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The New Militarism

Between the years 975 and 1050 the new military system of Southern France and Catalonia, which had grown slowly but steadily throughout the tenth century, became powerful enough to affect almost every aspect of its government, its Church, and its society. To some extent this had been true of regions like the Spanish March, the Albigeois, the Limousin, and parts of Provence before 975. Now, unchecked by any really effective governmental authority, this military system spread until by 1050 every region south of Poitou and Burgundy was affected by the activities of the nobles and milites who dominated local areas near the old or newly built castles which they occupied. These nobles and milites were not, in many cases, new men, adventurers without background, who had usurped authority. They were often the descendants of the same old ruling families who had for generations dominated their local regions. What was new about them was their method of domination and control. They exercised authority from their castles as knights or milites, lightly armed men who could command respect and fear, not as rich allodial proprietors of broad acres with rights of patronage over their neighbors and nearby church establishments. Thus this period saw the appearance of a harsher, more brutal age than that which had preceded it -- one which was to lead directly to a reaction against this new militarism in movements which we know as the Peace of God, the Truce of God, and the struggle against Lay Investiture.

Was this new military system a response to external or internal needs for defense? On the whole our answer must be in the negative, for internal and external pressures on the Midi and Spanish March were relatively inconsequential during these years, particularly when we contrast them with those which we have found in previous periods. Thus north of the Pyrenees we hear only of occasional Viking raids along the coasts of Aquitaine and a brief flurry of activity by Moslem fleets of Denia along the coasts of Roussillon. That is all. Even in the Spanish March we know of only two important Moslem offensives, one the expedition which Almansor sent into Catalonia in 985, which captured Barcelona, and the other an assault along Catalan frontiers in 1002 which did some damage. From this time on, as a matter of fact, it was the Christian rulers of the Spanish March who were the aggressors, penetrating into Moslem Spain as far as Cordova and beginning that steady advance to the south which we know as the Reconquista -- an advance in which the Basque nobles of Gascony to the west participated as allies of Sancho the Great of Navarre. Indeed it is hard not to ascribe the very success of this advance to the new military system which had developed in the Spanish March and its Southern French back country during this period.

When we examine the internal situation we can find some evidence of conflicts which may have stimulated the growth of the new military system. Largely from the pen of Ademar of Chabannes we learn of the efforts of the counts of Poitou, now dukes of Aquitaine, to advance their domains south into
Saintonge, Angoulême, the Limousin, and finally Gascony, first in alliance with the Capetians and then with the assistance of the House of Anjou. At first their efforts to the west in Saintonge and Angoulême were more successful than those directed against the Limousin, where the counts of La Marche barred their path. But even in the Limousin by 1027 they had begun to establish a measure of control as they did in Western Auvergne. And then a little later by means of marriage alliances and conquest they managed, shortly after 1050, to add western Gascony to their realm. A great duchy of Aquitaine had at last been created. But even in the course of this Poitevin advance south there is ample evidence that warfare was by no means constant. There were long intervals of peace, and we have no way of being sure that the military system which we find developing in these years in this part of the Midi was a response to such military activity on the part of the dukes of Aquitaine.

Elsewhere what evidence we have seems to point to disorders which were more sporadic in nature. Thus from Southern Auvergne and Rouergue we find charters dating from between 984 and 1050 which mention land "ex conquestu." In one case there is even a reference to a war in which the castle of Castelars near Conques was destroyed -- probably the result of an attempt by the lords of High Auvergne, like the viscounts of Carlat and the comtors of Nonette, to seize land belonging to the house of Toulouse-Rouergue. But, judging from our documents, these disorders were less frequent than those which we find in these same regions in earlier periods. To the east in the Vienne region we also know of some disorders attendant upon the attempt of Archbishop Burchard's nephew to succeed him as archbishop of Lyon in 1031 -- an attempt thwarted by German intervention. We hear of certain conquests which were made by Count Humbert of Savoy as he began to build up a principality in Savoy and other Alpine regions east of Vienne. We find one charter from Provence which mentions damage done by Count Bertrand near Toulon in 1031, which was probably the result of antagonism between his house and that of the viscontal family of Marseille.

We find formal war taking place in only one other region -- that which stretched from Carcassonne south into Catalonia. Here the ambitions of Count Oliba Cabreta of Cerdanya-Besalu clashed with those of the houses of Carcassonne-Razès to the north and of Barcelona-Urgell to the south. This led for a period to some conflicts in the Berga-Urgell region and warfare to the southwest of Carcassonne in the Pyrenean foothills. Judging from our sources, however, both these conflicts were spasmodic and did not last long.

In other words examination of the Midi and Catalonia gives us little evidence of continual conflict and disorder anywhere in these regions, and in some areas like Eastern Languedoc we have no evidence of any conflicts whatsoever. It therefore is impossible to view the new military system of the period as an automatic response to internal aggression anymore than we can view it as a response to a need for defense against external conflict. If castle building became the order of the day and the class of steadily grew in number and in influence, we must consider that this happened in response to circumstances other than those which were necessitated by defense against internal or external enemies.

With this in mind, let us examine the new military system of the Midi and Catalonia. Its chief characteristic seems to have been the multiplication of the number of castles everywhere, many more of them than we found earlier. Let us first examine evidence of this which can be found for the region of the Massif Central; that is to say for Auvergne, Rouergue, and the Albigeois. Here documents show the following castles were in use between 957 and 1050: one, whose name we do not know in Rouergue in 984, Lautrec, Castelluz, Mons Pantiaro, Vertasionem, Gergora, Salem, Budrono, Roca Savona, Rochaneuil, Pallerios, Nonette, a castle near Mauhon, Ebaino, Montagut, Bornaz, Balcagi, Persc, Conques, Aurose, Castrum Novum, Elnone, Castelaro, Bello [Bellum], Causago, Berencs, Vintronem, Castelnou, Dunine, Geccago, Villamare, Vauro,
Vetus Brivate, Brezons, Brosadolz, Cussac, Castro Vetulo, Muret, Mermens, Castro Novo (de Moet), Saint-Ucruze, Turlande, Cayles, Carlat, and Mandillac. Though it seems obvious that most of these castles were new foundations, three of them, judging by the name of "castrum novaum" or new castles, were certainly newly built. So was another at Albi according to a document which dates from the year 1040.

When we examine evidence of castles existing in the nearby region of Velay and Vivarais we find a similar concentration of fortresses. Those mentioned in our sources of the period are Mercurio, LaFara, Cherssac, Espolede, Saint-Alban, USSarie, Lardariola, Mont Rochefort, Rochos, Capdeneco, Capitoliensi, Camberliaco, Bisatico, Castellar, Bellomonte, Saint-Desiderio, Chalencon, Bellommen, and Barholmes. Nearby in the Middle Rhone region which comprises Forez, the Lyonnais, the Viennois, Dauphiny, Savoy, and Valence we find reference to such castles as Ionis, Savigny, Saint-Julian, Mons Meruli, Ay, Novum Castellum, Pupet, Beatti Cassiani, Geneva, Grenoble, Visalia, Chanoux, Sentiae, Saint-Barnard, Tehes, Laurico, Turre of Ebrard, Pailhares, as well as new walls which were built to protect Vienne. Again at least two of these are definitely mentioned as being built during these years: one near Savigny constructed about the year 1000 and the new castle near the river Isarn which is mentioned about 1016. So are the new walls and towers mentioned at Vienne in 1019.

When we turn our attention to Provence we find abundant evidence of castles in existence in this period, which is not surprising since this was a region in the Midi organized around newly built castles. Our sources mention Almis, Malacruca, Gap, Arlerc, Avignon, Sparro, Podium Odolinum, Artiga, Vitrola, Collongellos, Revella, Lurs, Petro Foco, Morera, Auriole, Nantes, Geminias, Auribello, Castro de Petro Castellanus, Salerna, Toramencis, Poraes, Oleras, Sinna, Cagueli, Buchodenes, Inter Castello, Vite Albano, Vennena, Favat, Condorcet, Forcalquier, Lunis, Altonum, Bar, Charengugues, Guanin, Pictanis, Sarraix, Flaisoe, Turrivis, Castelinova (of Nice), Castelloum, Calars, Agoldi, Gordon, Archinoe, Castromuris, Canneto, Castrum of Boson, Boric, Rocheta, Rocca (of Nice), Boxetum, Rochabuna, Saint-Vincent, Aureiac, Coruis, Acet, Cagnes, Gontard, Orion, Bruso, Palacionem, Guardec, Cauo Longo, Fos, Gordiano, Podietum de Malanate, Trigantis, Rhodencs, Dyilo, Marsens, Sex Forno, Solario, Rodancs, Drôme, Ducelea, Tarascon, Senez, Mota, Mugins, and Grasse. Obviously many of these were newly built, but we only have definite proof that the new castle of Nice was constructed during this period.

In nearby Eastern Languedoc we find the same pattern of numerous castles built and occupied everywhere. Nîmes which had new walls in 1015 had at least four such fortresses in the city whose names we know; Moriocipium, Turre Magna, Juncariot and the castrum of Sainte-Marie, as well as nearby Salvense and Anduze. Further to the west our sources mention the castles of Lignano, Turre of Adfaix (Béziers), Substantion, Béziers, Mercariolo, Adellano, Portiars, Pedinates, Mesoia, Varrigo, Florensiaco, Pavalleno, Nibian, Paulianus, Melgueil, Maguelonne, Duas Virginias, Charos, Porcano, Omelas, Rochabuno, Saint-Tiberio, Mellando, Rochafullo, Lunel, Frontiniaco, and Pouget. We have definite proof that at least one of these, that of Maguelonne, was constructed in this period between 1000 and 1010.

In Western Languedoc and along the borders of Eastern Gascony we find just as many castles mentioned in the documents dating from these years. Among the more important ones are Saint-Pons, Saint-Martin, Choriano, Burg of Villanova, Colijo, Colliensi, Sexago, Minebe, Foix, Razès, Savartione, Castelopendente, Pierrapertusa, Queribus, Durbin, Dourgne, Palejano, Cula, Dunes, Roccamare, Lodet, Durimane, SaintHilaire, Lézat, Miravels {Mirabels}, Aureiac, Saint-Marcello, Porta
Spina, Confolencs, and Castro Novo \[Castelnau\],\(^{34}\) as well as the new walls and towers of Narbonne\(^{35}\) and Carcassonne.\(^{36}\)

When we turn to Gascony, though our sources are not very voluminous for this period, we again find a number of castles mentioned in our documents. One was near the abbey of Blasement\(^{37}\) and a second, Castello Mousqué,\(^{38}\) seems to have been not far from the monastery of Lucq. The old castle of Blavia near Bordeaux was still being used\(^{39}\) as well as a new one built by Count Geoffrey of Angoulême.\(^{40}\) Not far away were the castellum of Fronciac and other castella which Count Aldouin of Angoulême acquired as a result of his marriage about 1028 to the daughter of the duke of Gascony.\(^{41}\)

In Western Aquitaine, that is to say in the Limousin, Quercy, Angoulême, Périgord, Saintonge, and the borders of Poitou documents again show many new castles as well as older ones which have been mentioned \[297\] in earlier chapters. Our sources speak of Angély, Belea, Traliburcense, Fracta Bute, Surgiaco, Marestay, Tulle, Tormente, Bré, Montchâter, Rochechouart, Turres, Consolente, Solignac, Castello Novo \(\text{(Limoges)}\), Niolo, Nobiliaco, Botvilla, Marfines, Cohec, Manslé, Castellar, Bellacum, Procea, Conca, Brossac, Roccamolten, Turre \(\text{(Limoges)}\), Massai, Argaton, Marillac, Roifrac, Martignac, and Saint-Angelus.\(^{42}\) Many of these, according to the testimony of Ademar of Chabannes and other sources, were newly built during this period.\(^{43}\)

From references in the relatively abundant sources which we possess for this period, then, we know of the names of some 275 castles and other fortresses which were in use in Southern France north of the Pyrenees during this period. Some 46 were in the Massif Central region of Auvergne-Rouergue-Albigeois, 37 in the vicinity of the Middle Rhone Valley, 86 in Provence, 5 in Gascony, and 34 in Western Aquitaine. By 1050 the castle had spread everywhere and became a symbol of the new militarization of the Midi. What had started slowly in the ninth century had become, by the mid-eleventh, a reality for the society of Southern France in every region south of Poitou and Burgundy.

There remains a consideration of castles in the Spanish March which, as we have already noted, was already covered with fortresses by the year 975. Nevertheless, documents from this region dating from this period give us information about many more of them. They mention Plana de Courts, Saint-Stephen, Livorte, Cabrera, Vultrairo, Pareds, Granario.\(^{298}\) Monte Juliaco, Puigreig, Odene, Pinna Nigra, Santa-Cruscis, Moralias, Viridaria, Miralles, Montbui, Villademaier, Montegut, Rocheta, Tous, Vivario, Leone, Mallato, Castro Comitale \(\text{(Barcelona)}\), Audelino, Ohrella, Selma, Albinaflo, Cedemilla, Aquitaro, Ervilla, Gariago, Aqualonga, Primaliano, Lauro, Calaf, Fonte Rubio, Malerdula, Turres Becces, Castelloi, La Granada, Orpino, Fontaneto, Castellet, Valle Fornes, Mogio, Saint-Vincent de Calders, Nure, Mediam, Santa-Oliva, Berano, Saint-Martin, Besalu, Lucca, Berga, Balcoreigne, Dua Castella, Oris, Curul, Menen, Völtniger, Sousa, Fallat, Vacherias, Ardalva, Areng, Orit, Monteclaro, Pontilans, Sandila, Santa-Perpetua, Lordanis, Fores, Fornells, Paladl, Far, Pax, Cubelles, Tarati, Taganarit, Gayan, Banvure, Tamarnit, Villo, Ales, Todela, Medolio, So, Folet, Agudo, Rochamauro, and Castellnou.\(^{44}\) In addition to these fortresses we find a number of references to turres or smaller fortresses, one near San-Cugat,\(^{45}\) one belonging to Daniel,\(^{46}\) one belonging to Hennego,\(^{47}\) another to Igiga,\(^{48}\) and one to Suniofredo,\(^{49}\)\(^{299}\) as well as to the new walls of Barcelona which were built about 1030.\(^{50}\) Of these almost a hundred castles which we find referred to in our sources, a number were definitely built during this period, like the fortress of Castellnou in Vallespir,\(^{51}\) or those at Berga, Fones, Albinańo, and Castellet,\(^{52}\) especially along the frontiers where the marcher lords who built them were advancing slowly, but surely, toward Tarragona and Lérida and other Moslem holdings in the Ebro Valley.
Our sources for this period, however, reveal to us more than just evidence of how castles increased in number during these years. They also contain frequent references to *milites*, or, as they are called in some parts of the Midi, *caballarios*. Some seven charters from Auvergne contain references to *milites*, generally speaking of them as *milites* of a certain castle. For Rouergue and the Albigeois we find them mentioned in some five documents of the period, all of which use the term *caballarios*. They are referred to in documents from the Velay region which date from 980, 1022, and 1030, as well as in some ten charters from the Middle Rhone region, the earliest of which dates from the last years of the tenth century. In the Provence region, where the terms *miles* and *caballarius* seem to be used almost interchangeably, we find thirteen references to this class also, one as early as 979. In Languedoc we find this class referred to less frequently in specific terms, but we still find it mentioned four times starting as early as about 980. On the other hand, in Gascony where, judging from our sources, castles were still relatively rare, there are six documents which mention *milites*, one of which dates from as early as 985, which makes us suspect that there existed here a fairly large class of such warriors. The same seems to be true of Western Aquitaine where eleventh century charters mention them some nine times. Nor was the Spanish March without its class of *milites*, though they are specifically called so infrequently; one reference to them was found which dates from 987, another in 1040. In every section of Southern France and Catalonia, then, by 1050 a special class of *milites* had appeared which was recognized as distinct by the society of the period, and which occupied the old and new fortresses of every region south of Poitou and Burgundy.

How were the castles and other fortresses which these *milites* garrisoned owned and held during these years? That is our next question. In this period, as in earlier ones we have examined, many of them were either owned outright by Church establishments or were the alodial possession of important magnates and their families. Our documents from Auvergne and Velay, which mention Ictor of Castro Rochareuil, or Maurice of Castro Pallerios or Amblard, *comtor* of Oppida Noneda or even Gerald, old *miles* of Rochas, certainly imply that each of the above owned the fortress in question as alods. We know, for instance, that in 1020 the castle of Saint-Julian in the Lyonnais was a family alod of the Guerin clan, each member owning a portion of it. Just so the castles of Pupet and Novum Castellum, which King Rudolf gave to his wife Queen Ermengaude about 1011, were his alods. At about the same period in Provence we find Bellielis, daughter of Viscount William of Provence, owning one castle outright and one-third of another which was probably part of the family possessions of the house of Marseille. In 1034 a similar one-third ownership of castles is revealed by the gift of certain rights over fortresses to the abbey of Saint-Victor of Marseille by another member of this same family. When we consider Languedoc and Aquitaine we find the same situation. The castle of Anduze and others nearby seem to have been the outright alodial possessions of the marquises of Anduze. So were a number of castles which Viscount William of Béziers in 990 left to his wife and his daughters in his will. Similarly, examination of the legacies left by Count Roger the Old of Carcassonne reveals that many of the castles in his domains were alods -- alods which were often divided in a rather complex way among various members of the family. Just so a charter of 1037 shows us that at least some of the castles which Count Pons of Toulouse gave to his wife Majore as a bridal gift were outright alodial possessions of this important nobleman. In the nearby Limousin the counts of La Marche owned castles like Bellacum and Roccamolten as alods. So did Count Geoffrey, brother of Count Aldouin of Angoulême, who built a new castle near Blavia about 1028, and Aldouin himself, who, we learn, owned the fortress of Fronsac "*in dominio pro prietatis.*"
Such castles owned as allods by important magnates were particularly common as well in the Spanish March. Many seem to have small fortresses or *turrens* like those which our sources show us were owned by lords like Deacon Suniofredo, Hennego, or Igiga. Others were important castles like Montegut which a charter dating from 992 mentions as an allod belonging to Lord Belleron, or Ervilla which Count Raymond Borell of Barcelona and Count Ermengol of Urgell sold to Lord Hennego in this same year. The exchange of still another castle, Masquefa, which Hennego made with the abbey of San-Cugat in 998 in return for the castle of Gellito reveals the same kind of allodial ownership. So does the gift of two castles, Mogio and Albinaño, to this abbey by two members of the viscontal family of Barcelona in 1010 -- a gift, incidentally, which was unsuccessfully challenged by other members of this family before a court presided over by Count Raymond Borell in 1011. A little later, about 1023, we find Count Raymond Berengar I of Barcelona selling as an allod still another castle, for the price of sixty ounces of gold, the buyer being a marcher lord called Guillelm. And as late as 1048 still another fortress, given to Count Raymond Berengar by Bernard, son of Ermengaud, shows that allodial castle ownership continued in Catalonia, particularly along the frontiers. In the Spanish March, as elsewhere in the Midi, the castle which was owned outright as an allod by an individual magnate or by important families was still to be found down to 1050.

Along with this allodial ownership of castles, which was a common feature of this period, as it had been earlier, we find still another method of castle control. This was also not new, but perhaps became a more elaborated and highly organized system during these years. I refer to a division of a castle between him who owned it and had "*domino proprietates*" over it, and him who was in actual possession of it or *held* it. By this time in most examples of this system which we find in Southern France and the Spanish March, this latter individual was said to hold one-half of such a castle *"in feudo*" or *"in beneficio."* A castle held as a fief or benefice, then, generally is thought of as a sort of division in which the possessor divides it with the allodial owner. A somewhat later document seems to be describing the use of this system in Dauphiny during this period when it tells us that the bishops of Grenoble held the allod of the castles built in Dauphiny and the noblemen the *feudum*. That such an interpretation is the correct one seems to be confirmed by a charter of 996 which shows Bishop Humbert giving to Cluny *his half* of the castle of Visalia. In Provence, where this half and half system of holding castles was no doubt encouraged by the example of the *medium plantum*, we can find other examples of this practice. Thus a charter of 984 shows us Pons, bishop of Marseille giving one-half of the castle of Almis to the abbey of Saint-Victor and reserving one-half for himself *"ad allodem,"* and a charter of four years later shows another landowner doing the same in giving one-half of the castle of Gap to Cluny. Another nobleman, called Richard, did the same in the year 1000 in giving property to this same abbey. Sometimes our records seem to show that an allodial owner of a castle, having already granted one-half of it as a fief contented himself with giving one-half of his reserved allodial rights. This seems to explain how in 990 Count William could give to Saint-Victor one-quarter of the castles of Arlerc and Avignon, and why in 1023 Cluny received a gift of one-half of one castle and one-quarter of four others from two brothers, Leodegar and Pons. As late as 1040 this method was still not uncommon, as we learn from documents which tell us of how Rambaud, archbishop of Arles, gave one-half of the castle of Ornon to Saint-Victor of Marseille, and how Viscount William of this city gave one-half of the castle of Mato to this same abbey.

When we turn to Languedoc we find what appears to be the same system in a charter telling of how Viscount William of Béziers and his wife gave back to the church of Béziers in 990 one-half of the
castle of Nibian and one-half of that of Morecino. In 1030 we also find a reference to a certain Esco, who gave to Rotmund of Folgerius one-half of the honorem, which he says he has "in meo domino" over the castrum of Lignano. In 1028 we learn of the one-half of their allod in the castle of Auriac given by a certain Odalric and his brother to Viscount Aton II of Albi, and a little later of how Count Pons of Toulouse gave one-half of the castle of Porta Spina to his wife Marjore. Nor was Aquitaine unacquainted with this method of holding castles. Ademar of Chabannes, for example, tells us how about 1028 Count Aldouin of Angoulême gave to his brother Geoffray three-quarters of the castle of Blavia "in beneficio" and kept the remaining quarter as an allod. A little later about 1035, according to our sources, the bishop of Limoges gave to Saint-Martial the fevum of a new castle which he had received from the duke of Aquitaine, who still possessed the dominio or allod of this fortress. About 1050 another document tells us of the burg of Manslé, of which one-half had been given "in feudo" by the canons of the church of Angoulême.

It is Catalonia, however, which seems to furnish us with the most complete information concerning the workings of this system. As early as 987, for instance, a charter tells us of how Count Borell II of Barcelona gave one-half of the castle of Miralès and its surrounding territory to the bishop of Ausona, and in 999 we hear of how Lady Irvanna sold to a certain Hugh one-half of the castle of Montegut. In 1012 we learn from a charter of the gift of one-half the castle of Cleriana and the devastated land pertaining to it to a marcher lord named Gundallo, a castle which seems to belong to Guitard, abbot of San-Cugat. The same abbey is revealed in a charter of 1013 to have similarly divided the castle of Saint-Martin with a Lady Adelaise.

Even more specific information comes from a document dating from 1037. This tells us how Abbot Guitard of San-Cugat gave the castle of Saint-Vincent of Calders to a certain Bernard and his sons. Bernard and his heirs are to hold one-half of this fortress as an allod for two generations and the other half "per nostrum fevum." If they did not rebuild the castle in ten years they were to pay a fine of ten ounces of gold to the abbey. A charter of 1038 shows us Count Raymond Berengar I of Barcelona giving a similar castle, that of Flores, which needed to be rebuilt, to another such marcher lord; and another document of 1040, which mentions a grant of land of San-Cugat to another such lord, illustrates this system again. This latter grant concerns an agreement to rebuild the castle of Arampufla and repopulate its lands over a period of some seven years. The recipient of this castle and its surrounding territory and his heirs were to have one-half of this castle as an allod and one-half "pro fevum." The abbey of San-Cugat reserved for itself, on the other hand, pasturage rights, one-quarter of all castle dues and tithes, and one-third of all captives and booty taken by the castellan and milites of this fortress. In 1045 still another charter tells us of a grant of land to a certain Argila by a certain Raymond Isembert in which one-half of the land was to be held by Argila and one-half reserved for Raymond. Finally a charter of about this same date contains an agreement between the abbey of San-Cugat and a certain Gerald, castellan of Cleriana, in which the latter agreed to pay the abbey one-half of the court fines, one-half of the tithes, and one-half of the censives for the castellaris of which San-Cugat is the allodial owner.

These many and varied examples of how in the Midi and Catalonia castles were given out as fiefs, however, does not exhaust the ways in which castles were controlled. In addition to the fief or fevum of a castle we find in this period still another system used, the guarda or baillem. The castle of Solignac in the Limousin, which Aton held as castellan from the bishop of Limoges some time between 1024 and 1050, seems to have been such a guarda. So were a number of castles and border districts mentioned in charters from Catalonia which date from 991, 992, and 1017. Even a bishop like
Frotaire of Cahors could hold the *guarda* of a castle, in this case one which in 985 belonged to Viscount Isarn of Lautrec.\(^{113}\) During this period then, *guardas*, more limited in scope than fiefs, are also found in our regions and used as a method of entrusting such fortresses to someone who does not possess the allod or *dominio* of them.

What seems clear then is the fact that castles and the districts pertaining to them were, in this period as earlier, owned and granted out in a bewildering series of ways. There was no single system for owning or holding castles, but a variety of them which existed side by side with one another. They could be owned by a church or an individual outright. They could be subject to loint family ownership. Some could be granted out as benefices or fiefs under the 50-50 system, or they could be entrusted to a castellan as *guardas*. Always we find that the revenues of the castle\(^{307}\) were divided too between occupier and owners when such a division of control took place. All of which makes it clear that such castles and the rights pertaining to them were considered as *property* in the Midi and Catalonia. Like other property they followed natural laws of division and inheritance, even in the conditional grants of rights. They seem in this sense indistinguishable from other allodial, *aprisio*, or feudal property found in these regions.

Yet when we insist on this view of castles as property, we must still recognize that for this age in the Midi and Catalonia such castles were an unusually *important* type of property. The nobles and ruling families and churchmen of the Midi and Catalonia recognized this fact too. They knew that castles were the key to effective political and economic control over local districts. This explains why in the wills of the leading nobles of this period, castles and their control are always mentioned so specifically. The conditions under which they are left to an heir are always made extremely clear. This is not only true of earlier tenth century wills left by members of the house of Toulouse-Rouergue. It is true also of the later ones of Count Roger the Old of Carcassonne,\(^{114}\) Viscount William of Béziers,\(^{115}\) and a number of the more important magnates of the Spanish March.\(^{116}\)

Nor is it only these wills which make clear how important ownership and control of castles was to the society of the Midi and Catalonia. We have another proof of their importance -- a number of examples of oaths and agreements made between the leading nobles and landowners of this period concerning castles. These oaths or agreements, which are generally reproduced in our charters, not in Latin, but in the vulgar tongue, are sometimes spoken of as examples of feudal homage. This is not entirely accurate in many cases as a description of them, for some concern agreements between members of the same family, such as that of Carcassonne, in which no feudal relationship in the ordinary sense of the word existed.\(^{117}\) What they seem to be, then, are agreements which concern castles made between those who actually are in *physical possession* of such fortresses and those who have rights of *dominio* over them. Possession of a castle might be the result of the grant of a fief, or the creation of a *guarda*. It might be the result of part-allodial ownership. But in any case, he who had a share in this castle in the form of allodial ownership or lordship needed to make clear his rights and to protect them from the one who occupied it. Hence these agreements were necessary.

This leads us to a consideration of the agreements themselves. In addition to one similar to the others, about which we have a rather vague and unsatisfactory statement in a charter from the Grenoble region dating from 1040,\(^{118}\) we possess some thirty such agreements or oaths. They come from a number of regions, from the Limousin, from the Toulousain, from the Albigois, from Melgueil, from Béziers, from Carcassonne-Razès,\(^{119}\) and from the Spanish March\(^{120}\) -- a fairly wide distribution over our regions. The largest number come from Catalonia; and all those from regions north of the Pyrenees and most of those from the south of it concern castles. All seem quite similar in form and, generally speaking, in content too. The earliest of them, mentioned in an earlier chapter, dates from 954.\(^{121}\) The last one we will be considering is dated just after 1050.
In almost all agreements an individual who holds a particular castle swears *fidelitas* to him who has *dominio* or allodial rights over this fortress. This oath almost never, in our examples, is one of general support, but rather a promise not to aid the latter's enemies, not to deliver the castle over to such enemies, sometimes specified by name, and generally to surrender this castle or castles to him upon demand. Exceptions are often specifically mentioned. In return he who has rights of *dominio* over the castle swears to respect the rights of the castellan who occupies this fortress and to protect him in case of need against his enemies, though even here sometimes exceptions are specified. In some cases both parties to these agreements produce *fidejussores* who guarantee these oaths and promise large payments of money in case either part defaults in the performance of their promises.

Now an analysis of these oaths leads one to some interesting conclusions. Their emphasis seems essentially negative. He who holds the castle and he who has *dominio* over it emphasize not a positive *fidelitas* to each other, but a negative one -- what they will not do. The scope of these agreements also seems in general very limited. They seem to concern not *fidelitas* in the Carolingian or Northern French sense of the word, but *fidelitas* as regards a particular piece of property. One is not swearing homage to a man; one is swearing a limited *fidelitas* for a castle or castles. One gets the impression that castles were important property, and that owners and those who occupied them needed to specify the exact way in which they were to be controlled, but that in so doing they did not, as in Northern French feudalism, set up any general personal tie of loyalty. And this was to continue to be true in the Midi and the Spanish March long after this period. The basis of power was still the *allod*, considered property, above all, in the Roman sense of the word, and even castles and their control reflected this point of view.

So far in this chapter we have concerned ourselves only with the increase in the number of castles to be found and the methods by which they were owned, granted out as fiefs or *guardas*, and safeguarded for owner and possessor alike. But there still remains another important question which needs to be examined -- the effect of such castles upon Southern France and Catalonia during this period. Here we must emphasize what we began to find was true during the preceding period, that a castle had become more than a mere fortress. It had become the center of a territory or district which in varying degrees was subject to the authority of its castellan and its *milites*. In almost every region south of Poitou and Burgundy, it had become what contemporary sources call a *mandamenta*.

In Dauphiny and Provence where, from 950 on, the castle had tended to be an instrument of government for organizing regions which had no law and order, we would expect to find a good deal of evidence of such *mandamenta* centering about castles during this period. And we do. In 1015, for instance, a charter which mentions a "castellum novum" in Dauphiny speaks of its "apendiciis et mandemences." In Provence we find even more abundant references to the territories which pertained to castles in charters which date from 988, 990, 1000, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1022, 1023, 1025, 1027, 1030, 1031, 1033, 1038, and 1040. Nor need we be surprised that in the Spanish March, where from the time of Count Guifred, frontier land was organized around the castle, this still remained true throughout this period. This accounts for references to territory belonging to castles found in charters dating from 976, 977, 981, 983, 986, 988, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 999, 1001, 1005, 1006, 1010, 1012, 1018, 1020, 1030, 1031, 1036, 1037, 1038, and 1045.

What seems to be a more significant development though, is the spread of this system into other parts of the Midi where, prior to 975, it was rarer than in Provence and the Spanish March. Thus, in the Massif Central region of Auvergne, Rouergue, and Velay we can see the beginnings of such *mandamenta* in references to "*in territorio Castelluc"* in 983, the *mandamenta* of the castle of Ussarie in 986, the *mandamenta* of the castle of Cairovolo between 996 and 1031, the "*vicaria de Castro"
Capitoliensi" in 1030, or the podium of Mons Barcolomio "cum boschaticum" in 1050. In Western Aquitaine we find a reference late in the tenth century to the caslania of the castrum of Tulle, the "vicaria de Castro Traliburcense" in 1016, and Castro Fronciaco "cum omnibus in circuitui terris et castellis" in 1028.

In Languedoc a document of 978 mentions the circuitu of the castle of Saint-Martin; the castle of Sexago "cum ipsa caslania et ipsa virgarias" is referred to in one of 1002 and so is that of Minerbe and the land pertaining to it in the same year. In 1010 we hear of the castrum of Melgueil and its mandamenta, and in 1034 of the castle of Cula "cum ipsa terra." To these direct references to land surrounding castles which were subject to their authority, we should add references to the special dues their castellans and milites levied on regions nearby which give us indirect evidence of the development of such mandamenta. These dues were particularly heavy, when levied on land belonging to churchmen, and aroused the hostility of monastic establishments in particular. Thus charters of such establishments call them "malos consuetudines" or "malos toltos" in Auvergne. They refer to them as "usos" or "usura" in Rouergue, and "unjust rights," "unjust customs" or "malos consuetudines" in the Limousin. In Velay we find them again called "malos consuetudines" or "pravos usos," in Gascony "mala exactione et rapina," in Languedoc "malos albergos," in Dauphiny "servicium et hospitalia," in both Provence and the Spanish March the general term tasca seems to include not only the cens but such additional levies too.

What were these exactions levied upon surrounding territory by castellans and milites in the castles of this period -- exactions which called forth the terms of approbrium mentioned above? Perhaps the most important one was what was frequently known as the albergum or receptum, or even hospitalia. Originally it seems to have been a special additional levy of the Carolingian period or one used to a limited extent in the domains of the great abbeys. By this time it had become a tax in kind used to provide food for the milites of a castle, since it is often referred to as an albergum or receptum for so many milites or caballarios. Levied on the land, it in effect came to be an additional payment similar to a cens. Similar to this levy were special dues which we find laid upon the peasantry's livestock -- their pigs, sheep, goats, horses, cows, and even chickens -- particularly important in mountainous pastoral regions like the Massif Central, the Alps, or the Pyrenees. Then there was the banalités or dues which came from seigneurial monopoly of mill and oven, the portaticum, and a host of others. To these levies should be added dues or services of various sorts of a menial variety, which are mentioned several times in contemporary documents -- even military service or "hostem, pediatricum et cavalcadem" which seems to have been largely confined to the Spanish March where it was a survival of Carolingian customs.

Were rights of justice also included as part of the rights of such mandamenta? This seems probable as far as the Spanish March is concerned, and even in other parts of the Midi where vicaria were a part of the caslania or territory pertaining to a castle. It seems less certain elsewhere, especially in portions of Aquitaine, Provence, and the Valley of the Rhone where justice was still essentially a seigneurial right exercised by a landowner, who controlled a large alodial estate and controlled the justice for his tenants and peasant coloni. But even in such regions there seems to have been a tendency to combine rights of justice with the other rights or dues levied by the castellan and milites over the surrounding countryside. Gradually and inexorably, it would seem, such castellans were not only creating territories or districts about their fortresses, but usurping rights to cens and tithes, and levying new onerous dues and services upon their neighbors. They were also becoming dispensers of justice and replacing older minor officials like the vicars and judices in their role of judges over the humbler members of the society of the Midi and Catalonia. Slowly, but surely, many parts of the Midi seem to
have been approaching the situation found around a castle in Pallars in 1010 where "bannum et placitos, parados et albergos et servicios" and "hostem et cavalcadem" were levied upon the nearby population.\textsuperscript{(150)}

The results of the spread of castles and their increase in number, then, went far beyond the creation of a new class of \textit{milites} imbued with a new [314] and different military spirit. Whether castles were created as the result of definite policies, as in Dauphiny, Provence, and the Spanish March, or whether they grew more haphazardly as in the rest of the Midi, the result was the same. New, almost cellular units, appeared in the countryside, which we call \textit{mandamenta}. The castles, which formed the center of such territories, required new dues and services from neighbors, as well as usurping older \textit{cens} and tithes; and a new justice began to be dispensed. This sort of government -- for, legal or illegal, government it was -- was much resented by allodial landholders, peasants, and churchmen alike, who saw in it a threat to their freedom, their livelihood, and the exercise of their legal rights. Led by the Church, they attempted to combat this trend in movements known as the Peace and Truce of God which we will examine in the next chapter. By 1050, then, the new militarism had become powerful enough not only to create castles and \textit{milites} everywhere, but also to create a new system of \textit{mandamenta} which threatened the allodial landholding system and Church of the Midi and which was to lead directly to a new era in lands south of Poitou and Burgundy.
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