

Trinity College

Trinity College Digital Repository

Faculty Scholarship

1989

The Struggle between the Abbey of St. Lucien and the Men of Grandvilliers

Jonathan Elukin

Trinity College, Jonathan.Elukin@trincoll.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/facpub>

 Part of the [History Commons](#)

Trinity College
HARTFORD CONNECTICUT

The Struggle Between the Abbey of Saint-Lucien and the Men of Grandvilliers

BY JONATHAN M. ELUKIN

According to the account preserved in Princeton University's Medieval Manuscript Garrett 163,¹ on the Friday (2 October) after the feast of Saint Michael in 1278, Abbot Eudes Cholet de Nointel and the monks of Saint-Lucien, a prominent monastery in the region of northern France known as the Beauvaisis,² came to terms with their *hospites*, the men of the village of Grandvilliers who were the legal "dependents" of the abbey.³ The agreement resolved a dispute over the extent of certain services owed by the rustics to Saint-Lucien.

Although the contest between the abbey and its dependents was a local issue, the manuscript and the events it records have wider implications. Garrett 163 deserves our attention because it illustrates the dynamics of negotiations between lords and rustics, though whether we can trust the amicable tone of the compromise to represent the real quality of relations between lords and their dependents is problematic. Those historians who argue that dependents were only able to wring concessions from lords by constant struggle and rebellion would be suspicious, and rightly so, of accepting our agreement at face value.⁴ Other scholars refuse to regard rebellion or collective vio-

¹ My transcription and translation of Medieval ms. Garrett 163 may be found at the end of this article. I would like to thank Professor William C. Jordan for his editorial and substantive criticisms of this paper.

² The Beauvaisis, as the name suggests, is the region in northern France centered around the town of Beauvais.

³ *Hospites*, or *hôtes*, were free individuals who, by reason of their residence within a lord's territory, owed the lord certain services. *Hospites* usually designated people, or their descendants, who had been established in a region to *assart*, or clear new land. Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, 2 vols., translated by L. A. Manyon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), Vol. 1, p. 265.

⁴ See, for example, Rodney Hilton, *The Decline of Serfdom in Medieval England* (New York: Macmillan, 1969), p. 25, or his *Class Conflict and the Crisis of Feudalism: Essays in Medieval Social History* (London: Ronceverti; West Virginia: Hambledon Press, 1985), and Robert Brenner's contributions to *The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and*

lence as the key to changes in the conditions of land tenure and the personal status of servile and quasi-servile rustics.⁵ In any case, to privilege moments of outright rebellion, which were relatively rare in the High Middle Ages, obscures the routine tensions that characterized relations between lords and the greater part of the rural population. Refusals to pay rent, theft from the lord's demesne, work stoppages during harvest or planting time, and flight from the manor can all be interpreted as acts of resistance against the seigneurial regime. Not every illegal act or shirking of an obligation is an act of "resistance," but short of armed rebellion, these acts were the only way dependents could resist the seigneurial regime or at least vent their frustrations. They must be taken into account when judging the attitude of dependents to lordly impositions.⁶

The compromise of Saint-Lucien, when seen against the economic and social background of the 13th-century Beauvaisis, demonstrates how people negotiated in the hostile, yet not overtly violent, society of medieval Europe. My goal here is thus quite circumscribed. I will try to place Garrett 163 in the context of Saint-Lucien's relations with its men in Grandvilliers, the monastery's other disputes, and conditions in the Beauvaisis. By doing so, I hope to suggest that the manuscript, although couched in the language of compromise, should be

Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe, edited by T. H. Aston and C.H.E. Philpin (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

⁵ M. M. Postan, who is the target of Hilton's and Brenner's critique, argues that changes in population, like the post-plague demographic collapse in 1348, were the most important factors in medieval economic and social change. After the Black Death created a scarcity of labor, peasants had economic leverage over lords and could bargain effectively for better wages and conditions. Postan, *The Medieval Economy and Society, An Economic History of Britain in the Middle Ages* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972), p. 152.

⁶ For examples of resistance that could also spark armed demonstrations, see Christopher Dyer, *Lords and Peasants in a Changing Society: The Estates of the Bishopric of Worcester, 680-1540* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), pp. 275-281. The so-called Toronto School plays down the antagonism between lords and peasants by concentrating on the independent vitality of the village community and the common interests of lords and dependents. See, for example, Britton, who confronts labor strikes in his evidence, but explains them away by citing their routine character and the absence of recorded coercion against strikers: "The non-performance of labour services [followed by a fine] was simply a *de facto* form of commutation." Edward Britton, *The Community of the Vill: A Study in the History of the Family and Village Life in Fourteenth-Century England* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1977), pp. 169-170. For a critique of the Toronto School, see Zvi Razi, "The Toronto School's Reconstruction of Medieval Peasant Society: A Critical View," *Past and Present*, Vol. 85 (1979) 141-157.

seen as a product of the persistent conflict embedded in relations between lords and their dependents.

*

The manuscript, which must be an authentic copy of the original agreement,⁷ records that four vassals of the abbot of Saint-Lucien — Richard de Breteuil, Raoul de Gaudechart, Dreux de Saint-Quies, and Pierre de Iuvegnies — acted as judges in the abbot's court. Before them stood, on the one side, the abbot Eudes and the monks of Saint-Lucien and, on the other, the men of Grandvilliers. Eudes claimed that his dependents were obliged to help Saint-Lucien in the maintenance and prosecution of accused and captured criminals. Eudes specifically charged that all or some delegation of the Grandvilliers inhabitants were obliged to guard the criminals, to bring them to the abbot's court, and to aid the abbot's officials in enforcing justice. It was by neglecting these obligations, according to Eudes, that the men had recently sparked the dispute. The abbot sought to reassert his authority and to secure the restoration of the services.

The men of Grandvilliers countered that they were no longer obliged to provide the assistance demanded. They invoked a charter of "Erardus," a former abbot of Saint-Lucien who had refounded the village of Grandvilliers;⁸ and on the basis of that charter they claimed to be *immunes et quitos* of the specified services.⁹ They clearly interpreted release from *omnimoda exactione*, specified in the foundation charter, to include freedom from the disputed subsidies for prisoners and guard duty. The *hospites* may also have relied upon the foundation charter's grant of freedom from the *exercitus*, or military service, as applying to the guarding of criminals. In either case, the obliga-

⁷ L. E. Deladreau and Mathon, "Histoire de l'abbaye royale de Saint-Lucien," *Mémoires de la Société Académique d'Archéologie, Sciences & Arts de Département de l'Oise*, Vol. 8 (1871 - 1873) 257-385; p. 358, Plate III.

⁸ Erardus is Evrard de Monchy, abbot of Saint-Lucien from 1210 - 1237, who refounded Grandvilliers in 1212 with Philippe de Dreux, bishop of Beauvais. Deladreau and Mathon, "Histoire de l'abbaye," p. 343.

⁹ "Hospites omnes ejusdem villae erunt quitti et immunes a tallia, ab exercitu, equitatione et omnimoda exactione." (All *hospites* of the same village were quit and free from tallage, host, horse service, and all types of exactions.) The charter is preserved in Pierre Louvet, *Histoire et antiquitéz du diocèse de Beauvais*, II (1614?), 109, cited in Deladreau and Mathon, "Histoire de l'abbaye," p. 345.

tions were perceived as repugnant, and the men of Grandvilliers looked back to the charter to broaden their exemptions.

The stalemate was resolved, according to our record, by the intervention of Jean Cholet, brother of Eudes and archdeacon of Caux in the diocese of Rouen. He formulated an agreement essentially re-establishing the earlier obligations. Both parties promised to observe the pact and obligated themselves and their successors to observe it under penalty of 200 marks of silver and forfeiture of their and their successors' goods. Order was no doubt restored by the agreement, but by setting the dispute in its social context, we may be able to chip away at the veneer of concord created by the legal language of the contract.

*

Let us turn first to the evolution of the conflict between Saint-Lucien and its *hospites*. The abbey was a major social and economic force in the Beauvaisis. According to Pierre Louvet, the 17th-century historian of Beauvais:

This abbey over the years was marvelously enriched, not only by the kings of France, but also by the nobility of the Beauvaisis, [and] by [their] alms and donations [the abbey] possesses a great number of seigneuries which she holds from the King under the title of a barony, with all forms of justice, high, medium, and low, [holding] court and [the hearing of] appeals.¹⁰

Saint-Lucien was particularly assiduous in its campaign to bolster these rights to administer justice. The *droits de justice* were attractive both as a mark of lordship and as an increasingly important source of revenue. A brief review of several disputes — and there were likely others — in which Saint-Lucien was involved both before and after

¹⁰ "Ceste Abbaye par succession de temps a esté merueilleusement enrichie, non seulement par les Roys de France, mais aussi par la noblesse de Beauvaisis, par les aumosnes & largesse desquels, elle possède un grand nombre de seigneuries, lesquelles elles tient du Roy sous le tiltre [sic] de Baronnie, & avec toute Iustice haute, moyéne, & base, assises & ressort." Pierre Louvet, *Histoire de la ville de Beauvais* (Marseille: La-fitte Reprints, 1977; reprint of Rouen edition, 1613), p. 237.



Photo: Don Breza

"Vue de L'Abbaye de Saint-Lucien en 1788," *Mémoires de la Société Académique d'Archéologie, Sciences & Arts du Département de L'Oise*. Beauvais: Imprimerie de D. Pere, 1871.

1278 makes this point clear. In 1267 the abbey complained in the *parlement* of Paris, the highest court in the kingdom, that the *bailli*, or chief royal officer, of Senlis was unjustly interfering with its jurisdiction over a case of homicide in one of its villages.¹¹ Saint-Lucien compromised in 1290 with Renaud d'Auteuil, chevalier, in another dispute over rights of justice in which Saint-Lucien preserved its privileges.¹² In 1300 the abbey won a decision from the *prévôt* (royal administrator) of Paris, against Lancelot de Saint-Mars, seigneur of Abbecourt, for the rights of justice in the village of Abbecourt.¹³ Finally, negotiations with the abbey of Saint-Quentin were held in 1316 to "determine the limits of their justice on the lands and waterways lying between the two abbeys."¹⁴

The abbot and monks of Saint-Lucien clearly had the influence and

¹¹ "Conquerebantur abbas et conventus Sancti-Luciani Belvacensis quod ballivus Silvactensis indebite impediabat eosdem quominus gaudere possent justicia cujusdam multri quod acciderat in villa sua de Sequacio, licet ibidem omnimodam justiciam habeant per cartam . . ." *Les Olim ou Registres des arrêts rendus par la cour du roi*, ed. A. Beugnot, 1 (Paris: Ministre de L'Instruction Publique, 1839), 690, xxix.

¹² *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départementales série H, archives ecclésiastiques*, edited by A. Rendu and Couard-Luys (Beauvais: Ministre de L'Instruction Publique, 1888), pp. 328-329.

¹³ *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départementales, série H*, p. 266.

¹⁴ "Pour déterminer les limites de leur justices sur les terres et cours d'eau situés entre les deux abbayes." *Inventaire Sommaire des Archives Départementales, série H*, p. 262.

resources to protect their rights. Their experience in litigation made them formidable adversaries for the *hospites* of Grandvilliers. Perhaps more important, at least in the evolution of the dispute, was the preoccupation of the abbey with preserving its rights to *administer* justice. The importance of this aspect of their lordship to the abbot and monks put particular pressure on the men of Grandvilliers. The *hospites*, by supplying food and housing for criminals awaiting trial, provided a free service to the monastery in its judicial administration, a benefit which the abbot and monks would have had to pay for if the *hospites* were not compelled to continue their service. The monastery's relatively large physical size, which increased its expenses, made squeezing its dependents for the maximum (legitimate) amount of service and rents imperative.¹⁵ Moreover, lords were increasingly faced with fixed rents whose value was eroded by inflation throughout the 13th century, giving greater urgency to the collection of all possible dues and services.¹⁶

What pushed the monastery's dependents in Grandvilliers to rid themselves of their tasks, particularly when they knew such obligations were crucial to the abbot and monks? Perhaps the men of Grandvilliers had always perceived the exactions as unfair impositions and had finally reached a point where they decided to defend their original privileges. It is certainly possible, however, that the men of Grandvilliers were provoked to assert themselves precisely because the demands of the abbot bore hard upon them in the years before 1278 — hard enough, perhaps, to make them confront the repercussions of antagonizing an institution as powerful as Saint-Lucien. I would like to suggest, in fact, that it was the nature of Saint-Lucien's demands, combined with the particular social and economic conditions of the Beauvaisis, which made life as servants of the monastery increasingly burdensome for the men of Grandvilliers.

These rustics, albeit dependent, were not serfs. They were still free of many of the obligations that marked serfdom. Many of them had no doubt been attracted to the refounded village by the freedom from arbitrary taxation and other privileges of non-servile status offered by the monastery and the bishop of Beauvais. In an area of

¹⁵ The physical extent of the abbey buildings is evident in Jacques Henriët, "Saint-Lucien de Beauvais, mythe ou réalité?" *Bulletin Monumental*, Vol. 141 (1983) 272-294.

¹⁶ William C. Jordan, *From Servitude to Freedom: Manumission in the Sénonais in the Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986), p. 28.

France known for the servile condition of its rural population,¹⁷ the *hospites* in Grandvilliers cherished their liberties.

One can imagine that the nature of the services demanded by the monastery helped to make Saint-Lucien's dependents especially antagonistic to the monastery's demands. Aside from the contributions required to support the accused and imprisoned troublemakers, the obligation imposed on the men of Grandvilliers was, essentially, to be at the beck and call of the officials of Saint-Lucien. It is likely that many of the people the *hospites* guarded were fellow villagers who had run afoul of the abbey. While they no doubt had a personal stake in maintaining order in Grandvilliers, acting as the abbey's henchmen could have put them in uncomfortable and potentially volatile positions. Moreover, the requirements described in the arbitration were open-ended and probably threatened to interfere with the villagers' own crucial endeavors. Such loosely defined requirements could be abused by the abbot or his officials. The abbot was demanding, in a sense, a qualitatively servile kind of duty, a type of obligation which the men had previously escaped because of their status as *hospites*.

Aside from the irksome character of Saint-Lucien's demands, I believe the costs of the obligations were far from trivial. Getting free of them would have been more than just a symbolic victory, for the confrontation between Grandvilliers and Saint-Lucien took place against a background of demographic and political upheaval in the late 13th century, which exacerbated the pressures on Grandvilliers' inhabitants. As population rose in northern France, the pressure on local resources increased.¹⁸ The growing population created a twofold demographic problem for the men of Grandvilliers. It no doubt meant the incarceration of more people and a general heating up of the abbey's judicial machinery, and thus an ever increasing amount of contributions and labor expected of the abbey's dependents. The strain on the resources of Grandvilliers had already begun to tell by 1278. Without increased support from the abbey (or perhaps conscientious delivery of current food subsidies), the *hospites* refused to provide for the criminals. Under Cholet's agreement, in a more expanded version than the Garrett 163 records, the abbey thus

¹⁷ Robert Fossier, "Aperçus sur la société du Beauvaisis au xiii siècle," *Colloque international Philippe de Beauvais et les coutumes de Beauvaisis, 1283 - 1983* (Beauvais: Groupe d'études des monuments et oeuvres d'art du Beauvaisis, 1984?), p. 40.

¹⁸ Fossier, "Aperçus sur la société," p. 39.

promised to provide "as much wine from its stores and as much soup from its kitchen as would be required, as it had done in the past."¹⁹ Before the agreement, the *hospites* had been squeezed, either by a growing criminal population or insufficient aid from the abbey.

One final factor may be relevant to the growth of the dispute between the men of Grandvilliers and their lords, namely the so-called communal movement for town independence. To be sure, the communal movement had lost much of its vitality by the 13th century. Internal oligarchical divisions had sapped the strength of the existing communes, and royal power, wary of independent factions, had suppressed others and prevented the formation of new collective efforts.²⁰ Grandvilliers, moreover, was not a commune. We have no evidence that its citizens took an oath, the mark of a collective association. Indeed, the mayor (*maire*) of the village apparently held his office in fief from the abbot of Saint-Lucien.²¹ Grandvilliers appears more like a *villefranche*, a free town of dependent villagers who had been granted specific freedoms by a lord.

Why then invoke the communal movement as a contextual factor in understanding the dispute resolved by Garrett 163? Although Grandvilliers itself may not show signs of communal agitation, a remarkable exception to the quiescence of the communal movement can be found in Beauvais, the major town in Saint-Lucien's region. The violent struggle between communal forces and the bishop of Beauvais had become a scandal in the 13th century.²² The intensity and duration of the conflict in nearby Beauvais gives a larger perspective to the refusal of the men of Grandvilliers to perform services for Saint-Lucien; it is quite unlikely that the men of Grandvilliers articulated their resentment, and the sense of collective solidarity

¹⁹ Deladreau and Mathon, "Histoire de l'abbaye," p. 357.

²⁰ Charles Petit-Dutaillis, *The French Communes in the Middle Ages* (Amsterdam, New York, and Oxford: North Holland Publishing Company, 1978), pp. 1-82.

²¹ Deladreau and Mathon, "Histoire de l'abbaye," p. 356.

²² L. H. Labande, *Histoire de Beauvais et de ses institutions communales jusqu'au commencement du xv siècle* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1892), pp. 62-87. The dispute between Philip Augustus, the French king, and the bishop of Beauvais over who would control local currency quickly drew in Saint-Lucien. The abbey, among other local institutions, petitioned the bishop in 1214 to resist the intrusion of royal money and to reform his own behavior. Later in 1305 - 1306, after nearly a century of dispute and violence among communal forces, the bishop and the king, Saint-Lucien swung its support to the commune in order to counter the excesses of the bishop's men. Where its own interests were concerned, Saint-Lucien was clearly less tolerant of signs of collective resistance.

against an ecclesiastical foe, without some reference to the communal battle being waged in the major town of the region.

Unfortunately, the connection between the unrest in Grandvilliers and the violence in Beauvais remains circumstantial. Yet, disruptive behavior was nothing new in Grandvilliers, either. In 1262, 16 years before the conflict recorded in Garrett 163, several noble vassals of the abbey passed judgment on "ceux de Grandvilliers."²³ The transgression of the villagers is obscure, but the anonymity of the peasants suggests a large group, perhaps the entire village. The 1278 episode that we have been studying would appear less isolated if it were possible to trace the communal resistance to seigneurial exactions in other towns of the Beauvaisis, a strategy that might be pursued. Played out against the background of the communal struggle in Beauvais, such attempts at organized local resistance, even if not directly inspired by Beauvais, must have been interpreted in relation to that dispute by both lords and dependents. Perhaps the men of Grandvilliers were emboldened to pursue their rights by the example of the townspeople of Beauvais. At the very least, the confrontation recorded in Garrett 163 would have impressed the abbot and monks of Saint-Lucien, who were part of the seigneurial elite, as a dangerous echo of the collective action in Beauvais.

*

Jean Cholet, the archdeacon and brother of Abbot Eudes who arbitrated the dispute, ultimately decided in favor of Saint-Lucien. He found the demands of the abbey legitimate and admonished the men of Grandvilliers to obey. Nonetheless, the agreement was not completely one-sided. We have already seen that the monastery was expected to supply wine and soup for the prisoners and accused criminals. Saint-Lucien also agreed to perform executions within the boundaries of its directly administered land (*ancien fief*), and thus by implication, cease carrying them out in Grandvilliers.²⁴ Here the men

²³ V. Leblond, "Notes pour le nobiliaire du Beauvaisis d'après un manuscrit inédit du xvii siècle et autres documents originaux," *Mémoires de la Société Académique . . . de l'Oise*, 21, 2nd part (1911) 673-858; p. 735.

²⁴ Daniel, "Notice sur l'ancienne Abbaye de Saint-Lucien de Beauvais," *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Picardie*, Vol. 8 (1844 - 1845) 123-154; p. 146.

of Grandvilliers conform to the pattern of local authorities who resisted the costly obligation of constructing and maintaining a gallows. Yet while recognizing the importance of such a concession, we should be chary of accepting outright the stylized language of the resolution, which implies that the men of Grandvilliers willingly agreed to the compromise and took up their old (if modified) obligations.

Such skepticism is reinforced by noting the background of Jean Cholet, the arbiter. Since Jean, as the archdeacon of Caux, was not the juridical superior of Saint-Lucien, the abbot Eudes Cholet may have turned to his brother simply as a convenient and sympathetic judge. It is hard to believe that the men of Grandvilliers would have accepted the mediation of the abbot's brother unless he had an unusual reputation as a trustworthy man. Cholet, at least, seemed to merit respect. He would soon become a cardinal and an ambassador for his friend Pope Martin IV.²⁵ Nevertheless, it is difficult to see how his sympathies would not have been moved by the claims of the abbey. His family had been closely allied to Saint-Lucien. His largess to the monastery would secure him a tomb in the choir of the abbey's church.²⁶ Moreover, in judging the claims of the men of Grandvilliers, he was not dealing with social equals. It is his ties to the abbey and the social distance between him and the inhabitants of Grandvilliers that begin to suggest an undercurrent of intimidation in the relations between Saint-Lucien and its men. On the other hand, Cholet's reputation and his influence at the abbey would have made it difficult for the abbot and monks to fault or protest any concessions made by the archdeacon to the men of Grandvilliers.

Leaving Cholet's involvement aside, the need to bring the weight of local aristocratic society to bear on a recalcitrant village is evident in the participants who attested to the resolution. The abbey assembled 13 local notables to enforce the agreement. In addition to the four vassals named as judges in Garrett 163, the original document was apparently witnessed by nine others: Robert, abbot of Saint-Symphorien, Dreux, seigneur of Milly, Eustache de Wavignies, Pierre and Raoul de Leglantier, Jean de Caigny, Dreux le jeune de Milly, Etienne de Milly, and Etienne de Manasses, the comital *bailli* of Beauvais. (They may be more accurately considered judges as well.)²⁷ The

²⁵ Deladreue and Mathon, "Histoire de l'abbaye," p. 360.

²⁶ Deladreue and Mathon, "Histoire de l'abbaye," p. 358, Plate III.

²⁷ Deladreue and Mathon, "Histoire de l'abbaye," p. 358. They cite as their source

array of local power was impressive: the abbot of another important monastery, the chief comital official of Beauvais, and scions of the Milly, one of the most prominent seigneurial families of the region. These individuals all were bound to Saint-Lucien by a network of donations and feudal obligations.²⁸

Ties among the local aristocracy took precedence over older allegiances, depriving the aggrieved men of Grandvilliers of those individuals among the witnesses who might have been potential allies. For example, Dreux de Saint-Quies, one of the four original squires (*armigeri*) who appears in Garrett 163, was a former mayor (*maire*).²⁹ His origins on the lower side of the social scale might have made him more sympathetic to the peasants of Grandvilliers. Another witness, Pierre de Iuvegnies, is perhaps identical to that Pierre de Iuvegnies, noted in 1278 as a mayor of the seigneurie of Iuvegnies, also held in part by Saint-Lucien;³⁰ but he too is denoted as an *armiger*. Thus despite their compromising origins, both Dreux and Pierre, as *armigeri*, and probably self-conscious of their new status, had become part of the seigneurial elite. Taken together, the involvement of so many of Saint-Lucien's powerful local supporters suggests that the abbey met the continued possibility of resistance from the men of Grandvilliers by a kind of intimidation.

It remains an open question whether the guarantee of food supplies and the concession on executions by the monastery were enough to pacify the men of Grandvilliers. We may not be able to judge, then,

for the names the 17th-century manuscript work of G. Hermant, *Histoire de Beauvaisis*, Book 7, Chapter 15, which contains copies of documents from archives in the Beauvaisis. Since Garrett 163 only notes by name the four *armigeri*, or squires, the other nine individuals must have been named in the original agreement. In Leblond's collection of documents on the nobility, we may also have a fragment of the original agreement or another copy, which — unless it is a case of transcription error — seems to differ slightly from our copy. It reads: "in virum memorabilem . . ." Compare Garrett 163: "in virum venerabilem . . ." Leblond, "Notes pour le nobiliaire du Beauvaisis," p. 123. Leblond must have seen the original, or another copy, for he records a summary of the case under his entry for the Milly in which the "judges" differ from Garrett 163: "Ego Drogo miles et dominus de M . . . ego Droco de M. junior . . . ego Stephanus de M . . . souscrivent comme arbitres ou consillers en un jugement de Jean de Nointel, archidiacre de Rouen, dit le cardinal Cholet, contre les habitants de Grandvilliers dans un différend avec l'abbaye de S. Lucien. Octobre 1277]. Titres de S. Lucien." Leblond, p. 55.

²⁸ They are scattered through Leblond's collection.

²⁹ *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France* (ca. 1269), ed. L. Delisle, Vol. 24 (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1904), p. 722: "Droconam, quondam majorem de Saint-Quies . . ."

³⁰ Robert de Malinguehen, "Juignies: notice historique et archéologique," *Mémoires de la Société Académique . . . de l'Oise*, Vol. 10 (1877–1879), p. 312.

from Garrett 163 and associated evidence whether the atmosphere in the court of Saint-Lucien on the Friday after the feast of Saint Michael in 1278 was exclusively one of compromise or coercion. Most likely it was a mixture of the two. This contained tension, a balance between intimidation and negotiation, was probably common to the interaction between lords and their dependents throughout medieval Europe. One thing is sure: The accommodation reached between Saint-Lucien and the *hospites* of Grandvilliers did not stop the deterioration of their relations during times of greater distress. The inhabitants of Grandvilliers are remembered now for taking a prominent role in the greatest rebellion of the Middle Ages, the savage Jacquerie of 1358.³¹

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY MEDIEVAL MS. GARRETT 163

The parchment manuscript, one folio in length and apparently folded for storage after its composition, is of irregular dimensions, varying in width from 28.2 to 27.2 cm. The length is approximately 29.0 cm. It is slightly damaged in the lower right-hand corner. The bottom edge of the manuscript has been folded upwards to secure slots for seal tags. There are ten such openings, and the parchment strip for one seal survives in place. The script virtually fills the page, with an even margin from the edge of the parchment. It is written by a single scribe in a standard 13th-century chancery hand. Cursive qualities of the basic Carolingian style appear in the looped abbreviations and lightly connected minims. Light rules are visible throughout but there are no marginal pinpricks. All ceasuras marked in the text by different forms of punctuation are rendered in the edition by periods. Capitalization follows the usage in the manuscript.

Universis presentes litteras inspecturis. Ricardus de Britolio. Radulphus de Gaoudeschart. Droco de Sauquezes. et Petrus de Iuvegnies armigeri. homines feodati abbatis sancti Luciani Belvacensis. iudicantes in curia eiusdem abbatis de antiqua et approbata et hactenus pacifice observata consuetudine. salutem in domino. Noveritis quod cum inter predictum abbatem et conventum eiusdem loci ex una parte. et homines suos hospites in villa de grandivillari ex altera con-

³¹ *La Grande Encyclopédie*, 31 vols., eds. André Berthelot et al. (Paris: H. Lamirault, 1886–1902), Vol. 19, p. 197.

tentio verteretur. super eo quod idem abbas dicebat contra prefatos homines de grandivillari quod tam ipse quam predecessores sui sunt et fuerunt in possessione vel quasi sive saisina iuris huiusmodi. quod homines supradicti de grandivillari. omnes aut aliqua pars eorum custodierunt et custodire solent aut ad custodiendum adiuvere quotiens opus fuerit ad mandatum seu preceptum dicti abbatis vel ministrorum suorum. malefactores captos aut detentos apud dictam villam de grandivillari. et in territorio eius. Item quod homines supradicti ad mandatum seu preceptum dicti abbatis vel ministrorum suorum. omnes aut aliqua³² pars eorum conducunt et conducere solent aut ad conducendum adiuvere ad dictam abbatiam sancti Luciani malefactores predictos captos aut detentos apud grandivillari. Item quod homines memorati omnes vel maior pars eorum pergunt et pergere solent cum gentibus et ministris dicti abbatis ad faciendam iusticiam de dictis malefactoribus et videndam dictam iusticiam fieri et prestandum auxilium si opus esset et amovendam vim et impedimentum si dictis gentibus et ministris predicti abbatis ab aliquo vel aliquibus contingeret³³ inferri. et quod ad predicta omnia dicti homines de iure tenentur. Item quia predicti homines nuper et noviter aliqua de predictis contra iusticiam facere recusarunt. petebat dictus abbas hoc sibi a dictis hominibus emendari. Dictis hominibus econtrario negantibus predicta et dicentibus ad ea minime se teneri. et per cartam Erardi quondam abbatis sancti Luciani et eiusdem loci conventus se immunes et quitos existere a servitiis et Redevantiis memoratis. Tandem homines supradicti in iure et curia dicti abbatis propter hoc adiornati et coram nobis constituti pro se ex parte una et dicti abbas et conventus ex altera. unanimiter compromiserunt de alto et basso in virum venerabilem et discretum magistrum iohannem de noientello archidiaconum Rothomagensem super omnibus articulis supradictis. promittentes. dictum. pronuntiationem et ordinationem archidiaconi memorati sub pena ducentarum marcharum argenti a parte resiliente parti huius arbitrium observanti plenarie persolvenda. integre et inviolabiliter observare. se et successores suos et omnia bona sua adhuc specialiter obligando. insuper voluerunt et etiam consenserunt³⁴ homines memorati quod abbas qui pro tempore fuerit resilientes ab observatione predicti arbitrii si qui fuerint. ad observationem eiusdem sine offensa possit compellere prout viderit expedire. et quod

³² [A]liqua repeated in ms.

³³ Ms: *cuntingeret*.

³⁴ Ms: *congenserunt*.

pena commissa. sive exacta fuerit sive non. dictum tamen arbitrium firmum in suo robore perseveret. voluerunt etiam quod dictus archidiaconus de omnibus articulis supradictis simul aut divisim de aliquo vel aliquibus valeat dicere. pronuntiare. ac etiam ordinare. In cuius rei testimonium et munimen nos homines feodati supradicti ad instantiam partium presentes Litteras fieri fecimus et sigillorum nostrorum munimine roborari. Nos autem abbas et conventus sancti Luciani hic pluries memorati sigillum nostrum et sigillum capituli nostri. et sigilla vicinorum nostrorum presentibus Litteris apponi fecimus ut presens instrumentum maiorem habeat roboris firmitatem. et hoc omnibus quorum interest vel interesse potest volumus esse notum. Actum anno domini. m. cc. lxxmo. octavo. Die veneris post festum beati michaelis.

Dorse: An inscription, littera homines de grandvillari, survives with three more recent archival markings. The abbreviations in the inscription are different from those used in the body of the text, but the writing is contemporary.

TRANSLATION OF GARRETT 163

To all those who will see the present letters, Richard de Breteuil, Raoul de Gaudechart, Dreux de Saint-Quies, and Pierre de Iuegnies, esquires, [and] enfeoffed men of the abbot of Saint-Lucien of Beauvais, who by the ancient, approved and still peacefully observed custom are judging in the court of the same abbot, greetings in the Lord. You should know that a dispute has arisen between the afore-said abbot and convent of the same place on the one side, and his men, the *hospites* in the village of Grandvilliers on the other in which the abbot spoke against the said men of Grandvilliers, [claiming] that

Detail of the agreement between the Abbey of Saint-Lucien and the men of Grandvilliers. The two lines read "Universis presentes litteras inspecturis. Ricardus de Britolio. / . . . [Petrus de Iuegn]nies armigeri. homines feodati abbatis sancti Luciani Belvacensis." French, 1278. Medieval ms. Garrett 163, Princeton University Library.

both he and his predecessors are and were in possession or quasi-possession or in seisin of this right, namely that the aforesaid men of Grandvilliers, all or some part of them, daily guarded and were accustomed to guard or to assist as was necessary in guarding the criminals captured or detained at the said village of Grandvilliers and in its territory, at the command or order of the said abbot or his officials. Likewise that the aforesaid men, all or some part of them, transported and were accustomed to transport or to assist in transporting the aforesaid criminals, captured or held at Grandvilliers, to the said abbey of Saint-Lucien at the command or order of the said abbot or of his officials. Likewise, that the said men, all or the majority of them, assisted and were accustomed to assist the men and officials of the said abbot in doing justice to the said criminals and in seeing that the said justice is done, and in offering aid if there were need and in opposing any force or resistance if it happened to be brought against the said men and officials of the aforesaid abbot by anything or anyone. And that the said men are obliged to [do] the aforesaid things by right. Likewise, because the aforesaid men have recently and unusually refused, contrary to justice, to do any of the aforesaid things, the said abbot petitioned that this [behavior] toward himself by the said men be corrected. The said men, on the contrary, deny the aforesaid [claims] and say that they are not bound to [do] them at all. And [they say that] by the charter of Erard, formerly the abbot of Saint-Lucien, and of the convent of the same place, that they are free and quit from the said services and dues. Thereafter the aforesaid men had their day in the justice and court of the said abbot on account of this [dispute] and assembled before us on their own behalf on one side and the said abbot and convent on the other. They agreed unanimously from high and low before the venerable and distinguished man, master Jean de Nointel, the archdeacon of Rouen, about all of the aforesaid issues, promising to observe fully and inviolably the pronouncement and order of the said archdeacon under pain of 200 marks of silver to be paid by the party at fault to the party fully observing this agreement and they pledge themselves and their successors and especially all their goods to this [end]. In addition, the aforesaid men wished and agreed that any future abbot should be able, without blame, to compel as he will deem necessary those ones defaulting from the aforesaid arbitration, if there are such individuals, to observe it and once the penalty has been incurred, whether it

will have been exacted or not, the said arbitration should nevertheless continue binding. They have desired also that the said archdeacon should [have responsibility to] declare, pronounce, and give orders concerning all of the aforesaid articles together or about any one or more of them individually. We, the aforesaid enfeoffed men, had these present letters made in attestation and preservation of this agreement at the request of the parties and it is confirmed by the affixing of our seals. We, moreover, the abbot and convent of Saint-Lucien, mentioned here several times, have caused our seals and the seal of our chapter and the seals of our neighbors to be affixed to the present letters so that this instrument should have greater strength of authority. And we wish that this be noted by all of those to whom it concerns or can affect. Done in the year of the Lord 1278, on the Friday after the feast of Saint Michael.