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I. INTRODUCTION

The Benedictine monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport, founded by count Robert of Eu in 1059, appears the ideal focus for a study of the border of northeastern Normandy during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries for two reasons.¹ First, situated in the city of Le Tréport on the mouth of the Bresle, the monastery lay in a transition zone between the Norman county of Eu and the neighboring county of Ponthieu. The geographical location of the monastery suggests that the documents produced by monks living there would be able to provide unique insight into the nearby borders and borderlands of northeast Normandy during both the ducal and Capetian periods and during the transition from one to the other in 1204. Second, the sources and documents of Saint-Michel du Tréport, rather than being confined in distant French archives, are easily accessible in the form of a cartulary composé compiled and published by P. Laffleur de Kermaingant in 1880.² These circumstances combined with several assertions made by Daniel Power provided the spark of inspiration for a project examining the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport from its foundation in 1059 until the death of Louis IX of France in 1270.³

The single most important source for this study is the Cartulaire de L’abbaye de Saint-Michel du Tréport compiled and edited by P. Laffleur de Kermaingant. Not an actual medieval cartulary, this nineteenth-century work is instead a collection of all the

¹The monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport is often referred to as Le Tréport, which is also the name of the city within which the monastery was located. To avoid confusion, this study will always specify when it is referring to the city and not the monastery.
³For example, Power makes the claim that ” in the late twelfth century the count of Eu held fiefs in Ponthieu, while Bernard de Saint Valéry held many of his fiefs in Ponthieu from the count of Aumale and a great part of his wealth lay in England and Normandy.” Daniel Power, The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 248-50.
documents relating to Le Tréport which Kermaingant was able to locate, edit, and arrange chronologically in a single volume. Though this collection has its faults, it has been invaluable to this study, for the primary sources it contains and also for the efforts which Kermaingant has made to identify the persons and places mentioned in these charters. Kermaingant’s *Cartulaire* contains two hundred and twenty-one charters for the years between 1059 and 1270. In collecting all the relevant materials from Saint-Michel du Tréport for this period, Kermaingant appears to have been very thorough.

For his materials from the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, Kermaingant drew on five sources: the departmental archives of the Seine-Maritime; the thirteenth-century cartulary of the counts of Eu, Bibliothèque Nationale de France ms. lat. 13904; an eighteenth-century cartulary for Le Tréport preserved as Bibliothèque Saint-Geneviève ms. 1651; the charters provided by Dom Coquelin in his *L’histoire de l’Abbaye de Saint-Michel du Tréport*; and a volume which Kermaingant refers to as the *Cartulaire de Foucarmont*, which appears to be ms. 1224 (Y. 013) of the Bibliothèque Municipale de Rouen. From the departmental archives of the Seine-Maritime, Kermaingant used ninety-two originals (two of these were chirographs) and seven copies of older documents. According to the *Guide des Archives de la Seine-Maritime* (1990), many if not all of these charters are still extant. The thirteenth-century cartulary of the counts of Eu contributed twenty-three charters, while seventeen came from Coquelin’s

---


work, and three from the *Cartulaire de Foucarmont*.\(^6\) Kermaingant drew the most charters from ms. 1651 of the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève in Paris, one hundred and sixty-three in total, though many of these documents were also found in Kermaingant’s other sources.\(^7\)

This thesis focuses on four topics. First, it examines the ecclesiastical context of Saint-Michel du Tréport and the monastery’s relationships with other secular and regular ecclesiastics. Second, this project considers the lay patronage of Saint-Michel du Tréport. Third, this project uses the charters of Saint-Michel du Tréport and related documents as a lens through which to study the Normanno-Ponthevin border and the boundary between the dioceses of Amiens and Rouen. Lastly, this thesis explores the impact of the Capetian conquest of Normandy in 1204 upon the borderlands of northeast Normandy, as seen from the perspective of Le Tréport’s charter record. This project covers the period from the monastery’s foundation in 1059 through the death of Louis IX in 1270. This time span is in part a function of the Capetian conquest of Normandy in 1204 since by the time of Louis IX’s death sixty-six years later any effects of the conquest should have had ample time to become visible in Le Tréport’s charter record.

This study has taken a mixed approach to its sources. First, it has employed a close reading of Le Tréport’s charters and the other relevant primary sources. The information gained in this way was then compiled into a database. This allowed a correlation of all of the donations made to Le Tréport with their donors, witnesses, and

---


locations. This information was then displayed spatially on a map showing the location of all of Le Tréport’s possessions. This map, the database, and the close readings of Le Tréport’s charters have all been critical components of the research undertaken for this project.

**Evidence for Saint-Michel du Tréport’s Early History**

Before turning to the main body of the thesis we must first discuss the dating of several pancartes contained among Kermaingant’s earliest charters and the date of Saint-Michel du Tréport’s foundation. Reconstructing a narrative of the early years of Saint-Michel du Tréport is difficult. The first, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth charters in Kermaingant’s collection are pancartes, and all of them carry internal dates which appear to be plausible but are revealed upon closer examination to be incorrect. To date these documents properly, and thus to reconstruct accurately the events of Le Tréport’s foundation and early history, one must consider not only the year given in the first recorded act but also the relationship of the rest of the acts in the pancarte to that date and to each other.

The easiest charter to date is the sixth. While the charter opens with *Anno Dominice Incarnationis M˚. centesimo VII˚, ego Henricus, Augensis comes*, the later contents of the document reveal that this date is impossible, at least for the date of the creation of the entire pancarte. While 1107 is a plausible date for the first act recorded in this document, a confirmation by Count Henry of Eu (c.1095 – 1140) of the possessions of the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport, a subsequent act in the charter refers to Hugh of Amiens as archbishop of Rouen yet he was elevated to the metropolitan seat only in 1129

---

8 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 24, no. 6.
or 1130. Moreover, several of Hugh’s archdeacons witnessed the same act, one of whom, Geoffrey, became archdeacon only in 1133. The attestation of another archdeacon, Richard, allows us to date this to either 1133 or 1134. In his *Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals in the Ducal Period, 911-1204*, David Spear points out that this act is likely the last recorded for Richard, probably placing this act in 1133. The final act in this pancarte is a confirmation issued by count Henry of all the gifts which Ancellus de Fréauville had made to Saint-Michel, and, since Henry died in 1140, this means that the earliest date for this pancarte must be somewhere between 1133 and 1140.

Kermaingant’s fifth charter is similar in structure but more difficult to date as it offers fewer clues and those it does offer are considerably more ambiguous. This pancarte’s first act is dated to 1107, but subsequent acts make this date implausible. The juxtaposition of several of the acts in this charter suggest the passage of time between them. For example, one act records a donation made by a Eremburgis, the mother of Gerald de Horneio and of Guidonus, to which both Gerald and Guidonus consented. The next act, however, was issued by Eremburgis’ son, Gerald, but this one records a gift made on the day that his brother, Guidonus, was buried. This implies but does not prove that some time had passed between Eremburgis’ donation and Gerald’s. Other evidence within this pancarte, however, suggest that events it records may have occurred close

---

11 Spear, *Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals*, 210. Spear says that there is a slight possibility of Richard appearing in 1134, but that might also have been another person. Either way, it does not make much difference for the dating of this act.
13 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 23 no. 5.
14 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 23 no. 5.
together in time. The donation of Gerald de Horneio is witnessed by Geoffrey de Sancto Martino, one of the original donors to the monastery at its foundation. The last reliably dated charter in which Geoffrey appears occurs at the opening of Kermaingant’s sixth charter and is dated to 1107. Since Geoffrey de Sancto Martino also witnessed Gerald de Horneio’s act, and since at some point in Count Henry’s tenure Geoffrey faded from the charter record to be replaced by his Walter, it is possible that Gerald’s donation did not occur much later than 1107. Unfortunately, none of the charters in which Walter appears offer any clue as to their date, making it impossible to date Geoffrey’s death and thus the date before which Gerald’s donation must have occurred.

This makes this pancarte difficult to date with any certainty. While there is evidence which suggests the passage of time, there is also evidence that not much time had passed. The best that can be said about this pancarte is that 1107 is a plausible date for the first act, but less plausible for subsequent acts and certainly least plausible as a date for the compilation of the pancarte.

As in Kermaingant’s fifth and sixth charters, in the fourth charter only the first act contains a date, 1101, and this is clearly incorrect for the entirety of the pancarte. While the first act was witnessed by Geoffry de Sancto Martino, a subsequent undated act was witnessed by his son, Walter, suggesting that by that time Geoffrey had died. As we saw mentioned above, the last reliably dated act in which Geoffrey appeared placed him in 1107, and the appearance of Walter in this pancarte suggests that it was compiled after Geoffrey had died, sometime after that date. Unfortunately, due to the nature of these pancartes, it is impossible to determine with certainty that Walter did not witness acts

---

16 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 23 no. 5.
17 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 25, no. 6
18 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 21, no. 4.
while his father was still alive. The evidence of these pancartes suggests that Walter did not since Walter and Geoffrey never attested an act together and, in most instances, acts to which Geoffrey witnessed only appear before acts witnessed by Walter in these pancartes. Future research into other documentary sources, however, will be needed to corroborate the assertion that Walter only began attesting acts after his father’s death.

Kermaingant’s third charter reproduces Saint-Michel du Tréport’s foundation document, a copy of the original but unlike the original, its verbs are in perfect tense rather than present, and the document has been expanded with details concerning the monastery’s founding donations and with records of donations which occurred after Le Tréport’s foundation and through the tenure of William, count Robert’s son. Many of the additions in this charter are formulaic, added, it seems, to fill out the spare style employed in an earlier copy of Le Tréport’s foundation charter, the first document in Kermaingant’s collection. Almost invariably these formulae take the form of pro sua et antecessorum suorum anima inserted into the account of each donation. Occasionally these interpolations include details which are not formulae but instead commentated upon the original contents of the document. For example, when recording the donation of Geoffrey de Sancto Martino, this charter adds that the donation was made at the request of Geoffrey’s brother, William, who was a monk of Le Tréport, a datum not present in

---

19 The exception to this is in Kermaingant’s third charter, which is discussed in more detail below. In this pancarte, Walter witnessed an act of one Havisa while later in the pancarte Geoffrey attested to the donations of Count William while his father, Count Robert, was still alive. I do not think this contradicts the assertion made above since the chronology of this pancarte is less straightforward than that of charters four, five, and six. Walter’s attestation comes after a recounting of all of the donations made by Count Robert after his initial foundation of Saint-Michel, while Geoffrey’s attestation is of the donations made by Count William, Robert’s son, while Count Robert was still alive. Thus, it is possible that Geoffrey’s attestations actually predate Walter’s in this case. See Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 16-17, no. 3.

20 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 12, no. 3.
the initial foundation document, at least as preserved in Kermaingant’s first charter. The inclusion of details such as these suggests that this pancarte was compiled by someone who either was present at the founding, had access to the charters of the non-comital donors confirmed by the foundation document, was familiar with the monastery and its patrons, or all three.

The date of this pancarte’s first act, as in the pancartes previously considered, is belied by the later contents of the pancarte. While the first act is dated to 1059, the fact that this document includes acts from after William’s accession to the countship between 1089 and 1093 makes this date inappropriate for all of the contents of this pancarte. The real clue to this pancarte’s date comes in its record of the donation of Richard de Fréauville, which mentions that Richard was the father of Abbot Osbern. This suggests that this pancarte was compiled during Osbern’s abbacy, which Véronique Gazeau in her Prosopographie des abbès bénédictins (Xe-XIIe siècle) dates as beginning before 1101 and ending after 1118, though according to these pancartes the earliest appearance of Osbern in a charter can be dated to after 1107 and the last to 1133. The reference to Osbern’s abbacy within this pancarte means that this pancarte was also likely compiled sometime during his time in office.

---

21 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 13-14, no. 3.
22 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 17, no. 3
23 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 14, no. 3
24 This first date has been arrived at based on the evidence of Kermaingant’s fourth charter, the earliest charter in which Gazeau was able to locate Osbernus. In this charter, Osbernus is not mentioned until the very last act, while both Goifridus and Walterius de Sancto Martino are mentioned in earlier successive acts. Since the last dated act extant in which Goifridus appears is 1107 and since his son appears later in the same charter with the assumption that his father has died by this point, it makes sense that the act in which Osbernus is mentioned, which comes after the act in which Walterius appears, comes after 1107. This means that the earliest charter in which Osbernus appears could have been written at the earliest in 1107 though likely sometime later. The second date was reached from the appearance of Osbernus in conjunction with Hugh of Amiens and his two archdeacons, in the act from Kermaingant’s sixth charter discussed above, which occurred in 1133, which is later than the last date which Gazeau gives for Osbernus.
All four of the charters considered above appear to have been compiled during the abbacy of Osberne de Fréauville (after 1107 – after 1133) or perhaps just shortly thereafter in the case of charter six. It is unclear why the monks felt a need to create these pancartes during this period. Certainly Normandy was not short of turmoil in the 1110s or in the mid to late 1130s, but a definitive reason for the creation of these pancartes will unfortunately have to await further research and another project.

Interestingly, the foundation document of the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport, as preserved in Kermaingant’s first charter, is simultaneously the most obviously misdated and the most clearly truthful about when it was written. The date of 1036 which this charter gives is patently false. The protocol of the document refers to Maurilius as archbishop of Rouen, but his first appearance as archbishop cannot be attested until 1054, while in 1036 a Robert was archbishop of Rouen. While the date which the charter itself provides is clearly wrong, there is nothing no other evidence in this document to suggest that it was not composed at Le Tréport’s foundation or shortly thereafter. The clues which this charter provides for its own dating, and thus also for the date of Le Tréport’s foundation, lie in its references to Maurilius as archbishop of Rouen. This places this document and Le Tréport’s foundation after 1054 but before Maurilius’ death in 1067.27 One can only assume that the date of 1036 given within the charter itself must have been corrupted at some point during the document’s transmission.

But, Kermaingant’s third charter allows this riddle to be solved. The date which it assigns to the foundation of Saint-Michel du Tréport, 1059, does not conflict with the reference to Maurilius as archbishop of Rouen. This date is further supported by the fact

25 Spear, 
Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals, 196-7.
26 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 1, no. 1.
27 Spear, 
Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals, 196-7.
that this pancarte appears to have been compiled by someone who had access to the original uncorrupted document or who was present at the foundation or who was familiar with people who had been, since it contains information only a such a person would know. Additionally, a correct date for the foundation charter in this document would also confirm to the general pattern of these pancartes in having correctly dated first acts followed by a number of later undated acts. Ultimately, the charter record for Le Tréport only offers two options for the monastery’s foundation date – either 1036 or 1059. The first of these is clearly incorrect, while the second fits all the available evidence. It seems safe to conclude, then, that Kermaingant’s first charter, Le Tréport’s foundation charter, was written in 1059 and that this also was the year in which count Robert of Eu founded Saint-Michel du Tréport. Thus the early history of Le Tréport can only be established in outline as subsequent medieval rewriting of the past has prevented any more precise reconstruction.

28 For example, in this pancarte, the author often mentions if a donor had family members who became monks at Saint-Michel. When recording the gift of Geoffrey of Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard, the author comments that the gift was made at the request of Geoffrey’s brother William, who was made a monk at Saint-Michel du Tréport (et rogatu fratri sui Willelmi qui monachus factus est apud Ulterisportum). The inclusion of these details suggests to me that the compiler of this pancarte was either a monk at Le Tréport or was familiar with the community there. This, in turn, suggests that the author either had access to the original uncorrupted foundation document, or had access to people who remembered the event. For the reference to Geoffrey’s brother see Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 14, no. 3. For other mentions of monks in this pancarte see Kermaingant, Cartulaire 12, 14, 15, 17, no. 3.
II. SAINT-MICHEL DE TRÉPORT’S ECCLESIASTICAL CONTEXT

The monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport existed in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries within vibrant networks of ecclesiastics connecting the dioceses of Rouen, Sées, Avranches, Amiens, Beauvais, and even stretching across the channel into Norman England. Through these networks the monks of Saint-Michel interacted with a broad spectrum of ecclesiastics and religious including the archbishops of Rouen, the abbots of other monasteries, and local parish priests. This chapter aims to situate the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport within this ecclesiastical network, beginning with an examination of what is known about the inner workings of the house itself, then moving outwards to examine the relationship of the monastery with the ecclesiastical elite, secular religious, and with other monasteries. This chapter also examines some of the actions which the monks took in managing and increasing their own holdings.

A Benedictine monastery founded by Count Robert of Eu in 1059, the details of the founding of Saint-Michel du Tréport are shrouded by corrupted documents and conflicting sources.¹ Both the date of its foundation and the identity of the earliest abbots are the subject of debate.² As I pointed out in this study’s introduction, the date given in the foundation charter, that of 1036, is belied by a reference within the charter to Maurilius as the archbishop of Rouen which places the document not in 1036 but between 1054 and 1067.³ The introduction to this study makes the case for a foundation date of 1059 based on a year given in a copy of the foundation charter which was likely

¹ For my argument for this date as the year of Le Tréport’s foundation please see my introduction to this thesis. Gallia Christiana, Denys de Sainte-Marthe, t.11 (Paris: V. Palme), 244-53.
² For descriptions of the problems and debate surrounding Le Tréport’s origins see Véronique Gazeau, Normannia monastica: Prosopographie des abbés bénédictins (X°-XII° siècle) Caen, France: Publications du CRAHM, 2007), 363; Gallia Christiana t.11, 244-53 ; P. Laffleur de Kermaingant, ed., Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint-Michel du Tréport (Paris: Typographie de Firmin-Didot, 1880), xv-xxx.
made between 1100 and the mid-1130s. The *Gallia Christiana* claims that Saint-Michel du Tréport had sixteen abbots during the period from 1059 to 1270. Véronique Gazeau, however, in her *Normannia Monastica*, asserts that the identities of the earliest abbots of Saint-Michel du Tréport are obscured by lack of documentation in the charters for Le Tréport and conflicts between sources such as the *Gallia Christiana*, the *Neustria Pia*, and the *De immutatione ordinis monachorum* of Robert de Torigni.

**Saint-Michel du Tréport in the Thirteenth Century**

While Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charters do not reveal much about the monastery’s interior workings, the visitation notes in the *Register* of Eudes Rigaud, archbishop of Rouen from 1248-1275, do provide a picture of the monastery’s moral and financial state during his episcopate. Rigaud recorded in his *Register* fifteen visitations to Saint-Michel du Tréport: in 1248, twice in 1249, once in 1250, 1252, 1255, 1256, 1257, 1259, 1261, 1262, 1264, 1266, 1268, and for the last time in 1269. Though often brief, his observations and notes from these visitations reveal certain aspects of the community’s internal life at the end of our period.

During Archbishop Rigaud’s visitations the number of monks residing at Le Tréport averaged twenty-one. At any given time the majority of the monks were priests, with usually only about three lay monks at Le Tréport. During a 1269 visitation Rigaud

---

4 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 8, no. 3. For the dating of this charter please see my discussion in the introduction, pages 7-10.
5 *Gallia Christiana* t.11, 244-53.
recorded there were seven unordained monks, the highest number in any of his visits.
Novices at Saint-Michel du Tréport appear infrequently in Eudes’ notes. Their presence
was recorded only three times, in 1250, 1261, and 1269. In 1250 Rigaud noted the
presence of four novices, while in 1261 there was only one.8

The Register which Eudes kept of his visitations provides a sense of the wealth of
Saint-Michel du Tréport during his tenure. In 1249 and 1252 Rigaud noted that the
monastery’s incomes was one thousand, one hundred libri.9 This is the only record in the
Register of Le Tréport’s income. Rigaud also revealed that the monks were often in debt.
Over the course of Rigaud’s visitations, Saint-Michel du Tréport consistently owed
between two and five hundred libri through all of Rigaud’s inspections. Rigaud also often
noted that the monastery was owed several hundred libri as well, though the archbishop
observed twice that these were not very sound debts.10

Rigaud noted that Le Tréport possessed four priories, three in the diocese of
Rouen and one in the diocese of Amiens.11 Locating these priories, however, is difficult.
Rigaud referred to only one by name, the priory at Eurville.12 A priory at Rougecamp
near Cuverville-sur-Yères is suggested by a 1248 charter recording a donation made to
Rougecamp with the specific condition that if the house were to become uninhabited, the
gift would fall to Le Tréport instead.13 Dom Coquelin, in his history of the abbey of Le
Tréport, and the eighteenth-century geographer Michel Duplessis both agree that

8 Eudes Rigaud, The Register of Eudes of Rouen, 113-4, 464, 728.
13 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 200-2, no. 182.
Rougecamp was a priory of Le Tréport. Duplessis suggested la Frenoie as the location of a third priory and Coquelin follows suit, albeit using a slightly different spelling, suggesting that the monks had a priory at la Fresnoye. Both seem to think that this priory was near the city of Aumale. La Frenoie or la Fresnoye fits the description of Lafresnoye where the monks received donations from various members of the Visa family sometime in the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries, whose donations were confirmed by the count of Aumale. Cottineau lists Lafresnoye as a priory in his work, but does not say on which monastery it was dependent.

As for the location of Le Tréport’s priory in the diocese of Amiens to which Rigaud referred, Duplessis offers no help as his historical geography was concerned only with upper Normandy. Coquelin’s history does offer some insight, however. He claims that the monks of Le Tréport had seven priories altogether. Rigaud’s note that the monks only had four may indicate that either Coquelin considered some churches priories while the monks and Rigaud did not or that Le Tréport gained three more priories after the time of Rigaud’s visitations. Besides the three priories already discussed, Coquelin wrote that Saint-Michel du Tréport had priories at St. Croix, between the cities of Le Tréport and Eu, at Hornoy-le-Bourg, at Camps-en-Amienois, and at Hastings. An 1151 charter issued by Count John of Eu records the donation of the priory at Hastings to Le Tréport,
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14 F. B. Coquelin, Histoire de l’Abbaye de St-Michel du Tréport t.1 (Rouen: Chez Ch. Meterie, 1879) 226; Michel Duplessis, Description geographique et historique de la haute Normandie t.1 (Paris: Chez Pierre-François Giffart, 1711), 422.
15 Duplessis, Description geographique, 481; Coquelin, Histoire de l’Abbaye de St-Michel du Tréport, 218.
16 Duplessis, Description geographique, 481; Coquelin, Histoire de l’Abbaye de St-Michel du Tréport, 218.
17 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 16, 19, no. 3.
though the monks must have lost this priory by the time of Eudes Rigaud, as it seems he would have mentioned it.20

This leaves only Hornoy-le-Bourg and Camps-en-Amienois as possible locations of Le Tréport’s priory in the diocese of Amiens. The charter which records Gerald de Horneio’s original gift to the monks at Hornoy-le-Bourg leads us to think that Hornoy-le-Bourg was the location of Saint-Michel’s priory in the diocese of Amiens. This charter from the late eleventh or early twelfth century records that in addition to land in the area, Gerald gave to the monks his portion in the church of Hornoy-le-Bourg and “established the monks of St. Michael there” (et monachos ibi Sancti Michaelis statuit).21 In addition the grant of Ralph de Arenis to the monks of the church in Camps-en-Amienois at around the same time makes no mention of establishing the monks of St. Michael in that church.22 The 1301 pouillé from the diocese of Amiens muddles matters. In this document, the prior and abbot of Le Tréport are listed as patrons of the church in Camps-en-Amienois while a prior of Hornoy is listed as the patron of the church of Hornoy-le-Bourg.23 No priory of Hornoy or of Camps-en-Amienois is mentioned in the 1301 pouillé. Things become slightly more clear in the 1362 pouillé from the diocese of Amiens. While the patrons of churches are not listed in this document, the abbot and prior of Saint-Michel du Tréport are recorded as owing a fee for the house of Camps (pro domo de Camps) in the deanery of Airaines.24 Also in this list is a prior of Hornoy, who also owed a fee to the bishop, though for what is not specified.25 Additionally, a prior of

20 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 44-5, no. 18.
21 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 23, no. 5.
22 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 23, no. 5.
24 Longnon, Pouillés de Reims, 586.
25 Longnon, Pouillés de Reims, 586.
Floyssy who owed a fee for Hornoy and Linieres is listed as well.\(^{26}\) A list of the procuration fees owed to the archbishop of Reims from 1312 provides the final piece of this puzzle, recording a prior of Hornoy from Le Tréport (\textit{prior de Hornea, de Treport}).\(^{27}\) Unfortunately, Cottineau’s work is not very helpful in solving this problem since it seems that much of his information has been drawn from these same sources.\(^{28}\) Cottineau lists Camps-en-Amienois as a priory of Le Tréport and initially appears to list Hornoy as a priory of a Fleuzy or Floissy.\(^{29}\) In his sources, however, Cottineau admits a connection between Hornoy and Le Tréport when he also cites the list of the procuration fees of the archbishop of Reims which enigmatically pairs the prior of Hornoy with Le Tréport.\(^{30}\)

So, what should be made of this? We cannot know for certain whether the priory in the diocese of Amiens which Eudes Rigaud mentioned was at Hornoy-le-Bourg or Camps-en-Amienois. The evidence is simply too muddled. Based on the evidence which we do have, however, this is what appears to have likely been the case. It seems most probable that Le Tréport at some point in its history possessed priories at both Hornoy-le-Bourg and at Camps-en-Amienois. The priory at Hornoy-le-Bourg is suggested by the donation of Gerald de Horneio in which he established the monks in the church of Hornoy-le-Bourg and also from the reference to a prior of Hornoy from Le Tréport in the archbishop of Reim’s list of procurations.\(^{31}\) A priory at Camps-en-Amienois is also strongly suggested by the note in the 1362 \textit{pouillé} from Amiens which states that Le

\(^{26}\) Longnon, \textit{Pouillé de Reims}, 586.  
\(^{27}\) Longnon, \textit{Pouillé de Reims}, 717.  
\(^{30}\) Cottineau, \textit{Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés}, s.v. “Hornoy.”  
Tréport owed a fee to the bishop of Amiens for the house at Camps-en-Amienois. The priory at Hornoy-le-Bourg, however, does not appear in the sources after 1312 while the priory at Camps-en-Amienois is not mentioned until 1362. It seems plausible, then, that the monks of Le Tréport possessed a priory at Hornoy-le-Bourg until sometime after 1312 when they must have lost it, and that sometime before 1362 the monks acquired or founded a priory in Camps-en-Amienois. This means that it was likely the priory at Hornoy-le-Bourg to which Eudes Rigaud was referring when he mentioned that the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport possessed a priory in the diocese of Amiens. The four priories of Le Tréport, then, were located in Eurville, Rougecamp, Lafresnoye, and Hornoy-le-Bourg.

Rigaud’s Register makes it apparent that the behavior of the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport frequently did not meet the archbishop’s expectations. During the nine visitations for which we have fuller notes, the archbishop consistently rebuked the abbots and monks for their wayward behavior. The offenses of the monks of Le Tréport included the maintenance of a priory containing a solitary monk, the consumption of meat in priories, the refusal of the monks to accuse one another in chapter, the neglect of fasts being by traveling monks, the monks retention of their old clothes for their personal use, and the abuse of office by the cellarer and prior. In 1256 the archbishop imposed a penance on the abbot of Le Tréport because he had not enforced the Rule or kept account of the abbey finances, both of which Rigaud had commanded on earlier visits. In 1268

---

32 Longon, Pouillés de Reims, 586.
34 Eudes Rigaud, The Register of Eudes of Rouen, 301-2.
Rigaud noted that he found the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport “to be very contentious and quarrelsome.”

Some of these failings the monks appear never to have corrected. For example, the archbishop took issue with the monks for not accusing each other in chapter during nearly each of his visitations. Beginning in 1261, however, the monks began to claim that this was not due to neglect, but was a practice not included in their usages (unus non clamat alium, licet pluries preceperimus hoc fieri et emendari, et dicunt quod hoc non habent in usu). Rigaud seems to have accepted this claim with skepticism. He still noted in two out of his five remaining visitations that the monks did not accuse each other, but also observed that this was what they claimed to be their custom (unus non clamat alium, et hoc habent de consuetudine, sicut dicunt). On the other hand, it seems that some of the problems which the archbishop uncovered were addressed by the monks. In his visitations of 1249 and 1250 Rigaud enjoined the community of Saint-Michel either to recall a monk who was living alone at the priory of Eurville or to send another monk to join him. Between 1250 and 1252 this fault must have been corrected as the archbishop never mentions this problem again.

Eudes Rigaud’s Register presents the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport and its monks in a poor light. The archbishop’s notes are laced with comments on the failings of the monks and their resistance to Rigaud’s corrections. Le Tréport’s monks, however, may not have been as negligent as Rigaud’s Register makes them out to be. By its very

---

nature, a source like Eudes Rigaud’s *Register* highlights faults and glosses over merits. Adam Davis points this out in his biography of Eudes Rigaud.\(^\text{39}\) An example of this is seen in how Rigaud treated the issue of the monk living alone in the priory of Eurville. He noted this offense on two of his visitations, but, once this problem was addressed (and we must assume that it was from Rigaud’s subsequent silence) Rigaud did not record that the monks had amended the situation but instead let the matter quietly disappear. Furthermore, Davis points out, in some cases, especially when Eudes delivered the same reprimand more than once, it is likely that Rigaud was simply reminding a former offender not to commit the same transgression again.\(^\text{40}\) Several of the things for which Rigaud rebuked the monks of Saint-Michel, such as their failure to accuse each other in chapter and to keep account of their finances, were of specific interest to the archbishop and faults for which he reprimanded a number of monasteries.\(^\text{41}\)

**Bishops**

Visitations were not the only way in which Saint-Michel du Tréport’s monks had dealings with their diocesan. The archbishops of Rouen appear in Le Tréport’s sources as arbitrators of disputes between the monks and third parties, embroiled in suits with the monks themselves, and as confirmers and guarantors of Le Tréport’s possessions. There are four extant charters from the archbishops of Rouen from the period of this study which confirm possessions of Le Tréport. Three of these were issued by Hugh of Amiens (1130-1164) in 1145, 1150, and 1153, and the last by Walter of Coutances (1183-1207) in 1207.\(^\text{42}\) Hugh of Amiens’ charters in 1145 and 1150 both confirm nearly all of Le

\(^{40}\) Davis, *The Holy Bureaucrat*, 84.  
\(^{41}\) Davis, *The Holy Bureaucrat*, 72, 92-4.  
Tréport’s properties at the time of their issuing. The only possessions which Hugh’s charters from 1145 and 1150 did not confirm were those concerning holdings which lay outside the diocese of Rouen, such as the church of Saint-Severin de Vimeu. Walter’s 1207 charter also confirms only a single donation, a grant made by a Robertus Laicus and his son Stephanus Clericus to Le Tréport.

The charter record of Le Tréport for the period from 1059-1270 offers several examples of the archbishop of Rouen judging disputes between the monks of Saint-Michel and other parties. A dispute between Rogo de Fréauville and the monks over the tithes of the clearing of Greny near the end of the twelfth century was decided in the court of Walter of Coutances. Similarly, the archbishop of Rouen judged in a case between the monks and the priest of the church of St. Jacob in the city of Le Tréport. In one instance the archbishop of Rouen himself was involved in a suit with the monks. In the mid-thirteenth century Eudes Rigaud challenged the right of the monks of Le Tréport to the patronage of the churches of Aubéguimont and Réalcamp. In the end the disputants compromised: the monks of Le Tréport retained the patronage of Aubéguimont and the archbishop received the patronage of Réalcamp.

Other members of the ecclesiastical elite besides the archbishop of Rouen also interacted with the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport. The archbishop of Rouen sometimes delegated judgment in suits involving Le Tréport to other ecclesiastics for

---

43 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 31-6, 46-50, nos. 9, 19.
44 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 51-2, no. 20.
46 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 92, no. 56.
48 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 204-5, no. 185.
judgment. For example, a dispute between Le Tréport and Robert de Mombrai, a cleric, was delegated by Archbishop Walter to the judgment of Bishop William of Avranches (1198-1210) and two abbots.\footnote{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 113, no. 82. Spear, \textit{Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals}, 6.} In another instance, judgment in a case between Abraham, called \textit{magister}, a rector of the church St. Martin in Grandcourt and the monks was delegated to Robert of Dieppe, a canon of St. Mary’s of Eu, although a secular canon in all likelihood cannot be considered as among the ecclesiastical elite.\footnote{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 241, no. 213.} Other times, suits involving the monks of Le Tréport would be heard by other high-ranking ecclesiastics without any explicit consent of the archbishop, at least none that made its way into the charter record. Such a case was resolved in the thirteenth century by Octavien, the apostolic legate and bishop of Ostia, while in another Évrard, the bishop of Amiens (c.1211-1222), was the judge.\footnote{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 105-6, no.73; 140, no. 116. Pierre Desportes and Hélène Millet, \textit{Fasti ecclesiae gallicanae: Répertoire prosopographique des évêques, dignitaires et chanoines de France de 1200 à 1500} (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1996), 39, 52-3.} In the latter, the charter records that the case had been referred to the diocesan of Amiens by the pope.

Other members of the ecclesiastical elite besides the archbishop of Rouen confirmed donations made to Saint-Michel du Tréport. In 1147 Theodoric, the bishop of Amiens, redonated and confirmed the church of Saint-Severin de Vimeu, which lay in his diocese, to the monks.\footnote{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 39, no.13.} Milo, the bishop of Beauvais, assented to an association and exchange of land between Le Tréport and the monastery of Lannoy, situated in the diocese of Beauvais, in 1226.\footnote{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 154-5, no.135.} In 1185 the monks of Saint-Michel even received confirmation of all their possessions and rights from Pope Lucius III.\footnote{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 75-84, no. 46.}

\footnotetext[49]{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 113, no. 82. Spear, \textit{Personnel of the Norman Cathedrals}, 6.}
\footnotetext[50]{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 241, no. 213.}
\footnotetext[51]{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 105-6, no.73; 140, no. 116. Pierre Desportes and Hélène Millet, \textit{Fasti ecclesiae gallicanae: Répertoire prosopographique des évêques, dignitaires et chanoines de France de 1200 à 1500} (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1996), 39, 52-3.}
\footnotetext[52]{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 39, no.13.}
\footnotetext[53]{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 154-5, no.135.}
\footnotetext[54]{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 75-84, no. 46.}
Other Secular Ecclesiastics

The monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport also had dealings with secular clergy. One form these dealings took was that of patronage to the monastery. There are ten extant charters between 1059 and 1270 recording donations made by nine clergy to the monks, the majority of these occurring in the first half of the thirteenth century. These donations were made by a spectrum of secular clergy. Of the nine donors, two are identified by the term presbiter, one by magister, one by canonicus, and five by the general term clericus. Four of these clerics gave tithes, three donated land, one a house, one a revenue, and one a annual quantity of fish in addition to a revenue.

Church patronage was another means by which the monks of Saint-Michel interacted with secular clergy. In his work on Eudes Rigaud, Davis points out that patronage of a church conferred control of that church’s income and the right to nominate candidates for vicar should the position become vacant. Although focusing on an earlier period, Cassandra Potts in her study of early Norman monasticism, argues also that patronage over churches gave monks a level of control not only over revenue and appointments but over sermon content and religious celebrations as well. It is clear from Le Tréport’s charter record that the monks there held the patronage of a number of churches scattered across the county of Eu and beyond. In his 1145 confirmation of Le Tréport’s possessions, Hugh of Amiens lists nineteen locations in which the monks of
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55 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 70-1, no. 39; 117-18, no. 87; 121-2, no. 91; 123-4, no. 94; 124, no. 95; 158-159, no. 140; 167, no. 148; 172-3, no. 155; 184-5, no. 165; 185, no. 166.
56 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 70-1, no. 39; 117-18, no. 87; 121-2, no. 91; 123-4, no. 94; 124, no. 95; 158-159, no. 140; 167, no. 148; 172-3, no. 155; 184-5, no. 165; 185, no. 166.
57 Davis, The Holy Bureaucrat, 105.
Saint-Michel held churches or chapels. The *pouillés* (a census of churches in a diocese) of both the diocese of Rouen and the diocese of Amiens record the abbot and monks of Le Tréport as the patrons of multiple churches.

While the charter record is silent about what Le Tréport’s patronage meant for churches under its control in terms of sermon content and liturgical celebrations, it does reveal that control of a church’s revenue was often a source of contention between the monks and the parish priests. For example, a 1235 charter records the resolution of a dispute between the monks and Nicholas, the rector of the church of St. Jacob in the city of Le Tréport, the patronage of which the monks had received from Count Henry of Eu in 1101. The suit, over an annual pension of eighteen *libri turonensium* which the church owed to the monks, was settled in the monks’ favor. This ruling, however, did not settle the matter and in 1239 another suit between Nicholas and the monks was heard, this time about who bore the responsibility of paying the necessary expenses of the church of St. Jacob and how the income from various services and celebrations ought to be divided between Nicholas and Saint-Michel du Tréport. This suit was decided in the court of the archbishop of Rouen who made a complicated ruling dividing the expenses and revenues of the church of St. Jacob between Nicholas and the monks.

Nicholas is not the only example of church patronage leading to lawsuits between the monks and their parish priests. In fact, many of the disputes between Le Tréport and clerics recorded in the charter record stemmed from arguments over the allocation of

61 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 20 no. 4; 187-8, no. 169
revenues in churches under the monks’ control. Between 1207 and 1209 the monks quarrelled with Robert de Mombrai, a cleric, over the tithes of Bazoches-au-Holme. In 1209 Walter, a priest of Penly, issued a charter acknowledging the rights of the monks to a portion of the tithes of his parish. The curia of the archbishop of Rouen issued a charter in 1257 detailing the resolution of a dispute between another Nicholas, this time rector of the church of Aubeguimont, and the monks, who held the patronage of his church.

**Other Religious**

Other religious institutions appear as well in the charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport, engaging with the monks of St. Michael in a variety of relationships. Charters involving Le Tréport and the Augustinian canons of Eu or the Cistercians of Foucarmont, both, like Le Tréport, comital foundations, most often record quarrels between their houses. There are three charters detailing interaction between Le Tréport and the canons of Eu, showing that the two foundations were at odds in 1161, 1199, and with particular vitriol in 1256, when the two houses attacked each other with uncommon ferocity, accusing the servants of the other of despoiling their lands. Saint-Michel du Tréport’s relationship with Foucarmont was less tense, perhaps because the Cistercian monastery was more distant than the house of Augustinian canons. Of the two extant charters concerning Foucarmont and Le Tréport, one from the 1150s records a peaceful
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64 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 120-21, no. 90.
67 Cottineau, *Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés* t.1, s.vv. “Eu” and “Foucarmont.”
68 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 57-59, no. 27; 98-99, no. 65; 214-17, no. 194.
land exchange, while the other records a dispute over the tithes of the clearing and church of Aubéguimont.  

All of Saint-Michel du Tréport’s relationships with religious institutions outside the county of Eu appear to have been amicable. In 1141 the abbot and chapter of Le Tréport granted to the Hospitaller Knights of Jerusalem a coequal share in their possessions in Camps-en-Amienois, in the diocese of Amiens, their patronage of the church there, and their holdings in Gouy-l’Hopital, stipulating that the monks would share in whatever the knights were able to acquire at these places as well as in the prayers of Jerusalem.  

In addition to forming an association between their two houses in 1225, the monks of Le Tréport and of Lannoy (diocese of Beauvais) consolidated their respective holdings in a mutually beneficial exchange. The community at Lannoy gave whatever they possessed in the city of Le Tréport and the monks of St. Michael agreed to a semi-annual payment of salt. Furthermore prayers would be said in both monasteries on the death of a monk of either house. The bishop of Beauvais confirmed this arrangement in 1226.  

The monks of Saint-Michel also made an exchange with the community of Séry-aux-Prés (diocese of Amiens) in 1150.  

---

69 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 56, no. 25; 161-3, no. 144.
70 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 29-30, no. 8. According to the charter the only exceptions to this were those things belonging to the monks’ church, likely those things which were required by the monks living in Le Tréport’s priory at Camps-en-Amienois (exceptis illis que ad nostrum ecclesiam pertinent; sed monachi ibidem Deo servientes in furno et camba, absque furnagio et cambagio, panem er cerveisiam facient ad proprium usum).
71 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 153-4, no.134. Cottineau, Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés t. 1, s.v. “Lannoy.” Gallia Christiana t. 9, 838-42. In the charters Lannoy is referred to as the conventus de Briois, but I decided to call this monastery Lannoy in the text to make the citations in Cottineau and elsewhere easier to find.
72 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 154-5, no.135.
exchanges sometime before 1229 with Saint-Martin-au-Bosc, a priory in the county of Eu, and with Bec in 1229.\textsuperscript{74}

**Patronage and Acquisitions of Saint-Michel du Tréport**

In addition to being recipients of donations, the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport also granted holdings. For the period of 1059-1270 there are three extant charters recording grants of land made by the monks of Le Tréport. In 1224 the abbot of Le Tréport endowed Bernard de Melleville, a priest, with the life-tenure of an estate.\textsuperscript{75} A prepositus of the monastery received an hereditary grant of land from the monks in 1226.\textsuperscript{76} Last, a Goscelinus Tirlet also received an hereditary property from Saint-Michel du Tréport to reward his service to the monastery (\textit{pro suo servito}).\textsuperscript{77}

Besides granting lands, the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport also increased their interests in the mid-thirteenth century through the purchase of lands and revenues. Seventeen extant charters record these purchases.\textsuperscript{78} While there are many charters which record the monks of Saint-Michel giving money in return for “donations,” these seventeen charters are distinguished by the verbs which they use to describe the exchange. Ordinarily, Le Tréport’s charters concerning transfers of land make use of the verbs \textit{concedere} and \textit{dare} to refer to the act of donation, suggesting that any currency being paid by the monks were in fact countergifts. These seventeen charters, in contrast, employ the term \textit{vendire} to describe their transactions, suggesting that what they record are sales rather than donations.

\textsuperscript{74} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 163-4, no. 145; 165-6, no. 146. Cottineau, \textit{Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés} t. 2, s.v. “Saint-Martin-au-Bosc.”
\textsuperscript{75} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 199-200, no. 130
\textsuperscript{76} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 156-7, no. 138.
\textsuperscript{77} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 163-4, no. 145.
\textsuperscript{78} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 62, no. 30; 191-2, no. 172; 198-9, no. 179; 199, no. 180; 200, no. 181; 202-3, no. 183; 205-6, no. 186; 208-9, no. 189; 217-18, no. 195; 219-20, no. 196; 222-3, no. 198; 225-6, no. 201; 233-4 no. 207; 234-5, no. 208; 237-8 no. 211; 238-9, no. 212; 250-1 no. 221.
Charters making use of the verb *vendire* began appearing during the tenure of Count John (ca. 1140-1170) and continued through the end of our period in 1270. The frequency of these transactions increased beginning in 1238 and continued occurring regularly through 1270. For these years there are thirty-two extant charters, sixteen of which record sales. While some of these purchases by the monks were of entirely new property, several were lands or revenues from land which they already possessed but were held by tenants of the monastery. For example, in 1261 the monks purchased an annual revenue of four *solidi turonensium* from a William Florie de Kesneto for the sum of forty *solidi turonensium* and an anniversary service for Wascelinus de Kesneto (*et illi quatuor solidi turonensium annui redditus ad opus anniversariorum et ad anniversarium Wascelini de Kesneto assignantur*).\(^79\) In the charter, William says that this revenue was to come from his whole holding, which he held from the monks (*totum tenementum meum, quod de ipsis teneo apud Kesnetum*).\(^80\)

While the monks made similar purchases at Val-du-Roy and Grandcourt in the south of Eu, the majority of these transactions from 1238 until 1270 dealt with properties in the northeast corner of the county, in the region around Mesnil-Sterling, Mesnil-Sorel, and Les Quesnets. In each of these places Saint-Michel du Tréport had been well endowed at its foundation by Count Robert and it is unclear why the monks wished to strengthen their interests in these particular areas. The charter record offers no hint of the

---

\(^79\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 237-8 no. 211. The fact that these four *solidi* were allocated for an anniversary for a Wascelinus de Kesneto makes this charter more difficult to interpret. It seems likely, however, that the monks still obtained financial benefit from this transaction even if the cost of an anniversary were to come out of the rent of four *solidi*. Otherwise, why would the monks have been willing to pay forty *solidi* to Williem de Kesneto? It seems probable that the four *solidi* were enough to pay for the cost of the anniversary with some amount left over resulting in a net financial gain for the monks.

\(^80\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 237, no. 211. “Ego Willermus, dictus Florie de Kesneto, vendidi et concessi dominis meis, viris religiosis abbati et conventui de Ulteriori Portu, pro quadraginta solidis turonensium michi pre manibus solatis, quatuor solidos turonensium annui redditus super totum tenementum meum, quod de ipsis teneo apud Kesnetum.”
monks’ reasons for entering into these transactions, though it does provide the motivation for a few of the sellers. When, in 1247 and 1248, Walter le Sauvage and his uncle John Sevout between them made four sales of land to the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport, they stated in the charters that they were coerced into the transactions by need (necessitate me coactus).\(^{81}\) In the case of the revenue sold by William Florie to the monks discussed above, the motivation may have been to secure an anniversary for Wascelinus de Kesneto.\(^{82}\)

**Conclusion: Rouen and Beyond**

Interacting with a broad spectrum of clergy in many different ways, the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport were enmeshed in a complex network of ecclesiastical relationships spreading beyond their own diocese of Rouen. From the visitations and judgments of the archbishops of Rouen to property transactions and disputes with individual priests, the monks of Saint-Michel were fully engaged participants in the ecclesiastical activities of their corner of northern France. Not only were the monks involved in this world, they also helped to shape it through their patronage of churches and associations with other monasteries. The monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport were deeply embedded in the contours of the ecclesiastical landscape of their region and their actions are impossible to comprehend apart from their ecclesiastical context. The charter records for Le Tréport reveal that the ecclesiastical connections of the monks were not limited to the diocese of Rouen and the duchy of Normandy. Instead the monks of Saint-Michel interacted with ecclesiastics from outside the boundaries of Normandy, receiving


\(^{82}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 237-8 no. 211.
confirmations from the bishops of Amiens and Beauvais and exchanging land with monasteries of those dioceses. These interactions of Le Tréport show the monastery engaging individuals and institutions across borders and boundaries. The charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport reveals the wealth of connections that could spring up between the ecclesiastical institutions of different dioceses and provinces.
III. THE LAY PATRONAGE OF SAINT-MICHEL DU TRÉPORT

The greatest part of the possessions and wealth of the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport, situated in the county of Eu in Normandy’s northeast corner, originated in the pious donations of lay persons. This chapter will seek to describe and analyze the lay patronage of the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport, particularly the question of the social status of its lay donors, the kinds of patronage given to the monks of Le Tréport, and the geographic distribution of this patronage. Ultimately this chapter will seek to demonstrate that, while Le Tréport had some non-Norman donors whose gifts lay outside of Normandy and its politically connected polities such as England, the majority of Le Tréport’s patronage came from Eudoise donors within the county of Eu from Eudoise donors. This suggests that Le Tréport’s importance, influence, and appeal were regionally limited, confined primarily to the county of Eu, and that for the most part the borders of Normandy remained an effective, but not impenetrable barrier to lay patronage of the monastery.

Patronage of Eu’s Comital Family

As Saint-Michel du Tréport was a foundation of the comital family of Eu, it is fitting to begin the analysis of the monastery’s lay patronage with the donations and gifts of the counts and countesses of Eu and those of their immediate family members. For the period from Le Tréport’s foundation in 1059 until the end of this study in 1270 there were eight counts and countesses of Eu, and thirty-two extant charters recording their acts in favor of the monks of Le Tréport. In order, the counts and countesses of Eu were Robert, William III, Henry
John, Henry II, Ralph, Alice, and Alphonse.¹ In addition to the grants of the counts of Eu, there are also two bequests to the monks which we know were made by members of the comital family. One of these bequests is from Johanna d’Eu, the lady of Criel-sur-Mer and daughter of Alice, while the other is from Mary, the granddaughter of Alice and wife of Alphonse.²

While the first several of Kermaingant’s charters are difficult to date due to their pancarte structure, it is nevertheless clear that donations made by count Robert at the foundation of Saint-Michel-du-Tréport represent a staggering degree of patronage.³ The foundation document itself is not only one of the longer documents extant for Le Tréport’s patronage, but contains the largest single collection of grants to the monastery by any count.⁴ In total, the donations and gifts which Count Robert made to Le Tréport upon its foundation make up nearly half of all the comital patronage for the period from 1059 until 1270.

In the foundation charter, Robert is recorded as having bestowed a wide variety of possessions upon the new monastery, generously granting lands, tithes, and whole villae in addition to milling, fishing, and mercantile rights, churches, and blanket confirmations.

¹ Several of the counts of Eu share names with some of the more famous rulers of their era. To avoid confusion I will always use these names in reference to the counts of Eu unless otherwise specified. Daniel Power, *The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 497. For the dates of these rulers, please see the genealogy of the counts of Eu on page xi.
² To avoid confusion and the problems of a rapidly changing Latin orthography, I will employ modern place names as often as I can, both in reference to the actual location, and also with regard to toponyms. I will also anglicize Latin names wherever possible for the sake of convenience.
³ Please see discussion of these pancakes in the introduction.
⁴ P. Laffleur de Kermaingant, ed., *Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint-Michel du Tréport* (Paris: Typographie de Firmin-Didot, 1880), 1-7, no.1; 8-20, no. 3. The foundation document exists in two forms in Kermaingant’s *Cartulaire.* The first charter in his collection consists of just the foundation document, while the second charter is a copy of the foundation document with the addition of later patronage by count William and his men. For more on this, see my discussion of these documents in the introduction.
in the cities of Le Tréport and Eu. The most common comital donation in Le Tréport’s foundation charter was land, then churches, then tithes. Fishing rights also feature in this charter, with the kinds of fish the monks were allowed to keep spelled out in some detail.

In addition, Robert also gave to the monks of Saint-Michel fishing rights which were temporally as well as geographically localized. In the foundation charter, Robert endowed the monks of Le Tréport with “the water of Criel-sur-Mer from eight days before the feast of St. Michael, and on the night of the same feast … the water of Eu to the same abbey.” While it is unclear from this passage that what was being granted to the monks was indeed fishing rights, grants of “water” in later charters specifically state that they were intended for the fishing of the monks, suggesting that this too was Robert’s purpose in making this grant.

Robert also gave the monks of Le Tréport rights in the comital forest, granting Le Tréport the pasnagium of his forest in addition to the tithes of all the new assarts. Later confirmations, including one issued nearly a century after the initial gift, underline the value of these tithes to the monastery.

---

5 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 1-5, no.1.
6 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 2, no. 1. “Quod si homines abbatis picem qui vocatur turium capiunt, totus erit sancti Michaelis; crassus picis si captus fuerit, ala una et medietas caude erit monachis.”
7 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 4, no. 1. “aquam de Criolio VIII diebus ante festivitatem sancti Michaelis, et ipsa nocte festivitatis ejusdem aquam de Eu eidem abbatie do.”
8 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 34, no. 9; 41, no. 14; 69, no. 37.
9 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 2, no. 1. “Do ... decimamque pasnagii silvarum Augi omniumque exaltatuum earundem silvarum, ubicumque fiant.” The word pasnagii has proven difficult to translate. According to Du Cange, pasnagium can mean a fee paid for pasturing pigs in a woodland, a parceling out of the crop of acorns for a fee, or a tax on the movement of goods. Blaise suggests that pasnagium means the right of gathering acorns in a forest. Niermeyer refers the reader to pastionaticus which translates as a fee for grazing pigs on acorns. In this passage it seems likely that pasnagium refers to either the acorns in the forest or the fees paid for the right to pasture pigs in the woods. See Charles Du Cange, Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis in Database of Latin Dictionaries dir, by Paul Tombeur (Turnhout, Belgium, 2005), s.v. “pasnagium;” Albert Blaise, Lexicon latinitatis mediaeaevi in Database of Latin Dictionaries dir, by Paul Tombeur (Turnhout, Belgium, 2005), s.v. “pasnagium;” and Jan Niermyer, Medieval Latin Dictionary v.2 (Boston: Brill, 2002), s.v.v. “pasnagium” and “pastionaticus.”
10 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 54-5, no. 23; 68, no. 37.
Geographically, most of Robert’s major donations to Le Tréport (such as entire *villa* or large grants of lands or houses) were concentrated on the county’s northern coast, particularly around Criel-sur-Mer, Les Quesnets, Maisnil-Val, and Maisnil Sorel, all of which Robert gave to Le Tréport outright, or in and around the city of Le Tréport and to a lesser extent in the city of Eu. While the majority of Robert’s donations were in the northern half of his county, he also granted the monks the *villa* of Le Mesnil Allard and Saint-Martin-au-Bosc in the south of the county near Foucarmont, as well as Gremontmesnil near Blangy-sur-Bresle. Robert also gave smaller grants of individual churches, lands, tithes, or produce in locations scattered across the middle and southwestern parts of his county and along the coast to the west of Criel-sur-Mer. In addition Robert donated outside the county of Eu, either elsewhere in Normandy or across the channel in England. These included the church of Bourgtheroulde-Infreville, south of Rouen across the Seine, and Bonnington in England as well as the tithe of all the salt and meat he received from England.\(^\text{11}\) The fishing rights which Robert gave were located either in the city of Le Tréport, the city of Eu, or Criel-sur-Mer. In addition, Robert also gave the monks the tithe of his toll at Sept-Meules and Grantcourt (*decimamque thelonei VII\textsuperscript{em} Molarum et Grandicurie*).\(^\text{12}\)

For the countships of William III, Henry I, John, and Henry II (from the last decade of the eleventh century until the last decade of the twelfth) the patterns of comital patronage of Le Tréport remained fairly constant. For this period the single most common donation made by the counts of Eu were tithes. All the counts from William III to Henry II either bestowed new tithes upon the monks or re-endowed tithes which had been given

---
\(^\text{11}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 4, no. 1.
\(^\text{12}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 4, no. 1.
by one of their predecessors. After tithes, revenues were most often given, such as those from the market of St. John the Baptist in the city of Eu which Henry I gave to the monks. The donation of revenues by the counts increased throughout the twelfth century and by the thirteenth century most comital patronage consisted of annual revenues. The granting of forest rights continued under these counts. In the twelfth century Le Tréport was endowed with rights of justice for the first time.

The gifts of counts William III, Henry I, John, and Henry II are geographically distributed in a similar manner to the donations of count Robert. Their patronage clustered around the cities of Le Tréport, Eu, and Criel-sur-Mer in the north and Le Mesnil Allard in the south. In the last location there seems to have been a concerted effort by the monks in the twelfth century to build up their rights and properties. While Robert had initially given them the villa of Le Mesnil Allard they later purchased the fine of this villa from count John, who also granted the monks the freedom of the comital forest there, as well as the milling of the villa. Henry II later bestowed on the monks of Le Tréport all justice for blood and striking in their lands there (In Fontibus autem, et in Verleio, et in Adhelardi Maisnilo, et in omni terra sancti Michaelis, si quis aliquem percusserit, sanguinem, et justiciam omnem abbati et monachis concedo).

While many later counts made donations to Le Tréport in places where Robert had already given them possessions at the monastery’s founding, there were several new locations where these counts made grants as well. One such location was the town of

---

13 Kermaingant, Cartulaire 5, no. 1; 17, no. 3; 21, no. 4; 37, no. 11; 38, no. 12; 40-1, no. 14; 68-9, no. 37.
14 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 21, no. 4.
15 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 37, no. 10.
16 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 68, no. 37.
17 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 62, no. 30; 37, no. 10; 37, no. 11.
18 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 68, no. 37.
Villy-sur-Yères at which both John and Henry II gave a variety of forest rights to the monks. Other places were Le Tost, from which the monks received tithes, and Mont-Roty where they were granted a measure of produce annually. John also endowed Le Tréport with two gifts from outside the county of Eu, the first a chapel of St. Nicholas in Rouen and the second the church of St. Mary in Hastings, England, of which the counts of Eu at this time were also lords.\textsuperscript{19}

After Count Henry II (died 1190 or 1191) the dynastic and political circumstances of the counts of Eu changed. As Henry had no male heirs rule of the county was inherited by Alice, the count’s daughter, and Ralph d’Exoudun, her husband, bringing an outsider to the county. Furthermore, when eastern Normandy had fallen to the Capetians, Philip Augustus had taken control of some of the county of Eu in exchange for allowing Ralph increased rights in his Poitevin lands.\textsuperscript{20} When Ralph fought for King John of England at the battle of Bouvines in 1214, Philip took full control of the county of Eu, and returned it to Alice only after Ralph’s death in 1219.\textsuperscript{21} Alice ruled Eu as countess until her death in 1246, but, since she survived her only son, the county then passed to Alphonse of Brienne by virtue of his marriage to Mary, Alice’s granddaughter. Whereas Alice seems to have exercised some measure of authority jointly with Ralph (he issued only two charters in favor of Le Tréport during his tenure, one of which was a general confirmation of the acts of Count Henry, his predecessor, while the other recorded the donation of an annual revenue which was immediately confirmed by Alice in a separate charter) this does not

\textsuperscript{19} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 40, no. 14; 44-5, no. 18; David Crouch, \textit{The Image of the Aristocracy in Britain, 1000-1300} (London: Routledge, 1992), 311.

\textsuperscript{20} Power, \textit{The Norman Frontier}, 454-457.

\textsuperscript{21} Power, \textit{The Norman Frontier}, 454-457.
seem to have been the case with Alphonse and Mary.\textsuperscript{22} While they did issue charters jointly, it is Alphonse who appears to have taken the lead and is far more of a presence in the charter record for Le Tréport than is Mary.\textsuperscript{23} The only grant known to have been made solely by Mary to Le Tréport is a postmortem bequest of an annual revenue, and this is only known because of a charter of Alphonse’s in which he confirms it.\textsuperscript{24}

Whether because of dynastic changes, political upheavals, or underlying economic change, there is a marked change in the habits of comital patronage of Le Tréport which began with Ralph and extended to the end of this study in 1270. Comital patronage of Le Tréport as a whole lessened after Ralph assumes the countship. This may simply have been the result of more competition for comital patronage since, as David Crouch writes, “the six generations of the family from the Conquest to the thirteenth century between them brought into being five abbeys (Eu, Le Tréport, Foucarmont, Robertsbridge, and Sèry), two priories (St-Martin-au-Bois and Criel) and a major secular college (Hastings).”\textsuperscript{25} Whether or not the decrease in comital patronage to Le Tréport resulted from more competition for this patronage is difficult to determine without access to the cartulary of the counts of Eu currently in the Bibliothèque National de France.\textsuperscript{26} Whatever the cause, there is a marked decrease in the amount of comital patronage received by the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport. Ralph only issued two charters in favor of Le Tréport, one a general confirmation and the other an annual revenue (albeit rather valuable) of one hundred \textit{solidi} from the grain duty of Eu.\textsuperscript{27} Although Alice issued

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 88-90, no. 53; 97-8, no. 63; 98, no. 64.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 207-8, no. 188; 211-12, no. 192; 236-7, no. 210.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 236-7, no. 210.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} David Crouch, \textit{The English Aristocracy, 1070-1272: A Social Transformation} (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 231.
  \item \textsuperscript{26} B.N.F. ms. Lat. 13904.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 88-90, no. 53; 97-8, no. 63.
\end{itemize}
seven charters in favor of Le Tréport (the second most after her Count John, her
grandfather), three of these were confirmations, and one was an order to her baillis to
uphold he rights and properties claimed in the charters of the monks of Le Tréport.28

Only three of her charters were new donations to Le Tréport – two churches and an
annual revenue from the city of Le Tréport.29 Alphonse did not give any original
donations at all: all four of his extant charters for Le Tréport are confirmations. Mary,
Alphonse’s wife, did leave a bequest of thirty soli annually to the monks, but, as was
mentioned above, it is only known because of Alphonse’s confirmation of the gift.30

Interestingly, it is during the thirteenth century that an extant charter appears which
records the donation of a member of the comital family who was not a count or countess.
In 1252 Johanna, daughter of Alice, donated a revenue of twenty libratas annually from
the mills of Criel-sur-Mer, a gift subsequently confirmed by Alphonse.31

For the most part the geographic distribution of the comital patronage from Ralph
until the end of this study in 1270 repeated the pattern already established by the
donations of previous counts. Gifts and confirmations remain centered on Criel-sur-Mer,
the cities of Le Tréport and Eu, and the city of Blangy-sur-Bresle. The two churches
which Alice granted to Le Tréport, however, are in locations new to comital patronage of
Le Tréport - Realcamp and Aubéguimont.32 In a departure from the comital patronage of
previous centuries, no count or countess from Ralph through Alphonse is recorded as
having made a donation of lands or rights outside of the county of Eu.

28 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 98, no. 64; 147, no. 125; 196-7, no. 177; 148, no. 127.
29 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 151, no. 132; 168-9, no. 150; 143, no. 121.
31 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 209-10, no. 190; 211-12, no. 192.
32 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 151, no. 132; 168-9, no. 150.
Overall, consistency is one of the characterizing features of the comital patronage of Saint-Michel du Tréport. Even though the counts of Eu had no shortage of family foundations to patronize, each count, with the exception of Alphonse, made at least one original donation to Le Tréport sometime during his or her tenure as count. Alphonse’s lack of original donation of Le Tréport is difficult to account for. It may have been due to the fact that Alphonse was an exogamous to the comital family, count only by virtue of his marriage to Mary, and thus less attached to the family’s monastic foundations. This argument loses weight, however, when compared to the donation of Ralph, the other count-by-marriage, of an annual revenue to Le Tréport. In the end it is unclear as to why Alphonse was the first count since Le Tréport’s foundation not to have made an original donation.

The content of comital patronage varied greatly over the years between Le Tréport’s foundation in 1059 through 1270. The counts, countesses, and their family members made grants to the monks of tithes, lands, and revenues, forest, mercantile and judicial rights, houses, churches, and fishing privileges. The counts of Eu also endowed the monks of Saint-Michel in many locations across their county, from Criel-sur-Mer on the coast to Aubéguimont less than five miles north of the city of Aumale. Finally, the counts of Eu were consistent patrons of the monks of Saint-Michel, with only Alphonse, the last in our period, failing to make a grant to Le Tréport.

**Saint-Michel du Tréport’s Other Lay Patronage**

Saint-Michel du Tréport attracted many lay donors besides the comital family of Eu. These donors appear to have come from a broad spectrum of social positions. While

---

34 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 97-8, no. 63.
there were certainly members of the aristocracy, and indeed wealthy aristocracy, who
gave to the monks, there also appear to have been many donors of lower social status and
of less means. Titles offer one avenue of insight into the social status of Le Tréport’s
donors. Rare below the level of *comes* in the early charters for Tréport, many titles are
vague when they do start appearing later in the charter record. For example, titles such as
*dominus* and *miles* were employed frequently in charters from the second half of the
twelfth through the thirteenth century in the charter record for Le Tréport. Lack of
context in these charters often makes it impossible to determine, however, what these
titles signal about the social status of their holders. In addition, the use of these titles
appear to change during the course of this study’s period. For example, in early charters
*dominus* was applied only to elites such as lay lords and abbots, but by the end of this
period it appears to have become a general term of respect as it was used to refer to
village priests in addition to knights and members of the elite. An undated charter which
Kermaingant seems to have believed was issued at the end of the twelfth century was
witnessed by a Richard, priest of Archellis (*domino Ric[ardo] ... sacerdote de
Archellis*).35 Simon, a priest (*Symone, presbitero de Flosques*), witnessed a *vidimus* from
1250.36 In the witness list of a charter from 1234, the word *dominus* is used to refer to a
deacon, two priests, a knight, and an abbot (*domino Clemente, decano ... domino
Willelmo ... domino Rogero ... presbiteris, domino Waltero ... milite, Ricardo ... Ricardo ...
... servientibus domini abbatis*).37 Finally, a priest in addition to the prior and cellarer of

---

Le Tréport were referred to with this title in a 1232 charter (*donno Radulfo ... priore ... donno Willelmo ... cellario ... donno Johanne ... presbitero*).\(^{38}\)

Despite these examples instances exist in which titles do offer clues to the social standing of their owners. One of Count Henry I’s charters is witnessed by his brother Robert, Hugh de Envermeu, Hugh a viscount, Hugh’s son Robert, Geoffrey de Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard, Bartholomew de Longroy, and Ancellus de Fréauville, all of whom are collectively referred to as barons (*baronibus*).\(^{39}\) As Suzanne Deck points out in her article on the county of Eu, it is difficult to determine what was meant by this title. The size of some of their donations makes it seem that these barons did possess a level of wealth and influence that likely placed them near the upper reaches of the Eu’s social hierarchy.\(^{40}\)

The terms applied to Le Tréports lay patrons reveal that the monaster’s donors represented a cross-section of Eudoise society. Besides the term *baron*, the terms *vicecomes*, *miles*, *seneschallus*, *baillivus*, *burgensis*, and *vavassore* all are used to describe donors to Saint-Michel du Tréport.\(^{41}\) Some of the descriptors employed refer to livelihood instead of to social status. For example, a *forestarius* and a *carpentarius* both gave gifts to Le Tréport.\(^{42}\) The monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport once found donors even at the highest levels of Norman society. In the monastery’s early years Duke William the Conqueror gave the monks land near Bourgtheroulde-Infreville, southwest

---

\(^{38}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 209, no. 189.

\(^{39}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 20, no. 4.


\(^{41}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 5, no. 1; 6, no. 1; 102-3, no.69; 142, no. 119; 159-60, no. 141; 19, no. 3.

\(^{42}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 5, no. 1; 219-20, no. 196.
across the Seine from Rouen.\textsuperscript{43} The use of such a variety of titles and descriptors suggests that Le Tréport’s donors came from a variety of social and economic statuses.

This conclusion is further supported by disparities in the values of donations which the monks of Saint-Michel received. Even the foundation charter suggests that both the wealthy and the only moderately propertyed contributed to Le Tréport’s initial possessions. On one hand, men like William Caucheis were among Le Tréport’s founders, giving two \textit{mansiones} in the city of Le Tréport itself, the entirety of Mont-Goubert, and land at Criel-sur-Mer, the city of Eu, Sept-Meules, and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{44} Also present in the foundation charter are donors such as Richard Boistel, Hilduinus de Blangeio, Gustinus de Grimont Maisnil, and Henry Jaillardi, men whose status is never specified but who together donated only two \textit{garbas} of the tithe of their \textit{feodum} at Blangy-sur-Bresle to the monks.\textsuperscript{45} Later in the charter record the wealth of donors becomes even more difficult to determine because outright donations become less common, and are replaced either by gifts made in return for countergifts or outright purchases made by the monks. Among those mentioned in these transactions there still appears to be some range in the social and economic statuses of donors to Tréport, however. Representing the upper end of the social scale, Hugo de Oiry, \textit{miles}, and lord of Sant-Martin-Le-Gaillard made a large donation of land in several different locations to the monks of Le Tréport in 1241, while in 1230 Robert de Belleville made a humbler donation of twelve \textit{denarii} in annual rents.\textsuperscript{46}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{43} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 15, no. 3.
\textsuperscript{44} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 5, no. 1.
\textsuperscript{45} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 5, no. 1.
\textsuperscript{46} Kermaingant, ed., \textit{Cartulaire}, 195, no. 175; 180-1, no. 161.
\end{flushright}
Churches, lands, and tithes were the only kinds of donations which Saint-Michel du Tréport received from non-comital lay donors at its foundation. Of these, tithes were the most numerous, followed by lands, while only a single church was given. In the twelfth century, the gifts from this group became more varied. In addition to churches, lands, and tithes, the monks of Saint-Michel also received houses, produce, multiple confirmations, revenues, and three releases from customary dues which the monks owed. Lands and tithes were about equal in popularity for twelfth-century donors, followed by confirmations, then by churches. The thirteenth century saw a slight increase in the giving of lands to the monastery, while the popularity of tithes as gifts dropped dramatically. After land, revenues became the most popular gift, followed by houses.

Over the period from its foundation in 1059 to 1270, Saint-Michel du Tréport maintained relationships with several powerful families in the county of Eu besides the comital family. Some of these relationships were shortlived. The de Fréauvilles were an aristocratic family of Eu, a member of which, Ancellus de Fréauville, had been named as one of the *barones* in count Henry I’s charter of 1101. Richard de Fréauville and Roger de Salcheio, Ancellus’ father and uncle respectively, both made donations in the foundation charter, but the peak of this family’s giving came a generation later when in the early twelfth century Ancellus de Fréauville made several large donations in favor of Le Tréport, likely motivated by the fact that his brother, Osbernus, was abbot of the monastery at the time (*Anceillus de Fraelvilla, ortante donno Osberno abate, fratre suo*). After Ancellus the next interaction between the de Fréauvilles and Le Tréport occurred in the 1190s when Rogonus de Fréauville ceded to the monks disputed tithes at

---

47 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 20, no. 4.
Greny.\(^{49}\) The final de Fréauville recorded interacted with Saint-Michel du Tréport was Robert de Fréauville who, in 1203, confirmed a gift of a \textit{virgata} of land to the monks, and, sometime later, he exchanged an annual render of grain in one location for one held by the monks at his mills in Fréauville.\(^{50}\) There are no other donations extant from the de Fréauvilles.

A longer lasting relationship may be seen in the connections between Saint-Michel du Tréport and the family of Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard. Like the de Fréauvilles, a member of this family was also identified as one of Count Henry I’s \textit{baroness}, and similarly a member of this family also made several donations at the monastery’s foundation in 1059.\(^{51}\) However, unlike the de Fréauvilles, the lords of Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard maintained a fairly constant relationship with the monks of Le Tréport making donations being to Le Tréport in 1059, 1107, 1175, 1189, 1206, and 1240, as well as other undated acts in favor of Le Tréport.\(^{52}\)

While the monks of Le Tréport received donations from non-comital laity all over the county of Eu, and even sometimes outside of its borders, most of the donations from this group were made in the northwester half of the county while they gave relatively few gifts in the county’s southeast. This group’s donation was especially concentrated along the Yères river in the \textit{villae} of Villy-sur-Yères, Sept-Meules, Cuverville-sur-Yères, Grandcourt, Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard, and Criel-sur-Mer. There is also a concentration of donations in the area just to the south and west of the lower part of the Yères, in the

\(^{49}\) Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 92, no. 56.  
\(^{50}\) Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 108, no. 76; 132, no. 105.  
\(^{51}\) Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 20, no. 4; 6, no. 1.  
\(^{52}\) Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 6, no. 1; 25, no. 6; 66, no. 35; 87-8, no. 52; 104-5, no. 72; 114, no. 83; 130, no. 102; 195, no. 175.
region around Assigny and Auquemesnil. The city of Le Tréport was also a locus of gift-giving, as were the cities of Eu and Blangy-sur-Bresle.

There is a significant overlap between the distribution of comital and non-comital lay patronage. In many places of heavy patronage by the non-comital laity, such as Sept-Meules or the coastal region south of Criel-sur-Mer, there was also at least one – and sometimes numerous – donation by the counts. In many places, there was significant difference in the geographical distribution of comital and non-comital patronage. In the regions around Auquemesnil and Greny, Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard, and the region around Londinières there was significant non-comital patronage, but very few or no comital donations. Conversely, in the region between Criel-sur-Mer and the Bresle river, and the entire area between Foucarmont and the Bresle in the direction of Aumale, comital patronage was generous, but there was little to no donations made by the non-comital laity.

The geographic distribution of non-comital lay patronage remained rather stable over time. Much of the area in which the greatest donations were made had already been areas of patronage by the early twelfth century, and many twelfth- and thirteenth-century donations served only to make Le Tréport’s possessions in these areas more dense. While the geographic area in which Le Tréport received patronage from the non-comital laity did expand over time, this expansion was minor compared to the continual giving in areas in which the monks already held property. One of the few regions into which non-comital lay patronage of Le Tréport expanded during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was the area around Londinières in the south and west of the county. Overall, however, most of
the locations in which the monks of Le Tréport received donations from their lay patrons were locations in which they already possessed holdings.

In addition to its Eudoise holdings, Le Tréport also held possessions within the lands of the counts of Aumale. The monks of Saint-Michel received their properties in this region in a series of grants which all occurred in the late eleventh or early twelfth centuries. From members of the Visa family, the monks received the villa of Lafresnoye, one Gerald de Horneio gave possessions in and around Hornoy-le-Bourg, and Hugh de Arenis gifted the monks with property in Tronchoy.\(^53\) Stephen, count of Aumale, confirmed all of these gifts between 1107 and 1133 while staying with the monks of Le Tréport en route to England.\(^54\) Even though Stephen, a Norman count, confirmed all these donations, it seems possible that some or all of the lands and property given lay outside Normandy. In his confirmation of the gifts of Gerald de Horneio, the Visa family, and Hugh de Arenis, Count Stephen also stated that he consented to all the monks possessions in the territory of Aumale or in his viscounty of Vimeu \((tam\ in\ territerio\ Albemarle\ quam\ in\ vicecomitatu\ suo\ de\ Vimou)\).\(^55\) This suggests that some of the monks possessions in this region were in Vimeu, a region of Ponthieu between the Bresle and Somme rivers.\(^56\)

The monks of Saint-Michel also had other possessions in Ponthieu which did not lie within the lands of the counts of Aumale. In the late eleventh or early twelfth century Ancellus de Chaio gave the church of Saint-Severin de Vimeu to the monks of Le Tréport.\(^57\) The monks also received properties at Limeux from Eremburgis, the mother of

\(^{53}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 16-17, no. 3; 22-3, no. 5.
\(^{54}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 19-20, no. 3. For my dating of this charter, please see the discussion in the introduction.
\(^{55}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 19-20, no. 3.
\(^{57}\) Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 19, no. 3.
Gerald de Horneio, and from Hugh de Bricum Maisnil, one of Gerald’s men in the early twelfth century. The monks also had some holdings at Pendé, but, because the only two charters which reference them simply record quitclaims in the monks’ favor, we do not know when or from whom they acquired these holdings. In addition to these Ponthevin possessions, the monks of Saint-Michel also had a priory and holdings in Eurville, which was in Normandy but outside the county of Eu, and received a cash payment in Playden, England. In the eleventh century, Duke William the Conqueror gave to the monks land near Bourtheroulde-Infreville south of Rouen.

**Conclusion: An Eudoise Monastery**

Overall, the geographical distribution of Le Tréport’s possessions is telling. Instead of being near the center of its possessions, the monastery was peripheral to them, being located to the north and east of most of its holdings. Part of the reason behind this is undoubtedly economic. The monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport was situated in a port town at the mouth of the Bresle, a location that may explain why so many of the monastery’s possessions were located on the Bresle or Yères rivers or near the coast around or just to the south of Criel-sur-Mer. All of these places had easy access to the sea and thus to the monastery. What economic consequence does not explain, however, is why Le Tréport’s possessions stop abruptly at the Bresle. Le Tréport’s possessions to the east of the Bresle were very sparse, despite the presence of major rivers and the coast, suggesting that, while economic necessity played a role in the placement of the
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58 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 23, no. 5.
59 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 70, no. 38; 72, no. 42.
60 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 136-7, no. 112; 188-90, no. 170; 191-2, no. 172; 27, no. 6.
61 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 15, no. 3.
monastery’s property to the west of the Bresle, it does not account for Le Tréport lack of properties in Ponthieu.

Unfortunately, Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charter record does not offer a clear explanation for the paucity of the monastery’s possessions in Ponthieu. One possible explanation is that the monastery’s appeal was localized for the most part to the county of Eu because of its association with the comital family. Since the counts of Eu had founded and consistently patronized Saint-Michel du Tréport, it seems possible that the monastery appealed most strongly as an object of donation to the followers of the counts, whether because of pressure from the comital family or as a means of currying favor with the counts the charter record does not say. The majority of the monastery’s possessions lay within Eu, and even many of the properties of the monks which were located outside the county had been given to them by Eudoise aristocracy. Le Tréport’s priory at Hastings and church at Bonnington in England had both been gifts of the comital family, and the de Fréauvilles had also given holdings in England. A chapel which the monks possessed in Rouen as well as a church to the southwest of Rouen in Bourgtheroulde-Infreville had also both been donations of the counts. Perhaps the monks of Saint-Michel were not given many properties in Ponthieu simply because they were unable to effectively appeal to the Ponthevins.

There are, of course, other possible explanations for Le Tréport’s lack of Ponthevin possessions. It could have been that the monks felt no need to seek donations outside of the county of Eu since they were already well provided within it with a powerful patron and plenty of prospective donors. Another strong possibility is that the competition from already well-established monasteries in Ponthieu prevented the monks
of Le Tréport from receiving any Ponthevin patronage. The monastery of Saint-Valery-sur-Somme situated at the mouth of the Somme river had been founded in 611 by a Merovingian king, while the monastery of Saint-Riquier was a seventh-century foundation of a son of the count of Ponthieu.62 Another Merovingian foundation, the monastery of Corbie, was not far from the city of Amiens.63 In addition to these houses there were also newer foundations to compete with Saint-Michel du Tréport. In 1136, one Anselm of Cayeux founded the Premonstratensian house of Séry-aux-Pres near Blangy-sur-Bresle in the diocese of Amiens, while in 1191, Bernard de Saint-Valèry and his wife founded the Cistercian abbey of Lieu-Dieu in Gamaches on the Bresle river.64 In short, there were no lack of venerable, distinguished monasteries, or of more recent, reform-movement foundations for the residents of Ponthieu to patronize. Since Le Tréport’s documents do not offer any reasons for Le Tréport’s lack of Ponthevin possession none of the possibilities suggested above can be asserted with certainty until they have been corroborated with further research.

The monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport was patronized heavily by the counts and aristocracy of Eu as well as by others in Eudoise society. Whether owing to its association with the counts of Eu or competition from Ponthevin monasteries, the ability of Le Tréport to attract lay donors appears to have been limited primarily to the Eudoise which in turn meant that the majority of the monastery’s possessions were located within

62 Cottineau, Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés t. 2, s.v.v. “Saint-Valery-sur-Somme” and “Saint-Riquier.” Gallia Christiana t.10, 1231-1263.
63 Cottineau, Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés t. 1, s.v. “Corbie.” Gallia Christiana t.10, 1263-1289.
64 The foundation of Lieu-Dieu is particularly interesting because it was the daughter house of Fourcarmont, a Cistercian foundation in the county of Eu. The relationship between these two houses, crossing borders as it did, would be intriguing to pursue. Cottineau, Répertoire topo-bibliographique des abbayes et prieurés t. 1, s.v. v. “Sery-aux-Pres” and “Lieu-Dieu-en-Ponthieu,” Gallia Christiana t.10, 1362-1367, 1341-1342.
the county of Eu. From the perspective of the lay patronage of Saint-Michel du Tréport the boundary of the county of Eu and of Normandy seems to have served as the limit of its possessions, though not absolutely as seen in Le Tréport’s property and rights at Pendé and Limeux, the monks’ possession of the church of Saint-Severin de Vimeu, and the gifts which Stephen of Aumale confirmed as viscount of Vimeu. All told, the lay patronage of Saint-Michel du Tréport paints a picture of a regional monastery whose possessions were considerable within its immediate area but whose donor base and property holdings were sparse beyond it. While Saint-Michel du Tréport found itself the recipients of the pious generosity of the Eudoise, the monastery’s charter record suggests that the monks of St. Michael had few dealings with the Ponthevins despite their proximity to the monastery.
IV. SAINT-MICHEL DU TRÉPORT AND THE BORDERS OF NORTHEAST NORMANDY

The monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport was situated in the northeast extremity of the duchy of Normandy, across the Bresle from the county of Ponthieu and near the border of the dioceses of Rouen and Amiens. While the location of the ecclesiastical border is accessible through Le Tréport’s charter records, the divide between Ponthieu and Normandy, despite the monastery’s proximity to the former, remains elusive in its sources. Geographically, at least, Saint-Michel du Tréport was situated near secular and ecclesiastical boundaries, but how much did location influence Le Tréport and how, if at all, are these borders reflected in the monastery’s sources? Furthermore, what do Saint-Michel’s charters reveal about cross-border relationships in the Eudoise-Ponthevin region? Finally, do the sources for Le Tréport provide information on any changes in these border regions as a result of the Capetian conquest of Normandy in 1204, a change which placed both Normandy and Ponthieu under the authority of the French crown?

The Normanno-Ponthevin Border

The question of the location of the Normanno-Ponthevin border is a difficult one. While the location of this boundary is important for this study, the charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport provides insufficient information to enable us to reconstruct it. As a result, this study has been forced to rely on the understanding of other historians concerning the location of this border, particularly that of Daniel Power as expressed in his “What Did the Frontier of Angevin Normandy Comprise?” and The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Century.\(^1\) In these works, Power argues for a more
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nuanced view of the Norman border than had been espoused by previous scholars, one which takes into account the effect which the jockeying for power between the Norman dukes and the frontier aristocracy had upon the border regions. In the process Power redefines much of our understanding of several regions of the Norman frontier, suggesting that they were much more fluid and unstable than had previously been thought. Although, Power has significantly altered historians’ views of certain areas of the Norman border, particularly along the duchy’s southern extremities, his work still supports the notion of the Bresle serving as the northeastern border of Normandy, or at least the border between the counties of Eu and Ponthieu, though he does argue for an understanding of this region which is more sensitive to its cross-border ties. Furthermore, while the charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport does not allow for the reconstruction of the border, it contains no evidence which would cast doubt on the notion of the Bresle as being the boundary between Eu and Ponthieu. The border, between the counties of Aumale and Ponthieu, however, was considerably more complex, and may not have followed the Bresle. This shall be addressed below. Thus, for the purposes of this study, the Bresle river is assumed to be the border between the counties of Eu and Ponthieu.

As is mentioned above, the border between Normandy and Ponthieu is elusive in Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charters. Despite the monastery’s proximity to Ponthieu, a border is not mentioned once in more than two hundred charters dating from the monastery’s founding in 1059 through 1270. Although lay donations to the monastery

---

were fairly plentiful, the counts of Eu never to our knowledge issued a general
confirmation detailed enough to suggest limits to their comital authority. Witness lists
offer little help, since many of the names who appear in these lists do so only once and
with little information to aid in contextualizing their owners. A direct assessment of any
Normanno-Ponthevin border based solely on the charters of Le Tréport is difficult. This
is not to say that Le Tréport’s charter record reveals nothing about the nearby secular
border, only that it reveals more about the border’s function and nature than its
geographic position.

Both the charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport and the location and number
of fortifications along the Normanno-Ponthevin frontier suggest that this was not a
heavily militarized border region, especially when compared to other, roughly
contemporary, medieval frontiers. According to Daniel Power and Michel Parisse, the
entire length of the Normanno-Ponthevin border contained only five fortified sites – at Eu
and Aumale for the Normans, and at Gamaches and Selinport for the Ponthevins.5 By
comparison, the nearby and hotly contested Vexin contained considerably more
fortifications than did the Normanno-Ponthevin region, while the March of Wales in the
early thirteenth century contained more than four hundred castles.6 Violence, another
indicator of a heavily militarized frontier, is also almost entirely absent Saint-Michel du
Tréport’s charter record. The only reference to war comes in a charter issued by Count
John of Eu in 1169 or 1170 in which he admitted co-opting some of the wealth of Saint-
Michel du Tréport in order to wage a war for the king and recompensed the abbey for its

losses. Admittedly, Le Tréport’s charters may not accurately reflect the amount of violence in the region. The list of conflicts between Eu and Ponthieu which Lucien Groué provides makes clear that war and violence were no strangers to this area, as does an agreement between the lord of Saint-Valéry-sur-Somme and the counts of Ponthieu and Eu concerning the passage of plunder taken by raiding parties through the fortress of Gamaches. What the above agreement and number of fortifications do suggest, however, is that the counties of Eu and Ponthieu were not the site of sustained conflict over control of territory by the Eudoise and Ponthevins, and this in turn suggests that the border was fairly well established, mutually recognized, and stable. While borders raids may have occurred in this area, the counts of Eu and Ponthieu were not trying to expand their counties at their neighbor’s expense.

Unlike several other borderlands in Europe, such as the March of Wales, the Normanno-Ponthevin border does not appear to have comprised a cultural frontier in addition to a political boundary. The fact that the monks possessed property in Ponthieu, albeit not much, and that the charters recording the donations of these possessions and the disputes over them appear no different than those concerning Eudoise patronage suggests that customs of land ownership, donation, and dispute in Eu and Ponthieu were similar enough that navigating them did not present the monks a serious challenge. This is not to say that judicial or customary differences did not exist between Eu and Ponthieu, only that the continuity in Le Tréport’s charters concerning the two counties indicate that they

7 P. Laffleur de Kermaingant, ed., Cartulaire de l’abbaye de Saint-Michel du Tréport (Paris: Typographie de Firmin-Didot, 1880), 63-64, no. 32
had analogous customary cultures. For example, an undated charter which Kermaingant believes is from the second half of the twelfth century, records the resolution of a conflict between a Lucas de Joncheriis and the monks of Saint-Michel over a portion of the tithes of Pendé, near the mouth of the Somme.9 Another undated charter records the outcome of a dispute between the abbey and Alicia de Cumbes once again concerning the tithes of Pendé.10 Nothing about these disputes distinguishes them from those involving Eudoise properties of the monks. Similarly, the donations of Eremburgis, mother of Gerald de Horneio, and of Hugh de Briccum Maisnil at Limeux offer no indication that they are in any way different than the gifts which Saint-Michel received from the Eudoise aristocracy.11 Admittedly, the sample size which Le Tréport’s charters provide for this analysis is small since the monks held only a spare handful of properties in Ponthieu, but this view is bolstered also by the secondary literature. Both Power and E. Howard Shealy mention members of the Norman aristocracy or Norman monasteries which held land in Ponthieu.12 While more research is needed to establish this more concretely, the evidence from the documents of Le Tréport and the secondary literature suggest that the counties of Eu, Aumale, and Ponthieu were divided politically rather than culturally.13

The charter record for Saint-Michel du Tréport offers an interesting challenge when it comes to the boundary between the counties of Aumale and Ponthieu, to the south of the county of Eu. The view of this region afforded by the charters of Le Tréport
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9 Kermaingant, ed., Cartulaire, 70, no. 38
10 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 72, no. 42
11 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 23, no. 5.
13 Power also comes to this conclusion concerning the laws and customs of Normandy and those of the duchy’s neighbors in general. See Power, The Norman Frontier, 171-6.
comes from a spurt of grants made to the monastery in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries by a cluster of families who held property in the region between the cities of Aumale and Amiens. Within the space of a few decades at most the monks acquired possessions at Lafresnoye, Tronchoy, Hornoy-le-Bourg, Camps-en-Amienois, and Limeux. The challenge posed by these acquisitions and by the sources which record them is whether or not these holdings, and the families who donated them, belonged to Aumale, and thus to Normandy, or Ponthieu.

The charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport makes clear that several of the monastery’s donors in this region were connected to the counts of Aumale. The Visa family, who gave several gifts to Le Tréport at Lafresnoye over the course of two generations, had their gifts confirmed by Stephen, the count of Aumale, and by his mother, Alice. The last gift from the Visa family, made by William Visa, was even presented at Aumale. The donation given by Gerald de Horneio at Hornoy-le-Bourg were also confirmed by Stephen, though grants made by other members of Gerald’s family and retinue were not.

At first glance it seems that these donors and their gifts must have lain within the confines of Normandy since, after all, they had been confirmed by Stephen, a Norman count. The lordship in this region, however, is not so clear cut. In the charter in which Stephen confirmed the grants of the Visa family and of Gerald de Horneio, he also confirmed all of the possessions of the monks “tam in territerio Albemarle quam in
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14 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 22-3, no. 5; 16-7, no. 3.
15 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 16-7, no. 3.
16 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 17, no. 3.
17 Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 19-20, no. 3; 22-3, no. 5.
This is the only reference in Saint-Michel’s charter record to a viscounty of Vimeu and the Latin in this passage is unclear as to whether Stephen confirmed the donations of Gerald de Horneio and the Visa family in his capacity as count of Aumale or as viscount of Vimeu.19

Stephen’s claim to a viscounty of Vimeu is the chief interpretive difficulty presented in this passage. As was noted above, this is the only reference to a viscounty of Vimeu and accessible secondary literature does not aid in illuminating this claim. Much of the secondary literature treating Ponthieu concerns the period of the Hundred Years’ War or takes such a long view of Picardy that the details of twelfth-century lordship and geography are lost. A few sources, however, have proved somewhat useful. Lucien Groué in his Aux confins de la Picardie et de la Normandie provides a map showing that Vimeu was the region of Ponthieu between the Somme and the Bresle, though the map unfortunately cuts off just south of Aumale suggesting, though, that Vimeu extended south of the Norman city.20 Groué also provides brief narratives of the wars in which the counts of Ponthieu took part in against Normandy during the ducal period and the Capetian conquest.21 In the article, “The Persistence of Particularism: the County of Ponthieu in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries,” E. Howard Shealy mentions that in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the count of Aumale held land from the count of Ponthieu, but does not specify what the count of Aumale held or if this situation had
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18 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 19, no. 3.
19 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 19-20, no. 3. “Stephanus, comes Albemarlensis, mare transiturus, tempore Rogationum, cum uxor sua Havisa Ulterisportum advenit, ibique a donno Osberno abbate honorifice susceps, concessit donum de Fraxineta [Lafresnoye] quod Henricus Visa et Guillelmus filius ejus ecclesie Sancti Michaelis de Ulterisportu fecerant; et de his omnibus que jam dicta ecclesia habebat vel habitura erat a suis hominibus, tam in territerio Albemarle quam in vicecomitatu suo de Vimeu, ubi Truncetum [Tronchoy] et quedam alia a Geroldo de Horneio habebat ecclesia, firmam concessionem fecit, et donum super altare sancti Michaelis ispe, et uxor ejus posuit.”
20 Groué, Aux confins de la Picardie et de la Normandie, v.
21 Groué, Aux confins de la Picardie et de la Normandie, 119-23.
also obtained in the early twelfth century. Kermaingant, in the notes to his *Cartulaire* agrees with Groué in asserting that Vimeu was a region of Ponthieu. René de Belleval in his *Les Fiefs et les seigneuries du Ponthieu et du Vimeu* claims that the lordship of Hornoy-le-Bourg lay in Vimeu, though much of the information he presents is drawn from later periods. The earliest date which Belleval references is 1237 and much of what he conveys about Hornoy-le-Bourg emphasizes the period of the later middle ages through the French Revolution. None of these authors mention a viscounty of Vimeu which was held by the counts of Aumale in the early twelfth century or whether this viscounty comprised the whole of Vimeu or only part of it, or whether this viscounty was part of Ponthieu or of Normandy. The implications of a viscounty of Vimeu held by the count of Aumale are significant for a study of this section of the border between Normandy and Ponthieu, but, unfortunately, the charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport does not provide sufficient information for any clear conclusions to be drawn. It does seem likely, however, given that both Power and Shealy mention the counts of Aumale’s land holdings outside of Normandy, that Stephen’s viscounty of Vimeu was a territory within Ponthieu which he held from the Ponthevin counts. More information than this must await further research.

Uncertainty over Stephen’s viscounty of Vimeu causes interpretive challenges in determining the status of Gerald de Horneio and his family. Hornoy-le-Bourg, the source
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24 René de Belleval, *Les Fiefs et les seigneuries du Ponthieu et du Vimeu* (Brionne, France: Gérrard Monfort, 1975), 182-3. Much of the information which this source presents appears to be drawn from later periods, the earliest being 1237, so it may not be accurate as to Hornoy-le-Bourg’s status in the early twelfth century.
of Gerald’s toponym and the location of his donation to the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport, lies about a third of the way from Aumale to Amiens and, as was mentioned above, Gerald’s late eleventh- or early twelfth-century donation at Hornoy-le-Bourg was confirmed by Stephen count of Aumale.\textsuperscript{26} Gerald’s mother, Eremburgis, and one of his men, a certain Hugh de Briccum Maisnil, had both made earlier donations to the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport at a place called Limeux, located north of Amiens and well within Ponthieu.\textsuperscript{27} Both of these donations were confirmed by Gerald and his brother Guido. In the case of Eremburgis’ gift the charter is unclear as to whether Gerald and Guido confirmed as heirs or as lords, but Gerald is clearly identified as Hugh’s lord and consents as such to the gift.\textsuperscript{28} Not only, then, did Gerald de Horneio have lands at Hornoy-le-Bourg, but he or members of his family also held lands at Limeux, well within Ponthieu. Furthermore, while the gifts of Gerald were clearly confirmed by count Stephen of Aumale, those of his mother and Hugh de Briccum Maisnil were not. This may have simply been an oversight of the monks, since the charter recording Stephen’s confirmation is written in the third person and is not as formal a document as many of the other confirmations which the monks recorded.\textsuperscript{29} It could also mean, however, that part of Gerald’s holdings lay within the purview of Stephen while another part of his or his family’s property did not. The significance of the possibility that Gerald’s lands lay only partially under Stephen’s jurisdiction depends much on the details of Stephen’s tenure as viscount of Vimeu and whether or not Hornoy-le-Bourg was within or without Normandy. Even so, the holdings of Gerald de Horneio and of his family possibly

\textsuperscript{26} Daniel Power, \textit{The Norman Frontier in the Twelfth and Early Thirteenth Centuries} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), xix.
\textsuperscript{27} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 23 no. 5.
\textsuperscript{28} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 23 no. 5
\textsuperscript{29} Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 19-20, no. 3.
represent a cross-border lordship, while the possessions of Count Stephen of Aumale almost certainly do.

The Ecclesiastical Boundary Between Rouen and Amiens

Unlike the situation with the Normanno-Ponthévin border, Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charter record does provide sufficient information to assess the location of the boundaries of the dioceses of Rouen and Amiens, especially when their information is combined with data from the pouillé of these bishoprics. Hugh of Amiens, an archbishop of Rouen, issued three charters of confirmation to the monks of Le Tréport through the course of his career, on in 1145, one in 1151, and the last in 1153. Although Hugh’s charter from 1153 confirms only a single grant to the monastery, the 1145 and 1151 charters comprehensively list and confirm everything that the monks had acquired up until then within the diocese of Rouen. When combined with a mid-twelfth century pouillé from the tenure of Eudes Rigaud, another Rouen pouillé from 1337, and a pouillé from the diocese of Amiens in 1301, these sources allow the ecclesiastical boundaries of the dioceses of Rouen and Amiens and changes to them during this period to be approximated.

According to Hugh’s charters and the pouillés, the ecclesiastical boundaries of the dioceses of Rouen and Amiens followed the river Bresle from the coast until it reached the approximate latitude of the monastery of Foucarmont. Along this stretch, from the sea to the level of Foucarmont, the border between the two dioceses remained unchanged
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from the twelfth through the fourteenth centuries. South of Foucarmont, however, the boundary of Rouen left the river and arced eastward to enclose several locations between Aumale and Hornoy-le-Bourg before turning westward again. It is possible that the ecclesiastical border in this region shifted slightly between the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries.

In the twelfth century the confirmations of Hugh, the archbishop of Rouen, halted at Tronchoy, just east of Aumale, even though by this point the monks of Le Tréport held property further east in Hornoy-le-Bourg and Camps-en-Amienois. The thirteenth-century pouillé from Rouen, however, makes no mention of Tronchoy, instead including only Orival, a location to the south and west of Tronchoy, within the diocese. Again, no mention is made of Tronchoy in the fourteenth-century Rouen pouillé, but the 1301 Amiens pouillé claims Tronchoy for its bishop. This evidence suggests that either Archbishop Hugh overstepped his jurisdiction in the twelfth century or that over the course of the thirteenth century the diocese of Amiens gained Tronchoy at Rouen’s expense.

Cross-Borders Connections

Saint-Michel du Tréport’s documents reveal the existence of relationships which crossed both secular and ecclesiastical boundaries, though they do not offer much information concerning their details. To begin with, while most of the monks’ possessions were located within Normandy or England, a handful was in Ponthieu. For example, an undated charter records that Lucas de Joncheriis conceded to the monks a
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32 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 31-36 no. 9; 46-50 no. 19.
33 “Polyptychum Rotomagensis Dioecesis” in Recueil des historiens des gaules et de la France t.23, edited by De Wailly et al., 270.
34 Longnon, ed., Pouillés de la Province de Rouen, 47-8; Longnon, ed., Pouillés de Reims, 544.
disputed portion of the tithe at Pendé, a site close to the mouth of the Somme.\textsuperscript{35} Another charter, presumably later based on its placement in Kermaingant’s *Cartulaire*, records the concession in favor of the monks of Alicia de Cumbes of the tithes which she had claimed at Pendé.\textsuperscript{36} In the early twelfth century, Ancellus de Chaio gave to the monks the church of Saint-Severin de Vimeu.\textsuperscript{37} Also, as discussed above, the donations made to the monks by Eremburgis and Hugh de Briccum Maisnil were also likely located outside of Normandy.\textsuperscript{38}

Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charters also reveal the monks interacting with monasteries beyond the diocese of Rouen and receiving confirmations from and being judged by the bishops of Amiens and Beauvais. In 1147 Ancellus de Chaio’s gift of the church of Saint-Severin was redonated and confirmed by the bishop of Amiens.\textsuperscript{39} Another charter from the early thirteenth century records that a dispute in which the monks of Saint-Michel were embroiled was resolved before the bishop of the same diocese.\textsuperscript{40} In 1225 the monks of Saint-Michel exchanged land and entered into an association with a monastery in the diocese of Beauvais, Lannoy.\textsuperscript{41} This transaction was later confirmed by the bishop of Beauvais.\textsuperscript{42}

Patronage of churches was another way in which the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport interacted with ecclesiastics from outside of Normandy. As we pointed out in the second chapter, patronage of a church entailed the right to nominate vicars, control over that church’s income, and yielded some measure of influence over sermon content and

\textsuperscript{35} Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 70, no. 38.
\textsuperscript{36} Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 70, no. 38; 72, no. 42.
\textsuperscript{37} Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 19 no. 3
\textsuperscript{38} Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 23 no 5
\textsuperscript{39} Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 39, no.13.
\textsuperscript{40} Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 140, no 116
\textsuperscript{41} Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 153-4, no.134.
\textsuperscript{42} Kermaingant, *Cartulaire*, 154-5, no.135.
liturgical celebrations. While the majority of the churches which the monks of Le Tréport held were within Normandy, they did possess a few in Ponthieu. As we have seen, the monks were given the church of Saint-Severin de Vimeu in the early twelfth century by Ancellus de Chaio, even though they only held this church until 1150. Also in the early twelfth century the monks received the church in Camps-en-Amienois from Ralph de Arenis.

The existence of cross-border connections between laypersons is something about which Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charter record only hints. One charter, discussed above, references Count Stephen of Aumale holding the viscounty of Vimeu, likely from the count of Ponthieu. The lands of Gerald de Horneio and his family may also have straddled the border between Normandy and Ponthieu, though further research must be conducted before this can be asserted with any certainty. Similarly, both Ancellus de Chaio’s and Gerald de Horneio’s donation charters include prominent members of the Eudoise aristocracy among their witness lists. In the case of Ancellus de Chaio, his donation was witnessed by Ancellus de Fréauville, the brother of then-abbot Osberne, while Gerald de Horneio’s donation was witnessed by Geoffrey de Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard. Both Ancellus de Fréauville and Geoffrey de Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard were members of families identified as supplying the barons of the counts of Eu. Whether or not the presence of Ancellus and Geoffrey indicates connections between the Eudoise and

44 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 19, no. 3. In 1150 the monks of Saint-Michel traded away a church of Saint-Severin to the monastery of Sery-aux-Prés in return for an annual payment. See Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 43, no. 17.
45 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 23, no. 5.
46 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 19, no. 3 For my discussions on Count Stephen and his viscounty of Vimeu please see pages 26-7 and 56-60 of this thesis.
47 Kermaingant, Cartulaire, 19, no. 3, 23, no. 5, 20, no. 4.
Ponthévin aristocracy is a question which Le Tréport’s charters do not allow us to answer, and must also await further research. Even so, the secondary literature references cross-border landholding in this region sufficiently to suggest that such connections were not uncommon.\footnote{Power, \textit{The Norman Frontier}, 377; Shealy, “The Persistence of Particularism: the County of Ponthieu in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries,” 35.}

\textbf{The Capetian Conquest of Normandy}

Finally, what was the impact of the Capetian conquest of Normandy in 1204 upon the patronage of the monks of Saint-Michel du Tréport and upon the Normanno-Ponthévin border? The charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport is silent about the Capetian takeover of Normandy. In the two hundred and twenty-one charters from Le Tréport for the period from 1059 until 1270 there is not a single direct reference to the conquest or its consequences. The only oblique reference to the new political status quo comes in a charter from 1234. This charter records a long, drawn-out legal dispute between the abbot of Le Tréport and John de Vineis, a \textit{bailli} for the king of France in Falaise, over the possessions of the cleric Robert de Mombrai after his death.\footnote{Kermaingant, \textit{Cartulaire}, 177-179, no. 159} This dispute, which was ultimately resolved in the monks’ favor before the exchequer court of Rouen, was at one point argued before the court of the king of France.\footnote{For more information on justice in Normandy after the Capetian conquest and the role of French newcomers in that justice see Daniel Power, “L’établissement du régime capétien en Normandie: structures royales et réactions aristocratiques” in \textit{1204: La Normandie entre Plantagenêts et Capétiens} edited by Anne-Marie Flambard Héricher and Véronique Gazeau (Caen, France: Publications du CRAHM, 2007), 328-41.} Other than this, Le Tréport’s charters make no direct reference to direct Capetian control of Normandy.

Overall, the strongest impression which emerges from Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charter record after 1204 is one of continuity. The silence of Le Tréport’s charters concerning the conquest combined with the fact that the monastery’s patronage patterns
after 1204 remained much the same as before, suggest that the conquest did not have
much of an impact upon the functioning or holdings of Le Tréport. This is not to say that
there was no change after 1204, but that these trends, such as an increase in purchases
made by the monks do not appear to be the result of a political change. Except for the
dispute discussed above, one would be hard pressed even to realize from the evidence of
Le Tréport’s charters that such an important political shift had occurred in Normandy.
Because Philip Augustus intentionally followed existing Norman customs after his
takeover of Normandy, this is, in fact, not surprising. From the view afforded by the
charters of Saint-Michel things continued on after the conquest much the same as they
had before it. The counts of Eu still patronized Le Tréport regularly, most of Le Tréport’s
possessions still lay within the county of Eu, lawsuits were still brought against the
monks over property, and the monks still quarreled with the clerics of the churches whose
patronage they held.

Conclusion: An Emerging Picture

The charter record of Saint-Michel du Tréport for the years 1059 through 1270
offers a unique perspective on the secular border between Normandy and Ponthieu and
the ecclesiastical frontier between the dioceses of Rouen and Amiens. At first glance, Le
Tréport’s charters are silent about the Normanno-Ponthevin boundary, but upon closer
examination they show that the border was both a division in identity but not a significant
one in culture or custom. The sources for Le Tréport offer a clearer picture of the
ecclesiastical boundary between Rouen and Amiens, providing enough information, in
concert with several pouillés, to allow for an approximation of the location of this border,
revealing that it shifted westward slightly in the course of the twelfth century between

Aumale and Hornoy-le-Bourg. Concerning cross-border relationships, Le Tréport’s documents suggest the existence of a cross-border lordship in the holdings of Count Stephen of Aumale, while also revealing several avenues through which the monks themselves had dealings with persons and institutions from outside of Normandy, whether through their patronage of churches, interactions with the bishops of Beauvais and Amiens, or their relationships with other monasteries. In the end, what the charters of Saint-Michel du Tréport communicate best about the borders are avenues for further research. Le Tréport’s charter record offers many hints - about the nature of the borders, how they functioned, and cross-border interactions and lordships - but does not provide enough information for a detailed analysis. Instead, these hints lead to areas where future fruitful investigation may be undertaken. The sources for Le Tréport offer a window onto the border between Normandy and Ponthieu, but it must be combined with other sources before a complete and full picture can begin to emerge.
V. CONCLUSION

This thesis revolves around four topics. First, this project explored Le Tréport’s ecclesiastical context and relationships with other secular and regular ecclesiastics.

Second, it considered the lay patronage of the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport.

Third, this thesis examined how the Eudoise and Ponthevin border and the boundaries of the dioceses of Rouen and Amiens are reflected in the sources from Saint-Michel du Tréport. Finally, this thesis also sought to determine the impact of the Capetian conquest of Normandy in 1204 upon the border region, as seen through the lens of Le Tréport’s charter record.

The first chapter sought to situate Saint-Michel du Tréport within its ecclesiastical context. It began with an analysis of Archbishop Eudes Rigaud’s visitation records for Saint-Michel, examining the wealth of the monastery, the size of its population, and their moral state as assessed by the archbishop. The chapter then described the relationship of the monks of Saint-Michel with members of the ecclesiastical elite, the archbishops of Rouen and the bishops of Amiens and Beauvais. The relationships of the monks of Saint-Michel with other monastic institutions and their patronage of churches were also considered. The second chapter concluded with the observation that the ecclesiastical network of Saint-Michel du Tréport was not confined to their own diocese, but extended into the jurisdiction of other Norman bishops as well as neighboring non-Norman dioceses, such as Amiens and Beauvais.

The second chapter examined the lay patronage of Saint-Michel du Tréport from its foundation in 1059 until the death of Louis IX in 1270. It started with the donations of the comital family of Eu before then describing the gifts of Le Tréport’s other lay
patrons. Since most of Saint-Michel du Tréport’s holdings were located in the county of Eu and were given by Eudoise donors, this chapter concluded that the appeal of the monks of Saint-Michel as beneficiaries of pious donation was strongest in the county of Eu due to their strong association with the comital family. The chapter also suggested that, as another result of this strong association with the Eudoise comital family, Le Tréport was unappealing to Ponthevin donors despite the monastery’s proximity to Ponthieu.

The third and final chapter concerned how the secular and ecclesiastical border near Saint-Michel du Tréport were reflected in the monastery’s charter record in addition to a consideration of how the Capetian conquest of Normandy in 1204 impacted both the monastery of Saint-Michel and the nearby border regions. This chapter began with an assessment of the evidence concerning the Normanno-Ponthevin border contained in Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charter record, observing that it is insufficient to allow for a reconstruction of the geography of the border. Even though the location is out of reach based on the evidence of Le Tréport’s charter record alone, this chapter suggested that there was still much which could be discerned about the border from Le Tréport’s sources. Specifically, this chapter argued that the secular border was not heavily militarized, that it represented a political division rather than a legal or cultural one, and finally that it also represented a divide in identity, one that persisted even after the Capetian conquest in 1204. This chapter also analyzed, in as much as it could based on limited evidence, the status of the Norman border in the region between Aumale and Amiens, concluding that the holdings of Gerald de Horneio possibly constituted a cross-
border lordship while the lordship of Count Stephen of Aumale almost certainly did straddle the Normanno-Ponthévin border.

The third chapter also considered the ecclesiastical border between the diocese of Rouen and Amiens. It was able to gauge the location of this border based on evidence from confirmations of Archbishop of Rouen Hugh Amiens and several pouillé from both dioceses. This analysis suggested that the ecclesiastical border along the Bresle up until the latitude of Foucarmont remained stable through the course of this study’s period, but that the border south of Foucarmont had shifted slightly to the west during the same time frame. Finally, the third chapter considered the impact of the Capetian conquest in 1204 as seen through the lens of Saint-Michel du Tréport’s charter record. After observing that the Capetian conquest was nearly invisible in the sources from Le Tréport, it concluded that the lack of evidence pointed strongly to continuity between the pre- and post-Capetian county of Eu.

**Further Research**

Besides contributing to a better understanding of the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport, its patronage, ecclesiastical context, and the view of the nearby secular and ecclesiastical boundaries afforded from its sources, this thesis has also suggested a wealth of future avenues for research. One possibility is a study of the aristocracy of the counties of Eu, Aumale, and Ponthieu. While this thesis has described the relationships of the de Fréauvilles, the lords of Saint-Martin-le-Gaillard, the counts of Aumale, and the lords of Hornoy-le-Bourg to Saint-Michel du Tréport, much work still remains to be done concerning the narrative history, landed interests, influences, and connections of families such as these and the other aristocratic lineages of this region. Another possibility is an
examination of the patronage and any cross-border connections of other monastic foundations of the comital family of Eu such as the house of secular canons in the city of Eu and the Cistercian monastery at Foucarmont. Such a study could even be expanded to include monastic institutions in Ponthieu to see if their patronage patterns were similar to those of Saint-Michel du Tréport and other Eudoise houses. Thirdly, a more detailed study could be undertaken concerning the landed interests of the comital family of Eu and the role which the counts of Eu played in the defense of Normandy and the power structures of the Eu-Ponthieu-Aumale region. Finally, a more detailed analysis could be made, using a broad range of sources, of cross-border landholding and lordship in this region and the implications which this held for the distribution of power along the border region.

This thesis began as an inquiry into the secular and diocesanal boundaries near the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport, but evolved into an exploration of the monastery’s patronage and ecclesiastical context in addition to a study of the Normanno-Ponthevin and Rouen-Amiens borders. Although Le Tréport’s charter records do not mention either of these borders explicitly, they nevertheless have served as a window into the northeast extremity of Normandy during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. This thesis has worked to clarify our understanding of the early history of Saint-Michel du Tréport, its relationship to local aristocracy and ecclesiastical institutions, and the view afforded by its charters of the nearby secular and ecclesiastical borders. Ultimately, the monastery of Saint-Michel du Tréport was founded by the counts of Eu and it was within the social, economic, and ecclesiastical fabric of the county of Eu that the monks of Saint-Michel were most deeply rooted.
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