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Lotharius of Cremona

Although Lotharius of Cremona taught Roman law at Bologna in the last two decades of the twelfth and the early thirteenth century, following a career that did not normally lead to advancement in the Church, he became bishop of Vercelli in 1205 and was elected archbishop of Pisa sometime before December 1208. He is one of the few exceptions to the rule that civilians did not become bishops.

Pope Innocent III sent two decretals to Lotharius while he was bishop of Vercelli that were later included in decretal collections. The first was the famous Licet ex suscetto in which he instructed him that citizens of Vercelli could appeal to the pope only if the consuls of the city did not render appropriate justice to them. The second letter, written in February, 1206, arose from a complaint of the bishop of Novara. Lotharius had, it seems, been conducting an investigation of the church at Novara. Innocent, however, received complaints that he was not following the prescribed rules of judicial procedure as he carried out his duties. If these reports of judicial improprieties reported to the curia were correct, Innocent exhorted him to adhere henceforth to rules, lest injury arise from the birthplace of laws.

From the language Innocent used, Lotharius had been accused of taking procedural shortcuts.

---

1 Lotharius was, according to C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi* (2 vols. Monasterii 1913-23) I 399, 520, bishop of Vercelli, 1205-1208, and then, archbishop of Pisa from 1208, until he was translated to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem in 1218. Lotharius never became the patriarch of Jerusalem, see G. Fedalto, *La Chiesa latina in Oriente, 2: Hierarchia latina orientis* (Studi Religiosi 3; Verona 1976) 133-35. The connection between the bishop of Vercelli and archbishop of Pisa is certain. Innocent III mentioned that Lotharius, archbishop of Pisa, had been bishop of Vercelli in a letter to the bishop-elect of Novara: 'Ex litteris ven. fratris nostri patriarchae Antiocheni', Potth. 4095, PL 216.320-22. I can find no reason for giving Lotharius the family name 'Rosarius'. No contemporary source gives Lotharius this family name.


3 3 Comp. 2.2.1 (X 2.2.10), Potth. 2785, June 1206.

4 3 Comp. 5.1.4 (X 5.1.17), Potth. 2672. 'ne inde nascantur injuriae, unde iure nascentur'.

5 Ibid. 'Si uero qualibet occasione pretermisistis eundem, ne leui compendio ad graue dispendium ueniat, adhuc ipsum ordinem tempore oportuno volumus obseruari'
Lotharius of Cremona, the jurist, has left few traces. He wrote only scattered
glosses preserved in the margins of a few manuscripts. His name appears in only a
few documents. After the consuls of Bologna had promised that they and their
successors would never force him to hold classes or restrict him in the future,
Lotharius swore an oath to the commune of Bologna in 1189 that he would not
teach outside of the city. He was an ‘accessor causa’ at Modena in 1197. Phillip
Augustus of France called upon Lotharius for an opinion ca. 1202, in a case in
which a ‘vicedominus’ was accused of plundering episcopal possessions at the death
of the bishop of Châlons. Sarti published a document of 1204 in which ‘Dominus
Lotharius Cremonensis’ was present at court when Johannes, cardinal deacon of S.
Maria in Cosmedin rendered a decision. These scattered bits of evidence create no
biographical coherence.

Odofredus, the garrulous civilian, is the only near contemporary source who gives
us a glimpse of the man. He recounted a story of Lotharius’s encounter with
Emperor Henry VI and Azo with his typical love of exaggeration and detail. Henry
had summoned Azo and Lotharius, who were teaching in Bologna, to settle an
affair. As he rode with the two scholars one day, he posed the question: ‘To whom
does “merum imperium” belong?’ ‘You tell me’, Azo arrogantly asked Lotharius.
He declared that ‘merum imperium’ belonged to the emperor and to no one else.
Lotharius, explained Odofredus, was the better knight, but Azo was more learned
in our law (Roman law). Further, he told his students, Lotharius loved many
woman and looked on them with pleasure. Finally, Odofredus noted that when
Lotharius was elected archbishop of Pisa, Pope Innocent III sent the decretal Si

---

6 G. Dolezalek lists two manuscripts with glosses of Lotharius: London, B. L. Harley 5117 and Bamberg, Staatsbibl. Jur. 20; Repertorium manuscriptorum veterum Codicis Justiniani (2 vols. Repertorien zur Frühzeit der gelehrten Rechte, Ius commune, Sonderhefte 23; Frankfurt am Main 1985) 128 and 258. Annalisa Belloni prints a text from Vienna, Nat. Bibl. 2077 in which an opinion of Lotharius is reported in Le questioni civilistiche del secolo xii: Da Bulgare a Pilo da Medicina e Azzone (Ius commune, Sonderhefte 43; Frankfurt am Main 1989) 49.

7 Maurus Sarti and Maurus Fattorini, De claris Archigymnasii bononiensis professoribus a saeculo XI usque ad saec. XIV, ed. C. Albicinius and C. Malagola (2 volumes; Bologna 1888-1896) II 25 and also mentioned in a document dated 30 December, 1198. Chartularium Studii Bononensis: Documenti per la storia dell’università di Bologna dalle origini fino al secolo XV (Bologna 1909) 9. For the interpretation of these oaths see Fried, Entstehung des Juristenstandes 120-25.

8 Fried, Entstehung des Juristenstandes 64, n. 26.


10 Sarti and Fattorini, De claris Archigymnasii bononiensis professoribus 195. On Johannes, a relative of Innocent III, see W. Maleczek, Papst und Kardinalskolleg von 1191 bis 1216 (Publikationen des Historischen Instituts beim Österreichischen Kulturinstitut in Rom, Abhandlungen, 6; Vienna 1984) 136-37.
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diligenti to him. Odofredus is the only source that links the jurist and the archbishop.

Several historians have doubted Odofredus's testimony, to protect Lotharius the bishop from the accusation of unseemly behavior. One would, in fact, have good reason to doubt that Lotharius the jurist and the archbishop were the same. The most important objection would not be Odofredus's accusations of impropriety, but the rarity of a civilian's gaining high ecclesiastical office. However, Odofredus's identification of the lawyer and the bishop seems to be confirmed by legal documents from Pistoia and Florence that are edited in an appendix of this paper.

In the consilium from Florence, Ranuccinus, a judge in Pistoia, asked two jurists and the archbishop of Pisa for consilia in a dispute between Rainaldus and Nicholas and in a related question between Rainaldus and two other donors, Thomasius and Ildebrandinus. In both cases Lotharius's opinion is reported in detail and given precedence. The other two jurists simply confirmed his decision. This is good, if indirect, evidence that Lotharius was a respected jurist. Further, one of the signatories, Bandinus de Gaetano, was the same man who had been witness, along with Lotharius, to an oath that Bandinus Familiatus made to the city of Bologna in 1198. Bandinus de Gaetano confirmed Lotharius's opinion in both parts of the Florentine consilium. His association with Lotharius could hardly have been by chance and confirms the archbishop's Bolognese past.

---

11 Odofredus, *Lectura super Digesto* to Dig. 2.1.3 (Imperium), (2 vols. Lyon 1550-1552; repr. Bologna 1967-1968), Florence, Biblioteca nazionale (Grandi formati 39), Magliabecchiano Cl.xxix.27, fol. 34r: 'Vnde dominus imperator Henricus pater domini Frederici minoris qui regnabat modo sunt xl. <sexaginta Ed.> anni tunc temporis: dominus Azo et dominus Lotarius docebant in ciuitate ista et imperator uocauit eos ad se pro quodam negocio, et dum <deinde Ed.> una die equiaretur cum eis fecit eis talem questionem: 'Signori dicatis mihi cui competit merum imperium.' Dixit Azo domino Lotario, 'Dicatis mihi', et licet dominus Lotarius esset melior miles, tamen dominus Azo fuit melior in iure nostro, et debetis scire quod dominus Lotarius diligebat multum dominas et libenter eas uidebat, licet postea fuerit factus archiepiscopus Pisanus, et propter eum fuit facta decretalis, extra. de foro compet. e. Si diligenti <X 2.2.12 and 2.26.17>' In chapter I of *The prince and the law, 1200-1600: Sovereignty and rights in the Western legal tradition* (Berkeley-Los Angeles 1993) I have argued that the encounter between Azo and Lotharius is not true but arose from a corruption in the text of Azo's *Summa super Codice*.

12 Sarti and Fattorini mention several historians who believed that the jurist and the archbishop could not have been the same person, but rejected their arguments; op. cit. I 95-96.

13 Archivio di Stato, Firenze, Dipl. Pistoia (Città), 12— nr. 8, first cited by L. Chiappelli, 'Maestri e scuole in Pistoia fino al secolo xiv', *Archivio storico Italiano* 78 (1920) 160-214 at 163.

14 *Chartularium studii Bononiensis* I 9: 'domino Bandino Gaettani filio... domino Lothario legum perito'
The Pistoia document reports the outcome of a case that Lotharius heard in August, 1215. Pope Innocent III had delegated a dispute between a certain Sodus and the monastery of St. Michael in Forcale in Pistoia to Lotharius. He decided the matter in favor of the monastery and rejected Sodus's claims. Once again, Bandinus de Gaetano was among the witnesses. We can conclude from this evidence that Lotharius brought ‘iurisperiti’ with him from Bologna to Pisa. Bandinus was a citizen of Pisa, and Lotharius gave him a position at his archiepiscopal court.

His curia must have been noted for its legal learning. The consilium — whose survival is relatively rare for this period — indicates that judges from other cities turned to Pisa for legal advice. Since his predecessor was certainly not a lawyer, perhaps we may attribute some of the sophisticated organization of the archiepiscopal law court to Lotharius. Within a few years the court’s activities were being regularly recorded in a register, a fragment of which has been discovered and edited by Gero Dolezalek.

The rest of Odofredus's information is either not correct or cannot be confirmed, and it is difficult to decide what facts about Lotharius may be extracted from the details of his story. Since Lotharius died sometime before 1218 and had become bishop of Vercelli in 1205, Odofredus had probably not known him personally. His claim that Si diligenti had been addressed to Lotharius is false. Innocent had sent the decretal to Hubaldus, Lotharius's predecessor, in May, 1206. The firm dressing down that Innocent had given Hubaldus in the decretal was a subtle part of Odofredus's story. He knew, and most of his audience undoubtedly remembered, that Innocent had rebuked the archbishop for not knowing canon law in Si diligenti.

Hubaldus had written to Innocent asking whether a cleric could submit himself to the judgment of a layman in temporals. He cheerfully informed the pope that he maintained a cleric could and that he had held this opinion for some time.
Odofredus explicitly told his student-audience and the readers of his Lectura that Lotharius was not as learned as Azo in Roman law and subtly informed them implicitly that he knew no canon law as well, because the recipient of Si diligenti was manifestly not a jurist. Further, happily combining Lotharius’s scholarly ineptitude with moral turpitude, Odofredus blackened his portrait by declaring that Lotharius was a womanizer, an accusation he repeated at two other places in his commentary.\(^9\)

The following documents are the strongest pieces of evidence that Lotharius of Cremona was first a professor of Roman law at the law school of Bologna and later the archbishop of Pisa. Only one very tenuous piece of evidence would undermine the connection between the jurist and the bishop. A document in the Archivio capitolare in Pisa, dated 14 August, 1196, describes a conflict between Archbishop Hubaldus and his chapter. A certain ‘Magister Lotterius de Clemona’ is mentioned in the text. The first editor of the text, Antonio Felice Mattei changed ‘Clemona’ to ‘Cremona’, presumably because the thought ‘Clemona’, a small town in Friuli-Udine, was an unlikely reading.\(^2\) The original document reads ‘Clemona’, and the next editor, Natale Caturegli, restored the reading of ‘Clemona’ when he reedited it.\(^21\)

Although in the case of this word he faithfully adhered to the reading in the document, Caturegli’s edition is not very reliable. In the five lines following Lotterius’s name he left seven words out of his edition that appear in the manuscript. Caturegli seems to have done little more than mechanically change Cremona to Clemona and did not explore the implications of the change that Mattei had made. In any case, Lotterius of Clemona never reappears in the sources.

If Clemona is a mistake for Cremona, then the jurist and the bishop are very likely not the same man. Since Lotharius of Cremona (Clemona) and others were appointed to the cathedral chapter in order to perform pastoral duties, he could not have been a teacher at Bologna during the same time. Consequently, if we follow this very speculative line of thought, we might deduce that Lotharius of this document, a second Lotharius of Cremona, was not a jurist, became bishop of Vercelli, and was then elected archbishop of Pisa.

\([\text{temporalibus causis iuri suo, et sibi laicum iudicem constitutere, presertim ubi aduersarii voluntas accedit'}.\text{ Antonio Felice Mattei, Ecclesiae Pisanae historia (Lucca 1768-72) I 254-55, discusses the problems that Si diligenti raises for deciding whether Lotharius the bishop and Lotharius the jurist were the same man, but did not realize that the decretal predated his episcopal office at Pisa.}\]

\(^9\) Dig. 4.8.49 and Cod. 3.1.15. Savigny, Geschichle IV 385-90, is inclined to believe Odofredus. See also M. P. Gilmore, Argument from Roman law in political thought 1200-1600 (Cambridge, Mass. 1941) 18-19.

\(^2\) Ecclesiae Pisanae historia I 65-68.

\(^21\) Regesto della chiesa di Pisa (Regesta Chartarum Italicae 24; Rome 1938) 476.
However, unless other evidence surfaces, the following documents provide the best evidence that the jurist and the archbishop were the same person. Lotharius taught Roman law at Bologna before he became bishop and established his episcopal court in Pisa as a significant juristic forum for central Italy in the early thirteenth century. In spite of Odofredus’s assertions that Lotharius was not a first-rate lawyer, these documents demonstrate that his judgment was sought and respected in the early thirteenth century. Odofredus may have had a sharp tongue and a dull sense of truth.

*Syracuse University.*

KENNETH PENNINGTON

**TEXTS**

I.

Florence, Archivio di Stato, Dipl. Pistoia (Città), 12—. nr. 8 (After October 4, 1209).

In nomine Domini amen. Cum Ranuccinus iudex Pistor. petuisset consilium a domino Lottario Pisano archiepiscopo de causa Rainaldi et Nicholay, ideo archiepiscopus, uisis et auditis confessionibus et allegationibus utriusque partis et dictis testium intellectis, dixit et enim consuluit Nicholaum fore condempnandum Rainaldo ad prestationem annui afficti xxx. denariorum g. et ad restaurationem detenti asserens quod ius obligationis non pertinet ad donatarios, immo pertinet ad Rainaldum. Datum fuit hoc consilium apud plebem de Auana in Valle Sereli. Dominus Bandinus de Gaetano Pisanus cius iurisperitus consuluit idem. Henrigus Sexmundi cius Lucanus iurisperitus consuluit idem.

Item in causa que est inter Rainaldum et donatarios consuluit idem archiepiscopus Rainaldum fore absoluendum a petitione dictorum Tomasii et Ild <ebran-dini> donatariorum, uisis et auditis prius confessionibus et allegationibus et dictis testium utriusque partis <dicens quia> minor xxv. annis non potest donare et quia donatio non est contractus, cum contractus <obligatio est inter utro> citroque. Item dixit Bandinus predictus.

Ego Benentendus inuictissimi Ottonis Romanorum imperatoris iudex ordinarius prefatis cum domino Ranuccino iudice interfui ideoque scripsi.

Otto of Braunschweig was crowned emperor on October 4, 1209, which provides the terminus ante quem for document. Benintendus was a doctor of laws in Bologna.

II.

Pistoia, Archivio di stato, Dipl. S. Michele in Forcole, 1215, July 21.

In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti Amen.

Ego Lotharius Dei gratia eclelesie Pisane archiepiscopus ex delegatione domini pape cognitor litis que uertebatur inter presbyterum Sodium capellanum ecclesie Sancti Marci de Pistorio pro ipsa ecclesia ex una parte et presbyterum Siluestrum monachum et sindicum monasterii Sancti Michaelis de Furculis pro ipso monasterio
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ex altera ipsam litem sic diffinio. Petebat nāmque suprādictus presbyter Sodus a suprādicto presbytero Siluestro monacho et sindico suprādicti monasterii Sancti Michaelis pro ipso monasterio libras septuaginta quinque denariorum Pisane monete pro expensis trium precedentium annorum et, ut omnia massaria ei ab ipso monasterio prestarentur quam diu in suprādicta cappella Sancti Marci maneret, que omnia sibi deveri dicebat ex conventione quam fecerat cum abbate quando ipse unīt ad iam dictam cappellam. Petebat etiam unum antifanarium diurnum et unum par ceroferariorum et alia que erant in monasterio pertinentia ad cappellam suam.

De quibus omnibus dictus presbyter Siluester monachus et sindicus dicti monasterii dicebat monasterium suum omnino non teneri. Econtra idem Siluester indicus nomine monasterii sui petebat a suprādicto cappellano nomine ipsius cappelle ut tam ipse donec ibidem fuerit cappellanus quam successores ipsius singulis diēbus quando maiores misse cantantur in monasterio interesse debeant ipsarum celebrationi. Item in duabus festiuitatibus Sancti Michaelis et in nattuitate et assumptione Beate Virginis, nec non in festiuitate Sancte Lucie, in uigilii etiam suprādictarum festiuitatum tam in <die qua> m in nocte intersint diuinis officiis in suprādicto monasterio et celebrēt ibidem cum monachis, ita, scilicet, ut apud cappellam suprādictam nulla celebrēt diūina in suprādictis festiuitatibus uel uigiliis earum, neque pulsent campanas, neque celebrērī seu pulsāri faciant uel permittant, et ut crucem portari faciant ante corpora defunctorum parrochianorum suprādicit cappelle quando ad ipsum monasterium efferentur. Item quando corpora defunctorum aliunde portantur ad monasterium sepellienda ipsi cappellani eant pro ipsis cadaueribus efferendis. Petebat insuper ut idem cappellanus Sancti Marci alio secum assumpto cappellano ante fores monasterii recipiat letanias ciuitatis cum incenso et aqua benedicta. Petebat etiam centum oua annua que ab ipsis cappellanis dictis cappelle ipsi monasterio prestari debebre dicebat in Pascha. De quibus omnibus tam petitorio quam possessorio iudicio agebat, assēres monasterium suum longo tempore fuisset in quasi possessione omnium predictorum. De quibus omnibus suprādictus cappellanus se uel suos successores dicebat non teneri, licet aliquando fuissent facta uel prestanta ex consensus.

Visis igitur confessionibus et attestationibus utriusque partis et examinatis earum allegationibus diligenter, pronuncio monasterium de Furculis esse in quasi possessione omnium eorum que a sindico ipsius petita fuerunt, et in ipsa possessione debere defendi, eo excepto quod de celebratione diuinorum officiorum et pulsatione campanarum in cappella Sancti Marci non facienda in festiuitatibus suprādicti monasterii et uigiliis earum, ut dictum et petitum est, salua questione iuris seu proprietatis, si eam cappellani Sancti Marci aliquando mouere voluerant. De libris vero septuaginta quinque quas suprādictus presbyter Sodus petebat et de alimentis que sibi dicebat in futurum esse prestanta, cum propter absentiam ipsius presbyteryi qui legitime requisitum uenire contemplat, mihi de ipsa questione plene liquere non potuerit, suprādictum sindicum pro monasterio de Furculis et ipsum monasterium ab observatione iudicii mei absoluo. In ceteris autem petitionibus hincinde factis utramque partem inuiicem ab alterius petitione absoluo.

Datum et receptum in plebe de Cascina.

Presentibus domino Rainerio priori Sancti Fridani Lucane, magistro Rainerio Pisano canonico et magistro Johanne priori Sancte Marie de Forisporta Lucane


Ego Siluester filius quondam Boni, domini Henrigi Romanorum imperatoris iudex et notarius, hanc sententiam a supradicto domino archiepiscopo iudice in supradicta causa delegato me presente datam ipsius parabola et mandato scripsi et firmaui.