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Abstract

Recent scholarship emphasises that the exercise of political power by royal and aristocratic medieval women was commonplace. Building upon this work, my thesis examines the life of Adelaide of Turin (c.1014/24-1091), who inherited, and ruled, the mark of Turin. Her importance has often been overlooked however, particularly in Anglophone historiography. Older scholarship tends to focus on Adelaide in terms of her connection with the Savoyard dynasty (who later became kings of Italy), or on the rise of regional states. These traditional histories do not take account of the central issues with which I am concerned: gender and cultures of power. In focusing on Adelaide – and gender – my thesis illuminates wider issues, relating to the exercise of power in the eleventh century, as well as to imperial politics, and religious change.

Part I of the thesis considers Adelaide’s role in dynastic and imperial politics. Particular attention is paid to Adelaide’s acquisition and maintenance of power, and to the marital alliances forged between Adelaide’s dynasty and the imperial family. Through focusing on Adelaide key political events are reassessed, including two crises in the reign of her son-in-law, Henry IV of Germany (his attempt to repudiate his wife in 1069, and the events at Canossa in 1077). Revising the commonly held view that Adelaide and her dynasty had close ties with Savoy, Part II focuses on Adelaide’s power in Turin. Adelaide’s religious patronage and support of monastic reform are examined, as are her dealings with her officers and administration, her relationship with local elites, and her role in the administration of justice. Adelaide dominated the political landscape of Turin, and played key roles in imperial and papal politics. She was such an important non-royal ruler that (in preference to the more usual term, ‘lordly woman’) she is best described as a ‘princely woman’.
INTRODUCTION

In the later eleventh century, Adelaide of Turin (c.1014/24-1091), ruler of the mark of Turin, was one of the most important women not only in northern Italy, but within the German empire. She was the daughter of a powerful margrave – Olderic-Manfred of Turin (r.c.1000-1033/4) – whose lands she inherited. The margravial title was transmitted in succession to each of Adelaide’s three husbands – Hermann IV of Swabia (r.1036-1038), Henry of Montferrat (r.c.1041-1044), and Otto of Savoy (r.c.1045-1057/60) – then to her eldest son, Peter (r.c.1057/60-1078), and finally to Peter’s son-in-law, Frederick of Montbéliard (r.c.1080-1091). Adelaide shared her power with these men, but she did not relinquish it; she managed to hold, and maintain, her position for more than fifty years. Particularly during her widowhood (c.1060-1091), Adelaide was the real – and acknowledged – ruler of Turin.

Although not royal herself, Adelaide was closely related to the Salian dynasty, which ruled the kingdoms of Germany, Italy, and Burgundy (1024-1125). Thanks to her landed resources and family connections, Adelaide exercised supra-regional, trans-Alpine, influence, and was a key player in imperial and papal politics from the mid-eleventh century onwards. This thesis is the first full-scale study of Adelaide for more than two-hundred-and-fifty years, and the first to consider her in detail in English for more than one-hundred years. Although biographical in approach, this thesis is not a biography: the surviving sources are too scanty, and give little access to Adelaide’s interior life.\(^1\) It is, instead, a study of the interplay of power, politics and gender as exemplified in Adelaide’s rule.

Female rulers were an unusual, but not unique, phenomenon in the central Middle Ages.\(^2\) In eleventh-century Italy a number of women can be observed who, through their own

---


1

2
actions, determined that possessions would remain within their family; who transmitted lordship to other members of their family; and who, in certain cases, were themselves rulers. Adelaide of Turin’s activities are particularly well-documented, but other women in her family, including her mother, Bertha of Milan, and her sisters, Immilla and Bertha of Turin, were similarly active in Piedmont and Liguria.3 Two of Adelaide’s contemporaries, Beatrice of Tuscany (c.1020-1076),4 and her daughter Matilda of Tuscany (1046-1115), ruled large territories for extensive periods of time.5 The prominence of these women challenges assumptions, both medieval and modern, about the position of women in eleventh-century society and their relationship to power and authority.

The thesis is divided into two parts, focusing first on Adelaide’s role in dynastic and imperial politics, and second on her regional power. By identifying the people and networks involved in constructing, but also qualifying, Adelaide’s power, this thesis considers how she gained and maintained her position as ruler of Turin. Part I deals with Adelaide’s kinship networks, and their role both in Adelaide’s inheritance and succession in Turin (chapter 1), and in her involvement in imperial politics, including marital alliances, political diplomacy and military campaigns (chapters 2-3). Part II considers Adelaide’s fluctuating ability to win local and regional support in Turin by examining her correspondence with important churchmen, her interactions with churchmen and monasteries in Turin (chapters 4 and 7), and her dealings with local secular elites, including iudices, viscounts and castle-lords in Turin (chapters 5-7).

This introduction sets out the framework within which to view the rest of the thesis, by giving overviews of previous research into Adelaide, and the eleventh-century context

3 Chapter 1; Appendix 2; Bonanate, ‘Funzione’; Goez, ‘Typ,’ 170ff.
4 Goez, Beatrix; Bertolini, ‘Beatrice’.
5 Hay, Leadership; Eads, ‘Mighty’; Reynolds, ‘Reading’; Studi matildici I-III; Golinelli, Matilde; CISAM, Matilde; Overmann, Mathilde; Goez, Mathilde. The focus on Matilda is attributable to her extensive charter collection (n.138 below); and her prominence in contemporary narrative sources, due to her literary patronage and her relationship with Gregory VII.
within which she operated. The historiography of elite medieval women is discussed, with a
particular emphasis on: periodisations in women’s power; the roles and functions of elite
laywomen; and female lordship. Finally, the sources upon which this thesis is based are
summarised.

**Previous research into Adelaide**

Adelaide is not well-known, even among medieval historians. Research has primarily been
carried out in a regional context by scholars from Piedmont. There are two key strands to
this work. The first is genealogical and prosopographical. This is evident as far back as
Giovanni Tommaso Terraneo’s *La principessa Adelaide: contessa di Torino* (1759) – still the
only published monograph devoted to Adelaide – which attempted to establish the origins of
Adelaide’s dynasty. This genealogical emphasis continued throughout the nineteenth and
twentieth centuries, focusing particularly on the identities of Adelaide’s husbands. Recent
work by Enrico Bonanate, examining the marriages of Adelaide and her dynasty, is squarely
within this tradition. Chapters 1-2 of this thesis also focus on Adelaide’s kin, but the
approach is new, particularly the emphasis on Adelaide’s imperial connections, and her
relationships with her female kin.

Adelaide’s relationship with her third husband, Otto of Savoy, is central to most
genealogical studies of Adelaide, which anticipate the rise of the House of Savoy. This
dynasty, descended from Adelaide and Otto, ruled Piedmont from the twelfth century
onwards, and later, the kingdoms of Sicily (1713-1720), Sardinia (r.1720-1861), and Italy

---

8 For the view that Adelaide only married Otto: de Gerbaix Sonnaz, *Studi*, 215ff.; Renaux, *Marquis*, 52; only Otto
9 Bonanate, ‘Reti’.
(1861-1946). Nineteenth-century work on Adelaide was typically carried out by men who owed their position to Savoyard rulers; the Savoyard focus of their work is thus unsurprising. This emphasis diminished with the advent of professional historians, but did not disappear: the only English work to discuss Adelaide in any detail is Charles Previté-Orton’s *The Early History of the House of Savoy* (1912);¹¹ more recent work by Giuseppe Sergi and Laurent Ripart also considers Adelaide in connection with the House of Savoy.¹² This thesis, by contrast, revises the commonly held view of close ties between Adelaide and Savoy in the eleventh century, and focuses instead on her connections with the imperial dynasty (chapters 1-3), and her rule in Turin (chapters 4-7).

The second strand of research considers Adelaide in connection with political and territorial developments in Piedmont. Early exponents of this approach were Iacopo Durandi (1739-1817),¹³ and Cornelio Desimoni (1813-1899).¹⁴ Among modern scholars Sergi, whose key focus is on the transformation of the political landscape in the sub-Alpine area, has written about Adelaide in the most detail.¹⁵ A subset within this strand of research are local historical studies, which often pay tangential attention to Adelaide.¹⁶ Part II of this thesis is particularly concerned with Adelaide’s political activities in Turin.

For all her importance, Adelaide has been largely overlooked by Anglophone historians (with the notable exception of Previté-Orton) and, even in Italian, there is little recent work on Adelaide. The nine-hundredth anniversary of Adelaide’s death (1991) prompted the publication of a collection of Italian essays: some focussed on Adelaide in detail;¹⁷ others considered Adelaide as part of her dynasty;¹⁸ but many were only loosely

¹¹ Previté-Orton, *History*.
¹⁵ Sergi, *Confini*, chs.3-5; Sergi, ‘Secolo’.
connected with Adelaide, if at all. In Italian scholarship Adelaide has also been discussed – sometimes in detail – in studies which are not primarily concerned with her, or her dynasty. These include studies of monastic institutions; of notarial practices; of local elites in Turin; of specific cities; and of specific churchmen.

In general, previous research on Adelaide has not taken account of the central issues with which this thesis is concerned: gender and cultures of power. An exception is the work of Elke Goez. Goez predominantly studies Beatrice of Tuscany and her daughter Matilda of Tuscany, but in two articles Goez compares and contrasts several high-ranking eleventh-century women, including Beatrice and Matilda, Adelaide of Turin and her female relatives, and women from the Welf dynasty. Goez argues that the nature and scope of these women’s cultural, symbolic and religious activities indicates the emergence of ‘a new type of European princess’ (*ein neuer Typ der europäischen Fürstin*). Goez makes many important points, but her arguments are problematic for several reasons. First, many of the activities Goez identifies as characteristic of these princesses – such as their literary and religious patronage – are not new at all (as Goez partially acknowledges in her most recent article), nor are they exclusively female, nor princely. Second, within her category of princesses Goez conflates queens with noblewomen, and ruling women with consorts. Perhaps for this reason, Goez fails to fully appreciate some of the more distinctive features of female rulers such as

---

20 Casiraghi, ‘Chiusa’; Sereno, ‘Monasteri’.
21 Cancian, ‘Cartatio’; Olivieri, ‘Geografia’.
22 See p.145 n.3.
25 For discussion of high-ranking eleventh-century Italian women more generally: Skinner, *Women*, ch.5; Skinner, ‘Sikelgaita’; and, with caution, Golinelli, ‘Matilde’; de Matteis, ‘Ruoli’. Lazzari, ‘Potere’ and Sergi, ‘Matilde’ were not available to me.
26 Above nn.4-5; DD MT; Goez, ‘Markgrafen’; Goez, ‘Herrschaft’; Goez, ‘Welf’; Goez, ‘Matilde’.
27 Goez, ‘Typ’; Goez, ‘Mitteln’. (In the latter article, Goez modifies/qualifies some of her earlier assertions, but makes essentially the same argument.) Goez is preparing a study of Adelaide for publication.
29 Adelaide of Rheinfelden, wife of King Ladislaus I of Hungary (r.1077-1095); and, arguably, Adelaide of Savoy, wife of Rudolf of Rheinfelden, anti-king of Germany (r.1077-1079).
Adelaide, or Matilda of Tuscany, who inherited and ruled domains, administered justice, and engaged in military activities. Finally, as shall be seen, Goez’s comments on Adelaide are often inaccurate.  

Gender and power  

Gender history is the study not simply of women and men at different times and places, but of perceived differences between the sexes, and of the ways in which women and men’s roles and activities are primarily socially, rather than biologically, determined. Gender relations tend to be viewed as relations of power, and how these are constructed, maintained, and/or undermined. Studies of elite medieval women, particularly by Anglophone scholars, thus frequently focus on their power, authority and/or agency. Power is usually understood as the ability to act, or to influence and/or compel others to carry out one’s will. Conventional definitions of power – concerned primarily with ‘hard’ power, such as politics, force and violence – tend to exclude women. Wider definitions of power – which emphasise ‘softer’ forms of power, such as persuasion, threats, and manipulation of information – are more inclusive. Similarly inclusive are definitions of power as based on complex networks of asymmetrical and impermanent interrelationships, which are subject to constant re-negotiation, both by those with power, and those in more subordinate positions.

Post-structuralist concerns about the term ‘power’ mean that some scholars prefer to use ‘agency’ (or ‘margin to act’) when referring to medieval women’s ability to act.

30 Chapter 1, nn.144, 165, 171, 185; chapter 4 nn.101, 153, 194, 205.  
32 Scott, ‘Gender’; Scott, ‘Still’?; Connell, Gender; Butler, Gender; the contributions in: Davis, Gender.  
33 e.g. Stafford, ‘Emma,’ 10ff.; Huneycutt, ‘Power’; Fößel, ‘Frauen’; the contributions in: Erler/Kowaleski, Women; Erler/Kowaleski, Gendering; Fradenburg, Women; Carpenter/MacLean, Power; Finger, Macht; Zey, Mächtige. Studies of powerful medieval men, or of male rulership, are generally less concerned with defining power/authority.  
35 Popitz, Phänomene, 24-27, 33ff., 43; Mann, Sources. Cf. Nye, Powers, on ‘smart’ power as a third way between hard and soft power.  
36 Sofksy/Paris, Figurationen, 12.
independently and exert their own will.\textsuperscript{37} This concept is, however, not without its detractors.\textsuperscript{38} Notably, since medieval men are still most frequently discussed in terms of power/authority, referring to ‘women’s agency’ perpetuates the view that medieval women’s capacity to act was somehow different from men’s. Elite medieval women’s autonomy and ability to act was often circumscribed by comparison with that of their male peers. Yet, as we shall see, many of the bases of male and female power were the same in the eleventh century, and there were gendered and non-gendered aspects to Adelaide’s rule.

Authority is a subset of power: whereas power is the ability to act, authority is the legitimate or socially-recognised right to act (or rule).\textsuperscript{39} There is some disagreement among historians regarding the extent to which medieval women possessed authority. Some women, such as abbesses, and perhaps queens, held offices;\textsuperscript{40} others gained authority through their positions as wives and mothers.\textsuperscript{41} Heiresses, such as Adelaide, lacked the legitimacy of public office, but possessed authority in connection with their landed possessions, and their dynastic connections.\textsuperscript{42}

\textit{Contexts}

In addition to questions of gender and power, Adelaide’s rule must be considered against the backdrop of wider social, political and religious changes in eleventh-century Europe, particularly: the so-called ‘feudal revolution’ (discussed below); the Church reform movement;\textsuperscript{43} and the conflict between papacy and empire (the so-called ‘Investiture

\begin{flushleft}
38 In general: \textit{Sax, God, esp. 93ff.; Johnson, ‘Agency’; Kuehn, ‘Gender,’ }58ff. \\
39 \textit{Weber, Economy, esp. 215f.; Popitz, Phänomene, }27-29, 32. \\
40 See below, pp.57f. \\
41 \textit{Stafford, ‘Emma,’ }12f.; \textit{Earenfight, Queenship, }12; \textit{Tanner, ‘Queenship’; Rogge, ‘Mächtige,’ }453; \textit{Reinle, ‘Macht’}. \\
42 Chapter 1. \\
43 Chapter 4.
\end{flushleft}
Controversy’). All three of these concepts have been heavily revised – if not outright rejected – in recent historiography.

The ‘feudal revolution’ (or ‘mutation’) refers to social and political changes thought to have taken place, particularly in France, c. 1000. According to this model, the collapse of royal power in the early tenth century led, in the early eleventh century, to the emergence of a new type of lordship. This ‘private’ lordship, usurped from royal power, was marked by violence, exploitation, and the violation of customary rights. The nature, timing, and geographical range of these changes have been greatly debated. Yet it is still difficult to discuss the central Middle Ages without reference to the feudal revolution. Of particular relevance here are questions about the applicability of this model to Italy, and its impact on women.

Since the ‘feudal revolution’ has primarily been seen as a French phenomenon, there has been less discussion of this in relation to Italy. Yet, as in France, the kingdom of Italy underwent a series of dramatic political changes in the tenth and eleventh centuries, which undermined its institutional stability. These included the incorporation of Italy into the German empire (962); subsequent, unsuccessful, attempts to impose a non-German Italian king; the burning of the former royal palace at Pavia (1024); and the Italian wars of the 1080s. From 1024 Italy was ruled by the Salian dynasty (to whom Adelaide was related by marriage), but noble Italian dynasties increasingly took the place of the sovereign within their

---

44 See chapter 3.
46 Duby, Société, esp. 137-190; Duby, Chivalrous; Bonnasse, Slavery (esp. Bonnassie, ‘Rhône’); Bois, Transformation; Bisson, ‘Revolution’; Bisson, Crisis; Poly/Bournazel, Feudal.
47 The classic debate is: Bisson, ‘Revolution’; with replies by Barthelemy, White, Reuter, and Wickham, ‘Debate’. Also: Barthelemy, ‘Mutation’; Barthélemy, Serf; Barton, Lordship; White, ‘Feuding’; White, ‘Mâcon’; West, Reframing; Bowman, Landmarks; the contributions in Bisson, Power.
48 Barbero, ‘Polemica’; Carocci, ‘Signoria’.
49 On tenth/eleventh-century Italy: Sergi, ‘Kingdom’; Sergi, Confini; Tabacco, ‘Italy’; Tabacco, Struggle; Keller, Adelsherrschaft; Pauker, Regnum; Formazione e strutture, I-III.
50 Below p.34.
51 Chapter 3.
own territories. Some scholars, notably Chris Wickham, emphasise the similarity of the processes at work in Italy and France, particularly the increasing distinction between private (or ‘signorial’) lordship and Carolingian royal/aristocratic power. A key difference, in Italy, was the successful development of urban communes from the late eleventh century, and their survival into the thirteenth. Although increasing urbanisation is the key to much of Italian medieval history, such developments were less marked in Piedmont. Nevertheless, Adelaide is most frequently documented in cities, and – as we shall see – came into conflict with the nascent commune of Asti (chapter 6).

The changing nature of political structures in this period, accompanied by changes in dynastic structures, were once thought to have been detrimental to women’s rights, as power became increasingly masculine and militaristic. Yet it is increasingly argued that ‘the logic of lordship in this period was advantageous to elite women’. Struggles for dynastic power and territory in the tenth- and eleventh-century often resulted in women being given greater rights, and shares, of family property. This was not for their own sakes, but rather because it benefitted their dynasty as a whole. Nevertheless, it meant that some women, such as Adelaide, had greater opportunities to exercise lordship directly.

**Historiography of elite medieval laywomen**

Research on elite medieval laywomen has been undertaken throughout the early modern and modern periods, but the focus was often on so-called ‘exceptional’ women, such as Matilda of Tuscany or Joan of Arc, or tangential, in relation to the legal sphere and family

---


54 On changing dynastic structures: chapter 1, nn.14-19.


56 Bowman, ‘Countesses’ (quote: p.66); also Jordan, *Women*; Stafford, ‘Mutation’.

From the 1970s, and particularly the 1980s/1990s, scholars, especially Anglophone scholars, began to consider issues of gender, power, and status in relation to medieval women. Research carried out by, among others, Jinty Nelson, Pauline Stafford, Jo Ann McNamara and Suzanne Wemple, fundamentally altered the way royal and noblewomen in the earlier Middle Ages were viewed. Their work has been built-on and refined in recent decades, notably by Simon MacLean, Amy Livingstone and Kimberly LoPrete. Perhaps because of the language-barrier, there have been relatively few Anglophone studies of elite Italian women.

German and Italian scholars were, in general, slower to focus on women’s/gender studies than Anglophone historians. There were some studies of elite medieval women in the 1980s, but this did not become routine in Italy until the late 1990s/early 2000s. There is still a bias towards studies of urban women, and later medieval women in Italian scholarship. The professional historians, particularly in Germany, who first interpreted medieval sources, tended to focus on legal, political and constitutional history (Rechts- und Verfassungsgeschichte), based on diplomatic (rather than narrative) sources.

---

Nineteenth/early twentieth-century assumptions of politics as the sphere of men meant that many of these (male) historians were already predisposed to exclude women from medieval politics; the study of diplomatic sources – in which women appear infrequently – confirmed this view. It was not until the 1990s, stimulated by an interest in rituals, non-traditional political history, and nichthistoriographische Quellen (non-diplomatic sources), that studies of medieval women/gender became more frequent in German scholarship. A notable exception to this is a long-standing interest in the wives of German rulers, particularly from the Ottonian and Salian dynasties (tenth-eleventh centuries).

**Continuity and change**

In an influential article, first published in 1973, McNamara and Wemple presented a chronology of medieval women and power. They argued that in the earlier Middle Ages power was located in the household, and politics was family-based. Women were thus able to play key roles in gaining power for themselves and their family members. According to McNamara/Wemple, from the eleventh century onwards changing kinship and administrative structures led to the emergence of a public sphere, and women were marginalised from politics and the public exercise of power. McNamara/Wemple’s thesis was attractive to many scholars because it complemented other influential strands of eleventh-century historiography: including the Church reform movement, the ‘feudal revolution’, and changes

---

69 Stuard, ‘Fashions,’ 66f.
70 Baumgärtner, ‘Sicht’; Goetz, ‘Geschlechtsgeschichte’; Lundt, ‘Genderforschung’; the contributions in: Affeldt, Frauen; Korsch/Kuhn/Lundt, Lustgarten; Röckelein/Goetz, Frauen-Beziehungsgeflechte; Baltrusch-Schneider/Goetz, Lebensgestaltung.
in the structure of noble families. Notably, Georges Duby argued that in France, c.1050-1235, elite laywomen were able to transmit claims to rule, but did not themselves possess the power (potestas) to command and punish (symbolised by wielding a sword).\textsuperscript{75} According to Duby, these powers were ‘public’, and women were confined to the private, domestic sphere of the household.

Was Adelaide wielding power at a time when it was increasingly difficult for a woman to do so? More recent work has questioned both the timing and extent of elite women’s exclusion from political power.\textsuperscript{76} In particular, the concept of binary public/male and private/female spheres has been heavily critiqued and revised in relation to the medieval political order.\textsuperscript{77} Moreover, some early medievalists argue that women’s power was often more limited in the early Middle Ages than McNamara/Wemple argue.\textsuperscript{78} Other scholars emphasise continuities in women’s power across the tenth-twelfth centuries,\textsuperscript{79} and yet others demonstrate that many elite women were politically active both during and after the rise of administrative kingship.\textsuperscript{80}

Geography matters, too. Scholars of German (and Frankish\textsuperscript{81}) queens are more likely to highlight changes in women’s power across the long tenth century than scholars of Italian queens. In ninth- and tenth-century Italy the title of consors regni expressed Italian queens’ special status,\textsuperscript{82} as did their extensive dower goods (which were exceptionally large in comparison with other European queens’).\textsuperscript{83} The decline of the Italian kingdom, and its

\textsuperscript{75} Duby, ‘Women,’ esp. 72-75.
\textsuperscript{80} Johns, Noblewomen; LoPrete, ‘Ironies’; Shadis, ‘Blanche’; Mitchell, ‘Lady’; the contributions in: Evergates, Aristocratic; Zey, Mächtige.
\textsuperscript{81} MacLean, ‘Queenship’; MacLean, ‘Marriages’; MacLean, ‘Cross-Channel’.
\textsuperscript{82} Mor, ‘Consors’; Delogu, ‘Consors’; la Rocca, ‘Consors’; Tondini, ‘Consors’
incorporation into the German empire in the mid-tenth century, marked the end of Italian queens’ political centrality. By contrast, German queens/empresses gained greater political power from the mid-tenth century onwards, and scholars emphasise continuities in their power across the tenth- and eleventh centuries. The increasing powers of German queens/empresses can be seen particularly in the successful regencies of empresses Adelaide (d.999) and Theophanu (d.991). The presence of these powerful empresses normalised female power, and this could be built upon not only by subsequent queens/empresses but by other women, too. This was the case not only in tenth-century Germany, but also in Italy, where women such as Bertha of Tuscany (d.925) and the senatrix Marozia (d.937) exercised direct political power.

**Roles and functions**

Questions regarding the roles, functions and power available to elite women are central to most historiography on the subject. Pauline Stafford’s concept of women’s ‘lifecycles’ – which emphasises that medieval women, at all levels of society, were defined by their marital, as well as their social, status in a way that men were not – has been particularly influential. Many women derived status from their roles as wife and mother, but widowhood was a particularly important life stage, in terms of laywomen’s autonomy and access to power. Most scholars highlight the similarities between the roles and power of royal women and noblewomen, arguing (explicitly or implicitly) that gender cuts across class,
and that all elite women engaged in comparable activities. There were also differences: most notably the sacral attributes bestowed on royal women by coronation and consecration. Studies of queens thus differ from studies of noblewomen in their focus on questions of queenship-as-office, and queens’ status as consors regni.

Many studies highlight elite laywomen’s role as intercessors, and particularly the way in which they manipulated their status as wife/mother to gain influence. Equally, women’s roles as religious and cultural patrons are often examined. Women’s patronage was often gendered in a different way from men’s: women were particularly associated with commemorative acts, and certain types of gifts (particularly textiles and books) are often seen as specifically feminine. There are also numerous studies of the gendered way in which female authority is represented, both textually and in visual images such as miniatures, coins and seals. Elke Goez and Paolo Golinelli have recently emphasised many of these points in their studies on the power of eleventh-century Italian noblewomen, including Adelaide of Turin. Representations of female authority, intercession and female patronage, are also considered – and critiqued – in this thesis (chapters 1, 3-4).

94 Below, pp.57f.
95 Vogelsang, Herrscherin; Erkens, ‘Herrscherin’; Fößel, Königin, 56-66; above n.82.
96 Müller-Wiegand, Vermitteln; Althoff, ‘Königsherrschaft,’ 32f.; Althoff, ‘Verwandtschaft,’ 189-197; Baumgartner, ‘Färsprache’.
99 Duby, Women; Fößel, Königin, 222-249; van Houts, Memory, esp. chs.4-5; Geary, Phantoms, 51-54, 60-64.
100 Huneycutt, Matilda, 127ff.; Stafford, Emma, 157f.
101 Below n.163.
103 Goez, ‘Typ’; Goez, ‘Mitteln’; Golinelli, ‘Potere’ (whose arguments are based on old-fashioned essentialism).
Increasingly, the personnel, itinerary and household management of elite women are studied, as a means of demonstrating their role in politics and rule.\textsuperscript{104} Recently there has also been a focus on elite women’s involvement in lordship, particularly in the giving of justice, and warfare.\textsuperscript{105}

\textit{Lordship}

The relationships that medieval lords forged with those around them have long been seen as the key to their power, but understandings of the ways in which this power was exercised have changed.\textsuperscript{106} Previously, the emphasis was on binary, hierarchical relationships between lords and vassals, based on coercion and obligatory action.\textsuperscript{107} Historians also focused on the rise of strong monarchies, and sought in them the origins of the modern political order.\textsuperscript{108} More recently, scholars have questioned the validity of both ‘feudal’ constructs,\textsuperscript{109} and constitutional approaches to medieval government.\textsuperscript{110} Medieval politics is now presumed to have been based on consent, rather than on formal institutions of government.\textsuperscript{111} Scholars tend to analyse multiple co-operative bonds based on kinship, shared interests, and reciprocity,\textsuperscript{112} emphasising the inter-dependence of

\textsuperscript{104} E.g. Stafford, \textit{Emma}; LoPrete, \textit{Adela}.  
\textsuperscript{105} Below, esp. pp.101-108, 252ff.  
\textsuperscript{109} Brown, ‘Tyranny’; Reynolds, \textit{Fiefs}.  
\textsuperscript{110} Reynolds, \textit{Kingdoms}, 1-11; Keller, ‘Grundlagen’.
lords and men, and the importance of local connections, even for trans-regional elites.\textsuperscript{113} Through networks of interconnected groups of individuals and institutions, information was exchanged, and shared interests were built both to overcome conflicts and to promote specific agendas.\textsuperscript{114} Ritual actions and activities (gift-giving, feasting, oath-taking) were staged and utilised to create bonds between lords and their followers. Gerd Althoff, in particular, has demonstrated that ritual language and behaviour were central to the Spielregeln (‘rules of the game’) which constituted the medieval political order in Germany in the central Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{115} The collaborative ideal of consensual lordship often disguised social hierarchies and suppressed tensions: magnates jockeyed for position in a fierce competition for Königsnähe (nearness/access to the king);\textsuperscript{116} and rulers were still able to force their decisions upon their subordinates.\textsuperscript{117}

\textit{Lordly and princely women}

It is increasingly clear that elite laywomen acted as lords and wielded significant political power as a matter of course in the Middle Ages, but lordship is still implicitly gendered male. Female lords – once deemed ‘exceptional’ – have yet to be fully integrated into wider studies of medieval power, particularly as relates to conflict management, or consensual lordship.\textsuperscript{118} To some extent, traditional assumptions about women’s exclusion from the political sphere continue to have a detrimental effect on understandings of medieval women’s activities.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{113} Werner, ‘Important’; White, ‘Pactum’; le Jan, \textit{Famille}, 406-413; the contributions in: Davies/Fouracre, \textit{Property}.
\textsuperscript{114} Haseldine, ‘Networks’; Preiser-Kapeller, ‘Netzwerkanalyse’; Jullien ‘Netzwerkanalyse’.
\textsuperscript{116} Patzold, ‘Spielregeln’.
\textsuperscript{117} Dendorfer, ‘Heinrich’.
\textsuperscript{119} See chapter 3.
Kimberly LoPrete has carried out extensive work on female lordship. LoPrete focuses on northern French noblewomen in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, and particularly on an atypical noblewoman: Adela of Blois (c.1067-1137), daughter of William the Conqueror and Matilda of Flanders. Her research is very much a reaction against that of McNamara/Wemple, and of Duby, on women and power. LoPrete argues particularly strongly against Duby’s anachronistic importation of the public/private dichotomy to the central Middle Ages, emphasising that all medieval lordship was centred on the household, and on tradition and custom, more than on titles and the ability to wield a sword. This domestic core meant that all noblewomen, whatever their marital status or rank, were able to partake in lordship to some extent.

Most laywomen exercised lordship in ill-defined, or transitory roles: wives were involved in their husbands’ rule to varying degrees (although their positions were not equal); women could also exercise more extensive lordly powers as regents (in the absence or death of their husband/other male relative). More rarely, some women – usually heiresses – could rule independently in their own right. Sometimes heiresses were side-lined from power, and their husbands (or sons) ruled in their name, or through their claims. Sometimes heiresses took power and ruled for themselves. A woman’s rule was determined, in the first instance, by her elite status, yet a female lord was often more constrained than a male lord of similar status, because of her gender. Adelaide, for example, did not hold the title of

---

122 LoPrete, Adela, 3; LoPrete, ‘Lady,’ 64, 91, 98.
124 This was common with twelfth-century queens-regnant: Murray, ‘Women’; Corbet, ‘Entre,’ 232ff.; Lambert, ‘Queen’; Martindale, ‘Succession’; Huneycutt, ‘Succession’; Chibnall, Matilda
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margrave herself, but always had a male margrave alongside her. As we shall see, lifecycles also played a significant role in Adelaide’s exercise of power.

In other ways Adelaide’s rule, like that of other female lords, was indistinguishable from her male peers. Extensive charter records and evidence from narrative sources indicates that in the central Middle Ages elite women carried out a variety of lordly activities including: controlling and inheriting property; controlling markets, tolls, and other financial revenues; exercising jurisdiction over fideles and tenants; and controlling military activities. Medieval sources often refer to these women as dominae, which has no exact English equivalent. Dominae often carried out the same activities, and held the same powers, as male lords (domini) but ‘lady’, the English counterpart to lord, does not have these connotations. Some scholars thus prefer to leave domina in the Latin, others suggest ‘female lord’ or ‘lordly woman’ as an alternative.

Through an examination of Adelaide’s activities, this thesis intends to contribute to the historiography of elite medieval laywomen and power in general, and specifically to research on ‘lordly women’. It also aims to refine this literature, by introducing a new category – that of ‘princely women’. Just as there were distinctions between royalty and the nobility, there were also distinctions within the nobility: high-ranking nobles routinely took part in a greater range of activities, over a wider area, than lesser nobles; their status and powers were such that they were sometimes seen as quasi-regal. ‘Prince’ (from príncipes, meaning a pre-eminent non-royal ruler) is the term usually applied to high-ranking noblemen. Thomas Bisson argues that a distinct type of prince emerged in the period c.1050-c.1150 (that

126 See Part II.
is, in the crises of the post-Carolingian world, before the advent of administrative
government). These ‘lord-princes’ held public offices (either lay or religious). They ruled
personally and used subordinates (such as viscounts and *villici*) to rule in localities. Their
judgement and justice was respected and sought-after. They were militarily powerful; and
they negotiated with, and dominated, their *fideles*. They also held great courts and had
dealings with kings and popes. According to Bisson, women as well as men exercised
princely power, but Bisson did not consider the gender-specific characteristics of what he
termed ‘lord-princesses’. In parallel with LoPrete’s ‘lordly women’, this thesis proposes
the term ‘princely women’ in preference to ‘lord-princesses’. This thesis argues that princely
women constituted a real, but not explicitly acknowledged, category in the central medieval
period, and aims to show how Adelaide exemplified this category.

**Sources**

A (relative) abundance of material enables the theoretical and practical limits of Adelaide’s
lordship to be delineated. A substantial appendix to this thesis lists, chronologically: charters
issued by Adelaide; letters written to Adelaide (none written by her survive); and references
to Adelaide in narrative sources, including chronicles and annals. The appendix is based on
late nineteenth/early twentieth century registers compiled by Domenico Carutti, which are
primarily concerned with the counts of Savoy, and on more recent surveys of documents
issued by Adelaide’s dynasty by Patrizia Cancian and Bonanate. My appendix is more
comprehensive: it identifies thirty-seven extant charters (versus Cancian’s thirty-six, and

---

133 Adelaide is referred as *princeps* and *principissa* in: *AH*, V.11(12), 486, 488; VI.4, 544 (*principissa*). Cf. Sagulo, *Ideologia*, 91 n.118.
134 Carutti, *Regesta*; Carutti, ‘Supplemento’.
136 Cancian, ‘Cartario,’ does not provide a list of Adelaide’s documents, so it is unclear where the discrepancy
lies.
Bonanate’s thirty-two), plus thirteen *deperdita*. The appendix also contains entries estimating when key events in Adelaide’s life, for which no documentation is extant, took place (e.g. her birth and those of her children). Since the thesis itself is thematic, the register is intended to act as timeline, providing the fullest possible picture of Adelaide’s life and activities from birth to death.

**Charters**

Numerous charters issued by Adelaide survive, and are published in various editions of the *Biblioteca della società storico subalpina*. Over six decades (1029-1089) Adelaide issued thirty-seven charters (and thirteen *deperdita*): these primarily record donations, but also sales, exchanges, and judicial assemblies. This is a considerable collection of documents; few of Adelaide’s contemporaries – including members of her own dynasty – left comparable charter collections. The majority of Adelaide’s charters have survived because they were preserved in religious archives, primarily in the city of Turin and in private monasteries founded by Adelaide, and her parents, in Susa and the Pinerolese. Unsurprisingly, these documents indicate that Adelaide’s activities were largely concentrated in Turin, Susa and Pinerolo. The apparent focus of Adelaide’s activity may thus be misleading, both in terms of the types of transactions in which she engaged, and her geographic interests. First, and predictably, Adelaide’s extant charters are almost entirely comprised of documents which have been preserved because they were of relevance to religious institutions: many other documents have been lost or destroyed. Records of Adelaide’s dealings with laymen are particularly under-represented. Second, documentary scarcity for Savoy and the counties of
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137 Appendix 2. Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 341ff. argues that women made greater use of the written word to legitimise their lordship, which might explain why there are more extant documents for Adelaide than for her male relatives.
138 Matilda of Tuscany is an exception (139 extant charters/letters, plus 115 *deperdita*): DD MT.
139 Cancian, ‘Cartario,’ 174-177; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 671, 689.
141 All but one (Appendix, no. 31) of Adelaide’s extant documents was issued for a religious institution.
Auriate, Alba and Ventimiglia means that almost nothing is known of Adelaide’s lordship there.\textsuperscript{142} (This scarcity is partly because archives were frequently damaged or destroyed by invading armies, both in the Middle Ages, and afterwards; equally, fewer documents seem to have been produced in Savoy after the end of the Burgundian royal line in 1032.\textsuperscript{143}) Any examination of Adelaide’s political network necessarily focuses on the county – and city – of Turin.

There are methodological problems even with Adelaide’s extant charters.\textsuperscript{144} Eleven survive as originals;\textsuperscript{145} the remaining twenty-six are later copies. Some of these are authentic copies, but most are inauthentic copies in which the content of the charter has been truncated or otherwise altered. Some documents were preserved in later cartularies;\textsuperscript{146} others were copied by early modern antiquaries. In both cases, the original document is often distorted.\textsuperscript{147} Sometimes genuine documents have been manipulated or interpolated; sometimes the entire document is probably forged.\textsuperscript{148} Several of Adelaide’s extant charters are of doubtful authenticity, either because of problems with the text of the charter (including incorrect dating clauses, and the use of anachronistic/unusual phrases), and/or uncertainty over the provenance of the document.\textsuperscript{149}

Despite these problems, charters are vital because they are dated. Also, unlike other sources, they often emanated from Adelaide, and may thus provide evidence of the way she perceived herself.\textsuperscript{150} Charters do not simply record legal transactions: they are sometimes

\textsuperscript{142} For Adelaide’s activities in Savoy: Appendix 1, nos. 22, 33; for Auriate/Albenga: nos. 3, 27; on Ventimiglia: chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{145} Appendix 1, nos. 3, 9, 13, 16, 21, 25, 28, 34, 36, 40, 42.
\textsuperscript{146} On cartularies: Fichtenau, \textit{Urkundenwesen}, 73–87; Geary, \textit{Phantoms}, 81-114; Brown, ‘Charters’; Bouchard, ‘Cartularies’.
\textsuperscript{149} Appendix 1, nos. 1, 3, 10, 20, 27, 31-32, 39. On the interpolations in no. 27: Provero, ‘Revello’.
\textsuperscript{150} In general: Cimino, ‘Royal’; Bates, ‘Representation’.
also political narratives and instruments of social memory.\footnote{Wolfram, ‘Political’; Keller, ‘Privilege,’ esp. 78ff.; Koziol, Politics, 6ff.} Adelaide’s charters record her dealings not only with institutions, but also with individuals (particularly the witness-lists). They thus offer a view of her social and political network, and of the negotiations between Adelaide and others.\footnote{In general: Koziol, Begging, 47–54, 70–76; Rosenwein, ‘Friends’.} This can be augmented with the reconstruction of lost documents (\textit{deperdita}), from references in other sources.\footnote{On \textit{deperdita}: Hartmann, ‘Edition’; Esch, ‘Überlieferungs-Chance’; DD Mer, 489-496.} Adelaide’s \textit{deperdita}, for example, provide greater evidence of her interactions with laymen than her surviving documents.\footnote{Appendix 1, nos. 5, 15, 45, 48-49. On \textit{deperdita} having a higher proportion of ‘lay’ documents: Kosto, ‘Laymen,’ 48; DD Mer, 491ff.; Hartmann, ‘Edition,’ 25.} Some \textit{deperdita} can be reconstructed more securely and/or more fully than others. For example, an original document, issued by Adelaide in 1065, refers to her prior purchase of property from Marino and his sons, recorded in a charter of sale that is no longer extant.\footnote{Appendix 1, nos. 15-16.} Other \textit{deperdita}, by contrast, are only attested in later sources.\footnote{Appendix 1, nos. 19, 24, 44-45.}

Cautious examination of Adelaide’s charters – both extant and lost – allows a considerable (if incomplete) amount to be said about Adelaide’s activities, both in terms of her relationship with her family members, and their impact on her power (chapter 1); and of her dealings with local elites – both religious and lay (chapters 4-7).

\textit{Letters and literacy}

Adelaide received letters from several eminent churchmen: Pope Alexander II (r.1061-1073), Pope Gregory VII (r.1073-1085), Peter Damian, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, and Bishop Benzo of Alba.\footnote{Appendix 1, nos. 19c, 26a, 14b, 40a. On papal letters to powerful women generally: Kasten, ‘Papstbriefe’; Lubich, ‘Frauen’. For other churchmen’s letters: Ferrante, Glory.} With the exception of Alexander II, who wrote to inform Adelaide of an invalid episcopal consecration, these churchmen wrote to praise Adelaide for her care of religious institutions in Turin and Savoy, and to gain her support for specific projects (including the
imposition of clerical celibacy, and support for Henry IV of Germany). Most of these letters survive in late eleventh-century sources, rather than as originals, and since they were often preserved to make a political or rhetorical point, it is not certain that they were ever sent as individual pieces of correspondence.¹⁵⁸ No letters written by Adelaide have survived, and her response to the letters she received is not always known.¹⁵⁹ It is likely, however, that Adelaide corresponded not only with these churchmen, but also with other powerful individuals with whom she had dealings, such as Empress Agnes and Matilda of Tuscany (chapters 1, 3-4).

Peter Damian’s and Gregory’s letters to Adelaide have received some scholarly attention, particularly in relation to the way medieval women were perceived by their (male) correspondents.¹⁶⁰ Benzo’s letters to Adelaide have generally been neglected.¹⁶¹ Detailed analysis of Benzo’s letters in chapter 3 leads to a new understanding of when and why Adelaide began to support Henry IV of Germany in the 1080s. In chapter 4, Peter Damian’s and Gregory’s letters are utilised – alongside Adelaide’s support for religious institutions more generally – to delineate Adelaide’s relationship with the papacy, and with religious change, from the mid-eleventh century onwards.

Adelaide’s charters and letters raise questions about the extent of her literacy.¹⁶² Unlike some of her contemporaries,¹⁶³ there is no evidence of Adelaide’s having commissioned nor owned books, nor that she signed charters herself. Yet Peter Damian’s and Benzo of Alba’s letters are full of complex allusions to biblical and classical exemplars. If they expected Adelaide to understand these references, then they assumed that she had a high

¹⁵⁸ In relation to Benzo’s letters: chapter 3; in general: Lyon, ‘Letters,’ 53.
¹⁵⁹ This can sometimes be inferred from Adelaide’s subsequent actions: chapters 3-4.
¹⁶¹ An exception is: Oldoni, ‘L’iconografia,’ 216f, 223-228.
¹⁶³ Dockray-Miller, Judith; Hay, Leadership, ch.5; Rough, Gospels; Stafford, Emma; Bell, ‘Book’. 
level of familiarity with both Christian and classical literature.\textsuperscript{164} While there is little evidence one way or the other, it is likely that Adelaide’s literacy was of a passive or ‘pragmatic’ kind.\textsuperscript{165} In other words, although Adelaide could not necessarily read (or write) documents completely, she possessed enough literacy to make use of the letters and charters with which she came in contact.\textsuperscript{166}

*Narrative sources*

Part of the reason for Adelaide’s modern obscurity is that her life was not detailed by a contemporary biographer. There is no house-history of Adelaide, or her dynasty,\textsuperscript{167} but numerous – if sometimes brief – references to Adelaide can be found in contemporary narrative sources.\textsuperscript{168} These accounts were primarily written in Germany, rather than Italy,\textsuperscript{169} and are readily available in editions by the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. They include chronicles and annals, saints’ lives, and imperial polemics.\textsuperscript{170} These works were written by clerical and monastic authors,\textsuperscript{171} and were intended to appeal, in the first instance, either to their own religious communities, or to the king/emperor, whom the author was writing to praise or admonish.\textsuperscript{172} There was often a strong propagandist element to these works, which was intended to shape not only the memory of these events, but also contemporary politics.\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{164} Damian rarely cited classical authors but, writing to Adelaide, he referred to Terence’s *Eunuchus* (Appendix 1, no. 14b). Does this reflect Adelaide’s interests or, at least, Damian’s perception of them? (d’Acunto, *Laici*, 355f.)


\textsuperscript{166} Adelaide presumably maintained someone to read aloud/translate for her, as Matilda of Tuscany did: VM II, vv. 609-611.

\textsuperscript{167} For an ‘anti-history’ of Adelaide’s early dynasty: p.27 n.2.

\textsuperscript{168} On narratives sources: Goetz, ‘Methodology’; Geary, ‘Chronicles’; Kersken, ‘National’.

\textsuperscript{169} On the lack of eleventh-century Italian narrative sources: Wickham, ‘Time’.

\textsuperscript{170} For an overview: Oldoni, ‘Iconographia’.

\textsuperscript{171} Female and/or lay authors are generally lacking. On women’s voices: Nelson, ‘Genre’; Bennett, ‘Perspective’; Dronke, *Women*; van Houts, ‘Women’.

\textsuperscript{172} In general: MacLean, *History*, 17; Airlie, ‘Stories’.
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This is particularly evident in the polemics of the later eleventh century (produced during the so-called Investiture Controversy), discussed in chapter 3.

Depictions of women – as much as men – related to a given author’s political project, but struggles between networks of influence tended to result in particularly negative portrayals of women. Yet gendered criticism of Adelaide is generally lacking. Contemporaries frequently wrote in praise of Adelaide, both in narrative sources and in letters; and there is little extant disapproval of her rule, or even questioning of her right to rule. In the earliest phase of her life Adelaide was rarely mentioned in narrative sources.

Hermann of Reichenau (d.1054), who records Adelaide’s first marriage, does not even refer to her by name. By contrast, in sources written during (and after) Adelaide’s third and final widowhood (c.1060-1091), when Adelaide was ruling Turin, she is usually named. Some authors mention Adelaide briefly, but with approbation, particularly in relation to her dealings with religious institutions. William of Chiusa, the monastic author of the *Vita Benedicti II Abbatis Clusensis* (written 1095), described Adeleidis marchisia as *mulier in Dei rebus tunc bene devota, et in rerum administratione constantissima*, and praised her for aid of Abbot Benedict II of Chiusa. Similarly, the anonymous author of the *Vita Annonis arciepiscopi Coloniensis* (written 1105) commended Adelaide, *Alpium Cottiarum marchionissa*, for granting some of the relics of the Theban legion (martyred Roman soldiers) to Archbishop Anno of Cologne (r.1056-1075).

All of these authors acknowledged Adelaide’s princely status, which was also emphasised, in a non-religious context, by other contemporaries. In his *Liber gestorum*
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176 Appendix 1, no. 2d.
177 VB, c.12, 205.
178 Appendix 1, no. 43b.
179 Appendix 1, no. 23b.
recentium (written c.1077), Arnulf of Milan described Adelaide’s successful siege of the city of Asti, and called her prudentia comitissa and militaris admodum domina. Writing c.1077/8, the monastic annalist Lampert of Hersfeld described Adelaide and her son, Amadeus, as having auctoritas clarissima et possessiones amplissimae et nomen celeberrimum in the regions they ruled. As we shall see (chapters 2-3), several contemporaries, including Lampert, Gregory VII and Benzo of Alba, emphasised Adelaide’s importance during the political crises of the reign of her son-in-law, Henry IV of Germany. Adelaide’s role in these events has largely been overlooked by modern historians. By paying attention to Adelaide, and to gender more generally, my readings of these sources refine prevailing trends in the historiography, and sometimes provide a completely new take on key political events of the eleventh century.

180 Appendix 1, no.22a.  
PART I: DYNASTIC AND IMPERIAL POLITICS

Part I is concerned with Adelaide of Turin’s relationships with both her natal and marital kin. This introductory section provides a brief overview of Adelaide’s lineage, focusing on her ancestors, and their rise to power through royal and imperial patronage.

Adelaide’s dynasty and imperial patronage

Adelaide of Turin was born into an aristocratic dynasty which was of the first importance in northern Italy.¹ (Table 1.) Between the mid-tenth and the late-eleventh century her dynasty – known to historians as the Arduinds (or Arduinici) – ruled large parts of central and southern Piedmont. Their possessions were particularly focused on the city of Turin and the valley of Susa, but stretched from the Alps in the north, where they controlled key Alpine passes (including the Mont Cenis and the Mont Genèvre), across the Po Valley and south as far as the Ligurian Sea. (Map 1) Although Adelaide’s dynasty was prominent by the eleventh century, they did not claim the same pedigree as some of the ducal dynasties in Italy or the rest of the German Empire. Three factors were crucial for their advancement above the level of other noble lineages: the military success of Adelaide’s great-grandfather, Arduin ‘Glaber’ of Turin (d.c.977); control of major transport and communication routes in the region; and the patronage of successive Italian kings and German emperors.

Adelaide’s ancestors are poorly-documented: there are few extant tenth-century charters, and no house-history of the dynasty. What little is known of their origins was recorded by an anonymous monk in the *Chronicon Novaliciense* (written c.1050). The text is incomplete, not always accurate, and markedly hostile to Adelaide’s ancestors.² According to

the *Chronicon*, Adelaide’s forebear, Roger, and his brother Arduin were Frankish immigrants to northern Italy (perhaps from the Auvergne or Velay). Roger became count of Auriate (c.906-912) through the patronage of Berengar I of Italy (r.887-924), and through marriage to the widow of the previous count, Rudolf. Arduin Glaber, one of Roger’s sons with this unnamed widow, anchored the dynasty in Turin. Arduin succeeded Roger as count of Auriate, c.935, and thereafter gained further lands and titles through conquest and patronage.

Arduin was one of several ‘new men’ who were entitled margrave, probably by Berengar II (r.950-961). The titles of count, margrave and duke were hierarchical, with margraves ranking somewhere between counts and dukes. The margrave’s main role was to defend frontier or border regions. Arduin Glaber had proved himself particularly suited to protecting the coast and the western Alps from the ‘Saracen menace’ when he re-conquered the valley of Susa, driving out the Saracens, c.940. In addition to military protection, margraves were also responsible for administrative, judicial, and financial matters within their region. These regions, designated marks (or marches), were often made up of several counties. Unlike Carolingian margraves, the new Italian margraves exercised comital

---

3 CN, V.8.
6 CN, V.8; also CN, V.21: *Arduinus Glabrio*.
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authority themselves and had only viscounts as their subordinates.\textsuperscript{14} Adelaide’s dynasty is usually seen as having public jurisdiction over a unified territorial region: the mark of Turin (Map 5).\textsuperscript{15} Their jurisdiction was, however, less coherent than this phrase suggests: they possessed a loose agglomeration of property and rights, scattered throughout numerous northern Italian counties.\textsuperscript{16} They had comital authority in some of these counties (Turin, Auriate, Alba, Asti, Albenga); influence in others (Bredulo and Ventimiglia); while still others were controlled by other dynasties (Acqui, Parma, Piacenza, Pavia, Tortona, Vercelli, and Ivrea).\textsuperscript{17} \\

\textit{Map 1: North-West Italy (tenth/eleventh centuries)}\textsuperscript{18}

\[\text{Map image}\]


\textsuperscript{16} Ripart, \textit{Fondements}, 259-281, emphasises the lack of documentary evidence for the existence of northern Italian marks, and refers to the new margraves as ‘margraves without marks’ (\textit{marquis sans marche}).


\textsuperscript{18} Adapted from: \url{http://it.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Divisi%C3%B3n_marca_de_Ivrea.jpg}
Table 1: Main branch of Adelaide’s dynasty

- Arduin I
- Roger I of AURIATE
- Arduin Glaber of TURIN
- Roger II
- Arduin Glaber of TURIN
- Richilda of TURIN
- Arduin IV of TURIN
- Anseilba of TURIN
- Otto of TURIN
- Arduin V of TURIN
- Olderic Manfred of TURIN
- Bertha of MILAN
- Ario, bishop of ASTI
- Otto II of TURIN
- Hugo of TURIN
- Alfo of TURIN
- Wido of TURIN
- Adelaide of TURIN
- Herman IV of SWABIA
- Henry of MONTFERRAT
- Otto of SAVOY
- Otto of SCHWEINFURT
- Immilia of TURIN
- Eckbert of MEISSEN
- Bertha of TURIN
- Otto or Teto of LIGURIA
- Unnamed son?
Arduin Glaber’s eldest son, Manfred (r.c.977-c.1000), succeeded him as head of the dynasty. Yet all of Arduin’s sons – Manfred, Arduin IV and Otto I – were referred to by the margravial title,¹⁹ and frequent references to ‘third parts’ in documents relating to Arduin’s descendants indicate that at least some of his property was divided equally among his sons.²⁰ There is little tangible evidence of Manfred’s activities in the surviving sources, nor of his dealings with the Ottonian emperors. (The kingdom of Italy was incorporated into the German Empire in 962: Map 2). He married Prangarda, daughter of Adalbert Atto of Canossa,²¹ and was succeeded by his eldest son, Olderic, called Manfred. More is known about Olderic-Manfred, but even he is best documented in the last years of his life.²²

As margrave of Turin, Olderic-Manfred (r.c.1000-1033/4) was instrumental in securing, and extending, the gains made by his predecessors, in part through the mutually-beneficial relationships he cultivated with successive German emperors (Table 2). Olderic-Manfred campaigned alongside Emperor Otto III (r.983-1002) in Benevento and, in return for his faithful service, Otto III issued a diploma safeguarding Olderic-Manfred’s allodial possessions.²³ Olderic-Manfred was also on good terms with Otto’s successor, Emperor Henry II (r.1002-1024), at least initially.²⁴ In 1007/8, Henry helped to impose Olderic-Manfred’s brother, Alric, as bishop of Asti (r.1007/8-1036), which ensured Olderic-Manfred’s and Alric’s dominance in Asti.²⁵

---

¹⁹ Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 174; Ripart, Fondements, 279ff., 286.
²⁰ DD OIII, no. 408 (31st July 1001); DD KII, no. 67 (1026); Appendix II, III/5-6; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 662, 664f.; Previté-Orton, History, 151-155; Ripart, Fondements, 287ff.
²¹ Drei, ‘Carte,’ no. 78 (8th March 991). Narrative sources do not refer to Prangarda by name: CN V.11; Anselm, Rhetorimachia, 141; Fumagalli, Origini, 30-37, 52 n.189, 81f.; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 660f.; Violante, ‘Quelques,’ 108f.; Previté-Orton, History, 148f.
²³ DD OIII, no. 408 (31st July 1001); Pauler, Regnum, 7.
Map 2: German Empire (tenth/eleventh centuries)²⁶

Key:
- Extent of empire in 972
- Extent of empire in 1032
- Kingdom of Germany
- Kingdom of Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Ottonian and Salian emperors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry the Fowler (r.919-936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry I of BAVARIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry II of BAVARIA (r.1002-1024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto I (r.936-973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto II (r.973-983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liutgard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad the Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto of CARINTHIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry of SPEYER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad II (r.1024-1039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisela of SWABIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry III (r.1039-1056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes of POITOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV (r.1056-1106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha of SAVOY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry V (r.1106-1125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Olderic-Manfred’s good relationship with Henry II did not continue. Seeing an opportunity to expand his sphere of influence into Ivrea after the death of Arduin of Ivrea (r.1002-1014), Olderic-Manfred became involved in the anti-imperial movement in northern Italy (c.1015).\(^{27}\) He, and others, sought alternatives to German rule in Italy, first in Robert II of France, then in William V of Aquitaine (a descendent of Berengar II\(^ {28} \)).\(^ {29} \) During this time Olderic-Manfred took steps to prevent Henry II from confiscating his lands. A document from June 1021 records the sham-sale of Olderic-Manfred’s and his wife, Bertha’s, vast allodial property (over 650,000 acres) to the priest Sigifred, son of Adelgis.\(^ {30} \)

In 1026 Henry’s successor, Conrad II (r.1024-1039), the first of the Salian dynasty, arrived in Italy with his army.\(^ {31} \) Conrad II granted Olderic-Manfred’s cousins, Boso and Guido (sons of Arduin V), an imperial diploma, confirming them in their possessions;\(^ {32} \) he may also have issued a diploma (now lost) for Olderic-Manfred.\(^ {33} \) After Olderic-Manfred’s death, Adelaide’s dynasty – particularly Adelaide’s mother, Bertha of Milan – sought to maintain good relations with the Salian dynasty (Chapter 1). From the 1030s onwards, Adelaide’s dynasty consolidated their position as imperial allies through inter-marriage with imperial vassals and even with members of the imperial family. As we shall see, Adelaide derived prestige, power and influence from her connections with the Salian dynasty, but her relationship with Henry IV was not consistently friendly. Adelaide rarely opposed Henry openly but, at key points of crisis in his reign, nor could Henry automatically rely upon Adelaide’s support (chapters 2-3).

---


\(^{28}\) Bouchard, *Sword*, 261-279.

\(^{29}\) Rudolf Glaber, *Historiarum*, III.33; III.38; Behrends, *Fulbert*, nos. 103-104, 109, 111-113.

\(^{30}\) Appendix 2, II/1; Bresslau, *Heinrich*, I, 374ff.; Previté-Orton, *History*, 173ff.; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 664ff. Great trust was placed in Sigifred; he may have been related to Olderic-Manfred (Cognasso, *Umberto*, 103) or Bertha (Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 126).


\(^{32}\) DD KII, no. 67 (1026); Bresslau, *Konrad*, I, 121-125, 376.

Chapter 1
Adelaide’s natal and marital kin

This chapter examines Adelaide’s kinship network – her dealings with those to whom she was related by birth or marriage – and the rights, duties, and obligations that connected them. Little can be said about affectional relationships; the focus here is on the ways in which this network of relationships both constructed, and qualified, Adelaide’s exercise of power. Because of the interconnection between noble families, property-holding, and political power, bonds of kinship played a key role in medieval politics.¹ These bonds encompassed immediate family members, who shared a common ancestor and often political strategies, too. Since kinship is a social, as well as biological, construct these bonds also included those who were more distantly connected (including by marriage or spiritual kinship).² An individual’s kin thus encompassed those of similar social status, as well as their social superiors and inferiors.³ It was presumed that kin should help each other and, in theory, individuals had a wide kinship network to whom they could turn for support, if needed.⁴ In practice, certain relationships were more – or less – useful than others, depending on social and political circumstances. Alliances underwent continuous redefinition, and a person’s acknowledged kinship group changed over time.⁵

In the first section, Adelaide’s natal kin, and her inheritance and succession are discussed; the key roles played by Adelaide’s parents are emphasised. Second, Adelaide’s marital alliances are considered, in particular the reason(s) each of Adelaide’s three marriages

---

² Lynch, Godparents; Jussen, Patenschaft.
³ Althoff, Family, 23-41.
⁵ Schmid, ‘Structure’; Stafford, ‘Parents’; Barton, Lordship, chs.6-7; Hagger, ‘Kinship’.
were contracted; the amount of choice Adelaide had in her potential spouse(s); and her husbands’ impact on her exercise of power. Third, Adelaide’s widowhood, and her children’s impact on her exercise of power are discussed; particular attention is paid to Adelaide’s sons, and their direct heirs in Turin. The final section considers Adelaide’s relationships with her female relatives, which are often overlooked. Throughout, attention is drawn to the chance deaths, dynastic strategies, and actions of individuals, which led to Adelaide’s becoming her father’s heir, and which enabled her to maintain this position.

**Adelaide’s childhood**

Adelaide’s parents were Olderic-Manfred of Turin and Bertha of Milan (997-1037/40).\(^6\) Adelaide was born after c.1014 (the probable date of her parents’ marriage) and before c.1024 (since she married c.1036). She had two sisters: Immilla (also known as Ermengard),\(^7\) and Bertha.\(^8\) Adelaide probably also had an (unnamed) brother,\(^9\) but – since he did not succeed Olderic-Manfred – he either died in childhood, or was perhaps Bertha’s son by a previous marriage.\(^10\) Much of Adelaide’s early life remains obscure. A sole, fragmentary, document from this period suggests that Adelaide consented to a donation of Olderic-Manfred’s.\(^11\) None of Adelaide’s siblings appear in their parents’ charters: probably because none of them were old enough to do so, but perhaps also because it was Adelaide – presumably the eldest – who was being prepared to succeed her father.

---

\(^6\) Bertha’s father was probably Otbert II of Milan (Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I, 416; Terraneo, *Adelaide*, I, 69); or perhaps Otbert III (Hlawitschka, ‘Otbertinergenealogie’; Nobili, ‘Formarsi’).

\(^7\) She is called Immilla/Ermengard in her charters (Appendix 2, VII/3); and *Annalista Saxo* a.1036, 679.

\(^8\) Immilla/Bertha identified themselves as Olderic-Manfred’s daughters in their extant charters: Appendix 2, VI-VII; Adelaide in all but the following charters: Appendix 1, nos. 2, 4, 10, 14, 22, 33, 39, 46.

\(^9\) His existence is inferred from references in charters (Appendix 2, III/5; BSSS 3/2, no. 6; MHP Chart, II, no. 101), and narrative sources (*Annalista Saxo*, a.1067, 695); Previté-Orton, *History*, 154, 187; Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, I, 377; Terraneo, *Adelaide*, II, 273ff.

\(^10\) Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 22, 38ff., 120.

\(^11\) Appendix 1, no. 1.
Adelaide’s inheritance

Olderic-Manfred died on 29th October 1033/4, and Adelaide inherited most of his property. This was not a foregone conclusion, either politically or in terms of inheritance practices. According to an older model of family structures (which is particularly associated with Karl Schmid and Georges Duby, and thus with developments in Germany and France), women’s rights to family property decreased in the eleventh century. The model posits that, in response to the changing power dynamics of the post-Carolingian world, noble families became more rigidly patrilineal and hierarchical. A person’s role in their family became defined by birth-order and gender, with extended kin – particularly women and younger brothers – excluded from inheritance so that the family’s patrimony could be passed intact from father to eldest son.

The timing, nature, and extent, of these changes has been greatly debated. Most scholars now argue that family structures and inheritance strategies were more diverse – and flexible – after c.1000 than Schmid/Duby envisaged. In Italy, noble families had long been patrilineal, but often favoured joint succession and partible inheritance. In the tenth century, although there was a clear head of the family, male members of Adelaide’s dynasty jointly used the margravial title; they also received a share of the patrimony. To an extent, this inheritance practice continued in the eleventh century: Adelaide’s sisters were provided with

---

12 Appendix 1, no. 1.c. A necrology records Olderic-Manfred’s death-day. He issued a charter in March 1033 (Appendix 2, III/6), but was dead by 23rd December 1034: BSSS 3/2, no. 6; MHP Chart, II, no. 101. (Previously, these charters were dated 1035, thus his death is sometimes dated 1034/5: Carutti, Umberto, 129; Previté-Orton, History, 187; Ripart, Fondements, 306.)
14 Schmid, ‘Problematik’; Schmid, ‘Structure’; Duby, Chivalrous, esp. chs 2-3, 9; Duby, Knight; Bloch, Feudal; Tellenbach, ‘Carolingian’; Moore, ‘Duby’s’.
17 Stafford, ‘Mutation’; Livingstone, Love; Livingstone, ‘Diversity’; le Jan, Famille, 263-332; Herlihy, Households, 82-98; White, Custom, 86-129; Freed, ‘Reflections,’ 560-564; Drell, Kinship.
19 Above p.31; Sergi, Confini, 71-90; Ripart, Fondements, 281-316.
a (lesser) share of family property; and, as we shall see, Adelaide took care to provide for her younger son, Amadeus.

Eleventh-century noblewomen played an active role in inheritance strategies, even when they themselves did not inherit. Often, however, women had clear rights to inherit, administer and alienate property. Even when their rights were deferred in favour of their brothers’, in the absence of a direct male heir, women such as Adelaide were able to inherit their family’s patrimony. Some heiresses were political pawns, while others were able to carve out power for themselves. As we shall see, key factors in women’s access to property – and thus to power – were the stages of her lifecycle, and the support of kinship and friendship networks.

While women were able to inherit, they were typically excluded from succession. Instead, women were often the means by which titles/offices were conferred on men. In Turin, the margravial title – perhaps because it was closely associated with military matters – was reserved for men. Between 1036 and 1091 there were six margraves of Turin (discussed below), each of whom owed his office to his relationship with Adelaide: Adelaide’s three husbands, Hermann (r.c.1036-1038), Henry (r.c.1040/2-c.1044) and Otto (r.c.1045/6-1057/60), were successively margrave of Turin. Thereafter, Adelaide’s son, Peter (r.c.1057/60-1078); her grandson-in-law, Frederick (c.1080-1091); and her great-grandson, Peter II (r.1091-1092) succeeded each other as margrave of Turin. None of these men had

20 Appendix 2, VI-VII.
24 Above, p.13.
26 Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 181; Previté-Orton, History, 153. (Ripart, Fondements, 277f. suggests that women were prevented from holding the margravial title because of its judicial function; for Adelaide and justice: chapter 7.)
any claim to rule in Turin except through Adelaide, who represented a physical and symbolic link with the ruling dynasty of Turin.  

Succession to margravial office was the central point around which Adelaide’s dynasty was organised, but power was often held by Adelaide, rather than the nominal margrave. This was due, in part, to competing ideas about the origins of legitimate power. Although power was delegated by the ruler, public offices were also increasingly regarded, by those who held them, as their own property. Giuseppe Sergi distinguishes between two spheres of power held by Italian margraves who were, he argues, simultaneously public officers and dynastic lords (whose powers were local and patrimonial). This is clearly demonstrated in an imperial diploma issued by Otto III to safeguard Olderic-Manfred’s private property. Since these lands were in territories which Olderic-Manfred himself ruled as count and margrave, the diploma was a form of insurance against his ever losing these offices, and a clear sign of the importance of local power.

The preconditions for Adelaide’s successful inheritance were firmly established by Olderic-Manfred. Throughout his rule, and especially during the last five years of his life, Olderic-Manfred undertook a series of measures to secure his hold on his lands. These included: eliminating potential rival claimants, particularly his cousins, Boso and Guido, establishing a palacium marchionis at the Porta Segusina (western gate to the city) in Turin (Map 4); regaining control of the castle at Susa; and founding two private monasteries – San Giusto in Susa and Santa Maria in Caramagna. By the 1030s, Olderic-Manfred was

---

27 Sergi, Potere, 53.
28 Sergi, Confini, chs.2-5; Nobili, ‘Famiglie,’ 82f.; Nobili/Sergi, ‘Marche,’ 399-401.
29 Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 661-663; Sergi, ‘Potere,’ esp. 65ff.; also Settia, ‘Marche’.
30 Above, p.31 n.23.
31 Sergi, L’aristocrazia, 40f.; Tabacco, Struggle, 163f.
33 Sergi, L’aristocrazia, 76f. n.4.; Ripart, Fondements, 299ff., 305.
34 Appendix 2, II/3; cf. below, p.146.
35 Appendix 2, III/5; Sergi, ‘Potere,’ 68ff.
36 Appendix 2, II/2, III/5; chapter 4.
firmly established, both as margrave of Turin and as a dynastic lord. It was thus possible for political and administrative continuity to be maintained, even in the absence of an adult male margrave. Olderic-Manfred’s widow, Bertha, and his brother, Bishop Alric of Asti, played crucial roles in ensuring this continuity.

Bertha’s regency

Bertha and Alric were both closely associated with Olderic-Manfred’s rule: Bertha co-issued nine of Olderic-Manfred’s eleven extant documents, while Alric issued six documents alongside Olderic-Manfred and Bertha. After Olderic-Manfred’s death, Bertha and Alric acted together to maintain their power in the region: Bertha issued one document alone, and another (now lost) with Alric. Bertha is also named in a further six documents issued between 1034-1038 (discussed below). This suggests that after Olderic-Manfred’s death Bertha was the real power in Turin, and that she – perhaps alongside Bishop Alric? – was acting as regent for Adelaide.

Bertha’s actions, both as wife and widow, created a tradition of female involvement in rule in Turin upon which Adelaide was to build. Bertha’s ability to act was, however, constrained by her Lombard legal identity. Since Lombard law presupposed that women were not legally competent, Bertha utilised Sigifred, son of Adalgis, as her agent to make four

37 Sergi, Potere, 53f.
38 Appendix 2, II-III. Wives were often present in their husbands’ documents to gain experience of rule: Livingstone, ‘Aristocratic,’ 64; LoPrete, Adela, 20, 84; Goez, Beatrix, 75.
39 Appendix 2, III. On their complementary roles: Cancian, ‘Cartario,’ 177f. On sibling relationships: Lyon, Princely, esp. ch.2.
40 Appendix 2, IV.
41 Referred to in a charter of Adelaide’s: Appendix 1, no. 36.
43 Tenth-century empresses-regent provided strong precedents for Bertha’s regency: above p.13 n.85. Women, and male religious, were often preferred as regents, as it was presumed they were less likely to co-opt power for themselves: Offergeld, Reges, 822f.
44 Guerra-Medici, Diritti, 70-86; Cortese, ‘Mundio’; la Rocca, ‘Pouvoirs’.
transactions on her behalf (1034–1037). In addition, Bertha is named in two further charters at this time: an imperial diploma (discussed below), and a donation she made with Adelaide to the monastery of San Stefano in Genoa. Unlike Bertha, Adelaide’s legal identity was Salic, which placed fewer constraints on her freedom of action. In this charter Adelaide had a function to similar Sigifred’s: she was the means by which Bertha could act without a mondoald (male guardian). The body of the charter states that Adelaide made the donation alone, but the eschatocol indicates that it was issued by Berta comitissa et filia sua Adaleida. Bertha’s status – she is listed first, and titled, while Adelaide is not – underlines her power at this time.

A key means by which Bertha secured her position, and that of her daughters, was by allying herself with the imperial family. Bertha supported Emperor Conrad II in his conflict with Archbishop Aribert II of Milan (r.1018–1045). In 1037 Bertha sent sui satellites to capture envoys who were trying to cross the Alps from Piedmont to Champagne. The envoys’ letters revealed the details of a conspiracy against Conrad II by Archbishop Aribert, along with several bishops, and Odo II of Blois-Champagne. Bertha warned Conrad, who was able to seize the bishops and exile them beyond the Alps. In return, the emperor issued a diploma confirming all the donations made to Bertha’s and Olderic-Manfred’s foundation of San Giusto in Susa (located c.9km south of the Mont Cenis pass). At the same time – further reinforcing the view that Conrad II wanted to ensure that the holder of this important

---

45 BSSS 3/2, no. 6 (23rd December 1034); MHP Chart, II, nos. 101 (23rd December 1034); 103 (1037); MHP, Chart I, no. 299 (28th June 1037). On Sigifred: above p.34 n.30; Morello, ‘Plociast,’ 13-16; Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 119ff.

46 Appendix 1, no. 3. The charter is mistakenly dated 4th July 1049. It was issued when Adelaide was coniux Ermanni dux et marchio, thus: 1036x1038: Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 685f.; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 21f. Previté-Orton, History, 161, 210f. (Embriaco, Vescovi, 104f. prefers 1038x1041.)

47 Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 130f. (Embriaco, Vescovi, 105ff. suggests a later copyist removed Bertha’s name to emphasise Adelaide’s role.)

48 Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 131, 179.

49 Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 124f.

50 Cowdrey, ‘Aribert’. Bishop Alric died fighting on Aribert’s side at Campomalo: Appendix 1, no. 2c.

51 Appendix 1, no. 2e; Previté-Orton, History, 219f.; Bonante, ‘Reti,’ 9.

52 DD KII, no. 254 (29th December 1037).
Alpine pass remained loyal to him – Conrad also arranged Adelaide’s marriage to his step-son, Hermann IV of Swabia.

**Marital alliances**

Love rarely played a part in the marital strategies of medieval magnates: a spouse was chosen to increase the power of their dynasty by creating and strengthening political alliances. Adelaide – a wealthy heiress, who could transmit a margravial title to her husband – was a highly desirable bride, who brought with her a network of power, wealth and prestige. Her high status is reflected in the matrimonial alliances she made.

**Adelaide and Hermann**

Adelaide’s first husband was Hermann IV, duke of Swabia (r.1030-1038). He was the son of Gisela of Swabia by her second husband, Ernest of Swabia (d.1015). Gisela’s third husband was Emperor Conrad II; Hermann was thus Conrad’s step-son, and half-brother to the future emperor, Henry III. (Table 7) Adelaide probably married Hermann in 1036. At about this time, her sister Immilla married Otto of Schweinfurt. Unlike their forbears, whose spouses were from important Italian families, Adelaide and Immilla contracted trans-Alpine alliances, bringing the ir dynasty ever closer into the imperial orbit. These were among several trans-Alpine marriages arranged by Conrad II, c.1036/7, including: the marriage of Conrad’s niece, Beatrice, a Lotharingian heiress, to Boniface, margrave of Tuscany (Adelaide’s first-cousin-once-removed); and of Cuniza of Altdorff to Adalbert Azzo II of

---

54 Appendix 1, no. 2d; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 18-22.
56 Carutti, *Umberto*, 130, 307; Hellmann, *Grafen*, 13 argue that Adelaide was married by 1035.
57 Appendix 1, no. 2b; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 24ff.
Este (Adelaide’s first cousin).\textsuperscript{60} That Conrad II’s imperial policy in relation to northern Italy was conducted, in part, through marital alliances, emphasises that the medieval political realm can only be fully understood if women, as well as men, are considered.

\textit{Table 3: Marriages arranged by Conrad II, c.1036/7}

The fathers of all of these women were already dead, and this evidently created opportunities for imperial intervention.\textsuperscript{61} Choosing a husband for an heiress, in most cases, also meant choosing the person who would administer her lands,\textsuperscript{62} and a ruler did not want an officer who was opposed to him. Bertha may have had little say in Adelaide’s and Immilla’s marriages, but Conrad II’s intervention safeguarded their rights. Adelaide’s male relatives

\textsuperscript{60} Schneidmüller, \textit{Welfen}, 123; Störmer, ‘Welfen,’ 265.

\textsuperscript{61} Waßn, \textit{Verfassungsgeschichte}, 92; Ganshof, \textit{Feudalism}, 143f.

were unlikely to oppose her inheritance since this would bring them into conflict with Conrad, who had designated his step-son, Hermann, margrave of Turin. Conrad’s support was a crucial prop to Adelaide’s position after Olderic-Manfred’s death. Without it, it is unlikely that Adelaide – and Bertha – would have been able to retain their control of Olderic-Manfred’s lands.

In addition to fostering closer relations with the Salian imperial dynasty, Adelaide’s marriage to Hermann was intended to provide stability and strong rule in Turin. The contemporary chronicler Hermann of Reichenau records that, in 1036, *Herimannus quoque dux Alemanniae* [Swabia] *marcham socri sui* [Olderic-] *Meginfredi in Italia ab imperatore* [Conrad II] *accepit*.63 This suggests that Hermann was invested as margrave of Turin either when he married Adelaide, or shortly afterwards. Moreover, it indicates that although the margrave was a public officer, appointed by the emperor, the office was also hereditary. In other words, Hermann was appointed because he married Adelaide, Olderic-Manfred’s heir. Only two years after marrying Adelaide, Hermann died of illness whilst campaigning for Conrad II in southern Italy.64 Because the marriage was short-lived, and produced no children, the trans-Alpine relationship between Adelaide’s and Hermann’s dynasties did not endure.65 The political-dynastic connections between Adelaide and the imperial dynasty were, however, to prove more lasting.

_Adeleides and Henry_

Immediately after her father’s death, Adelaide had several powerful protectors: her uncle, Bishop Alric (d.1036);66 her husband, Hermann (d.1038); Hermann’s step-father, Conrad II

---

63 Hermann, _Chronicon_, a.1036, 122.
64 Appendix 1, no. 3a.
65 They had, however, intended to forge closer connections with one another: Archbishop Poppo of Trier (Hermann’s paternal uncle), intervened in an imperial diploma alongside Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, for San Giusto in Susa: above n.52.
66 Appendix 1, no.2c.
(d.1039); and her mother, Bertha (d.1040?). By c.1040, all of these individuals were dead, and Adelaide, who was in her late teens/early twenties, was attempting to rule alone. Widows – particularly young widows, with no close family to support them – were often vulnerable. There is clear evidence that Adelaide’s rule was contested at this time, by local elites, both in Turin and Asti. To ensure that she retained control of her lands, Adelaide needed both a male margrave, and an heir.

Adelaide’s second husband was Henry of Montferrat, a member of a lineage known to historians as the Aleramids. Henry’s dynasty ruled territory south of the Po River and east of Turin, focussed on Casale Montferrat and the southern part of the diocese of Vercelli. (Map 1) There were well-established links between Henry’s and Adelaide’s dynasties, and also her mother’s dynasty (the Otbertiners). In the early eleventh century members of these dynasties had been part of the northern Italian opposition to Emperor Henry II. Representatives from all three families can also be found in a charter issued by Adelaide’s parents in Turin in 1031. There were ties of kinship as well as politics between them, including several intermarriages. Most recently (c.1036/40) Adelaide’s sister, Bertha, had married Teto/Otto of Liguria, an Aleramid, who was, in all probability, the son of Anselm II and Adelaide of Milan.

---

67 There is no record of Bertha’s death. She does not appear in sources after c.1038, suggesting that she died then, or shortly afterwards: Appendix 1, no. 3c; Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 134.
69 Discussed below; also chapters 4, 6.
72 Merlone, ‘Prosopografia,’ 573f.
74 Appendix 2, II/3: witnessed by Adelaide’s maternal uncles, Adalbert and Opizo, and by Henry’s father, William.
75 Provero, Marchesi, 37ff.; Sergi, Confini, 198ff., 216f.
76 Appendix 1, no. 3b; Provero, Marchesi, 40ff., 56f.; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 23f.
Table 4: Intermarriages between the Arduinid, Otbertiner and Aleramid dynasties
Adelaide’s marriage to Henry, and Bertha’s to Teto, were the only two Italian marriages contracted by Adelaide’s family-members in the eleventh century. Enrico Bonanate recently ascribed this to a (temporary) lack of imperial interest in Turin during the first years of Henry III’s reign (r.1039-1056). In fact, Henry III issued three diplomas, c.1040/1, in Adelaide’s lands: he granted immunity to the monastery of San Michele of Chiusa; he increased the territory of the bishopric of Asti; and appointed an episcopal vassal, Cunibert, as missus in Asti and Bredulo. Charles Previté-Orton (writing in 1912) argued that these diplomas increased the power of Chiusa, and the bishopric of Asti, at Adelaide’s expense and are thus evidence of Henry III’s displeasure with Adelaide. Previté-Orton attributed this to Adelaide’s marrying Henry without imperial permission. Comparison with Henry III’s response to Beatrice of Tuscany’s unapproved marriage to the imperial rebel Godfrey the Bearded in 1054 (Henry took Beatrice captive and – temporarily – deprived her of her lands) suggests, however, that this was not the case. As will be discussed in chapter 6, these diplomas were, instead, Henry’s attempt to ensure public order, particularly in Asti, at a time when Adelaide’s rule was in crisis. In other words, these diplomas were not directed against Adelaide and there was no interruption, at this stage, in good relations between Adelaide and the imperial family.

Since there is evidence of a crisis in Adelaide’s rule in 1041, this suggests that Adelaide was ruling alone, without either her mother, or a margrave alongside her. It is thus possible that Adelaide did not marry Henry, c.1038-1040, as most scholars argue, but rather in late 1041, after these diplomas were issued. Either way, their alliance was short-lived:

78 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 22ff.
79 DD HIII, nos. 14 (undated: early 1040?); 70 (26th January 1041), 71 (undated: 1041?).
81 Lampert, Annales, a.1055, 67; Goez, Beatrix, esp. 20-29; Glaesner, ‘Mariage,’ 393ff.
82 Below, pp.223-226.
83 Previté-Orton, History, 221; Bresslau, Jahrbücher, I, 377; Giesebrecht, Geschichte, III, 190; Merlone, ‘Prosopografia,’ 580.
Henry is first attested as Adelaide’s husband in January 1042, and last in May 1044. No source confirms Henry’s death, but this must have occurred shortly afterwards.

Adelaide and Otto

Adelaide’s third, and final, husband was Otto of Savoy, a younger son of Humbert I of Savoy and his wife Auxilia. Humbert had been closely connected with King Rudolf III of Burgundy (r.993-1032) and his second wife, Ermengard (who may have been Humbert’s sister). After Rudolf’s death without heirs, the kingdom of Burgundy was incorporated into the Holy Roman Empire, and Humbert allied himself with the imperial dynasty. By 1039 Humbert ruled the county of Savoy, including royal lands which Rudolf III had granted to Ermengard. Humbert’s territory stretched from Lake Geneva and the middle-Rhine to the peaks of the Alps, and included Maurienne, Chablais, the Tarentaise valley, Moûtiers and the valley of Aosta.

Otto is first attested as Adelaide’s husband in 1057, but they probably married c.1045/6. Odo marchio witnessed a charter in 1046, and since his family did not hold margravial office, this suggests that Otto had married Adelaide, and become margrave of Turin, before then. Guided by hindsight, some scholars have argued that the desire to unite the contiguous territories of Turin and Savoy was a decisive factor in the marriage. Yet if
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84 Appendix 1, nos. 6-9.
85 Appendix 1, no. 9a.
86 Appendix 1, no. 9b; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 29-30.
88 Labruzzi, Monarchia, 166, 172; Ripart, ‘Royaume,’ 265ff.; Demotz, ‘Humbertiens’.
90 Previté-Orton, History, 74-100; Ducourthial, ‘Géographie,’ 223-238; Ripart, ‘Royaume,’ 263ff.
91 Appendix 1, nos. 9b, 10.
92 Chevalier, Collection, no. 212.
93 Sergi, Potere, 55f.
94 Previté-Orton, History, 221; Tabacco, ‘Italy,’ 81f.
Table 5: Humbertine Dynasty

Unknown

Humbert I of SAVOY
Auxilia (of Lenzburg?)

Rudolf III of BURGUNDY
Ermengard?
Otto, bishop of BELLEY

Amadeus I of SAVOY
Adela

Humbert
Aymon, bishop of BELLEY

Otto of SAVOY
Adelaide of TURIN

Aymon, bishop of LYON
Burchard, bishop of SYON

Peter of TURIN
Amadeus II of SAVOY
Bertha of SAVOY
Adelaide of SAVOY
Otto, bishop of ASTI?
Adelaide married Otto c.1045/6, this cannot have been the case because Otto was not his father’s heir. In 1045 Otto’s father, Humbert I; his older brother, Amadeus I; and Amadeus’ young son, Humbert, were all still alive.

Although Adelaide needed to marry again, to have a margrave in Turin and produce an heir, these factors alone do not explain why she married Otto. Several scholars suggest that Henry III played a role in arranging the marriage. If so, then Adelaide may have had little choice in the matter. Yet marriage to Otto had several benefits. Given the close association between the Humbertines and the Salian emperors, and also their possible connection to the Burgundian royal house, this was a distinguished match. Moreover, marriage to a younger son may have been an attempt on Adelaide’s part to ensure that she retained her status in Turin, and/or ensured that her husband would concentrate on her lands, rather than his own (while Otto’s parents, for their part, ensured that a younger son was well-provided for). It was, in any case, logical for Adelaide, as much as for Otto’s dynasty, to ensure that she was on good terms with the dynasty which ruled territories adjacent to her own.

There is earlier evidence of co-operation between their dynasties: in the 1030s both Humbert and Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, supported Conrad II against Odo II of Blois-Champagne. An Italian army, led by Humbert and Boniface of Tuscany, travelled through Turin to campaign in Burgundy on Conrad’s behalf in Summer 1034. It is likely that Adelaide and her mother sent troops to fight for Conrad II, too. Adelaide may even have
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95 Sergi, Potere, 48, 52, 55.
97 Previté-Orton, History, 40; Sergi, Potere, 47; Tellenbach, ‘L’evoluzione,’ 41; Tabacco, ‘Forme,’ 344ff.; Ripart, Fondements, 307ff.
98 Widows had the right to arrange their own marriages (Parisse, ‘Veuves,’ 256-263; Gillingham, ‘Love,’ 293ff.), but they were often subject to external pressure: Archer, ‘Ladies’; Santinelli, Femmes, 263ff.; Stafford, ‘Women,’ 236, 238.
99 Bresslau, Jahrbücher, II, 117; Ripart, Fondements, 117-124.
100 Above nn.50-52.
101 Appendix 1, no. 1b.
met with Humbert (and his sons?) at this time. Thus, it is possible that Adelaide chose to marry Otto for personal as well as for political reasons. Charters issued by Adelaide after Otto’s death tentatively suggest that there was a degree of affection between them. Unlike her first two husbands, to whom Adelaide made no further reference after their deaths, she sometimes commemorated Otto in her charters. Adelaide’s emotional bond with Otto is particularly emphasised in a charter for her foundation of Santa Maria in Pinerolo, which records that Otto’s death *mihi fuit luctus nominatim*.

Co-ruler or consort?

McNamara and Wemple argued that elite medieval women’s power came ‘through the family,’ but a woman’s kin could equally pose a threat to her exercise of power. Each of Adelaide’s marital alliances helped her to secure her hold on her inheritance, but at the same time, each husband had the potential to undermine Adelaide’s position. Since it was assumed that her husband would rule once she married, heiresses’ claims did not always translate into effective rule. Was this the case with Adelaide? Unfortunately, this period of Adelaide’s life (1036-1060) is sparsely documented, making it difficult to discern the extent of the influence Adelaide had on her husbands, and vice versa. Adelaide had an advantage compared with most women: as an heiress, she did not relocate after marriage, which undoubtedly provided her with a considerable advantage in terms of securing support and access to power. Given the limited sources, the impact of Adelaide’s husbands (and other family members) on her exercise of power is considered through an examination of charters, focusing in particular
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103 On re-marriage leading to the oblivion of previous husband(s): Jussen, ‘Memoria’.
104 E.g. Appendix 1, nos. 11, 14, 26, 32.
105 Appendix 1, no. 14.
on: whether Adelaide is present/absent; the titles used; who has precedence; and whether or not Adelaide required her husband’s consent to act.

Adelaide’s first husband, Hermann, was invested as margrave of Turin by Conrad II, either when he married Adelaide, or shortly afterwards. Hermann is only mentioned in one of Adelaide’s extant charters, in which he is entitled dux et marchio. This dual title reflects Hermann’s status as both duke of Swabia (r.1030-1038) and margrave of Turin (r.1036-1038). Although Hermann had titular authority in Turin, given the short duration of their marriage, compounded by the fact that for much of it he was on campaign in southern Italy, it is unlikely that he had much impact on Adelaide’s – and her mother’s – position in Turin.

Similarly, the short duration of Adelaide’s second marriage suggests that Henry had little lasting impact on Adelaide’s power. In contrast with Hermann, no source confirms that Henry was invested as margrave of Turin. Henry was entitled margrave in the documents he issued with Adelaide, but this could refer to his position in Montferrat, of which he was co-margrave with his brother, Otto II, from 1042 onwards. During their marriage, Adelaide and Henry worked closely with one another, just as Adelaide’s parents had done, suggesting that they held power together (in a type of consortium). Between 1042 and 1044 Adelaide co-issued three charters with Henry, plus a fourth with his consent. The first document they issued – a donation to the cathedral church of San Giovanni Battista in Turin – was a clear assertion of dynastic continuity. Although the charter does not explicitly refer to Adelaide’s father, or his burial place, other documents indicate that Olderic-Manfred was

109 Above n.63.
110 Appendix 1, no.3.
111 Appendix 1, no. 2f.
112 Carutti, Umberto, 307.
114 Appendix 1, nos. 6-9; they also intervened in a fifth document together: Appendix 1, no. 8a.
115 Appendix 1, no. 6.
interred in the cathedral. The presence of Olderic-Manfred’s body in San Giovanni Battista created a physical and spiritual link between Adelaide’s dynasty and the sacred space of the cathedral. Adelaide’s and Henry’s grant renewed this link, and reinforced their connection with Adelaide’s father – and predecessor – in Turin. In this, and later documents issued jointly by Adelaide and Henry, domnus Henricus marchio is listed first, domna Adeleita comitissa is listed second.

Two of Adelaide’s documents were explicitly issued pro consensu eidem viro suo: the donation to the cathedral church, and another, issued by Adelaide alone, but with Henry’s consent, to the monastery of Cavour. In this latter document, Henry is referred to, without title, as Enricus iugale meum. These references to Henry’s consent are unusual: although Adelaide often co-issued charters with family members, only one other document (discussed below) refers to their consent. In general, there is no indication that Adelaide was restricted in her ability to dispose of property as she wished. This lack of constraint was due partly to Adelaide’s increasing strength and confidence as a ruler, but also to her profession of Salic law, which allowed Adelaide greater control over property than her mother had. This was a decisive factor in the success of Adelaide’s rule.

Adelaide was married to her third husband, Otto, for longer than her previous husbands, but almost no documentation survives from this period. The sole extant charter issued by Adelaide between 1045 and 1060 records a donation made by Odo et uxor eius Adalaisis et filii eorum Petrus et Amedeus, et filiae eorum, to the canons of San Lorenzo, Oulx. In this document – of dubious authenticity – neither Adelaide nor Otto is referred

116 Appendix 2, IV; above n.45; below, n.167.
117 Appendix 1, nos. 6-8.
118 Appendix 1, no. 6.
119 Appendix 1, no. 9.
120 Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 310.
121 For a similar argument, in relation to southern Italian women: Skinner, Family, 155-157.
123 Appendix 1, no.10.
124 Cau, ‘Carte,’ 199, n.54.
to by any title. While there is little evidence of Adelaide’s activities at this time, three documents issued in the 1050s refer to Otto. The first records the donation of Odo marchio dei gratia to the canons of the church of St. Peter in Tarentaise (now Moûtiers, Dep. Savoie). The second document indicates that a dispute between Aimon and the canons of Belley was settled in the presence of Odo merchio (sic). Third, Otto may have been present at a diet held by Henry III in Zurich.

A fourth document, issued in the mid-to-late 1060s, provides further evidence of Otto’s activities. It indicates that an unauthorised mint was active at Aiguebelle (Dep. Savoie) in the 1040s-early 1050s. Archbishop Leodegar of Vienne (r.1030/1-1070), who claimed the sole right of minting in the province, complained both to Otto, who immediately forbade the coining, and to Pope Leo IX (r.1049-1054), who excommunicated the coiners. The mint revived again, twice, after Otto’s death (d.1057/60); at Leodegar’s request, it was forbidden each time by Adelaide. The document from the late 1060s repeatedly stresses that the coiners were acting without Otto’s knowledge (in the 1050s) or Adelaide’s (in the 1060s). Since Aiguebelle was located in the valley of Maurienne, a centre of power for Otto’s dynasty, it is, however, likely that the coiners were acting with – at least – Otto’s and Adelaide’s tacit approval. It is even possible that the mint was under their control (although they did not issue coins in their own name). It thus appears that there was a long-

125 MHP, Chart, I, no.335 (1051); Sergi, Potere, 57 n.48 mistakenly asserts that Adelaide intervened in this document alongside Otto. On Dei gratia formulae: below, pp.168f.
126 Guigue, Saint-Sulpice, Appendix, no.3 (c.1050).
127 DD HIII, no. 318 (February 1054). The diploma was witnessed by: Oddo et Wilielmus et Albertus […] mones. Steindorff, Jahrbücher, II, 261 argues that mones is a contraction of marchiones. Nevertheless, Oddo marchio might not be Otto of Savoy.
128 The dating clause is incomplete, but the document was issued: November 1066x1069 (Henry IV is described as Adelaide’s son-in-law [Summer 1066]; and Archbishop Leodegar died in June 1070). It has previously been dated: 1065 (Ripart, Fondements, 527f.); c.1066/7 (Previté-Orton, History, 224f.; Sergi, Confini, 60 n.62); 1060x1070 (Carutti, Regesta, no. CLXXIII); 1073 (Promis, Monete, 56; Muletti, Memorie, 271f.).
129 Appendix I, no. 22.
131 Hellmann, Grafen, 15.
132 Ducourthial, ‘Géographie,’ 237f. A mint was later established at Susa by Adelaide’s grandson, Humbert II of Savoy: Carutti, Umberto, 122.
running conflict between the margravial dynasty and the archbishop over coining. This was – temporarily – resolved in the late 1060s through the intervention of Abbot Adraldo of Novalesa-Breme, and the history of the dispute was obliquely recorded in a charter. The mint at Aiguebelle was broken up, and marchionissa Adelaide and her sons promised that no further coining would take place. Nevertheless, the mint revived again, perhaps during Adelaide’s lifetime,¹³³ and certainly shortly after her death.¹³⁴

There are several possible explanations for Adelaide’s absence from the sources during her marriage to Otto. First, the documents which mention Otto all relate to Savoy. It was in the nature of trans-Alpine marriages for spouses to be separated from one another with some regularity. Beatrice of Tuscany, and her daughter Matilda, for example, often remained in Italy while their respective husbands, Godfrey the Bearded and Godfrey IV, governed their own lands in Lotharingia.¹³⁵ Although there is no clear evidence of this where Adelaide and Otto are concerned, if Otto did travel to Savoy without Adelaide this would have left her, at least temporarily, as sole ruler in Turin. In this case, it should be assumed that Adelaide issued documents during this time which are no longer extant.

¹³³ Two undated charters – issued during the reign of Bishop Hugh of Grenoble, r.1080-1132 – refer to payment in denarii from Aiguebelle: Cibrario/Promis, Documenti, 36f.
¹³⁴ MHP, Chart, II, 191 (1103); Cibrario/Promis, Documenti, 38f. (4th July 1111).
¹³⁵ Overmann, Mathilde, 126, 242f; Goez, Beatrix, 26f., 30ff.; Hay, Leadership, 43.
Another possibility is that Otto is documented because he took an active role in governing, while Adelaide did not. This may relate, in part, to child-bearing. Adelaide and Otto had at least five children together: Peter, margrave of Turin (d.1078), Amadeus II, count of Savoy (d.1080), Bertha of Savoy (d.1087), Adelaide of Savoy (d.1079), and Otto, who perhaps became bishop of Asti (d.1102).136 (Table 5) Adelaide’s children were born c.1046-c.1055,137 which – perhaps coincidentally – are also years during which there are no extant charters issued by Adelaide. Some of Adelaide’s contemporaries, including Beatrice of Tuscany and Empress Agnes, are similarly noticeable by their absence during their pregnancies.138 It may thus be that childbirth had an impact on Adelaide’s exercise of power.139 Since Adelaide is documented extensively after Otto’s death, the possibility that Adelaide’s ability to act was limited by Otto, and/or by childbearing, must be taken seriously.

Based on surviving documents Adelaide’s status, and freedom of action, as a wife – particularly during her marriage to Otto – appears to have been closer to that of a consort than a ruler. Adelaide co-issued documents with her husbands less often than her mother did with Olderic-Manfred;140 and in these documents, Adelaide is always listed second. Adelaide rarely issued documents without her husbands: on one occasion – in Hermann’s absence – Adelaide co-issued a charter with her mother; and on another, she explicitly acted with Henry’s consent.141 While there is no evidence of Adelaide acting alone during her marriage to Otto, he clearly issued documents without her.

136 Adelaide’s sons are named in several of her charters (above n.123; below, n.180); her daughters are not: evidence for their parentage is found in narrative sources relating to their marriages: Appendix 1, nos. 9h, 12a, 18a, 21a-b, 21d, 24a. For Otto as bishop of Asti: chapter 6.
137 Appendix 1, nos.9c-g.
138 There are no extant documents issued by Beatrice 1044-1053, during which time she gave birth to three children: Goez, Beatrix, Reg. nos. 3-8. On Agnes’ absence from her husband’s diplomas: Black-Veldtrupp, Agnes, 8-13; Struve, ‘Interventionen,’ esp. 205. By contrast, Stafford, Emma, 221 suggests that Queen Emma’s appearances in the witness-lists of Æthelred’s diplomas were positively linked with marriage/childbearing.
140 Above nn.38-39.
141 Above nn.46, 119.
Titles and office?

Adelaide’s husbands (like her father\textsuperscript{142}) were almost always entitled marchio in charters; by contrast Adelaide (and her mother\textsuperscript{143}) were almost always entitled comitissa.\textsuperscript{144} This title-usage defined Adelaide’s husband(s) as the ruler of Turin, and relegated Adelaide’s status to that of consort. The title of comitissa was typically accorded to medieval women by virtue of their marriage to men who held public office. There was, however, a significant lag between the appearance of masculine titles (comes, dux, marchio) and their feminine counterparts (comitissa, ducatrix/ducissa, marchionissa).\textsuperscript{145} In the tenth and eleventh centuries, comitissa was the customary title for the wives of counts, dukes and margraves in much of France, Germany and Italy.\textsuperscript{146} No contemporary text specifically addresses the rights and duties of comitissae, although Peter Damian wrote letters to several Italian countesses, including Adelaide, suggesting that they should support the Church and religious reform; and that they should encourage their husbands to act mercifully.\textsuperscript{147} As is clear from the cases of Adelaide and her mother, Bertha, countesses also held lands, played key roles in the administration of their marital households, and governed alongside their husbands.

These forms of agency are comparable to queens’. Countesses mirrored queens in other ways, too: their power was typically derived from their status as wife and mother, which meant that their roles changed across the course of their lifecycles.\textsuperscript{148} Although queenship is sometimes described as office (with specific functions or responsibilities), it is more commonly seen as a range of possibilities upon which individual queens were able to

\textsuperscript{142} Appendix 2, I-III.
\textsuperscript{143} Appendix 2, II-IV.
\textsuperscript{144} Exceptions are: Appendix 1, nos. 1, 3, 10 (no title); 22 (marchionissa). Goez, ‘Typ,’ 174, 176 notes Adelaide’s preference for comitissa, but also argues that she used the same title as her father/husbands. On the titles used by Adelaide’s family: Previté-Orton, \textit{History}, 151ff.; Sergi, ‘Potere’, 63-67; Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 173-191; Ripart, \textit{Fondements}, 272-281.
\textsuperscript{145} Cartwright, ‘Matilda,’ 68; le Jan, \textit{Famille}, 358-365.
\textsuperscript{147} Appendix 1, no.14b; \textit{Briehe}, nos. 51, 143; Creber, ‘Mirrors’. On intercession/religious patronage: chs.3-4.
\textsuperscript{148} Stafford, ‘Emma’; Stafford, ‘Powerful’; Tanner, ‘Queenship,’ esp. 135f.
capitalise, or not, depending on their personal experiences, resources and strengths. \(^{149}\)

‘Countess-ship’ is even more nebulous (lacking the definition and status which coronation and anointment granted to queens). \(^{150}\)

Both Adelaide and her mother, Bertha, were clearly capable of acting authoritatively. Their status (as the wife/widow and daughter/heir, respectively, of Olderic-Manfred) presented them with the opportunity to become actively involved in politics, and both women capitalised on this. Bertha clearly shared in Olderic-Manfred’s rule, and established herself as Adelaide’s regent after his death. The extent to which Adelaide’s claims translated into power varied according to her age, whether she was married, and to whom: there is evidence of a good working-relationship between Adelaide and Henry, but she may have struggled to rule alongside Otto. After Otto’s death, as we shall see, Adelaide certainly established herself as the ruler of Turin. Despite a long tradition of female rule in Turin, a woman’s integration into government could not be taken for granted. After Adelaide’s death, her granddaughter, Agnes of Turin (discussed below), failed to make good her claims. Contemporaries may have been willing to accept individual powerful women precisely because their position was ad hoc, meaning it was possible to circumscribe their power, or that of their successors. \(^{151}\)

This argument is at odds with Bonanate’s view that the title of comitissa was derived from royal/imperial power, and thus indicates that Adelaide held traditional public office. \(^{152}\)

In addition to the thorny question of countess-ship as office, Bonanate’s argument is problematic for several reasons. First, it is based on the implicit assumption that Adelaide controlled the form and content of her charters. While Adelaide forged close relationships


\(^{151}\) Tanner, ‘Queenship’.

\(^{152}\) Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 180ff.
with some notaries, and it is likely that her charters reflected her wishes, the role of custom and notarial preference should not be overlooked. Second, the conception of comitissa as a public title, delegated by the emperor, is problematic. This is partly because the link between the margravial title and power in Turin had already begun to break down under Olderic-Manfred. With the exception of Hermann, there is little evidence that the title of margrave of Turin was derived from royal/imperial power, let alone that this was the case with comitissa. Moreover, Bonanate distinguishes between Adelaide’s use of the ‘public’ title of comitissa, and the dynastic or ‘signorial’ titles of marchionissa and ducatrix used, for example, by Beatrice and Matilda of Tuscany, whose status, Bonanate argues, was not imperially-approved.

Yet the use of the margravial title by women is not indicative of signorial power, so much as of a changing conception of the margravial role. When margraves began to lose their specifically military function in the mid-eleventh century, some women began to use margravial titles. With the exception of an early attestation in the mid-tenth century, Beatrice and Matilda are the first Italian women to regularly refer to themselves as marchionissa in their charters (from 1073). Adelaide was entitled marchionissa in a charter issued Savoy in the mid-to-late 1060s, and she was also occasionally referred to as marchisia/marchionissa in narrative sources written in the late eleventh and early twelfth century.
That there is less variation in Adelaide’s title than Beatrice and Matilda’s is not due to a distinction in the nature of their power. Rather, Adelaide had less need to innovate: in contrast with Beatrice and Matilda, who often ruled alone, there was always a male margrave in Turin. Custom may also have played a role: Adelaide had been using the title of *comitissa* since the 1040s, and may have seen no reason to change this when other titles – such as *marchionissa* – became available from the 1060s. It may also have been the case that Adelaide did not need to have her status validated by a margravial title. As we shall see, after Otto’s death Adelaide’s son, Peter, was margrave of Turin, but his position was nominal. Adelaide was the real ruler of Turin, and her authority was not noticeably different from that of her margravial predecessors.\(^\text{161}\) Since contemporaries recognised Adelaide’s authority, it may be that she was indifferent to the title by which she was called.\(^\text{162}\)

**Widowhood**

Adelaide was married three times, but after Otto’s death she did not marry again.\(^\text{163}\) She thus spent much of her adult life (from her late thirties/early forties to her seventies) as a widow. While their position was sometimes precarious, medieval noblewomen generally had more opportunities to act and exercise power independently as widows than as wives.\(^\text{164}\) Adelaide’s early career conforms to the expectation that a woman who inherited lands and titles would transmit power to her husband, rather than rule herself. After Otto’s death, however, Adelaide becomes much more prominent in the sources. In fact, the vast majority of extant sources relating to Adelaide date to her third, and final, widowhood (c. 1060-1091). This includes: all of the extant letters written to Adelaide; most chronicle entries; and twenty-nine of her thirty-

\(^{161}\) Ripart, *Fondements*, 278.

\(^{162}\) For a similar argument, in relation to Matilda of Tuscany: Reynolds, ‘Reading,’ 8.

\(^{163}\) Adelaide may, however, have considered re-marrying: Appendix 1, no. 14a.

seven extant charters. This thesis is thus primarily concerned with Adelaide’s activities as a widow.

The first document Adelaide issued as a widow indicates that she viewed herself as the rightful ruler of Turin. In 1060 Adelaide made a donation, solely in her name, to the cathedral church of San Giovanni Battista in Turin for the sake of Otto’s soul.165 This was not the first politically significant act which Adelaide had staged at the cathedral: in 1042 she issued a document there with Henry.166 As in the early 1040s, Adelaide’s position was somewhat precarious after Otto’s death, as there was no (adult) male margrave in Turin. Adelaide’s issuing of charters at the cathedral was significant for personal, as well as political and religious reasons. The 1060 charter explicitly emphasises Adelaide’s personal connections: it was issued in the cathedral, *ubi secus pedem altaris requiescit Magnifredus marchio*.167 With this act, Adelaide, *filia quondam Oldrigii sive Magnifredi marchionis*, asserted her status as Olderic-Manfred’s heir.168 The *intitulatio* of Adelaide’s charters emphasised her relationship with Olderic-Manfred more than any of her other family members, as it was this which gave Adelaide her legitimacy.169

*Adelaide’s sons*

The stable transition of power after Otto’s death was made easier by several factors. By 1060 Adelaide was a mature woman, with a long experience of ruling, in partnership both with her mother and her husbands. She had well-established links with the imperial family, and multiple children to provide dynastic continuity, including her eldest son, Peter, who became

---

165 Appendix 1, no.11. Goez, ‘Typ,’ 187; Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 331 mistakenly states that Adelaide and her sons made this donation to the monastery of San Solutore, where both Olderic-Manfred and Otto were interred.
166 Above, nn.115-117.
167 Adelaide’s 1042 charter is less explicit, but the significance of this location would have been apparent to those who witnessed her grant.
169 Above, n.8; Goez, ‘Typ,’ 174; Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 310f.
the new margrave of Turin (r.1057/60-1078). Peter is first attested with the margravial title at a *placitum* in 1064 (when he was probably in his mid-to-late teens). This suggests that the presence of a male margrave, however nominal, was needed to secure Adelaide’s hold on Turin. Some scholars describe Adelaide as Peter’s regent. There were strong precedents for female regency, both within Adelaide’s own family, and with the contemporaneous regency of Empress Agnes for her son, Henry IV (1056-1062). Yet this is not how Adelaide viewed herself. Adelaide shared some power with her sons, but did not cede power to them, and remained firmly in control of political affairs until her death (d.1091). Crucially, contemporaries also regarded Adelaide, not Peter, as the ruler of Turin: bishops and popes wrote letters to Adelaide, rather than Peter, and it was Adelaide’s actions – rather than Peter’s or those of his brother, Amadeus – which were typically recorded in narrative sources.

The nature of the relationship between family members depended on several factors, including politics, personality, and access to power. Some historians of the eleventh-thirteenth centuries highlight rivalry and conflict among kin, particularly between ruling fathers and their sons; others emphasise close, co-operative relationships between family members. Since women’s power was often linked to their relationship with their sons, historians are particularly likely to focus on shared political interests, as well as points of conflict, between mothers and sons. There is little evidence of conflict between Adelaide
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170 Appendix 1, no. 13.
173 Appendix 1, nos. 14b, 19c, 26a (during Peter’s lifetime); 40a (after Peter’s death). Gregory VII sent a message to Adelaide’s son, Amadeus: Appendix 1, no. 26b.
174 Exceptions are: Appendix 1, nos. 29a-b; 30a.
177 LoPrete, ‘Mother’; Chibnall, ‘Sons’; Stafford, ‘Sons’; Stafford, ‘Parents’.
and her sons, who appear to have accepted her right to rule. Beyond investing Peter as margrave, there was little attempt to maintain the fiction of male rule in Turin. Peter and Amadeus rarely appear in Adelaide’s surviving documents: between 1057 and 1078 Adelaide co-issued five charters with Peter (Amadeus also co-issued three of these documents). During this same period, Adelaide issued twenty-two further documents on her own (six of which are deperdita), her sons witnessed two of these documents, and consented to a third. By contrast, there are no extant documents issued solely by Peter or Amadeus, and only two deperdita. Whereas Adelaide’s husbands always took precedence in charters they co-issued, this was only the case on two occasions with Peter, and never the case with Amadeus. Moreover, while Adelaide is always referred to by a title in these charters, her sons are frequently identified only in terms of their relationship to her.

It was common for the children of rulers to appear in their parents’ charters, often from a young age. Sometimes children’s consent was required for alienation of property. Their presence was also a means by which they could become familiar with complicated legal documents, and with the people and institutions which made up the local and regional

178 Unlike some twelfth-century heiresses, there was no suggestion that Adelaide should step aside in favour of her son(s). Cf. Shadis, ‘Berenguela’; Chibnall, Matilda; Mayer, ‘Melisende’.
179 Sergi, Potere, 56ff.
180 Appendix 1, nos. 13, 33 (Peter); 10, 22, 32 (plus Amadeus). Adelaide and her sons also intervened in another document: no. 26d. 
182 Witnesses: Appendix 1, nos. 14, 21. Consent: no. 26
183 Appendix 1, nos. 33b, 36a.
184 Appendix 1, nos. 13: domnus Petrus marchio filius quondam bone memorie item Oddonis marchioni simul cum Adheleida comitissa matre sua; 32: Petrus marchio filius Oddonis marchionis et comitissae Ataleldae
185 Another possible means by which Adelaide distinguished herself from her sons is the use of a seal. One of her charters contains a sealing clause, and an extant seal impression (Appendix 1, no. 32). There are, however, questions about the authenticity of the charter to which the seal is attached. Cipolla, Monumenta, I, 168 and MHP, Chart, I, no.391 argue that the document and seal are later forgeries; Sergi, L’Aristocrazia, esp. 127f. that it is an authentic charter with later interpolations. For discussions of the seal (which is presumed: first, to be authentic; second, to have belonged originally to Adelaide’s husband, Otto): Goez, ‘Typ,’ 177f.; Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 312ff.; Vogelsang, Herrscherin, 51; Stieldorf, Frauensiegel, 45 n.107; Kittel, ‘Ehegattensiegel,’ 294; von Ledebrur, Frauensiegel, 3.
186 Appendix 1, nos. 22: Adelaidam marchionissam cum filiis suis Petro et Amedeo et Oddone; 26: consentientibus atque laudantibus filiis meis, videlicet Amedeo et Petro; 32: domna Adeleida comitissa ... cum filiis suis Petro et Amedeo.
187 White, Custom, 86-129.
political networks by which their dynasty exercised power. This kind of ‘anticipatory association’ or plural rule was designed to ensure the smooth succession of the next generation. As we have seen, Adelaide occasionally co-issued documents alongside her parents. Similarly, Adelaide associated her own sons with her rule, without giving up her own authority. In an ad hoc manner, Adelaide delegated various political, administrative and military responsibilities to her sons in order to prepare them for their roles as lords.

This is only apparent in Peter’s case in the 1070s (by which time he was in his mid-twenties). In 1072 a dispute concerning the episcopal monastery of Santa Maria in Cavour was settled by Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno, at Peter’s request. This indicates that Peter had been given some responsibility in relation to legal matters, and was also building up relationships with an important viscount, an important monastery, and the bishop of Turin. Peter and Amadeus may also have taken part in Adelaide’s military activities, such as her attacks on the city of Asti and/or Lodi. Lampert of Hersfeld emphasises that Adelaide and her sons possessed extensive arma et opes, and Peter later carried out a military assault on the monastery of San Michele della Chiusa. This attack took place in 1078 in conjunction with Bishop Cunibert of Turin, probably with Adelaide’s tacit approval. At about this time, Peter was perhaps also in dispute with Bishop Ingo of Asti over possession of Lavezzole. Here Peter may have been acting against Adelaide: Bishop Ingo was Adelaide’s protégé; and the dispute was settled in Ingo’s favour (Lavezzole was granted to the episcopal monastery of Santa Maria in Asti). Adelaide delegated certain responsibilities to Peter, and permitted him a degree of independence, but his freedom of action was limited and provisional.

189 Lewis, ‘Association’; Bianchini, Berenguela.
190 Above nn.11, 46.
191 Appendix 1, no.25b; chapters 5, 7.
192 Appendix 1, nos. 21c, 22a; chapters 2, 6.
193 Lampert, Annales, a.1069, 110.
194 Appendix 1, no. 30a; chapter 4.
195 Appendix 1, no. 33a; chapter 6.
While they may have differed on specific points, in general Adelaide and Peter worked together to ensure the success of their dynasty. The co-operative relationship between Adelaide and her sons meant that they could pursue complex political strategies to maximise their dynasty’s power and influence. First, Adelaide’s youngest son, Otto, entered the Church, and probably became bishop of Asti, which was intended to ensure the dynasty’s control in this county.  

Second, Adelaide appears to have formally divided the territories of Turin and Savoy: Peter was margrave of Turin, and Amadeus was count of Savoy. Adelaide clearly distinguished between her sons’ titles in a donation charter issued in March 1080 pro mercede ... quondam Petri marchionis sive quondam Amedei comitis. A division of territories is also implicit in Lampert of Hersfeld’s account of Canossa (1076/7), in which he refers to Adelaide and Amadeus’ possessions (but not Peter’s) along the route which led through the Alps from Savoy into Turin. Previté-Orton and Cognasso argue that while Amadeus may have possessed lands in Savoy, it was not until after Peter’s death (d.1078) that he exercised formal jurisdiction there. If so, Adelaide may have granted Amadeus Savoy as a sop to prevent him from contesting the inheritance of Peter’s daughter, Agnes, in Turin (discussed below). Yet Amadeus was a leading-name among the Humbertine dynasty, which suggests that he was always intended to play a role in Savoy. It is thus likely that Turin and Savoy were formally divided shortly after Otto of Savoy’s death (c.1060). In addition to Adelaide’s wishing to see both of her sons well-provided-for, an early division suggests that Turin and Savoy were always viewed as separate entities. Moreover, placing Amadeus in Savoy meant that there was less competition in Turin, not only for Peter (and

---

196 Chapter 6.  
197 Appendix 1, no. 37.  
198 Chapter 3, n.51; Sergi, Potere, 58f.  
200 On medieval naming patterns: Dunabin, ‘Name’; Bouchard, ‘Patterns’; Skinner, ‘Name’. Peter’s name is not characteristic of Adelaide’s, or Otto’s, dynasty; Otto is present in both dynasties; Bertha and Adelaide were named narrowly in the maternal line.  
later, his daughter, Agnes), but also for Adelaide: this division may have been a means by which Adelaide hoped to retain overall control in Turin and Savoy.202

Third, Peter and Amadeus played important – but distinct – roles in terms of papal and imperial relations. Peter helped to further Adelaide’s dynastic relationship with the imperial family. He married Agnes of Aquitaine, who was – in all probability – the daughter of William VII of Aquitaine (r.1039-1058) and his wife, Ernesinde.203 (Table 7.) This marital alliance served several functions. Agnes was the niece of Empress Agnes and first cousin of Henry IV; this marriage thus brought Adelaide’s dynasty even closer into the imperial orbit.204 There were also longer-standing connections between Adelaide’s dynasty and Agnes’.205 In 1024 Olderic-Manfred urged Agnes’ grandfather, William V, to accept the Italian crown.206 Although William ultimately rejected this proposal, he travelled to Italy with Olderic-Manfred, and one of his letters refers to the fides et amicicia quae inter nos est.207

By contrast Peter’s younger brother, Amadeus, fostered relations with the papacy. In 1066, aged about sixteen, Amadeus swore fealty to Pope Alexander II.208 Amadeus was reminded of his oath to protect the Holy See by Pope Gregory VII in 1074, who was hoping to gain his support against the southern Italian Normans.209 Amadeus also cultivated a close relationship with Rudolf of Rheinfelden, who possessed territory contiguous with his dynasty’s Savoyard lands (and who married Amadeus’s sister, Adelaide of Savoy).210 Amadeus may even have married a niece of Rudolf’s. Unlike his siblings, little is known

202 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 51.
204 Chapter 2.
205 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 49f.
206 Above p.34 n.29.
207 Behrends, Fulbert, no. 111 (1025).
208 Appendix 1, no. 19a.
209 Appendix 1, no. 26b.
210 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 61ff.; Duparc, Comté, 88.
about Amadeus’ marriage. He seems to have married a Burgundian noblewoman, whose lands were contiguous with his own territory in Savoy. Late sources suggest that his wife was Joan, daughter of Gerold of Geneva and Rudolf’s unnamed sister. Bonanate suggests that Amadeus’ favourable relationship with Gregory and Rudolf, c. 1074, is a sign that he was taking an independent political stance from Adelaide. This is unlikely, since Adelaide was on good terms with Rudolf, and other pro-papal princes, at this time and also maintained close links with the papacy. Moreover, Adelaide and Amadeus clearly had a good working-relationship: Amadeus was present with Adelaide for the events of Canossa in 1076/7. By contrast, Peter is not mentioned either in connection with Gregory’s planned expedition, or with Canossa. Peter’s absence from Canossa does not, however, indicate that he was excluded from power; instead, it is likely that he remained behind to govern in Adelaide’s (and Amadeus’) absence.

In the period immediately after Canossa (1078-1080) many of Adelaide’s closest relatives died, including: her sister Immilla (d. 1078), her children, Peter (d. 1078), Adelaide (d. 1079), and Amadeus (d. 1080), and her son-in-law, Rudolf of Rheinfelden (d. 1080). These deaths coincided with wider political conflict between Henry IV of Germany and Gregory VII, and led to a period of instability in Adelaide’s rule. One of the means by which Adelaide re-asserted her position was by forging closer relations with Peter’s wife, Agnes of Aquitaine, and his daughter, Agnes of Turin.

---

211 On his sister’s marriages: chapter 2.
212 For Amadeus’ marriage to Joan: Appendix 1, no. 19e; Guichenon, Histoire, I, 211. (Previté-Orton, History, 242, and Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 65 n. 229 are sceptical.) For Joan as Gerold’s daughter/Rudolf’s niece: CSGA, 210; also Hlawitschka, ‘Herkunft,’ 179f.
213 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 64f.
214 Appendix 1, nos. 14b, 26a-b, 26d; chapters 3-4.
215 Appendix 1, nos. 29a-c; chapter 3. Against this view: Ripart, Fondements, 309.
216 Appendix 1, nos. 29c, 33c, 35a, 36b; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 79.
217 Chapters 3-6.
Agnes of Aquitaine

Agnes of Aquitaine is not attested during Peter’s lifetime, but it is clear from subsequent charters that she was the mother of Peter’s daughter and heir, Agnes of Turin, whose rights in Turin were clearly signalled by Adelaide. After Peter’s death both Agnes of Aquitaine, and Agnes of Turin, appeared in Adelaide’s documents; this was not the case with either Amadeus’ widow, or his heir, Humbert II of Savoy. Adelaide supported Agnes of Turin in part because she was Peter’s heir; but this was also a means of ensuring Adelaide’s own power. Neither Agnes of Turin, who was still young, nor her mother, who was not Italian, posed any real threat to Adelaide’s position. Because they had not issued charters during Peter’s lifetime, Peter’s wife and daughter were not part of the networks of land and patronage through which power was exercised.

While Agnes of Turin was still young, Adelaide issued several documents with her mother, Agnes of Aquitaine. These were primarily donations to religious institutions, but Agnes also presided at a placitum alongside Adelaide. In these documents both Adelaide and Agnes of Aquitaine are entitled comitissa. This is unusual in charters issued by Adelaide’s family, in which there was typically only one marchio and/or comitissa. Bonanate – who sees comitissa as a public title – thus argues that after Peter’s death, Agnes of Aquitaine, acting as regent for her daughter, was fully integrated into government alongside Adelaide. This was not entirely the case. Although Adelaide and Agnes maintained a good working-relationship, Adelaide always took precedence in the charters she issued with Agnes. She also issued more documents without Agnes than with her.

---

218 Appendix 1, nos. 34a, 47 (Pinerolo); 36 (San Solutore); 41 (Bobbio); 42-43 (Oulx); 46 (Asti). Patrone, ‘Agnes,’ 437 and de Matteis, ‘Ruoli,’ 37, following Guichenon, Histoire, II, 203, mistakenly argue that Agnes made donations to San Giusto in Susa and to Fruttuaria.
219 Appendix 1, no. 39.
222 de Matteis, ‘Ruoli,’ 37.
223 Appendix 1, nos. 34-35, 37-38, 40, 44-45, 49-50.
Moreover, there are extensive references to Adelaide’s other activities at this time in letters and chronicles.\textsuperscript{224} By contrast, there are no extant letters to Agnes of Aquitaine, nor is she mentioned in narrative sources. This suggests that, although Agnes was associated with Adelaide’s lordship, Adelaide retained her pre-eminent position in Turin, both over Agnes and the next margrave, Frederick of Montbéliard.

\textit{Agnes of Turin and Frederick of Montbéliard}

After Peter’s death, the next attested margrave is Frederick of Montbéliard, who married Peter’s daughter, Agnes of Turin (probably early 1080).\textsuperscript{225} In Summer/Autumn 1079 \textit{Count} Frederick was in Mantua.\textsuperscript{226} In March 1080, \textit{Fredericus comes} witnessed Adelaide’s donation to the monastery of San Solutore in Turin,\textsuperscript{227} but in May 1080 \textit{Fredericus marchio} presided over a \textit{placitum} with Adelaide and Agnes of Aquitaine to settle a dispute between the abbeys of Dijon and Frutturia.\textsuperscript{228} The record of this \textit{placitum} is unreliable, but the change in titulature suggests that Frederick married Agnes, and became margrave, between March and May 1080.\textsuperscript{229}

Given the political implications of this marriage, Adelaide presumably played a role in choosing Agnes’ husband.\textsuperscript{230} Frederick’s parents were Louis of Montbéliard and Sophie of Bar; he was Matilda of Tuscany’s first cousin, and Henry IV of Germany’s second cousin. (Table 6) Nevertheless, as a younger son, his marriage to Agnes raised his status considerably. This had parallels with Adelaide’s own marriage to Otto of Savoy. The benefit for Adelaide was twofold: first, like Agnes of Aquitaine, Frederick lacked any kind of power-

\textsuperscript{224} Appendix 1, nos. 39a, 40a-b, 41b-c, 43a-c, 47a-b, 47d.
\textsuperscript{225} Appendix 1, no. 38a; Parisse, ‘Sophie,’ 7ff.; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 74-81.
\textsuperscript{226} DD MT, nos. 27 (8\textsuperscript{th} July 1079); 28 (17\textsuperscript{th} September 1079).
\textsuperscript{227} Appendix 1, no. 37.
\textsuperscript{228} Appendix 1, 39; chapter 7.
\textsuperscript{229} Bernold of Constance also refers to Frederick as \textit{marchio} (\textit{Chronicon}, a.1091, 484), but Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 79 questions whether Frederick ever held the margravial title. By contrast, de Matteis, ‘Ruoli,’ 38 argues that Frederick was invested with the margravial title by Henry IV at Adelaide’s request.
\textsuperscript{230} On mothers'/grandmothers’ roles in making matrimonial alliances: Parsons, ‘Mothers,’ 63f., 72f.
base in Piedmont and posed no real threat to Adelaide’s position. He was never more than a nominal margrave. Second, this marital alliance was a means of furthering Adelaide’s relationship with her cousin, Matilda of Tuscany, whom she had worked alongside at Canossa (1077).  

Table 6: Kinship between Adelaide, Matilda, and Frederick

---

231 Chapter 3.
Frederick had close connections with Matilda: he is documented in charters issued by Matilda and her mother, Beatrice (Frederick’s maternal aunt) from 1071 onwards.\textsuperscript{232} Like Matilda, Frederick was a firm supporter of Pope Gregory VII.\textsuperscript{233} This suggests that Adelaide also hoped for continued close relations between herself and Gregory.\textsuperscript{234} Confirmation of this view can be found in the \textit{placitum} which Adelaide and Frederick presided over, at Gregory’s request in May 1080.\textsuperscript{235}

Frederick does not appear in any documents in Turin after May 1080. Given the limited sources for Turin in the 1080s,\textsuperscript{236} the significance of this is unclear. For at least some of this time Frederick was working with his cousin, Matilda, to support Gregory VII in his conflict with Henry IV.\textsuperscript{237} In particular, Frederick may have helped to funnel revenues from Matilda’s Lotharingian lands, via Montbéliard, to Gregory in Rome.\textsuperscript{238} Bonanate thinks that Frederick’s pro-papal stance threatened to destabilise Adelaide’s relationship with Henry IV, and that this is why Frederick disappeared from Adelaide’s documents.\textsuperscript{239} Yet Adelaide maintained good relations with Matilda until at least 1082,\textsuperscript{240} and it is possible that Frederick transported Matilda’s wealth to Rome via Turin. The presence of \textit{Ribaldus de Taurino} alongside Frederick in one of Matilda’s documents in Mantua tentatively supports this view.\textsuperscript{241} A man named Ribaldus witnessed several documents for Adelaide, and her sister Immilla.\textsuperscript{242} If this same Ribaldus was present in Mantua, it could suggest that Frederick was acting with Adelaide’s knowledge, and perhaps even as her agent.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Goez, \textit{Beatrix}, 31f.; Reg. nos. 25, 33; DD MT nos. 11; 27-28; 36; Dep 9; Poull, \textit{Maison}, 43, 47.}
\footnote{Chapter 3; Bernold, \textit{Chronicon}, a.1092, 495; Robinson, \textit{Authority}, 102; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 75ff.}
\footnote{Hellmann, \textit{Grafen}, 25f.; Bonanate ‘Funzione,’ 187.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{232} Above n.228.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{233} Chapter 3.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{234} Eads, \textit{Mighty}, 165f.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{235} Below, n.265.}
\end{footnotes}
Although Frederick was absent from Adelaide’s documents after 1080, his wife was not. In 1089 Adalasia comitissa issued a document *cum nuru mea Agneti, et filia eius Agnete*. This is the only occasion in which Agnes of Turin appears in Adelaide’s charters, and a rare instance of three generations of women working together.\(^{243}\) Unlike previous documents co-issued by Adelaide and Agnes of Aquitaine, this charter maintains a clear hierarchy between Adelaide — entitled *comitissa* — and Agnes of Aquitaine and her daughter, who are identified only by their familial relationships. Bonanate argues that Agnes of Turin was excluded from earlier documents because of her marriage to the pro-papal Frederick.\(^{244}\) Yet since Adelaide’s relationship with Gregory was good at this time, and since Frederick may have been acting as her agent, this was presumably not the case. Thus, while Adelaide may have felt the need to issue documents alongside a male margrave during the unstable years after Peter and Amadeus’ deaths (1078-1080), thereafter her position was more secure, and she may not have felt the need to issue documents with Frederick or his wife.

Towards the end of her life, Adelaide began to include Agnes of Turin, as well as her mother, Agnes of Aquitaine, in her documents, in order to prepare her for rule. The 1089 document is Adelaide’s last extant charter; she died (in her seventies) in December 1091, shortly after Frederick’s death (in his mid-forties, in June 1091).\(^{245}\) Thereafter Agnes of Turin tried, and failed, to hold Adelaide’s territory.\(^{246}\) Adelaide’s political authority was not automatically transmitted to Agnes, who had to renegotiate her position. Agnes faced stiff competition from the bishops of Turin and Asti, and from Adelaide’s male kin. These included: Adelaide’s grandsons, Humbert II of Savoy (Amadeus’s son), and Conrad of Italy (Bertha’s son), and her nephew, Boniface del Vasto (her sister, Bertha’s, son). These men had


\(^{244}\) Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 81.

\(^{245}\) Appendix 1, nos. 47c, 50a; Sergi, *Confini*, 89.

\(^{246}\) BSSS 45, no. 45 (March/April 1095); Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 81ff.
less direct claims than Agnes, and her young son, Peter II, but a greater ability to enforce their position.247

**Female networks**

Networks are rarely studied from a woman’s point of view; less common still is the examination of a woman’s relationship with other laywomen. In part, this is a documentary problem: medieval sources seldom focus on relationships between laywomen. Adelaide’s charters, for example, narrowly include her patrilineal kin. Consideration of other sources – and a degree of speculation – indicates, however, that Adelaide was part of a cohesive, trans-regional, network of wider, and specifically female, kin, upon whom she relied to maintain and expand her powerbase. This accords with evidence of other networks of medieval laywomen, often united by kinship, supporting and/or co-operating with each other to political and liturgical/religious ends.248

Different women were connected with Adelaide at different stages of her life, and her relationships with them varied in duration and intensity. Many were – or had been – rulers (either as regents, or in their own right), and they often exerted a great deal of political influence. As we have seen, Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, was of the utmost importance in Adelaide’s early rule. Then, after Peter’s death, Adelaide’s daughter-in-law, Agnes, and granddaughter, also called Agnes, were the means by which she attempted to ensure the future of her dynasty in Turin. In this section, the focus is on other women with whom Adelaide had dealings,249 including those to whom she was closely linked by ties of kinship,

---


249 Adelaide presumably had contact with other women: aristocratic girls whom she fostered, ladies-in-waiting, nurses, midwives, etc. There is little evidence for this, but cf. n.270 below; in general: Hanawalt, ‘Networks’.
such as her sisters, Bertha and Immilla of Turin, and her daughters, Bertha and Adelaide of Savoy. Women to whom Adelaide was more distantly related, including Empress Agnes, Ermesinde of Aquitaine, and Matilda of Tuscany, were also part of her network.

Adelaide’s sisters
Adelaide’s sisters, Immilla and Bertha of Turin, are poorly-documented by comparison with Adelaide. Unlike Adelaide’s parents, whose siblings often appeared in their documents, no extant documents were co-issued by Adelaide and her sisters, nor did they witness Adelaide’s charters (nor vice versa). Some scholars argue that noblewomen – who married into geographically distant families – maintained only limited connections with their natal families. That, though, would have negated the purpose of trans-regional marital alliances, which was to utilise women’s geographical and familial mobility to develop widespread political contacts. Although rarely documented in the eleventh century, there are hints in the evidence that there was ongoing communication between married women and their natal families, as well as periodic reunions to renew family bonds.

It is possible to discern some ongoing contact between Adelaide and her sisters. In the case of Adelaide and Bertha, this is limited to complementary donations they each made to the cathedral church of Asti in 1065. In Immilla’s case, there is greater evidence of connections, not only with Adelaide, but also with Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha of Savoy.

250 For Adelaide/Matilda: above pp.69ff. Golinelli, ‘Nonostante,’ 257-262, 265f. describes many of these women as Matilda’s ‘female friends’. Examining these relationships from Adelaide’s, rather than Matilda’s, point of view demonstrates their multi-faceted nature.
251 Olderic-Manfred frequently issued charters with his brother, Alric (Appendix 2, III); Bertha’s brothers are present in: Appendix 2, II/1, II/3. On broad kinship bonds in charters: Ripart, Fondements, 301f.; Violante, ‘Quelques’.
252 Turner, ‘Eleanor’; Herlihy, Households, 82, 185; Lyon, Princely, 52ff.
254 Below, p.227. They also made grants to monasteries in Genoa: above n.46: Appendix 2, VI/1.
Immilla spent much of her adult life in Germany married, firstly, to Otto of Schweinfurt, and then to Eckbert of Braunschweig. She thus played a key role in maintaining connections between Adelaide and the imperial court. Immilla was particularly associated with Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha, who married Henry IV of Germany. In June 1071, for example, Immilla was present, along with Bertha, Henry IV, and the rest of the imperial court, for the consecration of the new cathedral in Halberstadt.

After Eckbert of Braunschweig’s death, Immilla returned to Turin (1071x1073), where she appears to have remained until her death (d.1078). There is no direct evidence of contact between Immilla and Adelaide during this period. Adelaide – who took care only to associate the main branch of the dynasty with her charters – did not co-issue any documents with Immilla. Yet Immilla issued a number of grants at this time which complemented Adelaide’s donations to local monasteries, including Santa Maria in Cavour, San Pietro in Turin, their parents’ foundation of Santa Maria in Caramagna, and Adelaide’s own foundation of Santa Maria in Pinerolo. These documents were often written by the same notaries, and witnessed by many of the same individuals, including Margrave Wido of Sezzadio; the boni homines, Wido, Ribaldus, and William; the iudex Gosvino, and Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno. With the exception of the central branch of her dynasty, Adelaide rarely commemorated her family members (particularly women) by name, but she

---

255 Above, n.57.
256 Chapter 2.
257 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 55f.
259 Annalista Saxo, a.1071, 418; Gesta episcoporum Halberstadensium, a.1071, 96f.
260 Immilla returned to Turin after June 1071 (n.259) and before March 1073 (Appendix 2, VII/1).
261 Appendix 1, no. 29c. Immilla is not documented north of the Alps after 1073.
262 Appendix 2, VII. For Adelaide’s patronage: chapter 4. By contrast, Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 136ff. suggests that Immilla made her donations against Adelaide’s wishes.
263 E.g. the notarii sacri palacii, Giselbert (chapter 5); and Peter: Appendix 1, no. 25; Appendix 2, VII/2-3.
264 Below pp.142f.
265 Immilla: Appendix 2, VII/2-3, 5; Adelaide: below p.191 n.221.
266 Chapter 5.
made a donation for the sake of Immilla’s soul to the monastery of Pinerolo shortly after her death.\footnote{Appendix 1, no.30.}

**Adelaide’s daughters**

Previté-Orton argued that – since she made gifts for the souls of her sons, but not her daughters – Adelaide ‘seems to have cared little for her daughters’.\footnote{Previté-Orton, *History*, 250.}\footnote{Above n.123.} Certainly, she is rarely documented with Bertha or Adelaide of Savoy. They are mentioned, but not named, in a charter issued by Adelaide and Otto in 1057.\footnote{Appendix 1, no.48.} Bertha was also referred to in a grant of Adelaide’s (now lost) rewarding Adalbert-Curtes and Bona, who were part of Adelaide’s curia et familia, for nursing Peter and Bertha with great care.\footnote{Appendix 1, no. 9h. For Bertha in Germany: *RI*, III.2.3, nos. 47, 57, 189; DD HIV, no. 156.}\footnote{Bühler, ‘Kaiser,’ 38, 60; MvK, 1, 176; Zey, ‘Frauen,’ 73.}\footnote{Chapter 2.} Yet it is unsurprising that Adelaide and her daughters are seldom documented together. Bertha (aged four) was betrothed to Henry IV of Germany in 1055, and thereafter spent much of her time in Germany.\footnote{Appendix 1, no. 9h.} It is even possible that she was raised at the imperial court by Henry’s mother, Empress Agnes.\footnote{Bühler, ‘Kaiser,’ 38, 60; MvK, 1, 176; Zey, ‘Frauen,’ 73.} Similarly Adelaide of Savoy was probably between ten and twelve years old (the minimum canonical age for marriage) when she married Rudolf of Rheinfelden, c.1062; she lived thereafter in Swabia.\footnote{Bühler, ‘Kaiser,’ 38, 60; MvK, 1, 176; Zey, ‘Frauen,’ 73.} As subsequent chapters make clear, this does not mean that Adelaide ceased to care for her daughters, nor that she had little further contact with them. They were an important means by which Adelaide strengthened her relationship with the imperial family in the 1050s and 1060s.
Empress Agnes

There were also closer connections between Adelaide and Empress Agnes – and Agnes’ sister-in-law, Ermesinde – than has previously been recognised. These connections came about as a result of negotiations for marital alliances. Adelaide and Agnes first came into contact with each other in the 1050s, when Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha, was betrothed to Agnes’ son, Henry. In 1065, after Henry came of age, Agnes travelled to Rome with Ermesinde, the widow of Agnes’ brother, William VII of Aquitaine. In Rome, both Agnes and Ermesinde entered nunneries (probably not together). En route they visited the monastery of San Benigno in Fruttuaria (c. 19km north of Turin). The presence of Agnes and Ermesinde so close to the city of Turin alone makes it likely that they met with Adelaide. Moreover, since Agnes’ son, Henry, was shortly to marry Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha, and Ermesinde’s daughter (and Empress Agnes’ niece), Agnes, was shortly to marry Adelaide’s son, Peter, a meeting between the three women is almost certain. Thereafter, Empress Agnes continued to influence imperial politics, and travelled from Rome to Germany, via Fruttuaria, on several occasions. It is likely that she and Adelaide met with some frequency.

Subsequent chapters of this thesis will examine the ways in which members of this female network – particularly Adelaide, her daughters, Empress Agnes, and Matilda of Tuscany – acting both individually and collectively had an impact on the key political and religious affairs of the day. As chapter 2 will make clear, when Henry and Rudolf attempted
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274 Ermesinde is attested briefly during her marriage (above n.203), and in undated letter from Peter Damian: Briefe, no. 136. Cf. Bulst-Thiele, Agnes, 88; Black-Veldrupper, Agnes, 58f; MvK, I, 321.
275 Briefe, 4/3, no. 104; Struve, ‘Romreise’; Weiss, ‘Datierung’.
276 Briefe 4/3, no. 124, 408; Richard, Histoire, 265. Agnes had taken the veil by October 1061: Black-Veldtrup, Agnes, 27, 137, 367-372.
277 Appendix 1, no. 16a. Different sources give different dates for this visit: Berthold, Annales, a.1061, 193; Frutolf, Chronicon, a.1056, 72; Chronicon Fructuariensis, a.1066, 132. Struve, ‘Romreise,’ 18ff. demonstrated that Agnes left in 1065; also Weiss, ‘Datierung’. (Her journey was previously dated c. 1062/3: Giesebrecht, Geschichte, III, 83; Bulst-Thiele, Agnes, 84ff.)
278 Appendix 1, nos. 16b, 17a.
279 Appendix 1, nos. 19b, 23a, 25a, 26c.
to repudiate Adelaide’s daughters in the late 1060s, she applied both diplomatic and military pressure – and probably also enlisted Empress Agnes’ support – to ensure that their marriages were not dissolved. In chapter 3, Adelaide, Agnes, and Matilda of Tuscany will be seen working together in an attempt to reconcile Henry IV with Pope Gregory VII in the 1070s; Bertha probably played a crucial role in gaining Adelaide’s support for Henry at this time. And in chapter 4 I argue that Adelaide and her eponymous daughter, Adelaide of Savoy, worked together, along with Agnes, and others, to spread Italian monasticism into Germany.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has considered Adelaide’s dealings with her natal and marital kin, which varied over time. In relation to property Adelaide’s kin were structured hierarchically, with individuals playing distinct, but complementary, roles. There is little evidence of competition or conflict within Adelaide’s immediate family group during Adelaide’s lifetime. Instead, Adelaide’s family co-operated with, and supported, each other as they sought to maintain and expand their dynastic power. Eleventh-century noblewomen often played a key role in the inheritance strategies of their families. In Adelaide’s case, the absence of a brother meant that after the death of her father, Olderic-Manfred, she became a wealthy heiress. Her status was secured by Olderic-Manfred’s creation of a territorial principality. His importance is reflected in the fact that Adelaide identified herself, throughout her life, as Olderic-Manfred’s daughter (rather than as the wife/widow of any of her husbands). Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, who acted as her regent in the 1030s, also ensured Adelaide’s succession, in particular by fostering close relationships with the imperial dynasty.

Adelaide faced some challenges which were specific to female rulers. The first, is that, unlike her father, Adelaide did not become margrave of Turin herself. Instead, with imperial support, Adelaide transmitted the margravial title, successively, to each of her
husbands. Each of Adelaide’s three marriages was intended to ensure her dynasty’s control of Turin by forging political alliances either with the imperial dynasty (via Hermann IV of Swabia), or with key dynasties neighbouring Adelaide’s territory (Henry of Montferrat and Otto of Savoy). These marital alliances were relatively short-lived. Nevertheless Adelaide’s husbands, particularly Otto, had a clear impact on Adelaide’s exercise of power: between the 1030s and 1060, she only issued one document alone. A further limit on Adelaide’s rule at this time may have been her association with reproduction and childcare.

Adelaide’s status – and power – changed across the course of her lifecycle. During Adelaide’s early life, her parents, and then, successively, her husbands took precedence. After Otto’s death, the balance of power changed. Adelaide became increasingly prominent, and acted as the acknowledged, if not titular, ruler of Turin. She associated her sons, Peter and Amadeus (respectively margrave of Turin and count of Savoy), and later her daughter-in-law, granddaughter, and grandson-in-law, with her rule. This bolstered Adelaide’s own position, and ensured that these relatives gained the necessary political and diplomatic skills to administer their territories after her death. Adelaide also took care to ensure that she retained power in Turin during her lifetime.

Adelaide’s charters indicate the importance of patrilineal descent: she issued documents with, and commemorated, only her close paternal kin: her parents; her husband, Otto of Savoy; her sons; and the direct heirs of her eldest son, Peter. This narrow conception of kinship related specifically to the regulation of property, though; in other matters, extended kin, particularly female kin, continued to be important. Adelaide maintained co-operative relationships with several female relatives who were of the same, or higher, status than her: her sisters, her daughters, and more distant relations, such as Empress Agnes and Matilda of Tuscany. Together these women played key roles in many aspects of contemporary social and political life, as we shall see in the next three chapters.
Chapter 2

Imperial marital alliances, attempted repudiations, and Adelaide’s response*

This chapter considers the marital alliances forged between Adelaide’s dynasty and members, or close kin, of the imperial family in the mid-eleventh century. Initially, these high-profile marriages were an important prop to Adelaide’s position, and ensured her status as one of the leading princes in the empire. Yet individuals, and kin-groups, did not always gain what they hoped for from marital alliances. The concepts of monogamy and indissolubility meant that it was not easy to end marriages in the eleventh-century. Nevertheless, during a short period (1068-1071), members of the imperial family attempted to dissolve their respective marriages to three of Adelaide’s kinswomen: Henry IV of Germany attempted to repudiate Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha of Savoy; Rudolf of Rheinfelden attempted to repudiate her other daughter, Adelaide of Savoy; and Eckbert of Braunschweig attempted to repudiate Adelaide’s sister, Immilla of Turin. That Henry and Rudolf sought to repudiate their wives at the same time has been noted by several scholars, but this is rarely connected with Eckbert’s near-simultaneous attempt to end his marriage to Immilla. This could, of course, be coincidental. Yet it is striking that three such powerful men attempted to sever their ties to Adelaide’s kinswomen at the same time. Two questions arise: Had their political alliances with Adelaide’s dynasty lost its purpose? And how did Adelaide (or someone else) manage to dissuade them?

While Henry’s unsuccessful repudiation of Bertha was undoubtedly due, in large part, to the weakness of his case for separation, and to the opposition of Pope Alexander II and Peter Damian to his actions, Adelaide also played an important role in mobilising support for her daughters. This support was diplomatic and military. The accounts of Lampert of

*A version of this chapter won the 2017 German History Society/Royal Historical Society postgraduate essay prize and is forthcoming: Creber, ‘Breaking’.
Hersfeld and the *Annales Altahenses* indicate that contemporaries feared Adelaide’s violent response, and that she may even have attacked the city of Lodi at this time. Such threats and violence were part of the phases of medieval vendetta. In Adelaide’s case they were one step in the negotiating process that ensured her daughters’ marriages were not dissolved.

The thrust of this argument is somewhat at odds with David d’Avray’s recent two-part study on the dissolution of European royal marriages (860-1600), which emphasises canon law, not political motivations. D’Avray is concerned with papal judgements on royal marriages, and emphasises that canon law came to constrain the outcome of these cases. While d’Avray acknowledges the importance of both political motivations and legal arguments for understanding attempts to dissolve royal marriages, he is less concerned with the motivations – personal or political – which led a king (or, more rarely, a queen) to seek to end his/her marriage. Yet sources from the early and central Middle Ages (most of the cases discussed by d’Avray are thirteenth century or later) often contain only brief, untechnical references to legal procedures, and do not allow the legal grounds for dissolutions to be studied in detail. By contrast, although the private thoughts of earlier medieval men and women remain inaccessible, the reasons for attempted repudiations – both rational and emotional – can profitably be investigated, as can contemporaries’ response(s).

**Intermarriages between Adelaide’s kin and the imperial family (1050s-1060s)**

The marriages of Adelaide’s children continued the tradition of trans-alpine, imperial alliance begun by Adelaide’s marriage to Hermann IV of Swabia in the 1030s, but were even more distinguished. (Table 7.) Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, probably played a role in negotiating her

---

1 d’Avray, *Dissolving*; d’Avray, *Papacy*. Henry’s repudiation of Bertha is not included in d’Avray’s work, which focuses primarily on England/France/Iberian Peninsula, and on cases in which the pope was directly involved (Alexander II was only indirectly involved in Henry and Bertha’s case).


3 Chapter 1.
daughters’ marriages; Adelaide was presumably also involved in choosing spouses for her own children, and thus in bringing about closer connections between her family and the imperial dynasty. The betrothal and marriage of Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha, to Henry IV of Germany is, understandably, the best documented of all of her children’s. In December 1055, when she was four years old, Bertha was betrothed to Henry (aged five) at Zurich. Negotiations had perhaps begun when Adelaide’s husband, Otto of Savoy, attended a diet held by Henry III at Zurich the previous year. Bertha and Henry’s betrothal is often described in tactical terms as a counterweight to the power bloc created by the marriage of Beatrice of Tuscany and the imperial rebel Godfrey the Bearded of Lotharingia in 1054. To some extent, this narrow objective was negated when Beatrice and Godfrey reconciled with Henry III in 1056. Yet mistrust continued on both sides, and flared up again in the mid-1060s, at the same time that Bertha and Henry’s marriage was completed.

The betrothal and marriage of Bertha and Henry also had clear long-term benefits for both sides. The imperial dynasty secured safe routes into Italy through the Alpine passes held by Bertha’s dynasty (the Mont Cenis and the Montgenèvre); wealth in the form of Bertha’s dowry (including property in Avilana, Saluzzo, Chieri, and Albenga); and powerful allies in Adelaide and Otto. For Adelaide and Otto, it continued the trend of their own marriage, and brought them even closer into the imperial orbit, ensuring their status among the most important princes in the empire. After Otto’s death (d.1057/60), this alliance acted as an important prop to Adelaide’s position. It is almost impossible to demonstrate this, but it is
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5 Appendix 1, no. 9h.
6 Chapter 1, n.127.
7 MvK, I, 10; Hellmann, Grafen, 16f. On Beatrice/Godfrey’s marriage: chapter 1, n.81.
8 Zey, ‘Frauen,’ 66.
10 Jäschke, Gefährtinnen, 138.
11 Bresslau, Jahrbücher, I, 378f.
12 Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 670.
likely that imperial support helped to ensure that Adelaide’s position as ruler of Turin was accepted. Certainly, there is no evidence of any kind of crisis in Adelaide’s lordship at this time, when an adult male ruler was conspicuously lacking.

Ten-and-a-half years after the betrothal, Bertha (aged fifteen) was crowned in Würzburg on 29th June 1066, and married to Henry (aged sixteen) in Tribur the following month.\textsuperscript{13} Henry had been king in name since the death of his father, Henry III, in 1056 (when Henry IV was six).\textsuperscript{14} Establishing himself as king \textit{in fact} once he reached the age of majority in 1065 was difficult; he sought to strengthen his claim to rule with the support of powerful princes. Marriage to Bertha was one means of ensuring such support. Bertha’s father, Otto, had also died before the marriage was completed, but Adelaide proved to be a strong and capable ruler from the 1060s onwards.

Contemporaries also connected the completion of the marriage with Henry’s recovery from a serious illness in May 1066.\textsuperscript{15} The implication is that Henry’s brush with mortality convinced him, and the princes of the realm, of his need to marry and produce an heir.\textsuperscript{16} Although he makes no reference to Henry’s illness, Bruno of Merseburg (a Saxon polemicist, who was strongly opposed to Henry) records that Henry married Bertha only after pressure was brought to bear on him: \textit{Uxorem suam, quam nobilem et pulcrum suasionibus principum invitus duxerat.}\textsuperscript{17} Bruno, writing c.1082/5, made this assertion in the knowledge that Henry would attempt to repudiate Bertha only three years later.

\textsuperscript{13} Appendix, no. 18a.
\textsuperscript{15} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1066, 103f.; \textit{Annales Altahenses}, a.1066, 71f.
\textsuperscript{16} Bühler, ’Kaiser,’ 39f.; Tellenbach, ’Charakter,’ 347.
Table 7

Intermarriages between Adelaide’s kin and members/close relatives of the imperial family
Although Bertha was the only one of Adelaide’s children who made a direct marital alliance with the imperial dynasty, three further marriages connected Adelaide’s kin, if only tangentially, with the imperial family. First, shortly after Bertha was betrothed to Henry, Adelaide’s sister, Immilla, married Eckbert I of Braunschweig (r.1057-1068), who was Henry’s first cousin, and part of the inner circle of the imperial court. Second, Adelaide’s eldest son, Peter, married Agnes of Aquitaine, another of Henry’s cousins. Third, Adelaide’s eponymous daughter, Adelaide of Savoy, married Rudolf of Rheinfelden, duke of Swabia (r.1057-1079) (later German anti-king, r.1077-1080). Rudolf was already related to the imperial family by marriage: his first wife, Matilda of Germany, was Henry’s sister. Rudolf’s marriage to Adelaide of Savoy continued his alliance with the imperial family. It also continued the trend of intermarriages between women from Adelaide’s dynasty and the dukes of Swabia, which ensured co-ordination between the contiguous regions of Swabia, Savoy and Piedmont. Rudolf and Adelaide’s marriage is sometimes said to have taken place c.1066, but since their daughters married between 1077 and 1079, it is likely that they married c.1062.

18 Appendix 1, no. 11a.
19 Lampert, Annales, a.1057, 71; Robinson, Henry, 80. They were related through Gisela of Swabia: Table 7.
20 Above, pp.66, 68f.; Table 7; Appendix 1, no. 16b.
21 Appendix 1, no.12a.
23 Zey, ‘Frauen,’ 68.
24 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 61: Adelaide of Turin married Herman IV of Swabia (r.1030-1038); her sister, Immilla, married Otto of Schweinfurt, duke of Swabia (r.1048-1057); Adelaide’s granddaughter, Agnes of Germany, married Frederick of Swabia (r.1079-1105).
25 Previté-Orton, History, 231; MvK, I, 527 n.61.
26 Hlawitschka, ‘Herkunft,’ 182; MvK, III, 133f., 199.
The attempted repudiations of Adelaide’s kinswomen (1068-1071)

These parallel marriages were intended to strengthen the bonds between Adelaide’s dynasty and the imperial family, yet the factors which made these alliances desirable in the 1050s and early 1060s were evidently longer compelling by the late 1060s.

Immilla and Eckbert

According to Lampert of Hersfeld (writing c.1077),27 Henry IV’s cousin, Eckbert of Braunschweig, was the first to attempt to end his marriage. In late 1067 Eckbert intended to present his wife, Immilla, with a ‘bill of divorce’ (repudium scribere).28 This is one of several different phrases Lampert uses to describe the ending of a marriage, none of which exactly correspond with the modern understanding of ‘divorce’ (in which a valid marriage is held to have existed and then to have ended, leaving both spouses free to remarry).29 Lampert presents Eckbert’s motivation in personal terms: he hoped to marry a young widow, Adela of Louvain, quod haec forma elegantior et efferatis moribus suis opportunior videretur.30 Eckbert became ill and died, in January 1068, before he was able to put his plan into practice. Lampert presents this as divine judgement against Eckbert, whose intentions were contra leges ac statuta canonum.

Unlike the other couples discussed in this chapter (who had no children or only daughters), Immilla was the mother of Eckbert’s son and heir, Eckbert II. This suggests that there were strong factors motivating Eckbert’s attempted dissolution of their marriage. Enrico Bonanate argues that Eckbert wanted to repudiate Immilla because he could see that her dynasty were already falling out of favour with Henry IV.31 Yet Henry’s displeasure with

27 On Lampert: below, pp.89f.
28 Appendix 1, no. 19d. Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 52-56.
29 On medieval ‘divorce’/separation: d’Avray, Dissolving; d’Avray, Papacy; d’Avray, Marriage, esp. 74-99; Reynolds, Marriage, 173-238; Brundage, Law, 199-203.
30 Lampert, Annales, a.1068, 105; MvK, I, 615. On Adela’s ‘ferocious disposition’: n.80 below.
31 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 55.
Bertha did not become apparent until May 1068 at the earliest, and there is nothing to suggest that, by late 1067, Eckbert could have anticipated that Henry would try to repudiate Bertha in Summer 1069. Instead, Eckbert’s motivation is to be sought in his desire to marry Adela of Louvain. Eckbert and Adela were not only personally well-suited; their prospective marriage was also politically significant. Adela’s previous husband, Otto, margrave of Meissen (r.1062-1067), had died without a male heir; Eckbert had been invested as margrave of Meissen in his place. Eckbert was now firmly orientated towards territory in the north and east of Germany, where an alliance with Immilla’s northern Italian kin was of little benefit to him. Through marriage to Adela, Eckbert aimed to ensure his supremacy in his new mark. Although Eckbert died before he was able to repudiate Immilla and marry Adela, the importance of this connection can be seen in the fact that Eckbert II, who inherited the mark of Meissen on his father’s death, later married Oda, daughter of Adela of Louvain and Otto of Meissen.

Adelaide and Rudolf

According to two contemporary accounts, in 1069 Rudolf of Rheinfelden attempted to repudiate Adelaide of Savoy on the grounds of adultery. The *Annales Weissenburgenses* (written up to 1075) state simply: *Adalheid coniux Rudolfi ducis, quod castitatem non servaverit, falsa accusato et marito et honore privata est.* The continuation of the *Annales Sangallenses maiores* (written up to 1102) specifies that: *Uxor Rudolphi ducis quasi de*
Even if this was true, it did not provide Rudolf with the legal grounds to dissolve his marriage. From the ninth century onwards, a wife’s adultery was grounds for separation, not remarriage. According to both accounts, Rudolf reconciled with Adelaide in 1071, after she was cleared of the accusation of adultery in the presence of Pope Alexander II (r.1061-1073). Again the St Gall continuation supplies more detail, recording that Rudolf and Adelaide were reconciled after Werner successfully underwent a trial by boiling water.

There is little evidence of Adelaide of Savoy’s agency in this process. It is unclear if she actually committed adultery, or if the accusation was politically-motivated, much less if she wished to reconcile with Rudolf. There was a long tradition of accusing medieval queens of adultery (particularly with one of the king’s important councillors). These accusations were political: the criticism was sometimes directed against the queen (and the power of her natal family; and/or with the aim of de-legitimising her children), but more often against the king himself. Was the same true for accusations of adultery made against the wife of a magnate (and future anti-king)? Was this an attempt to impugn Rudolf’s honour, as much as his wife’s?

A letter written by the scholasticus Wenric of Trier c.1080/1 suggests that this may have been the case. Wenric wrote to Pope Gregory VII (on behalf of Bishop Theoderic of
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40 CSGA, a.1070, 192.
42 Annales Weissenburgenses, a.1071, 55.
45 In general: Becher, ‘Luxuria’; n.64 below.
Verdun) to chastise him for his actions at the Lenten synod in 1080 (at which Gregory had deposed Henry as king and enthroned Rudolf in his place). According to Wenric, Rudolf was a rex adulterinus who, among other crimes, had tres uxor(es) [...] eodem simul tempore uiuentes. In addition to linking Rudolf’s sexual activities with his (un)fitness to rule, Wenric’s letter also raises the possibility that Rudolf, like Eckbert, hoped to repudiate his wife in order to marry someone else. Rudolf’s first attested wife is Matilda, sister of Henry IV; his second is Adelaide of Savoy. No other source indicates that Rudolf had a third wife (let alone three at the same time), but if Wenric is partially correct, then there are different possibilities: 1) Matilda was not Rudolf’s first wife, and Rudolf (who was in his late thirties when he married Matilda) was already a widower; 2) during the period when he was separated from Adelaide, Rudolf attempted to marry again; 3) after Adelaide died in 1079, Rudolf married again, shortly before his own death in October 1080. If Rudolf was attempting to remarry c.1069, might he have been the source of the accusations against his wife?

Bertha and Henry

At the assembly of Worms in June 1069 Henry IV attempted to repudiate his wife, Bertha of Savoy, after only three years of marriage. Henry’s attempt to end his marriage is recorded in far more detail by contemporaries than Eckbert’s and Rudolf’s. The fullest account is found in Lampert of Hersfeld’s Annales. Lampert was a monk at Hersfeld (1058-1081), and later perhaps abbot of Hasungen (r.1081-1085). Although he was writing in an imperial
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47 Wenric, Epistola, 291, 294.
48 Above n.22.
49 Hlawitschka, ‘Herkunft,’ 181 n.22.
50 MvK, III, 413 n.113.
51 Appendix 1, no. 21a-b.
52 Lampert, Annales, a.1069, 105f.; Bühler, ‘Kaiser,’ 43f.; d’Acunto, Laici, 284f.; MvK, I, 612ff. Other key sources are: MU, no. 322 (June 1069); Annales Althahenses, a.1069, 78.
monastery, Lampert was opposed to Henry IV, and often critical of him.\textsuperscript{54} Nevertheless, Lampert wrote more about Bertha – and thus, by extension, Adelaide of Turin – than many of his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{55} This is probably attributable to Bertha’s extended stay at Hersfeld (1073-1074) during the Saxon rebellion (1073-1075). Bertha gave birth to her son, Conrad, at Hersfeld: he was baptised at the abbey, and Abbot Hartwig (r.1072-1090) was his godfather.\textsuperscript{56} Even if Lampert did not have any personal dealings with Bertha, this connection presumably put Bertha – and thus Adelaide – on Lampert’s radar.

According to Lampert at the assembly of Worms Henry declared to the princes of the realm that he wished to end his marriage to Bertha.\textsuperscript{57} As with the attempted repudiation of Adelaide of Savoy, there is little evidence of Bertha’s agency in this process.\textsuperscript{58} Many scholars have remarked upon the ‘coincidence’ that both Henry and Rudolf attempted to repudiate their respective wives in 1069.\textsuperscript{59} That their wives were sisters is rarely emphasised; instead scholars tend to focus on the contrasting grounds on which Henry and Rudolf attempted to end their marriages. Unlike Adelaide, Bertha was not accused of sexual impropriety. Instead, Henry explained that he had nothing with which to reproach Bertha; \textit{sed se, [...] nullam cum ea maritalis operis copiam habere}.\textsuperscript{60} He hoped that they could separate so that they could both find a \textit{felicium matrimonium} elsewhere.\textsuperscript{61} That Henry attempted to have his marriage to Bertha dissolved on the grounds of non-consummation (rather than adultery) has been seen, by some modern historians, as a sign of his ‘noble attitude’ (\textit{noble Haltung}).\textsuperscript{62} Yet Henry’s attempt to repudiate Bertha, however carefully expressed, damaged her status and

\textsuperscript{54} Robinson, \textit{Lampert}, 13f.; Struve, ‘Lampert,’ esp. 34.
\textsuperscript{55} Neither Benzo of Alba’s \textit{AH}, nor the anonymous \textit{Vita Henirici IV imperatoris} refer to Henry’s relationship with Bertha.
\textsuperscript{56} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1074, 174; Bühler, ‘Kaiser,’ 49f.
\textsuperscript{57} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1069, 106.
\textsuperscript{58} On Bertha’s lack of agency in general: Zey, ‘Frauen,’ 73.
\textsuperscript{60} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1069, 106; also \textit{Annales Althahenses}, a.1069, 78; Robinson, \textit{Henry}, 109f.; Zey, ‘Scheidung,’ 170f.
\textsuperscript{61} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1069, 106, 110. On this phrase: below, p.98.
\textsuperscript{62} Tellenbach, ‘Charakter,’ 349 (quote); Bühler, ‘Kaiser,’ 44; Suchan, \textit{Königsherrschaft}, 40.
reputation. Moreover, Henry’s refusal to accuse Bertha of adultery was also self-serving. Accusations of adultery did not simply impugn the woman in question, but also her lover and, perhaps especially, her husband. Henry was thus not simply protecting Bertha’s reputation; he was protecting his own.

As with Rudolf’s attempt to end his marriage on the grounds of adultery, Henry’s attempt to dissolve his marriage on the grounds of non-consummation was inconsistent with canon law. It was not simply his shaky legal position which hampered Henry at Worms. The princes, whose agreement Henry was seeking, saw nothing ‘noble’ in Henry’s behaviour. They deeply were shocked by Henry’s desire to repudiate Bertha, and thought it was feda res et ab regia maiestate nimium abhorrens. None of the princes wished to oppose Henry openly, however, so no conclusion was reached at Worms. A new synod was arranged, to be held at Mainz after Michaelmas in 1069.

In the interim, Archbishop Siegfried of Mainz (r.1060-1084), who presided over the assembly at Worms, referred the matter to Pope Alexander II. Siegfried’s letter to Alexander II emphasised Bertha’s status not only as Henry’s wife, but also his consors regni. In Siegfried’s view, the marriage was full and valid, and there was no fault or cause to justify their separation. Yet Siegfried did not wish to proceed without Alexander II’s support. He wrote to ask that Alexander send a letter granting him the authority to decide the matter at the synod of Mainz. Instead, as evidence of the gravity, and sensitivity, of the case Alexander II sent Peter Damian as papal legate to preside over the synod. Damian was

63 Cowdrey, Gregory, 85; Zey, ‘Scheidung,’ 170.
65 Consent, not consummation, constituted a valid marriage: Reynolds, Marriage, ch.15; d’Avray, Marriage, ch.4; Weigand, ‘Konsensprinzips’; Duby, Knight, 27-30; Brundage, Law, 197f., 262, 268, 273f.
66 Lampert, Annales, a.1069, 106.
68 On the consors regni formula: Introduction, nn.22, 95. The archbishops of Mainz traditionally had coronation privileges, and Siegfried may well have crowned Bertha: Black-Veldtrupp, Agnes, 190 n.421; Fößel, Königin, 25.
69 Bühler, ‘Kaiser,’ 45; Robinson, Henry, 111; Althoff, Heinrich, 74; Zey, ‘Scheidung,’ 179.
known for his ability to mediate disputes,\textsuperscript{70} and was also an expert on canon law,\textsuperscript{71} who frequently wrote about marriage and sexual conduct.\textsuperscript{72} Of particular significance in relation to Henry and Bertha was Damian’s view that the clergy had a key role to play in resolving marital problems, even (or perhaps, especially?) when these involved kings.\textsuperscript{73} Equally importantly, following the model of the biblical Mary and Joseph (whose marriage he believed remained unconsummated),\textsuperscript{74} Damian argued for the indissoluble nature of the marital bond.\textsuperscript{75} These views strongly suggested that Damian would not decide in Henry’s favour.

The planned synod was held at Frankfurt, rather than Mainz, in October 1069. Damian warned Henry of the political consequences, and loss of prestige, which would follow if he continued with his attempt to repudiate Bertha. In particular, Damian emphasised that the pope \textit{suis manibus nunquam imperatorem consecrandum fore, qui tam pestilenti exemplo, quantum in se esset, fidem christianam prodidisset.}\textsuperscript{76} The princes assembled at Frankfurt agreed with Damian.\textsuperscript{77} They urged Henry to remain married to Bertha, and added another reason for doing so. According to Lampert of Hersfeld, they feared that Henry would anger Bertha’s relatives:

\begin{quote}
\textit{preterea ne parentibus reginae causam defectionis et iustam turbandae rei publicae occasionem daret, qui si viri essent, cum armis et opibus plurimum possent, tantam filiae suae contumeliam proculdubio insigni aliquo facinore expiaturi essent.}\textsuperscript{78}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{70} In his capacity as papal legate Damian intervened in several disputes: \textit{Briefe}, nos. 65, 88, 89, 120.
\textsuperscript{71} d’Acunto, \textit{Laici}, 279; Zey, ‘Scheidung,’ 179f.
\textsuperscript{72} Damian wrote about clerical celibacy and impediments to marriage caused by kinship: Elliott, ‘Priest’s’; Cushing, \textit{Reform}, 120-125; d’Avray, ‘Damian’.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Briefe}, 3, no. 102, 132ff.; d’Acunto, \textit{Laici}, 279-283.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Briefe}, 2, no. 49, 71. On Mary and Joseph’s marriage: d’Avray, \textit{Marriage}, 171f., 175; Reynolds, \textit{Marriage}, 341ff.
\textsuperscript{75} \textit{Briefe}, 4, no. 172, 261f. On chaste marriages: Elliott, \textit{Spiritual}, 94-131; McNamara, ‘Chaste’.
\textsuperscript{77} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1069, 110; Zey, ‘Scheidung,’ 182.
\textsuperscript{78} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1069, 110.
Although Adelaide of Turin is not named here, this passage indicates that among all Bertha’s kin, it was her response which the princes feared. This is apparent both from Lampert’s reference to Bertha as filia sua, and also from his use of the phrase si viri essent, which implicitly acknowledges Adelaide’s gender. The phrase is derived from Livy, who used it to mean both proving oneself through battle or conquest, and/or to avenging an insult or outrage. In Adelaide’s case, both of these meanings are intended. Lampert indicates that although Adelaide was a woman, she was a ‘man’ in the way that mattered: she would fight to defend herself and her family’s honour.

For the princes what was paramount was that Bertha had powerful backing, and Henry should avoid making enemies of her family, who might stir up the kingdom in response. Although Lampert does not say so explicitly, the princes evidently thought that Henry’s actions called his throne-worthiness into question. As king he was supposed to ensure that there was peace and tranquillity in the realm, but instead his actions threatened them with discord. Henry was often accused by contemporaries of not paying enough attention to the advice of the princes, but this was not the case at Frankfurt. Faced with this concerted princely and clerical opposition, Henry reluctantly reconciled with Bertha. Unlike other royal marriage disputes, which often dragged on for years, Henry’s attempt to dissolve his marriage was settled very quickly, and thereafter Henry underwent a dramatic volte face.

79 On the ‘rhetorical form’ of this phrase, also: MvK, I, 626 n.44.
80 On Lampert’s use of Livy: Robinson, Lampert, 7-9. Lampert also uses this phrase in in relation to Robert of Flanders (Lampert, Annales, a.1071, 121), and Adela of Louvain, an uxor saevissima who taunted her second husband, Dedi: si vir esset, non inultus iniurias acciperet (Lampert, Annales, a.1069, 107). (For Adela as the driving force behind Dedi’s rebellion against Henry IV: Lampert, Annales, a.1073, 150; Fenske, Adelsopposition, 73ff., 76; Patzold, Wettiner, 18ff., 97.)
81 Livy, Ab urbe condita, 1.41.3; 1.58.8; 2.38.8; 25.18.10.
82 Other references to Adelaide in the masculine: Appendix 1, nos. 14b, 40a.
83 Borgolte, ‘Faction,’ 398. Suchan, Königsherrschaft, 40f. argues that the princes perceived Henry’s attempted repudiation of Bertha as directed against them, because Henry was acting against the expected code of conduct of a Christian ruler.
84 e.g. Lampert, Annales, aa.1073, 1076, 147f., 151, 270, 277; Annales Altahenses, a.1072, 84; Bagge, Kings, 309, 311.
85 Lampert, Annales, a.1069, 110.
Henry’s diplomata suggest that Bertha was with Henry fairly continuously over the next few years, during which time they produced a string of children: Adelaide (b.1070), Henry (b.1071), Agnes (b.1072/3) and Conrad (b.1074).

Why did these men try to repudiate Adelaide’s kinswomen?

Although they are not explicitly mentioned in surviving sources, possible factors in Henry’s repudiation of Bertha can be derived from the motivations for their marriage. These explanations are not mutually exclusive: one, some, or all of them could have influenced Henry’s decision. First, since some contemporaries emphasised that Henry married Bertha only after pressure was brought to bear on him by the princes, his attempted repudiation of Bertha could be seen as an attempt to assert himself after he reached the age of majority, along with removal from power of figures who were influential during his minority, such as Archbishop Anno of Cologne and Otto of Northeim.

Another of the reasons for the marriage was the pressing need to guarantee the succession: if Henry’s marriage remained unconsummated, there was no hope that he would have an heir. Third, if Bertha and Henry’s marriage was contracted, in part, to limit the threat posed to the imperial dynasty by the marriage of Beatrice of Tuscany and Godfrey the Bearded, another factor behind Henry’s repudiation of Bertha in 1069 may have been Godfrey’s declining health (he became ill in 1068 and died in December 1069). This, of course, presupposes not only that Henry knew that Godfrey was seriously ill, but that the threat posed by Beatrice and Godfrey’s union was one of the prime reasons for his marriage to Bertha.

87 Robinson, Henry, 266; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 39ff.
88 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 35, 38f., 42f.
89 Robinson, Henry, 52.
90 On Otto: nn.100-101 below.
91 Goez, Beatrix, 21, Reg. nos. 19a, 21a.
A fourth possibility relates to Henry’s own ill health: he became seriously ill in early November 1067, and was still not fully recovered by Christmas.\(^9^2\) Henry began to distance himself from Bertha thereafter: by May 1068 he ceased issuing diplomas *ac interventum Berhtę reginae regni thori que nostri consortis dilectissimae*,\(^9^3\) and after October 1068 Bertha is completely absent from Henry’s diplomas until his attempt to dissolve their marriage had failed.\(^9^4\) Henry married Bertha shortly after recovering from a serious illness in 1066; might this second illness have led Henry to rethink the marriage?

A fifth, and crucial, explanation focuses on Henry’s alliance with Bertha’s natal dynasty. A key, but little considered, factor in Henry’s attempted repudiation of Bertha, is that at this time Rudolf of Rheinfelden and Eckbert of Braunschweig were also attempting to repudiate their own wives, who were, respectively, Bertha’s sister, Adelaide of Savoy, and her aunt, Immilla of Turin. While the ‘coincidence’ of Rudolf’s and Henry’s attempting to repudiate their respective wives in 1069 has been noted, few scholars have connected Henry’s and Rudolf’s repudiation of their wives with Eckbert’s attempt to end his marriage to Immilla.\(^9^5\) An obvious linking factor in these three attempted repudiations is Adelaide of Turin: she was Bertha’s and Adelaide’s mother, and Immilla’s sister. One of the motivating forces in each of these women’s marriages was the desire to forge a political alliance with Adelaide; the attempted repudiation of these women suggests that this politically-motivated alliance had lost its purpose by c.1068/9.\(^9^6\) When Henry married Bertha he was trying to strengthen his position, and hoped to gain support from Adelaide. Did she expect too much in


\(^{94}\) In May-October 1068 Bertha is mentioned in nine diplomas: DD HIV nos. 204-206, 208-213. Then she is absent until 29\(^{th}\) October 1069 (no. 224), when she is once again entitled: *Berhta thori regnique nostri consorte*. 

\(^{95}\) Above, n.59. Exceptions are: Cognasso, *Piemonte*, 112; Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ esp. 39.

\(^{96}\) There is no evidence that Henry’s cousin, Agnes of Aquitaine, attempted to end her marriage to Peter (Adelaide’s son) at this time. This could be a gender issue, or due to lack of surviving sources.
return? Did she provide less support than Henry had hoped? Or were the repudiations of Adelaide’s kinswomen precipitated by a crisis in Adelaide’s rule?

None of the surviving sources provide clear answers to these questions. Francesco Cognasso suggests there may have been questions over the dowry of one or all of the women, or disputes about territory in Savoy or northern Italy. It is certainly possible that Adelaide was experiencing financial difficulties in the mid-to-late-1060s, which meant that she was unable to honour the dowry agreements she had made for her daughters. In addition to her daughters’ dowries, Adelaide had the further expense of providing weddings for her sons, Peter and Amadeus. She also had find the money to fund her military intervention in Asti. Moreover, precisely when she needed it the most, Adelaide seems to have lost control of the mint at Aiguebelle. The view that a crisis in Adelaide’s rule encouraged Henry, Eckbert and Rudolf to repudiate their respective wives is speculative, but comparison with the repudiation of another noblewoman, Ethelinde of Northeim, by her husband, Welf IV of Bavaria, strongly suggests that this was the case.

**Ethelinde and Welf**

In 1062 Welf IV, son of Adalbert Azzo II, margrave of Milan, married Ethelinde of Northeim, the daughter of Otto of Northeim, duke of Bavaria (r.1061-1070). Otto was a highly influential figure during Henry IV’s minority, but in 1070 he was accused (perhaps by Henry himself) of being part of a plot to murder the king. Otto fell from grace and forfeited the duchy of Bavaria, and Welf lost no time in distancing himself from his disgraced father-in-law. Moreover, instead of claiming the duchy of Bavaria through marriage to Otto’s
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97 Cognasso, *Piemonte*, 112.
98 Appendix 1, no.22a; chapter 6.
99 Appendix 1, no. 22; chapter 1.
daughter, Welf *dein filiam eius* [Ethelinde] *a complexibus suis et thori consortio segregavit patrique remisit*. This raises several important points. First, the crucial impetus to Welf’s actions was Otto’s loss of office and status, which meant that, for dynastic and political reasons, Welf no longer wished to be associated with Ethelinde. It suggests that the attempted repudiations of Adelaide’s kinswomen were similarly politically-motivated. Second, Rudolf of Rheinfelden may have encouraged Welf to repudiate Ethelinde. According to the *Annales Altahenses*, royal councillors urged Welf to end his marriage to Ethelinde, as only then would he be trusted to receive the duchy of Bavaria. Although he is not named, it is likely that Rudolf was one of these royal councillors: other accounts emphasise that it was through Rudolf’s intervention that Welf gained the duchy of Bavaria; and also Rudolf’s role in bringing about Welf’s second marriage to Judith of Flanders.

If Rudolf played a role in Ethelinde’s repudiation, this suggests that these would-be ‘divorcées’ were reinforcing one another. A study of the structure and spread of divorce in modern Massachusetts indicates that the probability of a couple’s divorcing increases if their relatives, their friends, or even friends-of-friends, divorce. ‘Divorce’ appears to have been similarly ‘contagious’ among eleventh-century elites. The cluster of repudiations (attempted and actual) between 1068 and 1071 suggests that once Eckbert attempted to repudiate Immilla it became increasingly thinkable for other men (Henry, Rudolf and Welf) to end their own marriages. And perhaps not only thinkable, but also desirable. Whether or not Eckbert’s repudiation of Immilla was brought about by a crisis in Adelaide of Turin’s rule, it precipitated a further loss of status and power for her dynasty. This positive feedback loop increased the likelihood that other men (Henry and Rudolf) would attempt to repudiate her
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102 Ibid.
103 *Annales Altahenses*, a. 1071, 80.
106 McDermott/Fowler/Christakis, ‘Breaking’.
kinswomen. It is unlikely that Rudolf, in particular, would have proceeded against his wife and her natal family (to whom the king was also related by marriage) if Henry had not already made a move to repudiate Bertha.

Third, after rejecting Ethelinde, Welf was able to contract a more advantageous marriage. He married Judith of Flanders, c.1070/1, who was both phenomenally wealthy and well-connected.107 This has clear parallels with Eckbert, who attempted to repudiate Immilla in order to marry Adela of Louvain, and perhaps also with Rudolf, who may have attempted to marry again c.1069. Did Henry also have a better prospect in sight? According to Lampert, Henry hoped to contract a felicius matrimonium.108 Scholars often interpret this in emotional terms. Michael Borgolte, for example, understands felicius to mean ‘happier,’ and sees the phrase as an expression of the ‘new conception of love’ (neue Liebessaufassung) which emerged in the central Middle Ages.109 Yet it is not clear that this is what Lampert (much less Henry) intended. Felicius also means ‘more fortunate’, ‘more favourable’, and even ‘more fertile’: this could suggest that Lampert was referring to a marriage which would bring Henry greater political benefit, either by alliance with another dynasty, and/or by the production of an heir. Given the unrest in Saxony at this time,110 Henry (like his cousin, Eckbert) may have hoped to marry a Saxon noblewoman to consolidate his position in this key region. Alternatively, like Welf, Henry may have hoped to marry a woman with greater wealth and/or royal connections. This remains speculative, but Henry’s second wife, Eupraxia-Adelaide, whom he married in 1089 after Bertha’s death, was a Kievan princess, with connections to Saxony (she was the widow of Henry of the Saxon North Mark).111

107 Historia Welforum, ch.13, 462; Genealogia Welforum, ch.9, 734; Necrologium Weingartense, 224.
108 Above, n.61.
110 Becher, ‘Auseinandersetzung’.
Fourth, of the marriages discussed here, only Welf’s was successfully dissolved. Although medieval men (particularly high-status men) generally had more sexual freedom than women, there were limits to this.\(^\text{112}\) Even powerful laymen could not break their marriages at will; the church was called in to adjudicate.\(^\text{113}\) Henry had even less room for manoeuvre than other laymen: he was constrained not only by secular and canon law in his attempt to repudiate his wife, but also by his own (and Bertha’s) royal status. Because of the perceived connection between the king’s behaviour and the well-being of his kingdom,\(^\text{114}\) more was expected of Henry than of his magnates. It was thus harder, not easier, for him to end his marriage.

**Adelaide’s response**

After 1070, Ethelinde’s family was no longer powerful enough to prevent her repudiation. This indicates the key, and continuing, importance for women of powerful natal kin: Ethelinde’s connections failed her, but Bertha’s and Adelaide’s did not. They were able to rely upon the support of a powerful relative: Adelaide of Turin.

Whatever the reasons behind the repudiation of Adelaide’s kinswomen, it brought about a loss of status, not only for the men and women concerned, but also for Adelaide. If Adelaide’s alliance with the imperial family had previously acted as a bolster to her authority, the weakening of these ties jeopardised her position.\(^\text{115}\) Without Königsnähe Adelaide could not dispense patronage – and thus gather followers to her – as readily as she had before. Thus, Adelaide had to act decisively to prevent a crisis in her lordship. Yet it is not possible to say much about Adelaide’s response to this threat; certainly, no source explicitly refers to

\(^{113}\) Duby, *Marriage*, ch.1; Duby, *Knight*, esp. 216-226 sees this as an ecclesiastical model imposed on an unwillingly laity but there was, at least, a general acceptance of church regulation of marriage among the laity: McDougall, ‘Marriage’; Bouchard, ‘Consanguinity’; Stone, ‘Bound,’ esp. 476.
\(^{114}\) Blattman, ‘Unglück’.
\(^{115}\) MvK, I, 631f. For the effect of loss of royal favour on aristocratic status: Althoff, ‘Huld’.
her reaction. There is no extant charter activity by Adelaide in 1069 and her whereabouts are unknown. There are too few extant charters in general to draw any firm conclusions from this, but it is possible that none have survived because Adelaide was not in Turin at this time.\textsuperscript{116} She may have been elsewhere, currying support for her daughters to ensure that their marriages were not dissolved.

It is likely that Adelaide petitioned Alexander II for his help on her daughters’ behalf. Adelaide met with Alexander in Rome either in (or shortly after) 1069.\textsuperscript{117} The author of the *Annales Altahenses*, the only source to mention Adelaide’s journey to Rome, frames this visit in terms of Adelaide’s guilt over a brutal attack she had carried out on the city of Lodi (discussed below), but she may also have raised the question of her daughters’ marriages at this time. Since Adelaide’s relationship with Alexander was not entirely cordial (Alexander was displeased with Adelaide’s support of Ingo as bishop of Asti, \textit{c.} 1066/7;\textsuperscript{118} and he rebuked her, \textit{c.} 1069, for her attack on Lodi), Adelaide may also have approached the pope via an intermediary. Possible candidates include Adelaide’s son, Amadeus, who was on good terms with Alexander II;\textsuperscript{119} and the dowager Empress Agnes, who: was a member of Adelaide’s network; was living in Rome as a religious; was Henry’s mother; and had also been responsible for Bertha since their betrothal in 1055.\textsuperscript{120} Adelaide may also have asked Peter Damian, whom she had met in 1063, to intervene.\textsuperscript{121} Certainly, Alexander II sent Peter Damian to preside over Bertha’s case, and ensured that Adelaide of Savoy’s trial took place in Rome in 1071, where he himself presided. It is also likely that Adelaide herself, or a proxy, was present at Frankfurt alongside Peter Damian in 1069, and perhaps also in Rome in 1071.

\textsuperscript{116} Other gaps can be explained in this way: there are no extant charters for 1070/1 (when Adelaide travelled to Rome); or 1077 (when she travelled to Canossa); or 1084 (when she was probably on campaign with Henry).
\textsuperscript{117} Appendix 1, no. 25c.
\textsuperscript{118} Appendix 1, no. 19c; below, pp.228f.
\textsuperscript{119} Appendix 1, no. 19a.
\textsuperscript{120} On Adelaide/Agnes: chapters 1, 3-4.
\textsuperscript{121} Appendix 1, nos. 12b-c, 14b. On Damian/Adelaide: Creber, ‘Margraves’.
 Threats and military force

In addition to diplomatic pressure, Adelaide may also have applied military pressure. The main evidence for Adelaide’s activities at this time comes from the *Annales Altahenses*, which juxtapose Henry’s attempted repudiation of Bertha with an attack Adelaide supposedly made on the city of Lodi. The *Annales Altahenses* were written at the Bavarian monastery of Niederaltaich by an anonymous monk, c.1073/5.122 The anonymous author finishes his account of the marriage crisis by explaining (in language which echoes Henry’s diplomas): *et regina regali thoro rursus restituta.*123 He then immediately relates the following:

> Temporibus ipsis in Italia contigit huiusmodi res quaedam miserabilis. Adelheit, socrus regis, Laudasanis irata fuit; quapropter, vastata provincia, ipsam civitatem Laudam cum magna multitudine obsedit, quamque ex pugnatam igne fecit succendi, et portis obstrusis nullum patiebatur egredi. Igitur monasteria, ecclesiae cunctaque urbis moenia igne sunt concremata; quo incendio virorum, mulierum ac parvulorum periisse feruntur multa milia.124

This is the only source which records Adelaide’s sack of Lodi. Since it was written within a few years of the events being described, and by an author who was knowledgeable about Italian affairs,125 this account is accepted by some scholars.126 Others argue that the author of the *Annales Altahenses* confused Lodi with Asti (which Adelaide besieged and burned in 1070127). They argue that an attack on Lodi is unlikely, since contemporary Milanese authors (such as Arnulf of Milan) do not mention Adelaide’s attacking Lodi (located c.30km south-
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122 The *Annales Altahenses* survives only in a sixteenth-century manuscript. It was written in two stages: an earlier part (covering the period 708-1032), probably written by Wolfrhere of Hildesheim; and a later part (1033-1073), written by an anonymous monk: Giesebrecht, *Geschichte*, II, 584ff.; Oeffele, ‘Praefatio,’ XIVff. (Weiland, *Jahrbücher*, IXff. argues that one anonymous author compiled the whole text, c.1073.)
123 *Annales Altahenses*, a.1069, 78. For Henry’s diplomas: above, nn.92-93.
124 Ibid.
125 Ibid., ‘Praefatio,’ XV.
127 Appendix 1, no. 22a; chapter 6.
east of Milan, and subject to Milan); and because there is no other evidence to suggest that Adelaide had dealings with Lodi, or with central Lombardy more generally. 

Adelaide did have some connections with Lombardy: her mother’s dynasty were margraves of Milan, and a charter issued by her parents in 1021 indicates that her parents possessed property in the Lombard county of Pavia (c.30km south-west of Lodi). Adelaide could have used this as a staging-post from which to launch, and support, an attack on Lodi, which is located well beyond the confines of her territory (c.180km east of Turin). Arnulf of Milan’s silence about Adelaide’s attack on Lodi is equally explicable: it would have deviated from his narrative emphasis on Lodi’s formal subjection to Milan, and on the conflict between the people of Lodi and Milan which arose from this. Moreover, Arnulf overlooked Adelaide’s role in other events: he omits her from his account of Canossa (1077), for example. In fact, Arnulf only mentions Adelaide once in his work: in connection with her attack on the city of Asti in 1070. In relation to this attack, Arnulf refers to Adelaide as militaris admodum domina, but this description need not be limited to Asti; in fact, it would make more sense if this was not an isolated incident, and Adelaide had ordered other military actions as well.

If Adelaide did attack Lodi in 1069, then this would have been a dramatic demonstration of her power, which – presumably – preceded, and gave impetus to, Henry’s decision to remain with Bertha. Lodi was strategically important: it is located south-east of Milan at a vital crossing point of the Adda River (a tributary of the Po). Key routes linking Milan, Pavia and Piacenza intersected at Lodi. Control of Lodi meant control of mercantile routes, particularly of the waterways linking Milan and the Adriatic; of land routes from
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128 Previté-Orton, History, 228f.; Cognasso, Piemonte, 820; Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 102f.
129 Chapter 1.
130 Appendix 2, II/1.
131 Arnulf, Liber, II.2, 146f.; II.7, 151f.; II.10, 154f.
132 Chapter 3.
133 Above n.127.
Lombardy towards Rome; and also of trans-Alpine routes. Along with the Alpine passes Adelaide already held, possession of Lodi would therefore have left Adelaide in control – if only temporarily – of many of the major routes between Italy and Germany. Moreover, Lodi was not only an imperial city, but a city in which the bishop had been granted imperial protection. Adelaide’s burning of the churches of Lodi, along with the rest of the city, would have shown up the feebleness of Henry’s ‘protection’: it would have been an attack not simply on the city, but on Henry’s honour and authority.

There is, however, no collective memory of such an attack in later chronicles of the city of Lodi. This stands in stark contrast to Adelaide’s attack on Asti, which is documented in several thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Astigian chronicles (which include extracts from earlier chronicles, which have not survived). This may be because Adelaide’s attack on Lodi was not quite as devastating as the annalist claimed: his use of the passive indicative periisse feruntur when describing the deaths of thousands of men, women and children suggests that his account may have been exaggerated for effect.

While the question of whether Adelaide actually attacked Lodi remains open, what is significant here is that the author of the Annales Althahenses remembered and structured the attack in relation to the attempted repudiation of Adelaide’s daughter. In placing these events sequentially in his narrative (‘At this time a wretched thing happened in Italy…’), the anonymous author implies that there was a causal link between them: that Henry’s treatment of Bertha led to Adelaide’s angry attack on the city. This view accords with Lampert of Hersfeld’s account. Lampert does not refer to a specific attack, but rather to the concern of the German princes that Henry’s treatment of Bertha would give her family causa deflectionis.

134 For Adelaide’s control of Alpine passes as an important element in Henry’s reconciliation with Bertha: MvK, I, 634.
135 DD OII, no. 120 (24th Nov 975); DD HIV, no. 279 (after October 1056 before 24th February 1076).
136 Appendix 1, no. 22a; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 688f.
137 Disputes about marriage were often remembered as causing revenge/feud: Dean, ‘Marriage’; White, ‘Revenge,’ 116.
and that *cum armis et opibus plurimum possent, tantam filiae suae contumeliam procul-dubio insigni aliqua facinore expiaturi essent*. Lampert’s use of the word *facinora* elsewhere in his work suggests that he expected that this retaliation would involve violent attacks on people and, particularly, property: in other words, precisely the kind of attack that Adelaide carried out on Lodi, according to the *Annales Altahenses*.

Although neither the author of the *Annales Altahenses*, nor Lampert, says so explicitly, the logic here is that of the vendetta. At its simplest, vendetta refers to the taking of vengeance for (perceived) injuries. Distinctions between vendetta and other forms of vengeful and/or violent activity, including feud, ‘blood-feud’, rebellion, and warfare are not clear-cut. Feud is generally thought to describe a state of animosity, and a series of revenge actions, which are reciprocal and long-lasting (even across generations). Vendetta is sometimes equated not only with feud, but with a fatally violent sub-set of feud – the ‘blood-feud’. Other scholars, particularly of Italian history, distinguish between vendetta and feud, arguing that medieval vendetta referred to a more limited form of vengeance than feud, in which revenge was taken for a specific injury and then, so long as the revenge was proportionate, the conflict was concluded.

Vengeful activity originates in the perception of wrong on the part of an individual/group. This is often a perceived injury to a person’s honour, which is another prickly concept. It refers to the esteem in which a person was held, both by themselves and their peers. This could be damaged by shameful acts, either carried out by the individual
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138 Above, n.78.
141 Miller, *Bloodtaking*, 179ff; White, ‘Revenge,’ 108f.
142 For an overview: Netterström, ‘Introduction’.
him-/herself, or against them by someone else. Disputes over marriage, and the outrage of female sexual honour, were commonly said to be the cause of medieval vendettas, but other factors played an important part. Loss of honour diminished an individual’s status and authority, decreasing their ability to influence their peers and/or superiors, and to attract dependents. Given the intense competition for power and status among medieval aristocrats, the disgrace of one family member could undermine the status of a whole family. Individuals thus had a strong incentive to fight to re-establish the honour of their disgraced kin. According to this view, Henry’s repudiation of Bertha was not only a slight to Adelaide’s daughter, it also diminished Adelaide’s own dignity and standing. It was necessary for Adelaide to respond and, more importantly, be seen to respond to this attack on her family’s honour, or her own position would be jeopardised.

It was also necessary that Adelaide’s response followed the accepted ‘rules of conflict’ which aimed to balance the injustice which had been done, and thus to restore harmony rather than lead to further violence. The author of the Annales Althahenses describes Adelaide as full of anger (ira) before her attack on Lodi. This was typical behaviour: a medieval lord who felt him-/herself to be wronged would often respond, first of all, with a public display of anger. This was not – or not only – an emotional reaction; it was also part of a deliberate strategy. It highlighted the lord’s grievance, and was a sign that they intended to seek redress. This public display was also intended to activate the lord’s kinship and/or friendship networks, and to bring about mediation which would resolve the dispute. As is clear from the German princes’ fear of Adelaide’s reaction, and from other
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145 Above n.137.
147 On honour and personal bonds: Barton, Lordship, esp. ch.4; Miller, Bloodtaking, esp. 29-34.
148 Althoff, Family; Althoff, Spielregeln; Reuter, ‘Peace-breaking’.
153 Above n.78.
examples in the *Annales Altahenses*,\(^\text{154}\) displays of anger – with the threat of violence to come – had a strong deterrent quality, and were often enough to bring about the desired result. If, at this stage, adequate recompense was made, then no further action was needed.\(^\text{155}\) According to Lampert’s account, this was the case in 1069: the threat of Adelaide’s violence was enough to ensure that Henry reconciled with Bertha.

By contrast, according to the *Annales Altahenses*, Adelaide moved beyond angry gestures to actual violence. This was the next step in the ‘rules of conflict’: aristocrats were allowed to seek violent redress for the injuries done to them if other means failed.\(^\text{156}\) The annalist indicates that Adelaide laid waste to the province, and then besieged the city, of Lodi burning churches and monasteries, and causing the deaths of thousands of people.\(^\text{157}\) This was a conscious use of violence to assert Adelaide’s (and thus her daughter’s) position. Although brutal, the violence was rational: besieging and burning the city made Adelaide’s displeasure known. It also demonstrated her willingness to fight and her ability to act ruthlessly. And – in keeping with the view that vengeance must be proportional – it was also limited in scope: a (relatively) small-scale act of violence, rather than a declaration of war. If Adelaide attacked Lodi, then her actions met the threat posed by Bertha’s repudiation, and conveyed the message Adelaide – and her family – were not to be trifled with.

According to the *Annales Altahenses*, Adelaide’s actions were unjustified – and unjustifiable. The annalist records that when Adelaide later went to Rome to undertake penance for her attack on Lodi, Pope Alexander II was not sure what to do. Alexander *fatebatur enim, se nescire, si qua vel qualis in tot et tantis crimini bus deberet indici penitentia vel subsequi indulgentia*, and Adelaide apparently left Rome without being
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\(^{154}\) E.g. *Annales Altahenses*, a.1062, 60: Wibert of Parma marched on Rome, hoping that presence of his troops – the threat of violence alone – would scare his opponents into doing what he wanted.


\(^{157}\) Above n.124.
assigned penance.\textsuperscript{158} By contrast, Lampert’s account indicates that many of Adelaide’s (secular) contemporaries thought that she had a legitimate grievance and that a violent response, even a facinora, would be justified.

Even the author of the Annales Altahenses did not condemn Adelaide’s actions because she was a woman. This is somewhat surprising, since honour and violence were strongly gendered throughout much of the Middle Ages. The prime locus of honour for elite laymen was in courage in battle, and in the refusal to allow a public challenge to remain unanswered.\textsuperscript{159} Female violence, by contrast, was often perceived as unacceptable and destabilising,\textsuperscript{160} and women were frequently depicted inciting others to violence or vengeance, rather than acting themselves.\textsuperscript{161} Some scholars have argued that women’s inability to engage directly in warfare prevented them from ruling independently: unlike a male ruler, a woman always needed a male representative to lead her armies.\textsuperscript{162}

Yet many women played a sanguinary role in eleventh-century politics, both in vendetta and in warfare. Several of Adelaide’s contemporaries engaged in military activity, and were praised for doing so. Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, probably sent troops from Turin to take part in Emperor Conrad II’s campaign against Odo II of Blois-Champagne in 1034; she later used her troops to foil a conspiracy of Odo’s against Conrad.\textsuperscript{163} Adelaide herself may have attacked Lodi (in 1069), and certainly besieged and burned and Asti (in 1070 and 1091);

\textsuperscript{158} Annales Altahenses, a.1069, 78. If Alexander refused to impose penance on Adelaide, this was rectified Gregory VII. He either quietly assigned penance, or let the matter drop: Gregory wrote warmly to Adelaide (1073); and took her foundation of Pinerolo into papal protection (1074): Appendix 1, nos. 26a, 26d. Alternatively, Alexander may have imposed penance, and urged Adelaide to support monastic reform: chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{159} Karras, Men, 151f.


\textsuperscript{162} Duby, ‘Women,’ esp. 73; Jordan, Women, 46, 53f.

\textsuperscript{163} Appendix 1, nos. 1b; 2e.
she probably also campaigned on Henry IV’s behalf (1084).164 Her daughter, Adelaide of Savoy, defended her husband, Rudolf’s, Burgundian lands, whilst Rudolf was campaigning against Henry IV in Saxony in 1077.165 Elsewhere in eleventh-century Italy, Beatrice of Tuscany and Matilda of Tuscany in the north, and Sichelgaita of Salerno and Judith of Evreux in the south, defended and besieged towns, used their troops to block the routes of their enemies, and even engaged in pitched battles.166

It was thus entirely conceivable to contemporaries that Adelaide could sack and burn a city. Whether or not Adelaide actually attacked Lodi in 1069, contemporaries clearly feared her response to Henry’s actions. Adelaide’s role in Henry’s reconciliation with Bertha was thus based on bringing two different types of pressure being brought to bear on Henry. The first of these was political pressure: Adelaide called upon her powerful friends, including Empress Agnes and Peter Damian, for support. Yet she did not wait for mediation alone to work: she also applied military pressure. Whether she used force itself (and attacked Lodi), or simply threatened to do so, this threat reinforced the mediation of Adelaide’s friends. It improved her bargaining position, and increased the likelihood that others (the German princes) would also bring political pressure to bear on Henry, and thus that Henry, hemmed in by political and military pressure, would reconcile with Adelaide’s daughter.

**Conclusion**

In the mid-eleventh century members of Adelaide’s dynasty contracted multiple parallel marriages with members, or close relatives, of the imperial family: Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha, married Henry IV of Germany; her other daughter, Adelaide, married Rudolf of Rheinfelden; her son, Peter, married Agnes of Aquitaine; and her sister, Immilla, married

164 Appendix I, nos. 21c; 22a; 43a; 47b.
165 Bernold, Chronicon, a.1077, 289; MvK, III, 38f.
Eckbert of Braunschweig. These ties were intended to ensure good relations, and mutual support, between Adelaide’s dynasty and the imperial family. Yet in the period 1068-1071 Henry, Rudolf and Eckbert attempted to repudiate their respective wives. Contemporaries often portray these men as acting for personal reasons, but their motivation was also political. There is evidence that each of these men was seeking to contract a *felicius matrimonium*: a more politically advantageous marriage. A key, and hitherto little considered, feature of the attempted repudiations of Bertha, Adelaide and Immilla is that these women were closely related to one another. That three powerful men – Henry, Rudolf, and Eckbert – attempted to dissolve their marriages to Adelaide’s kinswomen at the same time suggests that an alliance with her dynasty was no longer seen as valuable.

This cluster of repudiations may also have been caused, in part, by a ‘domino effect’, whereby once Eckbert attempted to repudiate Immilla, it became increasingly possible – even desirable – for other men to attempt to dissolve their own marriages. Yet both Henry and Rudolf found that they could not break their marriages at will. First, this was because they both had weak legal cases for separation. Since there was little to support their cases in canon law, it is unsurprising that the intervention of high-ranking churchmen – Peter Damian and Alexander II – ensured that their marriages were not dissolved. Second, Henry (and perhaps also Rudolf?) was constrained by his own (and his wife’s) royal status, making it harder, not easier, for him to end his marriage.

Third, contrasting Henry and Rudolf’s inability to end their marriages with Welf of Bavaria’s successful repudiation of Ethelinde of Northeim highlights the importance for women of the support of their natal kin, even after marriage. Unlike Ethelinde’s family, Adelaide was able to leverage her long-standing connections with Empress Agnes, Peter Damian and Alexander II to ensure that her daughters’ marriages were not dissolved. She was also able to bring her military power to bear. It is clear from Lampert of Hersfeld’s account
that the German princes feared her response, while the *Annales Altahenses* suggests that Adelaide actually attacked the city of Lodi. This was a form of vendetta, in which threats, or actual violence, were carefully calculated responses to loss of honour and status. In Adelaide’s case, the threat of violence, combined with diplomatic pressure, ensured that her daughters’ marriages were not dissolved.
Chapter 3
Adelaide and Henry IV of Germany: Canossa and afterwards (1076-1084)

From 1069 onwards Henry IV of Germany was involved in one political crisis after another: after his attempted repudiation of Adelaide’s daughter was thwarted, he faced rebellion in Saxony, which eventually led to war in Germany. He also became involved in a long-running conflict with Pope Gregory VII, which eventually resulted in war in Italy, too.¹ The dispute between Henry and Gregory and their respective followers – the so-called ‘Investiture Controversy’ (1078-1122) – centred on the nature of royal versus papal authority, and the right to appoint high clergy to office.² This conflict was traditionally seen as top-down process in which spiritual and ideological change led to political and institutional conflict,³ but is now more likely to be understood as part of a wider ‘crisis of power’ in the eleventh century.⁴ Although ‘top-down’ interpretations have been undermined, the clash between Henry IV and Gregory VII in the 1070s and 1080s remains central to the Investiture Controversy narrative. Adelaide was closely involved in the power politics of the later eleventh century, and the focus of this chapter is Adelaide’s role(s) in the Italian crises of Henry’s reign (his conflict with Gregory VII, and the Italian wars of 1080s), and her representation in the accompanying polemical literature.

During the complex diplomatic and military manoeuvrings of the years 1076-1084, Adelaide’s support was sought by both sides because she was a powerful lord who held lands of huge strategic importance. Adelaide tried to reconcile the conflicting demands of papacy and empire, but her ambiguous position could not be maintained indefinitely. She was under

¹ For overviews: Struve, ‘Gregor’; Suchan, Königsherrschaft.
³ Fliche, Réforme; Tellenbach, Church; Blumenthal, Investiture.
⁴ Bisson, Crisis, 8, 197, 205, 210; Miller, Power; Miller, ‘Crisis,’ 1575f.; Cushing, Reform.
considerable pressure to support Henry, not only because of the marital alliances linking their dynasties, but also because her power derived from imperial authority. The first section of this chapter focuses on Adelaide’s role in the events at Canossa. While she was not one of the main protagonists, Adelaide nevertheless played an important part in the reconciliation of Henry and Gregory in January 1077. Adelaide’s contribution has been somewhat neglected in the historiography, but Henry and Gregory were not operating in a vacuum: what do the events at Canossa look like from the perspective of women, such as Adelaide, who played a crucial role in the outcome? The second section considers Adelaide’s role in events after Canossa, when Henry and Gregory’s relationship deteriorated, and open war broke out in Italy. Particular attention is paid to letters purportedly written by Bishop Benzo of Alba to Adelaide (c.1080-c.1082), which have also been neglected in the historiography. These letters were designed to encourage Adelaide to support Henry more fully. To what extent was the case? How active was Adelaide’s support for Henry after 1082? And was it Benzo’s letters, or other factors, which brought this about? Together these sections emphasise Adelaide’s importance in the conflict between Henry and Gregory in the 1070s and 1080s.

Canossa

Canossa refers, first and foremost, to a place: a fortification in the Apennines (c.27km south of Parma). In the late eleventh century this castle belonged to Adelaide’s cousin, Matilda of Tuscany, who had inherited, and was ruling, the mark of Tuscany. The term Canossa is also used, in a narrow sense, to refer to events that took place there in January 1077: Henry IV, who was under sentence of excommunication, stood in the snow at Canossa, barefoot and dressed as a penitent, asking Gregory VII for absolution. Henry did this for three days in a

---

5 A version of this section is forthcoming: Creber, ‘Women’.
6 Schneidmüller, ‘Canossa’.
row (25th January-27th January) after which, following the intervention of Adelaide, Matilda, and others, he was permitted to enter the castle, where Gregory released him from excommunication. Finally, ‘Canossa’ is used to encompass the wider implication of this meeting. The literature on this is vast, and concentrates in particular on the meaning of these events for papal and royal authority.\(^7\) Here the focus is not on Henry and Gregory, but on Adelaide’s role(s) at Canossa, and what contemporaries made of her presence.

**Women at Canossa**

Modern accounts of Canossa rarely mention Adelaide.\(^8\) Sometimes she is omitted completely;\(^9\) at others, she is referred to as an intercessor, but the wider implications of this are not considered.\(^10\) There is more discussion of Matilda’s role at Canossa,\(^11\) but she is often marginalised in the wider historiography, too. In part, this omission is the legacy of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century historians’ definition of politics and diplomacy as the sphere of men.\(^12\) The side-lining of women is also a consequence of modern historians’ tendency towards ‘split historiographies’, whereby scholars work narrowly on Henry and Gregory at Canossa, or on ‘medieval women’, or on ‘intercession and mediation’ without connecting these different, but complementary, strands together. The effects are not entirely benign: by omitting women, and their diplomatic efforts, from Canossa these accounts implicitly suggest that women’s actions were unimportant. Taken to its furthest extreme, JoAnn McNamara argued that ‘Canossa’ was emblematic of a crisis in gender relations in the eleventh century, which led to the erasure of women from public life.\(^13\) This view of

---


\(^8\) An exception is: Cognasso, *Piemonte*, 115f.


\(^12\) Above, pp.11ff.

\(^13\) McNamara, ‘Canossa’. On the ‘crisis of masculine identity’ which precipitated this: McNamara, *Herrenfrage*. 113
medieval women’s activities as ‘private’ and domestic, rather than ‘public’ and political is common, but erroneous.\textsuperscript{14} McNamara’s description of Canossa as a ‘womanless space’\textsuperscript{15} is particularly problematic, as this is emphatically not the view presented in contemporary sources.

Numerous contemporaries highlighted the important role played by Adelaide, and other women, at Canossa.\textsuperscript{16} Adelaide is mentioned in four accounts which were written within a decade of the events at Canossa: Gregory VII’s letter to the German princes and bishops (late January 1077); the \textit{Annales} of Lampert of Hersfeld (written c.1077); the \textit{Chronicon} of Berthold of Reichenau (written c.1080); and Pseudo-Bardo’s, \textit{Vita Sancti Anselmi Lucensis episcopus} (c.1085/6).\textsuperscript{17} This chapter focuses on Gregory’s, Lampert’s and Berthold’s accounts, as they discuss Adelaide’s role(s) in the most detail.\textsuperscript{18} Personal connections played a part in Gregory’s and Lampert’s inclusion of Adelaide. Gregory had a long-standing relationship with Adelaide (and her son Amadeus), so he naturally referred to her in his account of Canossa.\textsuperscript{19} Berthold, whose account closely follows Gregory’s, thus included Adelaide, too. Lampert, as we have seen, had a personal connection to Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha,\textsuperscript{20} which meant that Lampert also paid more attention to Adelaide than many of his contemporaries.

The political affiliation of contemporary authors, and their intended audience, had a decisive impact on whether or not Adelaide was included in accounts of Canossa. Gregory’s letter to the German princes, and the accounts of Lampert and Berthold, were all written for German audiences. They emphasise the role(s) played by Adelaide, and Matilda, at Canossa.

\textsuperscript{14} Above, pp.16f.
\textsuperscript{15} McNamara, ‘Canossa,’ 103.
\textsuperscript{17} Appendix 1, no. 29a-b. Matilda of Tuscany is named in these accounts, and two further early works: Arnulf, \textit{Liber}, V.8, 227ff.; Bonizo, \textit{Liber}, VIII, 610.
\textsuperscript{19} Appendix 1, nos. 26a-b, 26d, 39; chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{20} Above, p.90.
because the names of the king’s mother-in-law (Adelaide) and the king’s cousin (Matilda) were far more meaningful – and thus reassuring – to the German princes than a list of clerics or other Italian princes would have been. By contrast, works written by Italian contemporaries – even those, such as Arnulf of Milan and Benzo of Alba, who refer to Adelaide elsewhere in their work\textsuperscript{21} – tend not to mention Adelaide in connection with Canossa.\textsuperscript{22} This is largely because Italian authors do not write about Canossa in the same kind of detail as northern authors.\textsuperscript{23} In the cases of Bonizo of Sutri and Arnulf of Milan, who mention Matilda, but not Adelaide, it is also a reflection of their closer connections with Matilda.\textsuperscript{24}

The sources are also split along partisan lines. Polemical writers were actively engaged in the conflict between Gregory and Henry.\textsuperscript{25} Pro-papal and pro-imperial propaganda was produced both in Gregory and Henry’s chanceries, and also by their adherents elsewhere. Some of these polemics dealt with issues raised by the so-called ‘Investiture Controversy’; some made personal attacks on Henry or Gregory, or their adherents; others, including Benzo of Alba, engaged in letter-writing campaigns, designed to win support for their faction. The majority of the accounts which mention Adelaide were written by pro-papal authors;\textsuperscript{26} works written by pro-imperial authors rarely refer to her.\textsuperscript{27} Pro-imperial authors tend to view Canossa as the scene of Henry’s humiliation, and mention

\textsuperscript{21} Appendix 1, nos. 22a, 39a, 40a-b, 41c. On their omission of Adelaide: nn.24, 28, below.
\textsuperscript{22} Exceptionally: Pseudo-Bardo, \textit{Vita}, c.16, 18.
\textsuperscript{23} On Italian accounts: Golinelli, ‘Rezeption’.
\textsuperscript{24} Bonizo, \textit{Liber}, VIII, 610; Arnulf, \textit{Liber}, V.8, 227ff. Arnulf was part of a Milanese legation to Gregory shortly after Canossa (V.9, 229ff.). Since Gregory remained with Matilda until mid-1077, Arnulf naturally focused on her role. Bonizo probably composed his \textit{Liber} while at Matilda’s court in Mantua: Berschin, \textit{Bonizo}, 10, 23ff.
\textsuperscript{25} Much of the polemical literature is published in: \textit{Ldl}. For discussion: Robinson, \textit{Authority}; Witt, \textit{Latin}, ch.4; Melve, \textit{Inventing}; Hay, \textit{Leadership}, ch.5; Münch, ‘Tyrann’; Suchan, ‘Publistik’
it as briefly as possible, if at all.\textsuperscript{28} After 1085, when it had become clear how little the events at Canossa had actually achieved, there was a similar tendency to downplay Canossa in pro-papal accounts. From the late eleventh-century onwards, Adelaide is present only in works which closely follow (or include) Gregory’s own account;\textsuperscript{29} other works, written at this time by Matilda’s adherents, make no mention of Adelaide’s role.\textsuperscript{30} From the mid twelfth century Matilda, too, was increasingly omitted.\textsuperscript{31}

\textit{Journey to Canossa}

Gregory VII and Henry IV were in conflict in the period 1073-1076 largely because of the excommunication of several of Henry’s closest advisors by Gregory’s predecessor, Alexander II, as well as ongoing tensions over the appointment of a new archbishop in Milan.\textsuperscript{32} Several women – Matilda, her mother, Beatrice of Tuscany, and Empress Agnes – played an active role in initiatives aimed at reconciling Henry and Gregory during this period, including planning an assembly at Augsburg to reconcile Henry and Gregory (which was superceded by events at Canossa).\textsuperscript{33} These women were connected to each other, and to Henry, by bonds of kinship;\textsuperscript{34} and to Gregory by bonds of friendship and ‘spiritual kinship’.\textsuperscript{35} Despite Adelaide’s connections not only with Henry and Gregory, but also with these women,\textsuperscript{36} she does not seem to have taken part in these reconciliation attempts. Adelaide is first mentioned in connection with the second phase of the conflict between Henry and

\textsuperscript{28} This is presumably why Benzo of Alba – who refers to Adelaide extensively in his work (discussed below) – does not mention her at Canossa.

\textsuperscript{29} Paul of Bernried, \textit{Gregorii}, c.84, 524; Hugh, \textit{Chronicon}, II, 445.

\textsuperscript{30} Ranger, \textit{Anselmi}, esp. vv. 3157-3164, 1223; VM, II.1.

\textsuperscript{31} Golinelli, ‘Rezeption,’ 595-601.


\textsuperscript{34} Beatrice/Matilda were Henry’s cousins (and thus related to Agnes by marriage): Table 6.

\textsuperscript{35} For Gregory’s letters to/about Beatrice/Matilda: \textit{Registrum}, I.19-21; I.25-26; I.40; I.47; I.50; I.77, III.5; Agnes: I.19-21; I.85; II.30; III.10; III.15; IV.3.

\textsuperscript{36} Above n.19; chapters 1-2.
Gregory (1076-1080). This encompassed Gregory’s deposition at the Assembly of Worms by bishops favourable to Henry (January 1076); Gregory’s excommunication of Henry at the Lenten Synod (February 1076); and the (temporary) reconciliation of the two men at Canossa (January 1077).

Adelaide held lands of huge strategic importance, through which Henry had to travel to meet with Gregory. The significance of Adelaide’s control of Alpine passes was well-understood by contemporaries, one of whom wrote (in a different context) that Henry IV did dare not refuse Adelaide’s requests, *eo quod regni quodammodo claves et Longobardie teneret adytum*. There are, however, several misconceptions about Adelaide’s actions in modern accounts.

Lampert of Hersfeld is the only contemporary to emphasise Adelaide’s role in Henry’s journey to Canossa. Other accounts, which describe Henry’s journey into Italy, via Turin, do not mention Adelaide. In mid-December 1076 Henry travelled first to Besançon, where he spent Christmas. Then he met Adelaide and her son, Amadeus, at Civis. Scholars have suggested various Savoyard locations for Civis, most commonly Gex (following Holder-Eggers’ edition of Lampert’s Annals), but also Coise, Chignin, and ‘near Geneva’. If so, this would be one of the only times that Adelaide is documented in Savoy.

---

37 *Briefsammlungen Heinrichs*, no. 20 (24th January 1076).
41 VB, c.12, 205.
43 Berthold, *Chronicon*, a.1077, 288.
46 Holder-Egger, *Lampert*, 285 n.2 (who argues that Civis is a scribal error for *lais*, which he identifies as modern Gex).
48 Also: Appendix 1, no. 22, 33?
Map 3: Henry’s probable route to Canossa (Winter 1076/7)⁴⁹

⁴⁹ From: http://www.stepmap.de/landkarte/der-gang-nach-canossa-198576
Other scholars suggest that Civis is a misreading of Cinis, and that Lampert was thus referring to the Mont Cenis pass.\(^{50}\) This makes sense for several reasons. It corresponds with Lampert’s assertion that Adelaide and Amadeus: *in illis regionibus et auctoritas clarissima et possessiones amplissimae et nomen celeberrimum erat.\(^{51}\)* Since there is no evidence that Adelaide possessed lands at Gex, this fits better in relation to the Mont Cenis pass, where Adelaide’s lands and power are well-documented.\(^{52}\) It also makes sense in the context Lampert’s statements that Henry needed to enter Italy via Adelaide’s lands because his opponents had blocked other Alpine passes to prevent him from reaching Gregory, and that *immediately* after securing his passage, Henry began the difficult crossing of the Alps.\(^{53}\)

The sources do not state this explicitly, but Henry presumably hoped not only for safe-passage into Italy, but also for Adelaide’s on-going help: for Adelaide’s support as he travelled south; her mediation with Gregory; and securing a line of retreat, if needed.\(^{54}\) According to Lampert, who is the only contemporary to discuss this, Adelaide and Amadeus *nec iure propinquitatis nec tantae calamitatis miseratione quicquam moverentur*, and at first they refused to help Henry.\(^{55}\) Ian Robinson suggests that Adelaide’s unwillingness was because she ‘stood high in Gregory VII’s favour and may therefore have been out of sympathy with the king’.\(^{56}\) Of course, another reason – not mentioned by Robinson – that Adelaide may have been ‘out of sympathy’ with Henry is that his attempted repudiation of her daughter, Bertha, still rankled.\(^{57}\) Yet Adelaide’s refusal to give Henry her unconditional support was political as much as personal. First, Adelaide was being careful to alienate neither Henry nor Gregory; and second, it was simply good business that if Henry wanted


\(^{52}\) Previté-Orton, ‘Itinerary,’ 521.


\(^{54}\) Cognasso, *Piemonte*, 116.


\(^{56}\) Robinson, *Henry*, 160.

\(^{57}\) Cognasso, *Piemonte*, 115; Tellenbach, ‘Charakter,’ 35.
something from Adelaide, she should get as much as possible in return. As the ‘price of his passage’ Adelaide asked Henry to grant her *quinque Italiae episcopatus possessionibus suis contiguis*. She did not receive this: instead, after much deliberation, Henry agreed to give Adelaide a province in Burgundy, *bonis omnibus locupletissimam*.

Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha, was Henry’s trump card in these negotiations. Despite the fact that it was a particularly harsh winter, Henry brought his wife, Bertha, and their two-year-old son, Conrad, with him on his journey south. This was calculated to appeal to Adelaide: the presence of her daughter and grandson was a visible reminder of the dynastic reasons for helping Henry. Bertha is usually seen as lacking any political influence. Yet, by her presence alone, if nothing else, Bertha played a role in gaining Adelaide’s support for Henry. The location of this meeting is significant, too. If Adelaide travelled north of the Alps to meet with Henry at Gex or Coise, then it was a foregone conclusion that she would help him: why else would she have travelled so far (especially during a harsh winter)? If, on the other hand, Adelaide met Henry at the Mont Cenis pass, then her aid could not be taken for granted: Adelaide could have barred the pass if Henry did not agree to her terms. Once terms were agreed, however, Adelaide’s support for Henry was considerable: she not only granted Henry safe-passage into Italy; she protected and supported him en route to Canossa, where her presence (and that of the Lombard army) increased Henry’s bargaining position; and at Canossa, Adelaide, along with Matilda, and others, mediated between Henry and Gregory.

---

64 Previté-Orton, *History*, 237.
Mediation at Canossa

There were extensive negotiations between Henry and Gregory before Canossa in which the details of Henry’s actions, and Gregory’s response, were discussed and settled in advance. Modern accounts indicate that Matilda – and more rarely also Adelaide – acted as intercessors at Canossa, but they were in fact acting as mediators. These concepts are interrelated, but intercession differs from mediation in several ways. Intercession is petitionary in nature: the intercessor pleads with someone (usually the king) on behalf of someone else. Mediators, by contrast, use their power and prestige to play an active and independent role in the settlement of conflicts. While intercession is unilateral (primarily concerned with the relationship between intercessor and petitioned), mediation is bilateral (the mediator’s relationship with both parties is crucial).

Explanations of how medieval intercession and mediation functioned emphasise the importance of personal ties, and that the most effective intercessors/mediators had Königsnähe. For this reason, bishops, abbots, queens, and other high-status women frequently acted as intercessors and mediators in the Middle Ages. Although queens frequently acted as intercessors in the tenth and eleventh centuries, neither Henry’s mother, 65 For Canossa as stage-managed: Althoff, Heinrich, 152-160, Cowdrey, Gregory, 157-167; Reuter, ‘Canossa,’ 156-166; Robinson, Henry, 160-165. For an element of surprise: Weinfurter, Canossa, 17-26; Goez, ‘Canossa’. For negotiated rituals in general: Althoff, Macht; Althoff, Spielregeln.
67 On intercession/mediation: Gilsdorf, Favor; Kamp, Friedensstifter; Althoff, ‘Königsherrschaft’; Garnier, Kultur; the contributions in Althoff, Frieden.
68 There were also instances in which a ruler might petition, rather than command, or where – as at Canossa – the ruler himself needed intercession/mediation: Kamp, Friedensstifter, esp. 76ff., 82ff.; Garnier, ‘Herrschere’; Althoff, ‘Konfliktpartei’.
69 Gilsdorf, Favor, esp. 36ff.; Kamp, Friedensstifter, esp. 8f.
70 Kamp, Friedensstifter, esp. 13, 99, 180.
71 Kozioł, Begehung, 74f.; Gilsdorf, Favor, esp. ch.3; Kamp, Friedensstifter, esp. 81-110.
72 On bishops/abbots as intercessors/mediators: Gilsdorf, Favor, ch.4; Kamp, Friedensstifter, 92ff., 173-183. On queens: nn.73, 78-82, below; Gilsdorf, Favor, esp. 116-124; Kamp, Friedensstifter, 64-76, 93f., 155-160; Stafford, Queens, esp. 44f., 99ff.
Agnes, nor his wife, Bertha, are documented playing a role at Canossa. This may be because queens typically interceded with the ruler on behalf of others, while at Canossa it was Henry who was in need of intercession. In Agnes’s case, since she is documented attempting to resolve the conflict between Henry and Gregory beforehand, and later confirmed Henry’s oath at Canossa, it may simply have been that she was unable to travel to Canossa in time.

The key role played by mediators in peace-making is generally acknowledged, but the importance of Adelaide’s (and Matilda’s) intervention at Canossa has not always been recognised. This is partly due to historians’ focus on the disputants (Henry and Gregory), rather than the mediators without whom, however, the negotiations could not have taken place. Perhaps unconsciously the definition of Adelaide’s actions as ‘intercession’, rather than as mediation or diplomacy, further devalues her role. Although intercession is not necessarily gendered, there is a tendency both in some medieval sources, and some modern scholarship, to see intercession as a ‘womanly virtue’. In other words, a specific gendered model is added to a more general understanding of intercession. This ‘womanly’ model of intercession plays on traditional feminine images – of the nurturing mother and/or the virtuous wife; of the Virgin Mary, and the biblical Queen Esther. It was a means by which elite men could reverse their decisions without undermining their authority. This model thus reinforces gender hierarchies, and promotes the view that medieval women’s activities were
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74 Bertha is not recorded at Canossa. Goez, Mathilde, 105f. argues that she remained in Turin; Fried, Canossa, 67 that she travelled to Canossa.
75 Creber, ‘Women’.
76 Below, n.110.
77 Agnes’ whereabouts in January 1077 are unknown; she was in Rome with Gregory in December 1076; and at Piacenza with Henry by mid-February 1077 (DD HIV, no. 286; Bonizo, Liber, 610; Black-Veldtrupp, Agnes, 56, 99, 307, 312, 378ff.; MvK, II, 761, 767).
80 McNamara, Sainted, 74 n.47; Parsons, ‘Queen’s’ 147, 161f.; Parsons, ‘Pregnant,’ 53f.; Strohm, ‘Queens,’ 103ff.; Earenfight, Queenship, 12.
private and informal, while men’s were public and political.\textsuperscript{81} In the case of Canossa, it re-inscribes Adelaide’s (and Matilda’s) important diplomatic activity as ‘feminine’ and ancillary: as something that modern historians can ignore.\textsuperscript{82}

Contemporaries rarely depicted Adelaide’s (or Matilda’s) intervention as mediators in gendered terms, and instead emphasised their status as rulers. According to Berthold of Reichenau, Henry sought \textit{interventu et auxilio precipue domne Mahthildis marchionisse, socrus sue Adalhaide iidem marchionisse, et abbatis Cluniacensis [Hugh] [...] nec non omnium quoscumque sue parti attrahere poterat.}\textsuperscript{83} In addition to Matilda, Adelaide and Hugh, Lampert of Hersfeld adds that Henry also sought the intervention of Amadeus (Adelaide’s son), Adalbert Azzo II of Este (Adelaide’s cousin), \textit{et alios nonnullos ex primis Italiae principibus, quorum auctoritatem magni apud eum [Gregory VII] momenti esse non ambigebat.}\textsuperscript{84} In other words, Henry’s mediators were made up of both secular and religious princes;\textsuperscript{85} Adelaide and Matilda were named first because they were the princes with the highest status. These princely women were perfect intermediaries: they were trusted because of their close connections with Henry (Adelaide was his mother-in-law; Matilda was his cousin), with each other (they were cousins), and with Gregory.\textsuperscript{86} Adelaide and Matilda’s political dominance also meant that they were able to underwrite an agreement between Henry and Gregory.

Mediation was typically conducted in private, and is thus rarely described in detail in medieval sources. Yet several contemporaries depicted some of the deliberations which took place at Canossa. Although polemical in purpose, these accounts are nevertheless revealing

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{81} Parsons, ‘Queen’s,’ 149; Huneycutt, \textit{Matilda}, 82ff.; Huneycutt, ‘Intercession,’ 131; Strohm, ‘Queens,’ 101. This view of intercession is questioned by: Mulder-Bakker, ‘Jeanne’; Geaman, ‘Queen’s’.
\textsuperscript{82} On images of female intercession as masking complex social/political realities: Parsons, ‘Queen’s,’ 159; Stafford, \textit{Emma}, 150.
\textsuperscript{83} Berthold, \textit{Chronicon}, a.1077, 258.
\textsuperscript{84} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1077, 290.
\textsuperscript{85} While secular princes, and abbots and bishops, all had a role to play at Canossa, abbesses did not.
\end{flushleft}
about contemporary expectations concerning the way in which mediation was carried out, and by whom. In Berthold’s account, Henry \textit{premissis ante se ob adducendos ad se prenominatos interventores nuntiis ... Qui properanter ad conductum locum regi occurrentes, eam causam pro causam quam convenerant, diu inter se multifario sermone ventilabant, et sollerti consulatione omnimodos secum pensabant}.\footnote{Berthold, \textit{Annales}, a.1077, 258f.}

Although the mediators suspected that Henry was not entirely sincere in his promises, they nevertheless returned and \textit{totum papae seriatiim plenaria veritate enarrabant}. Lampert similarly depicts the mediators returning to Gregory \textit{precibus ac promissionibus oneratum}.\footnote{Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1077, 290.} Since Gregory was at Canossa, and Henry was probably at Bianello (another of Matilda’s castles, c.6km north of Canossa),\footnote{Goez, \textit{Mathilde}, 106.} the mediators had to travel backwards and forwards through the snow-covered mountains.\footnote{Hay, \textit{Leadership}, 67.} It was thus a physical, as well as a diplomatic challenge.

\textit{Ruins of the castle of Canossa}\footnote{From: http://nigelvoak.blogspot.co.uk/2013_01_01_archive.html}
In contrast with Berthold and Gregory’s accounts (discussed below), Lampert describes further consultations between Gregory and the mediators once they returned to Canossa: Gregory’s initial response was that Henry should meet with him, and the German princes, at Augsburg as planned.\footnote{Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1077, 291. On the planned assembly at Augsburg: above, n.33.} The mediators replied that because of the ultimatum the princes had given Henry at Tribur (to be absolved from excommunication by February 1077, or they would elect a new king)\footnote{Cowdrey, \textit{Gregory}, 150-155; Robinson, \textit{Henry}, 156f.} he could not wait until then for absolution. Gregory, \textit{superatus tandem importunitate perurgentiun et gravitate sententiarium}, responded that if Henry was truly penitent, he should demonstrate this by resigning the crown and the rest of the royal insignia into Gregory’s power.\footnote{Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1077, 291f.} The mediators countered that this request was \textit{durum nimis}, and \textit{vehementer insisterent, ut sententiam temperaret.}\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}} Vix et aegre the mediators prevailed on Gregory to meet with Henry, and to agree that – if Henry’s repentance was sincere – he would be absolved.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

Gregory – and Berthold, who follows Gregory’s account – omits these discussions. Knowing that many of the German princes hoped that he would not absolve Henry, Gregory tried to pre-empt their criticism by emphasising that he was obliged to absolve Henry.\footnote{\textit{Registrum}, IV.12 (late January 1077): Zimmermann, \textit{Canossagang}, 139ff., 160; Althoff, \textit{Heinrich}, 156f.} Writing to the German princes immediately after Canossa, Gregory explained that when Henry entered Italy he sent supplicant messengers, asking to be absolved, but Gregory \textit{cum diu multis consultationibus differentes acriter eum de suis excessibus per omnes qui intercurrebant nuntios redargueremus}.\footnote{\textit{Registrum}, IV.12.} Gregory makes no further reference to negotiations before Canossa, and does not mention any mediators by name. Instead he emphasises that Henry spontaneously came to Canossa and performed penance, and that his actions \textit{omnes},
qui ibi aderant [...] ad tantam pietatem et compassionis misericordiam movit. This unnamed audience at Canossa (which presumably included Adelaide, Matilda and Hugh) in turn put pressure on Gregory to absolve Henry: *Denique instantia compunctionis eius [Henry] et tanta omnium qui ibi aderant supplicatione devicti tandem eum relaxato anathematis vinculo.*

Although she is not always acknowledged by name, Adelaide played an important role at each stage of the high-level political negotiations which led to Henry’s reconciliation with Gregory in January 1077: she (and others) helped to maintain communications between Henry and Gregory; and she (and others) were actively involved in shaping a settlement which was acceptable to both sides. They consulted, and bargained, and also applied pressure when necessary. Not just Henry, but also Gregory, sought out, and relied upon, Adelaide – and other powerful women – as mediators: the reconciliation at Canossa could not have taken place without them.

**Confirmation of Henry’s promises**

After receiving absolution from Gregory, Henry confirmed the promises that he had already made through the intervention of Adelaide and the other mediators: he promised that he would address the grievances of the German princes, and assured Gregory’s safety if he ventured north of the Alps. Because of the variation in contemporary accounts, there is, however, some confusion as to the way in which these promises (*securitates*) – also referred to by contemporaries as an oath (*sacramentum/iuramentum*) – were made and secured. A series of verbal, written and gestural measures were employed by Henry, and others. Certain
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99 Ibid; also Berthold, *Chronicon*, a.1077, 259.
100 *Registrum*, IV.12. For the view that public penance compelled forgiveness: Kamp, *Friedensstifter*, 70ff.
facts are clear: Henry did not make his promise to Gregory in person;\textsuperscript{103} two bishops made it on his behalf.\textsuperscript{104} Henry’s promise was then written down and circulated throughout the empire.\textsuperscript{105} The promise was further secured by the intervention of others (many of whom had acted as mediators before Henry’s absolution).\textsuperscript{106} The difficulty lies in ascertaining exactly who confirmed Henry’s promises, and how (and with what degree of formality) they did so. Depending on the account, different configurations of ecclesiastics, male religious, elite laymen, and – less frequently – elite laywomen are said to have confirmed Henry’s promises. These individuals are variously said to have placed their hands in Henry’s, or in Gregory’s, or to have sworn an oath on relics, or simply to have pledged their faith.

Because of this disagreement in the sources, modern historians often fail to mention Adelaide’s (and other women’s) role. Yet two contemporaries include women as well as men in their accounts; they also indicate that all of those who confirmed Henry’s promise, whether male or female, religious or lay, did so in the same way. Writing to the German princes immediately after Canossa, Gregory explained that he had taken securitates from Henry; he included a written copy of these promises with his letter.\textsuperscript{107} In contrast with the first part of his letter, in which he did not identify the mediators by name, Gregory states that Henry’s promises were confirmed \textit{per manus abbatis Cluniacensis [Hugh] et filiarum nostrarum Mathildis et comitissé Adelaiè et aliorum principum, episcoporum et laicorum, qui nobis ad hoc utiles visi sunt}.\textsuperscript{108} The precise meaning of this confirmatory hand gesture is unclear, but it

\textsuperscript{103} After taking the coronation oath, eleventh-century kings did not swear formal oaths: Goez, ‘Eidesleistung,’ esp. 523ff.; Waitz, \textit{Verfassungsgeschichte}, 474ff., 487.
\textsuperscript{105} \textit{Registrum}, IV.12a (28\textsuperscript{th} January 1077).
\textsuperscript{106} Some scholars (Robinson, \textit{Henry}, 161; Fried, \textit{Canossa}, 129ff.; Cowdrey, \textit{Gregory}, 157) refer to these individuals – incorrectly – as ‘oath-helpers’: a kind of character witness used to prove the justice of a defendant’s case (Davies/Fouracre, \textit{Settlement}, Glossary, s.v.; Weitzel, ‘Eideshelfer’).
\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Registrum}, IV.12.
\textsuperscript{108} \textit{Ibid.}
seems to indicate that some kind of promise or pledge was given,\textsuperscript{109} and that Adelaide, Matilda, Hugh, and the unnamed others who were present, were assuming (a measure of) responsibility for ensuring that Henry adhered to his promise.

Gregory is the only contemporary who refers to Adelaide (and Matilda) by name, but Berthold of Reichenau similarly indicates that women were present. According to Berthold, Henry’s \textit{sacramentum} was solemnised \textit{in manus interventorum illorum qui presto fuerat, nec non imperatricis [Agnes] que necdum aderat}.\textsuperscript{110} Here we can infer that Adelaide was among the mediators who confirmed Henry’s promises; and we can also see further confirmation of Agnes’ importance, even though she was not at Canossa.

Other contemporaries imply that only \textit{men} were present when Henry’s promise were confirmed – even if they had already emphasised Adelaide and Matilda’s key role as mediators. Lampert of Hersfeld, for example, refers to a whole apparatus of crowds, oaths and relics to secure Henry’s promise, but makes no mention of Adelaide: \textit{Episcopus quoque Citicensis et episcopus Vercellensis et Azzo marchio et alii conventionis eius principes, allatis sanctorum reliquis, sub iureiurando confirmaverunt facturum eum [Henry] esse quae pollicebatur}.\textsuperscript{111} Cardinal Deusdedit similarly omits any reference to Adelaide in the version of Henry’s \textit{iuramentum} preserved in his collection of canon law (written in the mid-1080s). In contrast with the version preserved in Gregory’s \textit{Register},\textsuperscript{112} Deusdedit includes an extensive list of cardinals, archbishops, bishops, deacons, subdeacons, and abbots in whose presence Henry’s oath was taken; the list also indicates that \textit{multi nobiles viri} were also present on the king’s side, although they are not named.\textsuperscript{113}

\textsuperscript{109} Siegel, \textit{Handschlag}; Schempf, ‘Handschlag’.
\textsuperscript{110} Berthold, \textit{Chronicon}, a.1077, 259f.
\textsuperscript{111} Lampert, \textit{Annales}, a.1077, 294f.
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Registrum}, IV.12a.
\textsuperscript{113} Deusdedit, \textit{Collectio}, IV.421, 597f. Fried, \textit{Canossa}, 131, argues that this eschatocol is a later construct.
Contemporaries sometimes referred to Adelaide by masculine titles,\textsuperscript{114} so it is possible that she was implicitly included amongst Lampert’s ‘princes who had made this agreement’, and perhaps even among Deusdedit’s ‘noble men’. Yet there is a clear, and gendered, contrast between contemporaries’ willingness to name Adelaide as a mediator, and their reluctance to mention her in relation to Henry’s promise. Significantly, the same contemporaries who omit reference to Adelaide also emphasise the formal, legal nature of the confirmation. Lampert, for example, describes the oath taken by the princes as an \textit{iusiurandum}: this is a formal term used to describe a solemn oath pronounced as part of a religious and/or legal act. Lampert also distinguishes between the formal oath sworn by the princes, and Abbot Hugh’s actions: \textit{Sed abbas Cloniacensis, quoniam iurare monasticae religionis optentu detractabat, fidem suam coram oculis omnia cernentis Dei interposuit.}\textsuperscript{115} Although he does not refer to them as such, Lampert’s princes are acting as \textit{fideiussores}, who stood ‘pledge for the fulfilment of another person’s duties towards public authorities’\textsuperscript{116} Lampert’s text suggests that women – and Abbot Hugh – were excluded from this public role.

Adelaide’s absence from Deusdedit’s list is similarly explicable in legal terms. Deusdedit’s reference to Henry’s oath being taken ‘in the presence of’ these individuals suggests Deusdedit thought that they were acting as witnesses (rather than sureties), and – since their word had to be valid in a court of law – women were frequently prevented from acting as witnesses.\textsuperscript{117} Thus – although neither Lampert’s nor Deusdedit’s accounts are discussed by McNamara – their versions of Henry’s oath provide a limited confirmation of McNamara’s view of Canossa as indicative of the erasure of women from public life.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{114} Below, pp.136, 161.
\textsuperscript{116} Niermeyer, s.v.; Davies/Fouracre, \textit{Settlement}, Glossary, s.v. ‘fideiussores’; s.v. ‘sureties’.
\textsuperscript{117} On the inability of Italian women to act as witnesses: Wickham, ‘Disputes,’ 111; Skinner, ‘Disputes’. In general: Nelson, ‘Dispute,’ 51f., 58; Nelson, ‘Regiment,’ 62f.; van Houts, ‘Gender’.
\textsuperscript{118} Above, nn.13, 15.
Gregory’s and Berthold’s accounts show that elite women still played a key role in public, political events, including the swearing of oaths, but it is clear that other contemporaries were less willing to acknowledge their role. Because of the traditional view of women as intercessors, presenting Adelaide and Matilda as mediators at Canossa was – just about – acceptable; suggesting that they had played a formal, public role was not.

The lack of reference to Adelaide (and Matilda) in relation to Henry’s promise also relates back to the criticisms made against Gregory by German bishops at the assembly at Worms: that he allowed the Church to be administered by a feminarum novus senatus;¹¹⁹ and also of his rumoured sexual impropriety with Matilda.¹²⁰ Because of these accusations, Gregory distanced himself from women in general, and Matilda in particular, after Canossa.¹²¹ Although he ascribed a central role to Adelaide and Matilda in his letter to the German princes in January 1077, this is the only time Gregory did so: in later references to Canossa in general, and Henry’s promise in particular, Gregory omits any mention of them.

Writing to Archbishop Nehemia of Gran, Gregory briefly mentions his accepting per sacramentum ab eodem Heinrico rege securitatibus.¹²² In a letter to Bishop Udo of Trier, Gregory refers to the sacramentum, quod rex Heinricus nobis per fideles suos quosdam fecit data quidem propria manu sua in manum abbatis Cluniacensis [Hugh].¹²³ And in the record of the Lenten synod, held after Henry’s second excommunication in 1080 (at which point Henry’s promises were obviously null and void), Gregory simply refers to the promises Henry had made upon oath (iuramentum), per duos episcopos at Canossa.¹²⁴

As with Gregory’s earlier omission of the names of the mediators before Canossa, his decision to conceal Adelaide’s (and Matilda’s) role is not only about their actions, or even

¹¹⁹ Briefsammlungen Heinrichs, no. 20 (24th January 1076).
¹²⁰ Briefsammlungen Heinrichs, nos. 10-12; Lampert, Annales, a.1077, 251ff.
¹²¹ Hay, Leadership, 63ff.; Goez, Mathilde, 108f.
¹²² Registrum, IV.25 (9th June 1077).
¹²³ Registrum, V.7 (30th September 1077).
¹²⁴ Registrum, VII.14a (7th March 1080).
entirely about their gender, so much as about Gregory’s own agenda. This relates, first, to his intended audience: when writing primarily for ecclesiastics, rather than to the German princes, Gregory made no mention of Adelaide or Matilda. (Similarly, while Deusdedit listed the holders of various clerical offices, he did not mention any laymen – let alone laywomen – by name in connection with Henry’s oath.) Second, and perhaps more importantly, Gregory was concerned about how his reliance on Adelaide and Matilda might be used against him by his opponents. So although these women had obviously played an important role at Canossa – one which Gregory acknowledged at the time – thereafter it was evidently considered risky both by Gregory, and by pro-Gregorian contemporaries, to admit quite how important they were. Because of the fear that pro-imperial authors might use these women against Gregory, references to them were dropped, and their presence was glossed over, leading to the modern view of Canossa as a ‘womanless space’.

After Canossa

The events at Canossa did not provide a long-term solution to the conflict between Henry and Gregory. The same factors which made Adelaide a desirable mediator at Canossa also made her a desirable ally afterwards. From 1077 onwards there was increasing factionalism, with offices often being held by rival claimants, one backed by the imperial party, the other by the papal faction. Where aristocrats had formerly been able to have plural bonds and loyalties, they were increasingly required to choose one faction or the other. Adelaide was in a difficult position, particularly after her son-in-law, Rudolf of Rheinfelden, was elected as king in opposition to Henry in March 1077. Whom should she choose to support? After Canossa Adelaide maintained close connections with Gregory, and with pro-papal princes,

125 Althoff, Heinrich, IV.4; Robinson, Henry, ch.6; Cowdrey, Gregory, ch.3.5.
126 Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 71ff.
including Rudolf, Matilda of Tuscany, and Frederick of Montbéliard, which suggested that she was perhaps more likely to support Gregory than Henry.\textsuperscript{127} Yet Adelaide had dynastic and political reasons to remain on good terms with Henry, too.\textsuperscript{128} In June 1080 pro-imperial bishops deposed Gregory at the Synod of Brixen and elected Wibert of Ravenna as anti-pope Clement III in his place.\textsuperscript{129} Several bishops from Piedmont were present at Brixen, including Otto of Tortona (r.1077-1083), Ranger of Vercelli (r.c.1077-1089), and Otto of Asti (r.1080-1098/1102).\textsuperscript{130} Otto of Asti may have been Adelaide’s son;\textsuperscript{131} whether or not this was the case, the presence of bishops from Piedmont was seen as an indication that Adelaide might be receptive to Henry. Hoping to capitalise on this, Bishop Benzo of Alba began a letter-writing campaign in which he attempted to win Adelaide to the imperial cause.

\textit{Benzo of Alba’s letters (c.1080-c.1082)}

Around 1080 Bishop Benzo of Alba purportedly sent a series of metrical letters to Adelaide; he also sent letters about Adelaide to Bishop Burchard of Lausanne, and Henry IV.\textsuperscript{132} These are preserved in Benzo’s sole extant work, known to historians as \textit{Ad Heinricum IV imperatorem libri VII} (compiled c.1085/6).\textsuperscript{133} As the title suggests, this is a panegyric in honour of Henry IV, to whom it is addressed.\textsuperscript{134} The \textit{Ad Heinricum} was also intended to further Benzo’s own career.\textsuperscript{135} He was driven out of his see of Alba, c.1076/7,\textsuperscript{136} and by the

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{129} Cowdrey, \textit{Gregory}, 3.4; Althoff, \textit{Heinrich}, IV.3
\bibitem{130} Decretum Synodi, no. 70 (25\textsuperscript{th} June 1080).
\bibitem{131} Chapter 6, n.116.
\bibitem{132} Appendix I, nos. 39a; 40a-b; Lehmgüubner, \textit{Benzo}, 64f., 72f.; Seyffert, ‘Einleitung,’ 18.
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\bibitem{136} Benzo was probably driven out by the Pataria: Lehmgüubner, \textit{Benzo}, 55f.; Robinson, \textit{Reform}, 84.
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1080s was a disappointed man, who felt that he had not received the rewards which were his due. Thus in books IV-V of the *Ad Heinricum* Benzo included copies of letters which he had allegedly sent to various recipients, including archbishops, bishops, Henry, and Adelaide. These letters served as a record of all that Benzo had done to promote the imperial cause in Italy, and therefore provided a platform for his renewed appeals to Henry for patronage.

No letters written by Benzo have survived elsewhere and there is some debate about the authenticity of those found in the *Ad Heinricum*. Certain letters, including two supposedly written by Empress Agnes in support of anti-pope Honorius II in 1063, are universally thought to be literary fictions. There is, however, evidence that some of Benzo’s purported correspondents – including Adalbert of Bremen and Adelaide – actually received letters from him. In relation to Adelaide, Hugo Lehmgrubner argued that Benzo’s first letter to her is a draft of the letter he actually sent, which has simply been pasted wholesale into the manuscript of the *Ad Heinricum*. It is written on poor quality parchment, in narrow lines, with no chapter headings, and with the names of both the sender and the recipient abbreviated. It is markedly shorter than the other letters Benzo sent to Adelaide, and was evidently written at a different time from the rest of the manuscript. Lehmgrubner thus argued that what survives are notes sketching out the ‘concept’ of the final, improved version which was sent to Adelaide. Even if Benzo did send letters to Adelaide, they were probably reworked for effect before inclusion in the *Ad Heinricum*.

In Benzo’s mind, one of the greatest proofs of his value was that it was thanks to his actions that Adelaide began to support Henry. In the preface to his letters to Adelaide, Benzo
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140 Universitätsbibliothek Kiel, MS Bord, 1a, fol. 7v., cited in Seyffert, ‘Einleitung,’ 18f.
141 Lehmgrubner, *Benzo*, 19, 22, 72; Hartmann, ‘Handschrift,’ 52f. is sceptical.
142 *AH*, 482 n.200.
reminded Henry of his success: he compared Adelaide with *regina piscium, ammirabilis balena, non poterat capi neque hamo neque catena*.\(^{143}\) So Benzo approached Adelaide with *mellifluis verbis porrigens ei escas ex floribus nec non aromaticis herbis et [...] cottidie infundebat auribus eius Ambrosianas melodias maritimis associatus Syrenis* and by this means, *deduxit eam in sagenam fidei traxitque ad litus ante pedes imperatoris HEINRICI [IV]*.\(^{144}\) This evocative image of Adelaide as a great fish, pulled to the shore by Benzo, had biblical precedents,\(^{145}\) and may also have been inspired by a passage in Adam of Bremen’s *Gesta Hammaburgensis Ecclesiae Pontificum* (written c.1075).\(^{146}\) Benzo’s description of Adelaide as ‘queen of the fishes’ perhaps also implies that compared with Adelaide, Henry’s other supporters were ‘small fry’. The location of Benzo’s diocese of Alba probably influenced his view of Adelaide’s importance. Adelaide certainly had possessions in Alba, and may well have held comital power there too.\(^{147}\) Yet Benzo was not alone in his favourable opinion of Adelaide, and it is unlikely that he wrote to her on his own initiative. Both the preface of Benzo’s letters to Adelaide\(^{148}\) and his letter to Henry\(^{149}\) imply that Benzo wrote to Adelaide with Henry’s knowledge, and possibly at his request.\(^{150}\) As at Canossa, Henry and his followers actively sought Adelaide’s help in his conflict with Gregory.

In 1080 Henry’s position was precarious.\(^{151}\) There had been civil war in Germany since 1077, when Rudolf of Rheinfelden was elected as (anti)king in opposition to him. Henry’s forces had been defeated at Flarchheim in January 1080, and in March he was excommunicated for a second time by Gregory. Then, in summer 1080, open war broke out

\(^{143}\) *AH*, V.9, 480.

\(^{144}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{145}\) It is suggestive both of the ‘great fish’ which swallowed Jonah (Jonah, 1-3); and perhaps also of the idea of churchmen as ‘fishers of men’ (Matt. 4:18-22; 13:47-48); Seyffert, *AH*, 481f. n.199.

\(^{146}\) Adam, *Gesta*, IV.32, 265; Oldoni, ‘Iconografia,’ 225ff.


\(^{148}\) *AH*, V.9, 480ff.

\(^{149}\) *AH*, V.13(14), 496f.


in Italy, too; Henry entered Italy in 1081, and waged war there until 1084. This deepening crisis forms the immediate background to Benzo’s letters to Adelaide. Yet Adelaide, as is clear from Benzo’s letters, was unwilling to be drawn into the conflict.

Benzo wrote about Adelaide, c.1080, in a metrical letter to Bishop Burchard of Lausanne (r.1056-1088), the chancellor of Italy (r.1079-1087). Benzo attributed great political importance to Adelaide and encouraged Burchard to make her the leader of the imperial party in Lombardy: Per legatum clama eam magistram concilii, / Dominam atque ducatricem communis consilii, / Ut Hegeria dux fuit in causis Pompilii. Although he stressed her status as a ruler, to gain Adelaide’s support Benzo also advised Burchard to play on her kinship with Henry, and call her regis mater. Burchard may, or may not, have followed Benzo’s advice. In any event Benzo also wrote directly to Adelaide himself. In his letters to Adelaide, Benzo argued that in advising her to support Henry, he was relaying the will of God. Casting himself in the role of prophet, Benzo explained that Adelaide should not ignore her fore-ordained role as the protector of both Henry and the Church. Benzo emphasised the importance of obedience to authority, first with reference to the story of Jonah, who fled from the face of the Lord (Jonah 1-3), and reminded Adelaide that

\[ \text{Nil denique valuit Ionae quod fugam paravit; nolens, volens, verbum salutis} \]

\[ \text{Ninivitis ministravit. In voluntate ergo Dei universa sunt posita. Et vos sola} \]
\[ \text{nitimini modo contra eius imperium}\]

152 Robinson, Henry, ch.6; Althoff, Heinrich, IV.4-V.2; Hay, Leadership, ch.2; Struve, ‘Mathilde’.
154 Lehmgübner, Benzo, 73. No letter(s) from Burchard to Adelaide are extant.
155 AH, V.11(12), 488.
156 AH, V.10(11), 484; Oldoni, ‘L.’iconografia,’ 227. Benzo also compared himself to Jonah in his fourth letter to Adelaide: AH, V.12(13), 492.
Second, Benzo utilised the exemplar of the Virgin Mary, whose obedience Adelaide should emulate: *Dic ergo, o domna, sicut Maria ad angelum: “Ecce ancilla Domini, fiat michi secundum verbum tuum”* [Luke 1:38].

Whilst insisting that Adelaide must be obedient and support Henry, Benzo also tried to flatter Adelaide. In addition to comparing Adelaide with the Virgin Mary, and calling her *domina superdomina, dux, princeps, and Romani senatus patricia*, Benzo repeatedly stressed her importance to the imperial cause. Previté-Orton disparaged Benzo’s letters precisely because of his ‘base spaniel-fawning, his nauseous flattery,’ but this was typical for medieval letters of petition: their elaborate praise was intended to (re-)activate bonds of patronage and clientship. The increasingly frustrated tone of the letters Benzo wrote to Adelaide indicates that, despite his flattery, she did not rush to do his bidding and support Henry. Nevertheless, at the beginning of Lent 1082, Benzo wrote to Henry about the success of his letter-writing campaign, explaining that: *domna Adeleida cum lampade sua* [Matt 25:1ff.] *ante regis ianuam est*.

From Benzo’s account it appears that, although Adelaide was prepared to support Henry, she made high demands for doing so (just as she had previously done when Henry needed to travel through her lands to Canossa). There is no surviving evidence to indicate what reward Adelaide might have expected, but in his first letter to Adelaide, Benzo suggests that if she follows his advice and supports Henry, then *cum tranquillitate sedebis sub rege in solio regifice maiestatis, et videbis ante te duces cum principibus, orbis terrarum opes tibi ministrantibus*. With this image – redolent with Marian overtones – Benzo seems to envisage Adelaide being given some kind of authority in Italy; Saverio Sagulo suggests this
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158 AH, V.9(10), 482; V.11(12), 486, 488; V.10(11), 484; Sagulo, Ideologia, 91 n.118.
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may even have been a reference to vice-regal powers. Yet Benzo’s phrasing is ambiguous and what was meant in real terms is not clear: was this the trade-off for Adelaide’s help, or bombast on Benzo’s part?

Whatever Adelaide’s demands were, Benzo was evidently concerned that they were so high that Henry might reject her terms. To prevent this, Benzo enjoined Henry to:

*Recordare, quę deus precepit Abrahe: Omnia quæcumque dixerit tibi Sarra,*

*audi vocem eius* [Gen. 21:12]. […] *Omnia ergo, quę tibi dixerit domna Adeleida, audi vocem eius, Si dixerit: Eice sarabaitam [Gregory VII] et omnes sequaces eius, audi vocem eius, et si ‘Non’ dixerit, audi vocem eius, quia ad te est conversio eius* [Cant 7.10].

Although Benzo emphasises Adelaide’s authority here, he goes on to explain that, for all her power, Adelaide is subordinate to Henry: *Nam mulieri [Eve] predivit deus Ad virum est conversio tua, et vir dominabitur tui* [Gen. 3:16]. Similarly, Adelaide *ipsa vero audiet et faciet voluntatem tuam* [Henry IV] *in omnibus, quia tu dominaberis illius.*

**How far did Adelaide support Henry in 1082?**

Benzo certainly inflated the extent to which Adelaide was subordinate to Henry, and probably the extent to which she was willing to support him as well, but in 1082 Adelaide once again tried to mediate between Henry and his opponents. Did this mean that she was now firmly allied with Henry? And if so, did Benzo deserve to take the credit for this? Adelaide’s decision to support for Henry in 1082 must surely be attributed, at least in part, to her personal relationship with the imperial dynasty. It may even be the case that, as in 1076/7, her
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163 *AH,* V.13(14), 496f.

164 *AH,* V.13(14), 498.

daughter Bertha interceded with Adelaide on Henry’s behalf. Henry was also far more politically and militarily secure in 1082 than he had been in early 1080. If Adelaide had waited to ‘back the right horse’ after Canossa, then in 1082 Henry appeared to be winning. In October 1080 one of Henry’s antagonists (and Adelaide’s son-in-law), Rudolf of Rheinfelden, died at the battle of Hohenmölsen; and in Italy, Matilda of Tuscany, another of Henry’s antagonists, was defeated at Volta. Henry entered Italy in March 1081, and was militarily dominant thereafter, successfully undermining Matilda’s position throughout Summer/Autumn 1081. In Tuscany he issued privileges to the fideles cives of Pisa and Lucca, granting them rights and freedoms. This was intended to gain the support of these nascent Italian communes, and simultaneously to undermine Matilda, who lost not only her control of these cities, but also the legal basis for her rule.

It is possible that Henry also issued a privilege in Turin at this time. Previous emperors issued grants in Turin, but there are no surviving diplomas issued by Henry IV in, or for, Adelaide’s lands during her lifetime. Yet a diploma issued by his son, Henry V (r.1106-1125), suggests that Henry IV may have granted rights and privileges to the citizens of Turin, as well as to the citizens of Lucca and Pisa. In June 1116, Henry V confirmed the citizens of Turin in omnes usus bonos eorum and declared them free from the power of local secular lords, placing them directly under his authority (ut nulli mortalium deinceps nisi nobis serviant). According to Henry V, these customs and rights had been held by (and by
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167 For an overview: Eads, ‘Expedition,’ esp. 64f.
168 DD HIV, nos. 334 (23rd June 1081); 336 (1081); Puglia, ‘Reazione’; Struve, ‘Fideles’; Wickham, Sleepwalking, 76f.
170 Appendix 1, no. 41a; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 468f.; Sergi, ‘Principato,’ 537.
171 For previous imperial grants: pp.31 n.20, 41 n.52, 47 n.79, 159 n.37, 223 n.14, 225 n.26. That Adelaide did not intervene in, nor witness, any of Henry IV’s diplomas could suggest that she was not part of Henry’s inner circle; it could equally be due to charter survival. On the scarcity of diplomas (particularly for Italian recipients) from Henry IV’s reign: d’Acunto, ‘Canossa,’ esp. 570ff.
implication, granted to) the citizens of Turin since the time of his father, Henry IV. Privileges often made reference to customs granted by previous rulers, so this does not necessarily mean that Henry IV issued a grant for Turin, but it is suggestive.

If Henry IV issued a privilege for Turin, he probably did so c.1081/2 (after he had entered Italy, and at around the time that Adelaide began to intervene on his behalf). Was this a carrot or a stick? Kings could grant privileges to a city to prop-up the existing power-holder. Yet (following the example of Henry’s grants to Lucca and Pisa) it is more likely that Henry issued the privilege to counter Adelaide’s authority in Turin – the centre of her power – and to make the consequences of her continued refusal to help him abundantly clear. Significantly, while the diploma freed the citizens of Turin from the authority of their secular lord (Adelaide), it preserved the bishop of Turin’s customary rights over the citizens (salva solita iusticia Taurinensis episcopi). Cunibert was bishop of Turin at this time, and by Summer 1081 he was among the fideles who were accompanying Henry on his Italian expedition. Cunibert’s active support for Henry was a recent development, and Henry’s grant for Turin, which strengthened Cunibert’s position, may have been the price for his support.

Previté-Orton also suggests that a grant of property or power in Turin swayed Cunibert to the imperial side, c.1081. He bases this assertion not on Henry V’s 1116 diploma, but on a letter from Benzo to Cunibert. This letter, which is full of deeply obscure references, mentions Cunibert’s possession of Tracias, semper quod quesisti; Benzo warns Cunibert: Omnibus asconde, precor, tam sacrum mysterium. / Nam si dixeris hoc Eve, ammittes pomerium. / Generabit tibi lingua perpes improperium. This is often interpreted

173 Chapter 6, nn.109-110.
174 Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 468f. suggest 1077.
175 DD HIV, nos. 338, 339 (20th July 1081); 345 (23rd July 1082); Sergi, L’Aristocrazia, 185.
176 Chapter 4.
177 Previté-Orton, History, 246f.
178 AH, V.8, 476f.
as a warning to Cunibert that if Adelaide knew of his activities or possessions, he would lose them.\textsuperscript{179} Understanding \textit{pomerium} as ‘the land within the city limits, but outside of the walls of the city,’ Previté-Orton argues that Henry granted Cunibert some form of \textit{publica potestas} in Turin, but it seems more likely that he made a grant of episcopal immunity to Cunibert (which later formed the basis of Henry V’s more far-reaching grant to the citizens of Turin in 1116). The implicit threat in Henry IV’s privilege for Turin suggests that it was his actions, rather than Benzo’s letters, which ensured Adelaide’s intervention on his behalf in Summer and Autumn 1082.

Benzo does not indicate what kind of support he envisages Adelaide giving Henry in his letters, but elsewhere in the \textit{Ad Heinricum} he depicts Adelaide, now fully converted to the imperial side, as a mediator between Henry and Matilda of Tuscany.\textsuperscript{180} Following Henry’s military success, and his privileges for Lucca and Pisa, Matilda was in a relatively weak position. She was still a threat to Henry (as even Benzo admits), but in Summer/Autumn 1082 Henry was in Tuscany, undermining Matilda’s rule.\textsuperscript{181} As at Canossa, Adelaide’s own high status, and her connections both with Henry and with Matilda, made her the perfect mediator. According to Benzo,

\begin{quote}
\textit{De adventu principissē} \textit{[Adelaide]} \textit{totus mundus gaudeat},

\textit{Cuius parem non assignat orbis ephymerida}.\textsuperscript{182}

\textit{Peciit filium regem} \textit{[Henry IV]} \textit{domna Adeleida},

\textit{Inter regem et Mathildam fieri vult media}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{179} Pertz, MGH SS 11, 653 n.71; Lehmgribner, \textit{Benzo}, 70f; MvK, III, 168. Lehmgribner and MvK see \textit{Tracias} as a reference to property in Tarantaise (\textit{Tarantasias}) which Cunibert had appropriated from the monastery of San Michele della Chiusa. (On Cunibert’s long-running dispute with Chiusa: chapter 4.) By contrast, Seyffert, \textit{AH}, 478 nn.178, 180 sees this section as allegorical: ‘Thrace’ refers to an oracle which promises success, and \textit{pomerium} to the Garden of Eden. Seyffert also thinks that – given the praise for Adelaide elsewhere in Benzo’s work – it is unlikely that he would have referred to Adelaide as ‘Eve’, yet there are several references to Eve in Benzo’s letters to, and about, Adelaide: \textit{AH}, V.11(12), 488; V.13(14), 498.

\textsuperscript{180} As indicated above, n.28, Benzo does not mention Adelaide’s mediatory role at Canossa.

\textsuperscript{181} \textit{AH}, VI.4, 544; Eads, \textit{Mighty}, 148ff., 154ff.

\textsuperscript{182} Cf. \textit{AH}, V.9, 480.
Ipsa quidem se et sua dabit regi filio,
Ut sit frequens ceu Martha in regis consilio
Et Hegeria secunda recenti Pompilio.\textsuperscript{183}

Benzo is the only source for these events. It is not clear when Adelaide met with Henry (although Summer/Autumn 1082 is most likely). Nor is it clear if a meeting ever took place between Adelaide and Matilda – if so, little came of these negotiations.\textsuperscript{184} Yet that is not Benzo’s primary concern.

Benzo makes use of classical and biblical figures to depict Adelaide not just as a mediator, but also as one of Henry’s chief counsellors. Egeria is a classical exemplar of a female counsellor: she was a nymph who was an advisor to (and in some accounts, wife of) Numa Pompilius, legendary second king of Rome.\textsuperscript{185} The biblical Martha, along with her sister Mary (Luke 10:38-42; John 11:12ff, 12:1-8), were frequently interpreted as types of the active and contemplative life.\textsuperscript{186} Christian authors often saw the contemplative life as preferable to the active, but Martha (who represented the active life) was increasingly exalted from the eleventh century onwards.\textsuperscript{187} This is certainly the case in Benzo’s work, where Adelaide’s active support of Henry is praised. Yet just how active was that support in 1082? In 1080 Adelaide had been forging close connections with Gregory and, via Frederick of Montbéliard, with Matilda.\textsuperscript{188} Had these alliances evaporated by 1082? Adelaide’s offer to mediate between Henry and Matilda need not indicate that she had chosen one side or the other; it is possible that Adelaide was still supporting Matilda and Gregory at this time.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{183} \textit{AH}, VI.4, 544.
\textsuperscript{184} Robinson, \textit{Henry}, 221; Eads, \textit{Mighty}, 163.
\textsuperscript{185} Benzo also compares Adelaide with Egeria in his letter to Burchard (above, n.153); and uses her as an example of a wise counsellor elsewhere: \textit{AH}, IV.32(3), 372. For comparisons of Henry III/Henry IV with Numa Pompilius: V.1; VI, prologue; VI.6; Sagulo, \textit{Ideologia}, 75, 118 n.76.
\textsuperscript{186} Constable, ‘Martha’.
\textsuperscript{187} Ropa, ‘Bibbia,’ 396.
\textsuperscript{188} Above, pp.69ff.
\textsuperscript{189} Cf. above, p.71 for the suggestion that Adelaide was helping Matilda and Frederick funnel wealth to Gregory in Rome.
Adelaide may equally have provided Henry with material support by 1082. The evidence for this is ambiguous, but relates to Adelaide’s ally, Margrave Wido II of Sezzadio (located c.77km south-east of Turin). Wido was a member of a cadet branch of the Aleramid dynasty. He was related to Adelaide by marriage,\(^{190}\) and witnessed several charters issued by Adelaide and her sister Immilla.\(^{191}\) An ambiguous reference to Sezzadio in Benzo’s work raises questions about Wido’s affiliation in 1082. Benzo relates that in Autumn 1082: *Visitavit rex Vuidonem everso Sezadio.*\(^{192}\) This can be understood in two different ways: that Henry beset (*visitavit*) Wido, and destroyed Sezzadio; or that he visited Wido, and Sezzadio, which had been destroyed. The former suggestion – which indicates that Henry was punishing Wido for rebelling against him – is favoured by Anglophone and German scholars.\(^{193}\) Italian scholars tend to prefer the second interpretation, which contains no indication that Wido had rebelled against Henry.\(^{194}\) Further evidence suggesting that Wido was one of Henry’s supporters has been found in the record of a *placitum* held by Henry in March 1084 at Rieti, at which a Margrave Wido was present,\(^{195}\) and also in Donizo’s *Vita Mathildis*, which indicates that Henry’s standard-bearer was a ‘son of Otbert’ (the name of Wido’s father).\(^{196}\) If Wido was indeed supporting Henry after 1082, was he doing so at Adelaide’s behest?

Whether Sezzadio was destroyed by Henry, or by his opponents, it is likely that it was after this (Autumn 1082) that Adelaide began to support Henry fully. An attack on Sezzadio – so close to Turin – convinced Adelaide that her balancing act between Henry and Gregory was dangerous and untenable. For dynastic reasons she chose Henry and, after 1082,

\(^{190}\) Table 4; Bresslau, *Jahrbücher*, 394f.; Merlone, ‘Discendenza’.

\(^{191}\) Appendix 1, nos. 36; 41; Appendix 2, VII/5; Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 25.

\(^{192}\) *AH*, VI.4, 544.


\(^{194}\) Desimoni, *Marche*, 103; Cognasso, *Piemonte*, 145; Merlone, ‘Discendenza’.

\(^{195}\) PRI, III, no. 462 (March 1084).

Adelaide provided him not only with diplomatic support, but also with material assistance. In addition to Wido of Sezzadio, Adelaide may well have mobilised others of her followers on Henry’s behalf, although there is little surviving evidence of this. She also accompanied Henry herself: William of Chiusa (writing c. 1095) indicates that, in February 1084, Adelaide was able to intervene with Henry on behalf of the imprisoned Abbot Benedict II of Chiusa quoniam apud regem tunc temporis. In February and March 1084, Henry was in the Campania (c. 215km south-east of Rome), campaigning against Robert Guiscard. If we accept William of Chiusa’s account, then Adelaide had travelled hundreds of miles south of her own lands to accompany Henry. It is, in fact, likely that Adelaide was not simply with Henry, but also campaigning on his behalf. Adelaide’s support for Henry, in whatever form, paid off: Henry and Bertha received their imperial coronation in Rome in March 1084. Given her presence south of Rome in February 1084, it is likely that Adelaide was present when her daughter was crowned empress. Hostilities between Henry and the papacy did not end there – nor with Gregory’s death in 1085 – but Adelaide’s involvement diminished thereafter.

Conclusion

Adelaide played crucial roles in the crises of Henry’s reign (1076-1084), both as a diplomatic and as a military agent. The important diplomatic role played by Adelaide at Canossa was recognised by contemporaries. She accompanied and protected Henry to the meeting at Canossa, where she participated actively in the negotiations which led to Henry’s absolution. This was depicted by contemporaries not as ‘womanly’ intercession, but as high-level

---

197 Appendix 1, no. 43b.
198 Eads, Mighty, 171; Cowdrey, Gregory, 227; Robinson, Henry, 227.
199 Appendix 1, no. 43a; Previté-Orton, History, 247ff. On Adelaide’s military activities: Appendix 1, no. 21c, 22a; chapters 2, 6.
200 Appendix 1, no. 43c.
political diplomacy. Adelaide then witnessed the meeting between Henry and Gregory; and finally confirmed Henry’s promises. She took on these roles because of kinship connections and friendship networks (both with Henry and with Gregory); and also because she was a powerful Italian lord. Although Adelaide’s intervention was both expected and encouraged, some contemporaries found the *presentation* of her actions problematic – and distorted her role(s) in these events to serve their own agenda.

In contrast with the way in which some contemporaries deliberately glossed over Adelaide’s role at Canossa, Benzo of Alba emphasised Adelaide’s central importance to Henry after Canossa. He indicates that in 1082 Adelaide again acted as a mediator, in an attempt to make peace between Henry and Matilda of Tuscany. This did not, however, mean that Adelaide was firmly allied with Henry between 1077 and 1082. She was closely connected with Gregory and his adherents after Canossa, and may even have continued to support Gregory, via her connections with Frederick of Montbéliard and Matilda, until Autumn 1082. Thereafter, Adelaide backed Henry more determinedly. Benzo, unsurprisingly, emphasised his own key role in securing Adelaide’s help, but several other factors, including dynastic considerations, and Henry’s political and military dominance in Italy, played a role here. Henry’s own intervention was important in securing Adelaide as his ally: he probably issued a privilege for Turin, which undermined Adelaide’s position; and at the same time encouraged Adelaide’s support with the promise of potential rewards (even if nothing so explicit as vice-regal powers). In return Adelaide mobilised her followers, and perhaps even campaigned herself, on Henry’s behalf.
PART II: REGIONAL POWER

Part II is concerned with Adelaide’s dominance in Turin: how was she able to achieve, and maintain, this position? The concern is less with the geographic confines of Adelaide’s power, which have been well-described by Giuseppe Sergi and Charles Previté-Orton, as with cultures of power, and the individuals and groups upon whom she relied for support. Although local elite families in Turin have been studied before, the relationship between Adelaide and these groups has not been fully considered from her perspective. How did Adelaide interact with local elites? By what means did she attract, and secure, their service and loyalty? How did these relationships, and Adelaide’s power, change over time? Certain factors – Adelaide’s landed possessions, and the strategic significance of her control of Alpine passes – were of ongoing importance. Other were more – or less – important across Adelaide’s lifetime. These included: the rising autonomy of certain Italian cities; the impact of the Italian wars of the 1080s; and various crises brought about by deaths of Adelaide’s family members. This introductory section provides a brief overview of the territories Adelaide ruled, and of ‘local elites’ in Turin.

The city and county of Turin

Adelaide had vast possessions throughout north-western Italy, particularly in the counties of Turin, Auriate, Asti and Bredulo. The county of Turin was the largest, and most populous,

---

1 There is little evidence of Adelaide’s rule in Savoy (but cf. Appendix 1, nos. 22, 33), but contemporaries acknowledged Adelaide’s lands/jurisdiction there: chapter 3, n.51; Breife, 4/3, no.114, 297: in ditione vero tua, quae in duorum regnorum Italiæ scilícet et Burgundiae porrigitur; Vita Annonis, c.33, 480: Adelheida Alpium Cottiarum marchionissa.
2 Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 672-712; Previté-Orton, History, 153, 157-165; also Bresslau, Jahrbücher, 365ff., 369f.; Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 7-146.
4 A brief overview: Bordone, ‘Civitas,’ 43f.
county possessed by Adelaide’s dynasty. It was bounded to the north and west by the western Alps. To the north, via the Mont Cenis pass, lay Maurienne; to the west, via the Montgènevre pass, Provence. To the north-east, it was bounded by the mark of Montferrat; to the east and south lay other counties ruled by Adelaide’s dynasty: Asti, Alba, Bredulo and Auriate. (Map 5) The majority of Adelaide’s extant charters were issued from locations in the city or county of Turin, and for beneficiaries located within the county.

Adelaide was frequently documented in urban centres, particularly in the city of Turin which was her dynasty’s main residence, and the centre of their power. (Map 4) The location of the city, at the entrance to the valley of Susa (leading to the Mont Cenis pass), and at the confluence of several tributaries of the Po river (the Dora Riparia, Sangone and Stura di Lanzo) gave Adelaide’s dynasty control over communications and trade in the region.

Adelaide issued several important acts from the palacium marchionis, located at the Porta Segusina in Turin, suggesting that this was the centre of her politico-administrative apparatus. From here she held court, heard pleas, consulted with her followers, issued judgements, and received important visitors to the city. Coupled with her control of landed and commercial resources, Adelaide’s control of symbolic places of power in the city, ensured her dominance in Turin. In addition to the city of Turin, Adelaide also had considerable possessions in the area immediately around the city (up to a radius of c.20km).
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6 Exceptions are: Appendix 1, nos. 1, 3, 12, 15-16, 22-23, 27, 31, 33, 35, 41, 45-46, 48-49.
9 Sergi, ‘Città,’ esp. 20ff.
11 Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 700f.; Appendix 1, nos. 12 (Rivalta); 13 (Cambiano); 14 (Rivalta, Piosasco); 32 (Camerlletto); 36-37 (Calpice).
Map 4: Key sites in the city of Turin

Key:
Red lines: archaeologically-attested ancient walls/roads/buildings
Black lines: limits of the ancient Roman city
White lines: Roman roads

Adapted from: http://it.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Torino_romana.png
Map 5: Adelaide’s domains

13 Adapted from: Sergi, Confini, 102f.
Outside of this core area, the majority of Adelaide’s possessions in Turin were located in Alpine valleys to the west of the city, particularly in the valley of Susa, which extends in an east-west direction, following the Dora Riparia River, from Caselette (c. 13km west of Turin) to the western Alps.\textsuperscript{14} The valley of Susa had long been central to the interests of Adelaide’s dynasty,\textsuperscript{15} but Adelaide’s links with Savoy, and the imperial dynasty, increased her focus on the valley. Most of Adelaide’s extensive property in the valley of Susa was not urban, but the city of Susa itself was crucial to Adelaide’s control of the valley. Susa become a margravial seat under Adelaide: she issued several documents from the palace at the castle of Susa in the 1070s,\textsuperscript{16} alongside public officers such as Bruno the \textit{clusiarius}\textsuperscript{17} and Constantine the gastald.\textsuperscript{18} Adelaide further ensured her control of the valley of Susa through her patronage of religious institutions, both in Susa itself (San Giusto in Susa, and Santa Maria in Susa), and in nearby Alpine gorges (San Lorenzo in Oulx, and San Pietro in Novalesa).\textsuperscript{19} Dominance here ensured control over two Alpine passes: the Mont Cenis pass (c. 9km north-west of Susa); and the Montgènevre pass (c. 14km south-west of Oulx).\textsuperscript{20} These passes were located on key routes linking northern and southern Europe, and control of them was important in military, political and financial terms.\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Appendix 1, nos. 6-7, 10, 17-19, 24, 26, 36-37; 42-43; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 637, 710f. For Olderic-Manfred’s possessions here: DD OIII, no. 408 (25th July 1001).
\item Above, pp.28 n.12, 39 nn.34-36.
\item Appendix 1, nos. 26; 32: \textit{in civitate Secusie in castro in camera domine comitisse}. Adelaide issued a third document, now lost, from the city of Susa (no. 19); Sergi, ‘Potere,’ 63, 68, 76.
\item Appendix 1, no. 26.
\item Chapter 4.
\item Sergi, \textit{Potere}, esp. 24ff., 97f.
\item Chapters 1, 3; Fumagalli, ‘Adelaide,’ 245. On the importance of income from Alpine toll roads: Tellenbach, ‘L’evoluzione,’ 43, 58.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Local elites

‘Elite’ is a relative concept. Here it is used in relation to leading individuals/groups, who directed, and concentrated, wealth, power and status in their locality. Among religious communities, this refers to bishops, abbots and abbesses. Among the laity, this mostly means members of what Chris Wickham has termed the ‘medium elites’ (judicial experts with some landed resources); and, above them, the military aristocracy (who held lands in wide variety of localities, tithes in fief, and one or two castles). A reconstruction of Adelaide’s regional political network is primarily based on her charters. Property was a prime means by which Adelaide forged bonds between herself and others. Through founding and/or endowing religious institutions, Adelaide connected with elites in different localities, who either benefitted directly from her grants, or witnessed these transactions. She also granted land and rights directly to individual laymen. Adelaide’s power was not only defined by her control of material resources; Königsände also played a role, so long as she was able to utilise this relationship to advocate on behalf of her fideles. Another key point of connection were the public assemblies and judicial hearings (placita), where Adelaide did justice in the presence – and on behalf – of local elites.

Using Adelaide’s charters to reconstruct her interactions and power at the regional level is hampered by several factors. First, the incomplete nature of the documentary record means that an examination of Adelaide’s political network primarily focuses on the city and county of Turin. Second, there are problems even with the documents which have survived:

24 Wickham, Sleepwalking, esp. 53f.; Wickham, Rome, esp. 182ff., 220ff., 260ff.
25 On the military aristocracy: Wickham, Mountains, 274–292; Keller, Adelsherrschaft, 342–379; Bordone, ‘L’aristocrazia’. On differing levels in the aristocracy, also: Sergi, Confini; Cammarosano, Nobili; Collavini, ‘Spazi’.
26 On land as the basis of social/political, as well as economic, power: Wickham, Land, 1–5.
27 Cf. Appendix 1, no. 43b.
some are of dubious authenticity; and most provide only scant details about the individuals
who issued them, and even less about those who witnessed them. Often only a person’s given
name and title, if they used one, was included. Place names or occupations are rarely
added. Without such details when a name recurs in Adelaide’s charters it is not clear
whether we are dealing with one individual or several, making it difficult to identify which
family an individual was part of; to place them within the social hierarchy; or to ascertain
how long they were connected with Adelaide.

Constructing any kind of relationship between Adelaide and the individuals who
appear in her charters is based on a degree of conjecture, and particularly on the assumption
that witnesses with the same name, who appear in Adelaide’s documents in the same locality,
at a similar time, are in fact the same person. This approach is not fool-proof but, with
cautions, allows a great deal of information to be drawn from Adelaide’s charters about the
social composition and hierarchy around Adelaide. The construction of a network of
individuals associated with Adelaide, however tentative, has important implications in terms
of her exercise of power at the local level.

The majority of those who appear in Adelaide’s charters were laymen of lesser status
than her. Women, whether religious or lay, only appear very occasionally in Adelaide’s
documents, and then typically as co-issuers or beneficiaries of her grants, rather than as
witnesses. This is unsurprising: since their word had to be valid in a court of law, witnesses
were almost always free men with property. In contrast with her parents, who issued
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29 In general: Radding, Origins, esp. 47-50.
30 Sergi, Potere, 117 n.10, 125 suggests that toponyms are usually later additions/forgeries, but witnesses are
identified by toponyms in some of Adelaide’s original charters: Appendix 1, nos. 36; 38; 42-43 (all written by
31 In general: Cammarosano, Italia, esp. 80-83; Castelnuovo, ‘Nobili,’ 23f.; Reuter, ‘Nobility,’ 174-177.
32 For similar assumptions: Davies, Brittany, 110f.; Jarrett, Rulers, 39f., 139f.
33 Religious men were often the beneficiaries of Adelaide’s grants; and sometimes witnessed her documents, too: Appendix 1, nos. 4; 13; 27; 32; 34; 36; 39.
34 Adelaide issued documents alongside several female relatives: chapter 1. She also made donations to
institutions ruled by abbesses: Appendix 1, nos. 21; 25.
35 Chapter 3, n.117.
documents alongside members of other margravial dynasties,\textsuperscript{36} the nobles who appear in Adelaide’s charters were almost always her close relatives.\textsuperscript{37} Adelaide’s documents thus provide little evidence of her relationship with noble dynasties inside her territory, nor with margravial dynasties elsewhere.\textsuperscript{38} Neither are Adelaide’s charters revealing about the composition of her household.\textsuperscript{39} Instead Adelaide’s charters record the names of men whose value as witnesses is often hard to recover.

Because witnesses were usually present when a charter was issued,\textsuperscript{40} witness-lists are a key means of ascertaining the people with whom lords had dealings.\textsuperscript{41} They do not, however, provide a complete picture of a lord’s associates, nor does the number of times an individual appears in a witness-list necessarily fully reflect their social or political importance. Nor can a preferential relationship automatically be inferred between Adelaide and those who witnessed her charters.\textsuperscript{42} Nevertheless, many of these witnesses were connected to Adelaide, either by appointment to office, by landholding or other gifts, or because they owed her military service. Although they were of lesser status than Adelaide, most of these witnesses were, presumably, men of wealth and status in their own localities. Witness had to have sufficient stature, and be sufficiently respected, that their word would carry weight in the event of a dispute about the transaction.\textsuperscript{43} Wealthy witnesses were also preferred, as it was assumed that they would be less likely to accept bribes.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{36} Chapter 1, nn.74, 251.
\textsuperscript{37} An exception is Margrave Wido of Sezzadio: above, pp.142f.
\textsuperscript{38} For similar observations regarding eleventh-century Tuscan charters: Goez, Beatrix, esp. 103; Wickham, Mountains, 258f.
\textsuperscript{39} Exceptions are: Bona, who nursed Adelaide’s children: chapter 1, n.270; and P. de venator (Appendix 1, no. 27). On whether venator indicated a profession, or simply a court dignitary: Goez, Beatrix, 101; Airlie, ‘Bonds,’ 192; Jarrett, Rulers, 158.
\textsuperscript{40} On the addition of signatures after a document was issued, to strengthen the transaction: Martini, ‘Sottoscrizioni’. For an example of this: Appendix 1, no. 33.
\textsuperscript{41} In general: McKitterick, Carolingians, 98–103; Schoolman, ‘Networks’; Gawlik, Intervenienten.
\textsuperscript{42} In general: Barton, Lordship, 96ff.; Wickham, Mountains, 260-263; Bates, ‘Prosopographical,’ esp. 89f.; Vincent, ‘Court,’ 284f.
\textsuperscript{43} Wickham, ‘Justice,’ 200f.; Wickham, Mountains, 261.
\textsuperscript{44} Everett, Literacy, 202.
There was no constant group of signatories to Adelaide’s charters, but in specific localities there are nevertheless identifiable groups of men whose names recur. Most of the men who witnessed Adelaide’s documents did so only in a very local capacity (often within 10km of their place of origin): 45 men from the city of Turin witnessed Adelaide’s charters in Turin; 46 men from the city of Susa witnessed in Susa, 47 and so on. (This may explain why toponyms were not routinely used in witness-lists.) Other men travelled 10-30km (that is, up to a day’s journey) 48 to witness charters: Otto of Caselette (c.17km from Turin), for example, witnessed two documents in the city of Turin (one issued by Adelaide, one by her sister, Immilla). 49 A few individuals travelled greater distances: these were usually higher status individuals (iudices, viscounts, and bishops); they generally had clear reasons for making longer journeys; and they almost always travelled to Turin to do so. 50 Lack of documentation from Savoy means it is impossible to ascertain if individuals witnessed Adelaide’s documents on both sides of the Alps, but this seems unlikely, 51 as it is rare to identify individuals in Adelaide’s charters who travelled more than c.60km. 52

The succeeding chapters build on this overview, and discuss Adelaide’s dealings with specific local elites – particularly bishops, abbots, notaries, iudices and viscounts – in more detail.

45 For similar conclusions: Goez, Beatrix, 102f., 110f., 113; Jarrett, Rulers, esp. 66, 143f., 151f.; Davies, Brittany, ch.5.  
46 e.g. Appendix 1, nos. 7: Arenulphus de infrascripta ciuitate [Turin]; 42-43: Oberti de suprascripte civitate Taurini; Brumonis de suprascripte civitate Taurini; Domni Erenzonis vicecomitis ipsius civitatis [Turin].  
47 e.g. Appendix 1, nos. 26: Ysmido Secusiensis.  
48 McKitterick, Carolingians, 98–103; and Fried, Canossa, 63-72, suggest that rates of c.30-40km/day are ‘plausible’.  
49 Appendix 1, no. 30; Appendix 2, VII/4.  
50 In general: Davies, Brittany, 132f.; Nelson, ‘Charlemagne,’ 224.  
51 For similar conclusions in relation to Matilda of Tuscany and the Apennines: Goez, Beatrix, 102f. In the twelfth century some witnesses travelled from Savoy to Turin (not vice versa): Sergi, Potere, esp. 129ff., 271-284; Previté-Orton, History, 270f., 306f.  
52 A possible exception is: Appendix 1, no. 38: Anricus de civitate Papiae (Pavia, c.116km east of Turin).
Chapter 4
Adelaide, churchmen, and religious institutions

This chapter considers Adelaide’s relationships with successive bishops of Turin, and with key churchmen from further afield, including the papal legate, Peter Damian, and Pope Gregory VII. It also examines Adelaide’s dealings with various religious institutions, primarily located in Turin. Much has been written about this, but this chapter seeks to present new interpretations, particularly of Adelaide’s relationships with the monasteries of Santa Maria in Pinerolo and San Benigno in Fruttuaria. According to an older view, Adelaide and her family were thought to be in competition with, and often opposed to, the bishops of Turin. Recent scholarship, by contrast, emphasises that there was some sort of alliance — more or less prickly or polite — between Adelaide, the bishops of Turin, and key monasteries in the region. How far was this the case in practice? To answer this question, Adelaide’s dealings with four successive bishops of Turin are examined, beginning with Landulf (r.1010-1038) and Guido (r.1038/9-1046), whose episcopates coincided with Adelaide’s early rule. Then Adelaide’s relationship with Cunibert (r.1046-c.1082/3), whose long tenure as bishop overlapped with much of Adelaide’s rule, is considered. Finally Adelaide’s dealings with Cunibert’s successor, Vitelmo (r.c.1082/3-c.1092), are discussed.

The next section focuses on Adelaide’s religious patronage. This begins with a general overview of Adelaide’s donations to religious institutions. Then her relationship with two specific monasteries is discussed: her own foundation of Pinerolo, and the important monastery of Fruttuaria. The focus is on little-considered aspects of Adelaide’s dealings with
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2 Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 82ff.; Sergi, Potere, 74, 77f.
these monasteries, including the way in which she utilised her religious patronage to implement reform measures, and also to establish and maintain her own authority.

First of all, three key concepts which inform this chapter – ‘reform’, ‘religious patronage’ and the ‘margravial church’ – are introduced:

i) Eleventh-century reform

The historiography of eleventh-century reform is often confessional in nature. It is traditionally associated with the pontificate of Gregory VII (r.1073-1085); with the growth of papal government and the re-ordering of church–state relations; and with setting boundaries between the clergy and the laity (by suppressing simony, clerical marriage, and lay investiture). Many of these reforms were thought to be driven by, and also to support, the social and political changes associated with the ‘feudal revolution’. Recently, this view has undergone a series of revisions. Eleventh-century reform is now seen to have greater continuity with the recent past, and to be less monolithically ‘Gregorian’ than previously thought. The multiplicity of reform-initiatives is emphasised, as is the way these were shaped and implemented in localities. Lay and ecclesiastical elites, often in concert with each other, promoted local initiatives. This encompassed the rebuilding of existing monasteries and founding of new ones; the expansion – and transmission – of liturgical customs; and the promotion of new saints and cults. This chapter focuses on reform as local, monastic and patron-driven; and also on the interaction between local and trans-regional reforms. Adelaide’s patronage of monastic reform in Turin is considered, as is her involvement with...
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4 See especially: Fliche, Réforme.
5 Moore, Revolution; Cushing, Reform.
7 Capitani, ‘Età’; Gilchrist, ‘Reform’; Howe, Brefore; Melville, ‘Reformatio’; Vanderputten, ‘Reform’. For continuity with the Carolingian period: Hamilton, Church; Barrow, Clergy.
8 Howe, Reform; Miller, Formation; Cushing, Reform; Moore, ‘Property’; Moore, ‘Family’.
9 Howe, ‘Nobility’; Howe, Reform, esp. chs.5-7; Kleinen, Bischof.
10 Cushing, Reform, 92ff.; Bowman, ‘Bishop’.
wider networks of reform-minded individuals (including Peter Damian and Gregory VII), and her promotion of religious change further afield.

There is some debate about women’s involvement in reform.\(^{11}\) The rhetoric of reformers was frequently misogynistic,\(^ {12}\) and the effects of many initiatives – intended to separate the clergy and the laity – have been thought to have restricted the power of lay and religious women both in, and over, the Church.\(^ {13}\) Nevertheless, an association with monasticism was often seen as the acceptable face of female authority,\(^ {14}\) and numerous eleventh-century laywomen actively supported programmes of reform.\(^ {15}\) A particular focus of this chapter is on the dissemination of Italian monastic customs into Germany through the agency of Adelaide, her daughter, Adelaide of Savoy, and Empress Agnes. Although this activity was encouraged by high-ranking churchmen, these women were not the passive pawns of male clerics. Adelaide supported reform measures, including the suppression of clerical celibacy, the foundation of new monasteries, and the transmission of liturgical customs, both for reasons of personal piety, and also for her own political benefit.

ii) Religious patronage

One means by which Adelaide promoted religious change was through her religious patronage. Such patronage is primarily understood in economic terms – donations of land, resources, or movable goods – but could also encompass a range of political, military, and legal activities intended to support a religious institution.\(^ {16}\) This was a reciprocal arrangement: in return for their support, patrons received spiritual services: intercessory
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\(^{11}\) Griffiths, ‘Women’.

\(^{12}\) Cushing, Reform, ch.6. Leyser, ‘Custom’ argues that this rhetoric was really about competition between men.

\(^{13}\) Elliot, ‘Priest’s’; McNamara, ‘Herrenfrage’; Stafford, ‘Churchmen’. Schulenburg, ‘Women’s’.

\(^{14}\) MacLean, ‘Queenship’; MacLean, ‘Monastic’.

\(^{15}\) Goez, ‘Typ,’ 186-192; Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 317-324.

\(^{16}\) Key studies: Rosenwein, Neighbor; White, Custom; Bouchard, Sword; Nightingale, Monasteries. On gift-exchange: Bijsterveld, Gift-giving; Davies/Fouracre, Gift.
Both men’s and women’s religious patronage was motivated by a complex mix of pious and political factors, but women’s patronage is more likely to be understood primarily in pious, commemorative terms. Adelaide’s patronage has often been interpreted in this way. Yet, although motivated by piety, Adelaide’s patronage was also public and political. Monasteries were centres of dynastic power: Adelaide’s donations created and maintained alliances with clerical and monastic institutions in Turin, with powerful churchmen, including bishops of Turin and the pope, and also with other important lay patrons. Adelaide’s patronage asserted her own authority, and promoted her own prestige and that of her dynasty.

iii) The ‘margravial church’

The concepts of ‘reform’ and ‘religious patronage’ have wide applicability, but the ‘margravial church’ (Chiesa marchionale) is found in Italian historiography specifically in relation to Adelaide’s dynasty. Previously, Italian scholars emphasised the antagonistic nature of the relationship between Adelaide’s dynasty and religious institutions in Turin, but Gian Carlo Andenna’s concept of the ‘margravial church’ – introduced in 1992 – now dominates the literature. According to Andenna, Adelaide’s parents, Olderic-Manfred and Bertha, acting alongside Adelaide’s paternal uncle, Bishop Alric of Asti, attempted – in conscious imitation of imperial policy – to use the Church as an instrument of government, in which the entire church system was connected (and in most cases, subordinated) to their authority. Key features of this ‘margravial church system’ were: the foundation of private monasteries by
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17 Röcklein, ‘Founders’; Miller, ‘Donors’; Leyser, Rule, 49-74; Geary, Phantoms, 48-80.
20 Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 82ff.; Sergi, Potere, 74, 77f.
21 Andenna, ‘Adelaide,’ esp. 81ff. For Olderic-Manfred’s documentary imitation of imperial practice: Patrucco, ‘Caramagna,’ 61; Cau, ‘Carte’. On the ‘imperial church’ and whether this was a ‘system’: Reuter, ‘Imperial’.
Adelaide’s parents and Bishop Alric; Olderic-Manfred’s dealings with numerous bishops; and, especially, his activities with Bishop Alric, particularly in Asti. According to Andenna, the margravial church came to an end under Adelaide, whose religious patronage during the final years of her life consisted primarily of simple gifts, devoid of political significance.\(^{22}\) To what extent was this the case?

**Adelaide and the bishops of Turin**

*Bishop Landulf (r. 1011-1038)*

There is little surviving evidence about the background of the eleventh-century bishops of Turin, nor of how they came to be appointed. Adelaide and her father, Olderic-Manfred, clearly influenced episcopal appointments in Asti,\(^ {23}\) but this does not seem to have been the case in Turin. Bishop Landulf of Turin was an imperial chaplain prior to his appointment,\(^ {24}\) which suggests that he was chosen by Emperor Henry II.\(^ {25}\) Landulf was bishop throughout much of Olderic-Manfred’s rule; the last years of his episcopate overlapped with the first years of Adelaide’s rule. Landulf worked with Olderic-Manfred on several occasions, including: to combat heresy at Monforte (c.1028);\(^ {26}\) and perhaps to found the house of canons of San Donato in Pinerolo (c.1024-c.1029).\(^ {27}\) Landulf also pursued an independent policy of episcopal reconstruction,\(^ {28}\) including the restoration of the cathedral church, and building of new churches and castles in numerous locations around Turin.\(^ {29}\) This culminated in Landulf’s foundation of the monastery of Santa Maria in Cavour in 1037. Landulf’s foundation charter explained that this was necessary because the diocese of Turin had been

\(^{22}\) Andenna, ‘Adelaide,’ 85f., 100ff.

\(^{23}\) Chapter 6.

\(^{24}\) Peter Damian, *Odilonis*, col. 934.


\(^{27}\) Meyranesio, *Pedemontium*, 1293f.; on the date: BSSS 2, no. 4.


\(^{29}\) BSSS 3/1, no. 2 (1037).
devastated *non solum a paganis* [Saracens who had been occupying Alpine regions] *verum etiam a perfidis christianis nec tantum ab extraneis sed quod deterius est a compatriotis et filiis.*  

30 Although Landulf does not identify these ‘perfidious Christians’ it is likely that he had Adelaide’s dynasty in mind.  

Landulf’s measures were not only spiritual: the construction of a ring of castles around Turin enabled him to consolidate and expand his territorial power, particularly in the centre of the diocese.  

32 Andenna argues that Olderic-Manfred, in his capacity as head of the margravial church, permitted Landulf’s construction of these churches and castles.  

33 Yet the idea that Olderic-Manfred would have welcomed the building of castles which were subject to episcopal, rather than margravial, control strains credulity. It is more likely that Landulf was building up his own power-base against Olderic-Manfred’s wishes. With the foundation of Cavour in 1037 Landulf continued this trend: he extended his control into the Pinerolese, and utilised his foundation charter to condemn Adelaide’s dynasty for failing to protect the diocese of Turin properly.  

34 There is evidence of a crisis in Adelaide’s rule in the late 1030s, following the deaths of her father and uncle, and the absence of her husband, Hermann of Swabia.  

35 Landulf evidently took advantage of this power vacuum not only to strengthen his own position, but also to present himself as an alternative to Adelaide’s rule.  

36 At about this time, Landulf also gained control of the castle at the *Porta Doreana* in Turin (formerly a seat of secular power).  
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33 Andenna, ‘Adelaide,’ 78f.  
34 Gandino, ‘Testamento,’ 78f.  
35 Chapters 1, 6.  
36 Gandino, ‘Testamento,’ 15f.  
37 DD HIII, no. 198b (1st May 1047).
Bishop Guido (r.1038/9-1046)

Landulf died c.1038; his successor was Bishop Guido of Turin, about whom little is known.\(^{38}\) During Guido’s episcopate Adelaide worked to forge links both with Guido, and with episcopal clients, and thus to re-assert her position in Turin. She ceded property to the episcopal monastery of Cavour in 1041;\(^ {39}\) and made donations to Cavour (1041), and to the cathedral church of San Giovanni Battista in Turin (1042).\(^ {40}\) This latter document, as we have seen, was a means by which Adelaide attempted to assert dynastic continuity.\(^ {41}\) It was also a means of forging alliances with members of the local elite. The significance of Adelaide’s donation – to the church where her father was interred – would have been apparent to those who witnessed this grant. Among these witnesses were the boni homines Gosbert and Restagnus.\(^ {42}\) Gosbert was connected with the cathedral and Restagnus was probably from the valley of Susa (Adelaide’s donation included tithes from churches in the valley). Both men probably witnessed other documents issued by Adelaide.\(^ {43}\) Despite Adelaide’s grants to Cavour and the cathedral church, a donation charter of Guido’s from 1044 indicates his intention to continue Landulf’s commitment to reconstruction within the diocese – at Adelaide’s expense. Guido’s charter explicitly imitates Landulf’s foundation charter for Cavour, and includes verbatim the description of desolation in Turin, caused by ‘perfidious Christians’.\(^ {44}\)
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\(^ {39}\) Appendix 1, no. 4. This document is forged/interpolated, but reflects an actual transaction made by Adelaide, at Guido’s intervention: Sergi, ‘Città,’ 24; BSSS 3/1, 16; Baudi-di-Vesme, ‘Origini,’ 20ff.
\(^ {40}\) Appendix 1, nos. 5-6.
\(^ {41}\) Above, pp.52f.
\(^ {42}\) Appendix 1, no. 6.
\(^ {43}\) Appendix 1, no. 13, 42-43.
\(^ {44}\) BSSS 36, no. 4 (1044). Both documents were written by Adam indignus presbiter, on whom: Cancian, ‘Testamento,’ 32ff.
Bishop Cunibert (r.1046-c.1082/3)

The policy of signorial expansion continued under Guido’s successor, Bishop Cunibert of Turin, who nevertheless also tried to remain on good terms with Adelaide. Over the course of his long episcopate, Cunibert’s relationship with Adelaide fluctuated, but even though there were times when they were antagonistic, for long periods they co-operated with each other. This was important to Cunibert, who was not from Turin, and had no connection to the city’s traditional leadership (although, as a member of the Milanese da Besate family, he had powerful outside backing).

Part of the reason that Adelaide and Cunibert were able – by and large – to maintain a good working relationship is that they took a similarly moderate stance to empire and religious change. Adelaide’s and Cunibert’s support was sought by two churchmen with radically different views: the papal legate, Peter Damian, and the imperial polemicist, Bishop Benzo of Alba. Despite their antagonistic agendas, both Damian and Benzo envisaged that Adelaide and Cunibert could – and would – work together. In 1064, Damian – a determined advocate of clerical chastity – wrote separately to Adelaide and Cunibert, emphasising the necessity of regulating the conduct of the clergy in Turin. Although Cunibert himself was apparently celibate, Damian criticised him for failing to ensure that the clerics in his diocese were equally chaste. Disappointed by Cunibert’s inactivity, Damian also wrote to dux Adelaide, asking her to use her authority to ensure that his recommendations were effectively implemented throughout Turin and Savoy:

46 Andenna, ‘Adelaide,’ 95ff.; Sergi, Confini, 139, 337f.
48 Sergi, L’aristocrazia, 183, 185.
49 Briefe, nos. 31, 61, 57, 112, 114, 129, 162; Elliott, ‘Priest’s’; Cushing, Reform, 120-125.
50 On clerical celibacy: Barstow, Priests, ch.3; Brundage, Law, esp. 214-219.
51 Briefe, 4/3, no. 112 (1064).
Damian did not envisage Adelaide acting alone in this matter. Using the biblical exemplar of Deborah and Barak (Judges 4), Damian explained that, just as they supported each other in order to defeat the Canaanite general Sisera, so should Adelaide and Cunibert work together to suppress clerical incontinence. There is no direct evidence that Adelaide or Cunibert acted on Damian’s advice and supported clerical celibacy in Turin (or Savoy), but they each had much to gain, politically, from co-operation both with each other, and with Peter Damian.

Shortly after receiving Damian’s letter, Cunibert made a donation to the reformed canons at San Lorenzo in Oulx, which provides indirect evidence both of Cunibert’s support for celibate clerics, and of his working with Adelaide, who was already a patron of Oulx. Damian’s letter to Adelaide also indicates that the ‘margravial church’ was thriving in the 1060s: not only was Adelaide able to work effectively alongside Cunibert, and intervene in episcopal matters (to enforce clerical celibacy), Damian also implies that he and Adelaide had presided together over a council of bishops and abbots from dioceses in Turin and Savoy.

Benzo of Alba also seems to have envisaged Adelaide and Cunibert working together. Yet – in contrast to Damian who thought that Adelaide and Cunibert should prioritise clerical

---

52 Appendix 1, no. 14b.
53 BSSS 45, nos. 19 (1063x1065).
54 Appendix 1, no. 10.
55 Appendix 1, no. 12c.
celibacy – Benzo hoped to gain their support against the Pataria. This rather baggy term refers to religious factions, present in many cities in Lombardy, whose desire for far-reaching religious change led them into conflict with the episcopal hierarchy.\textsuperscript{56} Around 1075 Benzo wrote to Cunibert to admonish him for not doing more to resist the Patarenes.\textsuperscript{57} Benzo reminded Cunibert that the Pataria were opposed to the catholic and apostolic faith and asked him: \textit{Si Patarini vicerint, / Quid nobis patres dixerint?}\textsuperscript{58} To protect the faith, Benzo suggested that Cunibert should be like the sons of \textit{Gambara vetus avia}: when they followed Gambara’s advice, as Numa Pompliilius trusted Egeria, their people prospered and faith spread.\textsuperscript{59}

Massimo Oldoni sees Benzo’s discussion of Gambara simply as alluding to Lombard origin myths,\textsuperscript{60} but it is also an oblique reference to Adelaide. When Benzo was writing (c.1075), Adelaide, like Gambara, was ‘an old grandmother’, with two sons who ruled alongside her; Benzo also refers to Adelaide as Egeria on two other occasions in his work.\textsuperscript{61} Moreover, in 1070, she had acted decisively to prevent a Patarene candidate from becoming bishop of Asti.\textsuperscript{62} Benzo – like Peter Damian – thus appears to be suggesting that Cunibert should act alongside Adelaide, although to quite different ends.

Evidence of Adelaide’s and Cunibert’s good working relationship can clearly be seen in the charters they issued for religious institutions in Turin. During Cunibert’s episcopate Adelaide made several donations to episcopal institutions, including the cathedral church of San Giovanni Battista in Turin,\textsuperscript{63} and the episcopal monasteries of Santa Maria in Cavour (founded by Bishop Landulf)\textsuperscript{64} and San Solutore in Turin (founded by Bishop Gezo, r.998-

\begin{footnotes}
\item[57] \textit{AH}, IV.32(3), 370-378; Lehmgrubner, \textit{Benzo}, 44ff. Benzo was driven from his diocese by Patarenes: ch.3, n.136.
\item[58] \textit{AH}, IV.32(3), 374ff.
\item[59] \textit{AH}, IV.32(3), 370-372.
\item[61] Chapter 3, nn.153, 183, 185.
\item[62] Below, pp.227f.
\item[63] Appendix 1, no. 11.
\item[64] Above n.29.
\end{footnotes}
Adelaide also supported the female monastery of San Pietro in Turin which, like San Solutore, was *sub regimine et potestate* of the bishops of Turin. The monasteries of San Solutore and San Pietro were located close to the margravial palace in Turin: San Solutore was situated just outside the walls of the city, near to the *Porta Segusina*; while San Pietro was located inside the walls, in the south-western corner of the city (Map 4). Donations to these monasteries were a means by which Adelaide could maintain good relations not only with the bishop, but also with institutions located near to her own seat of power. These donations indicate that Adelaide wanted to maintain a strong presence in and around Turin, and also that there was genuine accord between Adelaide and Cunibert. Adelaide’s grants of property to these institutions often complemented and augmented possessions previously donated by the bishops of Turin. In 1068, for example, Adelaide granted tithes in Scarnafigi to San Pietro, supplementing two previous donations of property in Scarnafigi by bishops Amizo and Landulf; and in 1079 Adelaide donated half of the estate of Carpice to San Solutore, near property the monastery already possessed in Rivoli.

For his part, Cunibert made a donation to Adelaide’s foundation of Santa Maria in Pinerolo: tacked onto the end of one of Adelaide’s charters for Pinerolo is a confirmation by Cunibert of the donation of the churches of San Donato and San Maurizio to Pinerolo. Separately, Cunibert made donations to many of the same religious institutions as Adelaide, including the monasteries of Cavour and San Solutore, and the canons of San Lorenzo at
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66 Appendix 1, no. 21.
70 Appendix 1, no. 21; BSSS 12/2, nos. 1 (989); 2 (1017). San Pietro’s property at Scarnafigi was so extensive that a prioress was established to administer it: Casiraghi, ‘Pieve,’ 43-64.
71 Appendix 1, no. 36; Sergi, *Potere*, 103.
72 Appendix 1, no. 34. Adelaide’s father, Olderie-Manfred, and Landulf founded a house of canons at San Donato (above n.27); Adelaide and Cunibert may have both had rights over San Maurizio, too.
73 BSSS 86, no. 7 (1055); BSSS 3/1, no. 16 (25th April 1075).
74 BSSS 44, nos. 10 (11th May 1048); 11 (28th April 1054).
Oulx. Cunibert’s charters often emphasised his good relationship with Adelaide and her family: in 1075 Cunibert asked the monks at Cavour to pray for *Adelegida serenissima cometissa ac filiorum suorum.* The nature, and timing, of Cunibert’s donations further suggests that he was acting co-operatively, rather than competitively, with Adelaide. This is particularly the case with regard to the canons at Oulx.

As we have seen Cunibert began to patronise Oulx, at least in part, in response to Peter Damian’s letter. Yet there was another, more pressing reason, for both Adelaide’s and Cunibert’s support of Oulx: it was located in the valley of Susa, near to the Mont Genèvre pass. Adelaide and Cunibert both wished to ensure their control of this strategically important site, particularly against the counts of Albon and the archbishops of Embrun, who were also vying for control of Oulx. Adelaide and Cunibert thus worked together to forge connections between themselves and the canons. In the 1060s Adelaide granted numerous churches in the valley of Susa, which had been founded by her ancestors, to the church of Santa Maria in Susa. She then subordinated Santa Maria in Susa to the canons at Oulx. Since Adelaide had granted many of the churches in the valley of Susa to the cathedral church of Turin in 1042, she required Cunibert’s permission for both of these transactions (*cum spontanea voluntate ac beneplacita permissione maioris Taurinensis ecclesie*). With these grants, both
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75 BSSS 45, nos. 13 (1060); 14 (1060x1083); 17 (1061x1074); 19 (1063x1065); 21 (30th April 1065, forgery). For Adelaide’s grants to San Solutore: n.65 above; for her grants to Oulx and Cavour, below, nn.130, 136.
76 BSSS 3/1, no. 16 (25th April 1075).
77 Sergi, *L’aristocrazia*, 185.
78 For donations by counts of Albon to Oulx: BSSS 45, nos. 4 (1050-1079), 10 (1058-1079), 11 (1058?-1079?), 18 (1063), 23 (1073?), 24 (1073); and by archbishops of Embrun: nos. 5 (1055-1080); 6 (1056); 39 (22nd January 1084). On the struggle for control of Oulx: Patria, ‘Canonica,’ esp. 84ff.; Previté-Orton, *History*, 221f., 225; Sergi, *Potere*, 65f., 83.
80 Appendix 1, no. 17.
81 Appendix 1, no. 18 A document which purports to record Cunibert’s transfer of Santa Maria in Susa to Oulx is a later forgery: BSSS 45, no. 21 (30th April 1065).
82 Appendix 1, no. 6.
Adelaide and Cunibert were clearly shifting their focus from Turin itself to religious institutions in the valley of Susa.

Adelaide, Cunibert and San Michele in Chiusa

This same strategic rationale animated both Adelaide’s and Cunibert’s dealings with the monastery of San Michele in Chiusa (located c.29km west of Turin, at the entrance to the valley of Susa). Cunibert was in dispute with Chiusa from c.1066, when the monks elected a new abbot without reference to him. With the support of Abbot Adraldo of Novalesa-Breme and archdeacon Hildebrand (later Pope Gregory VII), the monks chose an abbot from among their own community, Benedict II (r.c.1066-1091). Cunibert refused to consecrate Benedict II, who was later consecrated in Rome. Thereafter, there were several attempts to settle the dispute, both in the late-1060s, and particularly in the mid-1070s. Yet – even when he was threatened with suspension from office by Gregory VII – Cunibert refused to make peace: he preached against Benedict II, and plundered Chiusa’s lands, burning its villages and churches. Finally, Cunibert enlisted the support of Adelaide’s son, Peter, to oust Benedict II. In Summer 1078 they attacked Chiusa with a host of soldiers, forcing Benedict to flee, and leaving them (temporarily) in control of the monastery.

The only account of Cunibert’s and Peter’s attack on Chiusa is found in William of Chiusa’s *Vita Benedicti II Abbatis Clusensis* (written c.1095-1100). William became a monk at Chiusa during Benedict II’s abbacy, and was one of his disciples. He does not refer to
Adelaide in relation to this conflict, so it is unclear what role – if any – she played. William does, however, mention Adelaide on two other occasions in his work. First, he describes how Adelaide intervened to secure Benedict II’s release after he was captured by Henry IV while en route to Montecassino (1084); and second, he explains that Adelaide later punished Chiusa after monks from the abbey mistreated Bishop Ranger of Vercelli. William thus depicts Adelaide as someone who, depending on the circumstances, would intervene to help the abbot of Chiusa, but who could equally act against the monastery to uphold episcopal rights.

San Michele della Chiusa

Both Peter Damian and Gregory VII wrote to Adelaide to entrust the monasteries of Fruttuaria and Chiusa to her care. In the case of Fruttuaria, as we shall see, their letters clearly had an effect. Thus – despite the lack of surviving evidence that Adelaide made

89 Appendix 1, nos. 43b; 50.
90 From: http://www.valdhotel.it/sites/default/files/sacra%20san%20michele_0.jpg
91 Appendix 1, nos. 14b; 26a. On Damian’s letter to Adelaide: Creber, ‘Margraves’.
donations to Chiusa – it is possible that Adelaide was a supporter of Chiusa’s. Gregory VII, who wrote to Adelaide in December 1073 (just before his attempt to settle the dispute between Cunibert and Chiusa at the Lenten synod in 1074) may even have hoped that Adelaide would play a part in the negotiations. Yet, if Adelaide acted as a mediator, this had little demonstrable effect, either on Cunibert’s treatment of Chiusa, or on her relationship with Cunibert. Adelaide was on good terms with Cunibert in the mid-1070s – even while his conflict, not only with Chiusa, but also with Gregory – was intensifying.

Adelaide may thus have supported (or at least, did not oppose) Cunibert’s and Peter’s treatment of Chiusa. Giampietro Casiraghi emphasises that there was a tradition of poor relations between Chiusa and Adelaide’s family, dating back to her father. In part, this was because Olderic-Manfred’s cousin, Arduin V – with whom Olderic-Manfred was sometimes in conflict – was involved in Chiusa’s foundation. Its strategic importance also meant that there were strong reasons for Adelaide, as much as Olderic-Manfred or Peter, to want to secure greater control over Chiusa. Peter may thus have been acting with Adelaide’s tacit approval when he attacked the monastery.

Shortly after attacking Chiusa, Peter died (August 1078). His death weakened Adelaide’s position: between 1078 and 1083 Adelaide issued a striking number of donation charters for religious institutions in Turin, suggesting that instead of conflict, Adelaide was seeking to renew her relationship with these institutions, and thus to re-establish her autonomy and authority. Several of these charters were issued from the margravial palace, and/or made use of devotional formulae alongside Adelaide’s title – Dei nutu/providentia
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93 Casiraghi, ‘Chiusa,’ 469f.
94 Casiraghi, ‘Chiusa,’ 463.
95 CN, Appendix, ch.9; BSSS 127, nos. 44-47; Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 83f.; Sergi, ‘Secolo,’ 435.
96 Casiraghi, ‘Chiusa’.
97 Appendix 1, no. 33c. William of Chiusa depicted Peter’s death as divine punishment for his treatment of Chiusa: VB, ch.11, 204.
98 Appendix 1, nos. 34; 36-39; 42-43; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 469.
99 Above, p.146 nn.8-9.
Elke Goez sees this title-usage as evidence of the insecurity of Adelaide’s position, which Goez connects to wider political uncertainties, particularly the crisis in the rule of Adelaide’s son-in-law, Henry IV of Germany. Yet it was also due to instability in Turin following deaths of Adelaide’s two sons (Amadeus died in 1080), and to Adelaide’s worsening relationship with Gregory VII following the Chiusa dispute.

Adelaide’s activities and title-use at this time are not, however, only indicative of insecurity: they are also part of a ‘re-branding’ exercise which emphasised that Adelaide’s power was both princely and God-given. At this time Adelaide also re-organised her political-administrative apparatus, replacing an incumbent viscount (Vitelmo-Bruno) and appointing a new viscount for the city of Turin from among her cadre of iudices. These measures were intended to ensure her continuing control in Turin, and Adelaide evidently did not wish to jeopardise her relationship with Gregory VII by continuing the dispute with Chiusa. Without the support of Adelaide or Peter, Cunibert’s position collapsed: the dispute was settled by Gregory VII in Chiusa’s favour in November 1078. The outcome of this conflict marks the end of good relations between Adelaide and Cunibert. A grant made by Adelaide in 1080 indicates that she felt she could no longer rely on Cunibert’s good-will. In 1080 Adelaide took steps to exempt the property she was donating to San Solutore from episcopal control. Her charter specified that if the bishop (or any other person) interfered with the property Adelaide was donating, it would remain in the possession of the monks, but revertatur in potestate mea ... non in proprietate sed in gubernatione ad defensionem.

102 For similar re-branding by Boso of Vienne: Airlie, ‘Nearly,’ 35. On Dei gratia formulae as indicating quasi-regal status: le Jan, Femmes, 29.
103 Chapters 5, 7.
104 Registrum, VI.6 (24th November 1078).
105 Appendix 1, no. 37.
The divergence in Adelaide’s and Cunibert’s interests was not only practical, but also ideological. Adelaide continued to maintain a close relationship with Gregory VII,\textsuperscript{106} but Cunibert took an increasingly pro-imperial stance.\textsuperscript{107} He is not listed among the bishops who presided over a \textit{placitum} in Turin, at Gregory VII’s request, in May 1080.\textsuperscript{108} Adelaide, however, was among those who presided, and her centrality here is further evidence that the margravial church did not cease in the 1070s. Although Cunibert did not attend the synod of Brixen in June 1080 (at which pro-imperial bishops called for Gregory’s deposition), by Summer 1081 he was among the \textit{fideles} who were accompanying Henry IV on his Italian expedition.\textsuperscript{109} As we have seen, Henry may have issued a privilege for Turin at this time, which supported Cunibert, and undermined Adelaide.\textsuperscript{110} Corroboration of the cooling of Adelaide in Cunibert’s relationship can perhaps also be found in a letter of Benzo of Alba’s to Cunibert – in which Benzo warned Cunibert that if Adelaide knew of his possessions, he would lose them.\textsuperscript{111}

\textit{Bishop Vitelmo (r.c.1082/3-c.1092)}

Cunibert died shortly after he began to support Henry IV. Very little can be said with any certainty about Adelaide’s dealings with his successor, Bishop Vitelmo of Turin.\textsuperscript{112} Vitelmo – who was probably the son of Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno\textsuperscript{113} – was appointed to office by Henry IV at a time when Adelaide was not on good terms either with Henry or Vitelmo-Bruno.\textsuperscript{114} Thus Vitelmo’s appointment was presumably intended to undermine Adelaide. Yet a lack of

\textsuperscript{106} Adelaide did not support actively Henry until at least summer 1082: chapter 3.
\textsuperscript{107} Rossi/Gabotto, \textit{Storia}, 105.
\textsuperscript{108} Appendix 1, no. 39. By contrast, Cunibert was present at a \textit{placitum} presided over by Adelaide and Peter in 1064: no. 13. Cf. chapter 7.
\textsuperscript{109} Chapter 3, n.175.
\textsuperscript{110} Above, pp.138f.
\textsuperscript{111} Above, pp.139f.
\textsuperscript{114} VB, ch.13, 205; chapters 3, 5, 7.
sources means that it is not possible to ascertain whether – or for how long – Adelaide’s relationship with Vitelmo was antagonistic. After 1083 there is only one further extant charter issued by Adelaide (a concession to the bishopric of Asti);\(^{115}\) and there are only two surviving charters issued by Vitelmo (both donations to the episcopal monastery of Cavour).\(^{116}\)

Nevertheless, there are hints that Adelaide and Vitelmo may not always have been at odds with each other: in a long-running dispute between members of Vitelmo’s family and the monastery of San Pietro (over tithes which Adelaide had donated), Vitelmo did not intervene on his family’s behalf.\(^{117}\) Nor, when Vitelmo revived Cunibert’s dispute with the monastery of Chiusa,\(^{118}\) did this bring him into conflict with Adelaide, who also acted against Chiusa (in the matter of the bishop of Vercelli) at about this time.\(^{119}\)

**Adelaide’s religious patronage**

Adelaide’s ambiguous dealings with Chiusa are unusual. In general, she was a strong supporter of religious institutions in Turin: she endowed them with property, and supported them in other ways.\(^{120}\) Adelaide is primarily documented making donations to monastic institutions in counties she ruled,\(^{121}\) especially the county of Turin.\(^{122}\) It is unclear how accurately the surviving sources reflect Adelaide’s patronage preferences, but Peter Damian’s letter to Adelaide suggests that she made fewer donations in Savoy than Turin. According to Damian, the bishop of Aosta (c.80km north-west of Turin; then part of Savoy) complained *non a te sibi de suis aliquid imminutum, sed conquestus est potius aecclesiae suae nil ex tua*
Based on extant sources, Adelaide’s religious patronage appears to have been concentrated particularly on the cities of Turin and Susa, and also in and around Pinerolo (in the southwest of the county of Turin). In Turin, Adelaide made donations to many of the same religious institutions as her parents, including the female house of San Pietro in Turin; and the male houses of San Solutore in Turin and San Benigno in Fruttuaria (discussed below). Adelaide tended to issue charters for these institutions from the beneficiary’s location, which reflects the importance of forging close connections with these institutions.

In Susa Adelaide did not patronise the same institutions as her parents. Olderic-Manfred and Bertha founded – and generously endowed – the monastery of San Giusto in Susa, but the only record of a donation from Adelaide to this institution is a later forgery. Instead, Adelaide patronised the monastery of San Pietro in Novalesa (c.6km north-west of Susa), which historically was on poor terms with her dynasty. She also made donations to the reformed canons of Santa Maria in Susa and San Lorenzo in Oulx (c.21km south-west of Susa). Again, this patronage stands in contrast with that of Adelaide’s parents, who primarily patronised Benedictine abbeys. The documents for these institutions were often issued from the margravial palace in Turin.
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123 Briefe, 3, no. 114.
124 Above, n.61. For her mother’s donation: chapter 7, n.115.
125 Above, n.65. Adelaide’s parents’ donations: Appendix 2, II/3, III/3-4; Carutti, Regesta, no. CV; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 667; Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 86f.
126 Appendix 2, III/5-6; also DD KII, no. 254 (29th December 1037) (issued at Bertha’s intervention).
127 Appendix 1, no. 2. Nevertheless, a charter issued by the index Secundo in 1064 indicates that San Giusto was sub regimine et potestate Adelasie compeste et filiorum eius: MHP, Chart, I, no. 356 (29th February 1064).
128 Appendix 1, nos. 19, 24, 32. On Adelaide and Novalesa: Sergi, Potere, 98f., 113f.; Sergi, L’aristocrazia, 66f. Sergi argues that Otto of Savoy influenced Adelaide’s patronage of Novalesa, but there is no evidence that Otto patronised Novalesa prior to his marriage to Adelaide. For antagonistic relations with Novalesa: above, p.27.
129 Appendix 1, nos. 17, 38.
130 Appendix 1, nos. 10, 18, 26, 42-43. On Oulx: Benedetto, ‘Collegiata’; Fonseca, ‘Canoniche’; Patria, ‘Canonica’.
131 For Olderic-Manfred’s foundation of a college of canons at Pinerolo: above n.27. For Adelaide’s grant to San Donato, and other houses of canons: Appendix 1, nos. 1, 8 (San Donato), 12, 27, 33.
132 Appendix 1, nos. 38, 42-43.
Adelaide also made many more donations in and around Pinerolo (c.45km south-west of Turin) than her parents.\textsuperscript{133} She granted property to her parents’ foundations of Santa Maria in Caramagna (c.31km south-east of Pinerolo)\textsuperscript{134} and the church of San Donato in Pinerolo.\textsuperscript{135} Adelaide also issued donations for institutions in Pinerolo which her parents had not patronised, including the episcopal monastery of Santa Maria in Cavour (c.11km south of Pinerolo);\textsuperscript{136} and, particularly, her own foundation of Santa Maria in Pinerolo. Enrico Bonanate characterises Adelaide’s patronage as mostly made up of ‘micro-donations’.\textsuperscript{137} While few of Adelaide’s grants were as generous as her parents’ foundation charters for San Giusto and Caramagna, she nevertheless made several substantial donations, particularly to Pinerolo. Adelaide’s relationship with Pinerolo is discussed in detail below, but first Adelaide’s dealings with the monastery of Fruttuaria are considered. Since there is only limited evidence that Adelaide made donations to Fruttuaria, her close connections with this important abbey have previously been overlooked.

\textit{San Benigno in Fruttuaria}

San Benigno in Fruttuaria (modern San Benigno Canavese) was founded in the early eleventh century by William of Volpiano, originally from Piedmont, who was abbot of Saint Bénigne in Dijon (r.990-1031).\textsuperscript{138} It was one of numerous monasteries William founded on the principles of the Benedictine monasticism practised at the abbey of Cluny.\textsuperscript{139} Fruttuaria was situated close to the city of Turin (c.19km north-east of Turin), on a key route linking Turin and Ivrea. The monks of Fruttuaria had a strong presence in Turin, where they built the

\textsuperscript{133} Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 670.
\textsuperscript{134} Appendix 1, no. 25. Foundation charter: Appendix 2, II/2.
\textsuperscript{135} Appendix 1, no. 8.
\textsuperscript{136} Appendix 1, nos. 4-5, 9, 20, 48a.
\textsuperscript{137} Bonanate, ‘Titolatura,’ 16.
\textsuperscript{138} Bulst, \textit{Untersuchungen}; Kaminsky, ‘Gründung’.
\textsuperscript{139} D’Acunto/Moretti, ‘Guglielmo’.
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church of San Benigno, along with a cemetery, a domus and a street (platea sancti Benigni). This could have led to tension with Adelaide’s dynasty, yet both Adelaide and her kin had a special care for the monastery for both pious and practical reasons. It was prestigious for Adelaide’s dynasty to be closely associated with Fruttuaria, which was not only linked with Cluny, but also received papal and royal/imperial patronage. Moreover, Fruttuaria was situated on the edge of the county of Turin, close to the border with Ivrea: gaining influence here was one means by which Adelaide and her dynasty could protect their territory from encroachments, and perhaps even extend their influence into Ivrea.

With the exception of papal and imperial diplomas, there are few extant records of eleventh-century donations to Fruttuaria. Nevertheless, it is clear that members of Adelaide’s natal family (her parents, two uncles, and a cousin; and later, her grand-daughter, Agnes) made donations to Fruttuaria. Moreover, both Peter Damian and Gregory VII commended Fruttuaria to Adelaide’s care. In 1064 Damian praised Adelaide for her protection of Fruttuaria: Ubi nimirum ita securi sub tuae protectionis umbraculo Deo deserviunt fratres, ac si sub maternis alis pulli confoveantur inplumes. Similarly, in 1073 Gregory VII wrote to Adelaide, his filia karissima, asking ut eis et opem consilii et presidii firmamentum contra omnia infestantium grava mina impendere studeatis.

There is only tenuous evidence that Adelaide made donation(s) to Fruttuaria herself, but she certainly used her judicial powers to confirm and preserve the monastery’s rights and property.

---

140 de Marchi, ‘Documenti,’ no. 1 (21st August 1058); BSSS 106, no. 9 (31st July 1080); Cibrario, Storia, 166f.
141 Bulst, Untersuchungen, 233ff.; DD HII, Arduin, no. 9 (28th January 1005); nn.143-144, 160-161, 167 below.
142 Casiraghi, ‘Chiusa,’ 464.
143 Henry II confirmed their donation(s?): DD HII, no. 305 (1014); for the view that some of the property donated to Fruttuaria belonged to Adelaide’s mother, Bertha: Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 40-43. For Adelaide’s parents and William of Volpiano: Rudolf Glaber, Historiarum, IV.7-8, 182ff.; Penco, ‘Movimento,’ 233, 236f.; Bulst, Untersuchungen, 128, 137.
144 DD HV, no. 107 (8th October 1112) confirmed Agnes’ donation to Fruttuaria. (According to DD HIV, no. 220 [23rd September 1069], the property Agnes donated already belonged to Fruttuaria.)
145 Appendix 1, no. 14b.
146 Appendix 1, no. 26a.
147 Appendix 1, nos. 13, 39; chapter 7; Andenna, ‘Adelaide,’ 95f.; Gledhill, Damian, 127, 132f.
According to an anonymous – and late – source (Chronicon Abbatiae Fructuariensis; early thirteenth century), after Adelaide re-captured the city of Asti in April 1070 she gave the church of San Secundo della Torre Rossa (now Santa Caterina) in Asti to Fruttuaria. Abbot Albert of Fruttuaria turned San Secundo into a priory, housing twelve monks from Fruttuaria.\footnote{Appendix 1, no. 23.} If so, then this coincided with a more general effort to disseminate the austere version of Cluniac monasticism practiced at Fruttuaria.\footnote{On the customs of Fruttuaria: Spätling, Consuetudines.} Also in 1070\footnote{Lampert, Annales, 244 n.6; Schieffer, ‘Romreise,’ 154-156. (For an earlier date of 1068: Semmler, Klosterreform, 36ff.; Robinson, Lampert, 18.)} Archbishop Anno of Cologne transplanted twelve monks from Fruttuaria to his foundation of Siegburg abbey (c.23km south-east of Cologne).\footnote{Semmler, Klosterreform, 35-50, 60-63, 118-120; Jakobs, ‘Rudolf’.} Shortly afterwards – probably in Summer 1072 – Fruttuarian customs were spread to the monastery of St Blasien.\footnote{Braun, Urkundenbuch, nos. 27 (c.1072); 28 (1072) (prayer fraternity); Vogel, ‘Rudolf,’ 28ff. Black-Veldtrupp, Agnes, 48ff., 305ff.; Jakobs, Adel, 39f., 269ff.; MvK, II, 167 n.98.}

Adelaide’s involvement in the promotion of religious reform has previously been overlooked, even by Goez, who emphasises both that eleventh-century monastic reform was often spread by informal trans-regional links between women, and Adelaide’s connections with reform-minded clerics.\footnote{Goez, ‘Typ,’ 186-192; Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 317-321.} Adelaide was closely associated not only with Fruttuaria, but also with some of the key religious figures of the day, including Peter Damian and Gregory VII,\footnote{Above, nn.52, 91, 145-146.} and with other reform-minded figures, including Abbot Adraldo of Novalesa-Breme,\footnote{Goez, ‘Typ,’ 188f. Peter Damian asked Adelaide to greet Adraldo on his behalf; and Adraldo intervened in a dispute between Adelaide and Archbishop Leodegar of Vienne (Appendix 1, nos. 14b, 22). For Adelaide’s donations to Novalesa: above, n.128.} and the papal legate, Hugh of Die.\footnote{Chapter 7, n.35; for Hugh’s legatine activity: Rennie, Law.} Further evidence of Adelaide’s support for reform can be seen in the emphasis which she placed on ‘correct’ religious observance in her charters: monks should live secundum regulam sancti Benedicti abbatis;\footnote{Appendix 1, no. 14.} and canons were
to follow the Rule of St Augustine. Moreover, Adelaide’s political and social connections further increase the likelihood that she played a part in spreading Fruttuarian customs into Germany.

- **Siegburg**

The imposition of Fruttuarian customs at Siegburg is traditionally attributed to Archbishop Anno of Cologne, Siegburg’s founder, who visited Fruttuaria and admired the monks there. Anno is thought to have acted at the intervention of Empress Agnes – whose links with Fruttuaria and with Anno – are well-documented. In particular, Agnes and Anno intervened together in two diplomas for Fruttuaria in 1070: one issued by Henry IV, and one by Alexander II. The papal diploma was issued in Rome, and it is possible that Adelaide was also in Rome in 1070, to seek penance for her attack on Lodi/Asti. Although there is no record of any penance being imposed, Previté-Orton suggested that Alexander II may have ‘received an undertaking from [Adelaide] that she would support reform in her lands’. In fact, Adelaide may have undertaken to promote monastic reform not only in her own lands, but also in **Germany**, and forged links with Anno and Agnes in order to do so. Certainly, at this time Adelaide granted Anno relics of some of the Theban legion, held at the abbey of Saint-Maurice-en-Valais in Savoy, for his foundation of Siegburg. Adelaide may also have influenced Anno’s decision to populate Siegburg with monks from Fruttuaria (particularly if she also helped to send monks from Fruttuaria to Asti at this time).
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158 Appendix 1, nos. 10, 26, 38, 42; Andenna, ‘Adelaide,’ 86f.
159 *Landulf*, *Annales*, a.1075, 244f.; *Vogel*, ‘Rudolf,’ 7f; Schieffer, ‘Romreise,’ 161f., 173.
160 DD HIV, no. 233 (15th June 1070).
162 Appendix 1, no.25c; chapter 2, n.158.
164 Appendix 1, no. 23b.
St Blasien was a private monastery of the bishops of Basel, but it was closely associated with the family of Rudolf of Rheinfelden. The impetus to reform St Blasien is usually attributed to Rudolf (although there is no direct evidence for this), probably at the intervention of Empress Agnes. This is possible, since Agnes had close connections with Fruttuaria and also with Rudolf (whom Agnes had invested as duke of Swabia, and who had – briefly – been married to her daughter, Matilda). A late source – the Liber constructionis monasterii ad S. Blasium (written in two phases: mid-thirteenth-century, and mid-fifteenth century) – explicitly refers to Agnes’ involvement. In 1072, with Agnes’s help, Abbot Giselbert of St Blasien sent two of his monks to Fruttuaria to learn their customs. Agnes thus deserved to be called accommodatrix regularis ordinis nostri monasterii.

Yet there is no reason to assume that Agnes alone influenced Rudolf’s or St Blasien’s connection with Fruttuaria. It is highly likely that Adelaide also promoted Fruttuarian customs in south-western Germany, alongside Agnes and Rudolf. In addition to her connections with Fruttuaria – and with Agnes – Adelaide was also related to Rudolf of Rheinfelden, who was married to her daughter, Adelaide of Savoy. While there is no evidence directly linking Adelaide of Turin to St Blasien, Adelaide of Savoy was closely connected to Rudolf of Rheinfelden through their marriage. Adelaide’s connections with Fruttuaria were likely influenced by Agnes and Rudolf, and Adelaide’s connection to Rudolf further solidified the ties between St Blasien and Fruttuaria.

---

167 Agnes was distantly related to William of Volpiano (Bulst, Untersuchungen, 115, 123). She intervened in her son, Henry’s, diplomas for Fruttuaria (DD HIV, nos. 142 [1st April 1065]; 233 [15th June 1070]); and Alexander II’s (above n.161). Agnes also wrote to Abbot Albert of Fruttuaria (Struve, ‘Briefe,’ 424 [dated summer 1062]; Weiss, ‘Datierung’ [dated Spring 1065]); and visited the monastery on several occasions: n.171 below. Cf. Black-Veldtrupp, Agnes, esp. 37ff., 46-49, 260ff., 286, 303ff.; Bulst-Thiele, Agnes, 93ff.; Struve, ‘Romreise,’ 14ff.; Gledhill, Damian, 206, 212, 239ff.
169 Chapter 2, n.22.
170 Mone, Liber, II.11, 91; Rotulus Sanblasianus, a.1086, 329.
171 Adelaide/Agnes were closely connected by marital alliances, and – in all probability – met together on several occasions in Turin (perhaps at Fruttuaria itself): above, pp.77ff. Gledhill, Damian, 212 emphasises Adelaide and Agnes’ connection with Fruttuaria, without reference to Rudolf or the spread of Fruttuarian customs.
connected with this monastery.\textsuperscript{173} There are no extant charters issued by Adelaide of Savoy for St Blasien, but she and her husband, Rudolf, are remembered in the \textit{Liber constructionis} as having enriched the monastery with \textit{innumera beneficia}.\textsuperscript{174} Adelaide was interred at St Blasien after her death in 1079,\textsuperscript{175} and was remembered fondly in the chronicle of Bernold of Constance – who was a monk at St Blasien, c.1085-1091.\textsuperscript{176} Several of Adelaide of Turin’s other relations also made donations to St Blasien, including: Henry IV, acting at the intervention of his wife (Adelaide’s daughter), Bertha of Savoy;\textsuperscript{177} Adelaide’s nephew, Eckbert II of Meissen (son of Immilla of Turin);\textsuperscript{178} and her cousin, Matilda of Tuscany.\textsuperscript{179}

A key point here is the way that patronage traditions could be spread through marriage alliances. Even after they married, many elite women continued to follow the same patronage traditions as their natal dynasty.\textsuperscript{180} It seems likely that Adelaide of Savoy’s religious patronage continued to be influenced by her mother, and by customs in Turin. The continuing influence of a woman’s natal dynasty on her religious patronage can also be clearly seen in relation to Adelaide of Savoy’s own daughter, Adelaide of Rheinfelden, who was a child when Fruttuarian customs were imported to St Blasien. In the late 1070s Adelaide of Rheinfelden married King Ladislaus I of Hungary (r.1077-1095).\textsuperscript{181} According to the \textit{Liber constructionis}, after she became queen of Hungary Adelaide continued to follow \textit{exemplum parentorur suorum}: she made numerous donations to the monastery of St Blasien, including

\textsuperscript{173} Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 317ff. (Cowdrey, \textit{Gregory}, 254 views the reform of St Blasien as brought about by Agnes, perhaps with Adelaide’s daughters, but not Adelaide herself.) On south-west German reform more generally: Patzold, ‘Reformen’.
\textsuperscript{174} Mone, \textit{Liber}, II.18, 94. For Rudolf’s lost donations to St Blasien: Braun, \textit{Urkundenbuch}, nos. 16 (1057x1077); 26 (3rd April 1071).
\textsuperscript{175} Appendix I, no. 35a. On St Blasien as the Rheinfelden mausoleum: Jakobs, ‘Stellung,’ 33ff.
\textsuperscript{176} Bernold, \textit{Chronicon}, aa.1077, 1079, 289, 358.
\textsuperscript{177} DD HIV, no. 240 (3rd April 1071). Bertha is not mentioned in Henry’s diplomas for Fruttuaria: above n.167.
\textsuperscript{179} DD MT, Dep. 58 (18th April 1076x6th February 1094; probably January 1086?). For Adelaide/Matilda: chapters 1, 3.
\textsuperscript{180} Óriain-Raedel, ‘Edith’; Bowie, ‘Daughters,’ chs.4-5. Cf. chapter 1, n.253.
\textsuperscript{181} On the marriage: Hlawitschka, ‘Herkunft,’ 182.
a relic of the True Cross, housed in an ornate reliquary. This donation – which took place during the abbacy of Giselbert (r.1068-1086) – was probably a memorial for her mother, Adelaide of Savoy, who was interred at St Blasien.

The ‘Adelaide Cross’, donated to St Blasien c.1080

---

182 Braun, Urkundenbuch, no.33 (c.1079x10th October 1086); Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 319; Skoda, ‘Blasien,’ 186.
Since Adelaide of Turin (and her mother, Bertha) patronised Fruttuaria, and since her daughter, Adelaide of Savoy, and her daughter, Adelaide of Rheinfelden, patronised St Blasien, it seems likely that Adelaide of Turin and Adelaide of Savoy were involved in spreading Fruttuarian customs to St Blasien in the early 1070s. There is no direct evidence for this, but their connections with these monasteries, and with key individuals – including Empress Agnes and Rudolf of Rheinfelden – are suggestive, as are their connections with monastic reform, and with Gregory VII’s friendship network in particular.  

The timing of the reform of St Blasien (the early 1070s) is particularly suggestive. In 1069 Henry IV of Germany and Rudolf of Rheinfelden had attempted to repudiate their respective wives – Adelaide of Turin’s daughters. Both men were forced to reconcile with their wives (Henry in 1069; Rudolf in 1071) – through the intervention of Adelaide of Turin, Empress Agnes, and also Peter Damian and Pope Alexander II. The marriage crises brought all of these individuals into frequent contact with each other, and – amongst the important negotiations about the marriages – there were perhaps also opportunities to discuss monastic reform. Against this background, St Blasien’s reform with customs from Fruttuaria, rather than from another monastery (such as Hirsau, or Cluny) takes on further significance. The importation of religious customs from Turin to St Blasien was as a visible symbol of Rudolf of Rheinfelden’s reconciliation not only with his wife, Adelaide of Savoy, but also with his mother-in-law, Adelaide of Turin. Henry IV’s issuing of a diploma for St Blasien in 1071 – at the intervention of his wife, Bertha, with whom he had also recently reconciled – can also be seen in this light.

---


186 Chapter 2.

187 Above n.160; Jakobs, ‘Stellung,’ 34f.
Adelaide of Turin’s promotion of Fruttuarian customs was thus not only religious, but also political. Transmitting these customs involved the (re-)activation of several different trans-regional networks of powerful individuals and institutions. Reinforcing her links with these networks, ensuring the high-status of a monastery located close to Turin, and demonstrating her ability to effect religious change well beyond the confines of her own territory, was a means by which Adelaide could increase her own power and prestige, as well as her trans-Alpine links.

*Santa Maria in Pinerolo*

In September 1064 Adelaide made a generous grant of property in the counties of Turin, Auriate and Albenga to the monastery of Santa Maria in Pinerolo. Adelaide’s sons, Peter and Amadeus, witnessed the charter but are not named as donors, and Adelaide’s status was further underlined by the use of a devotional formula: *Adeligia Christi misericordia comitissa*. Although often described as a foundation charter, this is nowhere stated in the document, nor is Adelaide described as the founder. The evidence that Adelaide founded Pinerolo comes from a later papal bull, issued by Gregory VII in 1074. Acting at the request of *carissima Sancti Petri filia comitissa Adeleida cum filiis suis, que eundem [sic] venerabilem locum [...] fundavit atque constituit*, Gregory confirmed the property which Pinerolo held legally, and placed the monastery and all of its possessions *sub sancta Romane et Apostolica sedis tutele et defensione susceptum*. The privilege also guaranteed the monks’ right to elect their own abbot, and specified that if the bishop of Turin would not invest their choice, then this could be carried out by the bishop of Asti or Alba. This clause was clearly
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190 Appendix 1, no. 26d. On this document’s possible interpolations: Gabotto, ‘L’abazia,’ 104; BSSS 2, 21.
intended to ensure that a conflict like that between Chiusa and Bishop Cunibert would not arise at Pinerolo.

Privileges which granted monasteries papal protection, and exempted them from the authority of diocesan bishops, were first secured by Fleury and Cluny in the tenth century, and became increasingly common in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. They are traditionally understood in terms of the limitation of secular and episcopal control over monasteries, and also of the enhancement of papal power in keeping with the ideals of ‘Gregorian reform’. In relation to Pinerolo, Andenna argues that Adelaide requested papal protection for Pinerolo because Gregory VII’s policy of reform was antithetical to extensive lay control over the Church. In Andenna’s view, Adelaide not only gave her property to Pinerolo, but also gave away her jurisdiction and rights over the monastery. He thus argues that Adelaide’s continued grants to Pinerolo after 1074 are evidence that the ‘margravial church system’, created by her parents, had come to an end.

Andenna contrasts Adelaide’s foundation of Pinerolo with two institutions founded by her parents: the female house of Santa Maria in Caramagna, and the male house of San Giusto in Susa. These foundations were the centrepieces of her parents’ political-territorial lordship. Both of these monasteries were founded whilst Adelaide was still a child, and shortly after Olderic-Manfred suppressed unrest in the city of Turin, c.1027/8. This was no coincidence: the foundation of these institutions was a means by which Olderic-Manfred reasserted himself, and provided himself with an alternative, and secure, base of operations. The foundation of San Giusto was intended to ensure his dominance in Susa; to rival the
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191 Prou/Vidier, *Recueil*, no. 71 (997); Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, nos. 351 (998); 558 (1024).
195 Appendix 1, nos. 28-30, 34, 40, 44, 47.
196 Appendix 2, II/2; Andenna, ‘Adelaide,’ 80f.
199 CN, Appendix VI, 330.
monastery of Novalesa (c.6km north of Susa); and to gain greater control over the nearby Mont Cenis pass.  

Similarly, the foundation of Caramagna was competitive with the nearby monastery of San Pietro in Savigliano. In both cases, the endowments were extremely generous: Caramagna was granted property, particularly in the Maira valley, totalling 10,000 iugera (c.6500 acres); while San Giusto was granted a third of the city, and a third of valley, of Susa. Yet Adelaide’s parents took specific steps to ensure their continuing control over these institutions: by exempting them from episcopal control; by reserving the right to elect the abbot/abbess; and by reserving the rights of gubernatio et defensio for themselves and their heirs. This ensured that they retained a measure of financial, judicial and military control over their foundations, and prevented outside interference (including by the bishop of Turin).

By contrast, Andenna argues that Adelaide’s patronage of Pinerolo, though extensive, served no political purpose. Instead, and particularly after Pinerolo was placed under papal protection, Adelaide’s donations simply dispersed her patrimony, in return for prayers for the souls of her deceased relatives. This view of Adelaide as a pious widow, dissipating her patrimony with little wider agenda, is based, primarily, on the idea that Gregory’s exemption limited Adelaide’s control over Pinerolo, as well as that of the bishops of Turin; and – perhaps implicitly – on the idea that women’s religious patronage was pious rather than political. Neither view is supported by an analysis of the sources.

First, Adelaide’s donations to Pinerolo were, if anything, less concerned with commemoration than her charters for other institutions. Adelaide’s first charter for Pinerolo
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specified in detail the family members for whom the monks were to pray: Adelaide herself, her parents, her uncle, Bishop Alric of Asti, her third husband, Otto of Savoy, and her sons (no mention was made of her daughters, sisters, or other relatives), but the pro anima formulae in Adelaide’s later charters for Pinerolo are far terser. Two charters record Adelaide making a donation only for the sake of her own soul, and two others, for herself and unspecified parentes. These latter two documents were issued shortly after the deaths of Adelaide’s sister, Immilla, and her children, Peter, Amadeus and Adelaide of Savoy, but none are mentioned by name. Since both of these documents were written by the ‘margravial notary’, Giselbert, they can be assumed to reflect Adelaide’s wishes. The most detailed, and most explicitly religiously motivated, pro anima formulae are found not in Adelaide’s donation charters for Pinerolo, but in her charters for the reformed canons of Oulx and Revello, and for the monastery of San Solutore in Turin.

Second, there were political-territorial reasons for Adelaide’s support of Pinerolo. The monastery was located in the city of Pinerolo, at the mouth of the Chisone valley, which extends westwards towards Sestriere. While not as significant as Susa, this valley was still strategically important. It lead, via the Sestriere pass, to the valley of Susa, and thence to the Mont Genèvre pass (located c.13km from Sestriere). Although the bishops of Turin had once held power in Pinerolo, its strategic importance meant that Pinerolo had long been of interest to Adelaide’s dynasty: Adelaide’s father founded the church (now cathedral) of San
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212 Appendix 1, nos. 10, 42.
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Donato in Pinerolo in the 1020s, to which Adelaide made a donation in 1044. Further attempts by Adelaide to monopolise control of the Mont Genève pass can be seen in her contemporaneous grants to the canons of Oulx (c. 14km north-east of the Mont Genève pass). Pinerolo was not only situated on a route of strategic importance, it was also located close to Landulf’s foundation of Cavour (c. 11km south of Pinerolo), and Adelaide’s parents’ foundation of Caramagna (c. 31km south-east of Pinerolo). Adelaide’s dealings with Cavour and Caramagna were both co-operative and competitive. The foundation of Pinerolo so close to these other institutions naturally decreased the likelihood that they would receive Adelaide’s religious patronage. Pinerolo was surely intended to undermine the power of the episcopal monastery of Cavour in the region, and thus also that of the bishops of Turin. Adelaide made several donations to Pinerolo in the period 1078 to 1083, when she was trying to (re)assert her authority. Yet Adelaide’s dealings with these monasteries were not only competitive. Her foundation of the male house of Pinerolo complemented her parents’ earlier foundation of the female house at Caramagna. And all three monasteries – Pinerolo, Cavour, and Caramagna – were closely connected with each other. Transactions in favour of Cavour or Pinerolo were often drawn up at Caramagna and vice versa, and the same men often witnessed Adelaide’s grants for Pinerolo and Cavour. The sheer number of donations made by members of Adelaide’s family to Caramagna, Cavour, and Pinerolo – as well as Immilla’s foundation of San Pietro in Musinasco (c. 19km south-east of Pinerolo) – also

216 Above n.27; Appendix 1, no. 8; also Bonanate, ‘Funzione,’ 135ff.
217 Above, nn.75, 78-81, 130.
218 Adelaide’s donations to Cavour all but ceased after the foundation of Pinerolo; above n.136.
219 Appendix 1, nos. 30, 34, 40; above, pp.168ff.
220 e.g. Appendix 1, no. 9, 20, 25, 40; Appendix 2, VII/2; Cancian, ‘Cartario,’ 176ff.
222 Appendix 1, no. 25; Appendix 2, II/2; VII/2.
223 Above n.136; Appendix 2, VII/1.
224 Pinerolo: above nn.188, 195; also: Appendix 1, nos. 34a; Appendix 2, VII/3. San Donato: nn.27, 216 above.
225 Appendix 2, VII/5.
suggests that this region, as much as the valley of Susa, was connected with the consolidation of the dynasty’s territorial power.

Thus, the placing of Pinerolo under papal protection did not necessarily mean that Adelaide was abrogating her rights, nor that she was abandoning the ‘margravial church system’. Instead it was part of a complex political calculation aimed at ensuring protection for, and the autonomy of, not only Pinerolo, but also Adelaide herself. The connection with Rome brought great prestige to Adelaide and her foundation, and further cemented Adelaide’s relationship with Gregory VII. Pinerolo’s exemption also placed the monastery, and its property, officially in the papal sphere of influence thereby decreasing the likelihood of interference by an outside power (secular or ecclesiastical). Yet the privilege did not ensure Pinerolo’s complete freedom. Adelaide only surrendered rights over abbatial elections. While papal protection was important in symbolic terms, in practical ones Rome was geographically distant enough that Adelaide lost little autonomy regarding local initiatives. She continued not only to make donations to Pinerolo but, as we shall see, to preside over court cases relating to the abbey. Certainly, in the early thirteenth century, Adelaide – rather than the abbot of Pinerolo – was remembered as ruling quasi regina ... in partibus illis.

Conclusion

Establishing reciprocal relationships with the Church was a key element of lordship.

Although there were sometimes tensions between Adelaide and various bishops of Turin, she
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took care to cultivate good relationships where possible, and was particularly successful with Cunibert. At the beginning of Adelaide’s rule, when she was struggling to establish her position in Turin, two successive bishops – Landulf and Guido – attempted to gain greater signorial control in the region, and counter the dominance of Adelaide’s dynasty. Adelaide asserted her position through strategic donations to the cathedral church in Turin, and to the episcopal monastery of Cavour. By the time Cunibert was appointed, Adelaide’s position was more secure. Thus Cunibert, an outsider who lacked local networks of support, allied himself with Adelaide.

Throughout most of Cunibert’s long reign as bishop of Turin, he and Adelaide worked together to ensure their joint dominance of political and religious life of Turin. Adelaide regularly made donations to monastic institutions over which Cunibert exercised control (Cavour, San Solutore and San Pietro). In turn, Cunibert supported Adelaide’s foundation of Pinerolo. Adelaide and Cunibert shared similar views, and – at the urging of Peter Damian – they probably acted together to suppress clerical marriages. They also jointly supported the house of reformed canons at Oulx. Yet their harmonious relationship came to an abrupt end in the late 1070s, with Adelaide’s withdrawal of support for Cunibert in his conflict with Chiusa. Cunibert’s subsequent support of Henry IV – at Adelaide’s expense – led to a final breach between them.

Another means by which Adelaide sought to maintain the balance of power in Turin was by cultivating close ties with key religious institutions. In particular, Adelaide patronised urban institutions in Turin and Susa, and also monasteries in and around Pinerolo. While she often supported the same religious institutions as her parents, Adelaide did not feel constrained to follow in their footsteps: she made very few donations to her parents’ foundations, preferring instead to support her own monastery of Pinerolo. From the 1060s onwards, Adelaide emerges as a major patron of monastic reform. She corresponded with
some of the key religious figures of the day, including Peter Damian and Gregory VII. Through her patronage of Fruttuaria, Adelaide was linked with William of Volpiano, and with the monastic reforms of Cluny more generally. Through the activation of familial and political networks, Adelaide helped to spread Fruttuaria’s customs into Germany. This is a testament not only to Adelaide’s trans-regional influence, but also to her ability to utilise her social and political contacts, particularly with other women, in order to effect religious change, and increase her own status.

Alongside Adelaide’s monastic patronage and promotion of religious change, another of this chapter’s key concerns is with the concept of the ‘margravial church’, which is clearly in need of modification. Andenna argued that Adelaide’s parents were able to use the Church as an instrument of government, but that Adelaide was less successful in ensuring her own authority via this means. Yet this was clearly not the case. First, although something approaching a ‘margravial church’ existed under Adelaide’s parents, it was not as programmatic and all-encompassing as Andenna suggests. Second, it did not cease to exist under Adelaide. Like her parents, Adelaide had authoritative dealings with bishops: this is clear not simply from her relationship with Cunibert in Turin, and from her presiding over a church council with Peter Damian in the 1060s, but also as we shall see, from her dealings with successive bishops in Asti, and from her presiding over a legal dispute – which related purely to Church matters – in Turin in 1080.\textsuperscript{231} Equally, as her parents had done, Adelaide founded her own private monastery – Pinerolo – which she used to further her political-territorial lordship. Andenna misunderstands Gregory VII’s grant of papal protection to Pinerolo in 1074: it did not signal the end of Adelaide’s control over her foundation, nor yet over ‘the Church’ in Turin more generally. Instead, Adelaide’s religious patronage had political, as well as religious, significance throughout her life.

\textsuperscript{231} Chapters 6-7.
Chapter 5
Adelaide’s officers, and administration in Turin

In order to rule effectively Adelaide depended on the services of competent officers, whom she appointed in an administrative capacity.¹ This chapter examines Adelaide’s relationships with notaries, iudices and viscounts.² Extensive research has been carried out on officers of this type elsewhere in Italy, but there has been no detailed study of Adelaide’s dealings with officers.³ Who were these men? What was the nature of their relationship with Adelaide? And what does their presence reveal about her administration? In order to build up a picture of these officers, and their role in administration, the roles, backgrounds and networks of key individuals are identified. Attention is paid throughout to the evolving roles of these officers.

Although there was a hierarchically-organised administration centred on Adelaide and the margravial court in Turin,⁴ neither Adelaide’s administrative apparatus, nor her officers, are identical with the bureaucracy and officials of the modern nation state. Nevertheless, Max Weber’s classification of modern bureaucratic officials can also be used to analyse non-modern officers.⁵ Like modern officials, medieval officers had specific functions and responsibilities; they were accountable to superiors; and followed general rules of management. There are notable differences however: medieval officers’ areas of responsibility were not always as clearly defined as modern officials’; they were not always employed full-time, nor salaried. Yet the key difference lies in the nature of the bond between a medieval officer and his/her lord, and a modern official and his/her superior. According to

¹ In general: Collavini, ‘Signoria’.
⁴ Sergi, Potere, 117; Sergi, ‘Potere,’ 62; Sergi, ‘Secolo,’ 443f.; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 466.
Thomas Bisson, a medieval officer’s administrative service was bound up with ideas of fidelity; a modern official’s with impersonal ideas of functional competence. Yet the distinction is not absolute: Adelaide’s officers, as we shall see, have elements of both fidelitarian service and functional officialdom.

Medieval rulers generally chose between one of two strategies when appointing an officer. They could appoint a member of the local aristocracy, whose position meant that he was able to impose the ruler’s commands authoritatively, and who – as an ‘insider’ – would perhaps also be more acceptable to the local community than another candidate. Yet there was always the risk that such an officer would use his appointment to strengthen his own power-base and thus become a threat to the ruler. Alternatively, a ruler could appoint a man of lesser status, who would be more dependent upon, and thus loyal to, him/her. Yet such an officer might lack the status to implement commands; his promotion might also alienate members of local elites, who had expected to hold office themselves. This chapter considers Adelaide’s solution(s) to this problem by investigating her administrative strategies in relation to a core group of officers who feature prominently in her charters.

Attention is also paid to the continuity of personnel across Adelaide’s career, and to the heritability (or otherwise) of office. Since there is little evidence of the officers who served Adelaide’s parents, it is difficult to ascertain what changes, if any, Adelaide made when she came to power. Certain names recur in her parents’ charters, particularly those of the notaries Erenzo (active 1028-1031) and Giselbert (active 1011-1042); the *iudices* Alfreðus (active 1023/4-1031) and Ribaldus (active 1028); and a man named
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Dominic (no title). One of her parents’ key agents was a priest named Sigifred, son of Adalgis (active 1021-1037). Like Dominic, Sigifred had no official title but was a close collaborator of Adelaide’s parents, and particularly of her mother, Bertha, after Olderic-Manfred’s death. With the exception of Giselbert, who wrote one document for Adelaide in 1042, none of these individuals are present in Adelaide’s charters.

Although there are few instances of direct continuity of personnel, as we shall see, several of Adelaide’s officers were the sons of men who had served her parents. In part this was because notarial and legal expertise was often transmitted from father to son (or nephew), which meant that sons were often best placed to succeed their fathers. Yet it also suggests that there was a loyal core of support for Adelaide and her dynasty: that her position was accepted, and even legitimised, by these officers. At the same time, this continuity also indicates a tendency towards heritability of office, which had the potential to limit Adelaide’s ability to appoint officers of her own choosing. This relates to a final, key, consideration: to what extent did Adelaide’s officers recognise her authority and act competently alongside her?

Notaries

Unless otherwise specified, the notaries who drew up Adelaide’s documents were probably laymen who wrote documents professionally. The majority of these men referred to themselves by the common northern Italian title of *notarius sacri palatii/palacii*. The ‘sacred
palace’ is thought to refer to the former imperial capital at Pavia, but ‘notaries of the sacred palace’ were not necessarily trained there.\(^{19}\) Instead the title distinguishes them from *notarii regis/imperatoris*, not found in Adelaide’s charters, who had links to the kings/emperors who appointed them.\(^{20}\) *Notarii sacri palacii*, by contrast, were appointed by non-royal powers,\(^ {21}\) meaning that those in Turin might have been appointed by Adelaide. Charters prepared by *notarii sacri palacii* (or notaries who were also *iudices*) are generally of higher quality than documents written by other scribes, and all of the men who wrote three or more documents for Adelaide referred to themselves by these titles.

Along with *iudices* (discussed below), notaries formed a cohesive group and held a position of social and economic prestige, particularly within cities.\(^ {22}\) Although little is known about most notaries beyond their names and notarial titles, it is possible to discern connections between certain notaries and specific individuals/institutions, on whose behalf they produced documents. The majority of these men were loosely associated with Adelaide, if at all. Certain notaries wrote more than one document for Adelaide (and/or her family), but most of her charters were written by men who had preferential relationships with specific religious institutions, or who had multiple relationships with different benefactors and beneficiaries.

\(\text{a) ‘Local’ and urban notaries}\)

The notaries who wrote Adelaide’s documents rarely travelled with her. Instead, notaries tended to remain in one place or, at most, have a localised mobility, issuing documents within


c. 30km of their place of origin.\textsuperscript{23} These notaries did not work consistently, nor exclusively, for Adelaide, and many wrote only one document for her.\textsuperscript{24} This is particularly common with donation charters issued for religious institutions located outside of the counties of Turin and Auriate.\textsuperscript{25} Even in the county of Turin, there were many notaries who had preferential relationships with specific religious institutions.\textsuperscript{26} For example, Aribert, \textit{notarius sacri palatii} (active 1020-1044), was connected with Bishop Landulf of Turin,\textsuperscript{27} and his foundation of Santa Maria of Cavour: Aribert wrote one charter on behalf of Adelaide and Henry for Cavour in 1044; and two for other clients.\textsuperscript{28}

Within cities there was a greater range of potential clients who might require a notary’s technical writing-skills. Thus urban notaries were able to maintain relationships with a range of clients and beneficiaries, both within and without the city.\textsuperscript{29} A clear example of this is Aldeprandus, called Bello, \textit{notarius sacri palatii} (active 1066-1089),\textsuperscript{30} who wrote four documents for Adelaide (1079-1083).\textsuperscript{31} These were all issued in the city of Turin, where Aldeprandus-Bello was evidently based; the beneficiaries included the monastery of San Solutore in Turin, and the canons of Santa Maria in Susa (c. 51km west of Turin), and San Lorenzo in Oulx (c. 67km west of Turin). Aldeprandus-Bello did not work exclusively for Adelaide and was evidently affiliated, if only loosely, with at least two of the institutions for which he wrote documents on Adelaide’s behalf. Between 1066 and 1089, he drew up several

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{23} Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ esp. 192f. On Italian notaries as ‘resolutely local’: DD MT, 6f.; Bougard, ‘Notaires,’ 459.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Appendix 1, nos. 2, 4, 9-10, 12, 13-14, 16, 20, 23, 25, 29-30, 35, 40.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 195f.
\item \textsuperscript{26} In general: Cancian, ‘Conradus’; Cancian, ‘Notai,’ 165f.; Nicolaj, \textit{Cultura}, 75ff.
\item \textsuperscript{27} BSSS 86, no. 5 (July 1020).
\item \textsuperscript{28} Appendix 1, no. 9; BSSS 3/1, nos. 3 (15th August 1037); 7 (12th June 1042); Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 182f. For another episcopal notary: chapter 6, n.40.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 190, 192; Petrucci, \textit{Notarii}, 12f.; Amelotti/Costamagna, \textit{Origini}, 200-203.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Appendix 1, nos. 36, 38, 42-43.
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charters relating to the monastery of San Solutore in Turin,\textsuperscript{32} the canons of San Salvatore in Turin,\textsuperscript{33} and the canons of San Lorenzo in Oulx.\textsuperscript{34}

\textit{b) ‘Margravial’ notaries}

Carolingian legislation specified that counts (along with bishops and abbots) were to have their own notaries, or at least, to supervise the redaction of their charters to ensure regularity in their documents.\textsuperscript{35} The prevailing view is that these ‘comital’ notaries disappeared between the tenth and eleventh centuries.\textsuperscript{36} Yet both Antonio Olivieri and Patrizia Cancian argue that in eleventh-century Turin, there were ‘margravial’ notaries who had preferential relationships with Adelaide and her family.\textsuperscript{37} Although neither Olivieri nor Cancian clearly defines what they mean by a ‘margravial’ notary, it can be inferred that the key factors are: writing several charters for Adelaide/her dynasty; writing for multiple beneficiaries; and drawing up documents from multiple locations. Two further factors, not emphasised by Olivieri and Cancian, also merit consideration: notaries particularly associated with monasteries founded by Adelaide’s family (Pinerolo, Caramagna, and San Giusto); and notaries who issued documents from the margravial palace in Turin. Although several notaries wrote three or more documents for Adelaide (and her family), few fulfil all (or even most) of these criteria, and so cannot be identified as ‘margravial’ notaries. Two \textit{notarii sacri palacii}, both named Giselbert, provide the clearest evidence that certain notaries may have been margravial officers.\textsuperscript{38}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32} BSSS 44, nos. 12 (19\textsuperscript{th} May 1066); 18 (26\textsuperscript{th} March 1089).
\textsuperscript{33} BSSS 106, no. 8 (31st July 1080).
\textsuperscript{34} BSSS 45 nos. 40-41 (4\textsuperscript{th} January 1088). Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ does not attribute these charters to Aldeprandus-Bello.
\textsuperscript{35} Fissore, ‘Problemi’, 43; Costambeys, ‘Laity,’ 247f.
\textsuperscript{36} Bougard, \textit{Justice}, 65-69.
\textsuperscript{38} Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 192 also defines Erenzo (active 1028-1031) as a ‘margravial’ notary: above n.9.
\end{flushright}
Giselbert (active 1011-1042)

Giselbert was first active in Asti, where he wrote documents for Adelaide’s uncle, Bishop Alric of Asti.\(^{39}\) He then moved from episcopal to margravial service, and is afterwards found in the city of Turin.\(^{40}\) In Turin, Giselbert wrote documents on behalf of Adelaide’s parents for the monasteries of San Solutore in Turin,\(^{41}\) and San Giusto in Susa.\(^{42}\) Giselbert also drew up documents on behalf of the margravial agent, Sigifred, son of Adalgis, for the cathedral church of San Giovanni Battista in Turin.\(^{43}\) These charters contain the earliest references to the margravial residence in Turin, where they were drawn up.\(^{44}\) Giselbert also issued a document on behalf of Adelaide and her husband Henry for San Giovanni Battista in Turin.\(^{45}\) Unlike her parents’ documents, Adelaide’s charter was not drawn up at the palace, but at Carmagnola, c.25km south of Turin. Nevertheless, Adelaide’s use of Giselbert as a notary is one of the only instances of direct continuity of personnel between Adelaide and her parents.

Giselbert (active 1062-1098)

Another notarius sacri palacii, also named Giselbert, is thought to have been ‘in the special service of [Adelaide’s] family’ (in speciale servizio della famiglia).\(^{46}\) He is distinct from the earlier Giselbert (active 1011-1042), but the fact that they share the same name, profession, and links with Adelaide’s dynasty, suggests that the two men may have been related, and that the office of ‘margravial’ notary was heritable. There are more extant documents written by the later Giselbert than any other notary in eleventh-century Turin. He wrote documents for
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\(^{39}\) Appendix 2, V/6, V/9.  
\(^{40}\) Cipolla, ‘Giusto,’ 16 n.1 suggests that Giselbert may also have written charters for the monastery of SS. Filino and Graciniano in Arona (c. 100km north-east of Turin): MHP, Chart, I, no. 256 (2nd November 1023); 280 (3rd April 1030); Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 181 n.340 is sceptical.  
\(^{41}\) Appendix 2, II/3.  
\(^{42}\) Appendix 2, III/6.  
\(^{43}\) MHP Chart, II, no. 101 (23rd December 1034); BSSS 3/2, no. 6 (23rd December 1034).  
\(^{44}\) Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 106f., 181 n.340; on the palace: above, p.146 n.8.  
\(^{45}\) Appendix 1, no. 6; Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 180ff. (Cipolla, ‘Giusto,’ 16 n.1 thinks this was a different notary.)  
\(^{46}\) Cancian, ‘Cartario,’ 176f.; also Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 184-188.
two key sub-alpine monasteries: the episcopal monastery of Santa Maria in Cavour, and Adelaide’s foundation of Santa Maria in Pinerolo (these two institutions were located within c.11km of each other). He drew up eight documents on behalf of Adelaide, and her family, for these institutions, and eleven documents for other clients. A final charter, apparently written by Giselbert for Adelaide, is probably a thirteenth-century forgery.

Unlike the earlier Giselbert, he did not explicitly issue documents from the palace in Turin, but he was active in several locations which were strongly connected with Adelaide’s dynasty: at two private monasteries – Pinerolo and Caramagna (c.31km south-east of Pinerolo) – and at Piossasco (c.16km south-west of Pinerolo), where Adelaide possessed the castle, and had donated the chapel to Pinerolo. The majority of the documents Giselbert wrote for other clients were issued at Cavour or Pinerolo, or within c.20km of these places. In fact, for much of his career, Giselbert did not travel beyond the c.30km radius typical of ‘local’ notaries. He travelled further than this for high-status clients, including Adelaide’s family and the bishop of Turin.

c) Why didn’t Adelaide have a chancery?

Although Adelaide clearly had preferential relationships with certain notaries, the vast majority of her extant charters were written not by ‘margravial’ notaries, but by ‘local’
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47 Adelaide: Appendix 1, no. 20; 34; 40; Peter: Appendix 1, no. 25b; Agnes of Aquitaine: Appendix 1, no. 34a; Immilla: Appendix 2, VII/1; Agnes of Turin: BSSS 86, no. 13 (27th August 1091); Humbert II of Savoy (grandson): BSSS 2, no. 30 (29th November 1098).
48 For Cavour: BSSS 3/1, nos. 10 (16th March 1062); 11 (24th April 1063); 12 (10th November 1065); 13 (8th November 1072); 20 (26th March 1091). For Pinerolo: BSSS 2, nos. 19 (17th December 1079); 21 (21st December 1080); 29 (28th March 1096); BSSS 3/2, no. 10 (14th February 1091); BSSS 86, nos. 12 (15th May 1089), 16 (12th May 1098).
49 Appendix 1, no. 35; Savio, ‘Cartario,’ 5-8; Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 184 n.349.
50 Giselbert did, however, record the settlement of a dispute in the margravial court: below, n.59.
51 Appendix 1, nos. 20, 34-34a.
52 Appendix 1, no. 40.
53 BSSS 86, no. 13 (27th August 1091); for Adelaide’s donation: Appendix 1, no. 14.
54 Giselbert travelled to Chiusa to write a document for Adelaide’s grandson, Humbert II (above n.47); and to Turin for Bishop Guibert: BSSS 86, no. 16.
notaries, who each wrote only one document for her. There is thus little evidence that Adelaide had an organised or sustained chancery. The lack of a chancery or writing-bureau is often seen as a black mark against early medieval lords. A formal chancery is seen as part and parcel of a modern, centralised administration; a disorganised, or non-existent, governmental structure is inferred from its absence. It is also presumed that documents produced in a chancery are more likely to reflect a lord’s wishes than those produced by local notaries. Yet does the lack of a chancery necessarily indicate a lack of governmental structures? Or that Adelaide had little say in the production of her documents?

Adelaide is likely to have had greater control over the content of documents produced by urban notaries than notaries who had exclusive relationships with specific institutions. Urban notaries produced documents for several beneficiaries and it is likely that their services were paid for by Adelaide. Moreover, some of these ‘urban’ notaries issued documents from the margravial palace. Such documents were clearly not beneficiary-produced, and had more of stamp of margravial authority than charters produced elsewhere. In Cancian’s view, evidence of not only the notary, but also the content of a document, being determined by the formal author of the charter can be found in a document issued by Adelaide’s son, Peter, in 1072. This charter was drawn up by the ‘margravial’ notary Giselbert (active 1062-1098) in the margravial court jussione domini marchionis Petri. Adelaide’s charters are rarely this explicit, but she clearly took an interest in the charters which recorded her transactions. Her documents insist not only on her presence at, but also her active participation in, their creation. Charters frequently record that they were drawn up at Adelaide’s request, and that

55 Sergi, Potere, 115ff.
56 For bureaucratic governments as more ‘advanced’: Bisson, Crisis, 5, 94, 325ff., 490, 577, 579ff.; Strayer, Origins.
58 Appendix 1, nos. 38; 42-43.
59 Appendix 1, no. 25b.
60 Sergi, Potere, 116ff.
they were read aloud to her, presumably so that she could ensure that the wording was as she wished. Her cadre of *iudices* (discussed below) were also on hand to scrutinise her documents. There is also evidence that Adelaide’s family made copies of at least some of their documents, which they presumably preserved in a family archive (that has since been dispersed). If Adelaide had wished to produce her own documents, she presumably could have done so. Instead, she preferred to let local notaries arrange matters.

Adelaide frequently issued documents in cities, particularly Turin and Susa. In these urban centres she had easy access to highly-skilled notaries, which meant that she had little need to establish her own chancery. Even when Adelaide travelled outside of urban centres, competent local notaries were readily available. There were benefits beyond ease-of-access to Adelaide’s use of ‘local’ notaries. Part of a notary’s job was to find suitable witnesses for the charters he drew up. A local man was obviously best placed to do this. His connections ensured that Adelaide’s grants would be recorded in the best way for his particular locality. Moreover, part of the purpose of issuing donation charters was forging new relationships, not only with the immediate beneficiary of the charter, but also with important local families. Again local notaries, who had pre-existing relationships with these families, were better placed to bind them to Adelaide.

---

61 E.g. Appendix 1, nos. 6-7; 16.
63 Fissore, ‘Pluralità,’ 160ff.
65 Cancian, ‘Notariato,’ 255.
Iudices

Iudices and, less commonly, iudices sacri palacii/palatii appear in many of Adelaide’s documents. Iudex has many meanings, none of which exactly correlate to modern English ‘judge’. At upper levels, iudex could refer to members of the aristocracy and could even be synonymous with ‘count’ or ‘duke’. At lower levels, the term could also refer to managers and assessors of estates, but it most commonly designated delegates of the count who performed a range of legal tasks: they made initial investigations, assessed evidence, determined how a case should proceed, and sometimes passed sentence. There is some evidence of iudices playing a specific legal role in Adelaide’s documents, but they acted most frequently as witnesses to her property transactions.

Iudices were laymen, who were often notaries before they became judges. They had a degree of literacy and some kind of legal expertise but, as with notaries, it is not precisely clear where, nor how, they were trained. Iudices sacri palatii were, in general, better educated, and had a higher status, than iudices. It is not certain who granted them their title, although it is likely that this was a royal or comital appointment. In other words, the iudices sacri palatii who appear in Adelaide’s charters may well have been chosen by her. Iudices seem to have been appointed for life, and were thus more secure in their position than viscounts (discussed below). Iudices also appear to have had a specific area of jurisdiction,
and are rarely documented elsewhere. A core group of *iudices* is often found in connection with Adelaide, particularly in and around the city of Turin, from 1064 onwards. This cadre of *iudices* was remarkably stable, and suggests that Adelaide succeeded in forging close ties with legal professionals who were beneficial to her. Three *iudices* in particular are discussed here: Burgundio, Gosvino and Erenzo.

*a) Burgundio (active: 1064-1083)*

The *iudex* Burgundio is particularly prominent in Adelaide’s documents. He is first recorded in a *placitum* held at Cambiano (c. 13km south-east of Turin) in July 1064, at which Adelaide and her son, Peter, presided over a property dispute relating to the monastery of Fruttuaria. This was a formal, public hearing at which Burgundio was present along with several other *iudices sacri palatii*, including Everard, Pagano, Vuazo, Albert, Erenzo and Gosvino. Several of these *iudices* frequently worked together alongside Adelaide.

In addition to this *placitum* Burgundio also witnessed many of Adelaide’s charters, particularly her important documents. In September 1064, for example, Burgundio and many of the same *iudices* who were present at Cambiano witnessed Adelaide’s generous grant to her foundation of Pinerolo. The reason that Adelaide’s documents were frequently witnessed by *iudices* is not entirely clear. Charles Radding suggests that their presence added to ‘the solemnity of the act and the bindingness of an agreement’. If *iudices* could bring security and authority to a document, it is not surprising that they frequently witnessed
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74 Gosvino, discussed below, is an exception. Padoa Schioppa, ‘Giustizia,’ 15 argues that *iudices* in Milan were quasi-itinerant.
75 Appendix 1, no. 13; on this *placitum*: chapter 7.
76 On Gosvino/Erenzo, see below. Everard also witnessed a donation of Adelaide’s to Pinerolo: Appendix 1, no. 14. Rossi/Gabotto, *Storia*, 98 n.2 argue that he is identical with the Everard found in two Novalesan charters: Cipolla, *Monumenta*, I, nos. 60 (2nd August 1020); 71 (26th February 1043). Vuazo, Albert and Pagano are only documented in this *placitum*. (Pagano might be identifiable with Pagano, viscount of Auriate [below n.110], or Guala-Pagano, Burgundio’s neighbour in Turin [chapter 7, n.97]).
77 Appendix 1, no. 14.
documents for the margravial family, and particularly their important acts. Nevertheless, their presence was not required for a document to be valid. After 1064, Burgundio did not witness Adelaide’s documents again until 1080, when he signed alongside Erenzo (now viscount of Turin). 79

More is known about Burgundio’s status, and his connection with Adelaide, than many other officers. 80 Burgundio’s father, Dominic, 81 may be identical with the Dominic who witnessed transactions for Adelaide’s parents, 82 which could indicate a long-standing relationship between Adelaide’s family and Burgundio’s. This is further suggested by his family’s origins in the valley of Susa, 83 a core area of Adelaide’s landholding. Burgundio is also one of the few officers documented in possession of property in the city of Turin. 84 Two charters issued in September 1075 indicate that Burgundio possessed a house in Turin, located near to the Porta Marmorea (one the principal gates to the city). 85 Burgundio’s house was a building of some significance which included a solarium, 86 from which these two documents (and perhaps others?) were issued. 87 These same charters also indicate that Burgundio owned property outside of the city, in Doasio (located at the confluence of the Sangone with the Po, just south of Turin), Magriano (modern Moncalieri?, c. 8km south of Turin), Venaria Reale and Collegno (c. 8km and c. 9km north-west of Turin). Burgundio’s

---

79 Appendix 1, nos. 38, 42-43.
80 Sergi, ‘Secolo,’ 459; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 484f.
81 BSSS 69/1, no. 9 (3rd September 1075).
82 Above, n.13.
83 Burgundio’s family were probably from Caselette (c. 17km west of Turin). (Baudi-di-Vesme, ‘Origini,’ 108 argues they were from Caselle, c. 14km north-west of Turin.) The purchase of land in Casellis is tentatively attributed to them on the basis of the recurrence of the names Domenic and Milo: BSSS 65, no. 2 (21st October 1020); Sergi, Potere, 123; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 485.
84 The index Alfredus (above n.11) also owned land in Turin: BSSS 44, no. 4 (1031).
85 BSSS 69/1 nos. 9-10 (3rd September 1075); Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 121f.
86 Houses with solaria were rare; there is only one other contemporary reference: Appendix 1, no. 14. On the solarium as a site of prestige/authority: de Jong, ‘Balcony’; chapter 7, n.94.
87 These are the only two documents issued in private homes in eleventh-century Turin; this remained rare until the mid-twelfth century: Fissore/Cancian, ‘Mobilità,’ 86ff., 103ff.
descendants built upon this land-lordship, particularly south of the city, to become the lords of Cavoretto (c.4km south-west of Pinerolo).  

*Burgundio’s signature (3rd September 1075)*

---

_b) Gosvino (active: 1063-1096)_

Information relating to the _iudex_ Gosvino is more speculative. Gosvino (with his name spelled in several different ways; sometimes with the addition of the nickname Merlo, sometimes not; and sometimes entitled _iudex_, sometimes not), witnessed documents for Adelaide, her son Peter, and her sister Immilla between 1064 and 1091. He also witnessed other people’s documents (1063-1080), and issued one of his own (1096). It is by no means certain that the _iudex_ Gosvino is the same man as either Gosvino (no title), or Gosvino-Merlo. Yet there are circumstantial, but suggestive, reasons for thinking that this is the case. Gosvino had connections with Adelaide’s dynasty, and with the monasteries of Pinerolo and Cavour. While he was primarily active in the Pinerolese, he also travelled to Turin to witness documents for Adelaide and her family. Moreover he is often attested alongside other key officers, including the _iudex_ Burgundio and Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno. This suggests that we are dealing with the same man, who was one of Adelaide’s officers.

---

88 BSSS 36, no. 14 (1153); BSSS 44, no. 31bis (1135); Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 487f.
89 From: Rossi/Gabotto, *Storia*, 98.
90 Appendix 1, no. 13: Gossinus iudex sacri palacii; 20: Goslinus; 25b: Gosuini qui Merulus dicitur; 37: Gozelini qui Melioret vocatur; 40: Gosuinus; Appendix 2, VII/5: Goselini. He may also have been one of the _boni homines_ who was present at a dispute settlement in Pinerolo: Appendix 1, no. 47a: Gauselmus.
91 BSSS 2/1, no. 19 (17th December 1079): Goslinus; no. 21 (21st December 1080): Goslini; BSSS 3/1, no. 11 (24th April 1063): Goslini iudex.
92 BSSS 2/1, no. 29 (28th March 1096): Gosuini qui Merulus dicitur.
94 Appendix 1, nos. 13; 40; Appendix 2, VII/5.
Gosvino was not simply part of Adelaide’s cadre of *iudices*: like Burgundio, he also built up land-lordship. In fact, Gosvino was more successful than Burgundio, and reached the stratum of the minor aristocracy (those who held lands in several localities, tithes in fief, possessed one or two castles, and/or other signorial rights). Burgundio did not quite reach this level: he had substantial property, in and around Turin, but there is no evidence that he possessed a castle, or other signorial interests. By contrast, in 1096 Gosvino-Merlo’s wife, Mary, acting with his consent, made a donation to the monastery of Pinerolo. The document was issued from the castle of Luserna (c.11km south-west of Pinerolo), suggesting that Mary and Gosvino-Merlo possessed the castle. They are thus identified as the ancestors of the lords of Luserna.

Although it is difficult to disentangle whether Adelaide appointed men as officers because they were already dominant in their localities, or whether these men leveraged the powers of office to become so, it is clear that office-holding was one means by which individuals (and their families) could become dominant at the local level. This bears out Bisson’s observations about ‘fidelitarian’ office, and its personal, proprietary nature: in return for their faithful service, eleventh-century officers received a share in lordship. Both Gosvino and Burgundio came from, and held lands in, core areas of Adelaide’s landholding and power, which suggests that they rose to prominence through her dynasty’s patronage. Gosvino and his descendants exercised power in and around Adelaide’s foundation of Pinerolo, although – perhaps significantly – it is not until after Adelaide’s death that we have evidence of Gosvino’s possession of the castle of Luserna. Burgundio and his family came
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95 BSSS 2/1, no. 29 (28th March 1096).
97 Sergi, *Potere*, 117, argues that officers owed their power to their appointment by Adelaide. In general: Collavini, ‘Signoria’.
98 Above, n.6.
99 Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 15f. By contrast, Barbero ‘Luserna,’ n.4, emphasises that the castle might have existed before this point, and simply not been documented.
from Caselette, in the lower valley of Susa (one area of Adelaide’s power); they owned
property in and around Turin, another centre of Adelaide’s power; and, as the lords of
Cavoretto, they also came to exercise power near Pinerolo, and over Caramagna (founded by
Adelaide’s parents).

c) Erenzo (active as iudex: 1064-1079; active as viscount: 1080-1095)

It is difficult to generalise about the status of Adelaide’s officers. Although some possessed
extensive property and even became part of the military aristocracy, others had fewer, and
more fragmented, landholdings. Erenzo, the final iudex under discussion here, is the latter
type. Erenzo had a long career alongside Adelaide, first as an iudex and later as a viscount.

The coincidence of names and occupations tentatively suggests that this Erenzo was related
to the Erenzo, notarius et iudex sacri palatii, who wrote several charters for Adelaide’s
parents. If so, this further suggests that Adelaide appointed officers from families with
whom her dynasty had long-standing connections. The younger Erenzo first appears in
Adelaide’s documents entitled iudex or iudex sacri palatii. He often witnessed
Adelaide’s documents alongside her other officers, including Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno, and
the iudices Burgundio and Gosvino. If the order in which individuals are listed as witnesses
in charters can be seen as an indication of their social standing, then Erenzo’s status was
high: in the witness-list of the placitum issued in 1064, his name is found immediately after
that of Adelaide’s son, Peter, and before all the other iudices. Yet Erenzo’s status was not
based on landholding: he is not documented accumulating extensive lands or signorial

100 Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 15.
101 Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 98f. n.2; on the earlier Erenzo: above n.9. Alternatively, Gabotto, ‘Visconti’ 219
speculates that Viscount Erenzo was a member of the Baratonia: n.173 below.
102 Appendix 1, nos. 14; 38.
103 Appendix 1, no. 13.
105 Appendix 1, no. 13.
powers. Instead he remained dependent upon Adelaide for his livelihood, and she rewarded him not with lands, but with promotion.

Just as some notaries progressed to become *iudices*, Erenzo’s career indicates that another possible progression was from *iudex* to viscount. Erenzo witnessed a document for Adelaide in July 1079, entitled *iudex*; by March 1080 he had been appointed *vice comes Taurinensis*.106 Thereafter Erenzo, entitled *vicecomes istius civitatis*, witnessed two further documents for Adelaide in Turin.107 Erenzo was not the only *iudex* to be appointed viscount.108 There was also Adalric, son of Arduin, *iudex adque vicecomes*,109 and Viscount Pagano of Auriate may well be the Pagano *iudex sacri palatii*, who was present at Cambiano in 1064 alongside Erenzo.110 The promotion of judices to the office of viscount suggests that Adelaide intended to create and maintain a core of skilled administrators.

This view is somewhat at odds with Bisson’s assessment of eleventh-century lordship, which he sees as based on fidelity, not administrative competence. Yet fidelity remained a factor in Adelaide’s decision-making: these newly-appointed officers were not simply competent; they also owed their position to Adelaide. Their promotion was means of ensuring their continued loyalty to, and, crucially, dependence upon, Adelaide. Unlike other *iudices* and viscounts, who were rewarded with grants of land and even castle-lordship, promotion to office was reversible. It was precisely because the fortunes of these officers were so closely tied to Adelaide’s favour and patronage that they are so prominent in her sources: these officers were less of a potential threat to her authority than men of viscomital or comital

106 Appendix 1, no. 38.
107 Appendix 1, nos. 42-43. Erenzo was also entitled viscount in a document issued by Adelaide’s granddaughter, Agnes: BSSS 45, no. 45 (March/April 1095).
108 Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 33f.
109 BSSS 44, no. 15 (14th June 1080). Adalric does not appear in any of Adelaide’s extant documents.
110 Appendix 1, nos. 13: *Paganus iudex sacri palatii*; 38: *dominus Paganus vice comes Auriatensis*. 
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The frequent presence of the same *iudices* in Adelaide’s documents, and the long duration of their careers, indicates the success of this policy.

**Viscounts**

The office of viscount was created by the Carolingians, and survived into the post-Carolingian era. Viscounts were typically local, urban, officers appointed by counts to act on their behalf. There was a potential for viscounts to become a threat to the count’s position. In French historiography, the appropriation of comital powers by viscounts in the eleventh century is often linked with discussions about the existence (or not) of a ‘feudal mutation’. In Italian historiography, the acquisition of autonomous power by viscounts is often compared with that of Lombard public officers called gastalds. Gastalds were appointed by the king to look after royal estates. They acted independently from Lombard dukes, with whom they often had an antagonistic relationship. Paolo Delogu maintains that, like gastalds, viscounts were competitors with counts in the administration of their counties. Was this the case with Adelaide’s viscounts?

a) **The Viscounts of Baratonia**

Viscounts are primarily documented in the city and county of Turin. There are occasional references to viscounts from elsewhere in Turin, but almost no evidence of viscounts in

Savoy at this time. Vitelmo-Bruno is Adelaide’s best documented viscount. He was a member of a family known as the Baratonia, after their main residence, the castle of Baratonia (c.25km north-west of Turin). The first reference to this castle is found in a donation charter issued by Vitelmo-Bruno for the canons of Oulx in 1090, but Vitelmo-Bruno was entitled *vicecomes de Barratonia* (sic) in a document issued by Adelaide in 1075.

*Vitelmo-Bruno’s 1090 donation charter (recorded in a later cartulary)*

*The reference to the castle of Baratonia is highlighted in yellow.*

The origins of the Baratonia may initially have been comparable to those of the *iudices* Burgundio and Gosvino, but by the mid-eleventh century the status of this family was elevated above their level. In addition to the title of viscount, and the castle of Baratonia, this family held a substantial amount of land to the north and west of Turin in the lower valleys of Ceronda, Susa and Lanzo. These were core areas of Adelaide’s landholding, and
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120 BSSS 45, no. 42 (July 1090).
121 Appendix 1, no. 27.
123 By contrast, Gabotto, ‘Visconti,’ esp. 218 argues that the Baratonia were descended from the ‘Manfrediner’ dynasty. For criticisms Gabotto’s methodology: Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ esp. 24f.; Settia, ‘Canonica,’ 22ff.
the Baratonia’s land-lordship was presumably accumulated with, at the very least, the permission of Adelaide’s family, and probably granted to them as a reward for their service. As we will see, the Baratonia also possessed the income from tithes and held other signorial rights; and, in the late eleventh century, a member of this family – Vitelmo – became bishop of Turin. Unlike some of the military aristocracy, the Baratonia increasingly had regional, rather than local, importance. Members of this family were thus both margravial representatives, and powerful territorial lords: this combination brought them into conflict with Adelaide.

Vitelmo-Bruno is found in connection with Adelaide in the 1060s and 1070s, sometimes entitled Viscount Bruno, sometimes *Vitelmi, qui Bruno vicecomes vocatur*, and on one occasion simply Viscount Vitelmo. Ferdinando Gabotto argued that Vitelmo and Vitelmo-Bruno were two different men with the same name. Yet a document issued by Adelaide’s son, Peter, in 1072 refers interchangeably to Viscount Vitelmo and Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno, indicating that this was one man.

Vitelmo-Bruno is sometimes said to be the same man, entitled Viscount Bruno, who witnessed a charter issued by Adelaide in 1041. Yet Vitelmo-Bruno also issued a document from the castle of Baratonia in 1090. If he is identical with this earlier Bruno, then he was active for almost fifty years (1041-1090). Although Adelaide was herself active throughout this period, Charles Radding argues that such lengthy careers are unusual. Moreover, the temporal break (1041-1064) is suggestive of change. Bruno and Vitelmo-Bruno may thus

125 Chapter 4.
126 *Bruno vicecomes*: Appendix 1, nos. 13, 21, 26, 27, 32; *Vitelmi, qui Bruno vicecomes vocatur*: nos. 14, 16; *Vitelimus vicecomitis*: no. 23.
127 Gabotto, ‘Visconti,’ 218.
128 Appendix 1, no. 25b; Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 24f.
130 BSSS 45, no. 42 (July 1090).
have been father and son.\footnote{Alternatively Gabotto, ‘Visconti,’ 218 argues that Vitelmo-Bruno’s father was Marchio/Marchisio, who witnessed one of Adelaide’s parents’ documents (Appendix 2, II/3): this explains why Vitelmo-Bruno’s son was called Henry-Marchisio.} Although the office of viscount (like that of \textit{iudex}) was not strictly heritable, Vitelmo-Bruno certainly groomed one of his sons, Henry-Marchisio, to succeed him. If Bruno and Vitelmo-Bruno were father and son, this would be further evidence of continuity of office-holding: Bruno may well have first served as viscount under Adelaide’s father, Olderic-Manfred.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{The Baratonia}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\hline
Viscount Bruno (1041) \\
\hline
Viscount Vitelmo Bruno (1064-1090) \\
\hline
Henry-Marchisio (1064-1090) & Otto (1090-1112?) & Vitelmo, bishop of Turin (c.1082-c.1092) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Vitelmo-Bruno is documented as viscount throughout much of Adelaide’s career. He is primarily found witnessing Adelaide’s documents, particularly those which were politically and dynastically significant, such as her first extant donation to the monastery of Santa Maria in Pinerolo.\footnote{Appendix 1, no. 14.} Vitelmo-Bruno is also present in many other documents issued by Adelaide, her son, Peter, and her sister, Immilla, for numerous religious institutions, including: the
monasteries of Fruttuaria,\textsuperscript{134} San Pietro in Turin,\textsuperscript{135} Caramagna,\textsuperscript{136} Cavour,\textsuperscript{137} San Pietro in Musinasco\textsuperscript{138} and Novalesa;\textsuperscript{139} the houses of canons at Oulx\textsuperscript{140} and Revello;\textsuperscript{141} and the cathedral church of Asti.\textsuperscript{142} With the exceptions of Asti and Revello, all of these institutions were located in, or near to, Adelaide’s centres of power: the cities of Turin (Fruttuaria, San Pietro in Turin) and Susa (Oulx, Novalesa), and the Pinerolese (Pinerolo, Caramagna, Cavour, Musinasco). Equally, these charters were either issued from the city of Turin and its environs,\textsuperscript{143} at other locations to the south and south-west of the city,\textsuperscript{144} or in the valley of Susa (a centre of Adelaide’s power where the Baratonia also held property).\textsuperscript{145}

Vitelmo-Bruno was one of the key officers in Adelaide’s entourage. He regularly travelled with Adelaide to witness her documents (in a way that other viscounts – discussed below – did not). This suggests, firstly, that Vitelmo-Bruno’s presence lent prestige and ‘bindingness’ to Adelaide’s agreements,\textsuperscript{146} and secondly that he had a wide-ranging jurisdiction. In fact, Giuseppe Sergi argues that Vitelmo-Bruno’s jurisdiction was so wide-ranging that it was not limited to one county.\textsuperscript{147} Yet Vitelmo-Bruno is only attested in charters which were issued in the county of Turin and, with one exception, for institutions which were also located in the county of Turin.\textsuperscript{148} Although he is not designated ‘viscount of Turin’ in any extant document, Vitelmo-Bruno was clearly a viscount with jurisdiction in the

\textsuperscript{134} Appendix 1, no. 13.
\textsuperscript{135} Appendix 1, no. 21; Appendix 2, VII/4.
\textsuperscript{136} Appendix 1, no. 25.
\textsuperscript{137} Appendix 1, no. 25b.
\textsuperscript{138} Appendix 2, VII/5.
\textsuperscript{139} Appendix 1, no. 32.
\textsuperscript{140} Appendix 1, no. 26; also Vitelmo-Bruno’s own document, above n.120.
\textsuperscript{141} Appendix 1, no. 27.
\textsuperscript{142} Appendix 1, no. 16.
\textsuperscript{143} Turin: Appendix 1, nos. 14; 21; Appendix 2, VII/4-5; Cambiano: Appendix 1, no. 13.
\textsuperscript{144} Appendix 1, nos. 25, 27.
\textsuperscript{145} Appendix 1, nos. 16, 25, 32.
\textsuperscript{146} Radding, \textit{Origins}, 48.
\textsuperscript{147} Sergi, ‘Origini,’ 16.
\textsuperscript{148} Adelaide’s donation to the cathedral church of Asti (Appendix 1, no. 16), is an exception, but this grant was issued at Almese, in the valley of Susa, and concerned property located in the county of Turin.
county of Turin. His territorial jurisdiction was evidently taken as read by his contemporaries.¹⁴⁹

It is not simply Vitelmo-Bruno’s area of jurisdiction which is ill-defined. Beyond a few sparse details, it is difficult to ascertain much about his role, or his relationship with Adelaide. Neat lists of functions can be misleading, particularly when taken from earlier or later periods, but evidence from Carolingian West Francia, as well as from twelfth-century northern Italy, indicates that viscounts were all-purpose officers, with wide-ranging responsibilities in the administration of the territory to which they were assigned.¹⁵⁰ Viscounts often had a financial role: they looked after the market of a city, oversaw trade and fairs, and were responsible for the collection of tolls and other revenues.¹⁵¹ This kind of managerial role accounts for Vitelmo-Bruno’s frequent presence as a witness: he had to be kept apprised of any property transactions that Adelaide made.¹⁵² Viscounts sometimes performed military service or guard duties, and are documented in possession of castles (as is the case with the Baratonia).¹⁵³ They also enforced the law and administered justice, presiding over local courts, mostly in relation to civil cases and lesser crimes, but sometimes more serious cases, too.¹⁵⁴ Appointing viscounts with legal expertise thus made good sense. Viscounts in Turin are only occasionally documented administering justice, but as we have seen, many of them were also iudices.

Although he was not entitled iudex in any extant document, Vitelmo-Bruno may also have had some form of legal training. One of Vitelmo-Bruno’s functions was assisting at the margravial court. He was present at one of the few extant placita held by Adelaide and her

¹⁴⁹ A viscount’s area of delegated authority was implicit in charters which were issued within that region. Viscounts were identified by regional jurisdiction only when they witnessed documents outside of this area, or alongside another viscount, e.g. Appendix 1, no. 38: dominus Erenzo vice comes Tiarinensis, dominus Paganus vice comes Auriatensis.
¹⁵⁰ Above n.112; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 469f.
¹⁵¹ Sickel, Vicecomitat, 62,75-79; Gardoni, ‘Famiglie,’ 189; Petti Balbi, ‘Visconti,’ esp. 139, 145ff.
¹⁵² Also: Hagger, ‘Vicomte,’ 64 (Norman viscounts).
¹⁵³ In general: Gardoni, ‘Famiglie,’ 190; Bordone, ‘Visconti,’ 395, 399f.
¹⁵⁴ Chapter 7; Sickel, Vicecomitat, 75; Bordone, ‘Visconti,’ esp. 386ff.; Bordone, Città, 346f.
son, Peter, where he acted as advocate for the monastery of Fruttuaria.155 According to Carolingian legislation, counts played a key role in choosing advocates either in conjunction with the bishop or local notables.156 Adelaide may thus have appointed Vitelmo-Bruno to act as Fruttuaria’s advocate.157 Adelaide’s son, Peter, did this more explicitly when he intervened in a dispute relating to Cavour in 1072. On Peter’s orders, vicecomes suus, Vitelmo-Bruno, requested that a document recording the settlement be drawn up.158

Even though Adelaide is not mentioned in this latter charter, it is important in terms of margravial administration in general and Adelaide’s power in particular. Given the number of counties under her control, Adelaide presumably delegated to viscounts (and other officers) with some frequency, but there is little surviving evidence of this. This could be a function of charter survival: documents issued by Adelaide’s family are more likely to have been preserved. Equally, it could indicate that either Adelaide, or her viscounts, had limited autonomy. Elke Goez argues that Adelaide’s contemporaries, Beatrice and Matilda of Tuscany (who ruled the mark of Tuscany), could not delegate to their officers with the same ease as their male family members.159 Was the same true for Adelaide? There is direct evidence of her son, Peter, delegating to Vitelmo-Bruno, and of her father, Olderic-Manfred, delegating the settlement of an earlier dispute,160 but there is less surviving evidence of Adelaide doing likewise.161 While certain iudices associated with Adelaide issued their own documents, and acted as witnesses for others,162 viscounts are found almost exclusively in

156 MGH. Capit. I, nos. 62 (809), c.22; 158 (822-823), c.9.
158 Appendix 1, no. 25b.
159 Goez, ‘Markgrafen,’ 94f.
160 Appendix 2, I/1.
161 But cf. chapter 7.
162 BSSS 2/1, nos. 19 (17 December 1079); 21 (21 December 1080); 29 (28 March 1096); BSSS 3/1, no. 11 (24 April 1063); BSSS 69/1, nos. 9-10 (3 September 1075).
documents issued by the margravial family.\textsuperscript{163} Did Adelaide feel the need to maintain greater control over her viscounts than she did over \textit{iudices}?

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{b) How much control did Adelaide have over her viscounts?}
\end{itemize}

The office of viscount was dismissible and there is some evidence to suggest that by c.1075/8, Vitelmo-Bruno was operating so far beyond Adelaide’s control that she felt the need to replace him with a more loyal officer. Vitelmo-Bruno was still alive, and calling himself viscount, in a document he issued at the castle of Baratonia in 1090,\textsuperscript{164} but neither he, nor his son Henry-Marchisio, are found in charters issued by Adelaide, or her family, after c.1075/8.\textsuperscript{165} Significantly, at about the time that Vitelmo-Bruno and Henry ceased to appear in Adelaide’s documents, other viscounts began to emerge:\textsuperscript{166} Viscount Anselm (of Revello/Auriate?),\textsuperscript{167} Viscount Erenzo of Turin, Viscount Pagano of Auriate, Viscount Adalric (no territorial designation)\textsuperscript{168} and Viscount Erembert (no territorial designation).\textsuperscript{169} The emergence of these new viscounts has been explained in two different ways: that Adelaide had multiple viscounts in Turin after c.1075/8; or that Adelaide removed Vitelmo-Bruno from office and replaced him with new viscount(s). Both of these arguments are made

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{163} Exceptions are: BSSS 44, no. 15 (14 June 1080); BSSS 45, no. 42 (July 1090).
  \item \textsuperscript{164} BSSS 45, no. 42 (July 1090).
  \item Vitelmo-Bruno is present in Adelaide’s sister, Immilla’s documents until December 1077 (Appendix 2, VII-4-5), but he may have ceased to appear in Adelaide’s documents before this, depending on whether a donation of Adelaide’s for Novalesa was issued in 1063 or 1078 (Appendix 1, no. 32). The authenticity of this charter is doubtful (chapter 1, n.185), especially its dating clause. According to the text of the charter, Adelaide and her sons made the donation on 16th July 1039 (\textit{Anno ab incarnatione Domini millesimo septuagesimo octavo indictione prima, epacta quarta, XVII kalendas augusti}). This must be a mistake, since neither of Adelaide’s sons was born in 1039. Moreover, the indiction given is not consistent with 1039 (and must be corrected to VII); it does correspond to the years 1063 and 1078. Consequently the charter is sometimes dated to 1078 (MHP Chart I, no. 391, col. 657; Muratori, \textit{Antiquitates}, I, 231); sometimes to 1063 (Carutti, \textit{‘Supplemento,’ no. XV}).
  \item \textsuperscript{165} For what follows: Tarpino, \textit{‘Tradizione,’ 13-17; Sergi, \‘Origini,’} 17f.
  \item \textsuperscript{166} Appendix 1, no. 27. This charter was issued in Revello, in the south of the county of Turin, and recorded the donation of goods primarily in the county of Auriate. Viscount Anselm may thus have been viscount of Auriate, or the lord of Revello.
  \item \textsuperscript{167} On viscounts Erenzo/Pagano/Adalric: nn.107-111, above.
  \item \textsuperscript{168} Appendix 1, no. 40. This charter concerns property in Saluzzo. Viscount Erembert might thus be the son of Viscount Aribert, who possessed lands in Villanova (modern Villanova Solaro?) in Saluzzo: Appendix 1, no. 27. (Erembert of Villanova witnessed another of Adelaide’s documents: no. 14.)
\end{itemize}
on the basis of charter evidence alone; while each has merit, the scarcity of charter attestations makes it impossible to reach a definite conclusion. In what follows, both explanations (plus a third inter-related possibility) are discussed; and it is argued that a letter written by Bishop Mainard of Turin (previously unconsidered in this respect) makes the case for Vitelmo-Bruno’s exclusion from office more compelling.

The first explanation is that since Vitelmo-Bruno was still entitled viscount (although not in Adelaide’s documents) in 1090, his office-holding overlapped with other viscounts. Sergi argues in favour of this on the basis of a charter recording Adelaide’s grant to Revello in 1075.\textsuperscript{170} According to Giovanni Collino’s edition of this charter, Vitelmo-Bruno was referred to in the witness-list as ‘viscount of Baratonia’, and his name was followed by that of his son, Henry (\textit{Henricus}).\textsuperscript{171} Yet Sergi, among others, indicates that the second name was in fact Erenzo (\textit{Herencius}); that the viscomital title is plural, and both Vitelmo-Bruno and Erenzo are entitled \textit{viscomites de Barratonia} (sic).\textsuperscript{172} For Sergi, this shared title indicates that Vitelmo-Bruno and Erenzo were related.\textsuperscript{173} Sergi further argues that ‘Viscount Erenzo of Baratonia’ is the same Erenzo who is also attested as \textit{iudex} and viscount of Turin.\textsuperscript{174} If so, this would indicate that there was familial continuity, and an (amicable?) overlap of office.

It is thus possible that after c. 1075/8 Adelaide had multiple viscounts in Turin and that Vitelmo-Bruno is simply undocumented in his (continuing) role. In 1083, for example, Erenzo is said to be \textit{vicecomes ipsius ciuitatis}.\textsuperscript{175} This could suggest that the city of Turin was gaining in prominence as an autonomous administrative area, and that a new viscount was required with specific jurisdiction in the city, while Vitelmo-Bruno continued as viscount.

\textsuperscript{170} Appendix 1, no. 27.
\textsuperscript{171} \textit{BSSS} 45, no 27: \textit{vicecomes de Barratonia Brunus, Henricus}.
\textsuperscript{172} Provero, ‘Revello,’ 293; Sergi, \textit{Potere}, 117 n.10; Sergi, ‘Origini,’ 18. These scholars all refer to the same manuscript (AST, Corte, Prevostura d’Oulx, mazzo I, n. 86), which I have not examined.
\textsuperscript{173} Sergi, ‘Origini,’ 18. Similarly, Gabotto, ‘Visconti’ esp. 218f. argues that both Vitelmo-Bruno and Erenzo, and also Viscount Adalric (above, n.109), were all members of the Baratonia. For criticism of Gabotto’s methodology: above, n.122.
\textsuperscript{174} Sergi, ‘Origini,’ 18.
\textsuperscript{175} Appendix 1, nos. 42-43.
of the county of Turin. Equally, some rulers chose to delegate the same, or similar, tasks and responsibilities to several officers at the same time. This overlapping jurisdiction ensured firstly, that even if one officer was not effective, another would be; but more importantly, it was a means of delegating to local elites whilst still maintaining central control, as officers were kept in constant competition with each other.\footnote{In general: Davis, ‘Pattern,’ 243ff.; Depreux, ‘Rôle,’ esp. 111; Brown, Unjust, 120-123.}

There are problems with Sergi’s argument: the Erenzo in Adelaide’s charter for Revello (1075) is unlikely to be to be Viscount Erenzo of Turin.\footnote{Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 27f.} This Erenzo is attested as \textit{iudex} (1064-1079), and only entitled viscount of Turin after 1080.\footnote{Above, pp.204ff.} It is improbable that he would have been entitled viscount in 1075, only to be designated \textit{iudex} in 1079, and then entitled viscount (now of Turin, rather than Baratonia) again after 1080.\footnote{Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 27f.} The nature of the manuscript makes this unlikely, too. The Revello charter only survives in a thirteenth-century copy, which contains later interpolations.\footnote{On the charter, and its interpolations: Provero, ‘Revello’.} This means that the reference to ‘Baratonia’ may well be a retrospective addition, and/or that copyists could have mistakenly pluralised the viscomital title, or altered Henry/Erenzo’s name.

The second explanation for the absence of Vitelmo-Bruno from Adelaide’s charters after c.1075/8 is that he had been deprived of office and replaced by Erenzo.\footnote{Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 15f., 33f.; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 467, 483.} If Vitelmo-Bruno was permanently excluded from office, then his continued use of the title of viscount in 1090\footnote{Above n.120.} suggests that this office, and his connection with the margravial family, was paramount in terms of legitimising his activities.\footnote{Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 7, 31f.; Sergi, ‘Origini,’ 18.} A third, inter-related, possibility, is that Vitelmo-Bruno was only temporarily deprived of office. Since Vitelmo-Bruno was a prominent and powerful man who was, for many years, one of Adelaide’s most important
advisors, it is unlikely that Adelaide wished to alienate him completely. She may thus have restored him to office. Erenzo is attested as viscount of Turin from 1080 to 1083 (and then again in 1095);\(^{184}\) it is therefore possible that Vitelmo-Bruno was excluded from office, c.1075/8-c.1083, and thereafter was restored to favour and to office.\(^{185}\) Vitelmo-Bruno’s use of the title of viscount in 1090 would thus be legitimate. As for Erenzo, after 1083 he is not attested as viscount again until 1095 – had Vitelmo-Bruno died by 1095? Or was there an overlap of office from c.1083 onwards?\(^{186}\)

Viscounts were appointed by counts/margraves to act as their officials and could be replaced by them,\(^{187}\) but to deprive a man of his office (even temporarily) was a significant political act: why might Adelaide have deposed Vitelmo-Bruno? Several factors suggest that by c.1075/8, Vitelmo-Bruno no longer fully recognised Adelaide’s authority. There is evidence that the Baratonia were starting to exercise ‘private’, dynastic functions at Adelaide’s expense. In particular, the designation of Vitelmo-Bruno as *vicecomes de Barratonia* suggests that he was gaining in both territorial and dynastic strength, and increasingly becoming a potential threat to Adelaide’s position.\(^{188}\) Hélène Débax argues (in relation to France) that viscounts prospered best when counts/margraves were weak or absent.\(^{189}\) It may thus be the case that the impact of the political crises of Henry IV’s reign,\(^{190}\) and/or the deaths of Adelaide’s sons Peter (d.1078) and Amadeus (d.1080),\(^{191}\) adversely affected her relationship with Vitelmo-Bruno. As we have seen, there is evidence that
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\(^{184}\) Above, pp.204f.

\(^{185}\) One stage in this restoration may have been Vitelmo-Bruno’s presence in Adelaide’s charters without the viscomital title. Gabotto, ‘Visconti,’ 218 suggests that the *iudex* Bruno, who witnessed two of Adelaide’s charters in 1083 alongside Viscount Erenzo, and the *indices* Burgundio and Otbert, could well be Vitelmo-Bruno, stripped of the title of viscount (Appendix 1, nos. 42-43). Without either the title, or the double name (Vitelmo-Bruno), this identification is dubious: Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 22 n.44.

\(^{186}\) For possible parallels with Pisa, where after 1081 there were two viscomital families (pro-Matildine/pro-imperial): Pratesi, ‘Visconti’; Wickham, *Sleepwalking*, 76.

\(^{187}\) Débax, ‘Vice-comtes,’ 14.

\(^{188}\) Débax, ‘Vice-comtes,’ 19.

\(^{189}\) Chapters 2-3.

\(^{190}\) Appendix 1, nos. 33c, 36b.
Adelaide felt the need to shore up her authority in the city of Turin between c.1078 and c.1083. As part of this process, Adelaide re-organised her political-administrative apparatus: appointing a new, loyal, viscount (Erenzo), in place of an officer from a family who had proved unreliable (Vitelmo-Bruno/the Baratonia).

Significantly, Erenzo had a different social profile from Vitelmo-Bruno. Erenzo was part of the cadre of iudices who were closely associated with Adelaide from the 1060s onwards. He was also one of several iudices whom Adelaide appointed as viscounts in the late 1070s/early 1080s, and while this encouraged their future loyalty to Adelaide, she did not simply rely on their goodwill. Based on surviving charters, Erenzo did not own extensive property either in the city of Turin or outside it. This lack of a landed power-base presumably made it easier for Adelaide to control Erenzo than Vitelmo-Bruno. Moreover, the precision of Erenzo’s title (uicecomes ipsius ciuitatis) suggests an attempt on Adelaide’s part to ensure that her new viscounts stayed within circumscribed limits. Nor, unlike the Baratonia, did Erenzo create a dynasty: nothing is known of his descendants.

By contrast, Vitelmo-Bruno groomed his son to succeed him. His son is sometimes attested simply as Henry, at others as Henricus qui vocatur Marchio/Marchisio, and sometimes as Marchisio. This nickname is indicative of the family’s elevated view of its own status. Henry-Marchisio witnessed at least three (and perhaps four) of Adelaide’s documents alongside his father. In at least one of these documents, Henry-Marchisio appears to share the title of viscount with Vitelmo-Bruno. It is uncertain whether Vitelmo-Bruno and Henry-Marchisio shared the office of viscount, or were using Vitelmo-Bruno’s
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192 Chapter 4, nn.101-103.
193 Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 33f.
194 Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 115 argue that Henry-Marchisio’s nickname suggests that he was related to Adelaide’s family.
195 Appendix 1, nos. 14, 16, 21; Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 14, 26f. As we have seen, there is some dispute about the fourth charter: no. 27.
196 Appendix 1, no. 21: Bruno vicecomites et Enrici pater et filio; perhaps also no. 27?
title as an element of family identity and power (like the Visconti in Milan), but in either
case, there is a clear tendency towards increasing their own autonomy. Nevertheless Adelaide
did not appoint Henry-Marchisio as viscount, but a new man instead. This emphasised, first,
that offices were not automatically heritable. Second, Adelaide’s decision indicates that it
was not simply Vitelmo-Bruno, but his whole family, that had fallen out of favour.

A letter written by Bishop Mainard of Turin (r.1099-1117/8) to Archbishop Jordan of
Milan (r.1112-1120) strongly suggests that Adelaide’s relationship not only with Viscount
Vitelmo-Bruno, but also with his son, Henry-Marchisio, became antagonistic. Mainard wrote
to request Jordan’s help in resolving a long-standing dispute between the female monastery
of San Pietro in Turin and Vitelmo-Bruno’s sons over possession of tithes in Scarnafigi. This
dispute, and its implications, are discussed in detail in chapter 7; the crucial point here is that
Henry-Marchisio appropriated tithes which Adelaide had donated to San Pietro. Adelaide
restored this property c.1075/8, that is, at about the same time that she also deprived Vitelmo-
Bruno of office. This was not a coincidence: Henry-Marchisio’s actions, combined with the
increasing territorial and dynastic strength of the Baratonia, convinced Adelaide of the need
to remove Vitelmo-Bruno from office.

**Conclusion**

Adelaide’s officers were not a homogenous body of men: they ranged across a spectrum from
(relatively) lowly notaries to members of the military aristocracy. With the exception of
particularly high-status notaries, the men who wrote Adelaide’s documents were only loosely
affiliated with her; instead they were chosen for their local connections, and thus they tended
to remain in one place. By contrast, Adelaide maintained successful, co-operative, working
relationships with several *iudices* and viscounts, many of whom travelled with her,
witnessing her charters in more than one location, over a long period of time. More is known
about some of these officers – the *iudices* Burgundio and Gosvino, and viscounts Vitelmo-Bruno and Erenzo – than others. Together these men formed the core of Adelaide’s advisors, who were present for the issuing of most of Adelaide’s most important documents. The presence of these officers in Adelaide’s documents is evidence of an increasingly organised administration, and of Adelaide’s control of the traditional margravial hierarchy. Adelaide’s close connections with these officers thus strengthened her position in Turin and in more peripheral regions.

Adelaide encouraged loyalty in her officers by rewarding them with lands and titles. This explains, in part, why these officers were more closely incorporated into Adelaide’s administration than men from comital or margravial families, who were a greater threat to Adelaide’s position. In addition to personal loyalty to Adelaide, institutional continuity also played a role in these preferential relationships: many of Adelaide’s officers, including the ‘margravial’ notary Giselbert, the *iudex* Burgundio, and the viscounts Erenzo and Vitelmo-Bruno, were (in all probability) the sons of men who had served Adelaide’s parents. Yet Adelaide was not constrained by tradition or heritability of office. The promotion of other men (from notary to *iudex*, or *iudex* to viscount) indicates that a key factor in Adelaide’s choice of officer was competence.

Notaries and *iudices* in Turin were, increasingly, highly-skilled professionals: they often had expert training; their areas of activity were (relatively) clearly defined; and there were prospects for advancement within their field. It is harder to describe Adelaide’s viscounts, who had such a wide-ranging competence that their role (and often their area of jurisdiction, too) was ill-defined, as ‘professionals’. Nevertheless, certain factors indicate a degree of professionalization here, too. The first is the appointment of legal experts as viscounts, and the second is the tighter definition of viscounts’ jurisdiction. These same
factors also emphasised the ‘public’ nature of the viscount’s office. Adelaide’s administration thus encompassed aspects of both ‘fidelitarian’ and ‘official’ service.

Several of Adelaide’s officers, including Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno and the _iudex_ Gosvino-Merlo, built up castle-lordships and formed lordly dynasties (the Baratonia and the Luserna). Nevertheless Adelaide maintained forceful and effective control over her officers. In fact, Adelaide’s power was such that, despite a tendency towards heritability of office, when officers threatened her position she was able to remove them. Despite their build-up of an independent lordship, the Baratonia evidently did not pose a significant threat to Adelaide: she was able to replace Vitelmo-Bruno, an established and powerful viscount, with new officer(s) of her choice. This indicates the strength of Adelaide’s position in Turin and the extent of her control in the city and its environs. It also, correspondingly, indicates the weak position of her viscounts, whose office-holding was characterised by a degree of vulnerability. Public power in Turin remained in Adelaide’s hands and those of the officers whom she chose to appoint.
Chapter 6
Adelaide and Asti, Bredulo and Ventimiglia

Adelaide is most frequently documented in the county of Turin, but she also had vast possessions throughout other counties in the mark of Turin. Her dynasty held not only margravial authority, but also comital authority in many – but not all – of the counties which made up the mark of Turin. Yet Adelaide was not dominant throughout all of her territory, all of the time.¹ She had to contend and compete with rival networks of bishops, monasteries, and local elites. Many of the men who appear alongside Adelaide also cultivated bonds with other lords (often bishops). By this means, they were able to shift their loyalties according to the situation so as to maximise their own position. Adelaide’s power, which was based on these changeable bonds, was thus not consistently nor systematically felt throughout her territories.²

This chapter considers by what means, and with what results, Adelaide attempted to impose hegemonic claims over her possessions in the linked counties of Asti and Bredulo, and also in the county of Ventimiglia. Successful rule depended, to a large extent, on a ruler’s ability to cultivate strong personal ties with those around them.³ This chapter considers the ways in which reciprocity was established between Adelaide and local elites in the counties of Asti and Bredulo, and the duration of these connections. In addition to Adelaide’s changing relationship with the bishops of Asti, the on-going processes by which Adelaide attempted to establish and maintain relations with the nascent commune of Asti and its surrounding area, and, particularly, with local elite families, are discussed. What did Adelaide offer these groups? And how did the impact of various crises of Adelaide’s power affect her

¹ In general: Tabacco, Struggle, 131-136; Sergi, ‘Anscarici’.
² In general: Barton, Lordship, ch.4.
ability to negotiate with these elites, and make her influence felt? Adelaide’s attempt to gain the support of key families in specific localities can clearly be seen in her dealings with two lordly families in border areas between the counties of Turin, Bredulo and Asti: the Morozzo and the Sarmatorio. Yet other groups could not be encouraged to join Adelaide’s political network: in the city of Asti itself, Adelaide used force to assert her control. By contrast in the county of Ventimiglia, which is considered in the final section of this chapter, Adelaide did not establish connections between herself and local elites, and appears to have accepted her loss of influence in this region.

**Adelaide and the counties of Asti and Bredulo**

*Adelaide’s dynasty and Asti*

The medieval county of Asti extended out from its centre, the city of Asti. It was bounded to the north and east by the mark of Montferrat; to the south and west, it was bounded by the counties of Alba and Turin. To the south-west, where Asti’s jurisdiction extended furthest (c.40-45km), it was bounded by the county of Bredulo. Adelaide’s holdings in Asti were extensive, particularly in the south-west of the county, and to the east of the city of Asti, around the castle of Annone (modern Castello di Annone). Because of the lack of surviving sources from Asti, there is little evidence of Adelaide’s dynasty’s possessions in, or control of, the county of Asti before Adelaide. The first clear reference to Adelaide’s jurisdiction in Asti is retrospective: after Adelaide’s death, Henry IV of Germany issued a diploma granting Bishop Otto of Asti (r.1080-1098/1102) jurisdiction over the county of Asti, *sicut illum*
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4 On medieval Asti: Bordone, *Città; Fisso*, *Autonomia.*
5 Appendix 1, no. 16.
6 Appendix 1, no. 46.
7 On documentary scarcity in Asti: Bordone, *Città*, 332. Bordone suspects that documents were deliberately destroyed by the bishop/citizens of Asti. Since the city was twice burned by Adelaide (discussed below), documents may also have been destroyed inadvertently.
8 BSSS 28, nos. 66 (950/1); 88 (January 964); DD OIII no. 408 (1001); Appendix 2, III/1; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 686-694; Previté-Orton, *History*, 163f.
Nevertheless Adelaide’s dynasty certainly had de facto control of the county, and probably also comital authority, from Adelaide’s great-grandfather, Arduin Glaber, onwards. Adelaide’s father, Olderic-Manfred, ensured that his dynasty was dominant in Asti during his lifetime: with the help of Emperor Henry II (r.1002-1024), he imposed his brother, Alric, as bishop of Asti (r.1008-1036).

After the deaths of her father and uncle in the mid-1030s, Adelaide lost influence in Asti for a time and, with imperial support, the bishops re-gained power. This can clearly be seen in a diploma issued by Emperor Henry III (r.1039-1056) for Bishop Peter II of Asti (r.1040-1054). In 1041 Henry III confirmed the extension of the bishop’s jurisdiction around the city of Asti in circuitu et circumquaque usque ad septem miliaria, and the bishop’s possession of the county of Bredulo including omnia eciam iura Bredulensis comitatus et publicas functiones. Although the grant appears to demonstrate the bishop’s strength, it indicates a crisis in his – and Adelaide’s – lordship. Members of local elites, such as the Morozzo and the Sarmatorio (discussed below), had taken advantage of the power vacuum brought about by the deaths of Adelaide’s father and uncle, and made gains at the bishop’s expense in Asti and, particularly, in Bredulo. Bishop Peter was unable to regain his possessions on his own. Adelaide was evidently unable (or unwilling?) to help him, and Peter turned instead to the emperor for support.

Further evidence of a crisis in Asti, c.1040, can be seen in an attack on the monastery of Sant’Anastasio in Asti. This female house, attested since the late eighth century, was
increasingly seen as an episcopal monastery in the eleventh century. A grant issued by Bishop Peter in 1043 indicates that Sant’Anastasio had been subjected to a violent attack, c.1040, in which its buildings were largely destroyed. It is not clear who carried out the attack, or why, but the perpetrators evidently did not fear reprisals either from the bishop of Asti, or Adelaide (whose uncle, Bishop Alric, had been a key supporter of Sant’Anastasio). Adelaide’s loss of power in Asti is further underlined by the nuns’ response to the attack: they did not turn to Adelaide for help, but to Bishop Peter, who ceded control of the castle of Bredulo and part of the forest of Bannali to Sant’Anastasio in recompense. Although the bishop of Asti had lost some power, he was evidently in a stronger position than Adelaide.

**Adelaide and Bredulo**

The medieval county of Bredulo was linked with the county of Asti in the eleventh century. Bredulo comprised of territory between the Tanaro and Stura rivers and the Ligurian Alps, and was completely surrounded by other counties in the mark of Turin: in the north, Bredulo intersected with the counties of Auriate, Turin, Alba and Asti; to the west it was bounded by the county of Auriate and the Ligurian Alps; to the south by the county of Ventimiglia; and to the east by the county of Alba. Adelaide is documented in possession of property throughout Bredulo, particularly in the north of the county. Although Bredulo was part of the sphere of influence of Adelaide’s dynasty, they did not – initially – possess comital
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18 Fissore, ‘Problemi,’ no. 1 (1043); Bordone, *Città,* 319, 326ff.
19 Appendix 2, V/3, V/11 (this latter grant was confirmed by Adelaide’s parents); Fissore, ‘Problemi,’ 449ff, 477.
20 Fissore, ‘Problemi,’ no. 1 (1043). Bordone, *Città,* 329f. sees further evidence of episcopal loss of influence in this grant, because Peter did not cede the property he currently held to Sant’Anastasio, but as it had been during Bishop Alric’s time.
21 Previté-Orton, *History,* 159.
22 Bordone, ‘Tentativo’.
23 Appendix 1, nos. 14, 31.
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Adelaide’s father, Olderic-Manfred, and uncle, Bishop Alric, exerted control in Bredulo, but after their deaths Adelaide lost influence, just as she had in Asti. As we have seen, Henry III’s diploma indicates that Bredulo was formally subject to the authority of the bishop of Asti in 1041.  

Probably also in 1041 Henry III issued a second diploma at the request of Bishop Peter. This records the appointment of one of Peter’s milites, Cunibert, as royal missus in toto episcopatu Astensi et in comitatu Bredolensi. Charles Previté-Orton interpreted the appointment of one of Bishop Peter’s milites as missus as further confirmation of the bishop’s control over Bredulo. Yet Adelaide’s loss of influence is not as total as sometimes supposed. Cunibert was an episcopal miles of long-standing, who thus had links with Adelaide’s dynasty. In 1034 Cunibert and his cousin, Viscount Lito (of Asti?), witnessed a charter issued by Adelaide’s uncle, Bishop Alric. No viscounts are present in any of the surviving documents issued by Adelaide’s parents, but it is likely that Viscount Lito was a margravial officer. Adelaide maintained links with both Viscount Lito and Cunibert.  

As we shall see, at some point between 1041 and 1089 (probably after 1070) the bishop’s control over Bredulo was undermined both by Adelaide and by local elite families. In fact, from the mid-eleventh century onwards, Adelaide attempted to increase her control throughout south-western Piedmont, especially in the border areas between the counties of
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24 Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 690-694; Previté-Orton, History, 159f.  
25 Above, n.14. Diplomas indicating that Bredulo was granted to the bishops of Asti in the tenth century contain later interpolations: Schiaparelli, Diplomi, nos. 13 (901); 5 (902).  
26 DD HIII no. 71 (dated 1041) = BSSS 28, no. 169 (dated 1041x1046).  
27 Previté-Orton, History, 159f.  
28 Bordone, ‘Visconti,’ 392f.; Bordone, Città, 328f.  
29 Appendix 2, V/18.  
30 Fissore, ‘Problemi,’ 79f.; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 689. Bordone first argued that Lito was a margravial viscount (Bordone, Città, 319f.); then that Lito was an episcopal viscount (Bordone, ‘Visconti,’ 392). Since Bishop Alric was Olderic-Manfred’s brother, Lito was an Arduinid officer in either case.  
31 Appendix 1, no. 8. Lito also issued a document of his own (PRI, II/2, no. 317), in which he promised not to disturb another of Adelaide’s grants (Appendix 1, no. 12); and may have witnessed another of Adelaide’s charters (no. 17).  
32 On power-struggles in the region: Bordone, Città, 80, 85, 328-351; Bordone, ‘Tentativo’; Sergi, Confini, 90ff., 116ff.
Turin, Bredulo and Asti. The next sections consider how Adelaide sought to increase her influence in these counties: through land acquisition and donations; by intervening in the appointment of the bishop of Asti; through the use of force; and by building relationships with members of local elites. Much of this activity was reactive: Adelaide did not have a fully worked out ruling ‘policy’, but rather responded to crises and opportunities as best she could to maximise her own position.

Adelaide and Asti (1040s-1060s)

That Adelaide – a young and inexperienced ruler – experienced difficulties in establishing her position after the deaths of her father and uncle is hardly surprising. In Adelaide’s case these difficulties were compounded by the fact that she was an unmarried woman. Thus – in an attempt to stabilise her position – Adelaide married Henry of Montferrat (c.1041).\(^{33}\) Marriage to Henry increased the likelihood that Adelaide would be able to re-establish her dominance in Asti and Bredulo not simply because now there was a titular margrave in Turin, but more specifically because Henry’s lands in Montferrat arched around the northern and eastern borders of the county of Asti (Map 1).\(^{34}\)

There are few extant charters from Asti in the 1040s and 1050s, but from the 1060s there is evidence that Adelaide was attempting to forge links both with Bishop Girelmo of Asti (r.1054-1065), who had been a subdeacon under her uncle, Bishop Alric,\(^{35}\) and also with episcopal clients. In 1064 Ribaldus of Fiblina was in Turin, where he witnessed Adelaide’s foundation of the monastery of Pinerolo.\(^{36}\) The toponym Fiblina links Ribaldus with the bishop of Asti, since Fiblina (probably identifiable with modern Fubine, c.19km east of Asti)

\(^{33}\) Above, p.47.
\(^{34}\) Bonanate, ‘Reti,’ 23f.
\(^{35}\) On Girelmo: Bordone, Città, 331ff.; Savio, Vescovi, 139f.
\(^{36}\) Appendix 1, no. 14.
was an episcopal castle. More significantly, in 1065 Adelaide and her sister, Bertha, acting separately, made sizeable (and complementary) donations to the cathedral church of Asti: in April, Bertha and her sons donated property from four estates in Castagnole Lanze, Loreto, Montaldo Scarampi and Rochetta Tanaro; and in May Adelaide donated property totalling 300 iugera (195 acres) in nearby Santo Stefano Belbo, and also in Canale. Both documents were written by the episcopal notary, Benzo notarius sacri palatii; they were also witnessed by Girelmo’s important lay officers (Paganus signifer and Rodulfus vicedominus respectively). Two clients of the bishop of Asti, Liudo and Amadeus of Serralunga, also appear in Adelaide’s document.

Adelaide’s donation in 1065 enabled her to intervene in Astigian affairs, but Girelmo’s death in late 1065 provided her with an even greater opportunity to increase her control in the county: she imposed Ingo as the new bishop. Ingo’s appointment was not intended to be inflammatory. Like Girelmo, he was probably Astigian; he had also been a subdeacon under a previous bishop of Asti (in Ingo’s case, Bishop Peter). He was thus knowledgeable about ecclesiastical affairs in Asti, and attempted to maintain good relationships with episcopal officers and clients. Yet Ingo had a reputation as a simoniac and anti-reformer, and Pope Alexander II (r.1061-1073) wrote to remind Adelaide that Ingo’s consecration – carried out by Archbishop Guido of Milan – was invalid. This letter suggests

37 Bordone, Città, 334 n.257. Fubine was confirmed as an episcopal castle in 1041: DD HIII, no. 70.
38 Appendix 2, VI/2.
39 Appendix 1, no. 16. Adelaide had previously purchased this property from Marino and his sons: no. 15.
40 Benzo (active: 1065-1094) wrote documents for three successive bishops of Asti (Girelmo, Ingo and Otto), as well as others, relating to the bishopric and the canons of Asti: Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 195.
41 Appendix 1, no. 16. Amadeus also witnessed a donation by Adelaide’s sister, Immilla (Appendix 2, VII/5). It is inferred that Liudo and Amadeus were episcopal clients, since Amadeus’ son – Lito – is later documented in the entourage of the bishop of Asti (BSSS 26/1, no. 110 [11th October 1117]); Bordone, Città, 334 n.257.
42 On Ingo: Bordone, Città, 335ff.; Savio, Vescovi, 140ff.; d’Acunto, ‘Ingone’; Appendix 1, nos. 19c, 22a, 32, 33a, 36.
43 Fissore, ‘Problemi,’ no. 1 (1043); d’Acunto, ‘Ingone’.
44 Many of Ingo’s documents were written by Benzo, who also wrote for Girelmo (above n.40). Ingo also carried out transactions with men who had long-standing connections with the bishopric of Asti, e.g. Stephen, son of Milo: BSSS 28, no. 180 (23rd May 1072), whose father, had previously witnessed documents relating to the bishopric: BSSS 28, no. 174 (21st August 1053); Appendix 2, VI/2.
45 Appendix 1, no. 19c.
that Adelaide had a key role to play in church matters, and is thus evidence of the continuing existence of the ‘margravial church’. Despite her promotion of other aspects of religious change, Adelaide continued to support Ingo, not only against papal opposition, but also against the opposition of many of the citizens of Asti. This lead to a long-running conflict (c.1066-1070) which, according to Arnulf of Milan (writing c.1077), culminated in Adelaide besieging and burning the city of Asti:

*Per idem tempus ad instar Papiensium* Astenses quoque datum sibi reprobant episcopum, set prudentia comitissae Adeleide, militaris admodum domine, post longi temporis conflicitus, incensa tandem urbe, contempto altero quem elegierant, priorem suscipiunt." 

Arnulf is the only contemporary to record Adelaide’s attack on Asti. Although details of these events are sparse, it is clear Adelaide’s hold on the city (and county?) of Asti was weak at this time, or she would not have struggled to impose Ingo as bishop. In this conflict Adelaide was presumably supported by the bishop and his entourage, which might have included men such as Liudo and Amadeus of Serralunga, and Ribaldus of *Fiblina*. Yet a sizeable proportion of the local elite (as well as the lower orders in the city?), who are now invisible to us, must have opposed Adelaide and Ingo.

Following Arnulf’s account, the factions in Asti are often seen as being pro-papal and pro-reform (the Patarenes and their unknown candidate), versus anti-papal and anti-reform (Adelaide and Ingo). This is overly simplistic. Although Alexander II questioned the legitimacy of Ingo’s consecration, Ingo was recognised as bishop of Asti by Pope Gregory
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46 Chapter 4.
47 The Pavians rejected Bishop Odelric, *c.*1056/7.
48 Appendix 1, no. 22a; Bordone, *Città*, 331, 335-340; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 689; Guglielmotti, *Morozzo*, esp. 90. Previté-Orton, *History*, 228 thinks Arnulf was referring to the imposition of Girelmo as bishop. Arnulf does not date these events, but later Astigian chronicles indicate that the attack occurred on 23rd April 1070, and thus related to Ingo.
50 Above n.45.
VII, while the pro-imperial author, Bishop Benzo of Alba, wrote dismissively about Ingo, disparaging his youth, and his trust in worldly wisdom. The conflict in Asti was as much about Adelaide’s increasing intervention in the city as it was about questions of reform. Cities in the mark of Turin were gaining prominence as autonomous administrative areas from the mid-eleventh century. In the city of Turin, political life was dominated by Adelaide and the margravial entourage, and there is little evidence of the inhabitants acting collectively. In Asti, by contrast, the nascent commune became increasingly organised from the 1060s onwards, and challenged Adelaide’s dominance in the city. It is probably no coincidence that this particular conflict came to a head in 1070, shortly after the attempted repudiation of Adelaide’s kinswomen. These divorce-attempts affected Adelaide’s prestige, which may have encouraged resistance to her rule; at the same time, if Adelaide attacked Lodi in 1069, this may well have encouraged her to take similarly violent action in Asti.

Adelaide’s integration of local elites into her political network (1070s)

Adelaide’s decisive action against the city of Asti eliminated many of the previous constraints on her power in the region. Although the unrest did not entirely cease after 1070, Adelaide was increasingly able to (re-)build a client base in Asti, and particularly in the county of Bredulo. This section discusses the integration into Adelaide’s political network of two of the key lordly families in this region (the Morozzo and the Sarmatorio), and also of
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51 Registrum, III.9 (1075); VII.9 (1079).
52 AH, IV.33(34), 384. Benzo was perhaps angry that Ingo did not support him after he was driven from his see by Patarenes (Bordone, Città, 340).
55 Chapters 5, 7; Sergi, Potere, 126.
56 Evidence of communal opposition in Turin can perhaps be seen in Henry IV’s privilege: Appendix 1, no. 41a.
57 Chapter 2.
58 Appendix 1, no. 21c.
59 Guglielmotti, Morozzo, 19; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 693f.; Previté-Orton, History, 160.
the inhabitants of Annone. The toponyms Morozzo and ‘Sarmatorio’ (modern Salmour) were contemporary designations, making these families readily identifiable in contemporary documents. Members of these families are found in Adelaide’s charters, as witnesses and as beneficiaries, for the first time in the 1070s. The evidence for Adelaide’s dealings with the inhabitants of Annone is more tenuous, but suggestive: where Adelaide made grants of land and rights to the Morozzo and the Sarmatorio, she confirmed the ‘customs’ of Annone to secure their loyalty.\textsuperscript{60} It was not simply concrete economic benefits which drew these groups to Adelaide. Her successful military campaign in Asti not only increased her wealth and dominance in the region; her martial prowess also generated prestige. All of these factors combined to make her a more desirable lord, and enabled her to attract members of elite families, and other groups, into her political network.

\textit{a) The Morozzo}

The Morozzo were an important family in Bredulo: they had substantial holdings in the county, centred on the castles of Morozzo, Chiusa, Vasco and Roccaforte.\textsuperscript{61} There was a long-standing relationship between the Morozzo and the bishopric of Asti,\textsuperscript{62} whose rights in the county of Bredulo, particularly where the Morozzo held land, were confirmed by Henry III in 1041.\textsuperscript{63} The Morozzo are first documented in connection with Adelaide’s family in the 1070s: William of Morozzo witnessed a property dispute relating to the monastery of Cavour, which was settled by Peter in 1072;\textsuperscript{64} Otto of Morozzo witnessed a donation of Adelaide’s to the canons of Revello in 1075;\textsuperscript{65} and Bruno of Morozzo witnessed her donation to the

\textsuperscript{60} Appendix 1, no. 45.
\textsuperscript{61} Guglielmotti, \textit{Morozzo}, esp. 48f., 65, and, 55f., 87f.
\textsuperscript{62} The earliest documents in which the Morozzo are found record their dealings (not always amicable) with the bishops of Asti: Guglielmotti, \textit{Morozzo}, esp. 34–40.
\textsuperscript{63} Guglielmotti, \textit{Morozzo}, 90, with reference to DD HIII, no. 70.
\textsuperscript{64} Appendix 1, no. 25b. On this dispute: chapter 7.
\textsuperscript{65} Appendix 1, no. 27.
monastery of San Solutore in Turin in 1079. All of these documents were issued some distance from Morozzo (and outside of the county of Bredulo); these men thus travelled from Bredulo to core areas of Adelaide’s power (including Turin and the Pinerolese), where they met, and formed connections, not only with Adelaide, but also with her son, and with key members of her administration (including Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno and the iudices Gosvino and Erenzo).

Adelaide may also have attempted to create ties of loyalty between herself and the Morozzo by granting land and rights to a member of this family. In 1123 Nithard of Morozzo renounced what he possessed in Roncaglia and Fontanile to the monastery of Cavour. He apparently produced a document demonstrating his legitimate ownership of these places (sicut legitimo instrumento monstratum est et probatum), which had been granted to him by Adelaide. No such document has survived, and it is not clear when (or even if) Adelaide invested Nithard with property. Roncaglia and Fontanile are located in the county of Asti; it is possible that Adelaide granted Nithard property here in the 1070s, after her attack on Asti and at the same time that a cluster of references to the Morozzo appears in her documents. If so, then Nithard was active over at least a fifty year period (1070s-1123). Alternatively, Adelaide may have invested Nithard with property at a later stage: perhaps in/after June 1089, when she received possessions in the county of Bredulo from the bishop of Asti. Since the first appearance of the Morozzo in Adelaide’s documents followed her attack on Asti in 1070, it may even be the case that she invested Nithard with property after her second attack on the city in March 1091 (discussed below).

66 Appendix 1, no. 36. The charter confirmed an earlier grant to San Solutore (now lost), by Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, and her uncle, Bishop Alric. It was thus issued in the presence of Bishop Ingo as well as Bruno of Morozzo.
67 On these officers: chapter 5.
68 BSSS 3/1, no. 22 (6th March 1123).
69 Appendix 1, no. 49; Guglielmotti, Morozzo, 55f.
70 Bordone, Città, 350; Appendix 1, no. 46.
Grants of property did not, in and of themselves, create ties of dependency (that is, feudovassal bonds); instead, such grants were intended to encourage ties of loyalty, which would incorporate local elites into a lord’s political network. The presence of the Morozzo in Adelaide’s and Peter’s witness-lists, and Adelaide’s grant of land to Nithard of Morozzo, indicates a reciprocal desire, on the part of Adelaide’s family and the Morozzo, to be more closely connected with one another. The Morozzo may have hoped for a closer relationship with Adelaide as an alternative to the lordship of the bishops of Asti. From Adelaide’s perspective, an alliance with an important family in Bredulo made her attempts to extend her control in southern Piedmont more likely to succeed.

b) The Sarmatorio

Another family which appears in connection with Adelaide for the first time in the 1070s are ‘the Sarmatorio’ (modern Salmour, c.55km south of Turin). The Sarmatorio controlled property (including the castles of Salmour, Lequio and Fontane), in the counties of Turin, Auriate and Bredulo, along both sides of the River Stura, near its confluence with the Tanaro. The Sarmatorio, like the Morozzo, were part of the military aristocracy, but they were more powerful: they held more lands, over a greater area, than the Morozzo, and they also had a greater consciousness of themselves as a dynasty (as we shall see, they founded two private monasteries in the early eleventh century).

Salmour was originally an episcopal castle and, given the control of the bishops of Asti in the county of Bredulo, the Sarmatorio may have gained possessions there as clients of the bishop. Yet, unlike the Morozzo, the Sarmatorio also had long-standing connections
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72 Guglielmotti, ‘Potenzialità’; Adriani, Sarmatorio; Pedroni, ‘Sarmatorio’.
73 Bordone, Città, 322ff., 342.
with Adelaide’s dynasty: this relationship was also instrumental in the early development of the Sarmatorio as a local power. Alineus, the progenitor of the Sarmatorio, may have come to Italy as a *cliens* of Adelaide’s great-great-grandfather, Roger of Auriate, and Adelaide’s grandfather, Manfred of Turin, may also have had dealings with the Sarmatorio in 984. The confused genealogy of the Sarmatorio (Table 9), and the somewhat dubious provenance of documents relating to this dynasty, means that the evidence for this remains tenuous.

Members of the Sarmatorio can be more securely connected with Adelaide’s parents and uncle in the early eleventh century. In 1029 Adelaide’s uncle, Bishop Alric of Asti, leased the estate of Santa Maria di Lequio (c. 10km south-east of Salmour) with all its revenues and appurtenances (including the castle of Lequio) to Abellonio and his wife, Amaltruda, for twenty-nine years in return for an annual rent of twelve silver *denarii*.

Abellonio’s brother, Robaldo III, witnessed two documents for Adelaide’s parents, Olderic-Manfred and Bertha, in 1021 and 1031, which could indicate that Bishop Alric was using episcopal lands to further dynastic policies.

Relations between Adelaide’s dynasty and the Sarmatorio may have been long-standing, but they were not always close. The Sarmatorio cultivated multiple networks in the early eleventh century: in addition to Adelaide’s dynasty, and the bishop of Asti, the Sarmatorio also enriched their network of relationships through marital alliance with another margravial dynasty, the Aleramids. Moreover, the brothers Robaldo and Abellonio, present in Olderic-Manfred and Bishop Alric’s documents, were of sufficient wealth and status that
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74 CN, V.8.
76 Pedroni, ‘Sarmatorio’.
77 Appendix 2, V/15.
78 Appendix 2, II/1, II/3. This Robaldo cannot be securely connected to the Sarmatorio, but it is suggestive that in both charters, a man named Albert witnessed alongside Robaldo.
79 Turletti, *Storia*, no.5; Merlone, ‘Prosopografia,’ 580f.
Table 9: Proposed genealogy of the Sarmatorio

(Tenuous connections are highlighted in blue)
they founded their own monasteries: San Teofredo in Cervere, founded by Robaldo in 1018; and San Pietro in Savigliano, founded by Abellonio before 1028. In order to ensure their independence, these monasteries were subordinated to religious institutions dedicated to the same patron saints, but located outside of Turin: San Pietro to St Peter’s in Rome, and San Teofredo to Saint-Chaffre-du-Monastier (near Le-Puy-en-Velay).

Before the foundations of Cervere (in Auriate) and Savigliano (in Turin), there is no evidence that Adelaide’s dynasty had private monasteries of their own. Almost immediately after the foundation of Savigliano, however, Adelaide’s parents founded the monastery of Santa Maria in Caramagna (c. 14km north of Savigliano). Cristina Sereno argues that these two foundations can be seen as evidence of solidarity between Adelaide’s dynasty and the Sarmatorio, with the female house of Caramagna complementing the male house of Savigliano, and both institutions contributing to the monastic colonization of the region. This development is perhaps also indicative of competition between the Sarmatorio and Adelaide’s dynasty. The Sarmatorio certainly seized the opportunity presented by the deaths of Olderic-Manfred and Bishop Alric to gain greater independence.

After 1031 no member of the Sarmatorio is present in documents issued by Adelaide’s family until 1078, when Adelaide granted *dilectus noster Albertus de Sarmatorio* estates, castles, land and rights. This is one of the few extant charters to record Adelaide’s interaction with other lay powers, but unfortunately there are concerns about its transmission. The charter only survives in a copy made by Giovan Battista Adriani in the mid-nineteenth-
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80 Chevalier, *Cartulaire*, no. 367 (5th February 1018). Robaldo is presumed to be the founder, but a lacuna in the text makes this uncertain. For donations by the Sarmatorio to San Teofredo: *Cartulaire*, nos. 368-370; Provero ‘Monasteri,’ 409ff.
81 Turletti, *Storia*, no. 4 (12th February 1028). This donation charter refers to Abellonio’s earlier foundation of the monastery.
82 Turletti, *Storia*, no.4; Provero, ‘Monasteri,’ 413.
83 Chevalier, *Cartulaire*, no. 367; Arneodo, ‘Teofredo’; Arneodo, ‘L’abbazia’. Saint Chaffre is another name for St Theofred.
84 Appendix 2, II/2.
85 Sereno, ‘Monasteri’ II.
86 Appendix 1, no. 31.
century. Giuseppe Sergi thinks that the whole text is dubious; other scholars argue (cautiously) for its authenticity. The charter is fragmentary, and there is no mention of what Adelaide received in return for her grant to Albert; his fidelity is implied, rather than specified, in the exchange.

According to the charter, Adelaide confirmed Albert’s rights of lordship, *cum iure et potestate iudicii*, and his licence to ‘expel by force’ (*armis expellere*) any who opposed him. Albert’s lordship was confirmed over places in three separate counties: in Auriate (Cervere, Villamairana, Caraglio, Fontane), in Turin (Savigliano), and in Bredulo (Salmour, Monfalone, Bene, Morozzo). The property in Bredulo was located in places where the bishop of Asti was traditionally powerful. This suggests that the Sarmatorio had usurped the bishop’s lands and rights, and were now turning to Adelaide to legitimise their power. In turn this indicates, first, that Adelaide’s rule in the region was sufficiently strong by 1078 for the Sarmatorio to seek her lordship; and second, that securing the support of the Sarmatorio was important enough to Adelaide that she was prepared to issue a grant which was detrimental to the bishopric of Asti. In supporting the Sarmatorio Adelaide was effectively acting against her protégé, Bishop Ingo. This not only demonstrates how important the Sarmatorio were to Adelaide; it is also revealing about Adelaide and Ingo’s relationship. Adelaide evidently expected Ingo to be subordinate to her, and was prepared to infringe upon his prerogatives in order to gain the support of powerful lay elites. This did not cause a notable deterioration in the relationship between Adelaide and Ingo, who continued to witness Adelaide’s charters in the late 1070s.
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89 Above, n.25.
91 Previté-Orton, *History*, 228, argues that the land between Annone and Rocca d’Arazzo (discussed below) was a source of dispute between Adelaide and Bishop Ingo.
92 Appendix 1, nos. 32, 36.
The licence to ‘expel by force’ indicates that Adelaide anticipated that her grant to Albert might be contested. Bordone suggests that this referred to the bishop of Asti, but the Morozzo could just as easily have been intended. Significantly, given Adelaide’s dealings with the Morozzo at this time, one of the places in which Albert was granted rights of lordship was in Morozzo itself. If the passage which refers to Albert’s possession of property in Morozzo is authentic rather than a later interpolation, then Adelaide was also prepared to undermine the Morozzo and subordinate them to the Sarmatorio. This is somewhat surprising, given Adelaide’s otherwise cordial dealings with the Morozzo in the 1070s. It suggests that to ensure her position Adelaide was prepared to exploit rivalries among local elites. It also sheds a different light on Adelaide’s grant to Nithard of Morozzo: it might be the case that Adelaide was compensating Nithard for the loss of Morozzo.

Adelaide’s charter for Albert of Sarmatorio does not indicate why she chose to delegate power in this contested area to the Sarmatorio rather than the Morozzo, but several possibilities suggest themselves. First, the Sarmatorio were more powerful, over a wider area, than the Morozzo: they were a significant lay power not only in Bredulo, but also in the counties of Turin and Auriate. Unlike the Morozzo, who travelled to Turin to witness Adelaide’s documents, Adelaide travelled to the castle of Sarmatorio to invest Albert with property. Adelaide needed to keep the Sarmatorio on her side, even at the cost of alienating the Morozzo. Second, there was a long-standing connection between Adelaide’s dynasty and the Sarmatorio: this explains how they came to possess property in core areas of Adelaide’s dynasty’s landholding; and perhaps also why Adelaide trusted the Sarmatorio (more than the Morozzo) to act on her behalf in the region. Adelaide often preferred to rely upon individuals
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93 Bordone, Città, 342.
94 Since the Sarmatorio’s possession of Morozzo is not otherwise attested, this reference is sometimes thought to be a later addition: Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 704; Guglielmotti, Morozzo, 88f.
95 Bordone, Città, 342 n.280.
96 Above nn.68-69; Guglielmotti, Morozzo, 88. If Nithard’s grant was compensatory, then it may have been issued in the late 1070s/early 1080s.
whose family members had previously served her father;\textsuperscript{97} in the case of the Sarmatorio, it is possible that members of this family had also served her grandfather and quite possibly her great-grandfather, too. Although there is some question about just how far back the relationship between Adelaide’s dynasty and the Sarmatorio can be traced, in 1078 Adelaide and Albert certainly felt it desirable to emphasise their long-standing connections. In Adelaide’s charter much of the property she confirmed as belonging to Albert was said to have been granted \textit{per predecessores nostros suis predecessoribus}.\textsuperscript{98} For Adelaide, this grant was thus a means of re-affirming ties with an important local family, and of gaining greater influence in a region where she had been weakly represented.

c) \textit{Annone}

Adelaide’s strategy in and around the city of Asti was more militarised than was the case with her dealings with local elites in Bredulo. In addition to her violent attacks upon the city of Asti in 1070 (and, as we shall see, in 1091), Adelaide constructed a network of alliances with local elites and, particularly, with the inhabitants of key neighbouring castles. This strengthened her control of the area around Asti, and thus of the city itself. We have already seen how Adelaide forged connections with Ribaldus of Fiblina and with Liudo and Amadeus of Serralunga in the 1060s.\textsuperscript{99} She also created ties of loyalty between herself and the inhabitants of Annone.\textsuperscript{100}

Serralunga and Annone were located on either side of the city of Asti (c.12km west of Asti, and c.9km east, respectively) on a Roman road – the Via Fulvia – which led from Turin to Asti, and then on to Alessandria and Tortona.\textsuperscript{101} Adelaide ensured that she was on good

\textsuperscript{97} Chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{98} Appendix 1, no. 31.
\textsuperscript{99} Above n.41. Tebald, also from Serralunga, is present in another of Adelaide’s documents: Appendix 1, no. 32.
\textsuperscript{100} Appendix 1, no. 45. On Adelaide and Annone: Nebbia, \textit{Storia}, 35ff.
\textsuperscript{101} Nebbia, \textit{Storia}, 17f. On Serralunga’s strategic importance: Bordone, ‘Valle’.
terms with local elites in both Serralunga and Annone, and her control of key points on this route was a means by which Adelaide strengthened her position around Asti. Annone was situated, not only on a major land route, but also on the River Tanaro. This enabled further control of communication routes, and also meant that Annone dominated the fertile lands of the Tanaro river valley (particularly between Annone and Rocca d’Arazzo).

In contrast with Serralunga, Adelaide possessed a great deal of property in Annone including the castle of Annone itself. There is some debate about whether Annone was always a margravial castle, or whether it alternated between margravial and royal control. Most scholars argue that Adelaide inherited the castle from her father, Olderic-Manfred, who issued a document from the castle of Annone alongside his wife, Bertha, in 1021. Yet there is another possibility: that control of the castle alternated between secular powers and the bishop of Asti. In 1041 Henry III implicitly recognised the bishop of Asti’s possession of Annone (c.9km east of Asti) when he issued a diploma confirming the extension of the bishop’s jurisdiction over all property, including estates, castles, and villages, within c.11km of Asti. Adelaide may thus have lost control of Annone after her father’s death. If so, Adelaide re-gained possession of the castle at some point thereafter (probably c.1070, after her attack on Asti), because, in 1089, when Adelaide granted Bishop Otto of Asti control of the territory around Annone, including the important land between Annone and Rocca d’Arazzo, she retained control of the castle for herself. The castle

---

102 Bordone, Città, 140f.
103 Nebbia, Storia, 32ff.
104 Previté-Orton, History, 163; Bordone, Città, 318f.; Nebbia, Storia, 34f.
105 Appendix 2, II/1: Actum intra castro Nono feliciter; Bordone Città, 140ff. (Morello, ‘Placiosci,’ 15 suggests that None = None, c.19km south-west of Turin).
106 DD HIII, no.70 (1041). Gabiani, Asti, 433f. and Vergano, Storia, 67 argue that the bishops possessed the castle by the mid-tenth century, but there is no evidence of this.
107 By contrast, Sergi ‘Circoscrizione,’ 710 argues that the castle never belonged to Olderic-Manfred: he was there in 1021 because it belonged to his brother, Bishop Alric.
108 Appendix 1, no. 46.
served as a bulwark, ensuring Adelaide’s continuing control of the territory around Annone, and thus of Asti itself.

Adelaide did not simply rely on her possessions at Annone to ensure her dominance of the area: she also made concessions to the inhabitants of the city to ensure their active support. This not directly attested, but a late twelfth-century agreement between the communes of Asti and Annone confirmed the *milites et homines* of Annone in *omnes illas consuetudines et bonos mores, quos et quas soliti sunt habere a tempore comitisse Alaxie usque nunc*. This suggests that Adelaide issued a document, now lost, in which she confirmed the people of Annone in their rights and customs. Documents recording the customs of particular communities often traced these rights back to a powerful figure from the past. Sometimes the names of powerful individuals were simply co-opted after their deaths to legitimise local customs, and certain elements in the twelfth-century charter for Annone could be new additions or alterations, validated by reference to Adelaide. Yet, given Adelaide’s control of Annone and the surrounding area, it is likely that Adelaide did in fact make some form of grant to the inhabitants of Annone, probably in the 1070s (i.e., shortly after gaining control of Annone).

‘Good’ customs specified the rights and obligations of lords and the local communities which were subject to them, and were agreed upon by negotiation between lord and community. This indicates the importance of consent to lordly power, and the need for lords to make concessions in order to secure consent. At the same time, it demonstrates that a lord’s jurisdiction was recognised in a given locality (why else would local communities negotiate with him/her?). Although the charter for Annone does not specify
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110 Ripart, ‘Comtè,’ 157ff.
111 For a similar argument (in relation to the customs of Tende): Fiore, ‘Giurare,’ 66f.
113 Fiore, ‘Potere,’ 503f.
which customs were confirmed, comparable charters recording local customs elsewhere in
eleventh-century northern Italy suggest that these might have included exemption from taxes
or other obligations, and/or rights over water or uncultivated land.\footnote{114} For example, a charter
issued by the counts of Ventimiglia in the mid-eleventh century recorded, among other
concessions, that the inhabitants of Tende, Saorgio and La Brigue would only have to host
judicial assemblies three times a year; that male inhabitants were exempt from all public
levies and tributes except for that of military service; and that they had the right use
uncultivated lands as pasture to collect wood or to hunt.\footnote{115} Given Adelaide’s recent history of
violence with Asti, she may have been particularly concerned to secure the loyalty of the
milites of Annone. A commitment from the milites regarding their military assistance would
have helped to ensure Adelaide’s dominance in this important location.

\textit{Adelaide, Asti and Bredulo (1080-1091)}

Adelaide’s protégé, Bishop Ingo of Asti, died in 1080; he was succeeded by Bishop Otto
(r.1080-1098/1102), who is often said to be Adelaide’s son.\footnote{116} Adelaide had a son named
Otto (a leading name both in Adelaide’s natal family, and that of her third husband, Otto of
Savoy), but the sources for him are scanty. He witnessed one of Adelaide’s charters in the
1060s, but is not otherwise mentioned in her documents.\footnote{117} It is possible that he died whilst
still young,\footnote{118} but if so Adelaide did not commemorate his death.\footnote{119} Alternatively Otto may
have become a cleric. Since Adelaide’s father imposed his brother as bishop of Asti, and
since Adelaide had earlier imposed Ingo as bishop, it is possible that she appointed her

\footnote{114} E.g. Imperiale-di-Sant’Angelo, \textit{Codice}, no. 3 (May 1056); Puncuh/Rovere, \textit{Registri}, no. 33 (1059).
\footnote{115} On this charter: below, n.138.
Muletti, \textit{Memorie}, 270; Ripart, \textit{Fondements}, 298, 309.
\footnote{117} Appendix 1, no. 22; Sergi, \textit{Potere}, 56 n.44 is sceptical about his existence.
\footnote{118} Hellmann, \textit{Grafen}, 17.
\footnote{119} Adelaide did commemorate the deaths of Peter/Amadeus: Appendix 1, nos. 34-35.
youngest son as bishop of Asti after Ingo’s death. Equally, if Otto were Adelaide’s son, this
would provide an additional motive for his support of Henry IV of Germany (his brother-in-
law), and would, in turn, explain why Henry IV issued three diplomas for the bishopric of
Asti after Adelaide’s death, in which Henry confirmed Otto (Adelaide’s last surviving child),
in his possession of Adelaide’s property and jurisdiction in Asti. Although it cannot be said
with certainty that Otto was Adelaide’s son, if this were the case, then it would add another
layer of complexity to her dealings with Asti in the 1080s.

Adelaide’s increasing control in Bredulo and Asti in the 1070s led to further conflict
with the bishop (and citizens) of Asti. This conflict is only recorded in passing; it is primarily
inferred from a charter issued by Adelaide in 1089, which indicates that she and Bishop Otto
were attempting to reach a peaceful solution. Both made large concessions, and received
important rights and territory in return. Adelaide ceded territory in Asti about which there had
been dispute to Bishop Otto, whose control around the city was thus strengthened. This
charter indicates that it was not just members of the military aristocracy, such as the Morozzo
and the Sarmatorio, but also Adelaide herself, who had made extensive gains in Asti and
Bredulo at the bishop’s expense. Among the property Adelaide returned was the parish
church of Levaldigi, the abbey of San Dalmazzo di Pedona, the forest of Bannali and the land
between the castles of Annone and Rocca d’Arazzo. All of this property was documented
in the possession of the bishopric of Asti in 1041. As with Annone, Adelaide evidently
gained possession of it at some point thereafter, probably c.1070. In return for the

120 On Otto as a pro-imperial bishop: chapter 3, n.130.
121 DD HIV nos. 427 (c.1091/2); 430 (25th April 1093); 436 (1093).
122 Appendix 1, no. 46. If Otto was Adelaide’s son, it is surprising that there is no reference to their relationship
in this charter; Agnes of Aquitaine is described as Adelaide’s nurus.
123 Appendix 1, no. 46.
124 DD HIII, no. 70 (1041). A late source suggests that Adelaide’s uncle, Bishop Alric, founded a house of
canons at Levaldigi: della Chiesa, Cronaca, col. 860; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 667 n.126. San Dalmazzo in
Pedona had been under the control of the bishops of Asti from the mid-tenth century: Casto, ‘Fondamento,’ 19,
32.
125 Bordone, Città, 344. A late source indicates that Adelaide granted property in Asti to Fruttuaria at this time:
Appendix 1, no. 23.
restoration of this property, Bishop Otto formally recognised the gains that Adelaide had made in Bredulo: he granted Adelaide *illud quod ecclesia Astensis habet in curte Bredulensi*.

This compromise did not hold for long: according to two late sources, in March 1091 Adelaide attacked the city of Asti and burned it almost completely. The sources are frustratingly laconic and provide no explanation for Adelaide’s behaviour; nor is it clear whether her attack on Asti was directed against Bishop Otto, the nascent commune, or both. It is generally thought that Bishop Otto, in alliance with the citizens of Asti, was attempting to limit Adelaide’s expanding lordship. Yet, given Adelaide and Otto’s good working relationship in 1089, and also their possible kinship, it seems more likely – as Chris Wickham has recently argued – that the Astigians revolted against both Adelaide and their bishop in 1091, just as they had done c. 1066.

A sizeable proportion of the citizens of Asti presumably felt threatened by Adelaide’s agreement with Bishop Otto in 1089. According to Bordone (who thinks that Adelaide faced opposition from the bishop as well as the citizens in 1091), the castle of Annone was a particular bone of contention. Annone’s strategic location meant that the citizens of Asti had an interest in securing full control of the castle (and its *milites*?), but the 1089 agreement left Adelaide in control of Annone. The importance of Annone to the citizens of Asti (as well as their power over the bishop), was proved just four years after Adelaide’s death, when Bishop Otto invested the consuls of Asti and all its citizens with the castle and estate of Annone, and all rights pertaining to it *ad commune utilitatem istorum civium*. If – as
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126 Appendix 1, no. 46. Previté-Orton, *History*, 159ff., 228; Sergi, ‘Circoscizione,’ 689ff., 710.
127 Appendix 1, no. 47b. The sources are thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Astigian chronicles, which indicate that Adelaide attacked and burned the city of Asti twice: in 1070 and again in 1091. Since the earlier attack is attested by Arnulf of Milan, this lends credence to the second attack. On these chronicles: chapter 2 n.136.
129 Wickham, *Sleepwalking*, 166.
130 Bordone, *Città*, 344ff.
131 Sella, *Codex*, III, no. 635 (28th March 1095). This charter is only preserved in a fourteenth-century copy, and may well contain interpolations: Fissore, *Autonomia*, 13-25; Bordone, *Città*, 355. For early communal activity
Bordone suggests – the citizens of Asti attempted to gain control of the castle of Annone by force, c.1090, then this may well have caused Adelaide’s retaliatory attack on Asti in 1091.

That violence broke out again in 1091 may also have been related to Adelaide’s age. Adelaide died in December 1091; although there is no evidence that she was ill in the months before this, it is possible that this was the case. Even if Adelaide was not actually ill, but only rumoured to be, this might have been enough to encourage rebellion against her. Matilda of Tuscany’s hagiographer, Donizo of Canossa (writing c.1111-1115), records that following the rumour of her death in 1114, the Mantuans seized and destroyed Matilda’s fortress of Rivalta. This fortress, located c.9km west of Mantua, played a comparable strategic role to Annone (located c.9km east of Asti). It may be that the Astigians were hoping to take advantage of Adelaide’s perceived weakness, c.1091. If so, they were mistaken: Adelaide went on the offensive (as did Matilda in 1114). Adelaide’s attack on the city of Asti (perhaps carried out with support from the milites of Annone, whose rights she had confirmed?) was, first and foremost, a reprisal against those who had attempted to usurp her rights. Yet it was also a pretext which allowed Adelaide to make one final attempt to subdue the city and dominate its political forces completely. Had she not died in December 1091, it is possible that Adelaide would have achieved this aim.

Adelaide and Ventimiglia

In contrast with the counties of Asti and Bredulo, where Adelaide fought to become dominant, she steadily lost influence in the county of Ventimiglia. This county was bounded by the counties of Albenga to the east, and Bredulo to the north; to the west it was bounded
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in Asti: Bordone, Città, esp. 297f.; Wickham, Sleepwalking, 166ff. For earlier evidence of collectivity in Asti: above pp.228f.
132 Appendix 1, no. 50a.
133 VM, II.19, and Appendix, vv.1430-1439; Riversi, ‘Usi,’ 17f.
135 Gabotto, Asti, 7f.; Brezzi, ‘L’organismo,’ 410 n.1.
by the Ligurian Alps, and to the south by the Ligurian Sea. Ventimiglia was thus more focussed on the sea than other counties in the mark: many of its major centres, including the city of Ventimiglia itself, were coastal. Charters indicate that Adelaide and her parents had possessions in Ventimiglia.\footnote{Appendix 1, no. 14; Appendix 2, II/1, II/3, III/6; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 708.} There is some question, however, as to whether Adelaide and her family possessed margravial authority in Ventimiglia, or whether the county was simply part of their sphere of influence.\footnote{Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 694–697; Previté-Orton, History, 162f.; Ascheri, ‘Conti’; Ripart, ‘Comté,’ 150.} An eleventh-century document known as the ‘charter of Tende’ is traditionally thought to indicate that Adelaide’s dynasty had jurisdiction in Ventimiglia, as it refers to immunities supposedly granted to the inhabitants of three mountain communities in Ventimiglia (Tende, Saorge and La Brigue) by Adelaide’s great-grandfather, Arduin Glaber.\footnote{Daviso, ‘Carta’; Settia, ‘Marche,’ 51, 57, 60; Embrisco, Vescovi, 26. For a new reading: Ripart: ‘Comté,’ esp. 153ff.} Charters issued by Adelaide’s parents, which refer to 
\textit{noster comitatus Vigintimiliensi}, and to their rights in the county, further suggest that they had jurisdiction in Ventimiglia.\footnote{Appendix 2, II/1, II/3; Ripart, ‘Comté,’ 150; Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 694ff.} Yet there is no evidence that Adelaide built upon these possessions and rights, nor that the counts of Ventimiglia became part of Adelaide’s political network.

In the early part of Adelaide’s rule, this may not have been a conscious choice. The crisis in Adelaide’s power, c.1040, which decreased her control in Asti and Bredulo, also limited her influence in Ventimiglia. Evidence of a comital family in Ventimiglia emerges in 1038/9, at precisely this time, when Adelaide was struggling to maintain control even in core counties in the mark. Even after the early 1040s, however, when Adelaide’s position was more secure, she did not focus on Ventimiglia and the Mediterranean. Instead, as we have seen, she concentrated on asserting herself in Asti, Bredulo, and – above all – in Turin. Because Adelaide was focusing her efforts in these counties, she may have been stretched too
thply to assert herself in Ventimiglia, too. Equally, at this time, she was increasingly looking north, towards Savoy and the empire (as evidenced by her marriage to Otto of Savoy, and the trans-Alpine, imperial marriages of her children\textsuperscript{140}), rather than south towards Ventimiglia. This lack of interest was reciprocal: part of the reason that Adelaide did not integrate the counts of Ventimiglia into her following was that the comital family seized the opportunity presented by Olderic-Manfred’s death, and asserted their independence.

The counts (and the county) of Ventimiglia are poorly documented until the mid-eleventh century.\textsuperscript{141} The first clear evidence of a separate comital family in Ventimiglia is found in charter issued by Conrad (II) of Ventimiglia (1038/9).\textsuperscript{142} This document indicates that the counts of Ventimiglia possessed a number of important rights (including \textit{placitum}, \textit{fodrum}, \textit{ripaticum} and \textit{alpaticum}), which Conrad granted to the bishop of Genoa.\textsuperscript{143} That Conrad was in a position to grant these rights, without reference to any other authority (i.e. Adelaide), indicates that he held (or was usurping) comital authority in Ventimiglia. Emperor Conrad II may have conferred this authority on Count Conrad as a reward for his support against the \textit{valvassores minores} of Milan in 1037/8.\textsuperscript{144} Alternatively, since Conrad of Ventimiglia’s father is also referred to as ‘Count Conrad’ (I) in this charter,\textsuperscript{145} there could have been a separate comital dynasty in Ventimiglia in the tenth century too.\textsuperscript{146} From 1038/9 onwards there is clear evidence of a comital family in Ventimiglia: Conrad II’s sons, Conrad III and Otto, both entitled count, issued several charters together between 1041 and 1077.\textsuperscript{147}

\textsuperscript{140} Chapters 1-2.
\textsuperscript{141} On the early history of Ventimiglia: Pavoni, \textit{Liguria}, 152-162.
\textsuperscript{142} \textit{Liber iurium}, no. 5 (30th January 1038). The regnal year and indiction indicate that the document may have been issued in 1039 rather than 1038: Embriaco, \textit{Vescovi}, 80, 90ff.
\textsuperscript{143} On these rights: Violante, ‘Einführung,’ 30, 39.
\textsuperscript{144} Ascheri, ‘Conti,’ 12. Adelaide’s uncle, Bishop Alric, was killed fighting against the Milanese \textit{valvassores minores}: Appendix 1, no. 2c.
\textsuperscript{145} \textit{Liber iurium}, no. 5.
\textsuperscript{146} Ripart, ‘Comtè,’ 149ff.; Embriaco, \textit{Vescovi}, 73, 81. (Sergi, ‘Circoscrizione,’ 695f. argues that there was a count of Ventimiglia in 954, but the document which records this is unreliable: Cais-di-Pierlas, ‘Conti,’ 10, 99; Rossi/Gabotto, \textit{Storia}, 37f.)
Table 10: Counts of Ventimiglia

The comital dynasty’s documents indicate the importance of coastal connections. This can already be seen in Conrad II’s 1038/9 grant to the bishop of Genoa (an important coastal city, located c.127km east of Ventimiglia). His sons, Conrad III and Otto, focused their activities in Ventimiglia itself,\(^{148}\) south to the Ligurian Sea; and west towards Provence. In particular, they made donations to the monastery of S. Honorat in Lérins, located on the Mediterranean island of Saint-Honorat (c.55km south-west of Ventimiglia).\(^{149}\) Conrad III and Otto issued charters for Lérins in 1041,\(^{150}\) 1063 and 1064.\(^{151}\) These documents were variously co-issued with their mother, Adelasis, and/or their respective wives, Odila and Donella. In 1082 Conrad issued a charter for Lérins without Otto, but alongside his wife, Odila, daughter of Laugier Rostaing, viscount of Nice (c.29km south-west of Ventimiglia).\(^{152}\) This marriage
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\(^{148}\) Cais-di-Pierlas, ‘Conti,’ no. 8 (5\(^{th}\) August 1077).
\(^{149}\) On their donations to Lérins: Cristofari, ‘Lérins’.
\(^{150}\) Moris/Blanc, *Cartulaire*, no. 167 (1041). The indication given in the dating clause (IV) does not accord with the year (1041) and must be corrected to IX. Alternatively, as Embriaco, *Vescovi*, 83 n.69 suggests, the fourth indication accords with the year 1051.
\(^{151}\) Cais-di-Pierlas, ‘Conti,’ nos. 5 (21\(^{st}\) December 1063); 6 (1064).
\(^{152}\) Moris/Blanc, *Cartulaire*, no. 166 (16th March 1082); Embriaco, *Vescovi*, 84.
provides further evidence of the orientation of the counts of Ventimiglia south-west towards Provence and Lérins, rather than north towards Turin (or even east towards Genoa). This territorial re-orientation was intended to remove the counts of Ventimiglia from the sphere of influence of Adelaide’s dynasty, and perhaps also the branch of the Aleramids into which Adelaide’s sister, Bertha, had married, and of the bishop of Genoa. Lérins was closer to Ventimiglia than Genoa or Turin, but was not powerful enough to threaten the counts’ freedom of action. Yet, because of its connections with the important abbey of Cluny, the counts’ support for Lérins still enabled them to increase their prestige and legitimacy.

The increasing autonomy of the counts of Ventimiglia can be seen in the documents issued by Conrad III and Otto. Their earliest donation to Lérins was issued simply in Ventimiglia (1041). Later charters were issued from the castle of Ventimiglia (1063, 1064), and by 1082 Conrad III was issuing documents in curte propria predicti comitis de castro Vintimilie. In other words, during Adelaide’s lifetime, the counts of Ventimiglia were becoming increasingly dominant in the city of Ventimiglia. They possessed the castle of Ventimiglia and, probably because of this castle-lordship, came to possess their own court. Further evidence of their independence can be found in the charter of Tende. As we have seen, this document, issued by Conrad III and Otto (1038/41x1077), confirmed immunities (supposedly) granted by Adelaide’s great-grandfather, Arduin Glaber, to communities in Ventimiglia. Although the reference to Arduin Glaber implies that Adelaide’s dynasty once had jurisdiction in these regions, Conrad III and Otto issued the charter without reference to
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153 Chapter 1.
154 Sergi, Confini, 121.
155 Poly, Provence, 257-264.
156 Embriaco, Vescovi, 88, 92ff.
157 Ascheri, ‘Conti,’ 14f.
158 The charter was issued after their father’s death (last attested 1038/9), probably when they were issuing documents together (1041x1077): Daviso, ‘Carta,’ 132, 142, and Ascheri, ‘Conti,’ 10 n.12 (‘after 1041’); Ripart, ‘Comté,’ 154, n.52 (1041x1077); Fiore, ‘Giurare,’ 51 (1065).
159 Above, nn.115, 138.
Adelaide, indicating that, in their minds at least, they (and they alone?) now had the right to make concessions to the inhabitants of these regions.

Adelaide failed to integrate into the counts of Ventimiglia into her political following. There is no evidence that she made grants of land or other rights to the counts of Ventimiglia, nor that members of the comital family witnessed her documents. Unlike the Morozzo and Sarmatorio, the comital family of Ventimiglia was strong enough, and far enough removed from Adelaide’s centre of power, to remain independent. Perhaps because she was struggling to assert her control elsewhere, Adelaide seems to have accepted her loss of influence in Ventimiglia. There is no evidence that she tried to assert her position by imposing a bishop; by founding, or making donations to, religious institutions; or through violence, as was the case elsewhere in the mark of Turin.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has examined Adelaide’s rule in the counties of Asti, Bredulo and Ventimiglia, and particularly the way in which her relationships with local elites in these counties were constantly shaped and re-shaped by circumstances. A number of factors suggest that Adelaide’s authority in Asti and Bredulo fluctuated after her father’s death. After a period of relative weakness, c.1040, Adelaide then rebuilt connections with local elites and strengthened her position in these counties. Following broad principles, rather than a definite ‘policy’, Adelaide responded with variety and flexibility to the problem of integrating local forces into her political network. To ensure her dominance in Asti and Bredulo, Adelaide intervened in episcopal elections, and twice took military action against the city of Asti (in 1070 and again in 1091).

Adelaide’s lordship depended as much on collaboration and consent as it did on force. In the 1070s – another period of flux – Adelaide restructured her political network in the
counties of Bredulo and Asti and actively sought to integrate members the military
aristocracy (the Morozzo and the Sarmatorio), as well as the inhabitants of key castles around
Asti, into her following. Adelaide successfully forged mutually beneficial alliances with
members of these local elites, to whom she had to offer something in terms of wealth, power
and prestige in order to ensure their co-operation. This allowed for a degree of agency:
different individuals/groups were able to negotiate different concessions from Adelaide,
according to their status. The Sarmatorio were more successful in this respect than the
Morozzo, perhaps because they were able to leverage long-standing connections with
Adelaide’s dynasty; perhaps simply because they had more power and influence in the first
place.

In contrast with Asti and Bredulo, where Adelaide successfully cultivated and
maintained relationships with key institutions and individuals, she failed to establish
reciprocal connections with the counts of Ventimiglia, and lost what influence her family had
in the county. The comital dynasty in Ventimiglia established its independence while
Adelaide focused on asserting herself elsewhere in the mark of Turin. This indicates that
relationships with local elites were not only ad hoc, and in constant in need of updating: they
were also competitive. Adelaide’s dealings (or lack thereof) with Asti, Bredulo and
Ventimiglia demonstrate that acceptance of her rule was not a foregone conclusion. At times
when Adelaide appeared weak, and in areas in which she did not regularly affirm her
authority, her rule was likely to be challenged. Adelaide could not control all her lands, at all
times, nor incorporate all local elites into her following. Instead, Adelaide had to decide
where to focus her attention, and sometimes fight to retain control. Although she lost power
in Ventimiglia, Adelaide was successful in re-establishing her rule in Asti and Bredulo.
Chapter 7

Adelaide and dispute resolution

The literature on medieval disputes is vast;¹ for Italy, Chris Wickham’s work is crucial.² Studies often focus on the process of disputes: on their origins, the various ways in which disputants attempted to improve their own position, and their response(s) to attempts at resolution. This is often hampered by the nature of the sources, which emphasise not the process, but the outcome of disputes.³ It is difficult to say much about process of disputing in eleventh-century Turin. Few records of disputes survive, and even fewer describe the process in any detail. Despite these limitations, this chapter considers the extent of Adelaide’s personal involvement in, and of her influence on, the administration of justice in her lands.

Medieval disputes could be resolved in several different ways, and thus provide evidence of differing governmental structures. Some disputes were resolved through judicial means (an authoritative court judgement), others through ‘extra-judicial’ ones, in which settlements were brought about less formally through the intervention of third parties.⁴ This latter type of intervention could take several different forms: intercession, mediation, or arbitration (authoritative negotiation).⁵ Adelaide’s role both in formal, public placita and in other, less formal, types of settlement are examined in this chapter. These cases are contrasted both with other disputes which were delegated to Adelaide’s officers or to local lords, and with cases which were settled without reference to Adelaide at all. Particular
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¹ White ‘Pactum’; White, ‘Feuding’; Geary, ‘Conflicts’; Martindale, ‘Disputes’; Brown, Unjust; Barton, Lordship, esp. ch.7; Halsall, ‘Violence’; Innes, State, 129-140; the contributions in Brown/Gorecki, Conflict; Davies/Fouracre, Settlement; Davies/Fouracre, Property.
⁵ On intercession/mediation: chapter 3.
attention is paid to the relationship between ‘margravial’ justice and other types of justice, and what this meant in terms of Adelaide’s power.

Most of the cases discussed in this chapter involve disputes with monasteries in Turin (Fruttuaria, Cavour and Pinerolo) over property or rights. This is typical of surviving dispute-records, which are skewed in favour of the religious institutions which preserved records (and/or whose records have survived). Moreover, each record describes only one stage in what is often a much longer process. As we shall see in relation to a dispute over tithes in Scarnafigi (described in a letter written by Bishop Mainard of Turin), many disputes had a long history which is not reflected in extant charters. Mainard’s letter is revealing about the importance of personal connections in dispute settlement; about different settlement mechanisms; and Adelaide’s power. This dispute is examined in detail in a final case study.

**Women and the administration of justice**

Justice was one of a ruler’s key obligations, and a sign of the strength of his/her rule was ensuring that their judgements were implemented. The right to sit in judgement was associated with office: counts, dukes, and margraves were the highest legal authority in their respective territories, and they dispensed justice as representatives of the king. There is evidence of princely women presiding over judicial assemblies, and also intervening informally in disputes, throughout much of Europe from the late tenth century onwards; noblewomen of lower status followed suit from the late eleventh century. Queens/empresses were often present at *placita*, but they are rarely documented sitting in judgement. In Italy,
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On these monasteries: chapter 4.  
Wickham, ‘Disputes,’ 105; Brown ‘Documents,’ 337f.  
the empresses Angilberga and Ageltrude presided over *placita* in the late ninth-century, as did Theophanu in 990, and Matilda in the early twelfth century. Emma of Imola is the first northern Italian noblewoman documented presiding over a court case in the early eleventh century, and Adelaide’s contemporaries, Beatrice and Matilda of Tuscany, are the first northern Italian women documented holding *placita* on a regular basis (after the mid-eleventh century). There is less evidence of Adelaide’s judicial activities in surviving sources: only two records of formal *placita* presided over by Adelaide are extant (and one of these is fragmentary). Adelaide is nevertheless the first documented woman to preside over court cases in Piedmont, and her involvement in the settlement of disputes provided occasions for her to demonstrate her lordship.

Adelaide’s right to sit in judgement was widely acknowledged, and there was no evident opposition towards her for taking on a traditionally male role. There are brief mentions of Adelaide administering justice in contemporary letters written by Peter Damian, Bishop Benzo of Alba, and Bishop Mainard of Turin. These high-ranking churchmen recognised that Adelaide possessed not just the legal authority, but also the power, to impose judgements and settle disputes. In 1064 Peter Damian, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, compared Adelaide with the biblical Deborah:

*De illa quippe legitur, quia iudicabat populum, ascendetantque ad eam filii*

*Israel in omne iudicium* [Judges 4:4-5]. *Ad cuius exemplum tu quoque terram sine virili regis auxilio, et ad te confluunt, qui litibus suis imponere legalis sententiae calculum concupiscunt*.
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11 PRI, I, nos. 92 (25th April 874); 104 (897); DD OII, Theophanu, no. 2 (1st April 990); Chibnall, *Matilda*, 33ff.
14 Appendix 1, nos. 13, 39.
15 Appendix 1, no.14b; discussed in more detail in my article: Creber, ‘Margraves’.
Bishop Benzo of Alba also thought that Adelaide had a key role to play in the administration of justice. Writing to Adelaide, c.1080, Benzo asked: *Quid est enim Adelegida nisi ‘Da legi Ade filios’? Hoc est dicere: Esto datrix legis super caulas christiani gregis.*

Damian and Benzo wrote primarily about the concept of justice, rather than its practice; Bishop Mainard of Turin discussed Adelaide’s administration of justice in more concrete terms. Writing to Archbishop Jordan of Milan, Mainard related that in the 1070s Adelaide settled the first phase of a much longer-running dispute between the monastery of San Pietro in Turin and the sons of Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno. Mainard dealt matter-of-factly with Adelaide’s involvement in dispute settlement: he did not question her right to sit in judgement, and indicated that her settlement was effective during her lifetime.

**Disputes over which Adelaide presided**

*Placitum* assemblies, which were a formal and expensive means of dispensing justice, were held in Italy from after the Carolingian conquest until c.1100. They dealt primarily with matters of property. Decisions reached at these assemblies were summarised and recorded in formulaic documents, also known as *placita*. Two factors gave legitimacy to decisions reached at *placita*: first, their connection with royal power (*placita* were presided over either by the king, or by high-ranking officers, such as counts or *missi*, to whom authority had been delegated); and second, the participation of key members of the wider community, including members of the clergy and aristocracy.
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17 Discussed in detail below.
19 Niermeyer, s.v. On the uniform nature of *placita*: Balzaretti, ‘Sant’Ambroggio,’ 2.
20 Wickham, ‘Justice’ 185-201.
a) Placitum held at Cambiano (1064)

Both extant records of placita over which Adelaide presided relate to the monastery of Fruttuaria. This is somewhat surprising given the general documentary scarcity for Fruttuaria. Yet counts and margraves had responsibility for disputes relating to religious institutions in their region, in the first instance, and Adelaide and her dynasty were long-standing supporters of Fruttuaria. Both Peter Damian and Pope Gregory VII praised Adelaide for her protection of Fruttuaria. Writing to Adelaide in 1064, Damian commended Fruttuaria to Adelaide’s care, and also urged her: *Et sic omnis iudicii tui calculus ad omnipotentis Dei gloriam tendat.* Significantly, that same year Adelaide presided over a placitum confirming Fruttuaria’s possession of property.

In July 1064 Adelaide and her son, Peter, sat in judgement of a case relating to Fruttuaria. The record of the placitum is fragmentary but concerns property which Walfred, son of Otbert, and his wife Ava, daughter of Gonzolinus, had donated to Fruttuaria. The placitum took place in a pavilion in the field of San Vicenzo near Cambiano (c.13km south-east of Turin). Several *iudices sacri palatii* (Burgundio, Everard, Pagano, Vuazo, Albert, Erenzo, and Gosvino) were present, along with Bishop Cunibert of Turin, eleven further named individuals, and *reliqui plures*. The presence of high-status witnesses, such as Bishop Cunibert, implies that there was wide-spread recognition of Adelaide’s and Peter’s judicial authority.

The placitum followed the format of ostensio cartae, common in tenth- and eleventh-century Italy, whereby charters of donation/sale were produced in court by beneficiaries in

---

22 Chapter 4.
23 Chapter 4, nn.145-146.
24 Appendix 1, no. 14b.
25 Appendix 1, no. 13.
26 Keller, ‘Gerichtsort,’ 53-71 argues that holding hearings at extra-urban locations indicates the weakening of the placitum tradition.
order to have their legitimacy acknowledged. 27 In this case, Abbot Albert of Fruttuaria and Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno, his advocate, presented Walfred and Ava’s donation charter at the placitum where it was read aloud and then transcribed, in full, into the record. Abbot Albert and Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno attested to the veracity of the charter and required Walfred (but not Ava 28 ) to withdraw his claim to the property. In theory, a donor could challenge this; in practice a positive response was expected. Certainly, Walfred and his brother Diso (again, no mention is made of Ava) declared that they would not contest Abbot Albert’s right to the property. Following this confirmation the property was acknowledged as belonging to Fruttuaria and a penalty was placed on anyone who violated the monastery’s possession of it in the future.

There has been some debate about the nature of ostensio cartae, and whether they were records of actual disputes, or a kind of notarial fiction intended to confirm transactions already entered into. 29 Walfred and Ava’s original grant to Fruttuaria was fairly recent, 30 which suggests that this placitum was not a record of the resolution of a dispute, so much as the creation of a publicly-validated consensus about property ownership, which was intended to pre-empt any future dispute about the property. It is likely that Fruttuaria was keen to secure the consent of Walfred’s brother, Diso, to the transaction, as this was not mentioned in the original donation charter. 31 The role of Adelaide, Peter, the iudices and all the other assembled notables was thus not to adjudicate, but simply to bear witness to the transaction. Adelaide and Peter also brought their margravial power to bear to provide Fruttuaria with greater legal security by threatening potential violators with heavy fines.

---

28 Ava’s legal identity was Salic; she was thus legally competent. That her confirmation was not required in the public sphere of the placitum, indicates the uncertain nature of women’s rights, compared with men’s. On women’s legal status: chapter 1, n.44.
30 Their charter was issued in 1060, but cannot be precisely dated: Anno dominice incarnationis millesimo se[xagesimo] ... primo die mensis ... [indictione] ....
31 Disputes could arise if individuals did not confirm a relative’s donation: White, Custom, 40-85; Rosenwein, Neighbor, 49-55.
Record of Adelaide’s and Peter’s placitum at Cambiano (31st July 1064)\(^3\)

\(^3\) From: [http://www.baratonia.it/Baratonia_Arcour/documento1%20per%20vitelmo%20bruno.htm](http://www.baratonia.it/Baratonia_Arcour/documento1%20per%20vitelmo%20bruno.htm)
b) **Placitum held at Turin (1080)**

Another public court hearing took place in Turin in May 1080. The document which records this assembly is not a formal *placitum*, but a *breve memoracionis*. It details the settlement of a dispute between the abbeys of Fruttuaria and Dijon (Dep. Côte-d’Or). Here, as in the previous *placitum*, there was a clear co-operation between ‘public’ and ecclesiastical powers in the administration of justice. A number of named individuals sat in judgement of the case, at Pope Gregory VII’s command. These included the papal legates Hermann, cardinal of S. Quattro Coronati, and Bishop Hugh of Die, as well as Bishop Hugh of Grenoble, Bishop Ermenfroi of Sion, and Bishop Artaud of Maurienne. The secular arm was also represented, but – as with the *placitum* at Cambiano – Adelaide did not preside alone: she acted alongside her daughter-in-law, Agnes of Aquitaine, and her grandson-in-law, Frederick of Montbéliard – the nominal margrave. A great number of other people were also present, but not named.

According to the document, Jarento, the newly-appointed abbot of Dijon (r.1079-1105), maintained that the abbey of Fruttuaria was subject to Dijon; the (equally newly-appointed) Abbot Wibert of Fruttuaria (r.1080-1090) denied this. Fruttuaria had been founded in the early eleventh century by William of Volpiano, abbot of Dijon. Ordinarily this would have made Fruttuaria subordinate to Dijon, but William took steps to safeguard Fruttuaria’s independence: he did not become its abbot, and he requested that Pope John XVIII issue a privilege placing Fruttuaria under papal protection. Subsequent popes confirmed this
privilege. Given the history of papal protection for Fruttuaria, it is unsurprising that the court found in its favour in 1080, and recognised the abbey’s independence. The abbot of Dijon was given the option of appealing this decision at the next Lenten a synod in Rome. Otherwise, he was to drop his claim.

The location of this *placitum* is significant. The case was not heard in Dijon, nor in Rome, but in Turin, c.323km south-west of Dijon, but only c.19km from Fruttuaria. Fruttuaria not only maintained close relations with the papacy, but also with Adelaide’s dynasty. As we have seen, Peter Damian commended Fruttuaria to Adelaide’s care in 1064, and she supported the monastery *in placito* that same year. In 1073 Gregory VII had urged Adelaide to protect Fruttuaria; since he arranged for the case to be heard in Turin in 1080, in Adelaide’s presence, its outcome was a forgone conclusion. Previté-Orton referred to this dispute as a ‘small matter’, but it is indicative of Adelaide’s status, and the faith which Gregory VII placed in her: she could preside at court alongside high-ranking churchmen; she could issue judgement on a dispute which related purely to church matters, and in which one of the religious institutions was situated far from her centre of power.

c) *Why didn’t Adelaide preside over more placita?*

These two documents indicate that there was knowledge of formal judicial assemblies in Piedmont at this time. They could be called upon, used correctly, and formally recorded, when needed. Why therefore was this not done more frequently? It is difficult to extrapolate an answer from such a small sample; and still more difficult to know how much can be read into the absence of documents. Nevertheless, there are three interlocking answers which help

---

40 *RI II*, 5, no. 1093 (1012-1014); *RI V*, 1, no. 91 (31st March 1027); JL 3452 (31st March 1070).
41 Above, n.23.
43 A charter from Ventimiglia contains a clause limiting the obligation to host *placitum* assemblies to three days each year: chapter 6, n.115.
to explain the absence of *placita* presided over, and issued by, Adelaide. These relate to changes in documentary practices; wider socio-political changes; and changes in judicial practice.

As regards the production and preservation of documents: it is possible that *placitum* assemblies were held, but not fully recorded (Adelaide’s 1080 *placitum* is recorded only in a *breve*). It is also possible that records were written, but have not survived. Neither of these answers is entirely satisfactory: if Adelaide recorded some *placita*, why not others? And since many of Adelaide’s donation charters have been preserved, why have records of her *placita* not also been preserved? More importantly, changes in documentary practices are also indicative of wider socio-political developments.

Wickham argues that the connection between *placitum* assemblies and public power is the key to understanding their decline. Royal sponsorship was required for *placita* to function. Thus in periods of political instability *placitum* records (temporarily) dried up. The sustained political and institutional crises in the kingdom of Italy in the eleventh century, and the concomitant weakening of public power, meant that *placita* became increasingly less common. Wickham, along with other scholars, thus views the decline in *placita* as indicative of broader socio-political changes in the post-Carolingian world (the so-called ‘feudal revolution’).

According to an influential view, between the tenth and twelfth centuries Carolingian ‘public’ order gave way to the ‘private’ (or signorial) exercise of power by lords, who incorporated aspects of public office into the dynastic power of their families. In turn, this had an impact on the administration of justice: the authority of courts declined and

---

44 Wickham, ‘Justice,’ esp. 194ff.; Wickham, ‘Court’.
45 Wickham, ‘Court,’ 19; Wickham, ‘Justice,’ 195, 247; Sutherland, ‘Placitum’.
48 Above, pp.7f., 37f.
counts/margraves acted increasingly informally, locally, and sometimes violently, when they settled disputes. Yet many scholars have questioned this contrast between Carolingian public order and eleventh-century privatised violence, emphasising that order is not dependent upon strong royal government; and that the operation of ‘public’ and ‘private’ justice is not easy to disentangle. In Turin, as we shall see, disputes were settled by both formal and informal procedures, which cannot easily be classified as ‘public’ or ‘private’.

Although the placitum tradition declined more sharply in Piedmont than in other regions of Italy, such as Tuscany, or the Veneto, this is not connected with a loss of margravial power under Adelaide, nor to her gender. There is similarly little evidence of placitum assemblies under Adelaide’s forebears: her father, Olderic-Manfred, is only documented at one placitum; and there is no surviving evidence of her grandfather, Manfred, administering justice. Moreover, in Tuscany, Adelaide’s contemporaries Beatrice and Matilda presided over numerous placita, despite their gender. It is worth noting, however, that, unlike Beatrice and Matilda, Adelaide did not preside over placita alone: on both occasions she acted alongside a nominal (male) margrave.

Adelaide’s formal placita both date to periods of crisis in her power: they were issued shortly after a new, and young, margrave was appointed. In 1064, Adelaide’s son, Peter, had just come of age; and in 1080, Adelaide’s grandson-in-law, Frederick, had just become the new margrave of Turin. This suggests two different possibilities: first, that individuals and/or institutions deliberately provoked a ‘dispute’ so that their rights could be confirmed and

53 Appendix 2, I/1.
54 Castagnetti, ‘Feudalizzazione,’ 739f. Cancian, ‘Cartario,’ does not mention the lack of placita in her survey of Adelaide’s documents.
55 Above n.13.
recorded. In the case of the 1064 dispute, for example, Walfred and Ava made their donation in 1060, shortly after Adelaide’s husband, Otto of Savoy, died.56 Did Fruttuaria feel the need to have their rights confirmed by the new margrave? Second, Adelaide’s holding of *placita* could be understood as an attempt to lay claim to public power and the traditions of the past in order to confirm her political power in the present. In other words, *placitum* assemblies were perhaps revived (or recorded) by Adelaide, on these specific occasions, as a means of asserting her own legitimacy, and that of the new margrave of Turin, as much as for resolving disputes.57 Ordinarily, Adelaide had no need to call upon *placita* to enforce margravial justice: as we shall see, she was more than capable of settling disputes solely on the basis of her own political legitimacy, without reference to office, or royal power.

In the absence of *placita*, how were disputes resolved in Turin? The third point is that the recourse to margravial power *in placito* was only one possibility for dispute resolution. Disputes could also be settled by extra-judicial means, through compromise, mediation, and negotiation.58 These less formal settlements were often more effective. While members of the local political community were still present, as were experts on local law/custom, their numbers were more limited, making controlling them, and the outcome of the case, much simpler.

The number of judges was also limited compared with formal *placita*. As we have seen (chapter 5) Adelaide built up a cadre of *iudices* from the 1060s onwards. These officers did not simply witness Adelaide’s legal deeds and transfers of property, they participated in court activity as well. They were presumably active in the initial stages of cases, which has left little trace in the sources: they questioned witnesses and disputants, and examined legal

56 Appendix 1, no. 10a.
57 Shortly after Adelaide’s death, her granddaughter Agnes made an unsuccessful attempt to establish her rule in Turin. She presided over a *placitum* with her son, Peter II, and Viscount Erenzo, regarding a donation Adelaide made to the canons of Oulx (BSSS, 45, no. 45). On the use of *placitum* assemblies as legitimising devices elsewhere: Goez, *Beatrix*, 92f.; Wickham, ‘Justice,’ 240ff.
documents. Although there is little evidence of their expert legal knowledge being used in the surviving sources (or of cases being settled according to legal norms), the activities of these iudices presumably ensured the smooth functioning of Adelaide’s courts. Because these officers were tied to Adelaide by fidelity and dependency, their activities also ensured Adelaide’s continuing control over dispute settlement. This in turn increased Adelaide’s revenues from judicial sources, and made her presence more concretely felt among her subjects. It also enhanced her reputation as a just ruler. In other words, even where dispute settlement was less formal, Adelaide remained central to the process. Adelaide and the same margravial officers (iudices and viscounts) who appeared in her placita are also found brokering more ‘informal’ settlements, including the next case under discussion.

d) Dispute between Pagano and his wife Otta, and alii homines (1091)

In February 1091 a charter was drawn up in Pinerolo detailing a complicated loan agreement between Pagano de Valle Ferraria and his wife Otta, Abbot Arduin of Pinerolo (r.1076/8-1095), and alii homines. Pagano and Otta had previously pledged property they owned in Pinerolo to the unnamed homines as part of a credit agreement, and had evidently defaulted on the loan. Abbot Arduin bought their debt, and the 1091 document records his investiture with Pagano’s and Otta’s property. In return, Abbot Arduin granted Pagano and Otta, and their heirs, the possession of a mill at Pinerolo, for as long as they kept faith with the agreement.

60 Vallis Ferraria has been identified as Val Ferrera, Switzerland (BSSS 3/2, 187); and Valfenera (c.29km south-east of Turin) (BSSS 2, 34); the latter identification is more likely.
61 Appendix 1, no. 47a. The charter is dated ‘after September 1090’ (BSSS 3/2, 187) on the basis of the eschatocal. The protocol enables more accurate dating: it was issued on Friday 14th February (Die veneris qui est quartodecimo die mensis febroarii). The notary was evidently following a calendar year which began in Easter (not the New Year); it was thus issued on 14th February 1091.
62 Olivieri, ‘Circolazione,’ 81 n.99.
Tacked onto the end of the charter is a reference to money that was paid to Adelaide and an unnamed viscount (given the date and location, this was probably Viscount Erenzo of Turin\textsuperscript{63}). This indicates that there had been some dispute about the debt, and that Adelaide had played a role in negotiating the settlement. In total, just over twenty pounds (of Pavese silver?)\textsuperscript{64} were paid to Adelaide and the viscount.\textsuperscript{65} This was a substantial sum, and its payment was sub-divided according to purpose. First, Adelaide was paid eight pounds, while the viscount was paid twenty-two solidi (significantly less than Adelaide). This may well have been a fee for hearing the case.\textsuperscript{66} In addition, and specifically for their role in the negotiations, Adelaide and the viscount were also paid eleven pounds (the proportion they each received is unclear). It appears that Adelaide and the viscount underwrote the agreement between Abbot Arduin and Pagano and Otta. The viscount presumably acted as Adelaide’s deputy here, using his legal training (Erenzo was also an *iudex sacri palacii*) to settle the agreement.

This document is unusual in recording the details of the payment made to Adelaide. Antonio Olivieri identifies Giselbert, who wrote the charter, as Giselbert *notarius sacri palacii* (active 1062-1098), who wrote numerous documents for Adelaide and her family.\textsuperscript{67} If so, Giselbert might have mentioned the fees paid to Adelaide, where other notaries did not, because he was a ‘margravial’ notary. Yet other records of disputes written by this Giselbert (including the settlement of a dispute relating to the monastery of Cavour by Adelaide’s son, Peter, discussed below) contain no references to payment. Since the Giselbert who wrote the 1091 charter does not use a notarial title to describe himself, it is possible that we are dealing

\textsuperscript{63} On Erenzo: chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{64} The currency is not specified, but the penalty clause in the charter refers to a fine of twenty pounds of Pavese silver. The same currency was presumably paid to Adelaide and the viscount.
\textsuperscript{65} Appendix 1, no. 47a: *preciu m comitiss e Adelaide solutum octo librarum esse videtur vicecomiti solidorum XXII precium autem in deliberandis rebus datum librarum undecim. et omnis huius precii summa in viginti librarum quantitate continentur.*
\textsuperscript{66} On viscounts’ right to receive fines from pleas: Hagger, ‘Vicomte,’ 80f. For local elites receiving revenues from judicial cases, see below.
\textsuperscript{67} Olivieri, ‘Geografia’ 137; chapter 5.
with a different notary, who was inexpert in the format required for this type of document. It is thus also possible that Adelaide intervened in similar cases, in which her role either was not, or is no longer, acknowledged in the record.

The less formal role of mediator, rather than judge, played by Adelaide in his dispute is not related to her gender. As we have seen, Adelaide often mediated high-ranking disputes: she was able to mediate because of her political power, and her personal connections with the disputants. Within her territory, these same factors were also behind the compromises brokered by Adelaide, along with changes in the way in which justice was administered.

e) Why did Adelaide intervene in disputes?

Some disputes warranted Adelaide’s intervention because of the status of the parties involved (e.g. the dispute between the important monasteries of Fruttuaria and Dijon). Others warranted intervention because of the gravity of case, or because there was a strategic advantage to be gained. Yet most of the disputes discussed so far were between local monasteries and individuals of ‘middling’ status, and involved relatively low-level matters. Although the status of Walbert/Eva, and Pagano/Otta was not negligible, neither was it particularly high. Based on the limited evidence available, they seem to have belonged to a ‘middling stratum’ of wealthy peasants and lesser lords. There is no evident connection between Adelaide and these individuals, prior to her involvement in these disputes.

69 Chapters 3-4; Appendix 1, nos. 29b, 41c, 43b, 50.
70 Pagano/Otta, for example, were of sufficiently high status that, even in debt, they were still granted a mill. Gabotto, ‘Visconti,’ 221 n.23 suggests that Otta was the sister of Viscount Adalric (chapter 5), as both were the children of a man named Arduin.
71 Walbert, Ava, and Otta are not otherwise attested in Adelaide’s documents. Men called Pagano appear in some charters (chapter 5), but are not obviously identifiable with Pagano de Valle Ferraria or with Pinerolo.
This is not to suggest that anyone could gain access to Adelaide. One reason that Adelaide became involved in these lesser disputes is that she was bound by ties of friendship and patronage to Fruttuaria and Pinerolo. Since Adelaide was the founder of Pinerolo, and thus Abbot Arduin’s patron, he may well have written to Adelaide asking for her help with the 1091 dispute. Abbot Arduin presumably intervened himself because Pagano and Otta,72 and/or the unnamed *hominis* had ties of kinship or dependence to him and/or the abbey of Pinerolo.73

Personal relationships were of crucial importance in the settlement of disputes. Cases were decided by the intervention of those with power and influence, who became involved because of their close ties to local monasteries, and perhaps also their relationship with lay disputants. Yet Adelaide did not act in a purely ‘personal’ capacity; she also took seriously the Carolingian idea that it was the count’s duty to administer justice. This was true even in the 1091 dispute, which was settled without recourse to a formal *placitum*. Adelaide and her viscount settled this case informally with the help of men explicitly referred to as *boni homines*. These were men with local knowledge, status and reputation, who often played an important role in the resolution of disputes.74 One of the *boni homines* was the *iudex* Gosvino, who was part of Adelaide’s cadre of *iudices*, and also a local landowner.75 Another was William, who witnessed many of the documents that Adelaide issued in the Pinerolese.76 These local connections ensured that Adelaide had the specific knowledge needed to provide an acceptable resolution to the case.

In theory, Adelaide’s arbitration took effect because it was accepted by all parties, rather than because it was handed down by a higher power. Nevertheless, it is significant that

---

72 Gabotto, ‘Visconti,’ 218, 221 n.23 suggested that Otta was Abbot Arduin’s aunt.
73 The *hominis* may have been ‘the men’ (that is, clients) of Pinerolo.
75 On Gosvino: chapter 5.
76 Chapter 4, n.221.
it was Adelaide and her officer who were chosen to arbitrate: the resolution was evidently felt to be more effective if it was connected with representatives of margravial authority. As ruler of Turin, Adelaide was obliged to maintain the peace and administer justice; it also meant that she had the necessary clout to enforce decisions. She thus leveraged both her political centrality, and her local connections, in order (by official and less official means), to leave all the interested parties satisfied with her legal judgements. Nevertheless, some disputes were settled without reference to Adelaide. Why was this?

**Disputes over which Adelaide did not preside**

a)  *Dispute between Martin, son of Agtrude, and the monastery of Cavour (1072)*  
Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno acted as advocate for the monastery of Fruttuaria in a dispute presided over by Adelaide and Peter at Cambiano in 1064 (discussed above). He was also appointed by Peter to intervene in a dispute relating to Cavour in 1072. On Peter’s orders, Vitelmo-Bruno, *vicecomes suus*, requested that a document recording the settlement be drawn up.\(^{77}\) No reference was made to Adelaide. This document is often said to record the investiture of Agtrude, daughter of Lambert the priest, with half of the tithes in Pinasca, Villar Perosa and Malanaggio (in the Chisone valley) by Abbot Martin of Cavour, at Peter’s intervention.\(^{78}\) Yet what it actually details is the settlement of a dispute about these tithes between Agtrude’s son, Martin, and the abbey of Cavour after Agtrude’s death. It was decided *in curia nostri senioris marchionis Petri* that the tithes were to remain in the possession of Cavour, without molestation by Agtrude’s relatives or successors.

The information recorded in the charter is sparse and no explanation is provided as to why Martin, who was initially said to hold the tithes in benefice along with his mother, was

\(^{77}\) Appendix 1, no. 25b. On Vitelmo-Bruno: chapter 5, and below.  
\(^{78}\) BSSS 3/1, no. 14; Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 14; Sergi, ‘Origini,’ 17.
required to return them to Cavour. It is common for records of disputes only to record the point of view of the winning side. Here, the tithes are simply said to belong to Cavour by margravial fiat. This charter contains one of the few contemporary references to the existence of a margravial court (where Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno settled the dispute at Peter’s request). Another is found in the *Vita Benedicti II Abbatis Clusensis* (written c.1095-1100): Bishop Rainer of Vercelli went to Adelaide’s *curia*, to complain about his treatment at the hands of the monks of Chiusa; Adelaide found in his favour and punished Chiusa.\(^9^9\) The margravial court (which was not necessarily a permanent institution) was perhaps located at the palace in Turin, from where Adelaide and her family issued numerous documents.\(^8^0\)

\(b\) Delegation to the lords of Sarmatorio and Revello

In chapter 5, it was suggested that Peter’s delegation of the settlement of this dispute (between Martin and Cavour) to Vitelmo-Bruno could be seen as evidence both of Peter’s, and Vitelmo-Bruno’s, growing independence from Adelaide; and also that perhaps Adelaide could not delegate to her officers with the same ease as her male family members.\(^8^1\) Yet two documents issued by Adelaide indicate that the lack of evidence for Adelaide’s delegation to her officers could also be a function of accidents of charter survival. Adelaide’s grants to Albert of Sarmatorio, and to the house of canons at Revello, demonstrate that she did delegate the administration of justice at the local level. In June 1078 Adelaide granted property in full ownership to Albert of Sarmatorio *cum iure et potestate iudicii*.\(^8^2\) In Albert’s case it is not clear how far-reaching these rights were, nor how cases were to be brought to his attention.

---

\(^{99}\) Appendix 1, no. 50. Also: the *curia* of Adelaide’s cousin, Arduin V (*CSMC*, ch.15, 966); and a document issued by Adelaide’s father, Olderic-Manfred, in *sala propria*: Appendix 2, I/1. (*Sala* could have the sense of ‘sitting in court’: Niermeyer, s.v.)

\(^{80}\) Above, p.146 nn.8-9.

\(^{81}\) Chapter 5, nn.159-161.

\(^{82}\) Appendix 1, no. 31.
This is more clearly specified in a grant of lands and rights Adelaide made to the canons of Revello in May 1075. Adelaide’s charter stipulated that if their homines were disobedient, and the canons could not settle things themselves, then the head canon should complain either to Adelaide and her heirs, or to the lord of Revello, who would sit in judgement. Moreover the head canon and the lord of Revello would share the revenues from the case: *et pro forcia quoniam dominus magister contra rebellem suum banni medietatem habebit et alteram magister ecclesiae sibi retinebit.* The charter also contains concessions of public judicial rights to the canons – including placita comitatus/comitalia, with jurisdiction over homicides and perjury – but these are almost certainly later interpolations.

In this document the castle of Revello is explicitly said to belong to Adelaide (*oppidum meum Repellum*); the lord of Revello was thus one of her fideles. The castle-lord is not named in this charter. Given Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno’s control of the castle of Baratonia, it is possible that the lord of Revello was also a viscount (perhaps Viscount Anselm, who is named first in the witness-list of the Revello charter, without reference to his territorial jurisdiction). He was presumably appointed by Adelaide, and certainly performed judicial and military tasks delegated by her, in return for which he exercised rights, and received revenues, in the area. Such signorial rights did not simply have a financial incentive, however: they also increased the prestige of territorial lords, and their ability to cultivate patronage networks of their own.

In the cases of Albert of Sarmatorio, and Revello, rights over the administration of justice were not usurped by local lords, but delegated by Adelaide. It is probable that Adelaide

---

83 Appendix 1, no. 27.
84 The charter is interpolated, but Provero, ‘Revello,’ 284 argues for this paragraph’s authenticity.
85 Provero, ‘Revello,’ 283f.
86 For relations between Adelaide’s dynasty and Revello: Provero, ‘Monasteri,’ 420f.
87 Chapter 5, n.120.
delegated judicial powers to lords elsewhere in her domains, which may even have been divided into judicial districts, in which local officers dealt with minor cases in their locality. Although there is no reference to viscounts’ courts during Adelaide’s lifetime, it is likely that it was often Adelaide’s viscounts who enforced the law and administered justice at the local level. Justice at such local courts might well have been preferable to justice in placito: disputants and their witnesses did not have so far to travel, and the cost for bringing a suit was lower. Although Adelaide’s charters for Albert of Sarmatorio and Revello indicate that local courts were in operation, there is no extant record of a case presided over by one of Adelaide’s castle-lords. There is thus no evidence for the day-to-day operation of these local courts, but they probably functioned in a similar way to Adelaide’s court: since the same officers were present at both courts, they presumably shared the same judicial assumptions.

The lack of extant judgements from signorial courts sheds further light on the lack of documents issued by Adelaide’s viscounts. Charters issued by Adelaide’s castle-lords, or viscounts acting alone, are much less likely to have survived than those issued by Adelaide. Thus, it is possible that a viscount’s court existed during Adelaide’s lifetime and is simply undocumented. If mechanisms for dispute settlement at the lower level were not only in place, but effective, then there may have been little need not only for formal margravial placita, but for Adelaide to intervene in the majority of disputes. Adelaide may have presided over only a few cases: particularly those relating to important institutions, or to individuals under her protection, or to cases which could not be settled by other means.

---

89 Viscounts’ courts are first attested after the mid-twelfth century: BSSS 65, nos. 30 (21st May 1162); 52 (3rd August 1189).
90 On the lack of documents from signorial courts more generally: Wickham, ‘Justice,’ 216f.
91 Wickham, ‘Justice,’ esp. 228f.
92 Chapter 5, n.163.
93 Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 132, 350; Sergi, ‘Secolo,’ 444; Sergi, ‘Potere,’ 63; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 467.
c) Private dispute settlement by the iudex Burgundio (1075)

The next case under discussion – a private settlement, drawn up in the solarium of the iudex Burgundio\(^\text{94}\) – provides evidence of disputes which were neither presided over by Adelaide, nor delegated by her, and which were in fact settled without ever coming to court of any kind.\(^\text{95}\) In 1075 Burgundio, his wife, Unia, and their nepos Giselbert, son of Alaman, sold property outside of Turin, as well as a building and a piece of land in the city itself, to a priest named Adam, son of Constantine, for two hundred solidi.\(^\text{96}\) On the same day, Adam granted the usufruct of these assets to the infantuli of Vuala qui vocatur Pagano in perpetuity.\(^\text{97}\) Neither charter states explicitly that there was any dispute about this transaction, yet there was evidently some conflict about the transfer of this property to Guala-Pagano’s children. It is likely that the priest, Adam, was present because he helped to mediate the settlement (perhaps alongside other arbitrators?).\(^\text{98}\) Adam, who was placed in a position of great trust, may have been chosen to mediate because he was related to Burgundio.\(^\text{99}\)

The two charters indicate that the property held by Burgundio, Unia and Giselbert was transferred via Adam to Guala-Pagano’s children, Erno and Bernelda (not to Guala-Pagano himself). This dispute, like many medieval disputes,\(^\text{100}\) was evidently about inheritance, perhaps of property owned by Alaman, the (recently deceased?) father of Giselbert, to which Guala-Pagano’s children had a claim, but Guala-Pagano did not.\(^\text{101}\) The individuals in these charters were presumably related in some way that is now unrecoverable. Giselbert was the

\(^{95}\) Wickham, ‘Justice,’ 197.
\(^{96}\) BSSS 69/1, no. 9 (3\textsuperscript{rd} September 1075).
\(^{97}\) BSSS 69/1, no. 10 (3\textsuperscript{rd} September 1075).
\(^{99}\) Tentatively suggested by the recurrence of the names Giselbert (Burgundio’s nepos) and Adam in an earlier document relating to Burgundio’s family, which indicates that Milo, son of Domenic (Burgundio’s brother?) was the nephew of a subdeacon named Adam, son of Giselbert: BSSS 65, no. 2 (21\textsuperscript{st} October 1020).
\(^{100}\) E.g. La Rocca, ‘Confitti’.
\(^{101}\) For this, and what follows: Olivieri, ‘Geografia,’ 123f.
nepos of Burgundio and Unia; Alaman might have been their son,\textsuperscript{102} or one of their brothers.\textsuperscript{103} Guala-Pagano’s children were presumably also related to Alaman (perhaps via his unknown wife?) and thus had some claim to his property.

There are hints indicating how the dispute was settled. In Burgundio’s charter, which ostensibly records his transfer of property to the priest Adam, one of the plots was initially referred to as terra emtore (sic), but this was then deleted by the notary and replaced with terra Uala (land belonging to Guala-Pagano).\textsuperscript{104} The second document, which records Adam’s transfer of the usufruct of this property to Guala-Pagano’s children, is described as a carta vendicionis. Taken together, this suggests that the right of Guala-Pagano’s children to the property was recognised with the proviso that he paid a sum of money (presumably less than the property was worth?) to Burgundio. Having paid out money for the property on his children’s behalf, Guala-Pagano added a clause, in case they predeceased him, to ensure that he would receive half of the property in iure et potestate; the other half would revert to Burgundio and his heirs in full ownership. These two charters indicate that there were less official means of settling disputes, without recourse to Adelaide or the margravial court. If private agreements were a common means of dispute settlement, this also helps to explain why so few formal records of settlements survive.

\textit{Case study: Dispute over Tithes at Scarnafigi}

There are no extant charters recording the final dispute under discussion; it is referred to only in a letter written by Bishop Mainard of Turin (r.1099-1117/8).\textsuperscript{105} Unlike the documentation

\textsuperscript{102} There is no evidence that Burgundio and Unia had a son named Alaman. Two sons, Milo-Dondato and Gisbert, were present at this transaction (BSSS 69/1, no. 9). A third, Roger, was present with Milo-Dondato in later documents: BSSS 86, nos. 22 (9\textsuperscript{th} April 1103); 24 (9\textsuperscript{th} April 1104).
\textsuperscript{103} Unia’s father was Gisulf: BSSS 69/1, no. 9 (3\textsuperscript{rd} September 1075). He may be identical with ‘Gisulf called Alaman’, who witnessed one of Adelaide’s charters: Appendix 1, no. 21. If so, it is perhaps more likely that Alaman was Unia’s brother than Burgundio’s.
\textsuperscript{104} BSSS 69/1, no. 9, 151 n.4.
\textsuperscript{105} On Mainard: Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 473ff.; Sergi, ‘Principato,’ 537ff.
of the disputes discussed so far, Mainard’s letter allows us to trace something of this dispute’s background, and see how it developed over time. Sometime between 1112 and 1117/8 Bishop Mainard wrote to Archbishop Jordan of Milan (r.1112-1120), who was the metropolitan of the Piedmont dioceses. Mainard requested Jordan’s help in resolving the latest eruption of a long-standing dispute between the female monastery of San Pietro in Turin and the sons of Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno over possession of tithes in Scarnafigi (located c.44km south of Turin, in a region that was then disputed between the counties of Turin and Auriate). The tithes were evidently very valuable; hence the determination of Vitelmo-Bruno’s sons to acquire them.

Mainard’s letter has been discussed in terms of dispute settlement in early twelfth-century Italy; of early communal activity; and of the increasing power both of the military aristocracy, and of Adelaide’s nephew, Boniface del Vasto (r.1084-c.1130), after her death. It has not previously been discussed in terms of Adelaide’s role in dispute settlement, nor to explain why Adelaide replaced Vitelmo-Bruno with a new viscount. Yet, as the letter makes clear, the origins of the dispute at Scarnafigi could be traced back to Adelaide and Vitelmo-Bruno’s son, Henry-Marchisio. Since this dispute is only recorded in Mainard’s letter, it is unclear whether Adelaide attempted to settle it at a placitum assembly or not. Instead the letter is revealing about the long-running nature of disputes, and about the important role played by personal relationships in attempts at their resolution. It is a crucial

---

106 It was written after Jordan became archbishop of Milan (1112) and before Mainard died (1117/8), and is variously dated: 1112 (Rossi/Gabotto, Storia, 127), 1112x1118 (BSSS 12/2, 241; Wickham, Sleepwalking, 170; Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 473), 1112x1120 (Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 14).
107 BSSS 12/2, Appendix, no. 5 (Hereafter Mainard).
110 Chapter 5.
111 Appendix 1, no. 48b.
112 In general: White, ‘Feuding,’ 204-208; Bowman, Landmarks, 185ff.; Wickham, Courts, 92f.
piece of evidence for Adelaide’s interaction with her viscounts (and local elites more generally), and of the extent of her power in practice.

Tithes were a fixed payment of a portion of the annual harvest, and disputes about them were common.\textsuperscript{113} Since tithes were ordinarily due to the church, technically, neither laymen nor monasteries had any right to the income from them. Nevertheless the alienation of tithes to monks and the laity was a common form of network-building. Adelaide was evidently in possession of tithes (and other property) at Scarnafigi by 1068, when she donated them to San Pietro in a transaction witnessed by Vitelmo-Bruno and Henry-Marchisio.\textsuperscript{114} This donation was part of an on-going patronage relationship between Adelaide’s dynasty (particularly the women in Adelaide’s dynasty) and San Pietro: her maternal uncle, Otto, her mother, Bertha, and her sister, Immilla, also made grants to the convent.\textsuperscript{115}

Mainard relates that at some point after Adelaide made her donation, San Pietro needed Henry-Marchisio’s help. According to one edition of Mainard’s letter, Henry-Marchisio was thought most suitable to approach because his father, Vitelmo-Bruno, was then \textit{potentissimus in curia}.\textsuperscript{116} Therefore Giselmar, the chaplain of San Pietro, acting without the approval of the abbess, promised Henry-Marchisio a quarter of the tithes at Scarnafigi in return for his aid. Henry-Marchisio took possession of the tithes, and gave them in benefice to an \textit{eques} called Seniorino, who possessed the tithes for \textit{aliquanti anni}. Yet Henry-Marchisio did not help the monastery as he had promised, and when she heard about this Adelaide was aggrieved. She removed the tithes from Henry-Marchisio and Seniorino, and restored them to San Pietro. Thereafter, they remained in the monastery’s possession \textit{per}

\textsuperscript{113} On Italian tithes: Castagnetti, ‘Decimi’; Eldevik, \textit{Power}, ch.4; Violante, ‘Pievi’.
\textsuperscript{114} Appendix 1, no. 21. Bishop Mainard does not specify the tithes’ location; it is assumed that he is referring to Scarnafigi, since this charter records Adelaide’s only extant donation to San Pietro.
\textsuperscript{115} BSSS 69/3, nos. 3 (June 1016); 5 (1024, \textit{deperditum}); Appendix 2, VIII/4. On whether women were more disposed than men to patronise nuns: Jordan, \textit{Women}, 92ff.; Johnson, \textit{Monastic}, 34-61.
\textsuperscript{116} Savio, \textit{Vescovi}, 354: \textit{Marchisius filius Brunonis vicecomitis quí eo tempore potentissimus in curia habebatur precipue idoneus videbatur}. Neither this phrase, nor the viscomital title, is found in a more recent edition of the letter (Mainard): \textit{Marchisius filius Brunonis habebatur precipue idoneus videbatur}. Both editions are supposedly based on Mainard’s original letter, which I have not examined.
triginta annos et eo amplius sine litis contestatone possedisset. In other words, according to Mainard, Adelaide’s settlement lasted for the rest of her lifetime. If so, this is evidence of Adelaide’s control because, as we shall see, the Baratonia had not renounced their claim to the tithes at Scarnafigi.

Mainard’s letter raises key questions relating to Adelaide’s power in Turin. It confirms the view, put forward in chapter 5, that the Baratonia were becoming a threat to Adelaide, as they were considered potentissimus in curia; increasing their possession of important resources; had sub-invested a knight on their own; and were evidently prepared to flout her authority. Henry-Marchisio was not simply encroaching on monastic property: his actions represented a threat to Adelaide’s power. She was aggrieved not simply because Henry-Marchisio had failed to help San Pietro as he had promised, but because he should never have been granted the tithes in the first place. According to Mainard, Adelaide had given the tithes to San Pietro ad sustentationem sanctimonialium; if the tithes were used for any other purpose, then her grant became invalid.\(^{117}\) This is not explicitly stated in Adelaide’s 1068 charter which does, however, contain a penalty clause stipulating that the donation was to remain the property of San Pietro.\(^{118}\) Adelaide and her heirs were obliged to defend their donation to San Pietro in integrum ab omni omne, to bring suit against anyone who infringed on San Pietro’s rights, and inflict on them a heavy financial penalty.\(^ {119}\) This was clearly intended to ensure Adelaide’s continued control over the tithes she had donated: to make sure that they remained at San Pietro as she intended and did not enter the hands of another lay power.

\(^{117}\) Mainard; Tarpino, ‘Tradizione,’ 18 n.29.

\(^{118}\) On penalty clauses: Little, Maledictions, 52-59; Kosto, Agreements, 48ff., 121-124; Bowman, ‘Neo-Romans’.

\(^{119}\) Appendix 1, no. 21. There may also have been a financial penalty for Adelaide if she failed to defend her donation. Adelaide’s charters sometimes specified that if she was unable to protect her donation, then she should restore in duplum istas res in predicto monasterio: Appendix 1, nos. 6-7, 9, 30, 36-38, 42.
Yet this is precisely what happened: Henry-Marchisio and Seniorino possessed the tithes ‘for several years’ before Adelaide restored them to San Pietro. Thus it appears that Adelaide had – at least temporarily – lost track of what was going on at Scarnafigi. Nor did the nuns of San Pietro apply to Adelaide directly: neither for help in the first instance (they approached Henry-Marchisio instead), nor after Henry-Marchisio had failed to keep up his end of the bargain. Were they unable to do so? If so, this would suggest that the cases discussed above in which Adelaide became directly involved, even in relatively low-level disputes, were anomalous. Or did the nuns choose not to turn to Adelaide? Given Adelaide’s insistence that the tithes were to remain in San Pietro’s possession, were they worried about how Adelaide might react when she found out that the tithes had been granted to Henry-Marchisio? Did they perhaps turn to an intermediary, such as the bishop of Turin, for help? Unfortunately, Mainard’s letter does not provide answers to these questions.

Nor does Mainard indicate how Adelaide ensured that her donation was restored to San Pietro – his letter provides no details of any formal (or informal) means of dispute resolution by Adelaide. There is no surviving evidence that Adelaide brought a suit against Henry-Marchisio and Seniorino; nor that she issued a written judgement against them; nor that she sought, let alone received, the payment of a fine from them. Recent literature emphasises the role of consensus in the settlement of disputes.120 This was certainly the case in Mainard’s day: the renewed dispute was twice referred to the curia of Boniface del Vasto (Adelaide’s nephew, and one of her successors in the region); Mainard also tried, repeatedly, to settle the case in his own curia.121 Most recently (1111x1116), Mainard had convened a curia with judges chosen by the parties involved, who shared their counsel with representatives from the cities of Alba, Asti, Vercelli and Ivrea, as well as representatives

121 Mainard; Bordone, ‘Civitas,’ 29ff.
from Boniface’s curia, and others from Milan.122 Adelaide may have made similar attempts
to settle the dispute; some of her other officers, who were also Vitelmo-Bruno’s colleagues,
may have acted as mediators. Yet the tenacity with which Henry-Marchisio and his brothers
continued to pursue the tithes at Scarnafigi suggests that Adelaide may also have depended
on threats (or actual violence) to enforce her control.123

After Adelaide’s death (d.1091) the brothers of Henry-Marchisio and Seniorino (who
had both died without direct heirs) took the opportunity to (re-)assert their position, and insist
on their right to the tithes.124 This is unsurprising: first, because once a family had been
granted tithes (or other resources) to exploit, they would not easily give them up; and second,
because top-down decisions (by margravial or episcopal fiat) often failed to resolve disputes
in the long-term. In the twelfth century, for example, Boniface and Mainard made repeated,
and unsuccessful, attempts to settle the renewed dispute. Their lack of success was due in part
to the strength of the Baratonia, who had allied with another of Adelaide’s successors in
Turin: her great-grandson, Amadeus III of Savoy (r.1103-1148);125 and perhaps also to the
difficulties Mainard had in enforcing his authority outside the city of Turin. In any case,
Mainard felt compelled to admit publicly that he could not resolve the dispute himself, and to
turn to Archbishop Jordan for help.126 There is a clear contrast between Mainard’s and
Boniface’s inability to resolve the contemporary dispute and Adelaide’s earlier, apparently
successful, settlement. It was often difficult even for powerful rulers to enforce their will. Yet
the impression that emerges from Mainard’s letter is that Adelaide was a political heavy-

122 Mainard. There is no reference to representatives from Turin, which may suggest poor relations between
Mainard and the citizens of Turin: Bordone/Fissore, ‘Caratteri,’ 476f. Against this view: Rossi/Gabotto, Storia,
127ff.
123 For Adelaide’s violence against Lodi/Asti: Appendix 1, nos. 21c, 22a; chapters 2, 4. On the role of
violence/coercion in dispute settlement: Innes, State, 129-33; Geary, ‘Conflicts’; White, ‘Feuding’; Wickham,
‘Justice,’ 224ff.
125 Sergi, Potere, 260ff.
126 Bordone, ‘Civitas,’ 29ff.
weight: once she was made aware that there was a problem, Adelaide ensured that her officers complied (however unwillingly) with her wishes.

How reliable is Mainard’s account? Mainard explains that the content of his letter was based partly on what he himself had seen, and also on testimony that he had heard. This testimony came from men who had conducted San Pietro’s business since youth, who were thus aware of what had taken place, and whom Mainard believed to be reliable, including Giselmar ‘of good reputation’ (the now-aged chaplain priest of San Pietro?), Othert, Albert Carruso and Otto of Sancto Stephano (modern Santo Stefano Roero?). While Mainard is at pains to demonstrate his trustworthiness, he had a clear interest in the case being resolved in favour of San Pietro, which was *quidam monasterii nostri*, that is, was subordinated to the bishopric of Turin.127 Several of Mainard’s attempted settlements failed explicitly because the Baratonia suspected him of partiality.

Mainard’s assertion that, after Adelaide’s settlement, the tithes remained in the possession of San Pietro for thirty years and more, without any legal contestation, is also somewhat suspect. While Adelaide may have ensured that the tithes were restored to San Pietro, it is likely that this was contested by the Baratonia. Mainard used this specific phrase because he wished to demonstrate that San Pietro’s right to the tithes was beyond doubt. According to Lombard and Carolingian legislation (based on Roman vulgar law), holding property for thirty years without contestation established ownership in law.128 Mainard also omitted other details which might have furthered the claims of the Baratonia to the tithes. Although Mainard implied that the Baratonia had no legitimate grievance, it is possible that they had possessed the tithes at Scarnafigi before Adelaide donated them to San Pietro.

---

127 de Marchi, ‘Documenti,’ no. 2 (22 April 1095): *sub regimine ac potestate Sancti Iohannis*.
128 Wickham, ‘Disputes,’’ 100f. (Lombard legislation); Nelson, ‘Dispute,’’ 49ff. (Carolingian).
According to Mainard, when Adelaide made her original donation to San Pietro in 1068 she did so by taking the tithes away from her *milites*. Neither Mainard’s letter, nor Adelaide’s original grant, specifies who these *milites* were, and it is not possible to determine with any certainty who actually had a claim to them. Yet it is perhaps not too much of a leap to suggest that the *milites* were members of the Baratonia. If so, then the presence of Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno and Henry-Marchisio as witnesses to Adelaide’s grant to San Pietro in 1068 takes on new meaning. Donors often attempted to safeguard their grants against future disputes by securing the consent of those with an interest in the property, whose names then appeared in the witness-list of the charter. If the Baratonia had a pre-existing relationship with Scarnafigi (and/or with San Pietro), this would also explain why the priest Giselmar turned to Henry-Marchisio for help. Just as importantly, if Henry-Marchisio had (or thought he had) a plausible claim to the income from the tithes at Scarnafigi, then his actions become more understandable.

From Adelaide’s point of view, what was at stake in this dispute was her ability to act and have her wishes recognised, particularly by her officers. From the point of view of the Baratonia, it was not only their possession of property and income, but also the nature of their relationship with Adelaide, and with San Pietro, which was at stake. In part, they were concerned about their economic position: they naturally wished to retain full control of the tithes, but even if they lost the dispute there were still gains to be made. There was often a reward for the renunciation of a claim: this could be a cash payment, but could equally take the form of a precarial grant (or lease) of the disputed property. Yet disputes about property were rarely only about property; underlying the explicit dispute were conflicts about status, power and lordship. In particular, disputes were a means by which families and

129 Above n.114.
130 Vitelmo-Bruno (but not Henry-Marchisio) also witnessed a grant of Immilla’s to San Pietro, above n.115.
131 Geary, ‘Conflicts’; White, ‘Garsinde’.
individuals (re-)negotiated their status in their community.\textsuperscript{132} The possession of tithes was not only a source of income, but also of prestige, which could be used as the basis for extending power and lordship over the surrounding area.\textsuperscript{133} Given their status as Adelaide’s \textit{fideles}, the Baratonia presumably felt angry and alienated when Adelaide deprived them of such an important resource and granted it instead to San Pietro.\textsuperscript{134} Instead of supporting them, Adelaide was furthering her relationship with San Pietro at their expense.

Adelaide presumably granted San Pietro property at Scarnafigi, even at the cost of displacing her own men, in order to strengthen her dynasty’s relationship with the monastery, and/or because San Pietro wished to develop its patrimonial base there.\textsuperscript{135} In this conception, although it is likely that Adelaide or San Pietro made some form of recompense to her \textit{milites} for their loss, she was secure enough in her own position not to be concerned about the ill-will her actions might generate.\textsuperscript{136} Equally, Adelaide may have granted the property to San Pietro specifically to weaken the position of the Baratonia. Scarnafigi is c.60km south of the main power base of the Baratonia (in the valleys of Lanzo and Ceronda). It is possible that Adelaide viewed the extension of the Baratonia’s sphere of influence to this second region as a threat to her own position. In either case, the Baratonia attempted to regain control of the tithes as a means of re-asserting their status in the community. They may even have seen their re-acquisition of the tithes as legitimate. In Mainard’s day, Henry-Marchisio’s brother, Otto, certainly presented himself as having hereditary rights in Scarnafigi: according to Mainard, he entered into a \textit{pactum} with Boniface del Vasto that the tithes should be restored \textit{quasi paternum beneficium sibi subreptum}.

\textsuperscript{134} For similar conclusions (in relation to southern France): Geary, ‘Conflicts,’ 140f., 159.
\textsuperscript{135} In addition to donations by Adelaide and her relatives (above nn.114-115), two bishops of Turin also gave property in Scarnafigi to San Pietro: chapter 4 n.70.
\textsuperscript{136} On the ‘reversibility’ Ottonian/Salian grants of property: Leyser, ‘Crisis,’ esp. 25.
There is further evidence in Mainard’s letter of connections between the Baratonia and San Pietro, which makes their possession of the tithes more likely. Mainard explains that after the death of Abbess Bertha of San Pietro, Henry-Marchisio’s brother, Vitelmo, invested Romana as the new abbess. Mainard does not explain how Vitelmo was in a position to do this. One possibility is that the Baratonia had some form of lay advocacy over San Pietro. Originally intended as legal advisors, lay advocates often came to dominate the monasteries they were supposed to protect. Alternatively, it is possible that Mainard glossed over Vitelmo’s status: he may have been not only Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno’s son, but also bishop of Turin (r.c.1082/3-c.1092). This connection has previously been made on onomastic grounds, but Vitelmo’s investiture of the abbess of San Pietro could corroborate this view. In either case, it is likely that the Baratonia had greater rights in Scarnafigi than Mainard acknowledged.

It is thus possible that Adelaide displaced Henry-Marchisio from Scarnafigi not once but twice: in 1068, and again when she restored the tithes to San Pietro. The date of this latter event is significant. Mainard’s letter does not specify precisely when Adelaide restored the tithes, but this can be estimated based on the date of Mainard’s letter (1112-1117/8) and on statements in the letter itself: first, that Henry-Marchisio and Seniorino possessed the tithes for several years before Adelaide restored them to San Pietro; second, that after Adelaide restored the tithes they remained in the possession of San Pietro per triginta annos et eo amplius; and third, that thereafter Henry-Marchisio’s brother, Otto, along with Seniorino’s brothers, had possession of the tithes per tres annos iniuste. At a minimum, this places Adelaide’s settlement thirty-six years before Mainard wrote his letter; and given in inexact nature of Mainard’s descriptions, the real figure may have been higher than this.

137 Vitelmo-Bruno also acted as advocate for Frutturia: above, n.25; chapter 5, n.155.
138 West, ‘Advocating’.
139 Chapter 4 n.113.
Additionally, Mainard and Boniface had been trying (and failing) to settle the dispute for some time before writing to Archbishop Jordan for help. Cumulatively, this suggests that Adelaide moved against Henry-Marchisio in the mid-to-late 1070s. Since this roughly accords with the period in which the Baratonia fell out of favour with Adelaide (c.1075/8), Henry-Marchisio’s actions may even have been the catalyst for their loss of office. In other words, Henry-Marchisio’s violation of Adelaide’s will and authority, combined with the build-up of power by the Baratonia, convinced Adelaide that it was necessary to replace Vitelmo-Bruno as viscount in order to ensure her continued control of ‘public’ power in Turin. Henry-Marchisio’s role also explains why not only Vitelmo-Bruno, but also his son, were no longer found in Adelaide’s documents after this time. The viscount’s main role was ensuring that the count’s will was put into effect; Adelaide had no use for viscounts she could not trust.

**Conclusion**

Although Adelaide did not have a monopoly on the settlement of disputes, she was evidently considered an effective arbiter, who also possessed the political clout to enforce her decisions. Her right to settle disputes, and to receive fees for doing so, was widely accepted. Adelaide intervened in the administration of justice in various ways. In addition to formal, public *placita*, Adelaide also resolved disputes through more informal means. In some of these cases Adelaide acted alongside her relatives (Peter in 1064; Agnes and Frederick in 1080); while in others, she acted with one or more of her *iudices* and/or viscounts. A proportion of disputes were settled without Adelaide’s direct intervention. In one instance, Adelaide’s son, Peter, settled a dispute without reference to Adelaide, but with the help of Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno. Other cases were delegated by Adelaide to castle-lords (Albert of Sarmatorio and the lord of Revello), who were given jurisdiction over particular issues in
their locality. These cases provide clear evidence of co-operation in the settlement of
disputes: between Adelaide and bishops, abbots and the pope; between Adelaide and her
family members; between Adelaide and her officers; and between the margravial court and
local courts. There is also evidence of more informal, private arbitration, decided in a private
home, without reference to local or margravial courts.

For obvious reasons, surviving records are heavily weighted in favour of disputes
presided over by Adelaide, and cases in which monastic/ecclesiastical institutions were the
victors. The margravial court was often reserved for important matters, concerning high-
status disputants, while Adelaide’s officers presided over more minor cases in their localities.
Yet Adelaide (and Peter) also became involved in the settlement of relatively minor disputes
when these cases involved disputants to whom they were connected by ties of friendship and
patronage, or in areas where they possessed extensive property. Clear evidence of the
important role played by personal relationships can also be found in the Scarnafigi dispute,
which also indicates that disputes about property were rarely only about property, and that
disputes could continue across generations.

A key concern in this chapter has been the relative lack of margravial *placita*, and the
implications of this for Adelaide’s authority. The limited documentary evidence makes this
hard to answer definitively. An important factor is the existence of less formal mechanisms
for dispute resolution. Margravial *placita* co-existed with other forms of dispute settlement,
which were more local and more suited to arbitration. Informal dispute resolution was still
connected with, and dependent upon, Adelaide’s margravial power, and her cadre of officers.
In more informal cases, Adelaide and her officers played a dual role: they were acting
simultaneously as representatives of public power, and as holders of local power. In whatever
capacity she intervened in disputes Adelaide (and her officers) played a central role in the
administration of justice in Turin.
CONCLUSION

This thesis is the first major study in English of Adelaide of Turin (c.1014/24-1091), an important eleventh-century woman, who has previously been largely overlooked in modern scholarship. In addition to studying Adelaide’s life and career, this thesis has used Adelaide – and gender – as a principle lens to illuminate other issues, particularly those relating to dynastic and imperial politics, and the exercise of regional power. Part I focused on Adelaide’s relations with her natal and marital kin, and particularly her dealings with the imperial dynasty. Many powerful medieval laywomen – including Adelaide’s mother, Bertha – are found in ill-defined and transitory roles, but Adelaide’s position was more secure: she inherited, and successfully ruled, a large territory for a long period of time. Throughout her life, Adelaide acted in concert not only with her male but also with her female kin in order to maintain control of her lands, and consolidate her dynasty’s position. Yet even though Adelaide shared her power, she did not relinquish it. Particularly during the period 1060-1091, Adelaide outranked her relatives, and was the acknowledged, if not titular, ruler of Turin.

Adelaide’s position was underpinned by several factors. The first was the power of her natal family: she was born into an important, and well-established, northern Italian dynasty. The lands her dynasty held in Piedmont included strategically important Alpine passes, giving them control of major transport and communication routes. Second, there were socio-political and legal structures which affirmed women’s ability to inherit and control property, and – particularly – a view of public offices, and the lands that accompanied them, as dynastic property, which was thus heritable by women. A third factor was Adelaide’s longevity: she was exceptionally long-lived, especially for a laywoman. She outlived not only her father and (possible) brother, but also three husbands, most of her children, and even her
grandson-in-law, Frederick. The deaths of all these relatives meant that Adelaide inherited, and retained control of, greater wealth and power than was usual for an eleventh-century noblewoman.

The deaths of family members enabled Adelaide to gain her position, but they also had the potential to destabilise her power. In the late 1030s/early 1040s (following the deaths of her parents, first husband, and uncle), and again in the late 1070s/early 1080s (following the deaths of her sister, two sons, a daughter, and a son-in-law), Adelaide was involved in fraught negotiations, as she scrambled to prevent the erosion of her power. In the 1040s, Adelaide strengthened her position by marrying Henry of Montferrat, whose lands were contiguous with her own; and by forging links with religious and secular elites in Turin. In the late 1070s/early 1080s Adelaide re-asserted herself by making numerous donations to religious institutions in Turin; by re-organising her political-administrative apparatus; and by allying herself more firmly with the imperial dynasty.

Adelaide’s relationship with the imperial family was long-standing. In the 1030s, Adelaide’s connections with Emperor Conrad II (via her first husband, Hermann, and her mother Bertha) were crucial in ensuring that her rights were acknowledged and supported. The betrothals and marriages of Adelaide’s children and sister, Immilla, to members, and close relatives, of the imperial dynasty in the 1050s/60s were intended to further this alliance. The high-status marriages, particularly of Adelaide’s daughters, Bertha and Adelaide of Savoy (to Henry IV of Germany, and Rudolf of Rheinfelden) enmeshed Adelaide in imperial politics from the mid-eleventh century onwards. The consequences of this were not always positive, as is clear from the repudiation crises of the late 1060s, when the husbands of Adelaide’s daughters, and her sister, each tried to end their respective marriages. Adelaide’s response to these attempted repudiations – like her response to other crises – was resolute.

1 For the lack of dynastic crisis after the death of Adelaide’s husband, Otto of Savoy, see p.61.
She used diplomatic and military pressure to ensure that her daughters’ marriages were not ended.

Thereafter Adelaide’s relationship with Henry IV recovered enough that she played important roles in imperial politics in the late 1070s and early 1080s. She intervened in political and diplomatic matters at the highest level: trying to establish peace between Henry IV and his opponents – with Pope Gregory VII at Canossa (in 1077), and with Matilda of Tuscany (1082). Until 1082 Adelaide attempted to avoid declaring outright for either side in the worsening papal-imperial conflict. She had close links with Pope Gregory VII, and with several pro-papal secular princes, including her cousin, Matilda of Tuscany, her son-in-law Rudolf of Rheinfelden, and her grandson-in-law, Frederick. After 1082, at the urging of Bishop Benzo of Alba, and of Henry IV himself, Adelaide began to support Henry actively in the Italian wars of the 1080s, even accompanying Henry on campaign in 1084.

Part I emphasised the gender-specific characteristics of Adelaide’s position as a ruler, including her inability to hold the margravial title, the impact of lifecycles on her power, and a degree of contemporary resistance to the idea that Adelaide acted to secure Henry’s oath at Canossa. Contemporaries did not, however, question Adelaide’s involvement in military matters because of her gender. Close readings of narrative sources in chapters 2 to 4 – with an emphasis on Adelaide and gender – revealed that they still have much to tell us about women’s involvement in eleventh-century social, political and religious life. Adelaide was part of a network of elite women, including Empress Agnes and Matilda of Tuscany, who were routinely involved in high politics, diplomacy and warfare.

Revising the commonly held view that Adelaide had close ties with Savoy, Part II examined the negotiations and networks through which Adelaide gained and maintained power in Turin. In her dealings with local elites in Turin, as with the imperial dynasty, the impact of lifecycles Adelaide’s power is clear. There were crises in her power, particularly in
the counties of Turin and Asti, following the deaths of her relatives in the late 1030s and in the late 1070s. In other ways, Adelaide’s lordship in Turin had few gender-specific characteristics. As her parents had done, Adelaide founded, and endowed, churches and monasteries (primarily in the county of Turin). Adelaide not only supported these institutions with financial gifts, but also took an active role in their administration: she installed bishops and abbesses, and convened and presided over church councils. Adelaide sought to cultivate mutually-beneficial alliances with the bishops of Turin, particularly Bishop Cunibert. During Cunibert’s long episcopate, Adelaide and Cunibert’s generally supportive relationship contributed to the stability of both of their positions in Turin. Adelaide also promoted the canonical life in Turin, and worked with the papal legate Peter Damian, and with Bishop Cunibert, to enforce clerical celibacy in Turin and Savoy. At the same time, Adelaide forged alliances with popes and archbishops, and used her kinship connections, and wider political network, to promote monastic reform not only in Turin, but also in Germany.

In addition to cultivating close ties with religious institutions, Adelaide was adept at forging mutually-beneficial alliances with local secular elites, particularly legal professionals and the military aristocracy. In Turin, she appointed and promoted *iudices* and viscounts, and administered justice. She also controlled castles and military followers, and ordered military campaigns. Adelaide offered local elites pragmatic, and tangible, motives for accepting her lordship. These included: increased access to (or at least, retention of) economic resources, such as land, trade and other forms of revenue; and increased prestige through patronage and titled offices. Many of Adelaide’s officers owed their careers to her patronage; many of these men – or their fathers – had also served Adelaide’s parents. Adelaide was also able to leverage her social and political connections (particularly with the imperial dynasty.

---

2 Appendix 1, no. 24b.
but also with the papacy, and her own kin) on behalf of her followers (for example to secure the release of Bishop Benedict II of Chiusa). In the eleventh-century lordship was exercised competitively, but – although Adelaide’s authority was not uniformly imposed throughout Turin – there is little evidence that her rule was seriously contested. When Adelaide came into conflict with local elites, surviving records indicate that she generally managed to retain the upper hand. Incentives or threats were often enough, but sometimes, as with the city of Asti, Adelaide had to use force to maintain her dominant position. An exception to this is the county of Ventimiglia, where Adelaide appears to have lost influence over the course of her rule.

**What is – and is not – distinctive about Adelaide?**

As numerous studies have made clear, it was possible for elite women to exercise a great deal of power throughout much of Europe in the central Middle Ages. How distinctive was Adelaide? What are the continuities and differences between Adelaide’s experiences, and those of other elite women?

There were continuities in the activities elite women undertook, and the power they exercised, not only in the tenth and eleventh centuries (a period during which there were numerous powerful women in Germany and Italy) but also before. Elite women’s power derived from their position in the household, and within dynastic structures. A key – and continuing – limit on elite women’s power, including Adelaide’s, was the impact of lifecycles. Nevertheless many elite women played key roles in intercession, religious patronage, and cultural/literary patronage.

Adelaide, along with numerous other elite women, has often been described as an intercessor. As argued in chapter 3, however, Adelaide’s activities at Canossa are better

---

3 Appendix 1, no. 43b.
understood as political diplomacy. There was nothing inherently gender-specific about founding or endowing monasteries, but there was a long-standing connection between elite laywomen, religious patronage, and memoria.\(^4\) Adelaide patronised cathedral churches, houses of canons and monasteries, primarily in the county of Turin, but also further afield. Adelaide’s donations to religious institutions often commemorated her relatives, particularly where there was a clear political, as well as pious, reason for doing so (e.g. Adelaide’s donations to San Giovanni Battista in Turin, where her father was interred). By contrast, and against the arguments of Elke Goez and Giancarlo Andenna,\(^5\) Adelaide’s grants to her own foundation of Santa Maria in Pinerolo were less concerned with memoria. Even though Adelaide is not attested making donations to San Benigno in Fruttuaria, her connections with this monastery were clearly important. Adelaide played a key role, alongside other elite women, including her daughters, and Empress Agnes, in exporting monastic customs from Fruttuaria into Germany. Again, the promotion of religious change by eleventh-century women was not new:\(^6\) there is a long history of elite women’s involvement in the spread of Christianity, and of religious change throughout the Middle Ages.\(^7\)

Elite laywomen, especially those who moved geographically when they married, were likely to further trans-regional connections and exchange in the Middle Ages.\(^8\) For much of the Middle Ages, a key part of elite women’s ‘international’ role lay in their correspondence with high-ranking churchmen.\(^9\) Adelaide’s role, and that of her female relatives, in trans-regional matrimonial alliances, and in correspondence with churchmen, is well-documented. There is, however, little evidence of Adelaide’s acting as a cultural or literary patron.\(^10\)

---

\(^4\) Above pp.14, 156f.
\(^5\) Above, pp.183ff.
\(^6\) Contra: Goez, ‘Typ,’ 186-192.
\(^7\) Nelson, ‘Converters’; Nolte, Conversio.
\(^8\) Above, pp.74ff., 178f.
\(^9\) Above, p.22 n.157.
\(^10\) Goez, ‘Typ,’ 181; Goez, ‘Mitteln,’ 325 suggests, with reference to AH, V.9, 480, that Adelaide was not only a lover, but perhaps also a patron, of music.
Unlike her some of her contemporaries (e.g. Matilda of Tuscany and Judith of Flanders), Adelaide did not cultivate a public image either textually or artistically. In particular, she did not sponsor a house-history, nor any other written works. Thus there is less surviving information about Adelaide’s dynasty than Matilda’s, and less evidence of her involvement in key political events, such as Canossa. This was not because Adelaide did not understand the importance of the written word: her numerous extant charters, her cultivation of close relationships with notaries, and the possible existence of a personal archive, all indicate Adelaide’s awareness, and ability to make pragmatic use, of literacy for administrative purposes. Yet Adelaide does not appear to have been interested in legitimising her power, or securing her dynastic legacy, through literary and/or artistic patronage.

There are other key differences between Adelaide and both earlier elite women and many of her female contemporaries. Adelaide dominated the political landscape of Turin, and played key roles in imperial and papal politics. She was such an important non-royal ruler that (in preference to the more usual term, ‘lordly woman’) she is best described as a ‘princely woman’. This term has parallels with, but is distinct from, both the ‘new type of European princess’, whom Goez believes emerged in the eleventh century, and Thomas Bisson’s ‘lord-princes/princesses’, which he sees as a phenomenon of c.1050-c.1150. Goez and Bisson both argue that periods of socio-political crisis increased the scope for princely action. For Bisson, the wider crises of the post-Carolingian world underpinned princely power, while for Goez, the so-called Investiture Controversy, when both the imperial and papal sides both cultivated the support of princely women, was key.

Bisson’s argument is clearly connected with the concept of the ‘feudal revolution’. While scholars have debated the nature and extent of this phenomenon, it is clear that

---

11 Introduction, nn.15, 166; also Bisson, ‘Princely’.
12 Above, pp.18f.; Goez, ‘Typ,’ 192f.
struggles for dynastic power and territory in the tenth- and eleventh-centuries often resulted in women being given greater rights, and shares, of family property.\textsuperscript{13} This was intended to benefit the dynasty as a whole, but it meant that women, such as Adelaide, were sometimes able to exercise lordship directly. While female inheritance and rule was not the preferred form it was not anomalous, nor indicative of crisis, in the eleventh century. Instead, allowing some lordly and princely women to exercise the same kinds of powers as their male family members was a means of ensuring politico-dynastic structure and stability.

Thus – in contrast with Goez’s view that the Investiture Controversy expanded the powers of princely women such as Adelaide and Matilda of Tuscany – this thesis argues that their aid was sought because they already were powerful rulers, who exerted supra-regional influence over strategically-important lands. Moreover, far from increasing their sphere of action, the Italian wars of the late eleventh century destabilised both Adelaide’s and Matilda’s rule.\textsuperscript{14} During the period 1078-1083 – when Adelaide’s position was weakened not only by papal-imperial conflict, but also by the deaths of numerous family members, including two of her sons – Adelaide had to take numerous, determined, steps to ensure that she retained her hold on power.

Distinctions between princely women and other elite women are particularly apparent in relation to the representation of their authority, and in their exercise of lordship. First, as Regine le Jan and Goez emphasise,\textsuperscript{15} there is a change in the way princely women are represented in documents from the tenth century onwards: they are entitled \textit{comitissa} and then \textit{ducissa/marchionissa}; they also begin to affix seals to their own documents.\textsuperscript{16} Second, princely women begin to rule in their own name: they inherit and rule domains, administer justice, and engage in military activities. There is little evidence of elite women administering

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Contrast}: McNamara/Wemple and Duby, cf. above, pp.11f.
\textsuperscript{14} For Matilda: above, p.138.
\textsuperscript{15} Le Jan, ‘L’Épouse’; Goez, ‘Typ’; Goez, ‘Mitteln’.
\textsuperscript{16} Adelaide’s only sealed document is probably a later forgery: chapter 1, n.185.
justice in the tenth century (or earlier). Adelaide, by contrast, was regularly called upon to adjudicate conflicts in Turin (and was paid substantial sums of money for doing this). In addition to regional conflicts, Adelaide also mediated trans-national ones. This activity was not incidental, but an expression of her princely power. Equally, and in contrast with the ad hoc, and usually defensive, nature of earlier elite women’s intervention in military matters, princely women’s involvement in warfare was relatively common in the eleventh century – particularly in Italy, where there were several female military leaders, including Adelaide. Moreover, women’s military activities were less censured in this period than in the later Middle Ages.

Kimberly LoPrete’s and Goez’s research suggests that there were broad similarities between the powers and roles of female rulers and consorts, but there were also differences, both in terms of the authority with which female rulers acted, and – to some extent – the spheres in which they acted. Some of the women in Adelaide’s family – including her mother, her sisters, and her daughters – partook, to a lesser extent, in many of the same activities as Adelaide, including the administration of property, religious patronage, forging imperial connections, and military activity. Yet their powers were temporary and limited compared with Adelaide’s, and there is no evidence that they sat in judgement. Similarly, there is no evidence that in the eleventh century the women of the Welf dynasty (studied by Goez) administered domains, sat in judgement, or carried out military actions; there are no extant documents issued solely by Welf women, and no evidence that they used seals.

17 Above, pp.252ff.
18 Above, pp.107ff.
19 McLaughlin, ‘Warrior’.
20 Above, p.17; Goez, ‘Typ,’ 162.
21 Chapters 1-4; Appendix 2.
In conclusion, there were numerous continuities between Adelaide and other elite medieval laywomen. These included: the dynastic basis of her power; the impact of lifecycles on her power; her religious patronage; her correspondence with churchmen; her roles in the spread of religious ideas, and in trans-regional diplomacy. There were also changes across the long tenth century which set Adelaide apart both from earlier elite women, and from many of her contemporaries. Her status as heiress and ruler meant that she frequently issued documents solely in her own name, and was regularly involved in the administration of justice and in military activity. Even when she engaged in activities which were common to many of the lordly women who exercised power in the central Middle Ages, Adelaide was often distinguished from them by her status as a princely woman: by the extent of her resources and her control over them, and by the frequency and geographic range over which she undertook them. Adelaide’s exercise of princely power was often comparable to men of the same rank/status, yet because of her gender she also differed from her male contemporaries in crucial ways (including the impact of lifecycles, and her inability to hold the margravial title).

Although Adelaide’s importance in eleventh-century politics and society was recognised by her contemporaries, she has too often been overlooked by modern historians. This thesis is intended to address this neglect. Adelaide of Turin was a princely woman: she inherited wealth, position and authority; throughout her long career, she forged both papal and imperial connections, and exercised not only regional power, but also trans-regional influence.
Appendix 1: Itinerary/register of documents relating to Adelaide of Turin

Appendix 1 contains: a chronological register of charters issued by Adelaide, letters to Adelaide, and references to her in contemporary narrative sources. Only published documents are listed. Deperdita are included, as are charters of doubtful authenticity/possible forgeries. In addition some entries estimate when key events in Adelaide’s life, for which no documentation is extant, took place.

Charters issued by Adelaide are numbered; other documents/events are designated by letters. Each entry is listed according to the date and, if known, the place where it occurred (italics indicate that the modern location is unknown). The entries are listed in chronological order according to the last possible date the event/action could have taken place. Most of Adelaide’s charters contain precise dating clauses and are securely datable; dates for some other events (e.g. births) are more speculative.

[c.1014×c.1024] a
Adelaide’s birth.

[c.1015×c.1023] b
Birth of Adelaide’s sister, Immilla (also known as Ermengard).

[c.1016×c.1024?] c
Birth of Adelaide’s sister, Bertha.

1029 December 10th (doubtful authenticity) 1
Olderic-Manfred and his daughter, Adelaide, who consents to the transaction, make a donation to an unknown monastery (Revello?).
Source: Fragment, inserted in no. 27 below.

[1029×1034] a
Birth of Adelaide’s unnamed brother?

1034 Summer (uncertain)  b
Forces from the mark of Turin take part in Emperor Conrad II’s campaign against Odo II of Blois-Champagne?
**Evidence:** A ‘Lombard army’, lead by ‘Italian magnates’, travelled through Turin and into Burgundy to campaign on Conrad II’s behalf. Since Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, later used her troops to foil a plot against Conrad II (no. 2e, below), it is possible that they were also involved in this campaign.

**Sources:** Wipo, *Gesta*, c.32, Arnulf, *Liber*, II.8; PRI, III/1, no. 222a.

---

**[1033/1034] October 29th (Turin)**

Death of Adelaide’s father, Olderic-Manfred.

**Source:** *Necrologium Sancti Solutoris*, col. 227.

---

**1034 December 29th (forgery, c.1200)**

Adelaide, her husband, Otto of Savoy, and Humbert, donate property in Frossasco and Vigero to the monastery of San Giusto in Susa.

**Source:** Cipolla, ‘Giusto,’ no. 3 (4th January 1235). Cipolla argues that the forgery was made c.1200. Among its most noticeable errors is the fact that Adelaide did not marry Otto of Savoy until 1046 (no. 9b below).

---

**[c.1034x1036]**

Death of Adelaide’s brother?

---

**[1036? after May]**

Adelaide’s sister, Immilla, marries Otto of Schweinfurt.

**Source:** *Annalista Saxo*, a.1036, 371.

---

**1036 December 7th**

Death of Adelaide’s uncle, Bishop Alric of Asti, in the battle of *Campomalo*.

**Sources:** Arnulf, *Liber*, II.11; Wipo, *Gesta*, ch.34; Hermann, *Chronicon*, a.1036, 122; *Necrologium S. Solutoris*, col. 229.

---

**[1036?]**

Adelaide marries Hermann IV, duke of Swabia, step-son of Emperor Conrad II; Hermann is invested as margrave of Turin.

**Sources:** Hermann, *Chronicon*, a.1036, 122; *Annalista Saxo*, a.1037, 374.

---

**1037 [after June?]**

Adelaide’s mother, Bertha, captures envoys and foils a conspiracy against Emperor Conrad II.

**Sources:** *Annalista Saxo*, a.1037, 374. Without mention of Bertha: Wipo, *Gesta*, ch.35; Rudolf Glaber, *Historiarum*, III.38; *RI III.1*, nos. 254c, 254f.
1038 [before July]
Adelaide’s husband, Hermann, campaigns in southern Italy with Conrad II and Henry III of Germany.
Sources: Hermann, Chronicon, a.1038, 123; Bernold, Chronicon, a.1038, 425; Wipo, Gesta, ch.37.

[1036x1038] July 4th (Albenga) (doubtful authenticity)
Adelaide and her mother, Bertha, donate the land they have in Porciana, ubi nuncupatur Villaregia (near Pompeiana, in Albenga?) to the monastery of Santo Stefano in Genoa.
The charter erroneously records the date as 1049, Ind. VIII.
Source: Calleri, Codice, no. 73.

1038 July [before 28th]
Adelaide’s husband, Hermann, dies of pestilence.
Sources: Aninalista Saxo, a.1038, 377; Hermann, Chronicon, a.1038, 123; Bernold, Chronicon, a.1038, 425; Wipo, Gesta, ch.37; Libri Anniversiorum Sancti Galli, 477; Annales Necrologici Fuldenses, a.1038, 212.

[c.1036x1040] b
Adelaide’s sister, Bertha, marries Teto/Otto II, margrave of Liguria.
Evidence: Appendix 2, VI.

[c.1038xc.1040] c
Death of Adelaide’s mother, Bertha.
Evidence: Bertha was still alive in 1038 (above no. 3; Appendix 2, IV). Since there is evidence of a power vacuum in the mark c.1041, it is likely that Bertha died before this.

1041 (Cavour) (possible forger)
Adelaide and the lords of Fenile, at the intervention of Bishop Guido of Turin, concede an aqueduct on the river Pellice to the monastery of Santa Maria in Cavour.
Fragmentary charter.
Source: BSSS 3/2, no. 5.

1041 (deperditum; uncertain)
Adelaide, with the consent of the lords of Piasco, and at the intervention of the bishop of Turin, donates all her lands and possessions between the via Margeria and the val Celasca as far as Sant’Orso to the abbey of Santa Maria in Cavour.
Evidence: A sixteenth-century copy of another of Adelaide’s charters (no. 4, above), states: *Donò al detto anno 1041 [la contessa Adelaide] col consenso dei signori di Arpiasco, e a preghiera del Vescovo di Torino tutte le terro e possessioni circa i fini di via Margerica a Val Celasca sino a Sant’Orso*. Baudi di Vesme (BSSS 3/2) thinks it likely that the record is false.

**Source:** BSSS 3/2, no. 6.

**[after July 1038xbefore 29th January 1042; probably 1041]**

Adelaide marries Henry of Montferrat.

---

**1042 January 29th (Carmagnola)**

Adelaide, with Henry’s consent, gives the cathedral church of San Giovanni Battista in Turin: the church of Santa Maria in Susa and all the tithes and churches in the valley of Susa from Mont Genèvre and Mont Cenis, except for the monastery of San Giusto in Susa, the chapel of Santa Maria, located inside the castle of Susa, and the church of Sant’Antonio.

**Source:** BSSS 45, no. 1; BSSS 44, no. 2.

---

**1043 May 20th (Turin)**

Adelaide and Henry give to the abbey of Sant’Antonio *in valle Nobilensis* (*Saint-Antonin-Noble-val in the Rouergue?*) the church of Santa Agata in the valley of Susa, and all they have in Santa Agata, except for one third which belongs to San Giusto in Susa.

**Source:** MHP, Chart, I, no. 322, cols. 550ff.

---

**1044 March 14th (Pinerolo)**

Adelaide and Henry give property in Pinerolo to the church of San Donato in Pinerolo.

**Source:** Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 1.

---

**1044 May 21st**

The monastery of S. Martino in Gallinaria obtains papal protection from Pope Benedict IX, at the intervention of Abbot Albert, Adelaide and Henry.

**Source:** Costa Restagno, ‘Gallinaria,’ no. 2.

---

**1044 May 28th (Pinerolo)**

Adelaide, with Henry’s consent, gives the chapel of San Giovanni and property in Carmagnola to the monastery of Santa Maria in Cavour.

**Source:** BSSS 3/2, no. 8.
[After 28th May 1044]  a
Death of Adelaide’s second husband, Henry.

[1045x1046?]  b
Adelaide marries Otto of Savoy, who becomes margrave of Turin.
Sources: Annalista Saxo, a.1036, 371; no. 10, below.

[c.1046x1048]  c
Birth of Peter of Turin, Adelaide’s son by Otto.

[c.1048x1050]  d
Birth of Amadeus II of Savoy, Adelaide’s son by Otto.

1051 [September 21st?]  e
Birth of Bertha of Savoy, Adelaide’s daughter by Otto.

[before 1052]  f
Birth of Adelaide of Savoy, Adelaide’s daughter by Otto.

[c.1055]  g
Birth of Otto, Adelaide’s son by Otto.

1055 December 25th (Zurich)  h
Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha, is betrothed to Henry IV of Germany.
Sources: Berthold, Annales, a.1056, 179; Bonizo, LaA, V, 590; Annales Althahenses, a.1066, 72.

1057 May  i (doubtful authenticity)
Adelaide, Otto, and their children, give the tithes of the church of San Lorenzo, and of San Giusto (in Oulx?), and other churches in the parishes of Cesana, Oulx, and Salbertrand to the canons of San Lorenzo in Oulx.
Source: BSSS 45, no. 7.

[1058x1060] January 19th (Turin)  a
Death of Adelaide’s third husband, Otto.
1060 May 21st (Turin?)
Adelaide gives land at Buriasco to the cathedral church of San Giovanni Battista in Turin. Fragmentary charter.

[1057x1062]
Adelaide’s sister, Immilla, marries Eckbert of Braunschweig.
Source: *Annalista Saxo*, a.1067, 409.

1062 October 20th (Rivalta)
Adelaide gives the canons of Santa Maria and San Gaudenzio in Novara: the chapel of San Stephano and half of the castle of Mosezzo, and property in Carpaneto and Vuahingo.
Source: MHP, Chart, I, no. 354, cols. 599ff.

[c.1062]
Adelaide’s eponymous daughter, Adelaide, marries Rudolf of Rheinfelden, duke of Swabia (r.1057-1079) (later, German anti-king, r.1077-1080).

1064 July 31st (Cambiano)
Adelaide and her son, Peter, preside over a placitum relating to the monastery of Fruttaria.
Source: PRI, III/1, no. 416.
Adelaide donates half of the valley of Perosa, as well as lands in the counties of Turin, Auriate and Albenga, to the monastery of Santa Maria in Pinerolo.

Source: Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 2.

Adelaide considers marrying for a fourth time?

Evidence: In his letter to Adelaide (below, 14b), Peter Damian reassures her that her multiple marriages will not prevent her from entering heaven. He refers to her *iterata conjugii geminatione*. This could indicate her first two marriages (*conjugii geminatione*), plus her marriage to Otto (*iterata conjugium*); alternatively, Adelaide was perhaps thinking of marrying for a fourth time, making two times two, or ‘repeated doubling’.

Peter Damian writes to Adelaide asking for her help to end clerical marriages in her lands. He also encourages her to support the churches and monasteries in her region, particularly Fruttuaria and Chiusa.

Source: *Briefe*, 3, no. 114.

Adelaide purchases property in Sancto Stefano Belbo and Canale from Marino and his sons.

Evidence: In May 1065 (no. 16, below), Adelaide donated to the bishopric of Asti property *qui mihi aduenit per cartam uendicionis ex parte marjinus et filiis suis*.

Adelaide donates property, totalling three hundred *iugera*, to the bishopric of Asti.

Adelaide had previously purchased this property from Marino and his sons (above, no. 15).

Source: BSSS 28, no. 177.

Adelaide meets with Empress Agnes and Ermesinde of Aquitaine in Turin.

Evidence: Agnes and Ermesinde travelled from Germany to Rome in 1065: *Briefe*, nos. 104, 142; Struve, ‘Romreise,’ 18ff.; Weiss, ‘Datierung’. En route they spent time at the monastery of Fruttuaria, near Turin, where it is likely that they met with Adelaide. For other possible meetings between Adelaide and Agnes: nos. 19b, 23a, 25a, 26c.

Adelaide’s son, Peter, marries Agnes of Aquitaine.
Evidence: Agnes’ identity is confirmed in her charters: nos. 34a, 36, 41-43, 46 below.

[1061x1065?]

Adelaide grants the church of Santa Maria in Susa: churches in the valley of Susa, which had been founded by her ancestors, including Bruzolo, Exilles, Chiomonte, Giaglione, Mattie, Bossoleno, Canischio, San Giorgio di Susa, San Didero, Villarfocchiaro, and Frassinere.

Evidence: A twelfth-century charter refers to Adelaide’s grant to Santa Maria Susa. This grant – along with another to San Lorenzo in Oulx (no. 18, below) – was confirmed by an authentic charter (et per cartam authenticam ulciensi ecclesie hoc et Secusiensi confirmavit). Adelaide later confirmed her donation of many of these churches (and/or their tithes) to Santa Maria in Susa: nos. 38, 42, below.

Sources: BSSS 45, no. 162 (11th December 1172); BSSS 45, Appendix, xiii, no. IV (1061x1065).

[1061x1065?]

Adelaide grants the church of Santa Maria in Susa to the house of canons of San Lorenzo at Oulx.

Evidence: Adelaide’s grant is referred to in a twelfth-century charter: ecclesiam Secusiensis beatae Mariae ... comitissa Adalasia cum spontanea voluntate ... concessit, dedit et per chartam suam ad habendum libere perpetuo confirmavit Ulciensi ecclesiae Sancti Laurentii de Plebe Martyrum. It was later argued that Adelaide received a sum of money for subordinating Santa Maria in Susa to Oulx: BSSS 45, nos. 45 (March/April 1095); 125 (15th January 1149).

Sources: BSSS 45, no. 162 (11th December 1172); BSSS 45, Appendix, xiii, no. V (1061x1065).

1066 June/July

Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha, is crowned in Würzburg (29th June); she marries Henry IV of Germany in Tribur (or Ingelheim?) (13th July?).

Sources: Lampert, Annales, a.1066, 103f.; Berthold, Annales, a.1066, 203; Annalista Saxo, a.1067, 409; Annales Altahenses, a.1066, 71f. (Ingelheim); Bernold, Chronicon, a.1066, 396; Bonizo, LaA, VI, 596; Bruno, Saxonicum bellum, ch.6, 16f.; Annales Weissenburgenses, a.1066, 53.

1066 (Susa)

Adelaide donates vineyards to the monastery of San Pietro in Novalesa.

Evidence: Two inventories made for Novalesa by Pietro de Allavardo (1502 and 1512): Donatio comitissae Adelaide de quadam vinea, facta monasterio Novalicii anno 1066, in civitate Secuxie (Cipolla, Monumenta, I, no. 82).
Adelaide’s son, Amadeus, swears an oath to protect the Holy See before Pope Alexander II in Rome.

Evidence: Pope Gregory VII’s letter, reminding Amadeus (and others), of their oath (no. 26b, below).

late 1066-early 1067

Adelaide meets Empress Agnes in Turin, as Agnes travels from Rome to Germany to secure the support of her son, Henry IV, for Pope Alexander II?

Evidence: Agnes intervened in imperial diplomas in Germany in 1067 (DD HIV, nos. 188, 196). It is possible that she travelled via Adelaide’s lands, although she is not documented there, as she is on other occasions: 16a, 23a, 25a, 26c.

Pope Alexander II writes to Adelaide, reminding her that he had excommunicated Archbishop Guido da Velate of Milan for perjury, and that Guido’s consecration of Ingo as bishop of Asti was thus invalid.

Source: JL, no. 115.

[late 1067]

Shortly before his death, Eckbert of Braunschweig attempts to repudiate his wife, Immilla (Adelaide’s sister), in order to marry Adela of Louvain.

Sources: Lampert, Annales, a.1068, 105; Annalista Saxo, a.1068, 411.

[1060x1068?] Adelaide’s son, Amadeus, marries a Burgundian woman?

Late sources indicate that Amadeus married Joan, daughter of Gerold of Geneva: Chronica Altacumbae, col. 671; Chroniques anciennes, col. 92ff.

1068 June 5th (Pinerolo) Adelaide donates property in Pinerolo, Bagnolo, Roncaglia, Saluzzo, and a forest in Saluzzo, to Santa Maria in Cavour.

Sources: BSSS 86, no. 11; BSSS 3/2, no. 17 (5th June 1078).

1068 October 8th (Turin) Adelaide donates property in Scarnafigi to the female monastery of San Pietro in Turin.

Source: BSSS 12/2, Appendix no. 4.
1069 June (Worms)  
At an assembly at Worms Henry IV announces his wish to end his marriage to Bertha, Adelaide’s daughter.  
Another synod is arranged to decide the matter (below, no. 21b).  

1069 [after Michelmas] (Frankfurt)  
A synod is held at Frankfurt to discuss Henry IV’s repudiation of Bertha (above, 21a). The papal legate, Peter Damian, presides. Damian opposes the repudiation on the grounds of canon law; many German princes fear to anger Adelaide. Henry IV reluctantly reconciles with Bertha.  
**Sources:** Lampert, *Annales*, a.1069, 105f., 109f.; *Annales Altabenses*, a.1069, 78.

1069  
(uncertain)  
Adelaide besieges and captures the city of Lodi. She lays waste to the surrounding area, before shutting the gates to the city and setting fire to the buildings. Thousands of men, women, and children die.  
Adelaide later goes to Rome to undertake penance for her actions (below, no. 25c).  
**Source:** *Annales Altabenses*, a.1069, 78.

1069  
Rudolf of Rheinfelden attempts to repudiate his wife, Adelaide of Savoy (Adelaide’s daughter), on the grounds of adultery.  
Rudolf and Adelaide reconcile two years later (below, no. 24a).  
**Sources:** *Annales Weisenburgenses*, aa.1069, 1071, 55; Wenric, *Epistola*, 294; *CSG*, a.1070, 192.

1069 [21st/30th November]  
Adelaide, and her sons Peter, Amadeus and Otto, through the mediation of Abbot Adraldo of Novalesa-Breme and Artaldus, *praepositus* of Vienne, promise Archbishop Leodegar of Vienne that no further coining will take place in Aiguebelle.  
**Source:** BSSS 127, no. 65 (dated 29th November 1066).

1070 [23rd April?]  
After a long-standing conflict, Adelaide captures and burns the city of Asti, and installs Ingo as bishop.
Sources: Arnulf, Liber, III.7, 173f.; Ogerio Alfieri, Chronicon, c.6, 58 (dated 23rd April 1070); William Ventura, Memoriale, col. 733; Chronicon Abbatiae Fructuariensis, 132f. (23rd April 1070)

1070 [after 23rd April] 
( _deperditum_; uncertain) 23

After capturing the city of Asti (above no. 22a), Adelaide donates the church of San Secundo della Torre Rossa (now Santa Caterina) in Asti to the abbey of Fruttuaria.

Source: Chronicon Abbatiae Fructuariensis, 132f.

1070 [AprilMay?]

a

Adelaide meets with Archbishop Anno of Cologne and Empress Agnes either in Rome, or as they travel through her lands en route to Germany.

Evidence: At this time, Adelaide granted Anno relics for his monastery of Siegburg (no. 23b below). In early 1070 Anno and Agnes were in Rome (JL, no. 4675); Adelaide may also have been in Rome to seek penance from Alexander II (no. 25c, below). They may thus have met each other in Rome. Alternatively, they could have met in Turin: on his way from Rome back to Cologne, Anno took twelve monks from Fruttuaria with him to Siegburg (Lampert, Annales, a.1070, 245; _Vita Annonis_, c.23, 476). Agnes’ presence is not documented in Turin, but it is likely that she travelled with Anno from Rome, at least as far as Fruttuaria (Black-Veldtrupp, _Agnes_, 46f., 96; against this: Bulst-Thiele, _Agnes_, 92 n.6). If Agnes was travelling through Adelaide’s lands with Anno, it is likely that the two women met one another. For other possible meetings between Adelaide and Agnes: nos. 17a, 20b, 26a, 27c.

1070 [May?]

b

Adelaide orders the canons of Saint-Maurice-en-Valais to give the relics of the Theban legion to Archbishop Anno of Cologne.

Source: _Vita Annonis_, c.33, 480.

1070 
( _deperditum_) 24

Adelaide donates property and rights in Giaglione and Lostai to the monastery of San Pietro in Novalesa, and prohibits the monastery of Susa from taking tolls and pasturing their sheep.

Evidence: Attested in a charter of Adelaide’s grandson, Humbert II of Savoy (Cipolla, Monumenta, I, no. LXXXXX). The date comes from later inventories made by Pietro da Allavardo: _D. Aladia comitissa fecit domino priori investituram de uno manso in Iaglono sub anno 1070, alligata cum verto baculo._

1071 a

Rudolf of Rheinfelden reconciles with his wife Adelaide (Adelaide’s daughter), after she is cleared of the accusation adultery in the presence of Pope Alexander II.

For Rudolf’s attempt to repudiate Adelaide, above, no. 21d.
Sources: *Annales Weisenburgenses*, aa.1069, 1071, 55; *CSGA*, a.1070, 192.

**[After June 1059±Before 16th March 1072]**

Adelaide appoints Elizabeth as abbess of the monastery of Santa Maria in Caramagna.

**Evidence:** The first abbess, Richilda, is attested on 5th June 1059 (BSSS 15, no. 2), but by 16th March 1072 (no. 25, below), Elizabeth was abbess. Since Caramagna was founded by Adelaide’s parents (Appendix 2, II/2), who reseved the right to appoint abbesses, Adelaide presumably appointed Elizabeth.

**1072 March 16th (Carmagnola)**

Adelaide donates all of her possessions in Carmagnola to her parents’ foundation of Santa Maria in Caramagna.

**Source:** BSSS 15, no. 3.

**1072 [Summer] (uncertain)**

Adelaide meets with Empress Agnes in Turin, whilst Agnes is travelling north to an assembly at Worms in order to reconcile her son, Henry IV, and Rudolf of Rheinfelden.

**Evidence:** Lampert, *Annales*, a.1072, 137f. (assembly). According to a late source, at this time Agnes took monks from Fruttuaria to reform Rudolf’s monastery of St Blasien (*Mone, Liber*, c.11, 91). If Agnes was in Adelaide’s lands, it is likely that the two women met. Cf. nos. 17a, 20b, 24a, 27c.

**1072 November 16th (Turin?)**

At the request of Adelaide’s son, Peter, Viscount Vitelmo-Bruno intervenes in a dispute between Martin, son of Agtrude, and the monastery of Santa Maria of Cavour regarding lands Pinasca, Villar and *Malamorte* (Malanaggio?).

**Source:** BSSS 3/2, no. 14.

**[1069±before 23rd April 1073; probably late 1069/1070]**

Adelaide travels to Rome to undertake penance for her attack upon the city of Lodi (or Asti?). She meets with Pope Alexander II, who is not sure what to do; Adelaide leaves Rome without being assigned penance?

The text does not specify when Adelaide undertook this journey (which could thus have taken place at any point up to Alexander II’s death), but the implication is that she went to Rome immediately after attacking Lodi (or Asti?) (above nos. 21c, 22a).

**Source:** *Annales Altahenses*, a.1069, 78.
1073? May 21st (Susa)

Adelaide donates property in Urbiano to the canons of San Lorenzo, Oulx, with the consent of her sons, Peter and Amadeus.
Source: BSSS 45, no. 25.

1073 December 7th

Pope Gregory VII writes to Adelaide and commends to her protection the monasteries of Fruttuaria and Chiusa.
Source: Registrum, I.37.

1074 February 2nd (Rome)

Pope Gregory VII writes to William of Burgundy, asking for his help against the Normans in southern Italy, and for his support for the Christians in Constantinople. Gregory asks William to give the same message to others, including Amadeus, Adelaide’s son.
Amadeus had earlier sworn to help Pope Alexander II (above, no. 19a).
Source: Registrum, I.46.

early 1074 (uncertain)

Adelaide meets with Empress Agnes as she travels from Rome to Germany, in an attempt to gain the support of her son, Henry IV, for the reforms of Pope Gregory VII?
Evidence: For the presumption that Agnes travelled via Fruttuaria in 1074, as she had done before: Black-Veldtrupp, Agnes, 52. If Agnes were in Adelaide’s lands, and visiting a monastery under Adelaide’s care, it is likely that the two women met. Cf. nos. 16a, 19b, 23a, 25a.

1074 April 4th (Lateran)

At the intervention of Adelaide, her sons, and Abbot Arnulf, Pope Gregory VII issues a privilege placing the monastery of Santa Maria in Pinerolo, and all its possessions, under papal protection.
Source: BSSS 2, no. 10.

1075 May (Revello) (doubtful authenticity)

Adelaide grants the chapel of Santa Maria at Revello to the priest Gargano and to his successors at Revello, in confirmation of an earlier donation of her father Olderic-Manfred (above no. 1?). Adelaide also confirms earlier rights and tithes granted to the canons at Revello, donates property in Sanfront and Villanova (modern Villanova Solaro?), and invests the priest Gargano and all of his cappellania with the county of Auriate.
1075 July 23rd (Pinerolo)
Adelaide gives a half a mansus in the village of Pinerolo, and half of the income from the
market near the church of San Donato to the monastery of Santa Maria of Pinerolo.
Source: Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 4.

1076 November 12th (Pinerolo)
Adelaide gives three mansi held by Alburno, as well as a piece of land and all its assets, to the
monastery of Santa Maria of Pinerolo.
Source: Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 5.

[late 1076]
Adelaide and her son, Amadeus, meet with Henry IV and his wife, Bertha (Adelaide’s
dughter), probably at the Mont Cenis pass.
Henry required Adelaide’s permission to travel through her lands in order to meet with Gregory VII (below, no. 29b).

1077 January
Adelaide and her son (Amadeus?) travel with Henry IV (and Bertha?) to Canossa, where
Adelaide, along with her cousins, Adalbert Azzo II of Este and Matilda of Tuscany, and others,
act as mediators to secure Henry’s absolution from excommunication. Adelaide, and others,
then guarantee Henry’s oath.
Sources: Lampert, Annales, a.1077, 289f.; Registrum, IV.12; Berthold, Annales, a.1077, 258; Pseudo-Bardo, Vita
Anselmi, ch.16, 18.

1078 January 21st (Turin)
Death of Adelaide’s sister, Immilla.
Sources: Necrologium S. Andreae, col. 195; no. 30 below.

1078 April 29th (Turin)
Adelaide donates half of the following places: Portis, Turina, Malanaggio, Villar, Villaretto,
Pinasca, Mentoulles, Fenestrelle, Usseaux, Pourrieres, Perrera, Pragelato, Balboutet, Fraisse
and Sestrières to Santa Maria in Pinerolo.
Source: Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 7.
Adelaide’s son, Peter, and Bishop Cunibert of Turin unite to drive Abbot Benedict II from the abbey of San Michele della Chiusa.

Source: VB, chs.9-11, 203f.

1078 May 23rd (Salmour) (doubtful authenticity)
Adelaide confirms Albert of Sarmatorio’s possession of property and rights in Salmour, Monfalcone, Fontane, Montecapreolo, Cevere, Savigliano, Villamairana, Caraglio, Bene and Morozzo.

Fragmentary charter.
Source: Turletti, Storia, IV, no. 10.

1078? July 16th (Susa) (doubtful authenticity)
Adelaide, and her sons, Peter and Amadeus, donate property in Giaglione to the monastery of Novalesa. They confirm Novalesa’s possession of other property (in Camerletto, Novalesa, and Lostai).

Source: Cipolla, Monumenta, I, no. 70 (dated 1039).

[c.1078] before 9th August 1078 (deperditum)
A dispute between Adelaide’s son, Peter, and Bishop Ingo of Asti, over possession of Lavezzole, is settled. The land is promised to the monastery of Santa Maria in Asti.

Evidence: Referred to in another of Adelaide’s charters (no. 46, below): Remittimus etiam contentionem de Lavigia sicut finitum fuit inter domnum Petrum marchionem et episcopus Ingonem. It is likely that Peter asserted claims over Lavezzole (almost equidistant between Alba and Asti) after Bishop Benzo of Alba was driven out of his see, c.1077/8.
[before 9th August 1078] (deperditum) b
Adelaide’s son, Peter, donates three mansi, the chapel of San Giovanni in Covaciis, and vineyards, to the canons of San Salvatore in Turin.

1078 [August 9th] c
Death of Adelaide’s son, Peter.
Sources: Necrologium SS. Solutoris, col. 222; Necrology of S. Salvatore, in Savio, ‘Conti,’ 465; VB, ch.11, 204; no. 34a, below.

1078 October 26th (Pinerolo) 34
Adelaide donates half of the estate of Pinerolo and a castle to the monastery of Santa Maria in Pinerolo.
Agnes, Adelaide’s widowed daughter-in-law, donates the other half of the estate on the same day (below, no. 34a).
Source: Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 8.

1078 October 26th (Pinerolo) a
Agnes of Aquitaine, Peter’s widow, donates half of the estate of Pinerolo to the monastery of Santa Maria in Pinerolo, on condition that the donation does not take effect until after her death.
Adelaide donates the other half of the estate to Pinerolo on the same day (above, no. 34).
Source: Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 9.

1078 (in loco Romanisio) (possible forgery?) 35
Adelaide donates property in loco qui dicitur in monte prope destructum castrum to the church and monastery of Sant’Eusebio in Saluzzo.
Source: Savio, ‘Cartario,’ no. 1.

1079 [before March 24th] a
Death of Adelaide’s daughter, Adelaide of Savoy.
Source: Berthold, Annales, a.1079, 358; Annales Sancti Blasii, a.1079, 277.

1079 July 4th (Turin) 36
Adelaide, in the presence of Agnes of Aquitaine, Bishop Ingo of Asti, Bishop Albert of Acqui, and others, grants the monastery of San Solutore in Turin: half of the estate of Carpice, and
confirms the grant (now lost) of half of the estate of Coazze made by her mother, Bertha, and her uncle, Bishop Alric of Asti.

**Source:** BSSS 44, no. 16.

**[before 26th January 1080]** *(deperditum; doubtful authenticity)*  
Adelaide’s son, Amadeus, makes a donation to the monastery of Novalesa.

**Evidence:** a charter of Amadeus IV of Savoy (23rd May 1233), confirms donations to Novalesa by Adelaide, Amadeus II and Humbert II (Cipolla, *Monumenta*, I, Appendix, no. 11). Cipolla thinks the reference is to three separate donations: one by Adelaide in 1070 (no. 24, above); another by Amadeus; and a third by Amadeus’s son, Humbert II, in 1081 (Cipolla, *Monumenta*, I, no. LXXXX).

1080 January 26th (Turin)  
Death of Adelaide’s son, Amadeus.

**Sources:** Necrologium S. Andreae, col. 195; no. 37, below.

1080 March 8th (Turin)  
Adelaide confirms her donation of property in Carpice to the monastery of San Solutore in Turin, and places this estate under her special protection.

Fragmentary charter.

Adelaide donated half of the estate of Carpice to San Solutore in July 1079 (above, no. 36).

**Source:** BSSS 44, no. 16bis.

1080 March 10th (Turin)  
Adelaide gives the canons of Santa Maria in Susa: the tithes of Susa, Exilles, Mattie and San Didero.

**Source:** BSSS 45, no. 34.

**[late 1079xearly 1080]**  
Adelaide’s grand-daughter, Agnes of Turin, marries Frederick of Montbéliard, who becomes margrave of Turin.

**Evidence:** by May 1080, Frederick is entitled *marchio* (no. 39, below).

1080 May (Turin) *(doubtful authenticity)*  
At the request of Pope Gregory VII, Adelaide, Agnes of Aquitaine, and Frederick, as well as several cardinals and bishops, settle a dispute between the abbeys of Dijon and Fruttuaria.

Fragmentary charter.
Bishop Benzo of Alba writes a metrical letter to Bishop Burchard of Lausanne, encouraging him to make Adelaide the leader of the imperial party in Lombardy.

Source: AH, IV.42(13), 432-436.

Adelaide donates property to the monastery of Santa Maria in Pinerolo.

Source: Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 10.

Bishop Benzo of Alba writes four letters to Adelaide, urging her to support Henry IV of Germany.

Source: AH, V.9(10)-12(13), 482-495.

Benzo of Alba writes to Henry IV of the success of his (and Burchard of Lausane’s?) mediation with Adelaide: she is now prepared to support Henry.

Source: AH, V.13(14), 496ff.

Adelaide and Agnes of Aquitaine donate property to the monastery of San Colombano in Bobbio.

Source: BSSS 3/2, no. 9.

Henry IV of Germany grants an imperial privilege to the citizens of Turin, confirming them in their ‘good customs’ and placing them directly under his authority.

Evidence: Attested in a later diploma: DD HV, no. 190 (30th June 1116). If Henry IV made this grant, it is likely that he did so after he had entered Italy, and before Adelaide began to support him actively.
Adelaide permits wealth from Matilda of Tuscany’s Lotharingian lands to travel south, via her domains, to Gregory VII in Rome?

**Evidence:** Matilda was attempting to funnel money from Lotharingia to Rome at this time. Given the kinship connections between Adelaide and Matilda, it is possible that she did so via Turin.

**1082 [Summer/Autumn?]**
Following the intervention of Benzo of Alba (and Burchard of Lausanne?), Adelaide meets with Henry IV and offers to mediate between him and Matilda of Tuscany.

For Benzo’s letters to, and about, Adelaide: above, nos. 39a, 40a-b.

**Source:** AH, VI.4, 544-545.

**1083 April 22nd (Turin)**
Adelaide and Agnes of Aquitaine donate the tithes of Susa, Exilles and Mattie, and the churches of San Didero, San Giorgio di Susa, Bussoleno, Bruzolo, and Chianocco, with their tithes and pertinences to the rectory of Santa Maria in Susa, and to Nantelm, prevost of Oulx.

Adelaide earlier subordinated Santa Maria in Susa to Oulx (no. 19, above). On the tithes of Susa, Exilles, and Mattie: nos. 17, 38 above.

**Source:** BSSS 45, no. 37.

**1083 April 22nd (Turin)**
Adelaide and Agnes of Aquitaine donate the church at Chiomonte and the tithes pertaining to it, and a vineyard at Urbiano, to the canons of San Lorenzo in Oulx. They also free the canons from tolls on all goods which they move through the fortified pass to Susa, and confirm them in all possessions which they have legally acquired.

Adelaide’s previous donation of property in Urbiano to Oulx: above, no. 26.

**Source:** BSSS 45, no. 38.

**[1084 February]**
Adelaide is on campaign with Henry IV in the Campania?

**Evidence:** VB, ch.12, 205 records that Adelaide was much with the king at this time (quoniam apud regem tunc temporis multum poterat). On Henry’s campaign in the Campania (without reference to Adelaide): Anna Comnena, Alexiad, V.3; Frutolf, Chronicon, a.1084, 96ff.
1084 February

Adelaide intervenes to secure the release of Abbot Benedict II of Chiusa, who was being held by Henry IV.

Source: VB, ch.12, 205.

1084 March 31st

Imperial coronation of Henry IV and Bertha in Rome by (anti-)pope Clement III.

Adelaide’s presence is not recorded, but if she was on campaign with Henry IV in the Campania (c.215km south-east of Rome) in February 1084 (above, nos. 43a-b), then it is likely that she was present for the coronation.

1084 (deperditum)

Adelaide donates various goods in Carmagnola to the abbey of S. Maria in Pinerolo.

Evidence: Recorded in in the Ordo titulorum: Item carta donationis quam plurimam possessionum et aliarum rerum situarum in finibus Carmagnoliae ab Adalaxia comitissa. The date comes from the Series abbatum, written under Abbot Arduin, which states: L’an 1084 le trouve par une contesse Adalaxia quantité de terres biens et possessions à Carmagnole et sur son finage donnés à ce monastere (BSSS 2, no. 24).

1087 December 27th (Mainz)

Death of Adelaide’s daughter, Bertha.

Sources: Annalista Saxo, a.1088, 479; Annales Augustani, a.1088, 133; Frutolf, Chronicon, a.1088, 102; Annales sancti Disibodi, a.1087, 9; Necrologium S. Emmerammi, 333.

[after 23rd April 1070?before 13th June 1089; probably early 1070s]

After subduing the city of Asti (above, no. 22a), Adelaide takes control of the parish church of Levaldigi, the abbey of San Dalmazzo di Pedona, the wood of Bannali, the land between the castles of Annone and Rocca d’Arazzo, and the port at Rocca d’Arazzo.

Evidence: This property is documented in possession of the bishopric of Asti in 1041 (DD HIII, no. 70). Adelaide acquired possession of this property by June 1089 (when she restored it to the bishop of Asti: no. 46, below); it is likely that this occurred after her military ascendance in Asti.

[before 13th June 1089] (deperditum; uncertain)

Adelaide confirms the customs and rights of the milites et homines of Annone to ensure their support?

Evidence: A late twelfth-century charter confirms the people of Annone in omnes illas consuetudines et bonos mores, quos et quas soliti sunt habere a tempore comitisse Alaxie usque nunc (Codex Astensis, no. 638 [4th
December 1197]). If Adelaide made this concession, it probably occurred before she ceded the land around Annone to the bishop of Asti in 1089 (below, no. 46).

1089 June 13th

Adelaide, her daughter-in-law, Agnes of Aquitaine, and her grand-daughter, Agnes of Turin, grant to the cathedral church of Asti: the parish church of Levaldigi, the abbey of San Dalmazzo di Pedona, the wood of Bannali, and the land between the castles of Annone and Rocca, reserving for themselves the castle of Annone and the port at Rocca. In return, Adelaide receives in benefice all that the bishop of Asti held in Bredulo, from the centre of the river Tanaro up to, but not including, the castle of Rocca. Adelaide, Agnes and Agnes also confirm the compromise about Lavezzole which had been agreed by Peter and Bishop Ingo of Asti (no. 33a, above).

Source: BSSS 26/2, no. 212.

[1079x1091] 26th January (deperditum)

Adelaide and Agnes of Aquitaine donate property in Saluzzo to the monastery of Santa Maria in Pinerolo.

Evidence: Note added to Adelaide’s donation charter for Pinerolo (no. 40, above), in a late eleventh/early twelfth-century hand: *hanc investituram sive oblationem fecerunt Adeleida et Agnes comitisse VII kal febr de duabus manualiis positis in Salutiensis villa, Pinariolensi monasterio sancte dei genericis semper virginis Marie* (Cipolla, ‘Diplomi,’ no. 11).

1091 February 14th (Pinerolo)

Adelaide and an unnamed viscount are paid twenty pounds of Pavese silver for negotiating a complicated loan agreement between Pagan de Valle Ferraria (modern Valfenera?) and his wife Otta, unspecified *homines* (to whom Pagan and Otto owed money), and Abbot Arduin of Pinerolo, who bought the debt.

Source: BSSS 3/2, no. 10 (dated ‘after September 1090’).

1091 March 18th

Adelaide captures the city of Asti and burns it almost completely.

Adelaide had previously burned Asti in 1070: no. 22a, above.

Source: Alfieri Ogerio, *Chronicon*, c.6, 58 (dated XV Kalendas Aprilis 1091); William Ventura, *Memoriale*, col. 733 (dated 1101?).
1091 June 29th

Death of Frederick, Adelaide’s grandson-in-law and titular margrave of Turin.

Sources: Bernold, *Chronicon*, aa.1091, 1092, 484, 495f.; BSSS 86, no. 13 (27th August 1091).

[after 1033/4th December 1091?] (uncertain)

Adelaide protects and rebuilds the monastery of San Pietro di Parno, in Valle Bronda (near Saluzzo), following earlier damage?

Evidence: The reconstruction of San Pietro is traditionally attributed to Adelaide, probably because it was located in the centre of her power, and surrounded by monasteries which were founded and/or supported by her family: Peirano, ‘Pagno,’ esp. 82f., 89 n.46; Dao, *Chiesa*, 60; BSSS 127, no. 63.

[after 1051th before December 1091, probably c.1052?] (deperditum)

Adelaide gives Adalbert-Curtes and his wife, Bona, their freedom and property in Revello because they had cared for her children, Peter and Bertha.

Evidence: Referred to in a charter issued 1118x1185 (BSSS 45, no. 101; Provero, *Marchesi*, 200, suggests 1123x1163): Tempore nobilissme Adelaide comitisse fuit quidam vir de eius curia et familia nomine Adabertus cognomento curtes et uxor eius nomine Bona quibus predicta comitissa dedit per chartam libertatem et terram quam tenebat in allodium eo quod nutrierant ei magna cautela duos pueros scilicet Petrum marchionem et quandam dominam que in matrimonio imperatoris fuit. Since Peter and Bertha were both born by late 1051, it is likely that Adelaide issued this grant in the early 1050s.

[after 5th June 1068xbefore December 1091] (uncertain)

Adelaide subordinates the monastery of Sant’Eusebio in Saluzzo to the monastery of Cavour?

Evidence: Sant’Eusebio was probably subordinated to Cavour in the eleventh century; given her relationship with Cavour, and her control of property in Saluzzo, Adelaide may have played a role.

[after October 1068xbefore December 1091; probably c.1075/8]

Adelaide restores tithes (in Scarnafigi?) to the monastery San Pietro in Turin, which had been appropriated by Henry-Marchisio and Seniorino.

Source: BSSS 12/2, Appendix no. 5.

[after 1070xbefore 19th December 1091; probably c.1089/91] (deperditum)

Adelaide grants Roncaglia and Fontanile (and other adjacent places?) to Nithard of Morozzo.

Evidence: In 1123 Nithard renounced what he possessed in Roncaglia and Fontanile and adjacent locations to the monastery of Cavour: BSSS, 3/1, no. 22 (6th March 1123). When making this concession, Nithard displayed the document which recorded Adelaide’s grant to him of the property.
The bishop of Vercelli complains in Adelaide’s court about his mistreatment by the monks of Chiusa. Adelaide upholds his complaint, and imposes a heavy financial penalty on Chiusa as punishment.

Source: VB, ch.4, 205.

1091 December 19th

Adelaide’s death.

According to two late sources, Adelaide was buried in the church of San Stefano in Canischio: Chronicon Abbatiae Fructuariensis, 133; Chronicon Parvum Ripaltae, 6n.

Sources: Necrologium Sancti Solutoris, col. 227; Bernold, Chronicon, a.1091, 492; Necrologium Schafhusenses, 393.
Appendix 2: Extant documents issued by Adelaide’s close paternal kin

I. Olderic-Manfred of Turin (Adelaide’s father)
1. PRI, II/2, no. 322 (16th July 1023)
2. = Appendix 1, no. 1

II. Olderic-Manfred and his wife, Bertha of Milan
1. BSSS 3/2, no. 3 (6th June 1021)
2. BSSS 15, no. 1 (28th May 1028)
3. BSSS 44, no. 4 (1031)
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