

## TRACING THE TWELFTH-CENTURY *CHRONICA* OF RICHARD OF POITIERS, MONK OF CLUNY.<sup>1</sup>

In a dedication written to Abbot Peter the Venerable, a twelfth-century Cluniac monk named Richard offered a meagre chronicle for the use of his brethren.<sup>2</sup> With humility typical of a monastic author, he called his text a simple catalogue of previous times and of illustrious men. His work, he suggested, was finished once he had compiled a dossier of events worthy of memory; the task of constructing a polished historical narrative was best left to someone else. Richard may have initially envisaged his text to be a simple outline of history, but extant manuscripts reveal that it had become an intricate text as Richard rewrote and expanded the narrative.

The text that Richard of Poitiers left for posterity was a universal chronicle – an account of human history from Creation until the second half of the twelfth century. Though not with the thoroughness and breadth of a modern « World Civilization » textbook, Richard's chronicle nonetheless compiled in a single volume the entirety of historical knowledge that was then available. From the beginning to the last recorded minute of human time, and from one end of the Earth to the other, the *Chronica Ricardi Pictaviensis* created a single narrative that told how societies were born, reached ascendancy and were supplanted. The unity of this narrative derived from a fundamental premise – that historical change was not random, but occurred under the watchful eye of Providence.

In pursuing a universal history, Richard of Poitiers grounded his enterprise within a traditional framework and an increasingly popular format.<sup>3</sup> The genre had established itself in the Latin West through Jerome's fourth-century translation of Eusebius' universal chronicle and was perpetuated into the early Middle Ages by a number of prominent churchmen: Augustine of Hippo, Paul Orosius, Isidore of Seville, Cassiodorus, and the Venerable Bede, among many others. By the turn of the twelfth century, Sigebert of Gembloux had begun work on his *Chronica* and a *Libellus de viris illustribus*, two texts which continued Jerome's works from 381 until 1111.<sup>4</sup> By 1142, the Anglo-Norman Orderic Vitalis had completed his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, which told the history of the Church (and some Norman politics) from the birth of Christ until his time.<sup>5</sup> At the same time, the German Otto of Freising was finishing his *Chronica*

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Didier Méhu, the Département d'histoire at the Université Laval (Québec) and SSHRC Canada for the guidance, the opportunity and the resources to explore this topic. The present paper develops from an ongoing project to produce a critical edition of Richard of Poitiers' *Chronica*.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix A for an English translation of the dedicatory epistle.

<sup>3</sup> Richard of Poitiers does not refer to his own text as a universal chronicle, but this nonetheless remains a useful heuristic category; Bert ROEST, « Mediaeval Historiography : About generic constraints and scholarly constructions », *Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-Modern Literary Cultures*, (ed. B. Roest and H. Vanstiphout), Groningen, 1999, p. 47-57, here p. 49. For a summary of the universal chronicle tradition and a discussion of the difficulties in creating such a definition, see Karl H. KRÜGER, *Die Universalchroniken* (Typologie des Sources du Moyen Âge Occidental, 16), Turnhout : Brepols, 1976 (updated 1985).

<sup>4</sup> Mireille CHAZAN, *L'Empire et l'histoire universelle : de Sigebert de Gembloux à Jean de Saint-Victor (XIIIe-XIVe siècle)* (Études d'histoire médiévale, 3), Paris : H. Champion, 1999.

<sup>5</sup> ORDERIC VITALIS, *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, (ed. and trans. Marjorie CHIBNALL), 6 vols, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968-1980.

sive *Historia de duabus civitatibus*, which outlined human history from Adam until the year 1146.

In French regions, the flourishing of the universal chronicle was to take place only in the late twelfth century. After the ninth-century chronicles of Freulf of Liseaux and Ado of Vienne no universal treatments of history would appear until 1130, when Hugh of Saint-Victor published an introduction to the study of history, *De tribus maximis circumstantiis gestorum*. This work comprised a theoretical foreword and analytical tables listing the dates of notable secular and religious leaders from Adam until the twelfth century. Twenty years later, Richard of Poitiers would next take up the mantle and develop a lengthy prose universal history – an enterprise that predated the explosion in French universal chronicles by about fifty years.<sup>6</sup>

Though Richard's early position in the French tradition marks him as significant for understanding an evolving historiographical discourse, the lack of a complete edition of his *Chronica* has limited our knowledge of his specific contribution. By first identifying the links between Richard's text and contemporary historical writing and secondly by tracing the reception of Richard's text, this paper seeks to address this lacuna and to provide a preliminary description of the chronicle.<sup>7</sup> My conclusions remain provisional at this point, as they derive from an ongoing analysis of Richard's *Chronica* that will lead to a new critical edition.<sup>8</sup>

Due to this limitation, I will initially structure my comments around the prologue (dedicatory epistle), which identifies the intention and justification of his project. This text, while short, provides considerable insight into Richard's methodology and helps explain the content that follows. From the prologue and the chronicle as a whole, we glimpse a writer navigating between convention and innovation, between the text as a distillation of authoritative knowledge and as his particular transmission of this textual heritage. But before I turn to this subject, I will first introduce the chronicler, Richard of Poitiers.

## BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Little concrete information is known about Richard of Poitiers. The title of his chronicle, *Chronica Richardi Pictauensis monachi Cluniacensis, de diversis libris collecta*, offers basic biographical information. This ascription suggests us that he was likely a native of Poitou and a *monachus cluniacensis*, meaning that he was either a monk at the monastery of Cluny (in Burgundy) or a member of the *ecclesia cluniacensis* – a network of hundreds of priories and thousands of monks that recognized Abbot Peter the Venerable as its head.<sup>9</sup>

The chronicle itself provides little information about its author. The dedicatory epistle allows us insight into his reasons for writing, but gives little biographical information. In naming Peter the Venerable, it indicates that a first redaction must have been completed prior to Peter's

---

<sup>6</sup> CHAZAN (art. cit. n. 4), p. 18, according to whom (p. 18-21) Richard would be followed by a chronicler at Pontigny (1173), Robert of Auxerre (1190/1211), Guy of Bazoches (1199/1203), Helinand of Froidmond (1211/1223), and Nicholas of Amiens (1204). The number of universal chronicles increased dramatically after the beginning of the thirteenth century.

<sup>7</sup> This methodological approach is suggested by Gert MELVILLE, « Le problème des connaissances historiques au Moyen Age. Compilation et transmission des textes », *L'historiographie médiévale en Europe. Actes du colloque organisé par la Fondation Européenne de la Science au Centre de Recherches Historiques de l'Université de Paris I du 29 mars au 1er avril 1989*, Paris : Éditions du CNRS, 1991, p. 21-41.

<sup>8</sup> See appendix B for a list of printed editions.

<sup>9</sup> On the growth of this network, see D. W. POECK, *Cluniacensis Ecclesia. Der cluniacensische Klosterverband (10.-12. Jahrhundert)* (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 71), München : Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1998.

death at the end of 1156. It also makes reference to his brethren who were already using the chronicle. His relatively extensive list of sources, together with this mention of his audience, suggests that he belonged to a Cluniac house with a literate community and a well-endowed library.

The two modern studies of Richard –one written by Élie Berger in 1879 and a second by Ingemar Schnack in 1921– have scrutinized his writings for further information, but have identified no conclusive evidence about Richard’s identity or background. Berger indicates that Richard lived and worked in a Cluniac priory on the island of Aix in Poitou on the basis of local Poitevin material in a single manuscript of Richard’s works.<sup>10</sup> This claim was disputed by Schnack, who suggested that Richard resided and composed his chronicle at the monastery of Cluny.<sup>11</sup> Both possibilities remain viable given the lack of definitive supporting evidence.<sup>12</sup>

The bulk of manuscripts containing Richard’s *Chronica* testifies to the existence of two additional works written by the same author: the first, a register of the popes entitled the *Catalogus pontificum romanorum* and the second, a description of the Roman cardinals.<sup>13</sup> The first work appears to be formed of extracts edited from the first redaction of the *Chronica*, whereas the latter work is a short and seemingly original composition. His focus on the bishops, popes and cardinal deacons of Rome in these works may suggest he spent some time there, but it may merely manifest a traditional Cluniac attachment to the papacy.<sup>14</sup>

A number of poems are also ascribed to Richard, but unlike the works mentioned above they are not linked by extant textual evidence. Brian Scott, the most recent editor of these poems, upholds Richard’s authorship on the authority of John Bale, a sixteenth-century English literary historian.<sup>15</sup> If this ascription is valid, it would indicate that Richard was a native of the region of Aunis, that he had visited the monastery of Cluny (at the least), and that he had traveled to Cluniac houses in England.

It is telling, I believe, that a few short paragraphs are able to sum up in its entirety the known evidence for Richard’s existence. We are left with only a vague outline of a medieval monk humbly toiling in obscurity – an image that may very well have pleased Richard.

#### RICHARD’S HISTORIOGRAPHICAL PROJECT: THE PROLOGUE

---

<sup>10</sup> Berger’s analysis is of the ms. R4 ; É. BERGER, « Richard le Poitevin, moine de Cluny, historien et poète », in *Notice sur Divers Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Vaticane. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d’Athènes et de Rome*, fasc. 6, Toulouse : A. Chauvin & Fils, 1879, p. 45-140. For a description of manuscripts and a list of the signum, see appendix B.

<sup>11</sup> I. SCHNACK, *Richard von Cluny, seine Chronik und sein Kloster in den Anfängen der Kirchenspaltung von 1159. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Anschauungen von Kardinalskolleg und Papsttum im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Historische Studien, 146), Berlin : Ebering, 1921.

<sup>12</sup> For a succinct summary and critique of Berger and Schnack’s arguments, see H. KÜHL, « Zur Überlieferung und Rezeption der Weltchronik Richards von Cluny », in *Aus Überrest und Tradition. Festschrift für Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken* (ed. P. Engels), Lauf : Pegnitz, 1999, p. 73-92.

<sup>13</sup> A transcription of these two works (as found in R2) is printed in the *Antiquitates Italicae medii aevi* (ed. L. MURATORI), Milan, 1738-1743, IV, col. 1104-1114.

<sup>14</sup> On the relations between Cluny and Rome during the twelfth century, see Herbert E.J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform*, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1970, p. 253-65 and *idem*, « Cluny and Rome », *Revue Mabillon* 66 (1994), p. 258-265.

<sup>15</sup> Brian A. SCOTT, « Some Poems Attributed to Richard of Cluny », in *Medieval Learning and Literature. Essays presented to Richard William Hunt* (ed. J. J. G. Alexander), Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1976, p. 181-199. Scott cites JOHN BALE, *Scriptorium Illustrium maioris Britannie ... catalogus*, Basle, 1559, *sub saecula* XIII, n°19.

The very act of writing a universal chronicle marks Richard as uncommon for a Cluniac.<sup>16</sup> Both his desire to publish a written work and the fact that it took chronicle form were departures from the norm. For the most part, Cluniac literary production was limited to texts written by and at the request of the abbot (such as Odo of Cluny and Peter the Venerable) and these works tended to be of a monastic nature, mainly theological and disciplinary treatises, customaries and statutes, abbatial letters, and hagiographic tales.<sup>17</sup> Cluniacs seemingly did not, as Bernard Guenée suggests, share their Benedictine brethren's interest in writing annals, chronicles and histories.<sup>18</sup> Richard of Poitiers demonstrates, however, that there were exceptions to this trend.<sup>19</sup>

The lack of a long-standing Cluniac chronicle tradition did not mean that Richard approached his project with an untutored eye. As his prologue to the *Chronica* suggests, he was well aware of the concerns and conventions of the historian's craft.

The prologue to the *Chronica* outlines four aspects of the author's intention: he proposed to compile the material for a new chronicle, to restrict his narrative to illustrious men and portentous events, to write with simple Latinity and finally to draw his material from a corpus of authoritative histories.<sup>20</sup> A justification follows the first three of these statements: he defends the need for a new chronicle on account of the dearth of recent historians<sup>21</sup>, he explains that a record of notable men and omens would allow an informed posterity to understand similar occurrences in the future, and claims that his humble speech derives from a need to trim unnecessary words. Keeping words to a minimum, Richard asserts, was part of his intention to offer the work to his spiritual and literary *pater*, Peter the Venerable, the abbot of Cluny (1122-1156). Richard not only wished to dedicate the chronicle to his abbot, but also hoped that Peter, a renowned author, would rewrite the *chronica* into a polished work of *historia* –imbuing Richard's material with his eloquence and thought.

---

<sup>16</sup> Paolo LAMMA, *Momenti di storiographica cluniacense*, (Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo: Studi Storici, 42-44), Rome : Nella sede dell'Istituto, 1961, p. 12-13.

<sup>17</sup> On Cluniac literary life, see Dominique IOGNA-PRAT's comments in the *Dictionnaire des Lettres françaises. Le Moyen Age* (eds. Geneviève Hasenor and Michel Zink), Paris : Fayard, 1992, s.v. « Cluny », pp. 311-16. For a more detailed discussion, see Jean LECLERCQ, « Spiritualité et culture à Cluny », in *Spiritualità cluniacense: 12-15 ottobre 1958* (Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 2), Todi : Presso l'Accademia Tudertina, 1960, p. 103-151 and *idem*, « Cluny fut-il ennemi de la culture? » *Revue Mabillon* 47 (1957), p. 172-182. Idungus of Prüfening launches an attack on a « dangerous » Cluniac attachment to classical texts, which were « so pleasing that you make a study of it, you pore over it and you even teach it during the times which St. Benedict intended and decreed should be set aside for spiritual reading » ; *Dialogus duorum monachorum* (trans. Jeremiah O'Sullivan), in *Cistercians and Cluniacs: the Case for Cîteaux*, (Cistercian Fathers Series, 33), Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977, p. 29.

<sup>18</sup> Bernard GUENÉE, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'occident medieval*, Paris : Aubier, 1980, p. 47.

<sup>19</sup> Nor was Richard the first so-called « Cluniac » chronicler, as Rodulf Glaber demonstrates. On the identification of Rodulf as Cluniac see the introduction to RODULF GLABER, *Historiarum libri quinque* (ed. and trans. John FRANCE), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989, p. lviii- lxiii, as well as Edmond ORTIGUES and Dominique IOGNA-PRAT, « Raoul Glaber et l'historiographie clunisienne », *Studi medievali* 26 (1985), p. 537-572.

<sup>20</sup> See appendix A for an English translation of the dedicatory epistle. My translation is based on the edition by Georg WAITZ, *Ex Richardi Pictaviensis Chronica*, in *MGH SS*, Hanover, 1882 (reprint 1925), XXVI, p. 76-77 (hereafter cited as *Ex Richardi Pictaviensis Chronica*).

<sup>21</sup> The same justification is offered by RODULF GLABER: « there is nobody in our days who is taking upon himself the task of setting out [historical events] ... for those who come after us.... Moreover, for a period of two hundred years ... there has been no one concerned to leave any record for posterity. » (art. cit. n. 19), p. 4-5. Peter the Venerable makes a similar claim in the prologue to the first book of his *De miraculis libri duo* (ed. Denise BOUTHILLIER, *Corpus Christianorum - Continuatio Medievalis*, 83), Turnhout: Brepols, 1988.

By constructing his prologue as an extended dedication to a noteworthy patron, Richard of Poitiers follows a common twelfth-century practice and, perhaps, takes as a model an eleventh-century Cluniac chronicle dedicated by its author, Rodulf Glaber, to his abbot.<sup>22</sup> But whereas Rodulf does this in a few words, « For the most eminent of famous men, Odilo father of the abbey of Cluny », Richard infuses his entire prologue with the theme of gift-giving and outlines a threefold offering to his abbot. Richard wishes for Peter to enjoy eternal gifts (*eternis bonis*), he offers praise for Peter's literary genius (« a new Cicero » and « another Tertullian »), and he presents his text as a means for Peter to garner further renown—either from the fame won by rewriting Richard's text or from the memorialization of Peter which Richard had implanted in the text. This renown, Richard remarks, would be a gift, « better than gold, more precious than gems ».<sup>23</sup>

In addition to the dedicatory aspect of the prologue, Richard articulates further historiographical *topoi*: declarations of modesty, assertions of trustworthiness, and a list of authoritative sources. Through the invocation of these literary conventions, Richard seeks to verbalize his adherence to the norms of the chronicle-genre and also to point to the kind of history he wished to write.<sup>24</sup>

The modesty *topos*, for instance, is a means to link the *Chronica* to the form of analytic history conceived of by Hugh of St. Victor. In his opening statement, Richard apologizes, « Though I may seem foolish to write childish things (*puerilia*), that is, in copying, compiling, and drawing together the histories of the ancients, I have noted that nothing can be reworked more profitably (*utilius*) at the moment ».<sup>25</sup> What at first seems to be a simple example of humility, however, in fact alludes to the definition of *historia* provided by Hugh of Saint-Victor, who was a writer Richard knew and admired.<sup>26</sup> In calling it childish, Hugh did not intend to denigrate the field of history, but rather highlighted it as a subject suitable for introductory teaching (i.e. instructing children [*puer*]). After training in mathematics and in geography, Hugh

---

<sup>22</sup> RODULF GLABER (art. cit. n. 19). A. GRANSDEN notes that it was uncommon for twelfth-century chronicles not to contain a dedication, « Prologues in the Historiography of Twelfth-Century England », *England in the Twelfth Century*, Woodbridge - Wolfboro : Boydell Press, 1990, p. 55-81, here p. 62-63. Chroniclers most often represented the dedicatee as the commissioner of the text: the few exceptions prior to Richard were William of Malmesbury and Geoffrey of Monmouth.

<sup>23</sup> *Ex Ricardi Pictaviensis Chronica*, (art. cit. n. 20), p. 77; *auro melius, gemmis preciosius*. This comparison is likely drawn from *Proverbs* 22:1, « A good name is more desirable than great riches, to be esteemed is better than silver or gold ».

<sup>24</sup> Though historians have questioned the validity of recreating thinking about history from the *topoi* of chronicle prologues, see the analysis of B. GUENÉE (art. cit. n. 18) and John O. WARD, «Some principles of rhetorical historiography in the twelfth-century,» in *Classical Rhetoric and Medieval Historiography* (ed. Ernst Breisach, *Studies in Medieval Culture*, XIX), Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1985, p. 103-166, here p. 106.

<sup>25</sup> *Ex Ricardi Pictaviensis Chronica* (art. cit. n. 20), p. 76.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*, p. 85; *Hugo de Sancto Victore, vita philosophus, Parisius obiit, vir preclari ingenii et in quadrivio doctissimus. divinarum autem scripturarum, tantam scientiam habuit et memoriam, ut nulli sui temporis secundus extiterit. Reliquid autem, ad monumentum sui scripta perplurima, librum scilicet de sacramentis, de Ecclesiaste, de archa Noe, librum qui intitulatur Didascalicon et alia nonnulla opuscula valde utilia*. B. GUENÉE cites Hugh's *De Tribus Maximis Circumstantiis Gestorum* as a major text in the development of the late medieval chronicle genre, « Les Premiers pas de l'histoire de l'historiographie en occident au XIIe siècle », *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Paris : Institut de France, 1983, p.136-52, here p. 139-40, 143-44. On the topic of history in the *Didascalicon*, see Ivan D. ILLICH, *In the Vineyard of the Text: A Commentary to Hugh's Didascalicon*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993, p. 29-50; in the *De Tribus Maximis Circumstantiis Gestorum*, see W.M. GREEN, « Hugo of St. Victor, *De Tribus Maximis Circumstantiis Gestorum* », *Speculum*, 18 (1943), p. 484-93.

asserted, students should progress to learning history – dates, events and eras.<sup>27</sup> Reading history, Hugh believed, trained the memory and prepared the mind to recognize the underlying order of the created world. Hugh's conception, it appears, was a development of the Christian historiographical tradition as fashioned by Augustine of Hippo.

Hugh's historical project also mirrored conventional Cluniac practice. As Edmond Ortigues and Dominique Iogna-Prat have noted, the emphasis placed on typological history in Rodulf Glaber's eleventh-century *Historiarum libri quinque* is evidence of its underlying Cluniac mentality.<sup>28</sup> A century before Hugh of Saint-Victor, Rodulf prefaced his history with a commentary on the *divine quaternity*, which, as Rodulf explained, is the fundamental ordering principle embedded by God in the created world.<sup>29</sup> Likewise, Peter the Venerable's *De miraculis libri duo* – a text closer in time to Richard's – recounted modern miracles in an attempt to encourage the readers to see their lives as part of providential order.<sup>30</sup>

While the rest of Richard's *Chronica* shows little interest in preparing his fellow monks for the contemplative reading Hugh envisaged, the prologue does argue that illustrious men and natural portents are useful in demonstrating that history is subject to single ordering principle (*una clausula rationis*). Richard intends his readers to view the past as a guide useful for knowing the present and future. The prologue provides an indication, therefore, that Richard envisages his chronicle as serving a typological purpose.

The general intent of this mode of history, as Matthew Innes demonstrates, was to offer a legitimizing template for why things must be as they are.<sup>31</sup> What Richard was attempting to legitimize, however, remains unstated in the prologue. If we are to trust his prefatory remarks, Richard eschews implanting an order in his compilation. With almost postmodern flair, he tells the reader to make up their own minds about what to believe – and for this reason he will include multiple and even contradictory descriptions of events.

Some of Richard's modern readers have seen this method as creating confusion, but Richard viewed himself as a simple woodcutter gathering wood for someone else – a true craftsman – to fashion into a polished work. By this image, Richard suggests that his work is concerned with creating a reasonable chronology, not with weighing evidence and evaluating causes.<sup>32</sup> Richard further highlights the multiplicity of topics in his work when he speaks of its intended content: « omens or famines or solar and lunar eclipses, or any illustrious men who became renowned under certain kings. »<sup>33</sup> And since omens, natural disasters, astronomical events and biography provide insufficient focus, Richard also adds that if anything else important

---

<sup>27</sup> HUGH OF SAINT-VICTOR, *Didascalicon*, in *PL* 176, cols. 739-812, here V, iii, col. 800. For further discussion, see Mary J. CARRUTHERS, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, p. 81.

<sup>28</sup> E. ORTIGUES and D. IOGNA-PRAT (art. cit. n. 19), p. 548-58.

<sup>29</sup> RODULF GLABER (art. cit. n. 19), p. 4-9.

<sup>30</sup> Jean-Pierre TORRELL and Denise BOUTHILLIER, *Pierre le Vénérable et sa Vision du Monde. Sa vie – son oeuvre. L'homme et le démon*, (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, Études et Documents, 42), Leuven: Specilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1986, p. 145-48.

<sup>31</sup> On this topic, see Matthew INNES, « Using the past, interpreting the present, influencing the future » and Dominic JONES, « The World and its Past as Christian Allegory in the Early Middle Ages », in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (ed. Y. Hen and M. Innes), Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 1-9, 102-113.

<sup>32</sup> Gabrielle Spiegel notes that this is a common feature of twelfth-century French historiography, « Genealogy: Form and Function in Medieval Historiography », in *The Past as Text. The theory and practice of medieval historiography*, Baltimore – London: John Hopkins University Press, 1997, p. 99-110, here p. 101.

<sup>33</sup> *Ex Ricardi Pictaviensis Chronica*, (art. cit. n. 20), p. 77 : *portenta aut famas aut eclipsis solis et lune, aut qui viri clari sub quibus regibus claruerunt.*

became known to him, he put that in, too. In sum, Richard advertises that his *Chronica* would describe a broad spectrum of history - a *narratio rerum gestarum*.<sup>34</sup>

#### *AD COMPONENDAM FABRICAM*: RICHARD'S HISTORICAL SOURCEBOOK

Due to its chronological presentation and the author's intention to establish a wide-ranging compilation, it is difficult to describe succinctly the heterogeneous material that makes up the *Chronica*. The diversity of its sources is announced in its title (*de diversis libris collecta*) and, as preserved in the manuscripts, the very end of Richard's prologue devotes special attention to listing the sources ostensibly used, in a separate final paragraph:

In this work, I excerpt from the books of Augustine, Jerome, Isidore, Theodulfus, Josephus, Hegesippus, Eutropius, Titus Livy, Suetonius, Aimoinus, Justin (the abridger or excerptor of Pompeius Trogus), Freulf, Orosius, Anastasius (the librarian of the Roman see), Anneus Florus, Gregory, Bede, Ado, Gildas (the historian of Britain), the monk Paul (the historian of the Lombards), and of a few others.<sup>35</sup>

There is a certain order to Richard's seemingly haphazard outline. He begins his inventory with some of the major Church historians (Augustine to Theodulf), he moves to several Roman historians (Josephus to Suetonius), he inserts a Carolingian chronicler of the Franks (Aimoinus), then cites another Roman compiler (Justin) before referencing the universal histories of Freulf, Orosius, and the *Liber Pontificalis*. Richard concludes his list with regional histories: starting from Rome and jumping between Merovingian Gaul, Anglo-Saxon England, Carolingian France, England again, and finally Lombardy. Richard does allude to the existence of other works which he consulted or copied, but the main intent of this passage seems to be the inventory of authoritative historians.

As Antonia Gransden has noted, twelfth-century chroniclers traditionally acknowledged their debt to previous writers, but the selection of specific sources cited was meant to make a statement.<sup>36</sup> Richard's predecessors usually cited one or two historians on whom they depended. Rodulf Glaber, for instance, references Bede and Paul the Deacon. Orderic Vitalis stood out as uncommon for citing seven « great historians » from Moses to Paul the Deacon. Richard's successors, however, compiled an extensive inventory of up to forty-two works. Hugh of Saint-Victor seems to have been the key to this shift, as Bernard Guenée has suggested.<sup>37</sup> His handbook to history offered an authoritative list of sources— a list, he suggested, that every historian worth his salt would know and consult. If Richard were influenced to develop his list of authors by

---

<sup>34</sup> Hans-Werner GOETZ, « The Concept of Time in the Historiography of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries », in *Medieval Concepts of the Past: Ritual, Memory Historiography* (eds. Gerd Althoff, Johannes Fried, Patrick Geary) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 139- 165, here p. 145.

<sup>35</sup> Pg, f. 16v; R3, f. 1v; printed in *Ex Ricardi Pictaviensis Chronica* (art. cit. n. 20), p. 77; *Hoc opusculum excerpti de libris Augustini, Ieronimi, Ysidori, Theodulfi, Iosephi, Egesippi, Eutropii, Titi Livii, Suetonii, Aimoini, Iustini abbreviatoris seu excerptoris Pompeii Trogi, Friculphi, Orosii, Anastasii bibliothecarii Romane sedis, Annei Flori, Gregorii Turonensis, Bede, Adonis, Gilde Britonum hystoriographi, Pauli monachi Langobardorum hystoriographi et quorundam aliorum*. For a list of these authors and their identification, consult appendix A.

<sup>36</sup> GRANSDEN (art. cit. n. 22), p. 60.

<sup>37</sup> GUENÉE, « Les Premiers pas de l'histoire de l'historiographie » (art. cit. n. 26), p.137-9.

Hugh's tables of significant historians, Richard would rank among the earliest adopters of this convention.<sup>38</sup>

We can read Richard's list as an advertisement of his learning and his wide-ranging reading, as well as a suggestion as to how his chronicle will develop. The prominent position given to Augustine and Jerome conveys Richard's catholic credentials and suggests his concern with sacred history. His citation of Gaius Suetonius Tarquillus († ca. 130 CE), the author of *De vitae Caesarum* and *De viris illustribus* indicates his knowledge of Roman antiquity and signals a concern with secular studies.<sup>39</sup> Whether Richard actually consulted Suetonius, however, is another question. As with Justin, Anneus Florus, Josephus and Titus Livy, Suetonius is described by Paul Orosius; large portions of Orosius' text, in turn, are excerpted by Ado of Vienne and Freulf of Lisieux.<sup>40</sup> In the body of his chronicle, Richard explicitly cites his sources only a handful of times: a few citations of Scripture, and a single mention each of Philo Judeus, Josephus, Orosius, Gregory of Tours, Anastasius the Librarian and an anonymous life of Saint Sylvester. His list of sources, therefore, provides indications of Richard's historiographical intention, but does not help us to understand its potential content.

#### *NARRATIO RERUM GESTORUM: THE THEMATIC UNDERPINNINGS OF THE CHRONICA*

Unlike Augustine's juxtaposition of the two cities, Orosius' outline of four world empires, or Isidore of Seville's identification of the six ages of man, the *Chronica* does not provide explicit lines for interpreting human history. The absence of any of these analytic frameworks identifies Richard's text as one of a few exceptions to the universal chronicle tradition in this respect.<sup>41</sup> Richard's chronology, however, does show a marked concern with succession, lineage and the *translatio imperii*.

Richard opens his work with a lengthy description of Creation, emphasizing the divine underpinning to the human world and introducing the perfect society that existed in Eden. The chronicle then traces the genealogy of the first humans and outlines early biblical history, emphasizing two momentous events: the division amongst Noah's family after the flood and the multiplication of languages at Babel. These events accounted for the spread of humanity across the world, and for the diversity of customs which would arise. At this early stage, Richard's account largely summarizes Old Testament history and traces political regimes : the rise and fall of the Babylonian Empire, the rise of Persia, and the successive triumphs of Greek, Hellenistic and then Roman civilizations. With the political victory of Christianity under Constantine the Great, Richard's trajectory moves towards explaining the foundation of western Christendom as a political and religious community : how it defended itself against unbelievers (i.e. heresy and

---

<sup>38</sup> The order in which Richard lists his sources, however, does not correspond to that of Hugh of St. Victor (see *ibid.*). The sources he cites, moreover, would be familiar to him if, as Schnack argues (art. cit. n. 11), he was working in the library at Cluny, which had the catalogue of books written on huge boards hung from the walls. Most of the cited authors can be found as n° 17-23, 25-33, 53, 63, 64, 114, 164, 177, 181 and 218. On this inventory, see Veronika VON BÜREN, « Le grand catalogue de la bibliothèque de Cluny », in *Le gouvernement d'Hugues de Semur à Cluny. Actes du Colloque scientifique international (Cluny, septembre 1988), Ville de Cluny 1990*, p. 245-263.

<sup>39</sup> Richard's concern for citing Classical historians also reflects the make-up of his universal chronicle which focuses on the time before Christ more lengthily than his contemporaries; see the comparative tables presented in KRÜGER (art. cit. n. 3), p. 38-39, 42.

<sup>40</sup> BERGER, (art. cit. n. 10), p. 88-89.

<sup>41</sup> KRÜGER, (art. cit. n. 3), p. 41. Of the more than forty universal chronicles written since Isidore, only eight do not use one or more of these categories; for the twelfth-century, only Orderic Vitalis and Hugh of Flavigny do not.

Islam), how it expanded under Charlemagne and how it developed under medieval popes, emperors and kings.

Richard's narrative alternates between general geographic and historical information, (such as the comprehensive lists of all the Assyrian kings [f. 8r] or of all the Sibyls [f. 11v]) and detailed descriptions of the « great » men of history.<sup>42</sup> But while the text carefully notes the uninterrupted line of Jewish high priests and Christian popes, it never describes in detail any religious leader. The individuals that Richard focuses on tend to be heroic figures, sometimes of dubious historicity. He develops in-depth portraits of several notable leaders: Aeneas (f. 11v) and Brutus (f. 14v), Romulus and Remus (f. 16v), Cyrus the Great (f. 25r), Alexander the Great (f. 32v), Julius Caesar (f. 46r), Constantine the Great (f. 66v), King Arthur (79v) Mohammed (f. 90v), Charles Martel and Charlemagne (f. 95r). As he moves to history closer to his own times, Richard continues his focus on great men: Carolingian princes, French, English and German kings, as well as the nobility of Poitou, Aquitaine, Normandy and later, also Anjou. The end of the chronicle is concerned with French campaigns overseas, such as Robert Guiscard in Sicily, and Baldwin in Jerusalem.

The lives of Richard's heroes serve two functions. Firstly, they are emblems of grand themes : they provide the means to understand how Christendom came to be, and the dangers it faces. For example, Aeneas and Brutus allowed the spread of Trojan civilization to the West (Rome, Poitiers, London), and Constantine's faith was a symbol of how the Christian religion inexorably spread throughout the Roman Empire. Mohammed, in contrast, instantiates the evil that surfaces when charismatic heretics are not suppressed. The second function of these detailed portraits is to outline an ideal order against which to compare the present. They indicate the model life of virtue lived by a few elite figures (much in the same way as monastic *vitae*) by focusing on the enactment of Christian or proto-Christian values and conduct. King Arthur, for instance, provides the model of an ideal Christian king. He ruled beneficently in the interest of the public good, he always sought peace, and demanded that his knights retain Roman/ Christian civic virtues.<sup>43</sup>

As the *Chronica* outlines the various peoples, kings or empires, which successively dominated over time, it also seeks to class them according to a moral and genealogical schema. The justification for his ordering principle is first enunciated when describing humanity after the flood (f. 3v). In Richard's account, Noah's three sons founded the major peoples (*gentes*) of history. Since two of Noah's sons were given his blessing (Japheth and Sem), their successors (respectively the Goths and the Semitic peoples) were blessed and good, whereas Ham's people (the Babylonians) were cursed and evil. Japheth's children, the « firstborns », were destined to succeed. Sem's children were strong at first, but would eventually lose their way. Ham's children were, in Richard's schema, damned from the outset.

As Richard's narrative passes from biblical to more recent history, it continues to identify subsequent peoples as the descendents of Noah's sons. Ham's lineage is rarely mentioned after the fall of Babylon, though Richard does note that Mohammed, Islam and the Saracens were the fruits of Ham's cursed line. Sem's descendents, likewise, are not discussed after he finishes with biblical history, since the fall of Hebrew and Assyrian power marks the end of their authority. Japheth's line, in contrast, is Richard's main focus : Trojan, Greek and Egyptian civilizations emerge from Scythia (the first Goths) and from these arise the empires of Alexander and of the

---

<sup>42</sup> As it is a typical representative of the  $\beta$  redaction, R2 will be referenced.

<sup>43</sup> The Arthurian matter extends from 77v-82r in R2, and recounts not only Arthur's life, but also the background story of Vortigern and Merlin.

Romans, as well as the kingdom of Britain. The emergence of hitherto-unknown Gothic tribes in the first centuries of Christendom allow for the *renovatio imperii* when the Frankish people come to assume the imperial mantle. Richard ends his chronicle with the translation of imperial authority from the Carolingian Empire into the French, English and German kingdoms. The successful participation of these three nations in the crusades demonstrates the continued and inevitable ascension of the sons of Japheth.

The historical record that Richard presents, we see, is in large part a justification for the contemporary political and religious environment. A notable theme, for example, is the clash of Christendom with unbelievers. It is presented as an unavoidable conflict of peoples –one blessed, one cursed– whose result is a preordained victory for the sons of Japheth. From King Arthur's victory over the Saxons, to Heraclius' victories, or to Charles Martel's blow near Poitiers, Richard presents a narrative of continual pagan / Saracen defeat in the face of the martial superiority of Christendom, which in turn, confirmed its moral and religious authority. I say religious authority, because the line of Japheth is identified early in Richard's text with the followers of the one true religion : Cyrus the Great and Alexander the Great, for example, are presented as proto-Christians, whose actions prefigure those of Jesus Christ. In Richard's schema, terrible and cruel societies (e.g. Babylon, Islam) shared a moral and blood heritage originating in Ham, whereas successful, cultured and Christian(esque) societies (e.g. Greece, Rome, France, Britain, Germany) found their origin in Japheth.

By making a link between chronological succession and divine order, Richard of Poitiers articulates a commonplace of medieval historiography – that things are always as they should be.<sup>44</sup> His concern with « race », blood lines, and lineages springs from sources like Paul Orosius or Isidore of Seville, who were very concerned with elaborating the idea of what defined Christendom.<sup>45</sup> He enunciates a concern with political genealogy, moreover, that would come to define French chronicle writing in the thirteenth-century.<sup>46</sup> Despite his conventionality in these respects, there also seems to be something uniquely interesting about his chronology.

We catch a glimpse of Richard's innovation in a section of the text inserted into the second redaction of the *Chronica* – sometime after 1153 but before 1162.<sup>47</sup> This quite lengthy addition is the text of the « prophecies of Merlin » taken from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*.<sup>48</sup> In this section Merlin tells of coming events in colourful metaphorical language, which is sufficiently abstract to prevent any definite interpretation. This addition is significant in part because Richard is the first French chronicler to incorporate material from Geoffrey's version.

More telling about Richard's novelty, however, is how he recalls these prophecies to the reader in the course of subsequent history. At the very end of the second redaction of the chronicle, Richard relates how Henry II married Eleanor of Aquitaine, and thereby acquired dominion over Gascony, Poitou and Aquitaine, which « just as Merlin Ambrosius said ...

---

<sup>44</sup> Bernd SCHNEIDMÜLLER, « Constructing the Past by Means of the Present. Historiographical foundations of Medieval Institutions, Dynasties, Peoples and Communities », in *Medieval Concepts of the Past* (art. cit. n. 34), p. 167- 192, here p. 169-71.

<sup>45</sup> Karl J. LEYSER, « Concepts of Europe in the Early and High Middle Ages », *Past and Present*, 137 (1992), p. 25-47, here 26-27.

<sup>46</sup> SPIEGEL, (art. cit. n. 32), p. 103.

<sup>47</sup> On the five successive redactions of the chronicle, see appendix B.

<sup>48</sup> GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH, *The 'Historia Regum Britannie' of Geoffrey of Monmouth* (ed. N. Wright), 5 vol., Woodbridge : D.S. Brewer, 1988-2001, bk. VII, chp. 3-4.

accepted the yoke of royal servitude » and were pacified.<sup>49</sup> The fulfillment of this prophecy helps explain the addition of considerable English material into Richard's second redaction. New to this version was the inclusion of the story of Britain's legendary foundation by the Trojan Brutus. Remaining largely faithful to his source, Geoffrey of Monmouth, the narrator tells how Brutus' many adventures led him to seek a new homeland for the Trojans throughout the Mediterranean and France before settling on Britain. During one foray, a few Trojans settled Poitiers, but the bulk, led by Brutus, returned to the ships and eventually founded New Troy (London). This common heritage, it seems, not only explained how Aquitaine could come to be ruled by an English king, but would act to justify this political change.

From this anecdote, we can appreciate how the *Chronica* provides an important commentary on twelfth-century conceptions of social and political authority: it legitimizes the establishment of the Angevin Empire as well as arguing for the moral superiority of Europe. From its innovative contextualization of historical « facts », we can see that the *Chronica* was not a simple compilation unthinkingly taken from previous textual authorities. What impact Richard's text had on his contemporaries, however, is a more complex question.

#### RICHARD OF POITIERS' RECEPTION AND REPUTATION

Without knowing the precise textual relationship of the *Chronica* to its successors that a critical edition will indicate, it is difficult to determine its particular influence. Richard's prologue tells us that the first redaction was already being read by the mid 1150s, and manuscripts of the work prove that it was popular enough to merit several updates.<sup>50</sup> While it remains open for debate whether only one or two continuations were written by Richard himself, it is certain that five redactions in total were produced by 1175.

Henriette Kühl has argued that Richard of Poitiers' *Chronica* was fairly well received.<sup>51</sup> From a quantitative perspective, Richard ranks among moderately successful historians : his fourteen manuscripts compare with Otto of Freising's *Gesta Frederici* (fourteen mss.), Robert of Gloucester's *Metrical Chronicle* (twelve mss), Liutprand of Cremona's *Anapodosis* (eleven mss.) or Sigebert of Grembloux's *Catalogus* (nine mss.). The geographic distribution (France, Spain, England, Italy and Germany) suggests that it was of interest to a broad European audience, and its presence in episcopal, Dominican as well as monastic libraries indicate a diverse readership. Its popularity –judged on the basis of the dating of its manuscripts– spanned several centuries (s. XII- XV)

Subsequent chroniclers found his work useful and cited it as a major source. Fragments of an anonymous chronicle from La Charité-sur-Loire (ending in the year 1216) suggest that it was conceived as an update to Richard's text.<sup>52</sup> The thirteenth-century *Chronica pontificum et imperatorum* written by Martin of Troppau placed Richard's *Chronica* and *Catalogus* on par with Livy, Orosius and Paul the Deacon.<sup>53</sup> The *Actus Romanorum Pontificum* written by Amaury

---

<sup>49</sup> RICHARD OF POITIERS, (ed. MURATORI, art. cit. n. 13, col. 1002). The passage reads in full: *Istud vero factum tantum timorem Pictaviensibus & Wasconibus intulit, ut paene gladios suos in vomeres conflarent, & lanceas suas in falces. Exhinc, ut ait Merlinus Ambrosius, jugum Regiae servitutis tulerunt, & matrem suam, ligonibus & aratris vulneraverunt.*

<sup>50</sup> See appendix B for a discussion of the chronicle's redactions.

<sup>51</sup> KÜHL (cit. art. n. 12), p. 89-91.

<sup>52</sup> Noted by BERGER (art. cit. n. 10), p. 53.

<sup>53</sup> *Martini Oppaviensis chronicon pontificum et imperatorum* (ed. L. WEILAND), *MGH SS*, Hanover, 1872, XXII, p. 377–475, here p. 407-408. A modern edition of Martin of Troppau's *Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum* is

Augier of Béziers (ending in the year 1321) not only cites the authority of Richard's chronicle, but also reproduces the *Catalogus* as its beginning.<sup>54</sup> A manuscript of the late fourteenth-century *Chronica de pontificibus* of William Rede indicates that it does the same, attributing the first part of the text (until the year 1261) to Richard, a monk of Cluny.<sup>55</sup>

By the fourteenth century the utility of Richard's history writings had won him a certain degree of fame. Richard was counted among notable ecclesiastical writers in the fourteenth-century *Historia ecclesiastica nova* written by Bartholomew of Lucca. This author identified Richard as writing in the time of Pope Adrian IV and described him as « a monk of Cluny, but a native of Poitiers. He composed a chronicle from Adam until the time of Frederick I, relating much information about secular rulers and surveying the flow of history. »<sup>56</sup> Another Italian scholar and papal librarian, Bartolomeo Platina (1421-1481) cited Richard (via Bartholomew of Lucca) during his discussion of Pope Adrian IV. He comments, « Richard wrote... with a very elegant pen and rhetoric, of whom other writers offer no little praise. »<sup>57</sup> Richard's star, it appears, was still rising, especially among chroniclers and historians who lacked other sources for the early history of the papacy. Platina's use of the *Chronica* suggests that he came to the work through an intermediary text, but his admiration of Richard's style (something not referred to by Bartholomew of Lucca) hints that he may have consulted the manuscript (R1) of the *Chronica* already in the papal library.

A different story is told by the *Chronicon Cluniacense*, which hints that Richard's work had fallen out of circulation by the late fifteenth century.<sup>58</sup> This late medieval Cluniac chronicle briefly makes reference to Richard as a « great historian » writing during the abbacy of Peter the Venerable and provides a description closely mirroring the one given by Bartholomew of Lucca. Unlike what is done for other Cluniac authors, however, the text neither mentions whether the *Chronica* was in Cluny's library (even though it had been at one time<sup>59</sup>) nor cites it as a source

---

currently under preparation by Anna-Dorothee VON DEN BRINCKEN whose work confirms Martin's use of Richard; cf. *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising*, Düsseldorf : Triltsch, 1957, p. 205ff.

<sup>54</sup> As L. MURATORI recorded in his edition of AMAURY AUGIER de Béziers, *Actus Romanorum Pontificum*, in *Rerum Italicarum*, 28 vol., Milan, 1723-51; reprinted Citta di Castello : Lapi, 1900, III, col. 439 : *Secundum Richardum monachum monasterii Cluniacensis, cujus chronicae heic [sic] terminantur*. Alongside Richard's *Catalogus*, the manuscript at Tours, BM, n°993 contains Amaury's work which is entitled, *Cronice abbreviate, sive actus Romanorum pontificum, extracte de chronicis venerabilis et religiosi viri fratris Ricardi Cluniacensis*. See A. DORANGE *Catalogue descriptif et raisonné des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Tours*, Tours : Imprimerie Jules Bouserez, 1875, p. 432-33.

<sup>55</sup> WILLIAM REDE (Guillelmus Rede), *Chronica de Pontificibus a S. Petro ad Gregorium XI*, as present in London, British Library, Cotton Julius B III (s. XV), f. 15v. The text notes *Hujus chronici pars prior, nempe, usque ad Innocentium III. P. Ricardo monacho Cluniacensi tribuitur*. William Rede's work confirms that Richard's work circulated within England in the Middle Ages.

<sup>56</sup> PTOLOMEUS LUCENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica nova* (ed. L. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, art. cit. 54), XI, col. 751; the passage reads as a whole, *Hujus etiam tempore floret Richardus Monachus Cluniacensis, sed origine Pictaviensis, magnus Historiae Scriptor. Fecit Chronicon ab Adam usque ad tempora Frederici jam dicti, de omnibus quasi Principibus Mundi tradens, & cursus temporis requirit*.

<sup>57</sup> BARTHOLOMEUS PLATINA, *De Vita et moribus summorum pontificum historia*, Köln : ex Eucharii Cervicorni, 1529, s.v. « Adriano IV », p. 175.

<sup>58</sup> *Chronicon Cluniacense*, in *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* (ed. M. MARRIER and A. DUCHESNE), Paris : R Fouët, 1614; reprinted Mâcon : Protat, 1915, col. 594.

<sup>59</sup> Number 243 of the medieval library catalogue of Cluny records a *Volumen in quo continentur Origenes super cantica canticorum et chronica Richardi*. For the dating of this catalogue, see V. VON BÜREN, (art. cit. 38), p. 245-263. Cluny's library remained largely intact until the sixteenth-century Wars of Religion, during which it was subjected to a number of depredations, as were many other French monasteries.

(as might be expected for a subsequent Cluniac chronicler to do). This silence suggests that the fifteenth-century chronicler did not have firsthand knowledge of Richard. If a Cluniac historian did not read the chronicle of one of Cluny's celebrated sons, it stands to reason that Richard's work had surely been eclipsed as a source to consult.

Even though the *Chronica* may have stopped circulating by the late fifteenth century, knowledge of Richard's chronicle continued to be propagated by humanist antiquarians –who often had only a partial knowledge of their subject matter. Philip Foresti's *Supplementum chronicarum* (1486) sought to add weight to the medieval chronicles he was consulting by updating the critical apparatus. In the notes to Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum historiale*, he comments that the author repeatedly made use of Richard, a monk of Cluny.<sup>60</sup> With this attribution, Foresti conflated the *Chronica* of Richard of Poitiers (*Pictaviensis*) with the *Liber Excerptionum* of Richard of Paris (*Parisiensis*). By failing to distinguish between these two individuals, Foresti indicated that neither he nor his collaborators had read the *Chronica*. Foresti's conflation bears further witness to a declining public awareness of Richard's work and marks a clear trajectory in this medieval monk's scholarly reputation.

Subsequent researchers accepted Foresti's mistake and their own confusion about the subject matter meant that Richard came to be identified as the author of an ever-increasing number of works. Johann von Heidenberg, who wrote under the pseudonym Trithemius, repeated Foresti's positive assessment. In his *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum sive Illustrorum Virorum* (written before his death in 1516), this bibliophile admitted that he had not read any of Richard's writings, but was nonetheless aware of this Cluniac monk's great reputation for eloquence and learning.<sup>61</sup> Richard was known, von Heidenberg observes, to have written « an eminent and renowned history of his times in one book, and a book of letters. »<sup>62</sup> John Bale recopied von Heidenberg's description in his own *Scriptorum Illustrum maioris Britannie ... catalogus* (1559) where he redated Richard to 1140 and added that Richard was also the author of a series of poems relating to a trip to England.<sup>63</sup> Sisto of Sienna's *Bibliotheca Sancta* (1566) also cited von Heidenberg's description, but specified that the title of Richard work of history was the *Liber Contrariorum seu Contrapositionum* (a work now firmly attributed to Anselm of Havelberg).<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> JACOBUS PHILIPPUS FORESTI, *Supplementum chronicarum Opus preclarum supplementum chronica*, Venezia : Bernardum Rizum, 1490, book 12, p. 419 (sectional pagination, p. 225) : *Ricardus cluniacensis monachus divertissimus vir : et ipse hac etate claruit [ca. 1149] : et quedam ut Vincentius gallus testatur composuit. et inter cetera historia multorum temporum eleganti stilo conscripsit : quam multi scriptores magnifaciunt. Ex qua idem Vincentius in suo speculo multa excerptis.*

<sup>61</sup> JOHANN VON HEIDENBURG (Trithemius), *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum sive Illustrorum Virorum*, Cologne : Peter Quentell, 1531, p. 116, *sub saecula XII*.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.* : *eius insigne et clarum opus, historiam temporum (librum 1) [et] epistolarum ad diuersos (librum 1)*. I suspect that the attribution of a book of letters may be the conflation of Richard of Poitiers with Peter of Poitiers – a contemporary monk of Cluny who was an author, a poet and had compiled the letters of Peter the Venerable just before this abbot's death.

<sup>63</sup> JOHN BALE, *Catalogus* (art. cit. n. 15), *sub saecula XIII, n°19*. For Bale's life and writings, see PETER HAPPÉ, *John Bale*, New York : Twayne, 1996. How Bale arrived at this conclusion is unknown. Scott argues (art. cit. n. 15) that Bale consulted and referenced manuscripts and that his conclusion was likely recorded in a manuscript no longer extant. However, it seems equally possible that Bale may have been making reference to another poetic Richard – as is suggested by the observation that the Richard flourished ca. 1140.

<sup>64</sup> SISTO OF SIENNA (SIXTUS SENENSIS), *Bibliotheca Sancta ex praecipuis catholicae Ecclesiae auctoribus collecta, et in octo libros digesta*. Venice : apud Franciscium Senensem, 1566, II, p. 533.

While these augmentations to Richard's corpus falsely raised scholars' awareness of his authorial production, they would also lead to a negative assessment of his abilities. In the proto-encyclopedic *Commentariorum urbanorum Raphaelis Volaterrani octo et triginta libri* (1506), for instance, the Italian humanist Raphael Maffei makes succinct reference to Richard, a monk of Cluny, but a native of Paris, who composed a history of his time, « written more illiterately than ineptly ». <sup>65</sup> Unfortunately for Richard's reputation, not only does Maffei give credence to Foresti's misidentification, but he also condemned the work with his faint praise. Though it is unclear whether Maffei had read the work he condemned and to what work he referred (was it the *Chronica*, the *Liber Excerptionum* of Richard of Saint-Victor, or the *Liber Contrariorum* ?), he effectively removed the *Chronica* from the realm of proper historiography. Maffei's assessment was repeated verbatim in the foundational reference works of the Renaissance – Conrad Gesner's *Bibliotheca universalis* (1545) and Antonius Possevinus' *Apparatus sacer ad scriptores veteris et novi testamenti* (1603-6)– and thereby started a trend among scholars. <sup>66</sup> In comparison to the humanist historiographical model, Richard's text was seen to lack rigour and his Latinity was criticized for avoiding Classical refinement.

Gerard Vossius's *De historicis latinis* (1627) compounded the problems spawned by Foresti, Maffei and Sisto. <sup>67</sup> By compiling all known information in an entry on « Richard of Paris, a monk of Cluny », Vossius established a definitive early-modern portrait of Richard of Cluny, but one which was filled with false attributions. But while Vossius repeated most of the mistaken beliefs about a so-called Cluniac Richard, Vossius's text also opened the door to a more realistic assessment of the author of the *Chronica*, since it contained an entry for a « Richard of Poitiers, monk of the order of Cluny » fifty pages after his description of Richard of Paris. This second entry reproduces von Heidenberg's portrait, which limits Richard's output to a single chronicle and a book of letters. <sup>68</sup>

Noting the two distinct entries, the French bibliographer Casimir Oudin was so confused that, lacking adequate means to check his facts, he correctly concluded that earlier scholars must have conflated Richard of Poitiers and Richard of Paris, but the incorrectly takes this to mean that Richard of Poitiers must have written the *Liber Excerptionum*. <sup>69</sup>

Oudin's assessment of Richard characterizes the weakness of scholarship in this period, which can be largely traced to two major causes. When Richard's chronicle fell out of

<sup>65</sup> RAFFAEL MAFFEI (Volaterranus), *Commentariorum urbanorum Raphaelis Volaterrani octo et triginta libri*, part II, *Anthropologia*, Rome, 1506; Paris, 1516, book XXI, p. 217 : *magis illiterate, quam inepte*. Raphael spent considerable time in Rome while attached to the papal court; see Pio Paschini, "Una famiglia di curiali: I Maffei di Volterra," *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* 7 (1953), p. 337-376.

<sup>66</sup> CONRAD GESNER, *Bibliotheca universalis, sive Catalogus omnium scriptorum locupletissimus in tribus linguis, Latina, Graeca et Hebraica*. Tiguri : apud Christophus Froschoverum, 1545-1555 (rpt. Osnabrück, O. Zeller, 1966) ; and ANTONIUS POSSEVINUS, *Apparatus sacer ad scriptores Veteris et Novi Testamenti... synodos et patres latinos ac graecos... theologos scholasticos... poetas sacros*, 3 vol., Venice : apud Societatem venetam, 1603-1606.

<sup>67</sup> GERARD JOHANNES VOSIUS, *De Historicis latinis libri III*, Lyon, 1627 (rpt. 1651), p. 458 (from the 1651 edition). VOSIUS purchased a portion of Paul Petau's library from his son, Alexandre Petau, and so perhaps had access to Petau's records about Richard's chronicle, but not Petau's manuscript of Richard (R2) which had already been sold to Queen Christine of Sweden; K. A. DE MEYIER, *Paul en Alexandre Petau en die Geschiedenis van hun Handschriften (Voornamelijk op grond van de Petau-handschriften in de Universiteitsbibliotheek te Leiden)*, Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1947, p. 139.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 510.

<sup>69</sup> CASIMIR OUDIN, *Commentarius de scriptoribus Ecclesiae antiquis illorumque scriptis tam impressis quam manuscriptis*, Leipzig : M. G. Weidmannus, 1722, II, p. 1597-1601; and JOHANN ALBERT FABRICIUS, *Bibliotheca latina mediae et infimae aetatis*, Hamburg, 1734, I, p. 377.

circulation, few people had access to manuscripts of his work and therefore few could speak authoritatively about its content. Nonetheless, scholars willingly relied on the authority of a few brief entries found in a flawed encyclopedic works. A lack of precise knowledge about Richard was therefore compounded by the desire of these early-modern scholars to consolidate scattered pieces of knowledge into an orderly whole. While admirable in intention, this impulse encouraged historians to attribute additional works to Richard of Poitiers simply on the basis of similar names.

By the seventeenth century, a response to the overambitious encyclopedists was brewing. Interest in publishing printed editions of medieval manuscripts had become a concern of several ecclesiastical institutions for academic, inspirational or legal reasons and the result was a newfound rigour towards accepted historical narratives.<sup>70</sup> Much of the mistaken information surrounding Richard of Poitiers was resolved through this scholarship, but their historiographical models meant that the *Chronica* was devalued again, this time for its lack of originality.

Among the first early-modern researchers to unearth Richard's chronicle were Martin Marrier, a Cluniac monk at the priory of Saint-Martin-des-Champs in Paris and his collaborator André Duchesne who was a secular historian and editor educated by the Jesuits. Together they produced the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* (1614) – a thousand-page collection of the major sources of Cluniac history.<sup>71</sup> Though Richard's work was not published in this work, his name and chronicle were mentioned in excerpts taken from the *Chronicon Cluniacense*. Presumably it was this reference which allowed André Duchesne to recognize Richard's text when he found it in two different versions among the manuscripts gathered by Paul Petau and Jacques-Auguste de Thou.<sup>72</sup> One version (P2) was entitled *Cronica id est series temporum collecta de diuersis libris a Richardo pictauisiensi monacho cluniacensis*, whereas the second (R4) bore no attribution. Duchesne promptly copied this title to the second manuscript and transcribed its final folios. Duchesne's copy consciously limited itself to the most recent history treated in the *Chronica* (red.  $\chi$ ) : the events from Louis the Pious until the death of Bishop Henry of Winchester (†1171). He comments, « I omitted what happened before the reign of Charles the Bald since the information is not helpful, is very well known and is found throughout other chronicles. »<sup>73</sup> Duchesne's instrumental focus makes sense given his context – he was striving to record and to protect the fragile muniments of the French past, which recent history had demonstrated was in danger from destructive sectarian violence. To Duchesne the limits of the text's usefulness was determined by its uniqueness/ originality – a justification which valorized less than thirty percent

---

<sup>70</sup> See Marc SAURETTE, « Excavating and Renovating Ancient Texts », in *From Dead of Night to End of Day : The Medieval Customs of Cluny* (ed. I. Cochelin and S. Boynton), Turnhout : Brepols, 2005, p. 85-107.

<sup>71</sup> *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* (art. cit. n. 34).

<sup>72</sup> On Duchesne's relationship with these manuscript collectors, see Robert BARROUX, « Duchesne, André », in *Dictionnaire des Lettres Françaises*, vol. 2, *Le XVII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (ed. P. Dandrey), 2<sup>e</sup> éd., Paris : Centre National du Livre / Fayard, 1994, p. 408-9, and Emmanuel BURY, « Le "Père de l'Histoire de France" : André Duchesne (1584-1640) », *Littératures Classiques*, 30 (1997), p. 121-31. Bury notes (p. 66) that the libraries of these two collectors were formed of manuscripts gathered from the spoliation of French monasteries, which were looted and sacked during the wars of religion. These libraries went on to form the core of the Royal French Library and the Library of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, both now housed in the Bibliothèque nationale de France. Others were sold to the Queen Christina of Sweden, which were later transferred to the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (BAV), which explains the current presence of Petau's ms (R2) at the BAV in Rome. For the library catalogue of de Thou (1617) consult, Paris, BnF, ms lat. 17918, *Catalogus Mss. Bibliothecae Illustrissimi viri Jacobi Augusti Thouani*.

<sup>73</sup> P4, p. 485 : *Nos vetera, quae Caroli Calvi regnum praecesserunt, ut inutilia ac nimis trita ([added supra :] et in aliis chronicis passim reperiuntur, consulto) omisimus.*

of Richard's work and rested on a conception of the chronicle as a source from which the historian could extract objective facts. This justification and historiographical model would mean that for the subsequent four hundred year, over half of Richard's text would remain consigned to obscurity.

By the late seventeenth century, Duchesne's methodology had become the model for French institutional histories<sup>74</sup>, and when Duchesne's notes were passed on, so too were many of his judgements. Duchesne's assessment of Richard's *Chronica* likely influenced the Maurist scholars working at the monasteries of Saint-Germain-des-Prés and Blancs-Manteaux and led Edmond Martène (1654-1739) to publish a partial edition in 1730.<sup>75</sup> Unlike Duchesne's copy, Martène and Durand used a manuscript which Duchesne had consulted in de Thou's library but not reproduced (P2).<sup>76</sup> Like Duchesne's copy, Martène's extracts only reproduced the final folios of the *Chronica*, beginning in the year 754 and extending until the papacy of Adrian IV in 1153. Their rationale is summarized by an anonymous Maurist contributor to the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, « Dom Martène et Dom Durand ont livré cette portion au public dans le cinquième tome de leur grande collection. Ce qu'elle renferme de particulier, se réduit à fort peu de chose. L'auteur n'y a touché, pour ainsi dire, que la fleur des principaux événemens [sic]. »<sup>77</sup> A second Maurist endeavour under the direction of Martin Bouquet (1685-1754) printed a few further extracts pertaining to the last four hundred years covered in the *Chronica* in successive volumes of the *Rerum Gallicarum et Franciscarum Scriptores*.<sup>78</sup> It declined to publish any of the earlier history presented in Richard's *Chronica*.

Shortly before Bouquet's publication and unaware of Martène's edition, Luigi Antonio Muratori (1672-1750) sought to bring Richard's work to public knowledge in his *Antiquitates Italicae medii aevi*. In the fourth volume (1743), Muratori introduces and prints a transcription completed by his colleague Nicholas Carminus Falconis of a text in the Vatican Library (R2). Muratori's edition, much like his Maurist contemporaries, only reproduced the end of the *Chronica*, beginning with the reign of Charlemagne. The rest he summarizes in a few lines : « Richard opens his narrative with the beginning of the world which I have noticed is a common desire of those writing histories in that time. I, with some omissions, present Richard's discourse, beginning at the empire of Charlemagne (that is, from the year 800 on). What I passed over was

---

<sup>74</sup> We can see the evidence of his impact in a memorandum circulated by Luc d'Achéry, the librarian of Saint-Germain-des-Prés and one of the original founders of the Maurist monastic history project. His *Advis à celui qui écrira quelque pièce pour l'histoire ou quelque vie de saint* (8 March, 1648) notes, « Ceux qui composent l'histoire de quelque monastère peuvent imiter M. Duchesne dans les histoires qu'il a faites des maisons particulières, lequel ordonne premièrement l'histoire de suite selon l'ordre de la chronologie, et suivant les pièces qu'on luy avoit donné et les divers temoignages qu'il avoit colligé, et puis il insère lesdites pièces et tesmoignages tous entiers par année à la fin de chaque histoire. » Cited in Léopold DELISLE, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque impériale*, Paris : Imprimerie Nationale, 1874, II, p. 59-60.

<sup>75</sup> Duchesne's copy is bound with other works of Edmond Martène in P4, p. 485-500. It was printed as *Chronicon Ricardi Pictaviensis* (ed. Edmond MARTÈNE and André DURAND), in *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima collectio*. 9 vol., Paris : Montalant, 1724- 1738, V, col. 1160-1174.

<sup>76</sup> By Martène's time, this manuscript (P2) had entered the Royal library (by way of Colbert's collection), as evidence the catalogue numbers « cod. colb. 6213; Regius 4303 SS A » on f. 1r.

<sup>77</sup> *Histoire littéraire de la France... par des religieux bénédictins de la congrégation de S. Maur*, 12 vol., Paris, 1733-63; reprinted Paris : V. Palmé, 1868, XII, p. 478-480, 722.

<sup>78</sup> *Ex Chronico Ricardi Pictaviensis, monachi Cluniacensis* (ed. Martin BOUQUET), in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, Paris, 1752-1781; rpt. 1869, VII, 258; IX, 21, X, 263, XI, 258, XII, p. 411-421. Bouquet's edition notes that it printed transcriptions made by the great Maurist scholar Jean Mabillon (1632-1707); Mabillon's drafts are no longer extant.

burdensome, not erudite. »<sup>79</sup> Muratori offers the same breadth, he presents the same message and falls prey to the identical bias as the Maurists, according to which if the text is not original, it is not of interest.

Élie Berger, who was more sympathetic to the value of Richard's labours than his recent predecessors, undertook the first modern study of the *Chronica*. He concludes his study on Richard of Poitiers with a positive but cautious appraisal of the chronicle genre :

Les histoires universelles composées au moyen âge méritent d'être lues et analysées. Elles nous révèlent d'abord les goûts de nos devanciers, le degré de leur érudition, le profit qu'ils savaient en tirer. En même temps il en est peu qui ne contiennent dans leurs dernières pages quelques faits contemporains de ceux qui les ont écrites, étrangers aux autres histoires ou tout au moins présentés d'une manière originale. Nous avons trouvé à la chronique de Richard ce double caractère.<sup>80</sup>

Perhaps more telling are other comments, « il n'a de valeur que dans ses dernières pages » or, « pour nous, [il est] absolument dépourvu d'intérêt. »<sup>81</sup> When Berger devotes an appendix to what he views as the most valuable and interesting parts of the *Chronica*, he provides only the final sections of four different redactions of Richard's *Chronica*, since the rest of the text, in Berger's mind, was merely compilation and therefore was too derivative to reveal anything about the medieval mind.

And this trend continued unchanged. In his subsequent partial edition for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Georg Waitz criticized Berger's manuscript stemma, but did not reconsider the assumptions about authorship, authority and originality underlying Berger's choice of material.<sup>82</sup> Following his predecessors' model, Waitz's edition begins in the time of Charles the Simple without any justification for this choice. In his editorial method, therefore, Waitz shows himself to adhere to the scientific historical model prevalent in late nineteenth-century Germany, but he allows past tradition to determine his selection of material.

Since Waitz's edition, few scholars have sought to examine the *Chronica*. Ingeborg Schnack's 1921 monograph *Richard von Cluny* received a lukewarm reception by a disinterested academic public.<sup>83</sup> His conclusions, moreover, were criticized as unsubstantiated and then largely forgotten until very recently. Only in the last decade has new work appeared which contradicts this trend, particularly Henriette Kühl's article which seeks to gauge the popularity of Richard's

---

<sup>79</sup> RICHARD OF POITERS, (ed. MURATORI, art. cit. n. 13), p. 1078 : *Richardus autem ab exordio Mundi cursum narrationis suae inchoavit : quam scribendi libidinem familiarem fuisse eorum temporum Historicis saepe monui. Ego, ceteris omissis, ab Imperio Caroli Magni, hoc est ab Anno Christi DCCC loquentem exhibeo Richardum. Oneri, non Eruditioni, forent, quae a me praetermissa fuere.*

<sup>80</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 10), p. 119.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 88.

<sup>82</sup> Waitz's edition (art. cit. n. 20) represents an exercise in editorial exactitude but lacking in practicality. He makes corrections to Berger's stemma, he suggests minor changes to previous transcriptions, but ultimately he establishes an unusable text. It attempts to consolidate the five very different redactions of Richard's work into one narrative. The result is a confusing text overrun with several layers of sidenotes and footnotes. In order to resolve the different redactions, lengthy sections of the *Chronica* are placed in the footnotes or, if he finds previous editions to be satisfactory, they are replaced with ellipses and the reader is directed to previous editions.

<sup>83</sup> See, for example, the review of the book in the *English Historical Review*, 38 (October 1923), p. 616, which notes, « The contents of the chronicle, which is mainly a compilation from earlier sources, are not of great historical value, and are chiefly of interest as one of the main sources of the famous chronicles of the Dominicans Martin of Troppau and Bernard Gui. »

*Chronica*.<sup>84</sup> She too, unfortunately, restricts her comments to the printed sections of the text and while she admits that further work on the rest of the chronicle is necessary, she leaves it for someone else to do.

## CONCLUSION

If one were to make a judgement about Richard of Poitiers' *Chronica* based on the past four hundred years of scholarship, Richard would appear to be a poor writer of little interest to modern historians. Our assessment would be that Richard wrote a pointless, rambling and unoriginal historical compilation. The text of the *Chronica*, however, tells us a different story. It reveals a chronicler appealing to up-to-date historical theory and weaving together authoritative historical accounts. It asserts its role in disseminating a political discourse legitimizing Christendom. It offers its legitimization of the oppression of non-Christians. It cheers on the current kings and queens of Europe as they seek to establish their power. And it advocates an idea of hereditary superiority of certain nations over others.

The present analysis has sought to outline the evidence for the position of Richard of Poitiers' *Chronica* within the medieval historiographical tradition. From its use of common chronicle conventions and from its interpretive framework, we can see that the text not only conformed to twelfth-century models but also innovated upon them. The reception of this work, moreover, indicates that subsequent chroniclers were indebted to Richard's text. It can be asserted, therefore, that Richard of Poitiers exerted a greater influence on medieval historiographical traditions than has been previously thought.

---

<sup>84</sup> KÜHL (art. cit. n. 12).

APPENDIX A : TRANSLATION OF RICHARD'S DEDICATORY EPISTLE<sup>1</sup>

To his venerable father, abbot Peter of Cluny, brother Richard wishes the enjoyment of eternal gifts.

Though I may seem foolish to write childish things, that is in copying, compiling<sup>2</sup> and drawing together the histories of the ancients in a single work, I have noted that nothing can be reworked more profitably at the moment, especially since what has happened for the last four hundred years has almost been delivered to obscurity on account of the scarcity or the inactivity of writers.

To make provision for posterity, therefore, it pleases me to add, if not the sum of all things, then what little I am able to know about [the history] preceding our own times, and what happened during that time in different parts of the world. Though [what occurred was] often disparate, it was established under a single rational end. In addition, if any omens or famines or solar and lunar eclipses, or any illustrious men became renowned under certain kings, or something specific is known to have happened in any place, this also I committed to memory, so that if something similar happened at another time, an informed posterity might know how to consider them by comparing them with past events. It also pleases me to advise the reader that if something doubtful was placed in this little work, it was not the product of our ignorance, but took its origin from the disagreement of previous writers. For while many people disagree about different things, it is still proper to set down the issue about which a dispute arises, just as it happened or could have happened in someone's opinion.

I composed the present work with uncultivated speech, not as a stage for others' words, nor with finely flowing eloquence. On account of this, you, my father, who closely replicate Cicero in your epistolary style and who emerge as a new Tertullian in your reasoning when you relate your writings, please do not dwell on the poverty of our talent, I ask, nor trim and complete my dissonant words with unremunerative goodness. For a polished sophistication of words brings with it much [additional] matter. One who writes about another's feats wins the admiration of the reader; in the opinion of our elders, the writer<sup>3</sup> is esteemed for his written works hardly less than the doer of the deed. For woodcutters or wood sellers are not accustomed to merit the renown of carpenters, who shape, polish and refine [the wood]. But since the continuous labour of the work of God prohibits that I rework the limitations of the thought, I offer freely to you, as if wood from a forest, new material for composition, so that whatever praise is acquired by it is ascribed to you alone. For although our brothers willingly read this little work, they would desire it much more avidly if they glimpsed a sprinkling from the torrent of your genius. Indeed nothing will deliver your name to eternity as much as your writings—or writings about you or to you—will have done. Therefore, I implant the memory of you forever in

---

<sup>1</sup> This translation is based on the edition of the *dedicatio* printed by Georg WAITZ, *Ex Richardi Pictaviensis Chronica*, in *MGH SS*, Hanover, 1882 (reprint 1925), XXVI, p. 76-77.

<sup>2</sup> *compilando*: medieval academics distinguished *compilatio* from *collectio* on the grounds that a compilation had an order, while a collection did not. On this topic, see Alastair MINNIS, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic literary attitudes in the later Middle Ages*, London: Scolar Press, 1984, p. 97.

<sup>3</sup> Richard uses the word *scriptor* to designate an « author ». Scholastic discourse in the thirteenth century would come to distinguish sharply between the *scriptor* (scribe), *compilator* (compiler), *commentator* and *auctor* (as author of original material), but these distinctions do not yet seem apparent; cf. *ibid.*, p. 94.

our writings, so that your name may live and be loved in posterity. And this, eternal master, our ancestors judged better than gold, more precious than gems.<sup>4</sup>

In this work, I excerpt from the books of Augustine<sup>5</sup>, Jerome<sup>6</sup>, Isidore<sup>7</sup>, Theodolfus<sup>8</sup>, Josephus<sup>9</sup>, Hegesippus<sup>10</sup>, Eutropius<sup>11</sup>, Titus Livy<sup>12</sup>, Suetonius<sup>13</sup>, Aimoinus<sup>14</sup>, Justin<sup>15</sup> (the abridger or excerptor of Pompeius Trogus), Freculphus<sup>16</sup>, Orosius<sup>17</sup>, Anastasius<sup>18</sup> (the librarian of the Roman see), Anneus Florus<sup>19</sup>, Gregory<sup>20</sup>, Bede<sup>21</sup>, Ado<sup>22</sup>, Gildas<sup>23</sup> (the historian of Britain), the monk Paul<sup>24</sup> (historian of the Lombards), and of a few others.

---

<sup>4</sup> Richard is making a pun on the Latin *priores*, suggesting both his predecessors and his monastic superiors. Richard perhaps makes reference to Peter the Venerable's ep. 129 to Peter of Poitiers, stating *Libri, et maxime Augustiniani, ut nosti, apud nos auro pretiosiores sunt*; *The Letters of Peter the Venerable* (ed. Giles Constable), Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), I, p. 326-27. More likely this cites Proverbs 22.1, « A good name is more desirable than great riches, to be esteemed is better than silver or gold ».

<sup>5</sup> Augustine of Hippo († 430), author of *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*.

<sup>6</sup> Jerome (†419), translator and continuator of Eusebius' universal history, the *Chronicon*.

<sup>7</sup> Isidore of Seville (†636), reviser and continuator of Jerome's translation of the *Chronicon*.

<sup>8</sup> Theodulf of Orléans (†821), considered the author of the *Libri Carolini*.

<sup>9</sup> Flavius Josephus († ca. 100), author of *De antiquitatibus de excidio Ierosolimorum. Iudaicis* and *De bello Iudaico*.

<sup>10</sup> Hegesippus (fourth century), author of *De excidio urbis Hierosolimitanae*, an abridgement of Josephus's *Jewish War*.

<sup>11</sup> Eutropius († ca. 378), author of the *Breviarium historiae Romanae*.

<sup>12</sup> Titus Livius († 17), author of *Ab urbe condita libri*.

<sup>13</sup> Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus († ca. 130), author of *De uiris illustribus* and *De uita Caesarum*.

<sup>14</sup> Aimoinus of Fleury (ninth century), author of *Historia Francorum* and *Historia Abbatum Floriacensis*

<sup>15</sup> Marcus Iunianus Iustinus (third century), author of a Latin epitome of Pompeius Trogus, *Historiae Philippicae*.

<sup>16</sup> Freculf of Lisieux (†850), author of a universal history, entitled the *Chronica*.

<sup>17</sup> Paul Orosius (†420), author of the *Historia aduersum paganos*.

<sup>18</sup> Anastasius Bibliothecarius († ca. 878), author of the *Chronographia tripartita* and continuator (once considered the author) of the *Liber Pontificalis*.

<sup>19</sup> Lucius Annaeus Florus (second century), author of the *Epitome bellorum omnium annorum DCC libri duo*.

<sup>20</sup> Gregory of Tours († 594), author of *Historiarum libri decem*.

<sup>21</sup> Bede the Venerable (†735), author of numerous historical works, including the *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*.

<sup>22</sup> Ado of Vienne († 874), author of *Chronicon de VI aetatibus mundi*.

<sup>23</sup> Gildas of Britain († ca. 570), author of *De Excidio Britanniae*.

<sup>24</sup> Paul the Deacon († 799), author of the *Historia gentis Langobardorum* and the *Historia Romana*, a continuation of the Eutropius' *Breviarium*.

## APPENDIX B : MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS OF RICHARD'S *CHRONICA*

At present I have identified fourteen medieval manuscripts useful for reconstructing the *Chronica*.<sup>1</sup> Some manuscripts offer a complete version of the *Chronica*, while others provide only extracts.<sup>2</sup> Some of the manuscripts bear Richard's name; others are untitled.<sup>3</sup> A majority of the manuscripts originate in France, though one copy was definitely produced in Spain (M) and another in Eastern Europe (V), an additional two possibly in Italy (P5, Pg) and a final manuscript possibly in England (P3). The dates range from the late twelfth- to the early fifteenth century : three manuscripts date to the twelfth-century and five to the thirteenth century. The remaining manuscripts were copied in or after the fourteenth century.<sup>4</sup>

A comparison of these fourteen manuscripts reveal the kinds of differences that plague any text copied by hand. There are minor scribal errors, miscopying, and word substitutions. There are also differences in content. The manuscripts of the *Chronica* suggest that the text continued to be both augmented and revised by others and by Richard himself. Some manuscripts, for example, contain an updated chronicle, which extends the chronology into the mid and late thirteenth-century (M, V) and thereby postdates Richard's time. Most manuscripts, however, evidence successive chronological extensions during the approximate time of Richard's life. In a unique manuscript (P2) the narrative ends with the year 1153, the majority of manuscripts continue to the year 1162 and a handful of others continue to 1171 (R4), 1172 (R3) or 1174 (M).

On the basis of these changing endpoints and due to additional features I will now discuss, the manuscripts can be grouped into successive versions corresponding to five different stages of production. I have designated these subsequent redactions as  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\chi$ ,  $\delta$  and  $\epsilon$ .<sup>5</sup> In general, the later the end point of the manuscript, the more detailed an account it provides. Not all the manuscripts, however, get longer and more detailed as the chronology extends later into the twelfth century. The opening section of Richard's *Chronica* well illustrates this point. For example, in ms. P2 (red.  $\alpha$ ) the text begins with a sparse retelling of Genesis. In just over two hundred words, it recounts God's works on the first day of Creation and ends with Adam being cast from paradise. In R2 (red.  $\beta$ ) the same series of events is described in almost eleven hundred

---

<sup>1</sup> For general descriptions of manuscripts containing Richard's writings, see Élie BERGER, « Richard le Poitevin, moine de Cluny, historien et poète », in *Notice sur Divers Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Vaticane. Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, fasc. 6, Toulouse : A. Chauvin & Fils, 1879, p. 57-71, Georg WAITZ, *Ex Richardi Pictaviensis Chronica*, in *MGH SS*, Hanover, 1882 (reprint 1925), XXVI, p. 74-76 and Henriette KÜHL, « Zur Überlieferung und Rezeption der Weltchronik Richards von Cluny », in *Aus Überrest und Tradition. Festschrift für Anna-Dorothee von den Brincken* (ed. P. Engels), Lauf : Pegnitz, 1999, p. 82-87. Neither BERGER, WAITZ nor KÜHL examined all the manuscripts, so their descriptions remain incomplete. Additional comments on the manuscripts can be found in I. SCHNACK, *Richard von Cluny, seine Chronik und sein Kloster in den Anfängen der Kirchenspaltung von 1159. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Anschauungen von Kardinalskolleg und Papsttum im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert* (Historische Studien, 146), Berlin : Ebering, 1921. See below for a detailed list of the manuscripts and their designations.

<sup>2</sup> Mss. P2 (almost a complete version), P3 and T provide extracts or incomplete copies of the *Chronica*.

<sup>3</sup> Mss. B, P2, P5, Pg, R1, R2, T and V identify Richard of Poitiers as the author of the *Chronica* in the hand of the original scribe. Richard is also identified by a later hand in mss. M and R4. No identification of the author is offered in mss. P1, P3 and R3.

<sup>4</sup> The earliest manuscripts date to the late twelfth century: P2, P3, P5. The thirteenth-century manuscripts are as follows: B, M, P1, R1, R2, R4.

<sup>5</sup> These designations are my own, as reconstructed from my comparison of the manuscripts and the schemas suggested by É. BERGER, G. WAITZ, and I. SCHNACK (art. cit. n. 1).

words; the added material is a meditation upon the significance of Adam's sin. R2 describes, moreover, the very first day of Creation with thirty words, while R4 (red.  $\chi$ ) expands this section to almost two hundred words. The trend towards expansion is reversed, however, with the manuscripts R3 (red.  $\delta$ ) and M (red.  $\epsilon$ ). Though these manuscripts have a chronological endpoint (respectively, 1172 and 1174) later than that of R4, the description of creation almost exactly reproduces that of P2 (red.  $\alpha$ ) in length and composition.

The return to the  $\alpha$  model in later redactions complicates matters about how to view the successive versions of the *Chronica*. Why did the final versions return to his earliest and most minimal text even though they still show a concern with expanding it and bringing it up-to-date? I suggest the best explanation is that redactions  $\delta$  and  $\epsilon$  are continuations written not by Richard but by another chronicler who only had access to a copy of the  $\alpha$  redaction.<sup>6</sup> Two further points buttress this idea. Firstly, the additions in the last two redactions are jarringly different in style and form.<sup>7</sup> Secondly, Richard's dedicatory epistle to Peter the Venerable is attached to the manuscripts of the two last redactions. Had Richard been the one revising his text, presumably he would have excised (or at least modified) a dedication made to a person then dead. Someone who just added a few names and dates here and there would not have.

It seems prudent therefore not to view the last two redactions as Richard's work, and to consider them only as an editorial control for the manuscripts of the  $\alpha$  redaction. Unfortunately, the  $\alpha$  redaction itself has proven very difficult to establish. The only manuscript of this first redaction (P2) reveals itself to be an incomplete copy or an unfinished draft. The final paragraph ends mid-sentence (seemingly with much information to follow) and in the body quotations and poems are introduced which then do not follow.<sup>8</sup>

The problems associated with the first and the final two redactions convinced me to focus on the  $\beta$  version in this paper. Given that a single manuscript gives evidence for the  $\alpha$  redaction, eight for  $\beta$ , two for  $\chi$ , one for  $\delta$ , and two for  $\epsilon$ , we can regard the  $\beta$  version as circulating the most widely. The reception of Richard's work<sup>9</sup> also supports this conclusion, since subsequent chroniclers and literary historians most often identified Richard with the temporal panorama of the  $\beta$  version. It seems therefore that this second redaction provides a definitive version of Richard's *Chronica*.

### Manuscripts

A Assisi, Biblioteca Comunale, no. 606, ff. 155-68.<sup>10</sup>

s. XIV, gothica textualis.

*Catalogus Romanorum Pontificum, Cardinales Romae* (from red.  $\chi$ ). The text is a compilation of diverse materials: a martyrology, the *Rule of Saint Benedict*, Richard's treatises and extracts from the *Speculum Naturale* of Vincent of Beauvais.

---

<sup>6</sup> See KÜHL's thoughtful suggestions on the topic (art. cit. n. 1), p. 74-81.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 80-81.

<sup>8</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 75-77.

<sup>9</sup> See the section above, "Reception".

<sup>10</sup> Cesare CENCI, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad sacrum conventum Assisiensem*, Assisi : Casa Editrice Franciscana, 1981, II, p. 561; Giuseppe MAZZATINTI, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. 4, Iurea, Assisi, Foggia, Ravenna, Forli : Casa Editrice Luigi Bordinandini, 1895, p. 117-18. The former work names **Roberti de Pictavio** as author, but the latter's description cites **Riccardo di Poitiers**.

- Unknown origin, possibly France.<sup>11</sup>
- B Bern, Burgerbibliothek, ms. 575, ff. 1-70.<sup>12</sup>
- s. XIII, gothica textualis.  
Red. β (palimpsest): *Incipit Cronica Magistri Ricardi Pictauensis de diversis libris historicis collecta*.  
Unknown origin.<sup>13</sup>
- M Madrid, Biblioteca General de la Universidad Complutense, Fondo Histórico, 134 (olim 116-Z-46), ff. 103r-169v.<sup>14</sup>
- s. XIII<sup>2</sup>, gothica libraria.  
Red. ε, *continuatio ad 1244: Hinc frater Ricardus ducit Historiam ex variis auctoribus collectam* (title added in s. XV). Richard's chronicle forms the largest work transcribed in a compilation of early medieval chronicles with an emphasis on Visigothic and Spanish authors: Eusebius, Jerome, Isidore, John Bisclar, Victor, Prosper, the Mezoarabic chronicle, alongside others.  
Toledo, later transferred to the university library at Madrid.
- P1 Paris, BnF, ms. lat. 4934, ff. 1r-128r.<sup>15</sup>
- s. XIII<sup>ex</sup>, gothica textualis.  
Red. β: *Hec sunt chronice a principio mundi semet ab Adam usque ad incarnationem domini; Catalogus Romanorum Pontificum*. The manuscript concludes (ff. 139r-148v) with short annal entries taken from the *Chronica Turonense abbreviatum*.  
Unknown origin, likely France.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> A note on f. 196 reads, *Iste liber est M[agistri] J. de sanctis canon. Parisien., michi commodatus per suam capellanum. N. Sellanj*, likely indicating a Parisian origin. The manuscript is first described in the 1844-45 inventory of the library of San Francesco of Assisi written by Giovanni Giuseppe GHISOTTI as *Martyrologium antiquum* (XXX A. 151), in CENCI (*ibid.*), no. 2010, p. 561. Since neither a description of this text nor of anything similar is found in the numerous catalogues and inventories found before 1844, we can likely conclude that the manuscript entered the library after 1665/66, the date of catalogue most recently antedating Ghisotti's inventory.

<sup>12</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 62; the most complete published description is found in the Johann R. SINNER, *Catalogus Codicum Mss Bibliothecae Bernensis. Annotationibus Criticis Illustratus*, Bern : Ex Officina Typographica Reipublicae, 1760, II, p. 601-609. See also, Herman Hagen, *Catalogus Codicum Bernendium (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana)*, Bern : B.F. Haller, 1875 (rpt. Hildesheim – New York : Georg Olms Verlag, 1974), p. 462.

<sup>13</sup> The manuscript collection of the Burgerbibliothek had its beginnings in the early sixteenth century and was greatly expanded by bequests made in the early seventeenth century (such as that of the library of Jacques Bongars [†1612]). According to Hagen (*ibid.*, p. viii-1) the donated collections had a largely French provenience, but unlike many other texts in the library, there is no explicit indication of the previous owners of this manuscript.

<sup>14</sup> A complete description of this manuscript can be found in the introduction to *Victoris Tunnunensis Chronicon : cum reliquiis ex Consularibus Caesaraugustanis et Iohannis Biclarensis Chronicon*, (ed. Carmen CARDELLE DE HARTMANN) (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina, 173A), Turnholt : Brepols, 2001, p. 27-38. It is also briefly discussed in Carmen CARDELLE DE HARTMANN, « The textual transmission of the Mozarabic Chronicle of 754, » *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999), p. 13- 29, here p. 19-20.

<sup>15</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 60-61, 77-79, 83, 88, 90-93.

P2 Paris, BnF, ms. lat. 5014, ff. 44v-74v.<sup>17</sup>

s. XII<sup>ex</sup>, praegothica.

Extracts of red.  $\alpha$ : *Cronica id est series temporum collata de diuersis libris a Richardo Pictauiensi monacho Cluniacensi*. Richard's work is prefaced by extracts of several historical works (Hugh of Fleury, Isidore of Seville's *Etymologies* and Augustine's *City of God*) and is followed by two papal privileges granted to Cluny and numerous short unidentified annals and chronicles (including some passages from Isidore and Bede).

France.<sup>18</sup>

P3 Paris, BnF, ms. lat. 6237, ff. 2-6, 19r-35r.<sup>19</sup>

s. XII<sup>ex</sup>, praegothica.

Extracts of red.  $\beta$ , or sources for expansion into red.  $\beta$ ; followed by extracts from Jerome's translation of Eusebius' chronicle, the prophecies of Ambrosius Merlinus, and hymn.

Unknown origin, possibly England.<sup>20</sup>

P4 Paris, BnF, ms. lat. 17556, ff. 485-500.<sup>21</sup>

s. XVII, cursiva.

Extracts of red.  $\alpha$  and  $\chi$ : *Chronica Richardi monachi cluniacensis ab initio mundi ad annum usque MCLXXIII*. Entitled and transcribed from the conclusions of P2 and R4, by André Duchesne.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> The manuscript entered the library of Étienne BALUZE (†1718) and subsequently the Royal French Library (which became the core of the manuscript collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France) as attested by the library shelfmarks noted on f. 1r. Baluze's limited description can be found in his *Bibliothecae Baluzianae. Pars Tertia: Codices Manuscriptos, Diplomata, et Collectanea* (without editor or place), 1719, n°. 357. For further information about Baluze's library, see Lucien AUVRAY and René POUPARDIN, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Collection Baluze*, Paris : E. Leroux, 1921, p. vii-xxii.

<sup>17</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 56-58; KÜHL, (art. cit. n. 1), p. 82-83. Edmond MARTÈNE printed ff. 68v- 74v with minor changes in *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima collectio*, ix vols, Paris : Montalant, 1724- 1738, V, col. 1160-1174.

<sup>18</sup> BERGER (*ibid.*) conjectured that Richard brought this manuscript to Poitou (ca. 1159) where it remained until the seventeenth century. Shelfmarks on f. 1r evidence that the text entered the collection of Jacques-Auguste de Thou (†1617), the library of Jean-Baptiste Colbert (†1683) and the French Royal Library.

<sup>19</sup> This manuscripts is well described by Jean-Marie MARTINS, «Une histoire peu connue de Richard Guiscard.» *Archivio storico pugliese* 31 (1978), p. 47-66, who focuses solely on the Guiscard section and does not treat the extracts on King Arthur and Merlin taken from Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*. See also KÜHL, (art. cit. n. 1), p. 83.

<sup>20</sup> Shelfmarks (f. 1r) for the Colbertine library and the French *Bibliothecae Regis* indicate that the manuscript was in France by the seventeenth century. On paleographic grounds it is impossible to distinguish the text as English; the only basis for assigning an English provenience is the inclusion of a hymn written in *minuscula anglosaxonica* (f. 36) which seems to have been glued to the manuscript after its modern binding.

<sup>21</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 64-65.

<sup>22</sup> The identification of André Duchesne's hand is made by Léopold DELISLE, *Inventaire des Manuscrits latins de Notre Dame et d'autres fonds, sous les numéros, 16719-18613*, Paris : A Durand, 1874, p. 53; reprinted in

- Paris, France.<sup>23</sup>
- P5 Paris, BnF, ms. n.a.l. 670, f. 1r-114v.<sup>24</sup>
- s. XII<sup>2</sup>, praegothica  
 Red. β: *Chronica Richardi Pictavensis, Cluniacensis monachi, de diversis libris collecta*.  
 Origin unknown, possibly Monte Cassino, Italy.<sup>25</sup>
- Pg Perugia, Biblioteca Comunale Augusta, ms. 681 (*olim* I, 75; no. 16015), ff. 16v-92r.<sup>26</sup>
- s. XIV/XV  
*Dedicatio*, red. ε: *Chronica Richardi*. Richard's work is prefaced by the *Liber Hyeronimi de viris illustribus* and is followed by an updated catalogue of popes, an additional anonymous chronicle and a list of the kings and consuls of Rome, the Lombard princes and Roman Emperors.  
 Unknown origin, possibly Italy.<sup>27</sup>
- R1 Roma, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Borghes. 313, ff. 1r-32r.<sup>28</sup>

---

*Inventaire des manuscrits latins conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale sous les numéros 8823-18613*, New York : Georg Verlag, 1974.

<sup>23</sup> On the first page of his draft (f. 585r) Duchesne notes that his source manuscripts were in the collections of Paul Petau and Jacques-Auguste de Thou: *Nos vetera, quae Caroli Calvi regnum praecesserunt ut inutilia ac nimis trita et in aliis chronicis passim reperiuntur, consulto, omisimus. – Ex. bibl. D. Petavii [R4] – In hoc Chronica nulla est praefatio. – In exemplario etiam alio bibliothecae Thuanae [P2] cognominatur Richardus Pictavensis. – Nulla hic praefatio ut in codice domini Petavii*. The majority of the transcriptions in the manuscript were made by Edmond Martène (a Maurist at Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries) who seems to have used Duchesne's notes in the course of preparing his own printed edition of Richard's *Chronica*. On the transfer of parts of Duchesne's library to Saint-Germain-des-Prés, see Nathan EDELMAN, *Attitudes of the Seventeenth Century towards the Middle Ages*, Morningside Heights : King's Crown Press, 1946. The library number of the Maurist Blanc Manteaux (no. 21A, on p. ii) suggests that the tome was later transferred there, before entering into the Bibliothèque Imperiale (stamp on f. 1<sup>bis</sup>) and subsequently becoming part of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (stamp on f. 1r).

<sup>24</sup> This manuscript is briefly described by Henri OMONT, *Nouvelles acquisitions du département des manuscrits pendant les années 1898-1899*, Paris : Ernest Leroux, 1900, p. 12. Neither Berger, Schnack or Waitz were aware of, or consulted this text.

<sup>25</sup> The identification of Monte Cassino as the place of origin is made by Franz Liebermann in a notice, «Aus neueren Handschriftenverzeichnissen. Fortsetzung,» in *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 10 (1885), p. 588-602, here p. 592. My analysis of the manuscript, however, has not identified any evidence to support such a conclusion. LIEBERMANN'S brief description was made while the manuscript was in the collection of the English bibliophile Thomas Phillips (as no. 26644) in the mid-nineteenth century before it was sold to the BnF in 1898. Perhaps Phillips had additional information for this Italian provenience from when and where he acquired it.

<sup>26</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 70-72; Giuseppe MAZZATINTI, *Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. 5, *Perugia, Ravenna, Vigevano*, Forli: Casa Editrice Luigi Bordiniani, 1895, p. 176.

<sup>27</sup> A fifteenth-century hand notes (f. 1r) that the manuscript was a gift to the cloister library of San Domenico di Perugia from *R<sup>mi</sup> M<sup>di</sup> Leonardi*, a reference to the thirty-first master-general of the Dominican Order, Leonardo Mansuetis (†1480). This manuscript was part of his book collection donated to the priory, as recorded in a catalogue dating to 1474/78; see Thomas Käppeli, *Inventari di libri di San Domenico di Perugia (1430-80)*, Rome: Edizioni di Storia de Letteratura, 1982, p. 236.

<sup>28</sup> *Bibliothecae Vaticanae, Codices Borghesiani, recensuit Anneliese Maier*, Città del Vaticano, 1952, p. 357-58.

s. XIII<sup>in</sup>, gothica textualis.

Red. β and *Catalogus Romanorum Pontificum* : *Incipit Chronica Ricardi Pictaviensis. cluniacensis monachi. Ex diversis libris collecta.* Richard's work is followed (ff. 32r-32v) by a short work entitled, *Legendae variae de Pontio Pilato et de historia primi saeculi.*

Unknown origin, probably France.<sup>29</sup>

R2 Roma, BAV, Ottobon. lat. 481, ff. 1r-35v.<sup>30</sup>

s. XIII, gothica textualis.

Red. β and *Catalogus Romanorum Pontificum* : *Incipit Chronica Ricardi Pictaviensis. cluniacensis monachi. Ex diversis libris collecta.* Richard's works are followed by Hugh of Saint-Victor's *Soliloquium de arra anime* and *De archa Noe.*

Unknown origin, likely France.<sup>31</sup>

R3 Roma, BAV, Ottobon. lat. 750, ff. 1r-74r.<sup>32</sup>

s. XIV/ XV, gothica textualis.

*dedicatio*, red. ∂ : untitled. Richard's work is followed by various historical writings, including an anonymous treatise on the six ages of man, Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne*, extracts from the annals of Touraine, a catalogue of popes, a genealogy of the kings of France, and crusade materials. The manuscript finishes with a lengthy chronicle of Tours (ff. 130-264v).

Unknown origin, likely France.<sup>33</sup>

R4 Roma, BAV, Regin. lat. 1911, ff. 1r-91v, 98v-103v.<sup>34</sup>

s. XIII<sup>ex</sup>/ XIV<sup>in</sup>, gothica textualis libraria.

---

<sup>29</sup> This manuscript is recorded as no. 1141 of Urban V's Avignon library catalogue dating to 1369 (*ibid*, p. 358), which would make it the single Vatican manuscript to which Barthomeus Platina (†1481) would have had access. This library catalogue describes, *Item cronica Ricardi Pictaviensis, cooperta postibus sine pelle, qui incipit in secundo folio « apostolice » et finit in penultimo folio « tiberim »* ; Maurice Faucon, *La Librarie des Papes d'Avignon : sa formation, sa composition, ses catalogues (1316-1420)*, Paris : E. Thorin, 1886, p. 189.

<sup>30</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 59-60.

<sup>31</sup> An owner's mark (f. 1r) indicates that the manuscript entered the library of Paul Petau (†1614), a Parisian *savant*, bibliophile, and colleague of André Duchesne. This manuscript was subsequently acquired for the collection of Christine, the Queen of Sweden as no. 158 sometime before 1634 ; for a history of this collection, see André WILMART, *Codices Regineses Latini*, Vatican City : Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1937, vol. 1. Bernard de MONTFAUCON's 1739 printed catalogue gives evidence that this manuscript was transferred to the BAV by the early eighteenth century along with R4 ; *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum Manuscriptorum nova*, Paris : Briasson, 1739 (rpt. Hildesheim: Verlag, 1982), I, p. 17.

<sup>32</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 66-70.

<sup>33</sup> This manuscript served as the basis for Jean Mabillon's transcription (no longer extant) which was printed by Martin BOUQUET, as *Ex Chronico Richardi Pictaviensis, monachi Cluniacensis*, in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, Paris, 1781, VII, 258; IX, 21; X, 263; XI, 258; XII; 411-421, which suggests it was in France at least until the seventeenth century.

<sup>34</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 63-65.

Red.  $\chi$ , *Catalogus Romanorum Pontificum*, and *Cardinales Romae: Chronica id est series temporum Richardi monachi cluniacensis* (title added by André Duchesne in the seventeenth century). Richard's *Chronica* is followed by a brief extract from an annal, his treatise on the Roman cardinals, and the his *Catalogus*. The manuscript finishes with the *Constitutions of King Louis IX* (ff. 103v-105v).  
Unknown origin, likely France.<sup>35</sup>

T Tours, Bibliothèque Municipale, no. 993, ff. 4-7.<sup>36</sup>

1363 (dated on f. 65r : *Urbani, papas quinti, anno primo*), gothica textualis.<sup>37</sup>  
Extracts of red.  $\beta$ : *Chronice abbreviate sive Actus Romanorum pontificum, extracte de cronicis venerabilis et religiosi viri fratris Ricardi, monachi Cluniacensis*. These extracts follow a few short prayers, and preface Amaur Augier de Bezier's *Chronice compendiose summorum pontificum bone et utiles*. Bound to the end of the chronicle at a later date is a decree from the council of Basil against Eugenius IV, dated 1439. Cathedral of Saint-Gatien, Tours, France.<sup>38</sup>

V Vienna, Staatsarchiv, W 0402 (*olim*, n<sup>o</sup>. 787; n<sup>o</sup> 23, Universale), ff. 1r-49r.<sup>39</sup>

s. XV, gothica formata.

Red.  $\beta$ : *Incipiunt cronicum fratris Richardi Pict. ordinis Cluniacensis*. The chronicle is continued until 1264 with extracts from the chronicle of Martin of Troppau.

Unknown origin. The manuscript was once owned by Georg Hacke (from Slesia, Poland), bishop of Trient, who gave it as a gift in 1457 to Ladislaus, king of Bohemia, Hungary and Croatia.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> An owners' mark, *Petrus Paumier regis consiliarius* (f. 104v) indicates its French provenience and the presence of André Duchesne's marginal notations throughout suggests that the manuscript remained in France (likely Paris) at least until the early seventeenth century. The manuscript passed into the hands of the Swedish Queen (as no. 162), who transferred much of her manuscript collection to the BAV in the early eighteenth century; see Bernard de MONTFAUCON (art. cit. n. 31), p. 17. On the dissolution of Duchesne's library, see Nathan EDELMAN, (art. cit. n. 23).

<sup>36</sup> A. DORANGE, *Catalogue Descriptif et Raisonné des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Tours*, Tours : Imprimerie Jules Bouserez, 1875, p. 432-33.

<sup>37</sup> On f. 65, we find the comment, *Explicit hujusmodi nova compilatio facta apud Avinionem, anno a nativitate Domini MCCCLXIII, in die sancti archangeli Michaelis, mensis septembris, et pontificatus... Urbani, pape quinti, anno primo*; see also *Catalogue générale des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France: Tours*, vol. 37, Paris : Librairie E. Plon, Nourrit et Cie, 1905.

<sup>38</sup> DORANGE (art. cit. n. 36), p. 433 notes that it was transferred to the municipal library during the nineteenth-century.

<sup>39</sup> Constantin Edler VON BÖHM: *Die Handschriften des kaiserlichen und königlichen Haus-, Hof- und Staats-Archivs*, Wien : Willhelm Braumüller, 1873, p. 244-45.

<sup>40</sup> BERGER (art. cit. n. 1), p. 62, notes the dedication, *Iste liber fuit olim Ladislav filii Alberti ducis Austrie, et Romanorum, Hungarie et Bohemie regis, et Elisabeth filie Sigismundi filii Karoli IV suprascriptorum regnorum regine et quondam predecessori nostro Domino ... Georgio Heke de Slesia donatus in distributione rerum suarum monilium ac clendiorum una cum pychario deaurato quodam ad instar calicis formato, 1457, tempore julii*.

## Editions

BERGER, Élie, ed. Appendix to « Richard le Poitevin, moine de Cluny, historien et poète ». In *Notice sur Divers Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Vaticane. Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*. Fasc. 6. Toulouse : A. Chauvin & Fils, 1879, p. 45-140.

- Dedication and extracts of redactions A, B, C, D (Berger's stemma).

BOUQUET, Martin, ed. Ex Chronico Richardi Pictaviensis, monachi Cluniacensis. In *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*. Paris, 1781; rpt. 1869, VII, 258; IX, 21; X, 263; XI, 258; XII, 411-421.

- Extracts of Roma, BAV. Ottobon. 750 from copy made by Jean Mabillon.

MARTÈNE, Edmond, and André DURAND, eds. *Veterum scriptorum et monumentorum ecclesiasticorum et dogmaticorum amplissima collectio*. 9 vols. Paris, Montalant, 1724-1738, V, col. 1160-1174.

- Extracts of Paris, BnF, ms. lat. 5014.

MURATORI, Ludovicus, ed. *Antiquitates Italicae medii aevi*. 4 vols. Milan, 1738-1743, IV, col. 1075-1104.

- Introduction and Extracts from Roma, BAV, ottobon. lat. 481.

WAITZ, George, ed. *Ex Richardi Pictaviensis Chronica. MGH SS*, Hanover, 1882, XXVI, p. 74-84.

- Dedication and extracts of redactions A-E (Waitz's stemma).