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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 (9 October) after the feast of Saint Michael in 1278, Abbé 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 violence 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

---

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 hôtés, 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*, a vols., translated by L. A. Manyan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), Vol. 1, p. 285.


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 1453, 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: Weidenfield and Nicolson, 1972), p. 156.

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, Dreuex de Saint-Quiss, and Pierre de Iuveyninger — 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 to guard the criminals, to bring them to the abbot’s court, and to aid the abbatt’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 re-founded 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-

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 seignuries 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

9 “Hospites omnes ejusdem villae erunt quitii 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 antiquités du diocèse de Beauvais, II (1614). 109, cited in Deladreune and Mathon, “Histoire de l’abbaye,” p. 345.

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. Saint-Lucien compromised in 1290 with Renaud d'Auteuil, chevalier, in another dispute over rights of justice in which Saint-Lucien preserved its privileges. 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. 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.”

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

11 "Conquerentur abbas et conventus Sancti-Luciani Belvacensis quod baldius S. vacensis indebitie impediebat eodem quominus gaudere possent justicia cujusdam multii quod acciderat in villa sua de sequio, licet idem omnismodum justicium habeant per cartam.... Ies Olum Ou Registres des arrets rendus par la cour du roi, ed. A. Beugnot, 1 (Paris: Ministre de L'Instruction Publique, 1890), 690, xxix.


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

14 "Por determiner 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. 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.

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-serf status offered by the monastery and the bishop of Beauvais. In an area of


France known for the servile condition of its rural population, 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. 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 Chofet’s agreement, in a more 
expanded version than the Garrett 163 records, the abbey thus 

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.” 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. 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 lieu from the abbot of Saint-Lucien. 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. 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

22 L. H. Labande, Histoire de Beauvais et de ses institutions communales jusqu’au commencement du xve 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 1209 – 1206, 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 1263, 16 years before the conflict recorded in Garrett 163, several noble vassals of the abbey passed judgment on “ceux de Grandvilliers.” 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. Here the men 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 abbots’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. 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. 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.)


Deladre and Mathon, “Histoire de l’abbaye,” p. 358. They cite as their source
array of local power was impressive: the abbey 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.  

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, Dreu de Saint-Quies, one of the four original squires (armigeri) who appears in Garrett 163, was a former mayor (maire).  

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 Juvignies, is perhaps identical to that Pierre de Juvignies, noted in 1278 as a mayor of the seigneurie of Juvignies, also held in part by Saint-Lucien;  

but he too is denoted as an armiger. Thus despite their compromising origins, both Dreu 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, 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 habitus 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 Jaquerie of 1358.  

---

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 minimis. Light rules are visible throughout but there are no marginal pinpricks. All caesuras 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 Juvignies armigeri. homines feodati abbas sancti Luciani Belvacensis. iudicantes in curia eiusdem abbatis de antiqua et approbata et factus 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-
tentio vereretur. super eo quod idem abbas dicebat contra praefatus
homines de grandivillari quod tam ipse quam predecessores sui sunt
et fuerunt in possessione vel quasi sive sahis turris huinmadi. quod
homines supractic de grandivillari. omnes aut aliqua pars eorum
custodierunt et custodie solent aut ad custodiendum adiuvare quo-
tiens opus fuerit ad mandatum seu preceptum dicti abbatis vel min-
istrorum suorum. malefactoris capto aut detentos apud dictam vil-
lam de grandivillari. et in territorio eius. item quod homines
supractic ad mandatum seu preceptum dicti abbatis vel ministrum
sorum. omnes aut aliqua pars eorum conducunt et conducere so-
 lent aut ad conducendum adiuvare ad dictam abbatiam sancti Luciani
malefactoris predictos capto aut detentos apud grandivillari. Item
quod homines memorati omnes vel maior pars eorum pungunt et per-
gere solent cum gentibus et ministris dicti abbatis ad faciendam ius-
ticiam de dictis malefactoribus et videndum dictam justiciam fieri et
prestandum auxiliun si opus esset et antovendam vim et infidumen-
tum si dictis gentibus et ministris predicti abbatis ab aliqua vel aliqui-
bus contingeret inferri. et quod ad predicta omnia dicti homines de
iure tenentur. item quia predicti homines nuper et noviter aliqua de
predictis contra justiciam facere recusarat. petebat dictus abbis hoc
sibi a dictis hominibus emendar. dictus hominibus contrario nega-
tibus predicta et dicentibus ad ea minime se teneri. et per cartam
Eardi quondam abbatis sancti Luciani et eiusdem loci conventus se im-
munes et quitos existere a servitiis et Redevantii memoratis. Tandem
homines supractic in iure et curia dicti abbatii proper hoc adiornati
et coram nobis constituti pro se ex parte una et dicti abbas et convent-
tus ex altera. unaniimer compromiserunt de alto et basso in virum
evenerabilem et discretum magistrum iohanem de noientello archidi-
aconum Rothomagensem super omnibus articulis supracticis. pro-
mittentes. dictum. pronuntiationem et ordinationem archidioconi me-
 morati sub pena ducentarum marcharum argenti a parte resilienti
parti huius arbitrium observanti plenarie persolvenda. integre et in-
violalibilib observare. se et successores suos et omnia bona sua ad hoc
specialiter obligando. insuper voluerunt et etiam consenserunt
homines memorati quod abbas qui pro tempore fuerit resilientes ab
observatione predicti arbitrii si quii fuerint. ad observationem eius-
dem sine offensa possi compellere prout viderit expedire. et quod

pena commissa. sive exacta fuerit sive non. dictum tamen arbitrium
firmum in suo robore perseveret. voluerunt etiam quod dictus archi-
dioconus de omnibus articulis supracticis simul aut: divisim de aliquo
vel aliquibus valeat dicere. pronuntiare. ac etiam ordinare. In cuius
rel testimonium et muninien nos homines feodati supractic ad in-
stamam partium presentes Litteras fieri fecimus et sigillorum nostro-
rum munimine roborari. Nos autem abbas et conventus sancti Luci-
ani hic plurias memorati sigillum nostrum et sigillum capituli nostri.
et sigilla vicinorum nostrorum presentibus Litteras apponii fecimus ut
presens instrumentum maiorum habeat robos firmitatem. et hoc
omnibus quorum interest vel interesse potest volumus esse notum.
Actum anno domini. m. cc. lxxxmo. octavo. Die veneris post festum
beati michelis.

Dorsa: 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 Iuveg-
nies, 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
both he and his predecessors are and were in possession or quasi-possession or in seiun 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 abbey 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 abbey 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