

# ANALECTA BOLLANDIANA

REVUE CRITIQUE D'HAGIOGRAPHIE  
*A JOURNAL OF CRITICAL HAGIOGRAPHY*

PUBLIÉE PAR LA  
*EDITED BY THE*

SOCIÉTÉ DES BOLLANDISTES

TOME 128

I - Juin 2010

SOCIÉTÉ DES BOLLANDISTES

24, BOULEVARD SAINT-MICHEL

B 1040 BRUXELLES

John HOWE

**DID ST. PETER DAMIAN DIE IN 1073 ?  
A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON HIS FINAL DAYS\***

Should the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina* change St. Peter Damian's obituary from *Petrus Damianus S. R. E. Card. ep. Ostiensis, † 1072*<sup>1</sup> to *Petrus Damianus S. R. E. Card. ep. Ostiensis, † 1073*? Although today the *BHL* exists in an electronic form where dates can be silently modified and whole new fields of information introduced, this proposal for change deserves a formal discussion inasmuch as it contradicts the universally accepted 1072 death date enshrined in hundreds of thousands of library catalogues, printed works, and electronic media sites. Is a difference of one year worth debating? The problem would certainly have been relished by the early Bollandists who strove to present the earthly histories of the saints as accurately as possible in the *Acta Sanctorum*. Yet there is more at issue than an improved chronology. Given the interconnectedness of historical events, a change in even an apparently trivial historical detail may result in new understandings and perspectives, as I hope to demonstrate here.

St. Peter Damian, one of the towering figures of the eleventh century, needs no introduction. He had few equals as a promoter and theorist of monastic reform. He was cardinal bishop of Ostia, dean of the College of Cardinals, and a major leader of the Roman reform movement. He wrote prolifically and took care to ensure that his writings were preserved. Because scholars have meticulously plotted his itineraries and dated his letters, his career ought to hold few surprises<sup>2</sup>.

\* Special thanks are due to Maureen Miller and Kathryn Jasper, both of the University of California at Berkeley, for help with an earlier draft of this paper. Thanks also to the editors and readers of the *Analecta Bollandiana* whose suggestions greatly improved this essay. Abbreviations of works cited several times or more are listed at the end, p. 86.

<sup>1</sup> *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis* (= *Subs. hag.*, 6), Brussels, 1898-1901, vol. 2, p. 975. An electronic version, *BHLms*, now combines information from the *BHL* and the published Bollandist manuscript catalogues: see <http://bhlms.fltr.ucl.ac.be/>.

<sup>2</sup> Academic studies on Peter Damian are listed topically, with annotations, in U. FACCHINI, *Pier Damiani, un padre del secondo millennio. Bibliografia 1007-2007*, Rome, 2007. Facchini (*ibid.*, p. 21) still hails as the "studio fondamentale" for Peter Damian's work, G. LUCCHESI, *Clavis S. Petri Damiani*, in *Studi su san Pier Damiano in onore del cardinale Amleto Giovanni Cicognani* (= *Biblioteca cardinale Gaetano Cicognani*, 5), Faenza, 1961 (new ed. 1971), 1<sup>st</sup> ed., pp. 2-215; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 249-407; for Peter's career, see LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 1, pp. 13-179 and vol. 2, pp. 13-160. Recent biographies include A. CANTIN, *Saint Pierre Damien (1007-1072): autrefois – aujourd'hui*, Paris, 2006; and R. BENERICETTI, *L'Eremo e la cattedra. Vita di san Pier Damiani (Ravenna 1007 – Faenza 1072)*, Milan, 2007.

The historical narrative of Peter Damian's final years has been shaped by the belief that he died in early 1072. His chronic ill health, scholars assume, must have gotten worse as he reached his mid sixties<sup>3</sup>. He had shed his episcopal duties<sup>4</sup>. He had largely withdrawn from curial business<sup>5</sup>. His last known international errand was a trip to Frankfurt in 1069 to reconcile the nineteen-year-old Henry IV with his wife, Bertha of Turin<sup>6</sup>. His letters, most of which were public documents prompted by

<sup>3</sup> Scholars postulating a precipitous decline in Peter's health during his final years include, among others, P. MCNULTY, *St. Peter Damian: Selected Writings on the Spiritual Life*, New York, 1960, p. 25; LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 2, p. 102; Introduction, in BLUM, *Letters*, vol. 1, p. 32; and G. SPINELLI, *San Pier Damiani e Montecassino*, in *L'Età dell'abate Desiderio. III: Storia arte e cultura*, ed. F. AVAGLIANO – O. PECERE (= *Miscellanea Cassinese*, 67), Montecassino, 1992, vol. 1, pp. 213-214.

Peter did complain about his illnesses, but he did so throughout his whole career. Among letters from various years, note *Epist.* 55 (1058), 57 (1058), 75 (1060), 106 and 107 (1064), 122 (1065), and 148 (1067), ed. REINDEL, vol. 2, pp. 148-153, 162-190, esp. 178, 375-377, vol. 3, pp. 168-185, esp. 169-170, 185-188, esp. 186-187, 398-399, 544-546; trans. BLUM, *Letters*, vol. 2, pp. 355-360, 369-389, 157-158, vol. 4, pp. 174-191, esp. 175-176, 192-194, esp. 193, vol. 5, pp. 10-11, and 169-170. His chronic protestations of ill health sometimes appear self-serving inasmuch as Peter, who valued time in his hermitage, tends to couple them with demurrals along the lines of "I would surely visit you ... if feeble old age did not impede my faltering steps" (e.g. *Epist.* 106, 107, and 148 as cited above). Nevertheless, he did have real health problems: John of Lodi, *Vita Petri Damiani*, xv, ed. FREUND, p. 241, notes chronic night fevers; *Epist.* 55, cited above, describes an illness in 1058 so severe that Peter received the last rites; *Epist.* 106 and 107, cited above, indicate major illness in 1064, etc. Based upon the normal course of human events, it is tempting to infer that Peter's health problems became worse in his last years, but this alleged decline is not actually documented.

<sup>4</sup> In several letters Peter seeks to divest himself of his ecclesiastical dignities: see *Epist.* 57 (1058), 72 (1059-61), 75 (1060), 79 (1060-61), 96 (1063), ed. REINDEL, vol. 2, pp. 162-190, 326-366, 375-377 and 398-400, vol. 3, pp. 46-64; trans. BLUM, *Letters*, vol. 2, pp. 369-389, vol. 3, pp. 116-146, 157-158, 182-201, vol. 5, pp. 51-67. Because scholars lack the responses of the popes addressed, they disagree about what duties Peter actually managed to shed and when he shed them. Matters are complicated because Peter tended to retain his offices even after he had been dispensed from their actual responsibilities. No evidence indicates, however, that he still had any pastoral obligations in the 1070s.

<sup>5</sup> Letters from Peter to Archdeacon Hildebrand become fewer in the mid 1060s and cease entirely in 1069. On what appears to be an increasing distance between the two men, see F. DRESSLER, *Petrus Damiani. Leben und Werk* (= *Studia Anselmiana*, 34), Rome, 1954, p. 160, and COWDREY, *Pope Gregory VII*, pp. 39-43.

<sup>6</sup> LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 2, pp. 104-107 and 123-125; K. REINDEL, *Petrus Damiani in Bayern*, in *Land und Reich, Stamm und Nation. Probleme und Perspektiven bayerischer Geschichte. Festgabe für Max Spindler zum 90. Geburtstag*, ed. A. KRAUS, vol. 1 (= *Schriftenreihe zur bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 78), Munich, 1984, pp. 325-338, esp. 326; A. BÜHLER, *Kaiser Heinrich IV. und Bertha von Turin – Eine schwierige Ehe im Spiegel der Urkunden*, in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 83 (2001), pp. 37-61, esp. 45; Cl. ZEY, *Scheidung zu Recht? Die Trennungsabsicht Heinrichs IV. im Jahr 1069*, in *Von Sachsen bis Jerusalem: Menschen und Institutionen im Wandel der Zeit. Festschrift für Wolfgang Giese zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. H. SEIBERT – G. THOMA, Munich, 2004, pp. 163-183.

public events, became fewer after his retirement in the 1070s.<sup>7</sup> Peter confided to his brother Damian that "... I carefully watch the day of my death coming ever closer ... For while I count the long years, and notice that my hair is turning white, and become aware that in whatever group of people I find myself, almost all are younger than I am, I put aside all my concerns and think only of death..."<sup>8</sup>. Peter's biographers generally assume that by the 1070s the elderly hermit, enfeebled and withdrawn from active ecclesiastical leadership, had retreated to his beloved cell to prepare for a good death.

Yet reports of his demise may be premature. In an earlier study in the *Revue bénédictine*, I demonstrated that Peter had made the arduous fifteen-day trip from Fonte Avellana to Monte Cassino in 1071<sup>9</sup>. Later he embarked on a legatine mission to reconcile Ravenna with Rome, a final journey documented by his biographer and travelling companion, John of Lodi, who does not describe any disabling health problems during a smooth trip to Ravenna (*prospero pervenisset itinere*) or during the enthusiastic reception there (*in manu civium susceptus ingenti cum laetitia ... tota urbe immanis effecta est exultatio*). Peter's death soon after his departure from Ravenna was due to a sudden fever (*mox febre correptus*)<sup>10</sup> which struck him after he had stopped and been honorably received at Santa Maria fuori le mura in Faenza<sup>11</sup>. This caused his death eight days later, a health crisis that John believed had been exacerbated by Peter's age, labors, and penances<sup>12</sup>. Nevertheless, since Faenza is on no direct route from Ravenna to Fonte Avellana, Peter had probably been planning to travel onward in order to spend Lent at Fonte Avellana's hermitage at

<sup>7</sup> On the problems presented by Peter's letters, which survive in undated copies, see *Introduction*, in BLUM, *Letters*, vol. 1, pp. 12-27. Judging from those that modern scholars can date on the basis of references to external events, Peter's epistolary output fell off dramatically in the 1070s. Yet, because his letters would have become more difficult to date as he withdrew from high politics, the corpus of dated letters may not perfectly mirror his final correspondence.

<sup>8</sup> Peter Damian, *Epist.* 138 (sometime after 1065), ed. REINDEL, vol. 4, pp. 472-476, esp. 473; trans. BLUM - RESNICK, *Letters*, vol. 5, pp. 97-101, esp. 97.

<sup>9</sup> J. HOWE, *Peter Damian and Monte Cassino*, in *Revue bénédictine*, 107 (1997), pp. 330-351. The evidence for this 1071 journey is unrelated to the story that Peter Damian was at Monte Cassino for the dedication ceremony of 1071, a claim resting on a forgery by Peter the Deacon which two earlier lists of attendees do not support (see *ibid.*, pp. 347-348).

<sup>10</sup> The phrase used for Damian's sudden illness (*mox febre correptus*), while appropriate in John's narrative, is actually a borrowing from the *Vita Benedicti*: compare Gregory I, *Dialogi*, II, xxxvii, ed. A. DE VOGÜÉ - P. ANTIN, vol. 2 (= *Sources Chrétiennes*, 260), Paris, 1979, p. 244.

<sup>11</sup> A. SAVIOLI, *La chiesa di S. Maria 'foris portam' a Faenza e la tomba di S. Pier Damiani*, in *Studi Gregoriani*, 10 (1975), pp. 111-130.

<sup>12</sup> John of Lodi, *Vita Petri Damiani*, xxii, ed. FREUND, pp. 259-260.

Gamogna (founded by him in 1053 and visited by him many times)<sup>13</sup>. He must have been reasonably mobile right up until his final fortnight.

Today it is universally accepted as historical "fact" that Peter Damian died on the night of 22 February 1072. But how do we know this? John of Lodi, an eyewitness to Peter's dying requests made "to those of us standing around" (*nobis ... circumstantibus*), states unequivocally that Peter died during the night of the feast of the Chair of St. Peter, his patron saint, that is on 22 February<sup>14</sup>. This testimony is supported by martyrological traditions of Fonte Avellana<sup>15</sup> and Monte Cassino<sup>16</sup>. Therefore the 22 February date of death seems reasonably secure, despite other early traditions placing it on 21 February<sup>17</sup> and on 23 February<sup>18</sup>. The variants

<sup>13</sup> G. LUCCHESI, *I viaggi di S. Pier Damiani*, in *S. Pier Damiani. Atti del Convegno di studi nel IX centenario della morte*, Faenza, 30 sett. – 1 ott. 1972, Faenza, 1973, pp. 71-91, esp. 73-79; BENERICETTI, *L'Eremo e la cattedra...* (see above n. 2), p. 169.

<sup>14</sup> John of Lodi, *Vita Petri Damiani*, XXII, ed. FREUND, p. 261, situates Peter's death during the night of 22 February *circa medium octavae noctis silentium*.

<sup>15</sup> 22 February is found in Camaldolese martyrological traditions noted in G. MITTARELLI – A. COSTADONI, *Annales Camaldulenses Ordinis Sancti Benedicti*, vol. 2, Venice, 1756, pp. 344-347. These references presumably go back to an original Fonte Avellana calendar, but February is one of the months missing in the fragmentary earliest calendar described in U. FACCHINI, *La liturgia a Fonte Avellana al tempo di Pier Damiani*, in *Fonte Avellana nel secolo di Pier Damiani. Atti del XXIX Convegno del Centro Studi Avellaniti*, Fonte Avellana, 29-31 agosto 2007, ed. N. D'ACUNTO, Verona, 2008, pp. 251-283, esp. 273-282.

<sup>16</sup> 22 February is attested in the earliest Monte Cassino calendar, edited in H. HOFFMANN, *Der Kalender des Leo Marsicanus*, in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 21 (1965), pp. 82-149, esp. 103, and dated by him to around 1100 (pp. 82-83 and 94).

<sup>17</sup> 21 February is noted in P. LICCIARDELLO, *Il culto dei santi a Fonte Avellana nel Medioevo*, in *Fonte Avellana nel secolo di Pier Damiani...* (see above n. 15), pp. 383-456, esp. 395, where Fonte Avellana Archivio dell'Abbazia, Aa, an eleventh-century Fonte Avellana missal, has prefixed a list of obits that includes *VIII Kal. Martii Obiit Damianus prepositus* (fol. 1<sup>r</sup>). That day also appears in Bernold of Constance's calendar, ed. R. KUTHAN – J. WOLLASCH, *Der Kalender des Chronisten Bernold*, in *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 40 (1984), pp. 478-531, esp. 498. Oddly enough, Bernold has the correct day in his *Chronicon*, ed. I. S. ROBINSON, *Die Chroniken Bertholds von Reichenau und Bernolds von Konstanz, 1054-1100* (= *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*, n.s., 14), Hannover, 2003, p. 400; trans. ID., *Eleventh-Century Germany: The Swabian Chronicles*, Manchester, 2008, p. 252.

<sup>18</sup> 23 February, the day that would become Peter's standard feast, makes an early appearance in Berthold of Reichenau, *Chronicon* (s. a. 1072), ed. ROBINSON, *Die Chroniken Bertholds...*, p. 214; trans. ID., *Eleventh-Century Germany...*, p. 127. When editing the *Roman Martyrology*, Caesar Baronius carefully distinguished between Peter's actual death day and its celebration one day later: see BARONIUS, *Die 22 Februarii*, in his *Tractatio de Martyrologio Romano*, as rpt. in *Documenta Catholica Omnia* ([http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z\\_1538-1607\\_Baronius\\_Caesar\\_De\\_Martyrologio\\_Romano\\_LT.doc.html](http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/04z/z_1538-1607_Baronius_Caesar_De_Martyrologio_Romano_LT.doc.html)), but subsequent editions, less careful, sometimes offer 23 February without comment: see, for example, *Martyrologium Romanum Gregorii XIII. jussu editum, Urbani VIII. et Clementis X. auctoritate recognitum, ac deinde anno MDCCXLIX Benedicti XIV. labore et studio auctum et castigatum*,

could have arisen from scribal inattention (there are only minimal differences between *viii Kal.* or *viii Kal.* or *vii Kal.*), from divergent ways to date a death occurring during the night, or simply from the desire to avoid the conflict with the apostle Peter's feast.

The year 1072, however, is transmitted only by Berthold of Reichenau (d. 1088) and Bernold of Constance (d. 1100), whose interrelated continuations of the *Chronicle* of Hermannus Contractus (d. 1054) include important information about events in Italy<sup>19</sup>. So scarce are the witnesses to the precise year of Peter Damian's death that many late medieval and Renaissance historians misidentified it as 1080, probably because a 1080 date is included in an account of a miracle added right after the close of John's *Vita Petri Damiani*<sup>20</sup>. Caesar Baronius (d. 1607) definitively countered this error by citing the 1072 *obit* from the Reichenau tradition, by pointing out the documentation related to Peter Damian's successor as bishop of Ostia, Gerald, who died in 1077; and, more speculatively, by arguing that if Peter had lived until 1080 he would have come to the aid of Gregory VII during the Investiture Controversy<sup>21</sup>. Baronius' solution received universal acceptance. Gottfried Henschenius (d. 1681) embraced it in his article on Peter Damian for the *Acta Sanctorum*<sup>22</sup>. Giovanni Domenico Mansi (d. 1769) followed along<sup>23</sup>. The 1072 obituary date entered the *BHL* and major hagiographical dictionaries<sup>24</sup>.

new ed., Malines, 1913, p. 34. Commemoration on two dates seems to have led to the erroneous assumption that one must be the day of his birth, the other of his death: see for example, *Martyrologium Romanum*, ed. C. JOHNSON – A. WARD (= *Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae"*. *Subsidia*, 97), Rome, 1998, p. 45, where for 22 February, Peter, who was actually born in Ravenna, is assigned a natal day at Faenza: *Faventiae in Aemilia, natalis sancti Petri Damiani, Cardinalis...*

<sup>19</sup> Berthold of Reichenau, *Chronicon* (s. a. 1072) and Bernold of Constance, *Chronicon* (s. a. 1072), ed. ROBINSON, *Die Chroniken Bertholds...* (see above n. 17), pp. 214 and 400; trans. ID., *Eleventh-Century Germany...*, pp. 127 and 252.

<sup>20</sup> On the confused 1080 tradition, see MITTARELLI – COSTADONI, *Annales Camaldulenses...* (see above n. 15), vol. 2, pp. 344-347; LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 2, pp. 139-147 (nos. 227-231); and ID., *Giovanni da Lodi 'Il discipolo'*, in *San Pier Damiano. Nel IX centenario della morte (1072-1972)*, vol. 4, Cesena, 1978, pp. 7-66, esp. 26-29. The misleading appended miracle is edited in FREUND, *Studien*, p. 263.

<sup>21</sup> Caesar Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici*, vol. 11, Rome, 1605, pp. 411-412. His arguments are explicated in LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 2, pp. 139-147.

<sup>22</sup> AASS, Febr. III, Antwerp, 1658, pp. 88-114, esp. 112; 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 412-433, esp. 422. Peter appears in the AASS on 23 February, adopting the date used in the *Roman Martyrology*.

<sup>23</sup> G. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 19, Venice, 1774, cols. 995-996.

<sup>24</sup> *BHL*, vol. 2, p. 975. The standard *obit* also appears in P. PALAZZINI, *Pier Damiani*, in *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, vol. 10, Rome, 1968, cols. 554-574, esp. 560.

Although scholars who accept the 1072 *obit* have been able to overlook or explain away any potentially contrary evidence, sometimes rather creatively, that date deserves a closer look. It cannot be too far off the mark, given the arguments adduced by Baronius, as well as some additional ones to be presented over the course of this present study. Yet ultimately it rests on the reliability of the German chroniclers' unknown Italian source, and even if, for want of anything better, we choose to accept its testimony, the 1072 date is not necessarily what it appears to be. In central Italy in the eleventh century, scribes often reckoned incarnational years according to an ecclesiastical calendar that began on 25 March, the feast of the Annunciation, not on 1 January following the Roman civil calendar (the ancient usage that would regain its place as the Western norm during the Renaissance and early modern eras)<sup>25</sup>. A date we read today as 22 February 1072 might originally have designated the date we write today as 22 February 1073. This possibility deserves serious consideration because scholars could solve several historiographical problems by relocating Peter Damian's death.

One concerns a *placitum* held at "Colle de Vignolis" near Perugia on 7 July 1072, in the tenth indiction. This assembly guaranteed protection to Fonte Avellana and its enumerated dependencies. It was presided over by the rulers of Tuscany and Mantua, Beatrice "Countess and Duchess" and her daughter Matilda "likewise Countess and Duchess", along with lesser nobles and bishops. The monks and hermits connected with Fonte Avellana were represented by, in addition to their lawyer, *Damianus prior eremi Sancte Crucis, in loco qui vocatur Fons Avellani*<sup>26</sup>. This is surprising

<sup>25</sup> Although the practice of beginning the year in March had ancient parallels, the ecclesiastical style of incarnational dating that begins the year on the feast of the Annunciation seems to have spread from Fleury and Cluny in the tenth and eleventh centuries: see R. L. POOLE, *The Beginning of the Year in the Middle Ages*, in *Studies in Chronology and History*, ed. A. L. POOLE, Oxford, 1934, pp. 1-27. A. Polverari (*L'era di Cristo nello stile dell'Incarnazione. Risultanze dello studio delle carte di Fonte Avellana*, in *Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le Marche*, n. s., 83 [1978], pp. 157-165) alludes to the resulting problems in providing an incarnational year label for the first three months of the year, and in correlating these with indiction cycles; despite frequent anomalies, he finds that notaries and monastic communities ultimately adopted some relatively consistent solutions, but most of his exceptions and difficult cases date from the late eleventh century.

<sup>26</sup> *Placitum*, ed. A. GIBELLI, in *Monografia dell'antico monastero di S. Croce di Fonte Avellana, i suoi priori ed abbatì*, Faenza, 1895, pp. 335-336; ed. PIERUCCI - POLVERARI, *Carte*, pp. 88-90 (doc. 34); and ed. R. VOLPINI, *Placiti del 'Regnum Italiae' (secc. IX-XI). Primi contributi per un nuovo censimento*, in *Contributi dell'Istituto di storia medievale*, vol. 3, ed. P. ZERBI (= *Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Scienze storiche*, 12), Milan, 1975, pp. 245-520, esp. 434-446. On the enumerated dependencies of Fonte Avellana, see A.

if one assumes that St. Peter Damian had already been dead for four and a half months.

Some scholars argue that, leaving aside the question of the death date, Peter Damian could not possibly have been the community's representative at this assembly because he would have ceased to be prior back in the 1050s at the time when he became a curial official<sup>27</sup>. This objection is not decisive: Roman reformers tended to accumulate rather than trade in their dignities (popes Nicholas II and Alexander II both retained their earlier bishoprics). Peter would most likely have delegated the practical duties of the prior of Fonte Avellana, perhaps at times to the prior *Petrus de Rudolfo* (attested 1059) or to *Baruncius prior* (attested in charters 1067-69) or to brother *Aliprandus* (or *Liuprandus*) whom Peter addresses in a late letter in an unparalleled fashion as his *venerabilis frater* and who subsequently appears as prior in 27 documents issued during the years between Peter Damian and John of Lodi (prior 1082-1104 ?), and even well into John's reign<sup>28</sup>. Peter's continued involvement in the day-to-day life of the community is evidenced by the way his name appears in many of the charters issued during his lifetime, even some naming other priors. Although he ceased formally calling himself prior after the 1050s, it is not certain whether this was because he no longer held the office in some fashion or because the title did not fit his style of monastic humility (he preferred to designate himself as "hermit" or "monk" or "sinner"; he presented himself as the "pupil" of his ascetical stars, and he advised others against holding positions such as abbot<sup>29</sup>). Even if his official status were

POLVERARI, *I toponimi nelle carte di Fonte Avellana*, in *Fonte Avellana nella società dei secoli XI e XII*. II II Convegno del Centro di Studi Avellaniti, Fonte Avellana, 1978, pp. 249-262; and E. GOEZ, *Beatrix von Canossa und Tuszien: eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte des 11. Jahrhunderts* (= *Vorträge und Forschungen*, 41), Sigmaringen, 1995, pp. 217-218.

<sup>27</sup> PIERUCCI – POLVERARI, *Carte*, pp. XIV-XV; LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 1, p. 35; P. PALAZZINI, *Fonte Avellana e Pier Damiani*, in *Le abbazie delle Marche. Storia e arte*. Atti del Convegno internazionale, Macerata, 3-5 apr. 1990, ed. E. SIMI VARANELLI (= *Italia Benedettina*, 12), Cesena – Macerata, 1992, pp. 127-158, esp. 141.

<sup>28</sup> PIERUCCI – POLVERARI, *Carte*, pp. XVII-XVIII, 33-35, 60-62, 71-72, 103-104, 117-124, 129-134, 156-162, 165-166, 170-171, 176-182, 185-188, 191-192, 195-200, 203, and 206 (docs. 12, 24, 27, 40, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 65-68, 70, 72, 75-77, 79-80, 82, 84-86, 88, and 90); Peter Damian, *Epist.* 168 (post 1069), ed. REINDEL, vol. 4, pp. 238-247, esp. 240; trans. BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 6, pp. 236-243, esp. 237.

<sup>29</sup> See, for example, Peter's name forms cited in note 32 below; his insistence that he was the pupil of Dominic Loricatus, not his master, in *Epist.* 109 (BHL 2239), ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, pp. 207-223, esp. 207-210 and 212; trans. BLUM, vol. 4, pp. 207-226, esp. 212 and 216; his disparagement of the office of abbot in *Epist.* 105, ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, pp. 158-168, esp. 158-160; trans. BLUM, vol. 4, pp. 163-173, esp. 163-164.

only that of "former prior", because he was an office holder emeritus he could still have been designated by his earlier title in an appropriate situation. The 1072 *placitum* would have been such an occasion. The community would have wanted Peter to represent it because of his ties to the house of Canossa. He had collaborated closely with the late Duke Godfrey the Bearded (d. 1069)<sup>30</sup>; his correspondents had included Marquis Boniface, Duke Godfrey, and Duchess Beatrice<sup>31</sup>. These associations with the Canossans were probably what had made the assembly possible.

It might also be objected that *Damianus prior eremi Sancte Crucis, in loco qui vocatur Fons Avellani* is an odd designation for a man whose normal signature involved some iteration of "Peter", such as "Peter the Sinner", "Peter priest and hermit", or "Peter Archbishop of Ostia"<sup>32</sup>. In the *placitum* record, however, the name would have been supplied by the Canossan notary, not by Peter himself. Peter was an extraordinarily common name, much less distinctive than the additional *Damianus* which the young Peter seems to have adopted in honor of his brother. In chronicles and official documents, except on some occasions when the inclusion of his office as cardinal eliminated all ambiguity, outsiders almost always used the name "Damian", normally in iterations of "Peter Damian"<sup>33</sup>. Yet "Damian"

<sup>30</sup> Peter seems to have been a sort of spiritual director for Duke Godfrey from 1057 until his death in 1069: see *Epist.* 51 and 67, ed. REINDEL, vol. 2, pp. 132-137, esp. 133, and 280-289, esp. 281; trans. BLUM, vol. 2, pp. 335-340, esp. 336, and BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 5, pp. 70-78, esp. 71. Peter's letters allude to several conversations with the duke: *Epist.* 110 (1064), 140 (1066), and 155 (1068), ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, pp. 223-246, esp. 243, vol. 3, pp. 478-487, esp. 479-480 and 4, pp. 71-73, esp. 72; trans. BLUM, vol. 4, pp. 227-247, esp. 245, and BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 5, pp. 103-111, esp. 104-105, and vol. 6, pp. 76-78, esp. 77. On his personal contacts with Godfrey, see LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 2, p. 89. It was Godfrey's brother, Pope Stephan IX (1057-58), who had drafted Peter into the college of cardinals.

<sup>31</sup> Peter Damian's relationship with the lords of Tuscany is discussed in N. D'ACUNTO, *I laici nella Chiesa e nella società secondo Pier Damiani. Ceti dominanti e riforma ecclesiastica nel secolo XI* (= *Nuovi studi storici*, 50), Rome, 1999, pp. 298-330. His surviving letters include ones addressed to Boniface (1042/43), *Epist.* 2, ed. REINDEL, vol. 1, pp. 102-105; trans. BLUM, vol. 1, pp. 84-86; to Godfrey (1059-63, 1059-63, 1068), *Epist.* 67, 68, and 154, ed. REINDEL, vol. 2, pp. 280-289 and 289-297, vol. 4, pp. 67-71; trans. BLUM, vol. 2, pp. 70-78 and 79-87, BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 6, pp. 72-75; to Godfrey and Beatrice (1067), *Epist.* 148, ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, pp. 544-546; trans. BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 5, pp. 169-170; to Beatrice (1057), *Epist.* 51, ed. REINDEL, vol. 2, pp. 132-137; trans. BLUM, vol. 2, pp. 335-340; and to the chaplains of Godfrey (1066), *Epist.* 141, ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, pp. 488-502; trans. BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 5, pp. 112-126.

<sup>32</sup> PIERUCCI – POLVERARI, *Carte*, pp. 23-32, 36-39, 47-48, 76-79 (docs. 10-13, 15, 18, and 29). Plate 12 presents Peter's signature as "Peter the Sinner, monk" from a 1070 donation. More examples of Peter's autograph are reproduced in LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 2, pp. 80A-80B.

<sup>33</sup> For example, Berthold of Reichenau's *obit*, cited in note 19 above, speaks of "Peter Damian, cardinal bishop of holy memory". When the *Miraculum Hugonis* (BHL 4013), ed. M. MARRIER – A. DUCHESNE, *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, repr. Mâcon, 1915, cols. 460-461, describes

could appear as his sole name, as in Alexander II's letter canonizing Theobald of Provence (d. 1066), whose supporters included "bishops Mainard and Damian", presumably the cardinal bishops of Silva Candida and Ostia<sup>34</sup>. An incontrovertible example, found in an obituary list prefaced to an eleventh-century missal from Fonte Avellana, links a "Prior Damian" (here *Damianus prepositus*) to Peter Damian's death day<sup>35</sup>.

If the "Prior Damian" of the assembly at "Colle de Vignolis" were not St. Peter Damian, then who was he? Scholars have identified him as Peter's nephew Damian, who was educated in France, perhaps at Cluny<sup>36</sup>. It is conjectured that he could have succeeded his uncle as prior<sup>37</sup>. Yet this theory presents problems. Peter's nephew was quite young: in 1065 Peter describes him as "in the flower of adolescence" (*in adolescentiae flore*) and even calls him a "boy" (*puer*) in a school letter of recommendation<sup>38</sup>. He may not have been a permanent resident of Fonte Avellana: in a 1069 letter, Peter remonstrated with him, because he "suffered it badly ... that you have been seized by the teeth of the invisible wolf ... [and] have descended from the hermitage to a monastery", and exhorted him to return to the hermitage before "monastic laxity seduces your usefulness"<sup>39</sup>.

Peter, it is *De adventu Domni Petri Damiani Hostiensis Episcopi and domnum Petrum, Hostiensem videlicet Episcopum, cognomento Damianum*. Leo Marsicanus, *Chronica monasterii Casinensis*, I. II prol., II 63, II 99, I. III 20, III, 35, ed. H. HOFFMANN (= *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, 34), Hannover, 1980, speaks of *Petrus Damianus* (p. 164); *Petrus Ostiensis episcopus* (p. 292); *Petrus Damiani* (p. 356); *Petrus Damiani* (p. 386); and *ad Petrum Hostiensem episcopum* (p. 411).

<sup>34</sup> P. F. KEHR, *Italia pontificia*. Vol. 7: *Venetiae et Histria*, Berlin, 1923, p. 147.

<sup>35</sup> Fonte Avellana, Archivio dell'Abbazia, Aa, fol. 1<sup>r</sup>, ed. LICCIARDELLO, *Il culto dei santi a Fonte Avellana...* (see above n. 17), pp. 393-401, esp. 395.

<sup>36</sup> Peter Damian, *Epist.* 123, 125, and 158, ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, pp. 399-407 and 411-413, vol. 4, pp. 84-90; trans. BLUM - RESNICK, vol. 5, pp. 12-20, 26, vol. 6, pp. 88-93. *Epist.* 125 is usually accepted without question as a letter recommending Peter's young nephew for study at Cluny (an early edition conjectured that the recipient would have been Abbot Hugh of Cluny), but the letter survives only in fragmentary form, and, although it mentions Peter's visit to "the holy ones of Cluny", in its present form it does not specify either the recipient or the proposed place of study. This nephew was with Peter Damian in early 1065 when he was sent to convey a letter to Pope Alexander II (see *Epist.* 122, ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, pp. 398-399; trans. BLUM - RESNICK, vol. 5, pp. 10-11).

<sup>37</sup> LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 1, p. 35, and ID., *Giovanni da Lodi...* (see above n. 20), pp. 52-64; followed by FREUND, *Studien*, p. 181.

<sup>38</sup> Peter Damian, *Epist.* 123, ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, p. 400; trans. BLUM - RESNICK, vol. 5, p. 12; also *Epist.* 125, as discussed in note 36 above. In medieval Latin, the terms "boy" and "adolescent" can be used quite broadly, but the tone of the letters and their emphasis on an education in progress suggest that here they refer to someone quite young.

<sup>39</sup> Peter Damian, *Epist.* 158, ed. REINDEL, vol. 4, p. 86; trans. BLUM - RESNICK, vol. 7, pp. 90-91.

This young nephew's later career is much less well documented than his illustrious uncle's: he became abbot of Nonantola (as Peter had feared, he apparently preferred the coenobitic life); Gregory VII made him cardinal deacon of an unknown church; during the turbulent years of the Investiture Controversy he kept a low profile; he died after 1087, perhaps after 1091<sup>40</sup>. Could he have been the *Prior Damianus* who represented Fonte Avellana to the Canossan ladies? He was certainly affiliated with the Fonte Avellana community inasmuch as he was part of St. Peter Damian's *familia* and the recipient of his patronage. Yet nowhere, unless he is the "Damian" of the *placitum*, is he clearly identified as *prior*.

The title *prior* is key here. As has already become obvious, the early succession of the priors of Fonte Avellana "presents difficulties that are hard to solve"<sup>41</sup>. In the extended community of Fonte Avellana in the 1070s, someone named "Damian" ascended to or claimed a position of authority. In addition to the 1072 *placitum*, seven documents between 1072 and 1080 mention a "Damian" who boasts a rapidly changing array of extraordinary titles, including "rector", "provisor", "abbot" and "father of hermits"<sup>42</sup>. Many early surviving Fonte Avellana manuscripts bear the *ex libris* inscriptions of a *Domnus Damianus*, prompting long debates about whether this refers to Peter Damian himself<sup>43</sup>. Because he tended to avoid grand titles in his self presentation, the more pretentious "Damian" documents do not fit his personal style very well<sup>44</sup>. Their florid titulature is definitely linked to the nephew in the prologue of a collection of exegetical excerpts from Peter Damian's writings which John of Lodi dedicated to *Domino suo et Patri, domno Damiano, reverendo abbati* [abbot of what monastery is not specified] and in which he describes his sources as "the

<sup>40</sup> GIBELLI, *Monografia...* (see above n. 26), pp. 96-99; HÜLS, *Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms*, p. 247.

<sup>41</sup> PIERUCCI - POLVERARI, *Carte*, p. XIV.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 95-99, 104-115 and 125-127 (docs. 37-38, 41-44, and 50).

<sup>43</sup> M. BASSETTI, *Libri, scrittura e scritture a Fonte Avellana*, in *Fonte Avellana nel secolo di Pier Damiani*. Atti del XXIX Convegno del Centro Studi Avellaniti, Fonte Avellana, 29-31 agosto 2007, San Pietro in Cariano, 2008, pp. 309-382; FACCHINI, *Pier Damiani...* (see above n. 2), pp. 198-203 (who claims the debate is "unfortunately not yet resolved today").

<sup>44</sup> PIERUCCI - POLVERARI, *Carte*, pp. 66-70 and 80-82 (docs. 26 and 30) do present references in one document to the "abbot successors" of "lord Peter most holy anchorite" and in another to "lord Peter hermit and rector of the aforesaid hermitage", but these monastic titles are explicable in the context of donations to mixed monastic and eremitical communities and are not so prominently associated with Peter as to give any obvious inspiration for the more baroque titles associated with "Damian" in the later charters.

works of your uncle" (*avunculi vestri acta*)<sup>45</sup>. Therefore the late varied fancy titles are likely to refer to the nephew. On a personal level, they may witness the vacillations of an unseasoned young man struggling to define his role; on an institutional level, they probably reflect the still inchoate structure of Fonte Avellana's mixed community of monasteries and hermitages. Aside from the 1072 *placitum*, the title *prior* is never connected to the later Damian. After Peter Damian's death, monastic veterans of Fonte Avellana such as Aliprandus and John of Lodi appear as priors<sup>46</sup>. One is tempted to speculate that the later Damian might have found the office too burdensome and the title too modest. Given the varying nomenclature for titles and offices at Fonte Avellana and the uncertainties introduced by the use of a Canossan notary, no definite conclusion is possible here, but the *Damianus prior* at the *placitum* in July of 1072 appears at least as likely have been Peter Damian himself as the subsequent Damian for whom that title is not otherwise attested.

Another potential "posthumous" appearance of the elderly St. Peter Damian is memorialized in a dedicatory inscription enshrined in the church of SS. Donato e Nicola in Citille (in the province of Florence, near Chianti), which claims that this church was dedicated on 21 October 1072 by *Petrus episcopus Romane ecclesiae cardinalis*<sup>47</sup>. Scholars traditionally identify this cardinal Peter as "Fiery Peter" (*Petrus Igneus* or *Pietro Igneo*, d. 1089), a young Vallombrosan monk, formerly a herder of sheep and goats, who in 1068 had sought a divine judgement against the allegedly simoniacal Florentine bishop Pietro Mezzabarba by walking through fire. His success in this ordeal ultimately led not only to Mezzabarba's deposition but also to his own promotion to cardinal-bishop of Albano and to distinguished service to Gregory VII as a loyal and well-travelled legate<sup>48</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> John of Lodi, *Collectanea in Vetus Testamentum ex Opusculis B. Petri Damiani*, prol., ed. MIGNE, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 145, cols. 987-1176, esp. 987. See LUCCHESI, *Giovanni da Lodi...* (see above n. 20), pp. 39-52.

<sup>46</sup> On the early priors of Fonte Avellana, see GIBELLI, *Monografia...* (see above n. 26), pp. 75-103; LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 1, pp. 33-36; ID., *Giovanni da Lodi...* (see above n. 20), pp. 52-54; and PALAZZINI, *Fonte Avellana e Pier Damiani...* (see above n. 27), pp. 129-132 and 141.

<sup>47</sup> On the Citille inscription, see P. F. KEHR, *Papsturkunden in Italien: Reiseberichte zur Italia Pontificia* (= *Acta Romanorum pontificum*), Vatican City, 1977, vol. 3, p. 103. Mittarelli and Costadoni (*Annales Camaldulenses...* [see above n. 15], vol. 2, pp. 345-346) include not only a transcription but also an engraved image.

<sup>48</sup> Hüls (*Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms*, pp. 90-91) summarizes the scholarly evidence for Pietro Igneo's career as a cardinal. For more detail, see G. MICCOLI, *Pietro Igneo: Studi sull'età gregoriana* (= *Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo. Studi storici*, 40-41),

The problem here is that at no other time earlier than October of 1074 is Pietro Igneo described as a cardinal<sup>49</sup>. His career advancement would be much easier to comprehend if he had actually been named a cardinal by Gregory VII (1073-1085), who as archdeacon Hildebrand had supported the Vallombrosan radicals against considerable episcopal opposition<sup>50</sup>, than if he had been made a cardinal by Alexander II (1061-73), who opposed ecclesiastical ordeals on principle and who had specifically forbidden the ordeal against Pietro Mezzabarba (a prohibition that did not stop Pietro Igneo any more than the fire did)<sup>51</sup>. Thanks to the San Donato dedication, Pietro Igneo is assumed to have been created a cardinal prior to 21 October 1072 because at that time, allegedly, no other cardinal Peter could be found. But if Peter Damian were still around, he could have been the cardinal in question, a hypothesis that would make the ecclesiastical career of Pietro Igneo much easier to understand.

Here a digression is required in order to dismiss a proposal to shift the date of the San Donato inscription from 1072 to 1071, a change which allows Peter Damian to have overseen the dedication but which eliminates the inscription's use as evidence for his career after February 1072<sup>52</sup>. The argument is that if the inscription were to have used the Pisan method of calculation (which involves numbering years one year earlier), then the tenth indiction year it gives could correspond to a date of 1071. When faced with chronological problems, medieval diplomatists and paleographers often do find the indiction year more trustworthy. In this case, how-

Rome, 1960, esp. pp. 47-49; N. D'ACUNTO, *Lotte religiose a Firenze nel secolo XI: aspetti della rivolta contro il vescovo Pietro Mezzabarba*, in *Aevum*, 67 (1993), pp. 279-312, esp. 303-312.

<sup>49</sup> HÜLS, *Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms*, p. 90.

<sup>50</sup> On the conflict the swirled around Pietro Mezzabarba, see S. BOESCH GAJANO, *Storia e tradizione vallombrose*, in *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Evo*, 76 (1964), pp. 99-215; W. GOEZ, *Reformpapsttum, Adel und monastische Erneuerung in der Toscana*, in *Investiturstreit und Reichsverfassung*, ed. J. FLECKENSTEIN (= *Vorträge und Forschungen*, 17), Sigmaringen, 1973, pp. 205-239, esp. 233-234; D'ACUNTO, *Lotte religiose...* (see above n. 48), pp. 279-312; ID., *I laici nella Chiesa...* (see above n. 31), pp. 168-180. Cowdrey (*Pope Gregory VII*, pp. 66-67) concisely summarizes the issues involved in the ordeal. William D. McCready, emeritus at Queens University in Ontario, has analyzed *St. Peter Damian, the Vallombrosans, and the Pietro Mezzabarba Affair* (submitted to the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto).

<sup>51</sup> Alexander II, *Epist.* 122 (J-L 4505), in MIGNE, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 146, col. 1406-1407, condemns juridical ordeals as popular inventions with *nulla canonica sanctione*. Yet after Florence completely turned against its bishop in the aftermath of the ordeal, Alexander had to bow to the popular will. It is unlikely that he was pleased with this turn of events or with the Vallombrosans who precipitated it.

<sup>52</sup> HÜLS, *Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms*, p. 100; GOEZ, *Reformpapsttum, Adel und monastische Erneuerung...* (see above n. 50), p. 235.

ever, the tenth indiction specified in the inscription corresponds perfectly well to 1072 and agrees with contemporary local ecclesiastical charters: while there is little consistency, the *calculus florentinus* seems to have been more widespread near Florence than the *calculus pisanus*<sup>53</sup>. Because the datation is formally correct as it stands, it would be tendentious to throw it out. The date had been questioned only because of the puzzling "Cardinal Peter", who under a different dating system might be identified as Peter Damian, but that justification for a change disappears if, as argued here, Peter Damian was still among the living in October of 1072.

A third anomaly in Peter Damian's chronology relates to the fatal final journey to Ravenna, which, John of Lodi says, was undertaken at the order of Pope Alexander II (*jussu Alexandri II. Romani pontificis*) at a time when the archbishop of Ravenna had died (*erat quippe tunc temporis defunctus eiusdem urbis archiepiscopus*)<sup>54</sup>. Since Ravenna was Peter's hometown, it is no surprise that he accepted the mission. Although he had left Ravenna in the late 1030s when he entered the desert of Fonte Avellana, he remembered it fondly, encouraged its reform movements, and preached there on occasion<sup>55</sup>. After the death of Nicholas II in 1061, however, Ravenna supported the claims of Cadalus of Parma, the antipope Honorius II. Cadalus was backed by Roman nobles, Lombard bishops, and imperial courtiers, and the tide only turned against him after Hildebrand had rallied the supporters of Alexander II, most valuably Duke Godfrey and his troops, while Peter Damian had opened lines of communication with the imperial court, an initiative that, despite earning him criticism from Alexander and Hildebrand, ultimately helped secure the support of the new imperial regency<sup>56</sup>. In 1064 a council at Mantua acclaimed Alexander the rightful pope, so that, as H. E. J. Cowdrey succinctly states, "to all intents and purposes the Cadalan schism was at an end"<sup>57</sup>.

<sup>53</sup> Note for example the dating elements of the Fonte Avellana *placitum* discussed above or in the central Italian charters for the 1070s lumped together in MITTARELLI – COSTADONI, *Annales Camildulenses*, vol. 2. Pierucci and Polverari (*Carte*, pp. XXX-XXXI) document a mix of demonstrable Florentine and Pisan dating in the whole corpus of early Fonte Avellana charters, but one would expect the San Donato inscription to reflect the practice of its Florentine province.

<sup>54</sup> John of Lodi, *Vita Petri Damiani*, XXI, ed. FREUND, p. 259.

<sup>55</sup> H. P. Laqua (*Traditionen und Leitbilder bei dem Ravennater Reformator Petrus Damiani, 1042-1052* [= *Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften*, 30], Munich, 1976) analyzes Damian's relations with Ravenna.

<sup>56</sup> Peter Damian, *Epist.* 107, ed. REINDEL, vol. 3, pp. 185-188; trans. BLUM, vol. 4, pp. 192-194.

<sup>57</sup> COWDREY, *Pope Gregory VII*, pp. 50-55, esp. 51.

But not for Ravenna. Cadalus — whom Peter Damian continued to denounce as “the first born of Satan”, the “ancient dragon”, “the apostle of the Antichrist” — still held the bishopric of Parma and never abandoned his claims to the papacy<sup>58</sup>. Archbishop Henry of Ravenna, whose nefarious deeds and support for imperial interventions had gotten him into further trouble, remained excommunicate along with his whole church (ironically this is the same Archbishop Henry who, in the year of his accession in 1052, had received from Peter Damian the dedication of his most celebrated work, the *Liber gratissimus* on the efficacy of sacraments administered by simoniacal clergy)<sup>59</sup>. The pointless schism pained Peter deeply: he wrote Pope Alexander II, probably in 1068/1069, begging him to absolve “the unhappy bishop [*sic*] of Ravenna” because “it is certainly improper that such a vast number of people perish because of the offense of one little man, and that the guilt of one miserable person should subvert the great endeavor of Christ, for which he shed his precious blood, and destroy the souls of so many innocent people”<sup>60</sup>. John of Lodi claims Peter made such appeals frequently<sup>61</sup>. Yet neither these passionate pleas nor the many years that had passed since the settlement at the Synod of Mantua sufficed to end the city’s excommunication.

<sup>58</sup> Peter Damian directs an unparalleled stream of vituperation against Cadalus, in letters addressed both to him and to others: note *Epist.* 88 and 89 (to Cadalus in 1062), 120 (to Henry IV in 1065-66), 154 (to Duke Godfrey in 1068), ed. REINDEL, vol. 2, pp. 515-531 and 531-572, vol. 3, pp. 384-392, vol. 4, pp. 67-75, esp. 68-69; trans. BLUM, vol. 4, pp. 309-325, 326-369, and 387-396, and BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 6, pp. 72-75, esp. 72-74. The quoted phrases are only a small sample of a devastating volley of epithets in *Epist.* 120. On this theme, see G. M. CANTARELLA, *Pier Damiani e lo scisma di Cadalo*, in *Pier Damiani: l’eremita, il teologo, il riformatore (1007-2007)*, ed. M. TAGLIAFERRI (= *Ravennatensia*, 23), Bologna, 2009, pp. 233-267. Roman reformers feared Cadalus and his backers because they posed a real political threat, but Peter’s antipathy also seems personal. Perhaps he was appalled that Cadalus had led into schism Parma and Ravenna, the two cities where Peter had studied the liberal arts several decades earlier.

<sup>59</sup> Peter Damian, *Epist.* 40, ed. REINDEL, vol. 1, pp. 384-509, esp. 389-393; trans. BLUM, vol. 2, pp. 111-214, esp. 112-114. For Henry’s problems with Rome above and beyond the Lombard bishops’ support for Cadalus, see John of Lodi, *Vita Petri Damiani*, xxi, ed. FREUND, p. 259. On possible sequences for the excommunication, see LUCCHESI, *Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 2, pp. 78-80.

<sup>60</sup> Peter Damian, *Epist.* 167, ed. REINDEL, vol. 4, p. 237; trans. BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 6, p. 234. Although Reindel assigns this letter to a broad range between 1069 and 1072, a 1069 date ought to be preferred because the letter is an emotional response to an unspecified injury done to Peter by the pope, an outburst closely paralleling the situation and emotion of *Epist.* 154 (January 1069 to Archdeacon Hildebrand and Cardinal Stephan), ed. REINDEL, vol. 4, pp. 74-79; trans. BLUM – RESNICK, vol. 6, pp. 79-83.

<sup>61</sup> John of Lodi, *Vita Petri Damiani*, xxi, ed. FREUND, p. 259.

So what had changed to permit Peter Damian's mission to Ravenna? Perhaps not much, if we assume that he died in February of 1072. Everything, if we assume he died in February of 1073. The difference is that during 1072 the major causes of schism were eliminated when both Bishop Cadalus and Archbishop Henry died.

Unfortunately, the exact dates of their deaths are unknown. The only informative reference to the demise of Cadalus comes from Bonizo of Sutri's *Book to a Friend* (a justification of the armed struggle associated with the reform movement), probably written around 1085/1086. According to Bonizo, "at this same period Bishop Cadalus of Parma perished in body and soul. Not long afterwards the bishop [*sic*] of Ravenna died"<sup>62</sup>. In *eo-dem tempore* as what? Immediately in front of the quoted passage, Bonizo discusses two events: the emergence of Atto as a candidate for the see of Milan (i.e. January 1072) and the abuses perpetrated by Cardinal Hugh Candidus in France (i.e. on a mission already underway by mid 1071, punctuated by a Spanish embassy, and associated with bribery charges that were still news in 1073 after Hugh had returned to Rome)<sup>63</sup>. Slightly more information survives for the associated but chronologically later death of Archbishop Henry: a charter is said to verify that he was still alive on 15 June 1071<sup>64</sup>; the annals of the monastery of Altaich in Bavaria place his death in 1072<sup>65</sup>. These indications reveal nothing more precise than that the reprobate bishops died around 1072.

In an effort to situate their deaths prior to the alleged death of Peter Damian on 22 February 1072, scholars have assigned Cadalus's demise to late 1071 and Henry's to 1 January 1072<sup>66</sup>. This tendentious reconstruction still leaves too little room between the death of Archbishop Henry and

<sup>62</sup> Bonizo of Sutri, *Liber ad Amicum*, v, ed. E. DÜMMLER (= *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Libelli de lite imperatorum et pontificum*), vol. 1, Hannover, 1891, pp. 568-620, esp. 600; trans. ROBINSON, *The Papal Reform*, pp. 158-261, esp. 217-218.

<sup>63</sup> Bonizo, *ibid.* More details and chronological precision on these personages can be found in G. SCHWARTZ, *Die Besetzung der Bistümer Reichsitaliens unter den sächsischen und salischen Kaisern: Mit den Listen der Bischöfe, 951-1122*, Leipzig, 1913 (repr. Spoleto, 1993), pp. 81-82; HÜLS, *Kardindle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms*, pp. 158-160 and 185.

<sup>64</sup> Freund (*Studien*, p. 189) cites Giuseppe Luigi Amadesi, *In Antistitum Ravennatum chronotaxim ab antiquissimae eius Ecclesiae exordiis*, Faenza, 1783, vol. 2, p. 409. Presumably a new edition will be forthcoming in the not-yet-published later volumes of *Le Carte ravennati del secolo undicesimo*. *Archivio arcivescovile*, ed. R. BENERICETTI, Bologna, 2003-.

<sup>65</sup> *Annales Altahenses majores, s. a. 1072*, ed. W. VON GIESEBRECHT – E. FREIHERR VON OEFELE (= *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Scriptores*, 20), Hannover, 1868, pp. 791-824, esp. 824.

<sup>66</sup> SCHWARTZ, *Besetzung der Bistümer Reichsitaliens...* (see above n. 63), pp. 157-158, 186-187; followed by FREUND, *Studien*, p. 189; ROBINSON, *The Papal Reform*, p. 218.

Peter Damian's own death. Given that Peter died at Faenza on 22 February after an illness of eight days, even assuming that he had managed in only one day to travel from Ravenna to Faenza (ca. 20 miles), he still could not have left Ravenna any later than 14 February. In front of that date it is necessary to add the numbers of days Peter would have required to prepare for his journey from Fonte Avellana to Ravenna, to travel there, and to be elaborately greeted (*ingenti cum laetitia*) — presumably even then the Ravennatensi knew how to throw a *fiesta*. In an incidental aside, John of Lodi notes that Peter also spent additional time in Ravenna transacting other unnamed "official business" (*Istis vero aliisque nonnullis negotiis, quae tantum virum gerere decebat, patrat...*)<sup>67</sup>. So he cannot have left Fonte Avellana any later than the first days of February.

To make the traditional chronology possible, a great many things would have had to have occurred in January 1072. The bishops who allegedly died sequentially in 1072 would both have had to have died in January or earlier. According to John of Lodi, Peter was ordered to start on his journey by Alexander II. Therefore the pope had to have learned of Archbishop Henry's death. He had to decide to dispatch Peter, presumably after discussing this decision with Archdeacon Hildebrand with whom he was working quite closely in his last years. Then it would have been necessary to send a message to this effect to Fonte Avellana. If Rome thought Peter should carry credentials and letters to confirm his legatine power, officials would have had to draft them<sup>68</sup>.

How much time these preliminaries required would have depended upon how Alexander chose to proceed. One possible scenario is that he made a leap of faith and sent Peter off just as soon as he had heard about Archbishop Henry's death, without taking time to ascertain what was actually happening in the Church of Ravenna. Or, an alternative scenario, Alexander and Hildebrand, prior to sending Peter, might have undertaken the due diligence necessary to confirm that Ravenna would welcome unity with Rome. This second scenario is more congruent with the reformers' earlier hesitations about reconciling Ravenna and with their increasing political sophistication, but it could have required months. The surviving witness of ecclesiastical negotiations over Ravenna is Bonizo, who, after he had noted the deaths of the bishops, goes on to describe the intrigues of Guibert of Parma, the imperial chancellor for Italy back in the late 1050s

<sup>67</sup> John of Lodi, *Vita Petri Damiani*, XXII, ed. FREUND, p. 260.

<sup>68</sup> Perhaps such a credential would have resembled Alexander II's earlier *Diploma de legatione S. Petri Damiani in Gallias*, ed. MIGNE, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 145, cols. 857-858.

and early 1060s, who, after the death of Cadalus, first attempted to gain the see of Parma, where he had family connections, and then, after he had been rejected there, set his sights on the now vacant see of Ravenna, which he entered in style with many men; once he won acceptance there, he travelled on to Rome, where at Hildebrand's urging Alexander consecrated him<sup>69</sup>. Given the importance of the see of Ravenna to the Empire, and Guibert's former career as an imperial bureaucrat, his bid for Ravenna could have been supported by imperial officials and family members. Did his escort of "many men" perhaps include imperial troops? Bonizo is silent about such possibilities, but this might be explained by the fact that he opposed on ideological grounds any imperial involvement in episcopal elections<sup>70</sup>. His general narrative does receive some support from a letter written by Hildebrand, immediately after he had become Pope Gregory VII, in which he urges the new Archbishop Guibert to "now be at pains to show towards me the charity you promised to bear to the Roman Church in particular at this time"<sup>71</sup>.

To reconstruct the chronology of these events, it is necessary to work backwards from Guibert's consecration. Guibert had arrived at Rome for the Lenten synod, and, after making the appropriate pledges to Alexander, was consecrated in Easter season, right before the pope's death (i.e. prior to 21 April 1073, the third Sunday after Easter). Thus the affairs of the Church of Ravenna were not officially settled until April of 1073, well after Peter Damian's death. However, Guibert's delayed consecration does not prove that negotiations over Ravenna had lasted until then: the late date can be sufficiently explained by his desire to visit Rome at a time when he could attend the traditional Lenten synod and when he would actually find a pope residing there who could consecrate him (Alexander II had spent the last part of 1072 in his bishopric at Lucca<sup>72</sup>).

How does this chronology fit with Peter Damian's final mission? It is very difficult to squeeze all the interrelated events into the period before February of 1072 when Peter allegedly died. John of Lodi claims that

<sup>69</sup> Bonizo, *Liber ad Amicum*, v, ed. DÜMMLER... (see above n. 62), vol. 1, p. 600; trans. ROBINSON, *The Papal Reform*, pp. 218-219. For a detailed analysis of the complexities of this account, see J. ZIESE, *Wibert von Ravenna: Der Gegenpapst Clemens III. (1084-1100) (= Pápste und Papsttum*, 20), Stuttgart, 1982, pp. 26-30.

<sup>70</sup> ZIESE, *ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> Gregory VII, *Epist.* I, III, ed. E. CASPAR, in *Das Register Gregors VII.* (= *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae selectae*, 2), Munich, 1920, vol. 1, pp. 5-6; trans. H. E. J. COWDREY, *The Register of Pope Gregory VII: An English Translation*, Oxford, 2002, pp. 3-4.

<sup>72</sup> COWDREY, *Pope Gregory VII*, p. 54.

Archbishop Henry's death was the catalyst for Peter's papal commission. Therefore, if Cadalus and, some time after him, Henry died around 1072, even if we arbitrarily situate their deaths on the earliest possible days, this does not give much time for news to have reached the papal curia and for Hildebrand and Alexander to have commissioned Peter so that he could have left for Ravenna by the start of February of 1072. Events are easier to understand if Peter actually left for Ravenna at the start of 1073, for by then the deaths of Cadalus and Henry would probably have been old news, Guibert would have had the opportunity to investigate his episcopal options (both at Parma, and then later at Ravenna) and to consult with his friends at court, and the curia would have had ample time to negotiate with him prior to his formal arrival in Rome in Lent of 1073. Alexander and Hildebrand would have been able to move deliberately, to evaluate their options, and to conclude, presumably, that they had the situation well under control. Of course, students of ecclesiastical history, blessed with hindsight, will recognize that their efforts did not work out exactly as planned: within a few years, Hildebrand's "dear friend" Guibert who had been expected to oversee the concord of Rome and Ravenna<sup>73</sup> would be sitting on the throne of St. Peter as (antipope) Clement III (1080-1100) and presiding over the imperial coronation of Henry IV.

An *argumentum ex silentio* may add a little more weight to this dossier: the revised chronology explains why Gerald (d. 1077), Peter Damian's successor as cardinal bishop of Ostia, makes what had seemed to be a somewhat belated appearance in this capacity in the historical record. Berthold of Reichenau specifically connects the accession of Gerald to the death of Peter: "Cardinal bishop Peter Damian of pious memory, who had long been crucified by the world, departed to the Lord on 23 February [*sic*]. The monk Gerald, a monk of Cluny, who was distinguished for his knowledge of the Scriptures and whose character was similar to that of his predecessor, succeeded him in the bishopric"<sup>74</sup>. Yet the earliest reference to Gerald as a cardinal relates to events in March 1073<sup>75</sup>. The traditional

<sup>73</sup> See note 71 above.

<sup>74</sup> Berthold of Reichenau, *Chronicon* (s. a. 1072), ed. ROBINSON... (see above n. 17), p. 214; trans. I. S. ROBINSON, *Eleventh-Century Germany: Swabian Chronicles*, Manchester, 2008, p. 127.

<sup>75</sup> Gerald signed off on the acts of the Council of Chalons-sur-Saône as bishop of Ostia: see G. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 20, Venice, 1775, cols. 47-50. Lucchesi (*Per una Vita di san Pier Damiani*, vol. 2, pp. 142-145) and Hüls (*Kardinalle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms*, pp. 100-101) move Mansi's date for this council to March 1073. Paul of Bernreid (*Vita Gregorii VII*, ed. J. WATTERICH, *Pontificum Romanorum qui fue-*

date of 22 February 1072 for Peter Damian's death leaves a full year without any documented cardinal bishop of Ostia. A 1073 *obit* for Peter Damian eliminates this lacuna. It suggests that, immediately upon receiving the news of Peter's death, the Roman reformers promoted an important legate to the deanship of the College of Cardinals.

Do these arguments establish a conclusive case for moving Peter Damian's *obit* to 1073? If there is no internal reason not to read the medieval date of 22 February 1072 as the equivalent of our 22 February 1073, and if that reading successfully solves several vexing historiographical problems, then, barring the emergence of convincing counterarguments, a re-dating seems reasonable. However, because such a conclusion departs from today's unanimous consensus that Peter died in 1072, this present note is not likely to remain the final word. Some of the many scholars who are presently studying Peter Damian in particular and the Investiture Controversy in general may recognize advantages and disadvantages to this revised chronology that I have overlooked. But now it falls to the skeptics to make their case.

*Texas Tech University*

John HOWE

Department of History  
P.O. Box 41013  
USA - Lubbock TX 79409-1013

*Résumé.* L'assertion communément admise selon laquelle S. Pierre Damien mourut le 22 février 1072 manque de preuves décisives. Déplacer son *obit* à l'année 1073 permet d'expliquer sa possible présence lors d'un *placitum* tenu le 7 juillet 1072 et lors d'une dédicace d'église le 21 octobre 1072. Cette option aide en outre à clarifier la chronologie des avènements de l'archevêque de Ravenne Guibert et du cardinal d'Ostie Gérard. Un tel changement jette une nouvelle lumière sur les réformateurs ecclésiastiques œuvrant au début des années 1070.

*runt inde ab exeunte saeculo IX usque ad finem saeculi XIII vitae ab aequalibus conscriptae*, Leipzig, 1862, vol. 1, p. 505; trans. ROBINSON, *The Papal Reform*, pp. 262-364, esp. 302) describes Gerald as "chosen by the apostolic see from the region of Gaul": although this could be nothing more than a clumsy way to indicate that Gerald - a Regensburg native who was once prior of Cluny - was no Italian, Paul's language might have been prompted by a recollection that Gerald had been in France at the time he was appointed and learned of his appointment.