

Medieval Academy of America

Monks and Their Enemies: A Comparative Approach

Author(s): Barbara H. Rosenwein, Thomas Head, Sharon Farmer

Source: *Speculum*, Vol. 66, No. 4 (Oct., 1991), pp. 764-796

Published by: Medieval Academy of America

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2864632>

Accessed: 30/06/2009 09:58

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=medacad>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Medieval Academy of America is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Monks and Their Enemies: A Comparative Approach

By Barbara H. Rosenwein,
Thomas Head, and Sharon Farmer

INTRODUCTION

In a pioneering study Georges Duby showed how the system of justice that had prevailed in the Carolingian era ceased to function in the Mâconnais of the tenth century.¹ His observations about the breakdown of public institutions opened up a new field of research, for they suggested the development in the tenth century of a unique set of judicial institutions and practices, different in kind from the traditional public order of the Roman and Roman-influenced Carolingian worlds. This was an important change, and a number of scholars turned their attention to the developments described by Duby.

The central problem of this new field of study was posed by Fredric Cheyette: in the absence of a judicial system dominated by a king and his agents, how were crimes punished and disputes settled?² Cheyette's answer was, in part, to reformulate the issue. Disputes were not so much "settled" as negotiated; compromises and face-saving solutions were favored over final verdicts. Important studies followed Cheyette's lead, showing how medieval men and women handled their public and private differences.³ Concentrating on small regions, historians explored traditions of handling disputes within strictly defined local limits, analyzing the mutually dependent evolutions of

The papers brought together in this article were initially written separately: the section on Cluny by Barbara H. Rosenwein, that on Fleury by Thomas Head, that on Marmoutier by Sharon Farmer. They were presented at the 1990 meeting of the Medieval Academy of America in Vancouver, British Columbia, in a session chaired by Penelope D. Johnson. The authors wish to thank her and members of the audience for their useful comments and suggestions. Subsequently the authors worked together to coordinate the essays and draft the introduction. We are indebted to Fredric L. Cheyette and Giles Constable for reading and commenting on the result in its penultimate form.

¹ Georges Duby, "Recherches sur l'évolution des institutions judiciaires pendant le Xe et le XIe siècle dans le sud de la Bourgogne," *Le moyen âge* 52 (1946), 149–94, and 53 (1947), 15–38 (= Georges Duby, *Hommes et structures du moyen âge: Recueil d'articles* [Paris, 1973], pp. 7–60).

² Fredric L. Cheyette, "Suum quique tribuere," *French Historical Studies* 6 (1970), 287–99.

³ Stephen D. White, "Pactum . . . Legem Vincit et Amor Judicium: The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France," *American Journal of Legal History* 22 (1978), 281–308; Wendy Davies and Paul Fouracre, eds., *The Settlement of Disputes in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, Eng., 1986); Patrick J. Geary, "Vivre en conflit dans une France sans état: Typologie des mécanismes de règlement des conflits (1050–1200)," *Annales* 41 (1986), 1107–33, who prefers the anthropologically influenced terms "dispute processing or handling" to "dispute settlement."

social and judicial institutions originally highlighted by Duby. Their findings suggested that in post-Carolingian France local social and political networks shaped the ways in which disputes arose and were settled — whether by violence, retribution, posturing, or resolution.

Monks were not ignored by these historians of “dispute processing,” if only because most evidence on the subject came from monastic charters. Then, too, some historians studied monks in their own right. Jean-François Lemaignier, for example, stressed the relationship between the movement for monastic exemptions and the decline of political structures examined by Duby.⁴ Lester Little restored to proper centrality the maledictions that monks chanted to curse their enemies. Patrick Geary spoke of the “humiliation of saints,” dense rituals through which the monks upbraided their enemies, chastised their patron saints for inaction, and called upon them and God for deliverance.⁵ Stephen White showed that when monastic interests were not explicitly involved, local disputants often turned to monastic communities to serve as mediators and peacemakers.⁶ The role of monks in the Peace of God also was not overlooked, despite the recent consensus that bishops and lay princes, rather than monks, orchestrated much of the movement.⁷

Nevertheless, the question of how monks confronted their enemies has never been squarely broached. Maledictions and appeals to saintly patronage were only a small part of the arsenal of monastic weapons, and the role that monks played as mediators was only a subset of monastic social relations in general. It is time to focus on monks themselves, and it seems fruitful to do so from a comparative perspective, for from such a vantage point theoretical points may emerge without sacrificing local specificity. The essays that follow explore how the members of three monastic communities — Cluny, Fleury, and Marmoutier — dealt with their enemies, whether ecclesiastic or lay, internal or external. They are local treatments in the tradition of the historiography discussed above. But by presenting these studies together, the authors intend to broaden the scope of the inquiry to consider how the monasteries differed from or resembled each other when confronting their

⁴ Jean-François Lemaignier, “Structures monastiques et structures politiques dans la France de la fin du Xe et des débuts du XIe siècle,” in *Il monachesimo nell’Alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale*, 8–14 aprile 1956, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo 4 (Spoleto, 1957), pp. 357–400. Note, however, that the specific conclusions arrived at in the essays below are not entirely in accord with Lemaignier, who grouped Fleury and Cluny together.

⁵ Lester K. Little, “La morphologie des malédictions monastiques,” *Annales* 34 (1979), 43–60; Patrick J. Geary, “L’humiliation des saints,” *Annales* 34 (1979), 27–42.

⁶ Stephen D. White, “Feuding and Peace-making in the Touraine around the Year 1100,” *Traditio* 42 (1986), 195–263.

⁷ Hans-Werner Goetz, “Kirchenschutz, Rechtswahrung und Reform: Zu den Zielen und zum Wesen der frühen Gottesfriedensbewegung in Frankreich,” *Francia* 11 (1983), 193–240; Thomas Head and Richard Landes, eds., *Essays on the Peace of God: The Church and the People in Eleventh-Century France* (= *Historical Reflections/Réflexions historiques* 14 [1987]), forthcoming in revised and expanded version by the same editors as *The Peace of God: Violence and Religion in Eleventh-Century France* (Ithaca, N.Y.).

enemies. The essays are not meant to be conclusive but to suggest avenues for further research and discussion.

All three essays concern monasteries influenced by Cluny's brand of monasticism. Odo, Cluny's second abbot, reformed Fleury in the 930s, while Cluny's Abbot Maieul was involved in the reform of Marmoutier in the 980s.⁸ Yet the differences among these three institutions must also be stressed. Fleury and Marmoutier remained independent and influential houses, never becoming part of the formal *Cluniacensis ecclesia*. Moreover, as Kassius Hallinger has pointed out, Fleury's customaries reveal a decidedly different monastic round from the one followed at Cluny.⁹ In the essays that follow, we see as many differences as similarities in the ways that black monks perceived and handled their enemies.

The essays on Cluny and Fleury, which focus on the tenth century and the first half of the eleventh century, point up considerable differences between the two monasteries. They suggest that regional political variations decisively affected the outcomes of conflicts. Thus we find that at Cluny, which was far from the reach of king or pope, enemies were part of a tight social network composed of local aristocrats and the monastery itself. The lack of a supreme authority in the Mâconnais — where no king pretended to have power, where the counts were weak, and where a number of local castellans were only beginning to emerge around the year 1000 — encouraged compromise among the many competing authorities (which included Cluny itself). To this must be added the diffuse organization of the family. Before dynastic arrangements were set in place, before families were organized along patrilineal lines, family authority was itself dispersed. The exceptionally close ties among families around Cluny fostered an ongoing process of give-and-take, of fluid alliances involving not so much individuals as family groups and neighbors.¹⁰

At Fleury, by contrast, violence met with counterviolence as enemies were soundly beaten, often with the aid of what the monks regarded as miraculous intervention. This may be related to the political context. Fleury was situated in the Orléanais, a region in which royal power still functioned in its public role and where the Robertians themselves held considerable family interests. The Capetian kings could and did make claims of authority which, although never fully realized, nevertheless raised expectations for decisive public action. Fleury had long enjoyed a special relationship with both the Carolingian

⁸ On Fleury, see the letter of Leo VII dated 9 January 938 in Harald Zimmermann, ed., *Papsturkunden, 896–1046*, 3 vols., 2nd ed. (Vienna, 1988–89), 1:140–42; Maurice Prou and Alexandre Vidier, eds., *Recueil des chartes de l'Abbaye de Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire*, Documents Publiés par la Société Historique et Archéologique du Gâtinais 5, 2 vols. (Paris, 1900–1932), 1:110–14, no. 44; John of Salerno, *Vita sancti Odonis* 3.8–11, PL 133:81–82. On Marmoutier, Emile Mabille, ed., *Cartulaire de Marmoutier pour le Dunois* (Châteaudun, 1874), p. 80, no. 92; O. Gantier, "Recherches sur les possessions et les prieurés de l'abbaye de Marmoutier du Xe au XIIIe siècles," *Revue Mabillon* 53 (1963), 93–110, esp. p. 95.

⁹ Kassius Hallinger, ed., *Consuetudinum saeculi XI/XI/XII*, in *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, 7/3 (Siegburg, 1984), where Fleury's *consuetudines* are among the "monumenta non-Cluniacensia."

¹⁰ Georges Duby, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise*, rev. ed. (Paris, 1971); Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909–1049* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1989).

and the Robertian families. Its status as a royally protected community allowed the monks to look for, and indeed to expect, real winners and losers to emerge from legal disputes. The brothers of Fleury awaited decisive justice, whether they appealed to God, the pope, or the king. This perhaps accounts as well for a certain lack of internal cohesion within the community during the last quarter of the tenth century: even in internal matters such as abbatial elections, factions of monks within the community expected clear-cut victory rather than accommodation.

The issue of monastic exemption nicely illustrates the differences between Cluny and Fleury. In the 990s Abbot Abbo of Fleury wrote a series of works that set on course the movement toward monastic exemption later associated with Cluny. As Jean-François Lemarignier has noted, "The monastic exemption movement began with Fleury, or rather with Abbo of Fleury, for it was this one man who started everything."¹¹ At loggerheads with his local bishop, Abbo obtained a broad set of papal privileges for his abbey, which its monks used to defend Fleury from outside interference.¹² These privileges were to be of crucial importance in the disputes that continued to rage between the monks of Fleury and their bishop during the first half of the eleventh century.¹³

At Cluny, on the contrary, relations with the local bishop at Mâcon were extremely cordial throughout the tenth century and into the eleventh.¹⁴ Although Cluny, too, petitioned for and received from the pope documents exempting the monastery from local episcopal control, these privileges did not have a decisive effect on Cluny's relationship with its diocesan bishops. Those presiding over the see of Mâcon came from local families and were part of Cluny's donor network. The ideology of exemption was certainly articulated within Cluniac circles, but diocesan antagonisms were largely avoided.¹⁵

This is not to deny that the monks of Cluny appealed to outside authorities, while those of Fleury were sometimes pleased to patch up an accommodating peace with their enemies. But local conditions tended to limit the monks' opportunities and therefore their responses to conflict. The vast arsenal of methods of dispute settlement available to monks in the period — cursing,

¹¹ Lemarignier, "Structures monastiques," p. 384.

¹² Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, 2:655–57; on its authenticity, see below, p. 784, n. 27; on the use of the charter, see Thomas Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints: The Diocese of Orléans, 800–1200*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th ser., 14 (Cambridge, Eng., 1990), pp. 245–55.

¹³ Head, *Hagiography*, pp. 255–57, 276–77.

¹⁴ Ulrich Winzer, "Cluny und Mâcon im 10. Jahrhundert," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 23 (1989), 154–202, with bibliography on the issue of exemption at Cluny; Hermann Diener, "Das Verhältnis Clunys zu den Bischöfen vor allem in der Zeit seines Abtes Hugo (1049–1109)," in *Neue Forschungen über Cluny und die Cluniacenser*, ed. Gerd Tellenbach (Freiburg, 1959), pp. 221–352, esp. pp. 276–78, 326, where generally good relations between the monks and the bishops of Mâcon are stressed.

¹⁵ On the ideology of exemption, see Dominique Iogna-Prat, "Entre anges et hommes: Les moines 'doctrinaires' de l'an mil," in *La France de l'an mil*, ed. Robert Delort (Paris, 1990), pp. 245–63.

negotiating, compromising, appealing to political and supernatural powers, seeking mediators, performing rituals — was not drawn upon randomly but rather deployed as the situation mandated. Moreover, local structures influenced not only the methods but also the objectives of dispute settlement. In some regions — for example, the Mâconnais — an equilibrium was generally reached when new social bonds, whether horizontal or vertical, were forged by former enemies, while in other places — for example, the Orléanais — resolution was ordinarily achieved when a hierarchical order was imposed by powers outside the circle of antagonists. To be sure, when new sources of authority were introduced into a region, monks could expand their arsenal, taking advantage of changed conditions.

This last point becomes clear from the essay on Marmoutier, which focuses on the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the growth of centralized powers created political and juridical situations that were quite different from those of the tenth and early eleventh centuries. As a result of the papal reform movement the archbishop of Tours found his authority newly vulnerable at the end of the eleventh century, and he was eventually compelled to accept a compromise on the issue of Marmoutier's monastic exemption. This resolution safeguarded his local archiepiscopal position while affording the monks the "liberty" they craved. Similarly, the count of Anjou found that his attempts to dominate Marmoutier were undermined by the growth of papal power and of rival secular powers as well.

Like the monks of Cluny, those of Marmoutier resolved their disputes with their ecclesiastical and secular "enemies" through compromise, and they had fluid relations with friends who could become enemies and then friends again. Like the monks of Fleury, however, the monks of Marmoutier drew sharp institutional boundaries, carefully protecting the internal workings of the abbey from outside interference. The transitional nature of hierarchical authority at the end of the eleventh century may serve to explain this middle position. In its struggles with its archbishop and count, Marmoutier turned to increasingly effective centralizing authorities such as the papacy. But such authorities were not entirely effective in changing local conditions to their liking. In fact, the effect, at first, of the growth of papal monarchy was the weakening of local hierarchies. Marmoutier and the archbishop of Tours confronted each other as equals, and the end result was compromise. But unlike the compromises worked out at Cluny in the tenth century, the late-eleventh-century compromise between Marmoutier and its archbishop was formalized in a carefully worded document which finely delimited the rights and obligations of the two parties.

By the early twelfth century Marmoutier's monks found that hierarchical authorities were increasingly effective at resolving local disputes. The category of dangerous external enemies receded, while a new category of enemies — the monks themselves — moved to the foreground. The problem that the abbey faced was an outgrowth of material success: as their own community evolved into a complex bureaucratic institution, the monks found themselves needing to preserve or revive feelings of brotherhood and obligation among themselves. Their own success put them at risk of losing the sense of intimacy that had once bound the monks to each other.

While differences in political contexts help to explain many of the differences in the ways that Cluny, Fleury, and Marmoutier defined and dealt with their enemies, we should not ignore differences in their relations to their patron saints. It may well be significant that Fleury — the abbey that seems to have been the most active in calling upon its patron, St. Benedict, to punish its enemies — claimed exclusive access to the body of that patron saint. Cluny, by contrast, shared its patron, St. Peter, with other institutions, most notably the papacy. Between these two cases was Marmoutier, the relics of whose patron, St. Martin, were not enshrined there but rather at the nearby Basilica of Saint-Martin in Tours; the monks of Marmoutier had to go in processions to visit their patron.

Yet a caution is in order: one explanation for the differences among the monasteries may well be the chance survival of disparate source materials. The exceptional charter collections of Cluny reveal the monks as they interacted over time with their neighbors, showing the processes by which some neighbors became friends, then enemies, then friends again. The charters for Fleury are more limited, while rhetorical sources from that abbey — hagiography and canon law — are more extensive. It might well be that such rhetorical sources lend themselves to themes of power and authority rather than to descriptions of compromise; and if we had more charters from Fleury or more books of miracles from Cluny, the two houses might appear less different. However, the essay on Marmoutier draws on a mix of genres similar to that used for Fleury, but it reveals a very different picture and different rhetorical concerns. The techniques of negotiation, compromise, accommodation, and appeal to authority were available to all monastic houses; the chief difference appears to be the disparate ways in which political power was configured and wielded in different regions and at different times, offering the monks different options and presenting them with different concerns.

The monasteries to which we turn are presented in roughly chronological order. First is the monastery of Cluny, where the focus will be on the ways in which the monks handled their enemies through the first third of the eleventh century.

I. CLUNY

Upon first examination, the ways in which the monks of Cluny confronted their enemies were simple and straightforward: they used the standard arsenal of monastic weapons. These included written clauses of retribution against disturbers of monastic property, miracle stories about the bad end of malefactors, decrees obtained from church councils and ecclesiastical authorities, and liturgical and other ceremonies directed against their adversaries. Following a brief examination of how each of these was used at Cluny I shall argue that they reveal only one side of the issue, for at Cluny enmity was only one aspect of an ongoing social relationship.¹

¹ In the course of preparing this piece, I have occasionally made use of an index of lemmatized names from the charters of Cluny produced at the University of Münster under the direction

The *si quis*, or penalty, clauses found near the end of charters of donation to Cluny often invoked a fine against anyone who infringed the provisions of the charter. Sometimes they included a spiritual threat. This was one way in which the monks attempted to stave off their enemies. Thus, for example, in 958 one Constantine gave the church of Saint-Gengoux to Cluny in a very generous donation that included vineyards, fields, and tithes. Towards the end of the charter drawn up to record this donation is the following: "But if anyone — which we don't believe will happen — should be tempted to make a claim against this donation, let him first incur the wrath of omnipotent God, and unless he quickly comes back to his senses, let him be forced to pay fifty pounds of gold."² Sometimes penalty clauses more graphically damned the malefactor to the fate of Judas or to that of Datan and Abiron, who were swallowed up alive by the earth.³ There was nothing unusual about these clauses, and the only thing possibly exceptional in Cluny's case is how relatively infrequently spiritual sanctions were used even in the eleventh century, when elsewhere they often became the rule.

The threat of miraculous punishments was another common way in which monks attempted to deter their enemies. Grand collections of miracle stories were not drawn up at Cluny until the twelfth century, so we do not have the fine parade of punishments that we are told awaited the tenth-century malefactors of Fleury. Certainly, however, the Cluniacs harbored a fund of miracle stories, some of which appeared in their early writings. We hear of bad monks, the enemies of Cluniac reforms, who die at the hands of heaven-sent messengers.⁴ We learn of wicked men who persecute the poor and are struck down for their transgressions.⁵ In the famous *Life of St. Gerald of Aurillac* written in about 930 by Odo, the second abbot of Cluny, violent men who attack unarmed peasants and grasp at land are defeated in miraculous battles.⁶

Control over the fate of its enemies was a major theme in writings connected with Cluny. We can see this in the decrees of the peace council held at Anse in 994, where the abbot of Cluny clearly had exceptional influence and where provisions were drawn up explicitly on Cluny's behalf against its malefactors: "Let no one claim any of their churches . . . or any fortifications belonging to that holy place. . . . Let the violators be damned, anathema maranatha, unless they come to their senses and do penance and are absolved by the abbots or the brothers of that holy place Cluny; but if not, let them be damned to eternal punishment."⁷

of Joachim Wollasch; this was provided to me by Frau Maria Hillebrandt, whom I wish to thank most warmly.

² Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel, *Recueil des chartes de l'Abbaye de Cluny*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1876–1903) [henceforth CLU], 2:143–44, no. 1049 (June 958).

³ E.g., CLU 2:111–13, no. 1016 (956–57).

⁴ E.g., John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 3.1, PL 133:75–76; see Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1982), p. 94.

⁵ Odo, *Collationes* 3.34, PL 133:616–17; see Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros*, p. 68.

⁶ E.g., Odo, *Vita sancti Geraldi* 1.7, PL 133:646.

⁷ CLU 3:384–88, no. 2255 (994).

In the early 1020s Pope Benedict VIII wrote a letter at the behest of Cluny's abbot, Odilo, directed to various local bishops and archbishops, deploring the cruel persecutors of Cluny, the enemies who took Cluny's property. Boldly naming names — Wichard of Beaujeu, Bernard of Riottier, Hugh of Montpont, and so on — Benedict called upon these *persecutores, depredatores, invasores terrarum* to come to their senses, restore the lands and properties, and make satisfaction: "If they do this [Benedict wrote], let them have the grace and benediction and absolution of God, of St. Peter, and of ourselves. But if . . . they persevere in their malice, let them be cut off with the hot iron of ecclesiastical judgment like putrid members of the body of Christ. Let them be expelled far from the bounds of the holy church of God and cast off and excommunicated from the company of the faithful. Let them be damned standing and walking, waiting and sleeping, coming in and going out. Let them be damned eating and drinking."⁸ And so on. As Lester Little has shown, these sentiments were peculiar neither to Benedict nor to Cluny.⁹ Maledictions were part of the stock-in-trade of monastic defense programs. Indeed, they often formed part of the monastic liturgy in the *clamor*, a liturgical appeal to God for help against adversaries and persecutors.

Cluny, too, had a *clamor*: it was described, for example, in the *Liber tramitis*, the Cluniac customary that was written 1030–40 for the monastery of Farfa. First the *ministri* of the church covered the pavement in front of the altar with sackcloth on which they placed a crucifix and the bodies of the saints. Cluny had a great reliquary in the form of the head of St. Peter; inside were numerous relics, including a piece of the true cross, a part of St. Peter's body, and a portion of the Virgin's garment.¹⁰ Then the priests threw themselves prostrate onto the pavement, silently chanting an appropriate psalm. The custodians sounded the signal twice, and one priest stood before the consecrated Eucharist and the relics, saying the *clamor* aloud: "We come prostrate before you, Lord Jesus, complaining to you that men who are evil and proud and who rely on their own strength rise up from everywhere against us, invade, despoil, and waste the lands of this sanctuary of yours. . . . Rise up, therefore, in our aid, Lord Jesus; comfort us and help us overcome our attackers, and crush the pride of those who afflict us and your monastery."¹¹

In sum, the Cluniacs thought they had enemies, and they handled these

⁸ Harald Zimmermann, ed., *Papsturkunden, 896–1046*, 3 vols., 2nd ed. (Vienna, 1988–89), 2:1007–10, no. 530.

⁹ Lester K. Little, "La morphologie des malédictions monastiques," *Annales* 34 (1979), 43–60.

¹⁰ Peter Dinter, ed., *Liber tramitis aevi Odilonis Abbatis*, in *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, 10, ed. Kassius Hallinger (Siegburg, 1980), pp. 260–61. On the date of the *Liber tramitis*, see Dinter, pp. liv–lv, and Joachim Wollasch, "Zur Datierung des Liber tramitis aus Farfa anhand von Personen und Personengruppen," in *Person und Gemeinschaft im Mittelalter: Karl Schmid zum fünfundssechzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Gerd Althoff et al. (Sigmaringen, 1988), pp. 237–55. On the relics at Cluny and their significance, see Dominique Iogna-Prat, "La croix, le moine et l'empereur: Dévotion à la croix et théologie politique à Cluny autour de l'an mil," in *Haut moyen-âge: Culture, éducation et société. Etudes offertes à Pierre Riché*, ed. Michel Sot (La Garenne-Colombes [1990]), pp. 449–75.

¹¹ *Liber tramitis*, pp. 245–46.

people by opposing them, incriminating them, invoking the power of the relics and Christ's body and blood against them, and damning them.

But a closer look reveals that although this is the truth, it is not the whole truth. The penalty clause was the monks' first line of defense. It is instructive to see what happened when someone contravened it. I have already mentioned the case of Constantine, the donor of Saint-Gengoux. The people who were in fact tempted to claim Saint-Gengoux were his wife, Engela, and their four sons. Thus the "enemy" turned out to be Constantine's most intimate relations.¹² Enmity, then, may not be the best way to understand these people's relations with the monastery or the monastery's attitude towards them. Engela and her children remained closely involved with Cluny, despite their claim to Saint-Gengoux, for decades afterwards: they quit their claim in 988; they engaged in a major and extraordinary exchange of land and churches with Cluny in 992–93 (to which I shall return); and then, in 1020, one son, Wido, who had become a priest, gave Cluny the Church of Saint-Gengoux again along with much else. By that time Wido was part of the entourage of Hugh, the count of Chalon, bishop of Auxerre, and himself an important donor to Cluny. It was he, for example, who gave to Cluny the monastery of Paray-le-Monial.¹³

When Engela and her sons made their quitclaim of 988, they did so at a formal meeting held in the city of Chalon, in the presence of Count Hugh, his mother, and other notables. Four monks of Cluny were there to bring the complaint, while Engela had her own four sons on her side. Recognizing the injustice of their claim to Saint-Gengoux, Engela and her children made a quitclaim which included a public declaration that neither they nor their heirs would ever again do such a disgusting thing ("ne . . . nausiam facerent").¹⁴

Other quitclaim ceremonies, which c. 1000 increasingly took place at Cluny itself, included positive acts of reconciliation.¹⁵ When a woman named Eve made a quitclaim of land in the 1030s, for example, she and her relatives became participants and partners in the society and charity of the monks. At a *placitum* held at Cluny, she and one of her sons were formally received into Cluny's *societas*, and she was given the right to be buried in Cluny's cemetery.¹⁶ Here we see apparent enemies transformed into special friends of the monastery.

¹² CLU 3:45–46, no. 1789 (April 988), shows Engela and her sons quitting their claim to Saint-Gengoux. In CLU 3:151–52, no. 1933, we see that one of her sons is Wido, who in CLU 3:752–54, no. 2729, calls the original donor of Saint-Gengoux *pater meus*.

¹³ CLU 3:752–54, no. 2729 (1020); CLU 3:818–19, no. 2793 (c. 1025–39). On count and bishop Hugh, see Constance B. Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1987), pp. 106–10.

¹⁴ CLU 3:45–46, no. 1789.

¹⁵ On the changed venue of these occasions — and the political implications of such a change — see Georges Duby, "Recherches sur l'évolution des institutions judiciaires pendant le Xe et le XIe siècle dans le sud de la Bourgogne," *Le moyen âge* 52 (1946), 149–94, and 53 (1947), 15–38 (= Georges Duby, *Hommes et structures du moyen âge: Recueil d'articles* [Paris, 1973], pp. 7–60).

¹⁶ CLU 3:283–84, no. 2090; see Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909–1049* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1989), p. 55.

Official pronouncements also cannot be taken at face value. The letter of Benedict VIII spoke uncompromisingly about the persecutors, predators, and invaders of Cluny. Benedict named names; in fact, in a neat reversal of the apostolate, he cited precisely twelve malefactors. This is extraordinarily useful for us because, although we cannot identify all the people that he indicted, we do know that at least some were not simply predators, nor were they always treated as such by Cluniac monks.

One of the twelve was Wichard of Beaujeu, who, Benedict said (doubtless relying on information supplied by Cluny's abbot), had seized the church at Trades from Cluny. The castellan family at Beaujeu is well known to historians precisely because it showed intermittent interest in Cluny's welfare.¹⁷ Wichard's father had given to Cluny a chapel and a manor. Wichard signed as a witness to the gift of the manor, and in 1020 he redonated the chapel to Cluny.¹⁸ In 992–93 Wichard, his brother, and their father and mother were present when Engela and her four sons — the family of the Constantine mentioned above — made their exceptionally important exchange with Cluny. The group headed by Engela gave to Cluny the church of Trades and two other churches in the county of Autun, and in return the monks of Cluny gave back to Engela's family the church at Saint-Gengoux.¹⁹ Thus Wichard's seizure of the church at Trades must be viewed in the context of two different facts that led to different and indeed conflicting modes of action: first, he and his family supported Cluny; and, second, he and his family had an interest, probably proprietary, in the church at Trades.

We see from these examples that Cluny's enemies acted out of a variety of desires and expectations, not all of which neatly coincided and some of which in fact conflicted, such as giving a pious donation on the one hand and holding on to family property on the other.²⁰ Cluny's so-called enemies were people with whom its monks had a history of contacts, both good and bad; when they became Cluny's enemies, it was usually as lapsed donors rather than as evil outsiders.

The simple donor was often less tightly bound to the monastery than the lapsed donor who returned to the fold. We have already seen this phenomenon in the outcome of some quitclaims, and we can see it again in the case of a married couple mentioned by Benedict VIII. "Hugh of Montpont and his wife Azilina," wrote Benedict, "seized the *potestas* of Laizé and everything that pertains to it." He was referring to the church at Laizé, which had been given to Cluny in 950 by the count of Mâcon. In c. 994 it was given to Cluny yet again, by a man named Milo, whom Benedict called approvingly a *religiosus miles*, and by Milo's wife, Ermengarde.²¹ But the fact is that Milo and

¹⁷ Bouchard, *Sword*, pp. 289–91.

¹⁸ CLU 2:299, no. 1218; CLU 3:32–33, no. 1774.

¹⁹ CLU 3:151–52, no. 1933.

²⁰ On this point, and for other insights, see Stephen D. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The "Laudatio Parentum" in Western France, 1050–1150* (Chapel Hill, 1988), esp. pp. 81–83.

²¹ CLU 1:723–24, no. 768 (950); CLU 3:398–99, no. 2267 (c. 994). For redonations, see Rosenwein, *Neighbor*, pp. 122–25.

Ermengarde were the parents of Benedict's persecutorial Azilina, and she witnessed that very donation along with her husband Hugh.²²

Azilina must have died soon after Benedict wrote his letter; but some time later the son of Azilina and Hugh, Odulricus, and his half brother, Otto (the son of Hugh's second wife), quit their claim to the church at Laizé.²³ They did so for the salvation of their souls; the souls of their parents, Hugh and Azilina (Benedict's targets); the souls of their grandparents, Milo and Ermengarde; and the souls of their wives and children. They were then given a special kind of participation in the monks' good works, becoming part of the *societas* of Cluny, so that masses, prayers, and alms performed there redounded to their benefit. Later, on the occasion of the death of his son Otto, Hugh and his other son gave half of the villa of Laizé to Cluny, and the monks gave to Hugh, to his second wife, to his sons and their wives and children, and to all their relatives a part in the society and benefits of the monastery.²⁴ Developments like these show that although it is correct to speak of the fluid nature of enmities and friendships at Cluny, it is even more correct to say that confrontations were part of a process through which relationships were redefined. Indeed, renewed friendships were quite different from — and often more intense than — former friendships. Ties such as those of confraternity signaled a new status in Cluny's relationship with its supporters.

The processes of redefinition are exceptionally clear in the case of Cluny's relationship with its diocesan bishop.²⁵ The association began inauspiciously enough: the bishop of Mâcon apparently had nothing to do with Cluny's foundation in 909 or 910. Moreover, Cluny's foundation charter grouped bishops among those potentially audacious (*temerarii*) and violent (*improbi*) men who might invade Cluny's property or set a prelate over them against their will.²⁶ But already by 926–27 Bishop Gerard was at Cluny to witness a donation (or, perhaps, a quitclaim) of many homesteads and tenants in the

²² They are clearly the grandparents of Odulricus in CLU 3:298, no. 2110; he is the son of Hugo and Azilina (in CLU no. 2110 called Lecillina). In CLU 3:398–99, no. 2267, Azilina's name follows that of Milo and Ermengarde, while Hugh's name is eighth in the witness list. This implies that Azilina is the daughter of Milo and Ermengarde. Moreover, the church at Laizé may have been a maternal inheritance, passed down through the women of the family. That Milo and Ermengarde would give the church at Laizé and call it "de mea hereditate" implies that one of them was related to the house of Count Leotald, who gave the church in the first place. Leotald was married to an Ermengarde (CLU 1:420–21, no. 432), and this suggests that the Ermengarde who married Milo was a member of their family, indeed possibly their daughter.

²³ CLU 3:298, no. 2110.

²⁴ CLU 3:299–300, no. 2112.

²⁵ On this issue, see Ulrich Winzer, "Cluny und Mâcon im 10. Jahrhundert," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 23 (1989), 154–202.

²⁶ The bishop of Mâcon does not figure among the ecclesiastics in the witness list of Cluny's foundation charter: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Collection Bourgogne MS 76, no. 5; published in CLU 1:128, no. 112. The authenticity of this charter is not above question: it was the subject of a workshop I attended organized by Hartmut Atsma at Paris, 17 June 1991; the witness list of the charter was analyzed by Maria Hillebrandt. H. Atsma and Jean Vezin are preparing to publish this and other tenth-century charters of Cluny as part of their *Monumenta mediæ ævi*. I want warmly to thank Dr. Atsma and the other members of the workshop.

pagus of Chalon, given by a *fidelis* of William the Pious, the founder of Cluny.²⁷ At about the same time, Gerard was involved in a dispute with Cluny over the proceeds from churches and chapels in the Mâconnais that had recently been given to Cluny by a wealthy couple, Letbaldus and Doda.²⁸ The dispute was “resolved” in 929 under Gerard’s successor, Bishop Berno. The monastery received most of the dues and tithes from the churches, while the bishop and his community were accorded exceptionally close *familiaritas* with the monastery: “I, Berno, bishop of the church of Mâcon, in the name of Christ make known to all my successors . . . that the congregation of the monastery at Cluny is joined to us in a special friendship. As harmoniously as possible, we strive to aid [them] so that, God granting, we may participate in their good works.”²⁹ The same act spoke of the *socialitas* between all the monks of Cluny and the canons of Mâcon, both living and dead.

This is the context in which the letter of exemption of Pope John XI, granted to Cluny in March 931, must be understood. John confirmed that Cluny was “free from the domination of any king or bishop or count or any of the relatives of William [of Aquitaine].”³⁰ He restored to Cluny the tithes taken away by *quilibet episcopus* and made special mention of Cluny’s perpetual right to those conceded by *filius noster Berno episcopus*. This was the first of many, increasingly precise exemptions granted by the papacy to Cluny. Read as part of that series, it appears to make a programmatic statement about Cluny’s separation from outside, including episcopal, authority. But read in the context of Cluny’s social network, it functioned as an instrument of negotiation between Cluny and its closest contacts. John’s bull condemned their domination, to be sure, but it also affirmed their special status vis-à-vis the monastery.

That tenth-century bishops of Mâcon could belong to the same local donor network as Cluny’s lay friends is made clear by the example of Bishop Maimbodus (937–62).³¹ His family had property at *Vetus Canava* and Ruffey, both very near Cluny. Already in 926, his brothers Frodoendus and Rotardus

²⁷ CLU 1:261–63, no. 269, and 1:263–64, no. 270. The latter, a notice of the former donation, has the dorsal notation “Warpitio Girbalt.”

²⁸ The churches were given to Cluny in April 927 (CLU 1:278–79, no. 283). On the monastic (customary) right to tithes, see Giles Constable, *Monastic Tithes from Their Origins to the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, n.s. 10 (Cambridge, Eng., 1964).

²⁹ CLU 1:350–51, no. 373. Winzer, “Cluny und Mâcon,” p. 158, has observed that this act either reveals or establishes “eine Gebetsverbrüderung zwischen dem Kloster und dem Domkapitel.” The gift of the tithes of these same churches was made again by Bishop Maimbodus, Berno’s successor, in 938, reiterating the terms of the 929 agreement; see CLU 1:467–69, no. 484.

³⁰ Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, 1:107–8, no. 64. Zimmermann considers the text largely trustworthy except for an interpolation concerning minting rights. Nevertheless it should be noted that we do not have the original and that the only extant manuscript copy is from Cluny’s cartulary C: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. nouv. acq. 2262, pp. 11–12. On this point, see Dominique Iogna-Prat, “La geste des origines dans l’historiographie clunisienne des XIe–XIIe siècles,” *Revue bénédictine* (forthcoming). I thank D. Iogna-Prat for allowing me to see this paper prior to its publication.

³¹ See Winzer, “Cluny und Mâcon,” pp. 164–78, and his genealogy on pp. 195–97.

exchanged three meadows with the abbot of Cluny, who in turn gave them three others nearby (one, called *subtus Roca*, was to have a bit of a history, as we shall soon see). At that time a canon at the cathedral of Mâcon, Maimbodus served as scribe to draw up his brothers' *commutatio*.³² A year later, it was he who wrote the charter by which Letbaldus and Doda handed over their churches and chapels to Cluny.³³ Two years later he and two of his brothers, Rotardus (again) and Arembertus, gave Cluny more meadowland for the salvation of the souls of their parents and their brother Frodoendus.³⁴

After he became bishop, Maimbodus continued to participate in Cluny's gift network. In 947–48, for example, he made a generous donation there of his property at *Vetus Canava* for the souls of various family members.³⁵ In the late 940s or early 950s he was present to witness a quitclaim.³⁶ And in 945 he was party to an elaborate exchange with the monks of Cluny. He gave them two precious *curtiles* (they had belonged to his father and grandfather respectively) and much else besides. In return he received a number of properties, including the place called *subtus Roca*.³⁷ The recuperation of this family property shows that these transactions were part of a process of give-and-take between the family of Maimbodus and Cluny. In short, the bishop was not treated as someone from whom the monks were exempt; on the contrary, Maimbodus asked to be buried in Cluny's cemetery; and in turn the monks called upon him to exercise his episcopal powers, petitioning him, for example, to dedicate one of their churches.³⁸

Much has been made of Cluny's papal exemption of 998, which went further than previous tenth-century privileges in extinguishing the usual rights of the diocesan bishop over consecrations and ordinations.³⁹ Nevertheless, the relations between Cluny and the bishop of Mâcon remained fixed

³² CLU 1:251–52, no. 259.

³³ CLU 1:278–79, no. 283. The tithes from these churches were given again to Cluny by Maimbodus in 938 (CLU 1:467–69, no. 484).

³⁴ CLU 1:352, no. 374.

³⁵ CLU 1:661–62, no. 707.

³⁶ CLU 1:685–87, no. 730.

³⁷ CLU 1:620–21, no. 667, where the property is called a *campus*.

³⁸ CLU 1:520–21, no. 534, has Maimbodus's petition "in loco sepulture"; CLU 1:733–34, no. 780, has Cluny's petition to him to dedicate a church. On the former petition, see Dietrich Poeck, "Laienbegräbnisse in Cluny," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 15 (1981), 68–179. On the latter, see Winzer, "Cluny und Mâcon," pp. 168–69, with further discussion and references.

³⁹ See Jean-François Lemarignier, "L'exemption monastique et les origines de la réforme grégorienne," in *A Cluny. Congrès scientifique. Fêtes et cérémonies liturgiques en l'honneur des saints abbés Odon et Odilon (9–11 juillet 1949)* (Dijon, 1950), pp. 288–340, esp. p. 315: "Cluny, au tournant de l'an mil, avait levé les derniers scrupules des moines, enlevé l'ultime ligne de résistance des évêques"; idem, "Structures monastiques et structures politiques dans la France de la fin du Xe et des débuts du XIe siècle," in *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civiltà occidentale*, 8–14 aprile 1956, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 4 (Spoleto, 1957), pp. 357–400; Dominique Iogna-Prat, "Entre anges et hommes: Les moines 'doctrinaires' de l'an mil," in *La France de l'an mil*, ed. Robert Delort (Paris, 1990), p. 251. The exemption is in Zimmermann, *Papsturkunden*, 2:682–86, no. 351. Once again, our only manuscript source for this privilege is Cluny's cartulary C, where two copies of the bull appear: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. nouv. acq. 2262, pp. 24–26 and 30–31.

in the old mold through at least the first quarter of the eleventh century.⁴⁰ Letbaldus, bishop between 993 and 1016, was the nephew of the Letbaldus whom we have already met (along with his wife, Doda) as a generous donor to Cluny. Indeed, Letbaldus's family, which would later become known as the Grossi, had a long history of friendship (and enmity) with Cluny.⁴¹ Before his elevation to the episcopal see, Letbaldus himself had received a grand donation in *precaria* from Cluny.⁴² Afterwards, he continued to participate amicably in transactions with Cluny: for example, he confirmed an exchange of land between Cluny and the canons of Mâcon; he witnessed a quitclaim of his nephew Maieul Poudreux; and in 1006, "moved by the love of God and prayers of Lord Odilo," he gave two serfs to Cluny.⁴³

As we shall see, exemptions had a far different impact on monastic/episcopal relations at Fleury. There the papacy represented a high court; its exemptions were understood as directives excluding local diocesan powers; its judgments were decisive. At tenth-century Cluny, however, the papacy must be understood as one of a number of authorities enlisted to mediate local relations.⁴⁴ We shall later see yet another constellation of papal/episcopal/monastic relations in the case of late-eleventh-century Marmoutier. There pressures from the newly reformed papacy impelled the local archbishop and monastery to define their relationship ever more carefully apart from papal intervention.

In conclusion, then, Cluny's tenth- and early-eleventh-century enemies were people who had long-term connections with the monastery. While outside powers were often invoked, most disputes were settled within the context of a tightly woven local social network. And although enemies were at times treated as implacable foes, they were also often handled with delicacy and in a spirit of compromise. Thus Engela's family's claim to Saint-Gengoux was recognized by the monks; thus the charter in which Hugh and his son gave the villa of Laizé to Cluny was drawn up with deliberate ambiguity to read, "we give or give again";⁴⁵ thus Eve, who was given the right to be buried in Cluny's cemetery, could be portrayed as making a "quitclaim or donation," saving face; thus Bishop Berno's gift to Cluny of the tithes of numerous churches nevertheless excepted the *synodales eulogiae* and the *paratae*, which went to the canons at Mâcon.⁴⁶ In these ways, the trumpet calls of *clamores* and penalty clauses were muted by the hidden whispers of *societas*, *socialitas*, and *amicitia*.

⁴⁰ See Hermann Diener, "Das Verhältnis Clunys zu den Bischöfen vor allem in der Zeit seines Abtes Hugo (1049–1109)," in *Neue Forschungen über Cluny und die Cluniacenser*, ed. Gerd Tellenbach (Freiburg, 1959), pp. 234–35.

⁴¹ Rosenwein, *Neighbor*, esp. pp. 59–60 and 115–21; Bouchard, *Sword*, pp. 296–98.

⁴² CLU 2:513–15, no. 1460 (978–79); see also the precarial gift to Letbaldus together with his parents in CLU 2:181–82, no. 1088 (960).

⁴³ CLU 3:435–36, no. 2313; CLU 3:497–98, no. 2406; CLU 3:677–78, no. 2636 (August 1006).

⁴⁴ On Cluny's acceptance of diverse authorities, see Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros*, esp. pp. 94–100.

⁴⁵ CLU 3:299, no. 2111: "donamus sive reddimus."

⁴⁶ The *synodales eulogiae* were the fees owed by the priest of the church on the occasion of an episcopal synod. The *paratae* were the victuals (or a money substitute) due the bishop during his rounds of inspection or visitation.

2. FLEURY

The fluid situation of compromise found at Cluny, in which friends and enemies came from the same intimate circle of secular and ecclesiastical magnates in the Mâconnais, was not duplicated at Fleury in the decades around the year 1000. The monks of Fleury instead turned to friendly powers from outside the local elite of the Orléanais. By doing so the monks of Fleury sought — both rhetorically in their hagiographic literature and practically in their judicial suits and liturgical ritual — to gain decisive victory over their enemies. In the process the distinction between friends and enemies remained more rigid than it did at Cluny. In order to understand how the monks of Fleury dealt with their enemies, it is first necessary to understand the separate identity of these powerful friends.

Greatest among them was the man whom the monks repeatedly referred to as their father: Benedict of Nursia.¹ When the monastery was founded in 651, it was subject to the abbot of Saint-Aignan and dedicated to the Virgin Mary and St. Peter.² The independence, wealth, and prestige which Fleury garnered over the course of the following centuries, however, was a direct result of its acquisition of the relics of Benedict. These were allegedly obtained in the third quarter of the seventh century from the then-abandoned monastery of Monte Cassino.³ While Fleury's original patrons were never fully eclipsed, Benedict became the chief patron of Fleury's monks.⁴ Beginning in the time of Charles the Bald and continuing through the early twelfth century, members of the community recorded the special relationship which existed between the brothers and their saintly father in collections of miracle stories.⁵ The authors described that relationship in terms of kinship and often termed their community the *familia* of the saint. One told how Benedict

¹ For a more detailed discussion of Benedict's role as patron of Fleury, see Thomas Head, *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints. The Diocese of Orléans, 800–1200*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th ser., 14 (Cambridge, Eng., 1990), particularly chapters 4 and 6.

² These were the patrons of two earlier monasteries which Abbot Leodebodus of Saint-Aignan had joined together in order to create the new community of Fleury. His foundation charter is edited in *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoît*, ed. Maurice Prou and Alexandre Vidier, 2 vols., Documents publiés par la Société Historique et Archéologique du Gatinais 5 (Paris, 1900–1932), 1:1–19, no. 1. The only extant copy of the charter dates to the eleventh century, but the consensus of scholars is that the text is a reliable reflection of the original document.

³ Head, *Hagiography*, pp. 22–25 and the bibliography cited there.

⁴ See the analysis of charters contained in Jacques Hourlier, "La translation d'après les sources narratives," *Studia monastica* 21 (1979), 218–19.

⁵ These collections have been edited by Eugène de Certain, *Les miracles de Saint Benoît écrits par Adrevald, Aimoin, André, Raoul Tortaire et Hugues de Sainte Marie, moines de Fleury* (Paris, 1858). The editor provided book numbers to the various works as if they constituted parts of a continuous whole. The collection will be henceforth cited as *Miracula s. Benedicti* followed by book, chapter, and page references. On the composition and interrelationships of these collections see Alexandre Vidier, *L'historiographie à Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire et les "Miracles de Saint Benoît"* (Paris, 1965); Robert-Henri Bautier, "La place de l'abbaye de Fleury-sur-Loire dans l'historiographie française de IXe au XIIe siècle," in *Etudes ligériennes d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales*, ed. René Louis (Auxerre, 1975), pp. 25–34; Head, *Hagiography*, particularly pp. 39–41, 70–71, and 135–201 *passim*.

had appeared in a time of crisis and vowed to protect the community: "If you will take care to obey the precepts of the Almighty and will without hesitation take an oath to follow the commands of the rule which has been handed down by God through me to you, then all your adversities will turn to prosperity, your enemies will become friends, and your patron in his grace will deny you nothing good."⁶

The saint's patronage and corporal presence served the monks of Fleury as a bulwark against enemies both secular and spiritual. That presence was central to the manner in which the community's sense of identity was constructed, not only by the brothers themselves, but also by the outside world, for the abbey was often designated in charters as the place "ubi ipse sanctus Benedictus corpore requiescit."⁷ This sense of saintly patronage apparently differed from that found at Cluny and Marmoutier. During his tenure as abbot of Fleury, Odo of Cluny composed a sermon for the feast which honored the translation of Benedict's relics there. Odo recognized the importance of those relics and of the miracles worked in their presence, but he suggested that such forms of devotion should primarily serve the laity.⁸ In a similar vein, Odo's biographer, John of Salerno, criticized the monks of Fleury for being too attached to the physical presence of their patron and not engaging "in those tears and prayers which frequently serve to appease the threats of the Lord."⁹ It is not surprising to find that Aimo of Fleury later complained that "those miracles which the Lord allowed his holy confessor Benedict to perform at his tomb or in other places during the time [of Abbot Odo] remain unknown to us now, . . . partially because negligence allowed them to fall into oblivion."¹⁰ Like the monks of Cluny, those at Marmoutier did not stress the temporal powers of their patron saint. Rather, their miracle stories (most of them written in the twelfth century) emphasized the spiritual miracles that Martin could perform on behalf of the souls of repentant sinners.¹¹

The monks of Fleury had another special friend of great power: their king. The history of this relationship can be traced in the relatively few charters which survive for Fleury during this period. In 818 Louis the Pious bestowed a set of exemptions including judicial *immunitas*, the right of the community to elect its own abbot, and certain fiscal exemptions. The king promised his *defensio* of these rights in return for the prayers of the monks for the benefit of his soul and of his kingdom.¹² In various versions these privileges were

⁶ *Miracula s. Benedicti* 1.20, p. 49.

⁷ *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoît*, 1:32, no. 14 (818); 1:34, no. 15 (818); 1:137, no. 55 (967); 1:147, no. 60 (974); 1:168, no. 64 (979); 1:181, no. 69 (987); etc.

⁸ Odo of Cluny, *Sermo de s. Benedicto*, PL 133:721–29.

⁹ John of Salerno, *Vita s. Odonis* 3.8, PL 133:80.

¹⁰ *Miracula s. Benedicti* 2.4, p. 101.

¹¹ See Sharon Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin: Legend and Ritual in Medieval Tours* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991), pp. 135–50.

¹² *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoît*, 1:31–33, no. 14, and 1:33–36, no. 15. These charters were in fact renewals of privileges which had allegedly been granted by Pepin and Charlemagne. Those earlier privileges either were lost or had been forgeries.

renewed by Carolingian rulers and by Hugh Capet.¹³ The monks were friends of Hugh Capet not only because he was the successor to the Carolingians but also because they had a long-standing relationship with the Robertian family.¹⁴ Royal privileges, of course, could only exempt the monks of Fleury from temporal lordship and claims made against it in secular courts. Nevertheless, when respected and enforced, such exemptions could provide a “royal monastery” such as Fleury with an impressive weapon to be wielded against their neighboring secular and ecclesiastical magnates. Moreover it should be remembered that the Capetian king wielded more direct power over the Orléanais during this period than he did over the contemporary Mâconnais or over Touraine during the later eleventh and early twelfth century.

If their patron saint and their king were the greatest friends of the monks of Fleury, whom did they identify as their enemies and how did they deal with them? I will begin by examining in turn two separate disputes which occurred in the first decades of Capetian rule, each of which involved a man named Arnulf. The first Arnulf was bishop of Orléans.¹⁵ In the unstable time surrounding the dynastic change of 987, Arnulf, breaking from the Carolingian precedent of episcopal respect for Fleury’s royal grant of immunity, pressed temporal claims against its properties.¹⁶ In the words of the monk Aimo, author of one of the collections of miracle stories, “[Bishop Arnulf] never unconditionally loved the abbots of Fleury mostly because, as they honored only the command of the king, they never adhered to the command of [the bishop’s] will, subjection to which [Arnulf] loved beyond moderation.” The bishop sent armed men to prevent the serfs of the abbey from harvesting grapes at a vineyard located in the suburbs of Orléans. Behind his action lay the conviction that the royal immunity which granted the brothers of Fleury independence from his lordship was illegal. Arnulf summed up his arguments in *De cartilagine*, a work whose very title was a contemptuous reference to the parchment on which Fleury’s royal privileges were inscribed.¹⁷ Faced

¹³ *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoît*, 1:92–95, no. 34 (Charles the Simple); 1:136–38, no. 55, and 1:147–48, no. 60 (Lothar); 1:167–70, no. 64 (Louis V); 1:181–82, no. 69 (Hugh Capet). For newer editions of the middle three acts, see *Recueil des actes de Lothaire et de Louis V, rois de France (954–987)*, ed. Louis Halphen (Paris, 1908), pp. 66–68, no. 27; pp. 83–86, no. 34; pp. 173–76, no. 70. There may have been other confirmations of these privileges which are now lost. Charles the Simple, for example, made explicit reference to a lost, or possibly forged, act of Charles the Bald.

¹⁴ Hugh the Abbot had protected the monks against a Norman raid; see *Miracula s. Benedicti* 1.41, pp. 86–89. Hugh the Great had in part been responsible for the reform of Fleury under Odo of Cluny; see *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoît*, 1:110–14, no. 44.

¹⁵ The family was one of substantial stature in local ecclesiastical circles. Arnulf succeeded his uncle Ermentheus as bishop and was to be succeeded in turn by yet another relative, named Fulk. On Ermentheus as uncle of Arnulf, see Letaldus of Micy, *Miracula s. Maximini* 38–40, PL 37:815–16. Gerbert of Reims, in a letter to Bishop Arnulf, referred to a man named Fulcho as *filius vester*: *Die Briefsammlung Gerberts von Reims*, ed. Fritz Wiegler, MGH Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit 2 (Berlin, 1966), p. 228, no. 190. As Arnulf’s successor was named Fulk, this reference would seem to identify the two as relatives, most likely uncle and nephew.

¹⁶ *Miracula s. Benedicti* 2.19, pp. 123–25. On Jonas of Orléans’s respect of the rights of Fleury, see *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Saint-Benoît*, 1:45, no. 19; *Miracula s. Benedicti* 1.25, p. 56.

¹⁷ Unfortunately most of the only known copy of the work has perished. For the extant text,

with the temporary failure of royal protection, the abbot of Fleury sent a party of monks to the site armed with the chief religious weapon in their arsenal: relics.¹⁸ Confronted by the power of St. Benedict — who, after all, represented the will of God, the ultimate outside authority — the bishop abandoned his claims.

The second Arnulf was the nephew of this bishop. He was lord of the castle of Yèvre and thus held rights “under the title of advocate and vicar” over some lands which belonged to Fleury. In 994 Abbot Abbo brought a complaint against Arnulf before Hugh Capet, accusing the castellan of imposing *malae consuetudines* and thus pillaging the community’s properties. Hugh judged against Arnulf, revoking his rights over the disputed lands.¹⁹ The act was issued in Paris and was a decisive imposition of the royal will on local affairs. After rendering judgment, the king warned the bishop in no uncertain terms not to side with Odo of Blois in his machinations against Hugh. Then the king compelled the monks of Fleury to provide a modest amount of wine annually to the castellan, but only for the duration of the bishop’s life. While this does indicate an attempt on the part of the royal court to reconcile the opponents in a round of symbolic gift exchange, it should not mask the magnitude of Fleury’s victory, for Arnulf had lost his rights over the property in question.

But Hugh was not done. As Jean-François Lemarignier has pointed out, the king effectively widened the traditional understanding of immunity in the final clauses of the act.²⁰ He carefully enumerated the same list of judicial agents who had been included in the exemptions of Fleury from the time of Louis the Pious. But rather than exempt all the lands of Fleury from the power of such men, he stated explicitly that it was the lands under dispute which were thus protected. Thus he left no doubt as to which *episcopus*, which *comes*, or which *vicarius* was intended: he meant Arnulf of Orléans, Odo of Blois, and Arnulf of Yèvre, the losing parties in the dispute. Royal immunity did not remain some theoretical form of exemption but was extended to a specific set of monastic properties under specific circumstances.

This charter in essence records two different disputes. The first is the local quarrel in the Orléanais over the lands near Yèvre, which involved the monks of Fleury and the *Arnulfi*, with Odo of Blois playing a minor role as an ally of the latter. The second dispute was the ongoing discord between the Blèsois

see Philippe Lauer, “Le manuscrit des *Annales de Flodoard*: Reg. lat. 633 du Vatican,” *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire de l’Ecole française de Rome* 18 (1896), 493–94.

¹⁸ In this case the reliquary did not contain bones of Benedict. Apparently the monks judged his remains either too difficult or too precious to embark on such an errand. Instead they sent relics of a martyr named Maurus “under the name of Benedict.”

¹⁹ *Recueil des chartes de l’abbaye de Saint-Benoît*, 1:182–85, no. 70. The edition was made from the original parchment, which was conserved in the Archives départementales du Loiret until its destruction in the Second World War.

²⁰ Jean-François Lemarignier, “Le monachisme et l’encadrement religieux des campagnes du royaume de France situées au nord de la Loire, de la fin du X à la fin du XI siècle,” in *Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche della “Societas Christiana” dei secoli XI–XII: Diocesi, pievi e parrocchie*, Miscelanea del Centro di Studi Medioevali 8 (Milan, 1977), pp. 363–64.

and the Capetian families, in which Bishop Arnulf played a minor role as a potential ally of the former. While decisive judgment was rendered in the first instance, where Hugh was an outside authority capable of delivering adjudication, the king also attempted to seek compromise among the parties in the second dispute, one which involved him as a party. In any case, Fleury's appeal to royal authority had succeeded, and the monks were now armed with what was in practice more potent royal protection than that which they had earlier enjoyed. Well after the death of Bishop Arnulf, the monks used royal authority to consolidate their hold over the lands in question, and they literally destroyed the offending castle of Yèvre.²¹

The juxtaposition of the settlements of these two disputes reminds us that in Francia the monasteries and the episcopate often formed two antagonistic groups with separate interests. The actions of the two members of the *Arnulfi* clan were in essence the same: both had laid claim to revenues from lands which the monks thought belonged to their saintly patron. In each case the monks responded with a ritual plea to the power of a powerful patron: they appealed to royal law in the court of Hugh, and they displayed relics as a means of invoking Benedict. These were the two characteristic responses employed by the monks of Fleury against their enemies throughout the later tenth and early eleventh centuries. Each was recorded in a different genre of literature: the former in legal records, the latter in miracle stories. While the record of charters extant for Fleury pales in comparison with those of Cluny and Marmoutier, a significant legal tradition, that of the movement for monastic exemption, may be said to have been born at Fleury in the canonical works produced by Abbo, its distinguished scholar and abbot. It is in these works that we find the fullest records of the monks' attempts to appeal to royal power as a means of defeating their enemies. The hagiographic record for Fleury, for its part, is extensive; one important collection was compiled by Abbo's disciple Aimo. Virtually half these stories, like that of the defeat of Bishop Arnulf related above, concerned Benedict's victories over the enemies of his monastic *familia*.

In the years between his election as abbot in 988 and his violent death in 1004, Abbo defended the liberty of monks in general, and of his community in particular, in speeches made before a variety of ecclesiastical and secular courts.²² On these occasions he worked to strengthen the official powers of both abbot and king. A royal grant of immunity was of little value if royal power was dismissed contemptuously by neighboring bishops and castellans, such as the *Arnulfi*, who were the enemies of a community. To prepare himself for defending royal and abbatial power, Abbo turned to what was probably Fleury's second most valuable resource after its relics, its library. The abbot

²¹ On the destruction of the castle, see the evidence summarized in Head, *Hagiography*, pp. 220 and 277.

²² On the development of Abbo's legal and social thought, see Lemarignier, "Le monachisme et l'encadrement religieux," pp. 363–75; Marco Mostert, *The Political Theology of Abbo of Fleury: A Study of the Ideas about Society and Law of the Tenth-Century Monastic Reform Movement*, *Middelwee Studies en Bronnen* 2 (Hilversum, 1987); and Head, *Hagiography*, pp. 240–55.

assembled dossiers of relevant legal texts from canons of ancient councils and from patristic sources, most importantly the *Registrum* of Gregory the Great.²³ In these works he precisely defined the powers of the royal and abbatial offices as being absolute within their divinely granted spheres of authority. The message of his works — above all the *Apology to Kings Hugh and Robert* — was that kings and abbots were to work together against the enemies of peace in order to ensure social harmony and thus to protect the members of the monastic order against their enemies.

The dossiers which survive indicate that Abbo was at pains to define the monastic *ordo* as the summit of the hierarchy of human society, above the lay and clerical *ordines*. Monks and clerics should ideally work with one another for the good of the whole church, but monks were subject to attack from both the other orders. Because of the clerical heresy of simony, church property was given “to *milites* as gifts or dispersed as benefices,” and thus “ecclesiastical oblations do more good for the horses and dogs of laymen than they do for pilgrims, orphans, and widows, or even for the restoration of churches.”²⁴ Lay lords were also at fault: “Those who are these days called advocates of churches defend for themselves that which by law belongs to the church against the authority of laws and canons. Thus they inflict violence on clerics and monks, and they rob the property of churches and monasteries for their own use and profit.”²⁵ As Abbo stated elsewhere, an enemy of monastic rights was not just a “thief of property” but a “perverter of laws.”²⁶ Abbo grasped how the kinship ties of clerics influenced the dispersal of church property. Indeed these phrases could have been composed specifically to describe the actions of the *Arnulfi* against Fleury.

Abbo's efforts to secure wider immunities bore fruit as early as the judgment leveled against Arnulf of Yèvre in the court of Hugh Capet. Soon Abbo delivered another blow to the *Arnulfi*, when he persuaded the king to renounce his allegiance to Arnulf of Orléans and to back the program of monastic reformers in the West Frankish realm. The abbot also secured a different sort of immunity for Fleury, one which provided exemption from the ecclesiastical power of the local bishop. This time he turned, not to the king, but to another outside authority, the pope. In 996 he secured a papal bull which declared that the abbot of Fleury was “first among the abbots of Gaul” and could be judged only by a provincial council or the papal court. This act was the direct antecedent of more elaborate liberties issued for Cluny in the following year. While this last act did not, as we have seen above, imply the existence of an antagonistic relationship between the monks of Cluny and their bishop, the papal bull for Fleury (which may have been forged and

²³ On the importance of the *Registrum* for Abbo, see Lemarignier, “Le monachisme et l'encadrement religieux,” pp. 367–68 and 399–405 (appendix by Olivier Guillot), and Mostert, *The Political Theology of Abbo*, pp. 66–75.

²⁴ Abbo of Fleury, *Epistolae* 14, PL 139:440–41. See also *Collectio canonum* 13, PL 139:483–84.

²⁵ Abbo of Fleury, *Collectio canonum* 2, PL 139:476–77.

²⁶ Abbo of Fleury, *Apologeticus*, PL 139:461.

was in any case based on forgeries) certainly served as a bone of contention between monks and bishop.²⁷

The evidence may be found in a dispute which involved the successors of Abbot Abbo and Bishop Arnulf. On a feast of Benedict, most probably in 1008, Bishop Fulk intentionally violated the privileges granted by Gregory V by arriving at Fleury without abbatial invitation; Abbot Gauzlin caused the bishop to be forcibly driven from the monastery. The bishop immediately appealed to his metropolitan, Leothericus of Sens, who convoked a council to adjudicate the matter. The monks of Fleury read out a copy of the papal bull in their defense, but the partisans of the bishop offered to burn the troublesome document. The matter was solved only by an appeal to the pope, who sent letters to the principal parties in the dispute which threatened to excommunicate the enemies of Fleury.²⁸ The monks of Fleury, like their counterparts at Cluny, used their immunities as the basis of an appeal to outside authorities in an attempt to seek victory over their opponents. At Fleury, however, papal intervention apparently succeeded in shortcircuiting any attempts at negotiation of a local compromise.

This, then, was one strategy employed by the community of Fleury: an appeal to the king or to the pope and to the power of their law. In theory, such an appeal made the abbot of Fleury independent of local authority, particularly those troublesome individual lords — such as the *Arnulfi* — who happened to be enemies of the community. When so invoked, and when properly enforced, immunities (and the outside authorities which they represented) freed a monastic community from the need to undertake the painstaking processes of compromise by which enemies became friends.

The second strategy used by the monks of Fleury employed neither the royal nor the papal court but the court of heaven. The miracle collection

²⁷ The text of the two bulls may be found in *Papsturkunden, 896–1046*, ed. Harald Zimmermann, 3 vols., 2nd ed. (Vienna, 1988–89), 2:655–57, no. 335 (Fleury), and 2:682–86, no. 351 (Cluny). On their relationship, see Jean-François Lemarignier, “L’exemption monastique et les origines de la réforme grégorienne,” in *A Cluny. Congrès scientifique. Fêtes et cérémonies liturgiques en l’honneur des saints abbés Odon et Odilon (9–11 juillet 1949)* (Dijon, 1950), pp. 301–15, and H. E. J. Cowdrey, *The Cluniacs and the Gregorian Reform* (Oxford, 1970), pp. 19–36. Zimmermann provides a complete bibliography of the discussion of the authenticity of the bull for Fleury, an authenticity which I incline to support. If it is a forgery, then it is a contemporary one done by the monks of Fleury themselves for their own use and (as the bull for Cluny demonstrates) for the use of others. Whatever the authenticity of the papal act, the monks of Fleury felt that such an exemption fell in the papal, not royal, sphere of rights and privileges. Significantly the language of the act was based in part on another bull, allegedly issued by Gregory IV, which had been forged by Abbo, or at least under his direction: *Recueil des chartes de l’abbaye de Saint-Benoît*, 1:39–43, no. 18. On this forgery, see Marco Mostert, “Die Urkundenfälschungen Abbos von Fleury,” in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, 5 vols., *Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica* 33 (Hannover, 1988), 4:287–318.

²⁸ The record of this dispute is contained in Andrew of Fleury, *Vie de Gauzlin, abbé de Fleury. Vita Gauzlini abbatis Floriacensis monasterii*, ed. and trans. Robert-Henri Bautier and Gillette Labory, *Sources d’Histoire Médiévale Publiées par l’Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes* 2 (Paris, 1969), 18, pp. 50–59. See also Head, *Hagiography*, pp. 255–57. Note that even if the 997 act of Gregory V (see previous note) was a forgery, it was accepted in 1005 by John XVIII as genuine.

compiled by Aimo was a chronicle of the tribulations and triumphs of the *familia* of St. Benedict. These accounts hinged on a set of assumptions that I have called elsewhere “the logic of saintly patronage.”²⁹ Simply put, as a resident in the divine court, Benedict served as an *advocatus* for his family. These friends — the monks of the community, the serfs of its lands, and the pilgrims who came to its shrine — all provided Benedict with forms of service. In return they could expect such benefits as the cure of their illnesses and the remission of posthumous punishment. For the monks, an additional benefit was the expectation that their enemies would be punished or thwarted.

We have already seen in the work of Aimo how the community triumphed over an ecclesiastical enemy by means of the ritual invocation of saintly patronage. In his work, however, most enemies of the monks of Fleury and their patron were to be found among the *militēs*.³⁰ The way in which the monks of Fleury invoked the logic of saintly patronage against such fighting men can be seen in a story which concerned a castellan named Herbert of Sully whose *castrum* was located near the abbey. The abbot of Fleury had conceded certain properties to him *in beneficium*. Since Aimo described these lands as *praedia*, they probably were a form of bribe to keep the castellan from claiming or plundering other monastic properties. This attempt at compromise failed; Herbert continued to pillage the lands of Fleury. The monks then complained to King Lothar, or more properly — as Aimo remarks — to Hugh Capet, who was then *dux Francorum*. Again they were unsuccessful.

Finally the monks invoked the power of their saintly patron. They implored Benedict to relieve the hardships caused by Herbert and even rang their church’s bells to summon the serfs of their lands to join them in prayer, thus gathering the entire *familia* of the saint against their enemy. Herbert remained obdurate. Then the castellan dreamed that the figure of St. Benedict struck him between the shoulder blades with his *baculus*, or staff of office. The shouts of the castellan attracted his fellow knights, who found him stricken and approaching death. With his last words he asked them to bring him to the tomb of St. Benedict as a token of repentance. The monks reluctantly agreed to bury Herbert in their churchyard, a symbolic acceptance of his deathbed repentance and a ritual reincorporation of the vanquished enemy into the *familia* of Benedict.³¹

Yet another story from Aimo’s collection provides an interesting counterpoint. A layman named Walter had laid claim to some land used by the monks of Fleury. When he found himself riding near the disputed land in a

²⁹ Head, *Hagiography*, pp. 187–201.

³⁰ Interestingly enough, Aimo himself came from a knightly family; see Aimo of Fleury, *Vita s. Abbonis* 18, PL 139:408.

³¹ *Miracula s. Benedicti* 2.7, pp. 107–9. Other enemies vanquished in such a manner were not granted even posthumous forgiveness. Aimo recorded (*Miracula s. Benedicti* 2.5, p. 105) how a knight named Arnustus died after breaking a pact with the monks of Fleury. During the course of the knight’s illness his friends prayed in vain to Benedict that he be cured. Arnustus was later denied burial in the monastic cemetery.

party which included Abbo himself, Walter pressed his claim by offering to undertake judicial combat to prove the truth of his words. The abbot who so revered the law responded to this legal challenge by invoking Benedict's protective patronage. Walter was thrown from his horse and died. Aimo interpreted the event both as a miracle and as a form of ordeal: "Thus [Walter] fought alone the combat which he had proposed and through the will of God a judgment on the merits of his beloved confessor Benedict was made manifest." Abbo later allowed Walter, like Herbert of Sully, to be buried in the cemetery at Fleury.³² Once again the only compromise allowed was posthumous; only a defeated enemy could be reincorporated into the *familia* of St. Benedict.

Many other examples could be cited. Such stories of miraculous chastisements allowed only clear-cut winners and losers: such is the rhetorical stance of hagiography. From them we learn of the saintly patronage which the monks of Fleury trusted as one bulwark against their enemies. Aimo portrayed a world in which the friends and the enemies of their patron saint were starkly divided. To be sure, the ritual reincorporation of defeated enemies through burial in the monastic cemetery indicates that the processes of negotiation with neighboring magnates outlined above for Cluny were not absent in the Orléanais. The actions of the monks and the rhetoric of the hagiographer suggest that an attempt was made to forge friendly relationships with the next generation, but note that such friendly relationships were possible only after the death of the perceived enemy and only on the terms of the monks of Fleury. The tenacity with which the monks sought the destruction of the castle of Yèvre over two generations demonstrates their unwillingness to accept the sort of accommodation reached in the Mâconnais.

I would suggest that monastic authors composed collections of miracle stories in part to record oral traditions about the community's triumphs in those disputes where recourse to royal law had failed or where proper chancery records were lacking. Because of the nature of the sources involved, the appeals that the monks of Fleury made to the miraculous patronage of St. Benedict and the appeals which they made to the protection of law appear at first glance very different indeed. The monks of Fleury, however, saw them as complementary, not antithetical. When they sought the aid of Benedict against Herbert of Sully through prayer, they simultaneously sought the aid of the king's court. At other times, as when Arnulf laid claim to their vineyard, the monks turned to Benedict only after royal law had failed. For the monks of Fleury, royal privileges, papal bulls, and saintly patronage functioned together in concert to form their defenses against inimical local lords. Through these means the monks called upon outside authority in an attempt to obtain decisive, even violent victories. In a region where royal power still to a large degree functioned effectively, and for a community which could boast the corporal presence of a patron as powerful as Benedict, disputes could have decisive resolution.

³² *Miracula s. Benedicti* 3.10, p. 154.

3. MARMOUTIER

In the tenth century Cluny's worst "enemies" arose from the circle of its most intimate "friends," a circumstance favored by weak political authority and dispersed social arrangements. Marmoutier's social and political environment was quite similar to that of Cluny in the tenth century. By the mid-eleventh century, however, Marmoutier had felt the effects of the rise of powerful comital houses, and in the second half of the century it began to profit from the growing power of the reforming papacy. Nevertheless, even in these different circumstances the abbey's friendships and enmities could be closely linked. Literary sources from Marmoutier indicate that in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries the monks focused their anxieties and anger on three enemies or categories of enemies. To one degree or another, these enemies all had their origins in the intimate circle of Marmoutier's family or, more broadly speaking, in the community of St. Martin, Marmoutier's patron saint.

The first enemy to show up in Marmoutier's literary representations was Count Geoffrey the Bearded of Anjou, who, in 1064, attacked and ravaged Marmoutier's possessions because the monks had resisted his attempt to invest Marmoutier's abbot with the pastoral staff. In response to Geoffrey's actions, the monks made a barefoot procession to the Basilica of Saint-Martin in Tours, in order to visit the tomb of their patron saint. There they implored God to temper the count's behavior lest he destroy the abbey and thus earn his own damnation. In their rhetoric, the monks also relegated Geoffrey to a place outside the sacred community, which, in this case, was also the community of St. Martin.¹

Geoffrey the Bearded's enmity towards Marmoutier was an outgrowth of the traditional friendship between his family and the abbey. Both his uncle Count Geoffrey Martel and his grandfather Count Fulk Nerra had given gifts to Marmoutier, and both had asked monks from Marmoutier to reform major abbeys under their patronage.² This friendship between the Angevin counts and Marmoutier began to turn sour because Marmoutier's reforming influence undermined the Angevins' ability to control the internal governance of their favored abbeys. Sometime around 1032 Fulk Nerra expelled Marmoutier's monks from the Abbey of Saint-Nicolas in Angers; and after 1055, when Marmoutier introduced to the Angevin abbey of Saint-Florent in Sau-

¹ *Chronica de gestis consulum Andegavorum*, MS B, ed. Louis Halphen and René Poupardin, *Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise* (Paris, 1913), pp. 152–55 (see the introduction of Halphen and Poupardin, pp. xxxvii–xxxviii, for the argument that this part of MS B came from a source from Marmoutier); Louis Halphen, *Le comté d'Anjou au XIe siècle* (Paris, 1906), pp. 139–40; Olivier Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XIe siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1972), 1:106, 173–93; and Sharon Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin: Legend and Ritual in Medieval Tours* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1991), pp. 73–74.

² "Les prieurés de Marmoutier en Anjou," ed. Paul Marchegay, *Archives d'Anjou* 2 (1853), 50–52, 60; Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 1:177–78, 2:25, no. 8, 2:142, no. 209; and Penelope D. Johnson, *Prayer, Patronage and Power: The Abbey of La Trinité, Vendôme, 1032–1187* (New York, 1981), pp. 37–38.

mur the idea that laymen could not invest abbots with the symbols of spiritual authority, Geoffrey Martel stopped founding new abbeys.³ Geoffrey the Bearded's aggressions against Marmoutier in 1064 were thus the final explosion of a problem that had been simmering for a number of years. But the relationship between the Angevins and Marmoutier did not remain one of enmity for long. Geoffrey's successor, Fulk Rechin, gave some land to Marmoutier in 1085, and in 1096 Pope Urban II placed Marmoutier under Fulk's protection, with the expectation that the count would serve as the abbey's ally in its struggle against its second friend/enemy, the archbishop of Tours.⁴

The enmity between Marmoutier and the archbishop of Tours resulted from the version of the monastic exemption movement that Abbo of Fleury had instigated but which did not become fully articulated at Marmoutier until around 1080. At that time the monks there began to quarrel with their archbishop over two ritual expressions of the archbishop's spiritual dominance: episcopal visitations to the abbey during Easter week and the demand that a new abbot make an oath of subjection to the archbishop at the time of his consecration.⁵ In 1089 Urban II granted a bull of exemption to Marmoutier specifying that the archbishops could not make visitations to Marmoutier or demand oaths of subjection from newly elected abbots.⁶ Despite this papal exemption, the archbishops of Tours continued to vex Marmoutier until sometime between 1118 and 1124, when the monks, the archbishop, and the canons of the cathedral reached a compromise position upon which they could base a new relationship of peace and "mother-daughter" accord.⁷

³ Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 1:177–78, 181–83, 191.

⁴ Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 2:216–17, no. 347; Edmond Martène, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Marmoutier*, 2 vols., Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Touraine 24–25 (Tours, 1874–75), 1:482–83; and *Textus de dedicatione ecclesiae majoris monasterii*, ed. André Salmon, *Recueil de chroniques de Touraine* (Tours, 1854), pp. 339–40. For other examples of Marmoutier's relations of friendship and enmity with nobles and the abbey's tendency to resolve disputes by compromise, see Martène, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Marmoutier*, 1:502–4, 560–63 (sources discussed in Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 1:304–5); and Stephen D. White, "Pactum . . . Legem Vincit et Amor Judicium: The Settlement of Disputes by Compromise in Eleventh-Century Western France," *American Journal of Legal History* 22 (1978), 281–308.

⁵ On Marmoutier's struggles in the 1080s: *Notitia seu libellus de tribulationibus . . . majori monasterio injuste illatis*, in *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. Martin Bouquet et al., 24 vols. (Paris, 1738–1904), 14:93–94; Ivo of Chartres, Letter 73, PL 162:92. The canons of Saint-Martin, who had direct links with Abbo of Fleury, became involved in the exemption movement in 997. The issue of exemption may have been the source of an outburst at Marmoutier during an episcopal Easter visitation between 1023 and 1052, but there is no way to know for sure: Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 40–43; and Arnulphus, archbishop of Tours, "Decretum," ed. Johannes Maan, *Sancta et metropolitana ecclesia Turonensis* (Tours, 1667), pp. 248–49.

⁶ *Papsturkunden in Frankreich*, n.s. 5, ed. Johannes Ramackers, *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, ser. 3, 35 (Göttingen, 1956), p. 84, no. 21.

⁷ "De professionibus abbatum," ed. Jean Leclercq, in "Un traité sur la 'profession des abbés' au xii siècle," *Studia Anselmiana* 50 (1962), 182–91; Ivo of Chartres, Letters 108, 234, 235, PL 162:126–27, 236–38; Martène, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Marmoutier*, 1:551–60, 2:3–4; *Cartulaire de l'archevêché de Tours*, ed. Louis de Grandmaison, 2 vols. Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Touraine 37–38 (Tours, 1892–94), 1:94, no. 43 (1118–24). In 1095, at the Council of Clermont, Urban II had heard both sides of the case for a second time and again ruled in

According to the agreement, the archbishops would no longer make visitations to Marmoutier, and they would bless new abbots “without a written or oral profession of subjection.” New abbots would “promise as much obedience to the archbishop and his church as to a mother, with the obedience and authority of the Roman see preserved anew.”⁸ The working distinction seems to have been between an oath demanded by the archbishop and an oral promise of obedience freely offered by the abbot and limited by the obedience owed to the pope.

In the years before they reached this agreement of peace with the archbishop of Tours, the monks of Marmoutier cooperated with the canons of the Basilica of Saint-Martin, who were also fighting the archbishop over the issue of exemption, in creating a rhetorical and ritual universe that symbolically removed the archbishop of Tours from the Christian community and from the community of St. Martin.⁹ In order to understand the significance of this newly defined “community” of St. Martin, we need to examine how that community had been defined before the exemption movement exploded in Tours in the eleventh century.¹⁰

During the early Middle Ages the town of Tours constituted the principal “community of St. Martin.” Martin’s cult gave physical shape to the medieval town, whose major centers of settlement, religious cult, and commercial activity grew up around the three churches associated with the saint: the cathedral, where Martin had served as bishop in the fourth century; Marmoutier, which he founded and where he continued to practice the monastic life while he was bishop; and the Basilica of Saint-Martin, where he was buried. More important than this physical legacy, however, was the fact that fifth- and sixth-century bishops of Tours, especially Perpetuus and Gregory, employed Martin’s cult to create an ideal image of the civic community. Tours, its bishops suggested, was Martin’s town, and it was united under the authority of its bishop, who guarded Martin’s cult and inherited his position.

All three of Martin’s institutions were included in this ideal community. The religious calendar established by Bishop Perpetuus and recorded by Gregory of Tours indicates that the bishop controlled a cycle of processions and vigils that took place both at the cathedral and at the Basilica of Saint-Martin.¹¹ Apparently Marmoutier was part of this cycle as well.¹²

Marmoutier’s favor: *Notitia seu libellus de tribulationibus*, pp. 97–98; Jean-François Lemarignier, *Etude sur les privilèges d’exemption et de juridiction ecclésiastique des abbayes normands depuis les origines jusqu’en 1140* (Paris, 1937), p. 189.

⁸ “electum nostrum [abbatem] benedicendum coram archiepiscopo offeremus, quem ipse sincere benedicet absque scrutinio, absque scripto, absque professione; antequam vero fiat benedictio illa, vel postquam facta fuerit, tantum promittet abbas obedientiam ei et ecclesie sue sicut matri, salva ex integro obedientia et auctoritate Romane sedis,” *Cartulaire de l’archevêché de Tours*, 1:94.

⁹ Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 49–62.

¹⁰ For more extensive discussion of the background, see Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, chap. 1.

¹¹ Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* 10.31, MGH SSrerMerov 1/1:445.

¹² A miracle story written for Bishop Perpetuus indicates that the inhabitants of Tours made

Late Merovingian and Carolingian developments — most especially, the influence of Columbanian monasticism, which drove a wedge between bishops and monasteries — undermined the actual practice of civic/ecclesiastical unity at Tours.¹³ Nevertheless, until the late eleventh century the old images continued to predominate in representations of the town. Moreover, as late as 940 it was still possible for an archbishop of Tours to play a role in defining the way that one of St. Martin's feast days was celebrated at the Basilica of Saint-Martin.¹⁴

The exemption movement that had spread from Fleury to Tours brought an end to this cultic and representational unity. Because Marmoutier and Saint-Martin succeeded in gaining exemption from the disciplinary and liturgical dominance of their archbishop, the archbishop's access to Martin's cult became severely limited. After the end of the eleventh century, the archbishop had the right to visit Martin's tomb at the basilica only once during his episcopacy — at the time of his installation; and he had no right at all to visit the places at Marmoutier that were associated with Martin's life.¹⁵ New legends and liturgical observances, moreover, underscored the archbishop's exclusion: Tours became, in the symbolic representations that emanated from Marmoutier and Saint-Martin, two communities. First, there was the new urban "community of St. Martin," which consisted of Marmoutier, Saint-Martin, and the walled suburb around Saint-Martin. This community came together during a newly established urban patronal feast on May 12, which commemorated Martin's deliverance of his town from the Vikings in 903.¹⁶ Actually, it was the cathedral town that Martin had delivered

an annual Easter visitation to Marmoutier. It was probably the bishop who headed the visitation: Paulinus of Périgueux, *De vita Sancti Martini* 6, ll. 351–460, ed. Michael Petschenig, *Poetae Christiani minores*, 2 vols., Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 16 (Vienna, 1888), 1:153–57.

¹³ Saint-Martin became a reformed house along Columbanian lines c. 650, and it received a privilege of exemption c. 674: privilege of Pope Adeodatus, PL 87:1141; Friedrich Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich: Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert)* (Munich, 1965), p. 293; Edgar Raphaël Vaucelle, *La collégiale de St.-Martin de Tours des origines à l'avènement des Valois (397–1328)* (Tours, 1907), pp. 35–36, 65–66; Pierre Gasnault, "Etude sur les chartes de Saint-Martin de Tours des origines au milieu du XIIe siècle," *Positions des thèses, Ecole nationale des chartes* (1953), pp. 38–39.

¹⁴ *Brevis historia Sancti Juliani Turonensis*, ed. Salmon, *Recueil de chroniques de Touraine*, p. 226; Emile Mabille, *La pancarte noire de Saint-Martin de Tours* (Paris, 1866), p. 187, no. 143; Guy Oury, "La reconstruction monastique dans l'ouest: L'abbé Gauzbert de St.-Julien de Tours (v. 990–1007)," *Revue Mabillon* 54 (1964), 75–77.

¹⁵ "Bulla pro canonicis S. Martini Turonensis," *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, 14:719–20, and PL 151:449; Urban II, privilege to Marmoutier, *Papsturkunden in Frankreich*, p. 84, no. 21.

¹⁶ In 1115 Saint-Martin and Marmoutier agreed that Marmoutier would celebrate Martin's feast of May 12 (which dates from the eleventh century) at Saint-Martin: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 12875, fol. 607r; *ibid.*, Collection Housseau, vol. 4, no. 1356, fol. 159r. The legend *Saint Martin's Return from Burgundy*, written between 1137 and 1156, is the earliest source indicating that the May feast was associated with the Viking attack of 903: *De reversione Beati Martini a Burgundia*, ed. André Salmon, *Supplément aux chroniques de Touraine* (Tours, 1856), pp. 14–34; on the dates for this text see Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 305–6. Our

from the Vikings in 903.¹⁷ But the new feast and its public processions excluded both the archbishop and the cathedral town, which constituted the second community at Tours.

In their rhetoric the monks at Marmoutier went even further than they did in their rituals, defining one of their hostile archbishops as the enemy of St. Martin and his community. Perpetuus and Gregory of Tours had once indicated that the bishop of Tours was the closest of Martin's friends. Now, by contrast, the monks indicated that their archbishop was Amalek, the enemy of the people of Israel, while St. Martin played the role of Moses, who defended the Israelites from their enemy.¹⁸

When the monks and their archbishop made peace sometime between 1118 and 1124, they reestablished familial relations with each other. As part of their new relationship, Marmoutier's monks and the archbishop and canons of the cathedral agreed to attend the funerals of the highest dignitaries of each other's houses, to commemorate every monk or canon when he died, and to perform an annual trental or anniversary for the dead of each other's houses.¹⁹ Nevertheless, the archbishop did not regain the access to the abbey and to Martin's cult that earlier bishops and archbishops had enjoyed. While the monks agreed to visit the cathedral on the feast day of its patron saint, Maurice, they did not invite the archbishops to make similar visits to their abbey during Martin's feasts, and indeed, they explicitly stated that archbishops were to make no visitations to the abbey.

As a friend who became an enemy of Marmoutier, Count Geoffrey the Bearded resembled some of the friends/enemies of tenth-century Cluny. The same could be said of the archbishop of Tours as well, if in looking for the earlier "friendship" we stretch our memories back to the time of Gregory and Perpetuus, or if we understand that in one sense Marmoutier's intimate community included everyone who had a special relationship to the cult and relics of St. Martin. The archbishop's special relationship to that cult, which was still in evidence in the tenth century, came to an end in the late eleventh.

The struggles that arose at Marmoutier in the second half of the eleventh century emerged at a time when political and ecclesiastical relationships were increasingly defined in vertical rather than horizontal terms. In order to protect themselves from the domination of the counts of Anjou and the

source for the fact that this feast became an urban patronal feast dates from 1180–81: *De cultu Sancti Martini apud Turonenses extremo saeculo XII epistolae quatuor*, published in *Analecta Bollandiana* 3 (1884), 236, now reedited by Albert Derolez, *Guiberti Gemblacensis epistolae*, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 66 (Turnhout, 1988), pp. 90–91. For further discussion of the feast see Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 53, 284–89.

¹⁷ Radbod of Utrecht, *Libellus de miraculo S. Martini*, MGH SS 15/2:1239–44; Pierre Gasnault, "Le tombeau de Saint Martin et les invasions normandes dans l'histoire et dans la légende," *Mémorial de l'année martinienne M.DCCCC.LX–M.DCCCC.LXI* (Paris, 1964), pp. 63–64.

¹⁸ "Nisi noster Moyses, B. videlicet Martinus, stetisset in confractione pro nobis in conspectu [Domini], forsitan [archiepiscopus et canonici S. Mauricii] disperdissent nos in nationibus; et nisi Dei genitrix et nostra nobis lacessentibus manus suas extendisset, forsitan populum Domini Amalec extinxisset," *Notitia seu libellus de tribulationibus*, p. 93.

¹⁹ *Cartulaire de l'archevêché de Tours*, 1:95.

archbishops of Tours, Marmoutier's monks — much like those at Fleury — drew institutional boundaries which defined the inside of the monastery as something separate and distinct from its outside. The monks appealed to the authority of the reformed papacy to reinforce those boundaries.

A key element in defining the “inside” of the monastery was the office of the abbot. The counts of Anjou had never actually controlled the investiture of Marmoutier's abbots, but they did control it at other abbeys, such as Saint-Florent in Saumur, and they resented the fact that Marmoutier's influence undermined their power at such abbeys, defining the counts as “outsiders” when it came to the matter of investiture. Geoffrey the Bearded responded to these developments by attempting to assert greater domination over Marmoutier than any layman had exercised since the time of Marmoutier's re-foundation in the late tenth century. His successors — Fulk Rechin, Fulk V, and Geoffrey the Fair — had to accept relationships of friendship with Marmoutier that did not include any direct influence over its internal governance.²⁰ Similarly, the archbishops of Tours reentered friendly relations with Marmoutier only after they signed an agreement that strictly defined the limits of their “maternal” relationship with the abbey. Thus, at the end of the eleventh century, friends of Marmoutier who became its enemies might become its friends once again, but only after they had come to recognize Marmoutier's well-defined liberties.

In the second half of the eleventh century, then, Marmoutier stood somewhere between tenth-century Fleury and tenth-century Cluny in its relations with its enemies. Like the monks of Cluny, Marmoutier's monks were willing to resolve disputes through compromise, and they had fluid relations with friends who could become enemies and then become friends once again. Like the monks of Fleury, however, the monks of Marmoutier drew distinct institutional boundaries, carefully protecting the office of abbot and the internal workings of the abbey from outside interference. How do we explain this middle position?

The answer seems to lie in the transitional nature of hierarchical authority at the end of the eleventh century. Unlike tenth-century Cluny, Marmoutier had access in the later period to increasingly effective centralizing authorities. In their struggle with the archbishop of Tours, for instance, the monks took their case to the pope, his legates, and church councils, and the growing authority of the papal bureaucracy helped to tip the scales in their favor.²¹ Nevertheless, papal bulls and ecclesiastical councils were not entirely effective

²⁰ Fulk V (d. 1142) gave the priory of Trôo to Marmoutier, and, according to a twelfth-century collection of miracle stories from the abbey, he entered into a relationship of confraternity with the monks: Martène, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Marmoutier*, 2:49; *De rebus gestis in majori monasterio*, ed. Jean Mabillon and Luc d'Achéry, *Acta sanctorum Ordinis sancti Benedicti*, 9 vols. (Venice, 1733–38), saec. 6, pt. 2, no. 12, p. 402. This story was also included in John of Marmoutier's redaction of the *Chronica de gestis consulum Andegavorum*, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, *Chroniques*, pp. 161–62. John of Marmoutier is also our source for confraternal relations between Count Geoffrey the Fair (d. 1151) and Marmoutier: *Historia Gaufredi ducis Normannorum et comitis Andegavorum*, ed. Halphen and Poupardin, *Chroniques*, pp. 192–93.

²¹ See *Notitia seu libellus de tribulationibus*.

in changing local conditions. In the years between 1089, when Urban II granted Marmoutier its bull of exemption, and 1118–24, when the monks and their archbishop worked out their differences — without outside intervention — the monks had to contend with a local situation that was not unlike the one that predominated in the tenth-century Mâconnais, a situation of uncertain relations among local entities that were relatively equal in status and power. On the local level, at first, the growth of papal monarchy did not so much create hierarchy as destroy it. The archbishop of Tours and Marmoutier confronted each other as equals, and the end result was compromise. Unlike the tenth-century solutions at Cluny, however, the compromise worked out between Marmoutier and the cathedral involved a carefully worded document which defined the precise nature of the cathedral's rights as a "mother" and of Marmoutier's rights as an exempt monastery.

A similar argument could be made about the relations between Marmoutier and the counts of Anjou. The growth of papal power (as well as the increased power of the king of France and the duke of Normandy) helped to undermine Geoffrey the Bearded's attempts to impose his will on Marmoutier. But again, the immediate local result was not so much the creation of hierarchy as the reintroduction of uncertain, horizontal relations. It would seem that Fulk Rechin recognized the implications of the new situation — he pursued a policy of reconciliation and compromise with Marmoutier long before the pope called on him to serve as the abbey's protector.²²

After 1124, Marmoutier's relations with the counts of Anjou and the archbishop of Tours remained relatively stable, and centralizing authorities extended their power by providing sources of mediation and resolution for local conflicts.²³ Indeed, although twelfth-century sources told the story of the abbey's earlier struggles, only a third group of friends/enemies actually continued to threaten the abbey. This group consisted of monks at Marmoutier who were not living up to their obligations towards their living and dead brothers. Within this category of friends/enemies the classifications of outsiders who were also insiders, or of insiders who were redefined as outsiders, do not really apply. We have reached the core of the monastic community, and the existence of enemies here points to a crisis of community, one which arose precisely because that community was losing its intimacy.

It was the escalating growth and success of Marmoutier, and of abbeys like it, that transformed the nature of the monastic community.²⁴ As their liturgical and administrative responsibilities expanded, the monks needed to distribute their human resources across large distances and to create a liturgical and organizational division of labor. Monks who were members of the moth-

²² See for instance his charter of 1073, in which he agreed to observe certain privileges of Marmoutier that had been ignored by his comital ministers in recent years. Fulk held on to certain rights, but he also gave the monks the right to allow their pigs to forage in all of his forests: Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou*, 2:194, no. 305.

²³ Stephen D. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The "Laudatio Parentum" in Western France, 1050–1150* (Chapel Hill, 1988), p. 83; R. W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth, Eng., 1970), pp. 109–21.

²⁴ For a more extensive discussion see Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 119–34.

erhouse could be sent out to distant priories or deaneries, and they might not see their brothers for months or years on end.²⁵ Even those monks who remained at home were expected to fulfill some of their collective responsibilities — private masses for the dead, for instance — in places or at times when no one else was around.²⁶ It could no longer be assumed, in the twelfth century, that the members of a monastic community would share the same physical space, the same rhythm of liturgical activities. The watchful gaze of the community became less and less evident in the daily lives of the monks.

The monk-enemies who resided in the new, distended, monastic community were those who thought that they could get away with “cheating” their brothers because no one was watching. Twelfth-century ghost stories conveyed the message to the monks that the monastic community — which included both the living and the dead — was still capable of watching over its members. One such story concerned Ulrich, a monk of Marmoutier who was serving as the steward of the priory of Tavant. Apparently the relative independence of life in a priory had proved too much of a temptation for Ulrich. He thought no one would know, so he cheated Marmoutier’s dead of some of the income that had been designated for the benefit of their souls. But Ulrich’s dead brothers knew what he was up to, and two of them visited him, demanding their just deserts. When Ulrich failed, after two warnings, to amend his ways, the ghosts paid him another visit and “gave him so many floggings that he remained in bed for half a year tortured by the most severe pains.”²⁷

In addition to writing ghost stories, the monks of Marmoutier addressed the problems of lost intimacy and brotherhood through works of history. Those histories did not dwell on the subject of bad monks who were “enemies.” Rather, they attempted to instill in the brothers a deeper sense of connection — with each other and with their past. The unnamed “enemy” in this historical literature was a sense of alienation, alienation from the past

²⁵ Marmoutier’s priories and deaneries — at least 114 by 1100, and 151 by c. 1200 — were spread out all over northwestern France, and there were even a few in England: O. Gantier, “Recherches sur les possessions et les prieurés de l’abbaye de Marmoutier,” *Revue Mabillon*, 3rd ser., 55 (1965), 71–79; and Martène, *Histoire de l’abbaye de Marmoutier*, 1:393–96.

²⁶ Ulrich of Cluny, *Antiquiores consuetudines Cluniacensis monasterii* 3.29, PL 149:775; *Antiquae consuetudines majoris monasterii*, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 12879, fol. 110v.

²⁷ “[T]antis eum verberibus affecerunt ut per annum dimidium lectulo decubans gravissimis doloribus torqueretur,” *De rebus gestis in majori monasterio* 10, p. 400, with corrections from Bibliothèque municipale de Charleville, MS 117, fols. 116v–117r. See also a warning from ghosts in *De rebus gestis in majori monasterio* 2, p. 395. There were some precedents in ninth- and tenth-century ghost stories for the theme of the punishment of those who neglected to live up to their obligations to the dead: Franz Neiske, “Vision und Totengedenken,” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 20 (1986), 153, 161. I am not aware, however, of any works that focused exclusively on relationships between monks of the same abbey or that showed the same concern for a sense of monastic community that we find in the *De rebus gestis in majori monasterio*. For earlier discussions of this text see Sharon Farmer, “Personal Perceptions, Collective Behavior: Monastic Suffrages for the Dead,” in *Persons in Groups: Social Behavior as Identity Formation*, ed. Richard Trexler (Binghamton, N.Y., 1985), pp. 231–39; and Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 125, 134–50.

(which seemed to be receding at a faster pace than ever) and alienation from each other.²⁸

In one way or another Marmoutier's histories defined for the monks, from an internal perspective, what it meant to be members of the monastic community of St. Martin. The idea that Marmoutier was, almost literally, Martin's family, and that the monks' relationship to Martin was one of direct, genealogical, descent, predominated in these works. The author of the *Legend of the Seven Sleepers of Marmoutier*, for instance, introduced the idea that the first generation of monks at Marmoutier included seven men who were Martin's first cousins. The legend also claimed that those seven cousins were the sons of twin brothers. This assertion helped to symbolize the intensity of the common life in the monastery. The author tells us that just as the twins were brought forth during a single labor, they were content as well with a single house and a single estate. When the twins died, their sons, the seven cousins, gave their inheritance to the poor and established themselves "in a garret," where their life of sacred reading and prayer anticipated the life that they would later live (and that their monastic descendants continued to live) at Marmoutier.²⁹

In order to strengthen the sense that Marmoutier's twelfth-century inhabitants really were the spiritual descendants of Martin's original family at Marmoutier, the abbey's historians endeavored to reconstruct all of the time that had elapsed between Martin's time and their own. Moreover, they "corrected" the perception that the Vikings had totally destroyed Marmoutier, indicating instead that twenty-four monks survived a violent attack on the abbey and implying that some of those survivors eventually returned to the abbey to rebuild it.³⁰ In this way, the monks could come to believe that Martin's tradition had never been lost, that it had been passed down, almost like an inheritance, from one generation to another, and that their spiritual brotherhood came very close to resembling blood kinship. In their sermons

²⁸ For a more extensive discussion of these works of history, see Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, chap. 6.

²⁹ *Historia septem dormientium (majoris monasterii)*, PL 71:1105–18. This was written in the twelfth century, before Guibert of Gembloux made his visit to Marmoutier in 1180–81, and probably before 1156, when MS 1183 (now destroyed) of the municipal library of Metz was copied: *De cultu Sancti Martini*, p. 218 of the *Analecta Ballandiana* edition; Hippolyte Delehaye, "Guibert, abbé de Florennes et de Gembloux," *Revue des questions historiques* 46 (1889), 48–65; *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France, départements* (Paris, 1885–), 48:403. For further discussion of the date of this legend, see Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 310–11.

³⁰ "Narratio de commendatione Turonicae provinciae" and "Chronicon abbatum majoris monasterii" (these were originally one text), ed. Salmon, *Recueil de chroniques de Touraine*, pp. 302–26 (see Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 306–8, for the argument that these were written around 1227); *De reversione Beati Martini a Burgundia*, pp. 14–34. An eleventh-century history of Marmoutier, written c. 1095, had exaggerated the destructive impact of the Vikings at Marmoutier in order to exonerate the monks of any responsibility for the decline of the abbey into a house of canons: Bibliothèque municipale de Charleville, MS 117, fol. 102r–v; this constitutes pp. 302–3, 305–6, and 309–14 of Salmon's edition of the "Narratio de commendatione Turonicae provinciae." For discussion of this text, see Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin*, pp. 157–65, 306–8.

the monks even proclaimed that on the day of judgment Martin would recognize "both that he is our father, and we are his sons."³¹ Sons of St. Martin, the monks were also brothers to each other.

After the first quarter of the twelfth century, Marmoutier's worst enemies were psychological and spiritual, and its histories were addressed, primarily, to these enemies. Because they and their society were undergoing profound changes, and their world was becoming increasingly complex, the monks felt a need to recover an organic connection both with their past and with each other. They needed to convince themselves that they still were, and always had been, a community of St. Martin and that their community was actually a family, one whose intimacy could not be destroyed by change. The monks turned to their legendary past, elaborated it, and expressed themselves through it, not because they wanted to gain some kind of textual advantage over external rivals or enemies. Rather they desired to meet their deeper needs for meaning, order, and community.

³¹ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 12412, fol. 155v.