galo's 'translation' from Beauvais to Paris.

³⁸ Ivo, ep. 151 (PL 162, 156).

³⁹ On the latter event, see Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 179 and Guyotjeannin, *Episcopus et comes*, 76, n. 44, both quoting Paris, BN nouv. acq. lat. 1921, fol. 20r.

⁴⁰ Ivo, epp. 17, 31–2, 88, 98, 102, 104–5 and 151.

⁴¹ See, for example, the letters he wrote to the bishops of Soisson, Beauvais and Reims (epp. 42, 193 and 295, respectively).

⁴² Ivo, ep. 252.

⁴³ See the St Quentin rule quoted above and the obituary entry printed in *Gallia Christiana* ix (1751), 819.

Canon Law and the Letters of Ivo of Chartres

Ivo as bishop of Chartres (c. 1090–1115)

The bishopric Ivo was elected to was not only his native region but also one of the major sees in the kingdom of France.⁴⁴ Chartres was the ‘first church’ of the province of Sens, an honorific title that potentially meant considerable influence. The diocese itself stretched from the Seine basin in the north to the Loire River in the south, where one would find the castles and lands of the counts of Blois-Chartres, while the north overlapped with the royal domain. Chartres was close to the king in more than physical distance; it belonged to the twenty churches or so the Capetian kings could (to a certain extent) control, and was one of the few dioceses that even provided troops. How far the crown had a say in the nomination of the eleventh-century bishops is not entirely clear.⁴⁵ In Ivo’s case, though, the evidence is unambiguous; King Philip supported his election and granted investiture afterwards. Having received his pastoral staff from the king,⁴⁶ Ivo also became his vassal, providing advice as well as troops.

While royal influence was relatively strong at Chartres in the late eleventh century, it was not uniquely so; in particular the counts of Blois-Chartres were an important political counterweight in the region. When Ivo was elected bishop in 1090, the famous Count Thibaud III had just died the year before. Having accumulated multiple counties, Thibaud had left impressive estates to his heirs.⁴⁷ His eldest son Stephen-Henry, already in his forties, inherited the counties of Sancerre, Blois, Châteaudun, Chartres and Meaux, and territories in north-eastern Berry; Thibaud’s other inheriting son, Odo, received his father’s possessions in Champagne. Stephen-Henry in addition was married to Adela, the youngest daughter of William the Conqueror;⁴⁸ their marriage had sealed an alliance between two of the most powerful families of northern France. Together,

⁴⁴ On the complex political situation in the region, see most recently the splendid analysis in K.A. LoPrete, *Adela of Blois, countess and lord* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007). A valuable account of the history of comital and episcopal rights at Chartres is found in R. Kaiser, *Bischofsherrschaft zwischen Königtum und Fürstenmacht: Studien zur bischöflichen Stadtherrschaft im westfränkisch-französischen Reich im frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Pariser historische Studien 17, Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1981), 406–22. For Chartres as a town, see A. Chédeville, *Chartres et ses campagnes (XI–XIII s.)* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1973), esp. 397–480 (with ample references). On the ecclesiastical property, see Lohrmann, *Kirchengut im nördlichen Frankreich*.

⁴⁵ The evidence is often inconclusive for the bishops of the second half of the eleventh century. See Sprandel, *Ivo von Chartres*, 121–2 and Kaiser, *Bischofsherrschaft*, 416–20 for the influence of kings and counts. Sprandel assumes a rather strong royal influence; LoPrete, *Adela of Blois*, 232–3 argues that Thibaudian influence was stronger than commonly assumed.

⁴⁶ Ivo, ep. 8 (ed. Leclercq, 34).

⁴⁷ For the Thibaudian estates, see J. Dunbabin, *France in the making, 843–1180* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 190–6.

⁴⁸ On Adela (and Stephen-Henry), see most recently LoPrete, *Adela of Blois*, *passim*.