

# *Reframing the Lives of Gelasius II, Calixtus II and Honorius II in the Context of the 1130 Schism*

by ENRICO VENEZIANI and FRANCESCO RENZI

Universidade do Porto, CITCEM

Universidade Católica Portuguesa, CEHR

E-mails: [eveneziani@letras.up.pt](mailto:eveneziani@letras.up.pt); [frrenzi@ucp.pt](mailto:frrenzi@ucp.pt)

---

*During the 1130 schism, the Anacletian Cardinal Pandulf wrote three Lives of Gelasius II, Calixtus II and Honorius II. Historiography has usually read these Lives literally, as biographies. However, if they are considered in the light of the context in which they were written, our working hypothesis is that Pandulf created these Lives in order to support Anacletus and delegitimize his enemies. They therefore function as propaganda rather than as biographies. In this article passages from each Life will be presented that are significant in reading these works from the point of view of an Anacletian supporter in the context of the schism.*

---

At the death of Pope Honorius II in 1130, a group of cardinals gathered at the monastery of San Gregorio al Celio to elect Gregory, cardinal-deacon of Sant'Angelo in Pescheria, who took the name Innocent II.<sup>1</sup> However, the majority of the cardinals did not agree with the unusual electoral procedures adopted in this case and instead chose Peter Pierleoni, cardinal-priest of Santa Maria in Trastevere as the new pontiff, with the name Anacletus II.<sup>2</sup> While the Roman family of the

All translations are the authors' own unless otherwise stated; all references to the *Liber pontificalis* are to the Přerovský edition unless otherwise stated.

<sup>1</sup> The supporters of Innocent II were: cardinal-bishops: Matthew of Albano, John of Ostia, William of Preneste, Conrad of Sabina and Guy of Tivoli; cardinal-priests: Peter of St Anastasia, Goselinus of St Cecilia, Rusticus of St Ciriaco alle Terme, Hubert of St Clemente, Gerard of St Croce, John of St Crisogono, Anselm of St Lorenzo in Lucina and Peter of SS Martino e Silvestro; cardinal-deacons: Stephen of St Lucia in Orpheia, Haimeric of St Maria Nuova, Romanus of St Maria in Portico, Guy of St Maria in via Lata, Gregory of SS Sergio e Bacco and Albert of St Teodoro.

<sup>2</sup> The supporters of Anacletus II were: cardinal-bishops: Peter of Porto and Egidius of Tusculum; cardinal-priests: Gregory of SS Apostoli, Aldericus of SS Giovanni e Paolo,

Frangipane backed Innocent II, Anacletus II was supported by his own household, the Pierleoni.

This double election resulted in a schism that lasted until 1138. This clash has been understood through different historiographical models. The first interpretation, in ‘Das Ende des Reformpapsttum’, was proposed by Hans-Walter Klewitz, who saw the 1130 schism as a fight between ‘old’ and ‘new’ Gregorians. The old Gregorians consisted of the older cardinals, who fought against the emperors during the Investiture Contest, while the new Gregorians consisted of younger cardinals much more oriented towards a renewed collaboration with the empire after the Concordat of Worms (1122).<sup>3</sup>

Building on this model, Franz-Josef Schmale saw the schism as a fight between two parties with different views of the Church – one more compromised with the secular powers, and the other more spiritual and supported by the new monastic orders, such as the Cistercians.<sup>4</sup> Hayden V. White also read the 1130 schism as a reaction against the so-called Gregorian Reform, towards a more spiritual Church.<sup>5</sup> This Klewitz-Schmale view has dominated the historiography, and it is still current today.<sup>6</sup> However, this model has been questioned by several scholars, including Pier Fausto Palumbo, Mary Stroll, Glauco M. Cantarella and Ian S. Robinson. They have shown how the conflict was not determined by different ecclesiological views of the Reform but was a political clash between the Roman families of the Frangipane and Pierleoni for the control of the papacy, together with an internal split among the cardinals. The real novelty was the European impact of the new role of the papacy and its internationalisation.<sup>7</sup>

Crescentius of SS Marcellino e Pietro, Peter of St Marcello, Gregory of St Balbina, Boniface of St Marco, Amicus of SS Nereo e Achilleo, Matthew of St Pietro in vinculis, Desiderius of St Prassede, Comes of St Sabina, Sigizo of St Sisto, Saxo of St Stefano al monte Celio, Peter of St Susanna and Lictfredus of St Vitale; cardinal-deacons: Oderisius of St Agata, Johnata of SS Cosma e Damiano, Gregory of St Eustachio, Angel of St Maria in Domnica and John of St Nicola in Carcere Tulliano.

<sup>3</sup> H.-W. Klewitz, ‘Das Ende des Reformpapsttums’, *Deutsches Archiv für Geschichte des Mittelalters* iii (1939), 371–412.

<sup>4</sup> F.-J. Schmale, *Studien zum Schisma des Jahres 1130*, Cologne–Graz 1961.

<sup>5</sup> ‘The victory of Innocent II is a victory of reaction to Gregorianism, and this victory is signified in the composition of the De Consideratione by St. Bernard in which the papal office is shown to be a purely charismatic power based upon the ability of the individual pope to conform to ascetic values’: H. V. White, ‘The conflict of papal leadership ideals from Gregory VII to St Bernard of Clairvaux with special reference to the schism of 1150’, unpubl. PhD diss. University of Michigan 1955, 2.

<sup>6</sup> H. Bloch, ‘The schism of Anacletus II and the Glanfeuil forgeries of Peter the Deacon of Monte Cassino’, *Traditio* viii (1952), 159–264; S. Cerrini, ‘Onorio II’, in *Enciclopedia dei papi*, Rome 2000, ii, 255–8.

<sup>7</sup> P. F. Palumbo, *Lo scisma del MCXXX: i precedenti, la vicenda romana e le ripercussioni europee della lotta tra Anacleto ed Innocenzo II*, Rome 1942; M. Stroll, *The Jewish pope: ideology*

During the schism, each faction spread propaganda to support its own candidate. Among the Anacletians, there was Pandulf, cardinal-deacon of SS Cosma e Damiano. There is only a small amount of information about him. He arrived in Rome with his uncle Hugh of Alatri, cardinal-priest of XII Apostoli, and was appointed exorcist and *lector* by Gelasius II. In 1120–1, he was promoted subdeacon by Calixtus II. There are only a few hints at his activity as an Anacletian cardinal. He followed Anacletus II on his two journeys to Benevent in 1131 and 1135–7 and was among the subscribers to some of the extant documents produced by the chancery—he may have also written some of them. After Anacletus' death in 1138, he completely disappears.<sup>8</sup>

During the schism, he continued the *Liber pontificalis* and wrote three *Lives*, of Gelasius II, Calixtus II and Honorius II. The attribution to him of a fourth *Life*, of Paschal II, is tricky, and this article will not deal with it,<sup>9</sup> focusing instead on the *Lives* of Gelasius, Calixtus and Honorius. Historiography has usually read these *Lives* literally, as biographies. However, if they are considered in light of the context in which they were written, the 1130 schism, and building on the works of Louis Duchesne and Ian S. Robinson, among others, our working hypothesis is that Pandulf created these *Lives* in order to support Anacletus and delegitimize his enemies. Historiography has already argued for the value of chronicles as narratives framed in light of the political and ecclesiastical aims of their authors, as shown by the works of Maurice Halbwachs, Michael T. Clanchy, Chris Given-Wilson and Paolo Cammarosano.<sup>10</sup>

*and politics in the papal schism of 1130*, Leiden 1987; I. S. Robinson, *The papacy, 1073–1198: continuity and innovation*, Cambridge 2004; G. M. Cantarella, *Manuale della fine del mondo*, Turin 2015. For a general overview see S. Anzoise, 'Lo scisma del 1130: aspetti e prospettive di un lungo dibattito storiografico', *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* xlix (2011), 7–49, and G. Milanese, 'Bonifica' delle immagini e 'propaganda' in Aquitania durante lo scisma del 1130–1138, Verona 2013, 27–56.

<sup>8</sup> L. Duchesne, 'Le Liber pontificalis aux maines des Guibertistes et des Pierléonistes', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* xxxviii (1920), 181–93; *Liber pontificalis nella recensione di Pietro Guglielmo OSB e del card. Pandolfo glossato da Pietro Bohier OSB, vescovo di Orvieto*, ed. U. Přerovský, Rome 1978, i. 113–29; S. Anzoise, 'Pandolfo da Alatri', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, lxxx, Rome 2015, at <[<sup>9</sup> C. Vogel, 'Le "Liber pontificalis"' dans l'édition de L. Duchesne', in \*Monseigneur Duchesne et son temps: actes du colloque organisé per l'Ecole française de Rome\*, ed. H.-I. Marrou, Rome 1975, 99–127.](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/pandolfo-da-alatri_(Dizionario-Biografico)/></a>.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

<sup>10</sup> *Le liber pontificalis: texte, introduction et commentaire*, ed. L. Duchesne, Paris 1892, ii. 319 and n. 16; Robinson, *The papacy, 1073–1198*, 62–3. See also F. Renzi, 'Uno sguardo altro sul papato di inizio XII secolo: le elezioni di papa Gelasio II, dell'antipapa Gregorio VIII e il loro spazio sonoro', in G. F. Rodríguez, G. Coronado Schwindt and É. Palazzo (eds), *Paisajes sonoros medievales*, Mar del Plata 2019, 294–5; M. Halbwachs, *La Mémoire collective*, Paris 1950; M. T. Clanchy, *From memory to written record: England, 1066–1307*, Cambridge, MA 1979; C. Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: the writing of history in*

Applying this view to these papal *Lives* allows them to be read as works of propaganda rather than simply as biographies.

This article considers some passages from each *Life* that are significant if these works are read from the point of view of an Anacletian supporter in light of the schism. It is worth remembering that the schism was ongoing when the *Lives* were produced, and its outcome was uncertain: everything was still fluid.

*The pope, the cardinals and the Roman aristocracy in Pandulf's Life of Gelasius II*

‘All of them [the cardinals], in order to avoid the scandals which often take place during the elections due to our sins ... gathered together.’<sup>11</sup>

This is how Pandulf describes the gathering of the cardinals in Rome to elect the new pope Gelasius II following the death of Paschal II in January 1118.<sup>12</sup> Gelasius II, the former chancellor John of Gaeta, seems to have been supported by various Roman families, such as the Pierleoni, Corsi, Boccapecora and Boboni, among others.<sup>13</sup> Pandulf also tells us that the cardinal-bishop of Porto, Peter, was acting as the pope's vicar until the new election.<sup>14</sup> The reference to usual scandals is very significant: to what was he referring? It is difficult to read this passage literally because the papal elections of his immediate predecessors, Urban II and Paschal II, did not lead to any particular objection aside from the clerics who were still rooting for Clement III (Wibert, former archbishop of Ravenna), the pope elected in 1080 against Gregory VII with the support of the emperor Henry IV during the so-called Investiture Contest.<sup>15</sup> The more closely contested election was that of Victor III (abbot Desiderius of Montecassino) in 1086, more than thirty years before Gelasius II, although

*medieval England*, London 2004; and P. Cammarosano, *Italia medieval: struttura e geografia delle fonti scritte*, Rome 2016.

<sup>11</sup> ‘Hii omnes, vitantes scandalum quod in huiusmodi solet electionibus pro peccatis nostris accidere ... convenerunt’: *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 731.

<sup>12</sup> U.-R. Blumenthal, *The early councils of Pope Paschal II, 1100–1110*, Toronto 1978, and ‘Paschal II and the Roman primacy’, *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* xvi (1978), 67–92; C. Servatius, *Paschalis II. (1099–1118): Studien zu seiner Person und seiner Politik*, Stuttgart 1979; G. M. Cantarella, *Pasquale II e il suo tempo*, Naples 2002.

<sup>13</sup> C. Wickham, *Medieval Rome: stability and crisis of a city, 900–1150*, Oxford 2014, 428.

<sup>14</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 730.

<sup>15</sup> A. Becker, *Papst Urban II. (1088–1099)*, Stuttgart 1964, i. 91–6; Cantarella, *Pasquale II*, 26–31; J. Ziese, *Wibert von Ravenna: der Gegenpapst Clemens III. (1084–1110)*, Stuttgart 1982, 50–64; U. Longo and L. Yawn, ‘Framing Clement III (anti)pope, 1080–1100’, *Reti Medievali* xiii (2012), 115–19.

this occurred in a very particular situation after the exile and death of Gregory VII in Salerno.<sup>16</sup>

Throughout the *Life* of Gelasius II, Pandulf focuses on the city of Rome and on the Roman families rather than on the ongoing clash between the *regnum* and the *sacerdotium*. The scandals therefore seem to have belonged to this Roman context as well. If one reads the *Life* of Gelasius in light of the 1130 schism – which was already occurring when Pandulf wrote this piece of work – was the Anacletian cardinal referring to the situation following the double election of his time? Was this an attack against Innocent II and his supporters? The *scandalum* during Gelasius' election was caused by the Roman family of the Frangipane. And the Frangipane were the main supporters of Innocent in 1130.<sup>17</sup>

From the very beginning of Gelasius' *Life*, Pandulf seems to create the model for the perfect papal election. One of the topics stressed by the Anacletian is that of *unanimitas*, a criterion fully respected by the election of Gelasius, according to Pandulf's narrative.<sup>18</sup> This clearly emerges from the list of electors included in the account, although it does present various issues. There is a problem of identification in the case of some of the cardinals who could not have actually participated in the election. Here are three examples: Pandulf includes in the list a certain Henry, cardinal-deacon of St Teodoro. However, according to Ulderico Přerovský, he was appointed as cardinal only in 1121.<sup>19</sup> There is also Teobaldus *Buccapecus*, cardinal-priest of St Anastasia, who was promoted to that office only after 1121–2.<sup>20</sup> Last but not least, there is a cardinal-priest of SS Giovanni e Paolo: according to Rudolf Hüls, the only possible identification for this prelate is Nicolò, who held this office between 1112 and 1117, and in 1118, this title had already been given to Teobaldus.<sup>21</sup>

Furthermore, Pandulf tells us that there were eighteen cardinal-deacons and twenty-eight cardinal-priests. This latter number may be a further anachronism: Duchesne believed that the cardinal-priests numbered twenty-eight only during Calixtus' papacy.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>16</sup> E. Veneziani, 'Problemi dell'elezione di Vittore III (1086–1087)', *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo* cxviii (2016) 141–56.

<sup>17</sup> M. Thumser, 'Die Frangipane: Abriß der Geschichte einer Adelsfamilie im hochmittelalterlichen Rom', *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* lxxi (1991), 106–63; Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 230, 293–4.

<sup>18</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 731–2.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* i. 91.

<sup>20</sup> R. Hüls, *Kardinäle, Klerus und Kirchen Roms: 1049–1130*, Tübingen 1977, 149.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* 167. See also Renzi, 'Uno sguardo altro sul papato', 293–5, and *Mauricius Bracarenensis archiepiscopus, quae est civitas Hispaniae: le fonti narrative europee sull'arcivescovo di Braga e antipapa Gregorio VIII Maurizio 'Burdino' (secoli XII–XIII)*, Oporto 2021, 86–7 and relative notes.

<sup>22</sup> *Liber pontificalis* (Duchesne edition), ii. 319 and n. 11; L. Duchesne, 'Les Titres presbytéraux et les diaconies', in L. Duchesne (ed.), *Scripta minora: études de topographie romaine et de géographie ecclésiastique*, Rome 1973, 17–43; Robinson, *The papacy (1073–*

Pandulf did not mention the names of all the cardinals; according to his list, there were nine cardinals (Peter cardinal-bishop of Porto, Boniface of San Marco, Desiderius of Santa Prassede, Peter cardinal-priest of Santa Susanna, Saxo cardinal-priest of Santo Stefano al Monte Celio, Sigizo cardinal-priest of San Sisto, Amicus cardinal-priest of SS Nereo and Achilleo, Gregory cardinal-deacon of Sant'Eustachio, Oderisius cardinal-deacon of Sant'Agata/later abbot of Montecassino as Oderisius II) who then voted for Anacletus II, while there were only three Innocentians (John of Crema cardinal-priest of San Crisogono, Conrad cardinal-priest of Santa Pudenziana/later cardinal-bishop of Sabina and Stephen cardinal-deacon of Santa Lucia in *Orphea*).<sup>23</sup> The Anacletian cardinal adopted a similar choice later on in this *Life* when listing the appointments of cardinals made by Gelasius; among these, he did not recall Romanus cardinal-deacon of St Maria in Portico, a future Innocentian.<sup>24</sup>

The list of alleged electors thus appears to have been exaggerated: he even mentions the presence of some archbishops (a presence already criticised by Duchesne) together with the Roman clergy and lay members of the Roman elites.<sup>25</sup> Pandulf seems to depict a canonical and legitimate election, in accordance with both the eighth-century electoral procedures ('electio per clerum et populum') and with his interpretation of the 1059 *Decretum in electione pape*, a decree issued by Nicholas II during an emergency situation to justify the procedures followed in his election:<sup>26</sup>

Without any further delay he was chosen and praised by everybody including the bishops, who have not got any power in the election of the Roman pontiff but to approve or disapprove [the elect].<sup>27</sup>

This assertion does not match the electoral procedures foreseen by the *Decretum*, which gave a key role to the cardinal-bishops in the election:

1198), 63. On cardinals see the classic works J. Brixius, *Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130–1181*, Berlin 1912; B. Zenker, *Die Mitglieder des Kardinalkollegiums von 1130 bis 1159*, Würzburg 1964; W. Maleczek, 'Das Kardinalskollegium unter Innocenz II. und "Anaklet II."', *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* xix (1981), 27–78; and H. Tillmann, 'Ricerche sull'origine dei membri del collegio cardinalizio nel XII secolo', *Rivista di storia della Chiesa in Italia* xxvi (1972), 313–53.

<sup>23</sup> S. Anzoise, 'Per una riconsiderazione dello scisma del 1130: il ruolo dei cardinali dal 1059', unpubl. MA diss. Pisa 2009, 149–50 and nn. 431–2.

<sup>24</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 737; Hüls, *Kardinäle*, 236–7.

<sup>25</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 730–2; *Liber pontificalis* (Duchesne edn), ii. 319 and nn. 11–13.

<sup>26</sup> MGH, *Leges, Concilia aevi Karolini* [742–842], Hannover–Leipzig 1906, ii. 1, p. 86; H.-G. Krause, *Das Papstwahldekret von 1059 und seine Rolle im Investiturstreit*, Rome 1960, 271–5; Robinson, *The papacy (1073–1198)*, 35–6; A. Paravicini Bagliani, *Morte e elezione del papa: norme, riti e conflitti*, Rome 2013, 10–29.

<sup>27</sup> 'Nec mora; captus ab omnibus, laudatur ab omnibus; nec non etiam ab episcopis, quorum nulla prorsus est in alia electione praesulis Romani potestas nisi approbandi vel contra': *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 731–2.



'At death of the Pontiff of the Universal Roman Church, firstly the cardinal-bishops ought to discuss very scrupulously [the papal election], next they summon the cardinal-clerics [priests and deacons].'<sup>28</sup>

Where did Pandulf turn his view, then? Stroll has argued that Pandulf's source is a letter written by Peter, cardinal-bishop of Porto, to his fellow cardinal-bishops right after the election of Anacletus II,<sup>29</sup> whom he supported: 'Ultimately, neither you nor I have the right to elect [the pope] but we can only disapprove or approve whoever has been elected by our brethren.'<sup>30</sup> Peter of Porto charged his fellow bishops with having appointed the new pope by themselves, without consulting either him or the majority of the other cardinals – to whom the choice of the candidate was entrusted, according to him.<sup>31</sup>

The role of the cardinal-bishops in the papal election had been problematic since the second half of the eleventh century.<sup>32</sup> A second version of the *Decretum*, probably written in the milieu backing Clement III, had already widened the right of election to all cardinals without any distinction between bishops, priests and deacons.<sup>33</sup> Building on Duchesne and Robinson, it can be suggested that Pandulf was using and re-shaping a long-standing ecclesiological quarrel in order to attack Innocent's faction. The majority of the cardinal-bishops indeed voted for Innocent II, while Peter of Porto and Egidius of Tusculum were the only ones to support Anacletus. On the other hand, Anacletus gained the majority of the vote from the cardinal-priests and deacons – and this is why both Pandulf and Peter of Porto stressed the role of *unanimitas*. One of the main reasons adopted by the Anacletians to justify their choice was that he had been appointed as pope by the *maior pars* (the majority of the

<sup>28</sup> 'Ut, obeunte huius Romane universalis ecclesiae pontifice, inprimis cardinale episcopi diligentissima simul consideratione tractantes, mox sibi clericos cardinale adhibeant': Krause, *Das Papstwahldekret*, 271–2.

<sup>29</sup> Stroll, *The Jewish pope*, 91–2, and *The medieval abbey of Farfa: target of papal and imperial ambitions*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997, 200. Similar accusations were already expressed by Cardinal Deusdedit in his *Collectio Canonum* (1086–7): U.-R. Blumenthal, 'Fälschungen bei Kanonisten der Kirchenreform des 11. Jahrhunderts', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter: Internationaler Kongreß der Monumenta Germaniae Historica München*, Hannover 1988, ii. 241–62.

<sup>30</sup> 'Postremo nec vestrum sicut nec meum fuit eligere sed potius electum a fratribus spernere vel approbare': William of Malmesbury, *De historia novella* by William of Malmesbury, trans. K. R. Potter, London 1955, 8.

<sup>31</sup> 'Quod igitur, neglecto ordine, contempto canone spreto etiam ipso a vobis condito anathemate, me inconsulto priore vestro, inconsultis etiam fratribus majoribus et prioribus nec etiam vocatis aut expectatis, cum essetis novitii et in numero brevi paucissimi, facere praesumpsistis': *ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> O. Capitani, 'Problematica della Disceptatio Synodalis', in *Studi gregoriani X*, Rome 1975, 143–74; Stroll, *The Jewish pope*, 91–2.

<sup>33</sup> Krause, *Das Papstwahldekret*, 272–3; Robinson, *The papacy (1073–1198)*, 35–6.

cardinals). On the other hand, the Innocentians claimed that their candidate was chosen by the *sanior et melior pars* (the best and wisest part).<sup>34</sup> Gelasius' election was once again written taking into account the 1130 schism.

This conflict is further evidence that there was no consensus in Rome on papal electoral procedures. Already in the eleventh century, there were different positions on the *Decretum*, which was defended by Peter Damian (cardinal-bishop of Ostia) but rejected by Deusdedit, cardinal-priest of St Pietro in Vincoli and author of a canonical collection written at the end of Gregory VII's papacy. An agreement was only reached in 1179 during the Third Lateran Council, when Alexander III established that the new pope should be elected by two-thirds of all the cardinals, without any distinction among them. If one candidate asserted that he was the right pope without meeting these provisions, he and his supporters were automatically excommunicated.<sup>35</sup>

One last element worth considering is the role of the laity in the election of Gelasius II. Together with Henry V, Pandulf depicts the Frangipane family as the main enemy of Gelasius and of peace in the city of Rome.<sup>36</sup> Chris Wickham has shown how the Frangipane were among what he calls the new Roman aristocracy of the twelfth century, a group of families fighting over the control of the papal election, the office on which every appointment and concession depended.<sup>37</sup> The Frangipane were in control of an area between the Colosseum, the Circus Maximus and the church of Santa Maria Nova. The church of Pallara (today San Sebastiano al Palatino, the Cassinese dependency in Rome), where the cardinals, according to Pandulf, first gathered, was exactly in the middle of this area. Pandulf adds that this church was chosen because it was considered extremely safe.<sup>38</sup> However, right after the election of Gelasius, Pandulf describes the Frangipane's assault resulting in the kidnapping of both the pope and the cardinals, who were rescued by other Roman families, such as the Pierleoni and the Normanni. The account is

<sup>34</sup> Palumbo, *Lo scisma del MCXXX*, 272–3, 384; Stroll, *The Jewish pope*, 82–90. We would like to amend a mistake in E. Veneziani, 'Sed patitur Caelestis, ego nescio cur, aliquando quae nollet – Alcune considerazioni sull'elezione di Onorio II', in S. Blank and C. Cappuccio (eds), *L'universalità del papato medievale (sec. VI–XIII): nuove prospettive di ricerca*, Milan 2022, 120, where only Peter of Porto is noted.

<sup>35</sup> *Decrees of the ecumenical councils*, ed. N. P. Tanner, Washington, DC 1990, i. 205–25. On the Third Lateran Council see D. Summerlin, *The canons of the Third Lateran Council of 1179: their origins and reception*, Cambridge 2019.

<sup>36</sup> See, for example, *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 732–4.

<sup>37</sup> Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 29–31.

<sup>38</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 731. See also Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 230, 293–4, and L. Marchiori, 'Medieval wall painting in the church of Santa Maria in Pallara, Rome: the use of objective dating criteria', *Papers of the British School at Rome* lxxvii (2009), 225.



preceded by Pandulf's tirade against the wickedness of the Frangipane, where Leo Frangipane was even described as a dragon due to his violent behaviour.

When Gelasius was able to come back to Rome after his escape to Gaeta because of the approach of Henry v in March 1118, Pandulf tells us that the pope celebrated a mass in the church of Santa Maria in *Secundicerio* (also known as Santa Maria Egiziaca), at the invitation of the cardinal of Santa Maria in Prassede. This church was close to the houses of the Normanni and Corsi families, Gelasius' allies, but also to Frangipane territory, and the Frangipane assaulted the pope once again.<sup>39</sup> Were they so naïve that they twice gathered in dangerous areas of Rome? Or had some changes taken place among the Roman families?

Wickham has argued that these episodes may have been constructed by Pandulf.<sup>40</sup> There might be some seeds of truth in this because lay families often interfered with papal elections (as in 1124 and in 1130), and changes of alliance among Roman families were frequent. The Normanni, depicted as supporting Gelasius II,<sup>41</sup> backed Maginulf/Sylvester IV against Paschal II in 1105, according to the *Annales Romani*, and Gelasius had been Paschal's chancellor. On the other hand, Pandulf tends to divide Roman families into rigid blocks, for or against a pope, without taking into account the fluidity of the situation.<sup>42</sup>

Reading this *Life* in light of the 1130 schism might help us to understand it. The Frangipane were the main supporters of Innocent II and had a change of heart only later, after the flight of Innocent from Rome. Pandulf might thus criticise Innocent's supporters, depicting them as kidnappers of popes and close to the so-called antipopes. A similar hostility towards this family is present in the *Life* of Honorius II as well.

### *Reframing Calixtus II's election in 1119*

In March 1118, following the arrival of Henry v, Gelasius II fled Rome and went to Gaeta, where he was consecrated pope. Meanwhile, the emperor appointed the archbishop of Braga, Maurice 'Bourdin', as Pope Gregory VIII with the support of some of the Roman urban clergy and some lay families, such as the Frangipane. Gelasius II briefly returned to Rome, but he could not control the city and was forced to leave again, accompanied by

<sup>39</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 732–4, 738–9.

<sup>40</sup> Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 6.

<sup>41</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 734.

<sup>42</sup> 'Annales Romani', in MGH, *Scriptores*, ed. G.-H. Pertz, Hannover 1844, v. 477. See also Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 246.

some cardinals. He died in Cluny at the end of January 1119, where, a few days later, Archbishop Guy of Vienne was elected pope as Calixtus II.<sup>43</sup>

In the *Life* of Calixtus, Pandulf once again depicted the events as the perfect election in an account far less complicated than that of the appointment of Gelasius II. According to his narrative, the election met all the exceptions considered in the 1059 *Decretum*. This decree acknowledged at least two main dispensations. First, the cardinals had the right to choose a candidate who was not a member of the Roman clergy. Second, if it was impossible to elect the pope in Rome,<sup>44</sup> the cardinals could appoint the new pontiff anywhere else, as happened in 1058 with the election in Florence of Nicholas II who issued that very same *Decretum*.<sup>45</sup> These exceptions could have been justified, invoking the principle of *necessitas*, by the emergency situation in 1119 when the election took place.<sup>46</sup>

Pandulf also stressed that the election took place after the burial of Gelasius II and highlights that Calixtus II was elected and approved by all the cardinals, the whole clergy and the lay elites.<sup>47</sup> As in Gelasius' case, Pandulf portrayed a legitimate and canonical election following both the procedures of the 1059 *Decretum* and also the old eighth-century papal dispositions that entrusted the appointment of the new pontiff to the whole Roman clergy and not only to the cardinals. These norms, of 769, also established that after the election, all the people of Rome (*optimates* and *populus*) should praise the newly elected pope as *dominus omnium* ('lord of everyone').<sup>48</sup> The *Lives* of the popes included in the original *Liber pontificalis* confirmed this double recognition (election/acclamation) by *clerus et populus*.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>43</sup> M. Stroll, 'Calixtus II: a reinterpretation of his election and the end of the Investiture Contest', *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* iii (1980), 4–53, and *Calixtus II (1119–1124): a pope born to rule*, Leiden–Boston 2004, 57–71; B. Schilling, *Guido von Vienne – Papst Calixt II.*, Hannover 1998, 390–403, 445–61. See also S. Chodorow, 'Ecclesiastical politics and the ending of the Investiture Contest: the papal election of 1119 and the negotiations of Mouzon', *Speculum* xlvii (1971), 613–37.

<sup>44</sup> Krause, *Das Papstwahldekret*, 273.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. See also Paravicini Bagliani, *Morte e elezione*, 21.

<sup>46</sup> K. Pennington, *Pope and bishops: the papal monarchy in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries*, Philadelphia 1984, 87, 93, 97; F. Roumy, 'L'Origine et la diffusion de l'adage canonique "Necessitas non habet legem" (VIII–XIIIe)', in W. P. Müller and M. E. Sommar (eds), *Medieval church law and the origins of the Western legal tradition: a tribute to Kenneth Pennington*, Washington, DC 2006, 301–19; G. M. Cantarella, 'Dalla "necessitas" alla "dispensatio": un'indagine sul lessico in Bernardo di Clairvaux', in R. I. Castillo Lara (ed.), *Studia in honorem eminentissimi cardinalis Alphonsi M. Stickler*, Rome 1992, 37–50.

<sup>47</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 745–6.

<sup>48</sup> MGH, *Leges*, ii. 1, p. 86.

<sup>49</sup> R. McKitterick, *Rome and the invention of the papacy: the Liber pontificalis*, Cambridge 2020, 38–67, 83–4; Renzi, 'Uno sguardo altro sul papato', 310–11 and nn. See also O. Condorelli, 'L'elezione di Maurizio Burdino (Gregorio VIII), il concilio di Reims e la scomunica di Imerio (1119)', *Bulletin of Medieval Canon Law* xxxvii (2020), 1–64.

However, according to other sources and as shown by Stroll, not all the cardinals followed Gelasius to Cluny. There are two different lists of electors. In the *Life* of Gelasius II, Pandulf includes John of Crema of San Crisogono, Guido of Santa Balbina, Peter Pierleoni of SS Cosma and Damiano (the future Anacletus II), Gregory of Sant'Angelo (the future Innocent II), Roscimannus of San Giorgio in Velabro, Chrysogonus of San Nicola in *Carcere Tulliano* and the laymen Peter *Latro* and John *Bellus*, brethren of the Roman prefect Peter, among the people who went to Cluny with the pontiff.<sup>50</sup> A Cluniac charter issued by Gelasius II in December 1118 mentions other names, such as Lambert, bishop of Ostia (the future Honorius II), Conrad of Santa Pudenziana and Boso of Santa Anastasia.<sup>51</sup> The presence of Lambert at Cluny is particularly significant because of the role entrusted to the bishop of Ostia. This bishop was the most important officiant during the ceremony of consecration of the new pontiff, a role highlighted by Pandulf himself later on.<sup>52</sup>

It is true that, according to a further exception foreseen by the *Decretum*, the new pope could have been chosen only by the cardinals who were at hand at that moment.<sup>53</sup> However, this might not have been enough for Pandulf. Right after the choice of Guy of Vienne, the Anacletian recounts a mission to obtain the confirmation of the newly elected pope from the cardinals in Rome.<sup>54</sup> According to the *Historia Compostellana* (a history of the Iberian archdiocese of Santiago de Compostela written by different authors in the first half of the twelfth century), this mission was entrusted to Peter of Porto, but his presence in Cluny has been questioned by both Hüls and Zelina Zafarana.<sup>55</sup> It is worth stressing that while Pandulf's account meets the exception foreseen by the *Decretum*, the *Historia Compostellana* and Orderic Vitalis's *Historia Ecclesiastica* described a different election, in accordance with the preferable procedures included in the 1059 decree, especially the main role accorded the cardinal-bishops in the papal election.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>50</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 741; Stroll, *Calixtus II*, 58.

<sup>51</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 741; Stroll, *Calixtus II*, 58.

<sup>52</sup> U.-R. Blumenthal, 'The papacy, 1024–1122', in D. Luscombe and J. Riley-Smith (eds), *The New Cambridge Medieval History: c. 1024–c. 1198*, Cambridge 2004, iv/2, 33.

<sup>53</sup> Krause, *Das Papstwahldekret*, 273.

<sup>54</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 745–6.  
<sup>55</sup> *Historia Compostellana*, ed. E. Falque Rey, Turnhout 1988, ii. ix; Hüls, *Kardinäle*, 122–3 and nn. 28–9 (124); Z. Zafarana, 'Bosone', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, Rome 1971, xiii, at <[<sup>56</sup> \*Historia Compostellana\*, ii. ix; 'Lambertus Ostiensis et Boso Portuensis, Cono Praenestinus et Iohannes Cremensis aliique plures de Romano senatu clerici affuere, quibus specialis praerogativa concessa est papam eligere et consecrare': \*Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis\*, ed. M. Chibnall, Oxford 1969, vi. 184, 202.](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/bosone_res-b6e7f78d-87e8-11dc-8e9d-0016357eee51_(Dizionario-Biografico)/></a>; Anzoise, <i>Per una riconsiderazione</i>, 80–1 and n. 217.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

The letter sent in 1119 by the Roman clergy to confirm Calixtus' election is still extant, together with the subscriptions of the clerics. Among the names cited, there are only five (or six) cardinals, including Peter of Porto, but most of the senders were archpriests, abbots, priors and some exorcists, all members of the Roman urban clergy.<sup>57</sup> As argued by Tommaso di Carpegna, this local clergy was different and progressively separated from the Curia, which was mainly composed of cardinals. If one considers all the cardinals mentioned so far and the ones who were undertaking legatine missions (such as Cuno of Preneste in Germany), for the majority of them their position is not known.<sup>58</sup> The election of Calixtus may not have been as unanimous as Pandulf wanted to represent.

Once again, is it possible to read Pandulf's representation of Calixtus' election in the context of the 1130 schism? Might his emphasis on *unanimitas* and the high number of cardinals present at the election mean that a restricted group of electors did not have the legitimacy to choose the new pontiff? Only six cardinals had elected Innocent II, and that choice was without unanimity as well. Moreover, they did not ask for the approbation of the remaining cardinals, as occurred in 1119. Pandulf might indicate, then, that the remaining cardinals were 'forced' to elect Anacletus II, as he was the only legitimate pope. Quoting Jochen Johrendt, the Anacletian cardinal blamed Innocent and his supporters for the schism, so much so that it would become an 'Innocentian schism'.<sup>59</sup>

According to Gelasius' *Life*, the presence of Gregory of Sant'Angelo in Cluny might be a direct attack on Innocent II himself. He was present at a canonical and legitimate election, but then, during his own election, he deliberately did not follow the correct procedures.<sup>60</sup> Even a small detail, such as the election taking place after the burial of Gelasius II, might be further proof of Pandulf's careful reconstruction of Calixtus' election.<sup>61</sup> A similar remark can be found in Gelasius' *Life*. Pandulf described the election as the result of negotiations taking place sometime after the death of Paschal II between Peter of Porto and the remaining cardinals, priests and deacons, according to his ecclesiological view of the election.<sup>62</sup>

In the letter to his brethren the same cardinal-bishop of Porto accused the Innocentians of having elected the new pope while Honorius II was

<sup>57</sup> *Veterum Scriptorum et Monumentorum Ecclesiasticorum, Dogmaticorum. Moralium Amplissima Collectio*, ed. E. Martène and U. Durand, Paris 1724, i. 647–9.

<sup>58</sup> T. di Carpegna Falconieri, *Il clero di Roma nel medioevo: istituzioni e politica cittadina (secoli VIII–XIII)*, Rome 2002, 86–101.

<sup>59</sup> J. Johrendt, 'Das Innozenzianische Schisma aus kurialer Perspektive', in H. Müller, H. Hotz and B. Hotz (eds), *Gegenpäpste: ein unerwünschtes mittelalterliches Phänomen*, Vienna 2012, 127–63.

<sup>60</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 741.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 745.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.* ii. 730.

still alive.<sup>63</sup> This charge was nothing new in cases of contested election. The election taking place after the death and burial of the old pontiff was part of the Roman ecclesiological tradition, as attested by Gregory VII's accounts of his 1073 election. While in the first version included in a letter sent to Wibert of Ravenna in April 1073, Gregory VII claimed that he had been appointed by the *populus* of Rome during the burial rites of Alexander II, he later changed his version in the prologue to his *Registrum*. This time, he stated that he was elected by *clerus et populus* after the proper burial of his predecessor.<sup>64</sup> Pandulf may have condemned the Innocentians with the same accusation. His *Life* of Honorius II ends with the description of the pope's irregular burial.<sup>65</sup> It is worth stressing that Innocent II was the first to be elected in the 1130 double election.

There are other accounts of the election of Calixtus II that are worth mentioning because they depict a different scenario than that described by Pandulf. The first version is included in the *Historia Compostelana*. This describes a certain degree of conflict between Guy of Vienne and Pontius, the abbot of Cluny. The Cluniac raised some doubts about the canonicity of the election because the choice was not valid if not approved by cardinals and clergy in Rome.<sup>66</sup> The source then mentions Peter of Porto's journey to Rome, as mentioned above. Some scholars, such as Stroll, have argued that Pontius may have been one of the candidates for the papacy.<sup>67</sup> Others read this as an attempt by him to play a major role in the very same election and in the choice of the appointee: the election indeed took place at Cluny.<sup>68</sup> Moreover, the *Historia Compostelana* mentions the presence of *equites* (knights or armed supporters) among the followers of Guy of Vienne.<sup>69</sup> The reference to possible disputes between them and the Romans may have been evidence of a certain degree of lay interference in this election.<sup>70</sup>

The account in the *Historia Compostelana* is reasonably reliable. The clergy of Compostela was very close to Calixtus II: on the one hand, the newly elected pope was a relative of Raymond of Burgundy, count of Galicia (†1107), and of Henry of Burgundy, count of Portugal (†1112); therefore, he was a kinsman of the rulers of the area surrounding

<sup>63</sup> William of Malmesbury, *De historia novella*, 8.

<sup>64</sup> E. Caspar (ed.), *Das Register Gregors VII*, in MGH, *Epistolae Selectae*, Berlin 1923, II.1, 5–6; II.2, 1–2.

<sup>66</sup> *Historia Compostellana*, II. xiv.

<sup>65</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, II. 746.  
<sup>67</sup> Stroll, *Calixtus II*, 58–74.

<sup>68</sup> G. M. Cantarella, 'Come in uno specchio? Di nuovo su Ponzio di Cluny (1109–1122/26)', *Bullettino dell'Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo* cxvi (2014), 61–91. See also E. Veneziani, 'La caduta di Ponzio, dramatis personae', in M. Ferrero (ed.), *Un abate, un monastero, un Crocifisso: Ponzio di Melgueil da Cluny a Campus Sion*, Vicenza 2019, 54–5.

<sup>69</sup> *Historia Compostellana*, II. ix.  
<sup>70</sup> Veneziani, 'Sed patitur Caelestis', 117–18; Schilling, *Papst Calixt II.*, 390–403, 445–61.

Compostela. On the other hand, Calixtus would grant Diego Gelmírez the title of archbishop of Compostela. This account may also have benefitted from the information gathered through the strict relations between Compostela and Cluny, especially through the figure of Dalmatius Geret, Pontius' plenipotentiary in the Iberian Peninsula, and the abbot of the Iberian Cluniac priory of Carrión. The rumours of some disagreement between Calixtus and Pontius seem to be confirmed by future events. In 1122, Calixtus accepted (or forced) the resignation of the abbot and, while Pontius undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, the pontiff ordered the Cluniacs to elect a new abbot.<sup>71</sup>

The importance of laity for the definitive affirmation of Calixtus II is also highlighted by a very peculiar source, the *Annales Romani*. Unlike the account of the triumphal arrival in Rome described by Pandulf,<sup>72</sup> the *Annales* portrayed Calixtus in a bad light. The source relates that the pope was able to control Rome only thanks to the corruption perpetrated by Peter of Leo, the father of the future Anacletus II, who bought the fidelity of Maurice 'Bourdin'/Gregory VIII's supporters who were controlling St Peter's. It may be that all these lay interferences were not mentioned by Pandulf because they undermined his attempt to portray the perfect election and also cast a poor light on Anacletus' family.<sup>73</sup>

Last but not least, it is worth stressing that the election of Calixtus played a major role in Pandulf's *Life* to the detriment of other achievements of this papacy, such as the capture of Gregory VIII in Sutri (April 1121), which was crucial for Calixtus II. The pope sent a letter to the bishops of Gaul to inform them of the event.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, the victory over the antipope was part of some frescos portraying the triumph of the legitimate popes over their rivals.<sup>75</sup> Second, the Concordat of Worms, which ended the Investiture Contest, is only hinted at here. The agreement and its

<sup>71</sup> L. C. Amaral and M. J. Barroca, *Condessa-Rainha: D. Teresa*, Lisboa 2012, 133–54, 175, 187–95, 198–207, 209–14, 274–86; Cantarella, 'Come in uno specchio?', 61–91; Stroll, *The Jewish pope*, 21–54; C. M. Reglero de la Fuente, *Cluny en España: los prioratos de la provincia y sus redes sociales (1073–ca. 1270)*, León 2008, 606–9.

<sup>72</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii, 756.

<sup>73</sup> 'Annales Romani', 479; Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 398–426; F. Renzi, "'Imperator Burdinus Hispanum Romanae sedi violenter imposuit': a research proposal on the archbishop of Braga and antipope Gregory VIII, Maurice "Bourdin"', *Imago Temporis: Medium Aevum* xii (2018), 233.

<sup>74</sup> *Bullaire du Pape Calixte II. 1119–1124*, ed. U. Robert, Paris 1881, i, 337–8.

<sup>75</sup> M. Stroll, *Symbols as power: the papacy following the Investiture Contest*, Leiden–Boston–New York 1991, 17–39, 67–70, 208–11; Schilling, *Papst Calixt II.*, 589–603. See also I. Herklotz, 'Die Beratungsräume Calixtus II. im Lateranpalast und ihre Fresken: Kunst und Propaganda am Ende des Investiturstreits', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* lii (1989), 145–214, and K. Schreiner, 'Gregor VIII., nackt auf einem Esel. Entehrende Entblößung und schandbares Reiten im Spiegel einer Miniatur der Sächsischen Weltchronik', in D. Berg and H.-W. Goetz (eds), *Ecclesia et regnum: Beiträge zur*



negotiations should have played a major part, as in many other contemporary and later sources. Third, the First Lateran Council, where Worms was approved along with other dispositions such as the public *damnatio memoriae* of Gregory VIII, is not even mentioned.<sup>76</sup> All these absences are quite suspicious if Pandulf was merely writing a biography of this pope.

*The appointment of Honorius II in 1124: an irregular election?*

Pandulf wrote one last *Life*, of Honorius II, dated no later than the spring of 1138.<sup>77</sup> It is worth stressing that the schism was not over; it would end only with the death of Anacletus II and the failed attempt of Victor IV to succeed him.<sup>78</sup> This biography should be considered a work of Anacletian propaganda; most of the topics considered in the *Lives* of Gelasius II and Calixtus II were also used here. However, in the case of Honorius' *Life*, the arguments adopted are stronger and more polemical: perhaps a consequence of the ongoing struggle. The length and the detailed description of the 1124 election – a further example of a contested papal election – might exemplify this attitude. Pandulf's account is the only almost contemporary source for this election: there is no description of the event among Honorius' letters.<sup>79</sup>

Firstly, it is possible to acknowledge a change in how Honorius is treated. While in previous *Lives*, Lambert appeared as cardinal-bishop of Ostia and is mentioned in a neutral tone,<sup>80</sup> in this source Pandulf attacks him. Firstly, he compared him to a pig and an ox, 'using the classical topos that outward appearance reveals the hidden inner character', as pointed out by Carmela Vircillo Franklin.<sup>81</sup> Then Pandulf claimed that he was able to cheat Pope Paschal II when he was appointed cardinal-bishop: 'Because he sometimes seemed to be rigid in justice, he was received by Pope Paschal and

*Geschichte von Kirche, Recht und Staat im Mittelalter: Festschrift für Franz-Josef Schmale zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Bochum 1989, 155–202.

<sup>76</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 746; 'Constitutiones et acta publica imperatorum et regum, 911–1197', in MGH, *Leges*, ed. L. Weiland, Hannover 1893, i. 575.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.* i. 120–3. On Honorius II see E. Veneziani, *The papacy and ecclesiology of Honorius II (1124–1130): church governance after the Concordat of Worms*, Woodbridge 2023.

<sup>78</sup> T. di Carpegna Falconieri, 'Vittore IV, antipapa', in *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, Rome 2020, at <[<sup>79</sup> E. Veneziani, 'The strange case of Deusdedit and Pandulf: two accounts of Honorius II's election', in C. Heath and R. Houghton \(eds\), \*Conflict and violence in medieval Italy, 568–1154\*, Amsterdam 2022, 299–323.](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/antipapa-vittore-iv_res-cc14aafb-2816-11eb-abag-00271042e8dg_(Dizionario-Biografico)/></a>.</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

<sup>80</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 730, 737, 745–6.

<sup>81</sup> C. Vircillo Franklin, 'History and rhetoric in the *Liber pontificalis* of the twelfth century', *Journal of Medieval Latin* xxiii (2013), 29.

promoted to be bishop of [Ostia-]Velletri, since he seemed a bishop by his manner.’<sup>82</sup>

Then the Anacletian begins the description of the election of the successor of Calixtus II. The cardinals, together with Peter of Leo and Leo Frangipane, agree to wait three days before beginning the rite of papal election.<sup>83</sup> This is a reference to the ancient procedure *per clericum et populum*, already mentioned by Gregory VII in his first report of his own election in 1073.<sup>84</sup> Right from the beginning, Pandulf highlights the duplicity of Leo Frangipane, who was apparently supporting cardinal Saxo of Santo Stefano in Monte Celio, the candidate of the *populus* of Rome (and future chancellor of Anacletus II), while secretly working to elect Lambert:

Leo Frangipane’s reason for making this decision was so that, within the period he had been given, he could make up his mind rather more calmly about what he had been thinking about Lambert for quite a long time. The whole *populus* was asking him for Saxo, Cardinal of Santo Stefano, as their future Pope; and, to make it easier for him to deceive [them], Leo Frangipane pretended [to ask the same thing].<sup>85</sup>

Moreover, the source recalls the reluctance of the cardinals to gather because they feared that what had happened with Gelasius II and Cencius Frangipane would happen again. Only a ploy by Leo Frangipane broke through the situation. He convinced the prelates accompanying each cardinal to dress them with the *cappa rubea* underneath their dark cloaks, making them believe they would be elected pope: ‘Late that same day, however, Leo sent messengers separately to each of the cardinals’ chaplains, warning them in advance that they should be walking in front of their cardinal, without his knowledge, wearing a red cope underneath a black cloak.’<sup>86</sup>

Once gathered, the cardinals, including Lambert, elected Teobaldus cardinal-priest of Santa Anastasia as Pope Celestine II, dressing him with

<sup>82</sup> ‘Quoniam videbatur aliquando rigidus in iustitia, a domno Paschali receptus est et in episcopum Bellitrensem promotus, siquidem episcopus habitu videbatur’: *Liber pontificalis*, II, 750. The episcopal sees of Velletri and Ostia were officially joined together in 1150. See Louis Duchesne, ‘Le sedi episcopali nell’antico ducato di Roma’, in *Scripta minora*, 435.

<sup>83</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, II, 750. However, there were some precedents as in 1060: E. Pásztor, ‘Riforma della Chiesa nel secolo XI e l’origine del collegio dei cardinali: problemi e ricerche’, in *Studi sul medioevo cristiano offerti a Raffaello Morghen*, Rome 1974, II, 613.

<sup>84</sup> Cantarella, *Manuale*, 100.  
<sup>85</sup> ‘Hoc iccirco potissimum Leo Fraiapane statuerat, ut datum spatium quod de Lamberto diutius cogitaverat aliquanto quietus perfiniret, nam totus ab hoc populus Saxonem sancti Stephani cardinalem futurum papam petebant; quod, ut deciperet aptius, et Leo Fraiapane iudem simulabat’: *Liber pontificalis*, II, 751.

<sup>86</sup> ‘In sero autem praesenti idem Leo per nuntios unumquemque seorsum de cappellanibus cardinalium praemonet, ut mane summo diluculo cum pluviali rubeo sub cappa nigra retento, ignorante domino, eundem suum dominum anteiret’: *ibid.*

the *cappa rubea* (*immantatio*). The tone of the *Vita* suddenly changes with a remark from Pandulf: 'Sed patitur Caelestis, ego nescio cur, aliquando quae nollet' ('but God now and then allows things he would not want [to happen], I do not know why').<sup>87</sup> While Lambert was singing the *Te Deum* together with the assembly, the *masnada* (a kind of militia entrusted by Calixtus II to Cencius Frangipane, as highlighted by Pandulf), led by Robert Frangipane, broke through the gathering, assaulting Celestine and electing Lambert as pope. Pandulf establishes a parallel with what had happened to Gelasius in 1118.<sup>88</sup> According to the Anacletian cardinal, the laity performed all the rites up to the point that Lambert was enthroned upside down, in contrast to Celestine's appointment, where the cardinals were the main characters.<sup>89</sup> Vircillo Franklin calls this a pantomime of a papal election.<sup>90</sup>

The Anacletian cardinal therefore regards Honorius' election as highly irregular. However, the author was not able completely to hide a certain level of support for the new pope. In addition to the Frangipane, the *Life* recalls the participation of Gregory Astaldi (a member of the Roman Astaldi family, which Wickham ascribes to the new urban elites)<sup>91</sup> and of Uguccio Pierleoni, the son of Peter of Leo, who, on the contrary, is portrayed as agreeing to the election only because he is forced to do so by the *masnada*.<sup>92</sup> The Pierleoni, especially through the behaviour of the head of their family, are depicted as 'victims' of the violence of the Frangipane, who would become the main supporters of Innocent II in 1130.

A new gathering took place on Tiber Island, a territory belonging to the suburbicarian diocese of Porto and controlled by the Pierleoni, who were thus deeply involved in the negotiations around the election of the new pope, contrary to what the historiography has always believed.<sup>93</sup> During this meeting, the cardinal-bishop of Porto, Peter, asked Honorius II to resign from the papacy. Pandulf mentions only one further cardinal, Peter of Pisa, cardinal-priest of Santa Susanna, who kept supporting Honorius II, but his behaviour is almost justified by the writer, who asserts that Peter had second thoughts almost immediately.<sup>94</sup> It is worth

<sup>87</sup> Ibid. ii. 752. See also Veneziani, 'Sed patitur Caelestis', 114–15.

<sup>88</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 752.

<sup>90</sup> Vircillo Franklin, 'History and rhetoric', 29–30.

<sup>91</sup> Wickham, *Medieval Rome*, 222, 234–49.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid. 32, 230. See also Stroll, *The Jewish pope*, 18–19.

<sup>93</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 753–4. On the Tiber island see T. di Carpegna Falconieri, 'Circoscrizioni ecclesiastiche nel medioevo alto e centrale: Il territorio tra organizzazione e rappresentazione', in M. Royo, É. Hubert and A. Bérenger, *Rome des quartiers: des vici aux rioni: cadres institutionnels, pratiques sociales, et requalifications entre antiquité et époque moderne*, Paris 2008, 82–3.

<sup>94</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, ii. 753.

remembering that Peter of Pisa would be one of the electors of Anacletus II.<sup>95</sup>

Further evidence of particular attention to the future Anacletian cardinals can also be seen in the passage of the *Life* where Pandulf describes the appointment of new cardinals created by Honorius II. Although the author recalls the choice of only two future electors of Anacletus II (Gregory of Santa Balbina and Matthew of Sant'Adriano) and three Innocentians (Peter of Santa Anastasia, Conrad of Santa Sabina, whom Pandulf wrongly calls Comes, and Guido of Santa Maria in via Lata), he omits the names of the newly appointed cardinal-bishops (Matthew of Albano and John of Ostia) who voted for Innocent II in 1130.<sup>96</sup>

Pandulf perseveres in portraying the Frangipane in a bad light. During the night (a literary *topos* because it was the time of deception), together with Haimeric, the chancellor of the Roman Church, they bribed the prefect of Rome, Peter (a member of the Corsi family<sup>97</sup>), and Peter of Leo with the promise of future territorial gains; conversely, the remaining, reluctant, cardinals were promised that they would keep their *honores*.<sup>98</sup> Only after this episode was Honorius II finally recognised as pope, a choice that set the tone for the rest of the *Life*.

During the night Leo Frangipane and the chancellor Haimeric, first of all drew aside separately from the cardinals, and harnessed him, so to speak, to their plans, the prefect Peter, once he had been given the very strong fortress of Saint Peter of Formello, together with its treasures, then Peter of Leo, [who was given] Terracina with the remarkable, good stone fortifications ... That same night they surrendered themselves and bound themselves by oath (even though not long afterwards during the day, he lost what he had received during the night because of the sinners' cunning). They decided only this about the cardinals who had sold themselves that, provided they swore an oath, they could remain forever in their offices, at least in the ones they were holding. They swore and were paid ... What more [can I say]? Whether they were willing or not, he was confirmed by everybody and extolled as Pope.<sup>99</sup>

<sup>95</sup> S. Anzoise, 'Pisa, la Sede Apostolica e i cardinali di origine pisana da Gregorio VII ad Alessandro III: potere della rappresentanza e rappresentanza del potere', unpubl. PhD diss. Pisa 2015, 137–56; Hüls, *Kardinäle*, 210–11.

<sup>96</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, II, 755; Anzoise, *Per una riconsiderazione*, 149–50 and nn. 431–2.

<sup>97</sup> C. Wickham, *Sonnambuli verso un nuovo mondo: L'affermazione dei comuni italiani nel XII secolo*, Rome 2017, 130.

<sup>98</sup> *Liber pontificalis*, II, 754.

<sup>99</sup> 'Quos nocte Leo Fraiapane et domnus Aimericus cancellarius seorsum, – primo Petrum praefectum, dato ei Formello castro Sancti Petri fortissimo cum donariis super, deinde Petrum Leonis, Terracina cum Saxis munitionibus optimis ..., ipsi domno Petro eadem nocte contraditis et iuratis, licet non multo post in die quod de nocte suscepit per astutiam datorum perdiderit – a cardinalibus sequestrarunt et suis, ut sic dicam, consiliis adiunxerunt. Hoc solum de cardinalibus venditiis statuerunt, ut cum iuramentis in suis, in his saltem quos habebant, honoribus, perpetuo remenerent.

In this case, Haimeric, a future Innocentian, is described in a neutral way and not as the *Deus ex machina* of the papal elections of 1124 and 1130 as portrayed in the historiography.<sup>100</sup> Pandulf was not restrained when talking about the future supporters of Innocent II. Could it be that Haimeric did not play such a decisive role in the 1130 schism?<sup>101</sup> Or maybe this argument had lost some of its strength by this point in the schism?

The *Life* of Honorius II and, in particular, the section concerning his election, thus emerges as a propaganda work. Most of the elements included in the *Lives* of Gelasius and Calixtus (such as the role of the cardinals and the way in which the Frangipane are portrayed) are adopted and developed here. The Anacletian cardinal also resorts to new arguments, such as an attack on Lambert/Honorius II, instead of an emphasis on the role played by Haimeric. The *Life* is constructed in the light of the 1130 schism.

This article has argued that the *Lives* of Gelasius II, Calixtus II and Honorius II should be read together in light of the 1130 schism, its development and Pandulf's support for Anacletus II. They are therefore not merely historical accounts of the events between 1118 and the death of Honorius in 1130. A similar strategy would be adopted in Boso's version of the *Liber pontificalis* written in 1150s/1160s, as noticed by Susan Twyman.<sup>102</sup>

It is worth highlighting the preponderance attributed by Pandulf to the accounts of the papal elections in all three *Lives* to the detriment of other events. The elections of Gelasius II and Calixtus II are carefully constructed to represent the perfect appointment of the new pontiffs. Since the procedures foreseen by the 1059 *Decretum* were not shared by all – one might even think that consent was the really decisive element in the election of a pope rather than the canonicity of the electoral procedure – Pandulf mixed elements from various methods of electing a pope (as testified by the presence of the cardinals, the clergy and the people of Rome) so that the appointments of neither Gelasius nor Calixtus could be criticised on procedural grounds. On the contrary, the choice of Honorius II is represented as an irregular election performed by the laity and approved by most of the cardinals who would elect Innocent II.

Pandulf's ecclesiological view on the role of the cardinal-bishops should be read as an attack on Innocent II. Since they only had power to approve or

Iuratum est et redditum ... Quid multa? Sive vellent, sive nollent, auctorizatur ab omnibus et laudatur in papam': *ibid.* ii. 753–4.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.* On the traditional role attributed to Haimeric see Schmale, *Studien zum Schisma*, 91–191.

<sup>101</sup> Veneziani, 'Sed patitur Caelestis', 114–15.

<sup>102</sup> S. Twyman, 'Papal adventus at Rome in the twelfth century', *Historical Research* lxi (1996), 241–2.

disapprove a candidate, their vote was not enough to elect a pope, as occurred with Innocent, who enjoyed the majority support among them. Innocent's election was thus, according to Pandulf, not valid.

The figure of Peter of Porto, an expert on canon law, exemplifies this. According to Pandulf's works, while the cardinal-bishop played the major role in the two canonical elections of Gelasius and Calixtus, when an irregular election took place, he opposed it. The future Anacletian was always on the canonical side, as he would be in 1130, implicitly entailing a new meaning for *melior pars*. Was the real *melior pars* supporting Anacletus II too?

Finally, the Anacletian's consistently hostile portrayal of the Frangipane, Innocent's main supporters, and the omission of any possible events which may have cast any shadow over the behaviour of the Pierleoni, Anacletus' 'family', are crucial to Pandulf's attempt to create propaganda to use during the 1130 schism. Whoever supported Innocent II was always on the wrong side.