THE CLUNIAC ORDER UNDER ABBOT HUGH

1049 - 1109

by

NOREEN HUNT, B.A. (London)

Thesis submitted for the degree of

DOCTOR of PHILOSOPHY

in the

UNIVERSITY of LONDON

1958
ABSTRACT

St. Hugh the Great, 1024-1109, was sixth in a distinguished line of abbots who had made Cluny, founded in 909, famous.

During his abbacy, Ulrich and Bernard definitively recorded oral and written custom. The horarium, mainly liturgical, was already established, but growth in the order and considerable rise in numbers (causing notable building developments) had profound effects on the life of the abbey, whose privileges, especially as regards episcopal immunity, multiplied. The monastery was governed by an expanding body of administrative and disciplinary officials. Greater use of money, the increase of scattered resources, and heavier expenditure, characterised the economy of the period.

The greatest expansion of the order occurred under Hugh, though he tended to discourage it. A coincidence of factors caused monasteries to be founded or annexed in hitherto unpenetrated parts of France and Switzerland, and in Spain and Italy where the adoption of customs in
independent monasteries had already prepared the way. Cluniacs also went for the first time to England, what is now Belgium, Germany and even the Levant.

The beginnings of a system establishing a juridical link between Cluny and these monasteries appeared. Abbeys were reduced in rank to priories, except for some less fully incorporated. Dependent monasteries had, in turn, priories dependent on them. All monks made profession at Cluny and recognised Hugh as abbot; he controlled the appointment of abbots and priors. Annual payment of cens was not yet general. Once the spirit and basic pattern of life had been implanted, however, Cluny allowed dependent priories to develop with a reasonable measure of independence.

The foundation of Marcigny in 1054 marked the introduction of Cluniac nuns who were strictly enclosed and governed by Cluniac monks.

Hugh's abbacy was decisive, contributory and outstanding in many ways, though symptoms of later disasters were already apparent.
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### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albers</td>
<td>Consuetudines Monasticae, ed. B. Albers, quoted by volume and page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruel</td>
<td>A. Bernard and A. Bruel, Recueil des Chartes de l'Abbaye de Cluny, quoted by volume and number of charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cart.</td>
<td>cartulary. Preceded by the name of a monastery, indicates the cartulary of that monastery. A list of cartularies is included in the bibliography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congrèse</td>
<td>Congrès scientifique de Cluny, 1949.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDC</td>
<td>Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHG</td>
<td>Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Dictionnaire de Spiritualité.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTC</td>
<td>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farfa</td>
<td>Consuetudines Farfensis, ed. Dom B. Albers, Consuetudines Monasticae, vol. i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Gallia Christiana, ed. Benedictines of S. Maur, quoted by volume and column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrgott</td>
<td>Vetus Disciplina Monastica, ed. M. Herrgott.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L’Huillier  Dom A. L’Huillier, *Vie de S. Hugues, Abbé de Cluny*.

MG.SS  *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (Scriptores), ed. G.H. Pertz and others.


RB  *Revue Bénédictine*, Maredsous 1884 -


RM  *Revue Mabillon*, Ligugé 1905 -

Ulrich  *Udalrici, Consuetudines Cluniacensis*, PL 149, cols. 643-778.

Full details of these and other works cited in the thesis are given in the bibliography.
Professor Knowles, in *The Monastic Order in England*, draws attention to the want of an adequate study of the constitution of Cluny between 1050 and 1150 (1). This is surprising in view of the place Cluny held at that time. The outstanding personality of St Hugh, one of the leaders of the age, alone warrants attention and a modern biography is much needed. A study of Cluny is, however, the essential preliminary and it is generally agreed that his abbacy marked the apogee of Cluniac history. Moreover, the constitutional trends of the period were significant not only in the history of the order but in the development of monastic constitution as a whole, especially in the emergence of a system enabling a group of monasteries to function as one organism.


Looming as it does so large on the ecclesiastical horizon of the tenth and eleventh centuries and appealing to the imagination in its splendid liturgy and majestic buildings, the history of Cluny has been a happy hunting ground for romantic writers. At the outset, therefore, the historian is confronted with a mass of popular

literature which makes little real historical contribution but finds its way into every Cluniac bibliography.

Among historians there has been a preoccupation with what might be called the external history of Cluny in the tenth and eleventh centuries and this has led to a regrettable neglect of the decisive internal developments of the time. Even Sackur’s study, which remains the standard work for Cluniac history from the foundation to 1049, tends to deal with the monastic reform movements of the earlier period in general rather than the specific development of Cluny. (1) It also fails to depict clearly the constitutional trends of Odilo’s abbacy, 994-1049, the important prelude to that of Hugh.

Controversy over the relation of Cluny to Church reform has also been allowed to obscure objective historical study and some secondary works can almost be classed as polemic. Nineteenth century historians tended to attribute most of the so-called Gregorian Reform to Cluny’s inspiration and their claims were counteracted in the earlier part of this century by an equally exaggerated denial of the Cluniac contribution. Nor was this the last of such tendentious history, for it characterises the recent work of Dom Kassius Hallinger, whose two weighty

volumes—though a mine for detail about Cluniac life—are concerned with minimizing the influence of Cluny and extolling that of Gorze.(1)

Works purporting to be general histories of the order are disappointing, for they suppose a highly centralized system from the start and fail to convey any conception of constitutional development. The work of Pignot is out of date and in many ways unreliable.(2) The more recent study by Monsieur G. de Valous is rich in detail, especially as regards everyday life and the functions of the monastic officials, but the author has chosen too long a period and concentrates on the later defined form of the constitution.(3) The same applies to the few available English works. L.M. Smith's books should be used with great caution.(4) Dr. Joan Evans' The Monastery of Cluny 910-1157 is interesting and useful as far as it goes but the author herself has pointed out elsewhere that her


(3) Le monachisme clunisien des origines au XVe siècle, (3 vols. Paris, 1935). Monsieur de Valous himself told me that he would not consider a re-edition of his work as much of it would have to be completely rewritten.

(4) Cluny in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, (London 1930), and The early history of the monastery of Cluny, (Cambridge, 1920).
interest in Cluniac architecture led her to assemble the material for the book, which explains its 'general' nature. (1) One of the best constitutional studies, that by Dom J. M. Besse, 'L'Ordre de Cluny et son gouvernement' is an excellent examination of the later defined system, but its gradual evolution is under emphasised, so that much of the work is irrelevant to the earlier period. (2)

In certain defined fields, however, there has been much sound study, and within the last thirty years a notable improvement has taken place, which is reflected in the standard of the papers read at the Cluniac congress in 1949. (3)

These marked a scholarly advance on those published on the occasion of the thousandth anniversary of the foundation. (4)

In archeology and architecture the best work has been done by English-speaking scholars. Dr. Joan Evans has produced two magnificent volumes replete with photographs and illustrations of Cluniac art and architecture. (5)


Professor K. Conant's studies of the abbey buildings at Cluny are a major contribution. (1) An examination of Cluniac manuscripts is also being made at present which will probably result in them being accorded a higher place than heretofore in the history of art. (2)

The economic history of the order is closely bound up with regional economic development, and here the widespread nature of Cluny's possessions creates many difficulties. Perhaps the most contributory work in this field is the careful editing of so many monastic cartularies. We are also fortunate in having a recent detailed study of that part of Burgundy where Cluny is situated which provides a good background for the two works of Monsieur de Valous on the internal economy of the abbey. (3) German scholars, like G. Schreiber, have made penetrating studies of the relation of monastic reform to social and economic history. (4)


(2) I owe this information to Professor F. Wormald and Dr. H. Buchthal.

(3) G. Duby, La société aux Xle et XIIe siècles dans la région maconnais, (Paris, 1953). G. de Valous, Le domaine de l'Abbaye de Cluny aux Xe et XIIe siècles (Paris, 1925); and Le temporel et la situation financière des établissements de l'ordre de Cluny du XIIe au XIVe siècles, (Paris, 1938).

A few short but valuable articles on Cluniac liturgy have appeared of late, but this field has been considerably neglected despite its importance and the abundance of material.(1)

Other studies from various aspects also contribute to a history of Cluny during Hugh's abbacy. These are listed in the bibliography and some — such as those concerning customaries or cartularies — are discussed in conjunction with sources. Special mention should be made, however, of Dr. G. Letonnelier, who has examined thoroughly Cluniac exemption, and Professor M.D. Knowles who has depicted the trends of Cluniac history in a masterly fashion in different works, not all dealing specifically with Cluny.(2)

Few secondary works discuss the Cluniac dependent monasteries with any consistency, for whereas the history of the abbey of Cluny belongs to European history, the Cluniac monasteries have their place in local history. But a study of the constitution is concerned with both.

Innumerable monographs of unequal value on individual monasteries exist. They range from the local guide book

---


compiled with greater or lesser accuracy (usually lesser) to the scholarly introductions to edited cartularies. Generally speaking, where such an introduction exists, as for St Martin des Champs, La Charité-sur-Loire, Ste. Foi de Morlaas, Barbezieux, Domène, and others, it is the best secondary writing available. (1) Nevertheless, little attention is paid to the relations of the monasteries with Cluny. Such neglect is significant in view of the emphasis that is continually placed on the supposed over-centralised Cluniac system.

There are also a few territorial studies, such as those of Miss Rose Graham and Dom L. Guilloreau for England, which are useful in establishing the dates of the various foundations but constitutionally are more valuable for the later period. (2) Dom B. Egger's study of the Swiss priories and Dom L'Huillier's monograph on the Italian houses are among the best studies on the order as they give an integrated picture. (3) A series of excellent notices on individual

---

(1) A list of cartularies is provided in the bibliography p.360.


Italian priories has been written from an architectural point of view and helps to establish foundation dates. Unfortunately these articles are scattered in a number of obscure Italian periodicals.(1) Regional studies also exist for Poland and the diocese of Liège, and tentative articles have appeared on the Cluniacs in Spain, a field that still requires much work.(2)

2. Problems in Cluniac History

A survey of secondary works makes it apparent that the history of the order has still to be written, especially in certain aspects such as its liturgy and the development of the constitution. The obstacles in the way of filling these gaps should, however, be considered. Some of the difficulties arise from the very nature of Cluniac history and concern the earlier rather than the later period. All these problems are present in a study of Hugh's abbacy.

(1) By D. San Ambrogio. They have not been of use in this study, but further references to them will be found in Dom L'Huillier's article quoted in the last footnote.

The dispersal of the Cluniac archives was a tragedy for the historian. Before its destruction, the library of Cluny was one of the richest in Europe, and this is illustrated by the fact that in 1431 the Council of Basle requisitioned from Cluny the texts for the use of the assembly. In 1560, however, the abbey was threatened by Huguenots and part of the archives were transported to Auxerre and Lourdon for protection. Despite the precautionary measures, the Huguenots sacked the monastery in 1562, destroyed a large number of books, and carried off some manuscripts to Geneva. The French Revolution wrought even greater ravages which proved permanent. As the monks scattered in face of the onslaught they took with them some of the archives, but the rest were destroyed in the deliberate destruction of the monastery by the revolutionaries. Some charters eventually found their way to the municipal library at Cluny and some to Switzerland. A few even came to England and the British Museum, though how they got there is not known. (1) The greater part was preserved in Paris and a movement was started there to reassemble the existing Cluniac archives.

(1) B.M. add. charters, 1533-96. They are not of great importance and have been edited among the other Cluniac charters. They are all of a later date than that with which this work is concerned.
This has had some success and most of the known Cluniac manuscripts are now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, though they are still accumulating. (1) Numerous though they are, they represent only a fraction of the whole.

The archives of most of the French Cluniac monasteries suffered a like fate. Nor was dispersal confined to France, for the archives of the Italian monasteries have nearly all disappeared. It is possible that some may come to light with the more careful classifying of local archives, many of which, like those of Spain, have still to be explored.

On the whole, this problem is less acute for the later period. The archives of S. Martin des Champs in Paris have been largely preserved in the Archives Nationales. As this monastery later became one of the important administrative centres of the order, material concerning other monasteries was kept there. The seventeenth century Maurists also rendered great service in copying so many French monastic documents. Most of their writings have survived and are in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. A careful examination of them would yield much

---

(1) See L. Delisle, Inventaire des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds de Cluny, (Paris, 1884). The list of nouvelles acquisitions should also be consulted at the Bibl. Nat. Professor J. Richard's article in Congrès summarises the state of the sources.
information about Cluniac dependent monasteries, even in Hugh's abbacy and earlier. Unfortunately, the revised catalogue of Latin manuscripts is not complete, and any examination on a large scale is difficult. (1) Much is being achieved by members of the École des Chartes in the editing of cartularies, preserved either in copies or in the original, but it is to be regretted that there is no means of discovering precisely what has been published. (2)

A thorough study of Cluniac dependent monasteries would necessitate a careful searching of all departmental archives. Apart from the magnitude of the task, it is complicated by uncertainty about the identity of Cluniac houses, and the fact that these monasteries are rarely classified in the Cluniac category.

This difficulty of identification is one of the largest problems facing the historian, and probably accounts for the want of an accurate account of the development of the order. It seems unlikely that an adequate list of monasteries could be compiled, due to the scarcity and scattered nature of the necessary evidence, the penumbra of quasi-Cluniac houses

---

(1) At the time of writing only four volumes have appeared, describing manuscripts lat. n 1-3013. At this rate it will be some time before the Maurist manuscripts are fully described.

(2) An annual publication of the institute, the Position des Thèses summarises theses presented by students. No copy of these is retained however, and no record of published theses is kept, though many of them are editions of cartularies that are later published privately.
whose constitutional relations with the abbey were erratic, the disappearance without trace of a number of monasteries, and finally the fact that many monasteries were constitutionally bound to Cluny only for a time - a longer or shorter period of their existence. No official list seems to have been made before the introduction of General Chapters, so for the greater part of the first three centuries of the order's history each historian must compile his own list from papal bulls and charters.(1)

The question of names is, in itself, formidable. Monasteries sometimes changed their names or received a new patron, often St Peter, when given to Cluny, and are referred to under a variety of French or Latin titles. In some charters and bulls it is not always clear whether the word "ecclesia" refers to a small priory or a parish church. Spellings are also confused, especially in the papal bulls, whether by the scribe or editor is not known. Sometimes the mistakes are obvious, but there are examples - as in the case of some of the Italian monasteries - in which it is impossible to identify houses.(2) The creation of new dioceses and the alterations of boundaries adds to the problem of location and identification. The discrepancy

---

(1) See bibliographical note on lists of houses and maps p.355.

(2) See L'Huillier, loc. cit. p. 23.
between modern and medieval place names is a further difficulty. Thus, it is anachronistic to speak of Switzerland or Belgium in the eleventh century, but as historians have used modern territorial terms in discussing Cluniac expansion, I have done the same and employed modern place names, and even English equivalents where these exist and are accepted.

The widespread nature of the order and the vastness of its history are in themselves an indication of the equipment necessary for so colossal a task as a history of the development of Cluny. Moreover, the dying out of the order meant that its history has been more neglected than that of other Benedictine congregations and communities whose best historians are usually produced from their own ranks. Polemic concerning Cluny's relation to Benedictinism obscured the real issues, for Cluny seems to have been something of an "ugly duckling", an embarrassment to many Benedictine writers, on account of the particular constitutional development of the order.

Such problems may account for the hitherto haphazard nature of Cluniac studies. Even among those who are studying Cluniac history there is little correlation of approach. Some of the most valuable research is hidden in obscure or local reviews that are hard to come by.
Although work on the order must be done territorially, adequate results cannot be hoped for until a more systematic approach is made. Ideally speaking, team work similar to that now being used for the history of Parliament would be desirable.


This thesis is a constitutional study of the abbacy of St. Hugh the Great, 1049-1109. The choice of a period coinciding with his rule provides some measure of unity in the investigation. Moreover, the abbot's vital influence is one of the most important factors to be considered since the character and policy of each abbot was decisive in the early history of Cluny and Hugh's personal background, his character, his conception of his vocation, and the responsibility he accepted, largely account for the particular nature of the developments of the period.

The thesis falls into two broad divisions. The first deals with the abbey of Cluny itself, and aspects of internal history such as the horarium, the reception of candidates and their training, structure of the community, administrative and economic organisation, are considered from the constitutional standpoint.
The second part of the work attempts to define the nature of the order during Hugh's abbacy. This presents difficulties, as no written constitution existed and much study of individual Cluniac monasteries is required. It is here that the want of a list of houses is particularly felt, though in any case their number is prohibitive. A regional survey would not have availed, since position was often a factor in the relationship between Cluny and dependent priories and conclusions drawn from a study of the monasteries of one area are irrelevant to another district. Accordingly, I have sought to examine the history of as large a number of monasteries as possible, regardless of their position. It has not been possible to delve into the history of every single house, and for the most part I have confined myself to printed sources and relied on good monographs, especially those supported by pièces justificatives. This does, I think, give a fair picture and if not complete in all details, it is probably correct in its general conclusions. As more material presents itself—and the task is endless—more interesting facts tend to appear to support rather than to modify what has already emerged.

A brief study of Marcigny and Cluniac nuns is also included, as they first appeared during Hugh's abbacy and were henceforward part of the order.
In the last chapter, a contribution is made towards an assessment of the Cluniac order under Abbot Hugh. This is based on internal evidence and is in no way comparative with other reform movements. Nor does it extend to an examination of Cluniac influence outside the order.

The method pursued throughout has been the combined study of such legal documents as existed in the eleventh century — bulls, charters and customs — and the study of practice, as revealed by persons and in events. This is particularly necessary, a time when definition was still being framed.

The limitations of the work are obvious. A study of Cluny or its abbot in the eleventh century brings one into close contact with all the main currents of the age. But it is impossible in a work of this nature to deal adequately with such themes as Hugh's place in the Church and his relations with the secular world of emperor, kings and nobles, except in so far as they directly affected Cluniac development. Other aspects of life at Cluny have also been by-passed, including customs as regards food and clothing, art and architecture, structure of the liturgy. These topics have a less direct bearing on the
constitution and information about some of them is available elsewhere. (1)

4. Sources

(1) St. Hugh's Writings.

The personal traces that St. Hugh left for the historian are surprisingly few, especially when his achievements and his influence and position in the critical events of European history during his abbacy are considered. References to letters that have not survived indicate what has been lost in this respect, for from what must have been a voluminous correspondence only a handful of letters remains. All of them have been edited and few as they are they reveal something of Hugh's activity, his conception of monasticism, and his approach to men, for they were written to a variety of persons: popes, secular rulers including the Emperor and the kings of France and Spain, Cluniac monks, and St. Anselm. (2) Occasionally the letters afford a glance

(1) See the first section of this chapter where available literature is surveyed.

(2) Most of the letters are edited in the Bibl. Cl. and PL 159. References to them will be found throughout the text. The letters to St. Anselm are in PL 159, cols. 210 and 241.
of his own deep spirituality, as in the letter written to his monks before he died, and that addressed to the nuns of Marcigny. (1)

Apart from an exhortative sermon in honour of St. Marcel, some statutes, and references to a life of Our Lady that has not survived, there is no other evidence of writings by Hugh. (2) It is possible, however, that he composed some of the prayers that occur in the customaries written during his abbacy, though these may well have belonged to the oral tradition of Cluny.

(ii) Vitae.

The vitae of Hugh are equally disappointing. Unfortunately he had no Eadmer as his companion to record for posterity the doings of his long and active life. This is partly accounted for by the fact that Hugh stood very much alone, as much from choice as from necessity and no one figures frequently or for any length of time as his companion. This, added to the scarcity of his own writings, leaves historians very poor indeed. The

(1) PL 159, cols. 947 and 950.

(2) Mostly in PL 159 and Bibl. Cl. Statutes are referred to in appropriate places in the thesis.
biographies that do exist follow the traditional
hagiographical pattern with its aim of edification.
In each of them the sanctity of the saint's youth, his
entry to and early life in the cloister, his holy death
and the events surrounding it, and finally a collection
of miracles alleged to have been worked through his
intercession are related in much the same order. Such
narratives are not without historical value, since they
show that the memory of the subject was cultivated, but
their contribution to a constitutional study is almost
negligible beyond the provision of evidence concerning
Hugh's parentage, his character, and certain events in
his career.

The authorship and dates of these vitae have been the
subject of some discussion and controversy in the past but
owing to their relatively slight importance in this study
it is not proposed to devote much space to their examination.(1)
The conclusions of T. Schieffer, whose work on the subject
is the most recent, may be summarised except for a

(1) A summary of this discussion can be found in the article
by T. Schieffer, 'Notice sur les vies de S. Hugues de
The other main works, now superseded, are: R. Neumann,
De Sancto Hugone Abbate VI Cluniaeense (Vratislav, 1870),
and R. Lehmann, Forschungen zur Geschichte des Abtes
Hugo I von Cluny (Göttingen, 1869).
suggestion as to the author of an anonymous vita. Four biographies and two excerpts have come down to us:

1. Epistola Gilonis de Vita Sancti Hugonis Cluniacensis Abbatis.(1)

This was probably written c1120.(2) It is the most important of the biographies, being the longest and the fullest. It is written in a very flowery style and seems to have been composed independently of the other vitae and, as the author indicates, was written in Rome at the request of Abbot Pons. Cilo was probably a monk at Cluny and in 1121 became Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum. He followed the anti-pope, Anacletus II, but died reconciled to the Church in 1142, having been legate in Palestine.(3)

2. Vita auctore Hildeberto Cenomanensi Episcopo.(4)

This was also composed at the request of Pons, as is stated in the prologue, where Hildebert also refers to Gilo and Ezelo as predecessors in the field. Schieffer suggests c1121 as the date of writing.

(1) In L'Huillier, pp. 574-618.
(2) Schieffer, loc. cit., p. 86.
(3) ibid. pp. 85-7.
Gilo's vita has clearly been used as a basis and the material is much the same, save for the addition of one anecdote referring to Hildebert himself and occasional alteration in the order of narration. It is difficult to decide why Hildebert, Bishop of Le Mans 1097-1125, should have been asked to write a life, unless as one of the literary figures of the time he was approached to prepare the lessons for the office of Hugh who was canonised in 1120. That Hildebert knew Hugh is learned from a letter to the abbot congratulating him on his safe return from Rome and asking him for prayers. (1)

3. Epistola Hugonis Monachi. (2)

This is partly in the form of a letter to Pons, and was probably written at the end of 1121 or the beginning of 1122. The canonisation of Hugh in 1120 when Pope Calixtus II visited the abbey is described in the introduction. The author relates that the pope, dissatisfied with the documents concerning Hugh's life, asked to see personal witnesses. This is an interesting and early example of a canonisation

(1) Hildebert's writings are edited in PL 171; his letter to Hugh is in Col.287.

(2) Bibl. Cl. cols. 437-47; PL 159, cols. 916-23; Acta SS April III cols. 665-67
enquiry on the part of the pope, when the beginnings
of a recognised process were being established and
popular canonisations were coming to an end. (1)
Hugh the Monk is himself careful to quote the source
of his information and names the witnesses of events
he recounts. He refers to the existence of previous
vita e which he wishes to supplement. Hugh was
certainly a monk under Pons but as the name was a
common one at Cluny speculation about his identity
would be unwise.

4. Vita auctore Raynaldo Abbate Vezeliacensi. (2)
Raynald, a nephew of Hugh, spent his early years at
Cluny and became successively prior of Marcigny,
Abbot of Vezelay 1106–1123 and Archbishop of Lyons
1123–1128, so the vita was written before 1123. He
states as his motive for writing the wish to clarify
what others – whom he does not name – have written
in a more florid style. He adds that he does not
wish to offend them but some of the monks were
anxious that he should write. There is no mention
of Pons and one wonders if there is in Raynald's
prologue just the faintest suggestion of the divisions

(1) See E.W. Kemp, Canonization and Authority in the Western
is mentioned on p. 70ff.

(2) PL 159, cols. 893–905; Acta SS April III cols. 656–61.
that were so soon to be openly declared at Cluny. Raynald supplies a few personal details about Hugh with which as a relative he was familiar.

5. **Anonymous Vita.**

Schieffer calls this **Anonymous II**, suggests it was written before 1130 and explains additional material not found in other **vitae** by saying that the author had Ezelo's biography to hand. (2) The only reference to Ezelo's **vita**—usually considered as lost—is found in Hildebert's prologue. (3) I submit that Ezelo is the author of this so-called anonymous **vita**: there is no reason to suppose he is not.

The historian must depend on internal evidence as no contemporary manuscripts are available to supply palaeographic proof. The inclusion of some material similar to that in the writings of Gilo, Hildebert and Raynald, does not of necessity place the **vita** after these. It could well have been written before, and away from Cluny, perhaps at Vezelay. This would explain identical passages in this and

---

(1) Bibl.Cl. cols. 447-62. It is also edited, but with many omissions, in PL 159 cols. 923 ff. and in Acta SS April III cols. 668 ff.

(2) loc. cit. p. 97.

(3) Bibl.Cl. col. 414: "...post amplioris literaturae viros, Ezelonem loquor et Gilonem."
Raynald's biography and would also account for Gilo's independence of style and Hildebert's knowledge of its existence even if he had no access to it. The introduction is abrupt, unlike that of the other lives, and it is possible that part of it has been lost, particularly as there is no reference to Hugh's early life. The writer simply says that many things happened at Cluny under Hugh worthy of note, both to the honour of the abbot and for the edification of his sons - a sufficient motive for any hagiographer. In view of the apologetic character of most of the prologues, the absence of any reference to other writings is significant.

This vita provides information about St. Peter Damian's visit to Cluny, Hugh's relations with William the Conqueror, and some trouble with the Bishop of Macon that is not recorded by the other writers. Ezelo was a canon of Liège before coming to Cluny and in a letter to the Bishop of Liège, Peter the Venerable speaks with great praise of the former canon and two of his companions who had also become monks of Cluny.(1)

(1) PL 189, col. 230.
6. **Anonymous A.**

This fragment has received some attention so should be mentioned though it is of no use to the historian of Hugh's abbacy. Miss L.M. Smith who found the fragment among the manuscripts of the British Museum has suggested that Ezelo was the author. (1) Schieffer refutes this by drawing attention to the fact that the verses at the end of the fragment are incomprehensible without the existence of other vitae. He puts forward the hypothesis of its forming an introduction to Anonymous II. (2) But even supposing the introduction to the latter is missing there is enough of it to make the insertion of Anonymous A difficult. It is more likely to be a summary of other vitae, like another so-called epitome of the writings of Gilo and Ezelo which is in fact a summary of Gilo's biography and irrelevant for our purposes. (3)

---

(1) L.M. Smith, 'Ezelo's life of Hugh of Cluny', in *English Historical Review*, vol. xxvii (1912) pp. 96-101. The fragment is edited at the end of the article.

(2) loc. cit., pp. 100 f.

(3) PL 159, cols. 910 ff.; Acta SS April III cols. 662 ff.
These, and a poem of Peter the Venerable, which adds nothing new, are the sum of writings on Hugh. (1)

Even if Ezelo is not the author of Anonymous II it is unlikely that another vita in this tradition would add anything of great value and it remains true that "of all the biographies of the early abbots of Cluny those of Hugh are the most disappointing, the more when we consider that he lived when the monastery was at the height of its prosperity and that his rule lasted sixty years during which the struggle between Church and Empire had convulsed Europe." (2)

(iii) Charters and papal bulls.

The historian is richer as regards charters which form one of the main sources for the early history of the order. Indeed, the survival of so many of the original charters as well as the early cartularies resulted in the Cluniac archives forming the basis of all cartulary study. (3) Most of the documents belonging to the period before 1300 have been carefully edited by

(1) Bibl. Cl. col. 465.
(2) L.M. Smith, loc. cit., p. 98.
Bernard and Brueil, and their work is being continued by Professor Richard of the University of Dijon.\(^{(1)}\) There is still much to be done on the diplomatic and paleographic aspects of the charters, and an index is badly needed, but the printed charters can be relied on for the internal evidence they supply.\(^{(2)}\)

But the dates to which they are ascribed should be received with caution, for many of them are incorrect. Thus, of the 169 charters previously ascribed to Berno's abbacy, (909-26), only twenty-nine really belong to that period, and to Odo's abbacy, (926-44), belong only 120 of the supposed 268, which gives some idea of the pitfalls awaiting the unwary. Approximate dates of greater accuracy have been established by Chaume in a series of articles in the *Revue Mabillon*.\(^{(3)}\)


\(^{(2)}\) ibid. vol. i: A detailed survey of the state of the Cluniac charters and cartularies, and a full account of the documents used in the printed edition are given in the introduction to the first volume. A recent summary of the subject is contained in the article by J. Richard, 'La publication des chartes de Cluny', in Congrès, P.155 ff.

Unfortunately he was unable to complete this vast task of examining so many thousand charters and had hardly begun to work on those of Hugh's abbacy. It is agreed, however, that the problem of dating is not so acute in this period and later. Moreover, Chaume's conclusions were mostly based on internal proof, and if the same system is used it is not difficult to recognise those charters clearly belonging to Hugh's abbacy, and they are sufficiently abundant to make the omission of a few doubtful ones no great loss.

A great many of these charters are foundation or annexation charters of dependent monasteries, or copies of documents belonging to them. Many cartularies of Cluniac houses have also survived and a number of them have been carefully edited, mostly under the auspices of the École des Chartes, sometimes called the headquarters of paleography. There is still a treasury of material, especially seventeenth and eighteenth century copies, in the Bibliothèque Nationale and Archives Nationales in Paris, but so many edited sources have not been utilised that I have mostly confined myself to them. (1)

Papal bulls are of particular value as they mark the stages of constitutional development and the expansion of constitutional development and the expansion of

(1) A list of cartularies is included in the bibliography. See also p. 10 ff.
the order. A seventeenth-century Benedictine, Dom Simon, assembled and edited the most important of them in a rare book which seems to be unavailable in this country.(1) Apart from insertions in a bull of Pope John XI, 931, which have been proved apocryphal, they can be relied on for a constitutional study, though in some respects, as in the case of the list of monasteries contained in some of the bulls, it has been suggested they could have been better edited.(2) As it is, Simon's collection has been the main source for later editions because some of the originals have not survived.

(iv) Customaries.

Customaries form the other main source for Cluniac constitutional history. These have been surprisingly neglected despite the wealth of their contents. Dom Bruno Albers started modern editing, and a number of the documents in his Consuetudines Monasticae are Cluniac, including three tenth century fragments and the so-called

(1) P. Simon, Bullarium Sacri Ordinis Cluniacensis, (Lyon, 1680).

Consuetudines Farfensis. (1) It has been proved that
the last named were in fact the customs of Cluny and
were written between 1042 and 1049. (2) Work has been
done on the relation between these early documents and
those of Bernard and Ulrich, written during Hugh's
abbacy. (3) The latter wrote in 1079 or a little before,
as his work was used by William of Hirsau who wrote a
customary for his monastery in 1079. (4) Bernard wrote
after Ulrich, probably between 1083-88. (5) It is hoped
that a critical edition of these two customaries will
be prepared, as we are dependent on seventeenth century
editions which reproduce what was probably a "received"
text, and no indication of later interpolations is
given. (6) Albers was preparing an edition of Bernard's

(1) (5 vols. Stuttgart, 1900 and Monte Cassino, 1905-12)
(2) See V. Mortet, 'Note sur la date de rédaction des coutumes
de Cluny, dites de Farfa', in Milénaire.
(3) See below, Cap.III, section 1, p. 51ff. and H.R. Philippeau,
'Pour L'histoire de la coutume de Cluny', in RM vol.xxii
(1906) pp. 260-67; Dom B. Albers, Untersuchungen zu den
ältesten Mönchsgewohnheiten X - XI Jahrhundert, (Munich,
1905); Dom U. Berlière, 'Les coutumiers monastiques' in
(5) ibid.
(6) See Philippeau, loc. cit.
customary, which was never published, but plans are afoot at St. Anselm's in Rome to continue the editing of monastic customaries. (1)

Few customaries of Cluniac dependent monasteries have survived. With one exception they are all copies of Bernard or Ulrich and vary considerably in date, only one or two of them belong to Hugh's abbacy. (1a)

Nor is it always known whether they belonged to dependent monasteries or houses that had adopted Cluniac customs without joining the order. Mention should be made of one early twelfth century copy of Ulrich's customary, as some of its folios are annotated. (2) The notes mostly refer to minor liturgical rubrics observed at St. Martial of Limoges, from there the manuscript probably came.

The one customary that is not a copy of Ulrich or Bernard is that written in the early twelfth century at

(1) This scheme includes Cluniac customaries. Albers' manuscript (Herrgott's text of Bernard collated with mss. S. Maria Monte Reggio, no. 29) is in the possession of Professor F. Wormald.

(1a) The only ones I have located are the following:

- Bibl. Nat. ms. lat. 2208 (2) and ms. lat. 18353; (both Ulrich);
- ms. lat. 13875 (Bernard, early 12th century);
- ms. lat. 2431 (Bernard, end of 14th-beginning of 15th-century);
- ms. lat. 942 (Bernard, 17th century copy);
- Liège, Bibl. Un. no. 1420. See also J. Stiennon, 'Cluny et S. Trond au XIIe siècle', in Anciens Pays et assemblées d'États, vol. viii (Louvain, 1955) pp. 57-86, where other mss. are cited.

(2) Bibl. Nat. ms. lat. 2208 (2). Annotations are on fo. 173 ro.- 188vo.
St. Benedict's Polirone, or one of its dependencies.(1)

A monk of the monastery who had spent some time at Cluny learning the ordo compiled the work when he returned, using Ulrich and Bernard as a basis and incorporating local custom. The customary is of the utmost importance in a study of the Cluniac order, and the recent discovery of the manuscript at Padua leads to the hope that more of the same kind will be found when departmental archives are searched with the Cluniac dependent monasteries in mind.

There are references to other manuscripts that have been lost and among these it is probable that one, belonging to Sahagun in Spain, was not a mere copy of Ulrich or Bernard but was written in the same way as the Polirone customary. It was seen by a seventeenth century Benedictine, Yepez, who remarked on its resemblance to Ulrich, which suggests that it had its differences.(2)

---


(2) See Perez, Los monjes españoles, vol. ii, p. 444.
The only other references to lost customaries that I have come across seem to concern copies of Ulrich or Bernard, one belonging to Bermondsey, and another to Crema which was not a Cluniac dependency. (1)

(v) Miscellaneous Sources.

Cluniac liturgical manuscripts make a relatively slight contribution to a constitutional study, beyond providing some evidence of the influence of Cluny on the observance of dependent monasteries. Sources for a study of the structure of the liturgy abound, however, and if liturgical books are scarce, the customaries teem with references to the various services. (2) An eighteenth century collection of classified liturgical decrees exists which is a mine of information on the development of the liturgy at Cluny from the time of Ulrich and Bernard onwards. (3)


(2) See the article on Cluniac manuscripts in DAC, s.v. Cluny. Others have since been discovered and are at the Bibliothèque Nationale, where the nouvelles acquisitions, fonds de Cluni, should be consulted.

(3) Arsenal, ms. no. 637.
Some of the twelfth century sources which indicate the state of Cluny in that period should also be considered with reference to Hugh's abbacy, since they illustrate certain tendencies that must have emerged gradually, some of them in the eleventh century. The main writings to be considered are: the reforming decrees of Peter the Venerable, his correspondence with St. Bernard on the subject of criticisms against Cluny by members of the Cistercian order, and the facetious piece of pamphleteering written in the form of a dialogue between a Cluniac and Cistercian voicing criticism of the way of life at Cluny and abuses that prevailed at the abbey. (1)

Besides the sources that relate directly to Cluny and the order, important references abound in the general sources of the age: the letters of popes, kings and other leaders of the age; the vitae of the saints, including the Cluniacs Ulrich, Morandus and Anastasius; the cartularies and chronicles of the great monasteries of Europe; and miscellaneous writings such as the account

(1) Peter the Venerable's writings have been edited in PL 139; and Bibl. Cl. The Dialogus inter Cluniacensem monachum et Cisterciensem is in Martene, Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum, (vol. v. Paris 1717).
of St. Peter Damian's visit to Cluny in 1063. The variety and number of these references is enough to indicate that Cluny played a major part in the history of the eleventh century. It is not surprising, therefore, that the period was one of the most critical in the whole history of the order, and decisive of future development, constitutional and otherwise.

(1) Vita Udalrici, MG. SS. xii, pp. 249-267; Vita Anastasii, PL 149, cols. 423-36; Vita Morandi Bibl. Cl. cols. 501-6; De Gallica profectione Domni Petri Damiani, PL 145, cols. 865-880.
In 909 Duke William III of Aquitaine determined to realise his desire of founding a monastery where monks would serve God according to the Rule of St. Benedict. (1) At the time monasticism was at a low ebb. Abuses—especially secularization—prevailed within, and the political chaos of the ninth century disturbed from without.

In the light of future events, the duke's foundation at Cluny marked the beginnings of a revival that was eventually to extend to the whole Church. Similar significant stirrings were to take place elsewhere, as at Gorze c933 and Brogne c920 in Upper and Lower Lorraine respectively, but it is fair to say that ultimately Cluny became the most famous centre and was probably the most influential. (2)

No such future was augured in 909. To all outward appearances Cluny was just another foundation in the monastic tradition with a somewhat stronger emphasis on regular observance than was at that time the norm. To this end, complete independence of all secular and

(1) The date 910 is frequently given for the foundation owing to an erroneous calculation of the indiction; see art. Cluny, DHGE vol. xiii, col. 40.

(2) Sackur, op. cit., gives a good account of the other centres of monastic reform and Cluny's relation to them.
ecclesiastical control was assured by placing the monastery directly under the protection of the Holy See - an ineffectual patronage at the time. (1)

But if Cluny was protected from the abusive tendencies of the age she was nevertheless placed immediately within the full stream of the monastic tradition. Of this tradition much has been written by others who are more competent. (2) Suffice it to say that the way of life instituted at Cluny by the foundation charter was that of the Rule of St. Benedict, but the life as it had been shaped in the centuries following the Patriarch.

Berno, the first abbot 909-26, was the living link with the past, for before coming to Cluny he was Abbot of Baume whose traditions were marked with the influence of Benedict of Aniane's significant interpretation of the Rule in the early ninth century which had been decisive in the development of tendencies towards less manual work and an expanding liturgy. More will be said about the

(1) For the foundation charter see Bibl. Cl. col. 16 and Joan Evans, The Monastery of Cluny, pp. 4-6.

(2) The introductory chapters of Knowles, The Monastic Order, provide an excellent bird's eye view of the development as well as indicating the best literature on the subject. Dom C. Butler's Benedictine Monachism should also be mentioned, especially cap. III on pre-Benedictine monasticism. To these may be added the more recent work of Dom Philibert Schmitz, Histoire de l'Ordre de S. Benoît, (7 vols. Maredsous, 1942-58).
Rule and customs in the appropriate place.  

Berno was invited by William to choose the site and the foundation was made in one of the Duke's favourite hunting grounds in a relatively peaceful part of Burgundy. Within a few years Cluny was being regarded as the centre of Benedictine orthodoxy, and though the circumstances already mentioned contributed to this they do not explain it. More contributory were the lives of Cluny's first six abbots, outstanding alike in holiness, ability and exceptional longevity, for their abbacies spanned two centuries. The early history of Cluny is indeed the history of its abbots so that the background to Hugh's reign is best learned from a brief survey of his five predecessors. 

Unfortunately little is known of the beginnings of Cluny under its first abbot, Berno, 909-926. He had been abbot of Gigny and Baume and retained the abbacy of these monasteries. There was as yet no idea of an

(1) See chapter II section 1, pp. 53 ff. 

(2) See Saackur, op. cit., Valous, Le monachism clunisienne, and Joan Evans, The Monastery of Cluny, for more details about the earlier period of Cluniac history than are given here. Pignot, op. cit., should be used with care, and in all cases treatment of the "order" of Cluny should be regarded with caution. The most recent summary of Cluniac history is that in the article of G. de Valous, Cluny, in DHGE, vol. xiii.

(3) See art. Berno, DHGE.
organised central government radiating from one house, though some historians have seen in the co-ordinated effort of a group of houses under the direction of one abbot the germs of future development. But this was not new and shortly before his death Berno appointed Odo to be his successor at Cluny, Massay and Déols, and his nephew Guy as his successor at Gigny, Baume and Mouthiers, showing there was no necessary link between the group of monasteries. (la)

Though Berno’s reputation was not as great as his successors, his ability as a monastic reformer meant that he was asked to reform other monasteries, which in no way came under his permanent government. A few land grants to Cluny in this period have been recorded but at Berno’s death the economic situation of the monastery seems to have been somewhat precarious as in his testament the abbot transferred land from other monasteries to Cluny because of the latter’s poverty. (l)

Odo, Abbot of Cluny 926-44, is sometimes said to have laid the foundations of Cluniac greatness since under him the abbey definitely became associated with the work of

(la) Berno’s testament is in Bibl. Cl. col. 9.

(l) ibid. “et cœtus paupior est possessione et numerosa fraternitate.”
monastic reform. His abbacy was characterised by intense and varied activity connected with this. He travelled widely in France and also in Italy where Alberic appointed him director of the monasteries of Rome. But though the Cluniac spirit was introduced into many houses, including famous ones like Fleury, there was no attempt to introduce affiliation, though in some of the reformed monasteries Odo was recognised as abbot.

In 931 Pope John XI granted a privilege to Cluny that was significant in raising the monastery to the leadership of the monastic world. Any monk or canon fleeing from his own monastery in search of a more regular observance could be received at Cluny, and the abbot had licence to reform any monastery handed to him for that purpose. (1) Odo also contributed much to the particular spirit of Cluny in laying, as it were, the moral foundations of the monastery in his writings on the monastic life, his Collationes. (2)

Little is known of his successor, Aymard of Angoulême who had been appointed coadjutor abbot two years before Odo's death in 944. Aymard also appointed a helper when after ten years as abbot he went blind and Maieul, coadjutor.

(1) Bull Cl. col. 1; PL 132, col. 1055.
(2) Bibl. Cl. cols. 159 ff.
in 954, succeeded Aymard in 965 and ruled till 994. Maieul was a leading figure of his age. He was a friend of the Emperor and the King of France and at one time refused the dignity of the papal chair. Grants of land to the abbey increased steadily and monasteries continued to be reformed. Some priories had already become directly dependent on Cluny: Romainmoutier was ceded in 929, Suaxillanges was peopled with Cluniacs under Aymard, and Payerne was founded in 962. But the number of annexations was far exceeded by those reformed by Maieul. Most of these remained independent. Some of them, like St. Benignus of Dijon reformed in 978, became in turn centres of further reform.

The long reign of Odilo de Mercoeur, 994-1049, brought to an end the first phase of Cluniac expansion and it is regrettable that we are without a detailed study of the constitutional trends maturing at his death. Some historians prefer to see under Odilo rather than under Hugh the greatest phase of Cluniac history and Odilo was wont to boast in the phrase of the Emperor Augustus that he had found Cluny wood and left it marble.\(^1\)

His reputation as a monastic reformer and leader of

\(^1\) Ibid. col. 1820, Vita Odilonis.
Christendom was so great that he was called the archangel of monks.(1) During his abbacy the number of monasteries in France subject to Cluny increased enormously and the provinces of Burgundy, Provence, Auvergne and Poitou were drawn into the Cluniac orbit. Many Italian monasteries were also reformed during Odilo's nine journeys to Italy, and infiltration into Spain began when Cluniac customs were adopted in some monasteries, though they retained their independence.

There has been much discussion as to which period was the most decisive in the evolution of the final centralised system that bound the dependent houses together. In general it can be said that the Cluniac abbots of the tenth century were only concerned to promote the spirit of monasticism and to remove abuses. They dissociated their work of reform from any idea of a sustained juridical link with Cluny. Consequently there was a complete unconcern with constitutional details or preserving a bond of connection with Cluny, which is proved by the number of monasteries which regained autonomy after a brief period of influence by Cluny.(2)

(1) ibid. col.1823. Fulbert of Chartres gave him the title.
(2) See Sackur, op.cit., vol.ii, p.439: "Die Reform hatte sich zuerst in voller Freiheit vollzogen; man war zufrieden wenn man die Hauptübel beseitigt hatte ... in nebensächlichen Dingen war man offensichtlich nachsichtig."
Things were much the same under Odilo and though there was an increasing tendency to annex houses that had been reformed, at least in France, there was still no attempt to systematise relations between Cluny and dependent priories or to create a structure. The person of the abbot was the focus of any link that existed and connection was only preserved in so far as personal contact with the abbot was maintained. Moreover, he acted less in his capacity of abbot of Cluny than the more personal mode of a monastic reformer.

At Odilo's death, Cluny stood as the greatest monastery in Europe, with numerous dependencies in France and the beginnings of an infiltration into Spain and Italy. The abbey was important not only in the ecclesiastical sphere but also in the political, where it had been the promoter of peace through the pactum Dei (an attempt to protect certain persons and properties, especially ecclesiastical, from violation) and the truga Dei (an extension of the pactum which sought to establish a truce during short fixed periods). In 1014 the Emperor Henry III visited Cluny and thus emphasised the patronage of the imperial house that was influential in the temporal well-being of Cluny. Odilo, like his predecessors, came from one of the important feudal families and his connections
were undoubtedly a factor in the influence he exerted in contemporary society.

In 1049 Cluny stood in a very different Europe from that which had witnessed the monastery's foundation in 909. Order was emerging from the chaos that had particularly characterised France, and those trends, political, social, economic and religious, were clearly discernible which, in their full maturity were to characterise the Europe of the later middle ages. The eleventh century has been described as a watershed in the history of thought and institutions: "It was a scene of great disorder, moral, social, and political, on a background of Saracen invasions and general distress". (1) But this is only part of the picture, for with the emergence of feudalism and its system of land tenure based on military service an ever more clearly defined series of hierarchical relationships was evolving, conducive to order on the one hand, and on the other, provocative of private wars between feudal lords.

The least weakened state in the West was that of Germany, where the Ottonian Empire had been founded in 962. The Emperors, who sought control over North Italy, had created an alliance with the Church the full results of which were to appear in the clash of the second half of

of the eleventh century. The disintegration of the Carolingian Empire had produced feudal anarchy in France, and lack of consolidation prevented the monarchy from being a force in European politics. Most of the nominal territories of the crown lay outside the area of direct control and there were frequent wars between the small kingdoms wherein the counts and dukes reigned supreme. Burgundy particularly was a scene of disorder. Normandy was rapidly becoming the best organised state in France, and England, enjoying a short period of consolidation after the Scandinavian invasions, was on the verge of the Norman Conquest. The Iberian peninsula was divided into a series of small kingdoms - Navarre, Aragon, Castile and Portugal, and the Moors still occupied large areas which were to become the object of the Spanish crusades in the period dealt with in this thesis.

In the East, the Byzantine Empire had just passed its zenith under the Macedonian Emperors and was to be faced with almost insoluble internal problems as well as formidable attacks from without. Byzantium still had a foothold in Italy, mainly in the South, but there was a growing rift between East and West which was gradually to effect the schism that has persisted into our own day.

All these factors had vital repercussions on the Church which at that time was closely bound up with the
destiny of Europe. The alliance of the German Emperors led to a virtual control of the papacy which, in the tenth century had been the tool of the Roman nobility. There was much interference in the appointment of bishops, but the growing independence of the popes, almost imperceptible in the first part of the eleventh century, prepared the way for a centralised papal government that developed decisively in the second half of the eleventh century and led to the clash between Empire and Papacy and the struggles of the investiture contest. Lay control in the Church was everywhere apparent and among the clergy simony and nicolaism were rife.

But the beginnings of the so-called Gregorian reform were undoubtedly present. Already in the tenth century there had been an airing of ideas on the subject and attempts at episcopal reform had been made, though the weakness of the papacy and consequent dispersal of effort meant that cohesion was lacking. In 1049, however, Leo IX ascended the papal throne and with his coming a declared policy of reform asserted itself. In the same year, Cluny received a worthy successor to Odilo in the person of Hugh, often called the Great.

He was the eldest son of Count Dalmatius of Semur in Brionnais, in the diocese of Autun. (1) On his father's side

---

(1) See genealogical tree in Marcigny cart. facing p. 241, (compiled by J. Richard).
Hugh was related to the Dukes of Aquitaine and the Counts of Poitou. Hugh's mother, Aremburge of Vergy, also belonged to one of the noblest families of Burgundy. Hugh had four brothers and four sisters, all younger than himself, and most of them married into other great families of France such as Bourbon-Lancy and Burgundy, one of his sisters becoming Duchess of Burgundy when she married Duke Robert I in 1045.

Count Dalmatius hoped that Hugh, born in 1024, would succeed to the estate and accordingly sought to train him for knighthood, contrary both to the capacity and inclinations of the boy, who seems to have been studiously inclined and was hopeless and clumsy in the pursuits proper to boys training for the knightly calling. (1)

His mother encouraged him in those things to which he was more attracted and undoubtedly she laid the foundation of his religious training. The disappointed father eventually consented to Hugh's departure for the monastery of S. Marcel at Chalon to be educated there. The boy's great-uncle who was his Godfather and also called Hugh, Count of Chalon and Bishop of Auxerre, 999-1039, had given the monastery to Cluny, of which he was a benefactor. Hugh could now give full rein to the inclinations of

piety and study that appear to have been strong from an early age. His biographers relate how he used to visit churches secretly and how he once made amends to a peasant robbed of a cow by his rougher companions. (1)

In 1038, despite many obstacles, especially the opposition of his father, he entered the novitiate at Cluny, then flourishing under St. Odilo. (2) When Hugh was accepted by the chapter, one of the older monks who discerned the quality of the young candidate was heard to say what a gift had been given to Cluny in Hugh. (3) He was probably professed in 1039 and ordained priest at the age of twenty in 1044. (4)

From the start he was distinguished by his extraordinary fervour, the example of which is said to have overcome the tepidity of others. His exceptional qualities of mind and soul marked him out, and to this was joined a striking physical appearance. Tall and well-built, his countenance reflected that inner stability and harmony which sprang

(1) *Vita auct. Hildeberto*, PL 159, col.360; *Bibl.Cl. col.415.*

(2) *Vita auct. Gilo*, L'Huillier, p. 577: "innumeris difficultatisbus superatis".

(3) *Vita auct. Gilo*, L'Huillier, p. 578: "O felicem Cluniacum, qui thesaurum hodie suscepit".

from single-mindedness of purpose that is the mark of the true monk. (1) Indeed, seeing him grow into so fine a manhood, even his obdurate father was reconciled to the idea of his son being a monk. Hugh was mortified himself - we are told he was given to fasting and night watches and he was wont to subject himself to the endurance of thirst - but he did not seek to impose on others his own austere standards, and though he was intolerant of wanton laxity, he sought to guide each one along the way best suited to the dispositions of the individual. The love of prayer and study, and the deep piety that had characterised him from his earliest years enabled him to preserve a balance and integrity in his long life of arduous, delicate, sustained, and widespread activity, and one feels that Hildebert has aptly described Hugh's person in the phrase (which would lose in translation): "Deum supra se, proximum tanquam se, res infra se, ordinata charitate diligebat". (2)

If the dates of Hugh's profession and ordination are a matter for conjecture, his early association with the government of the abbey is undoubted and at the age of

(1) Gilo describes him thus: (L'Huillier, p. 579): "Forma angelicus, moribus compositus, naturali incessu conspicuus, sermone non affectate suavis, et aliis hujusmodi charismatibus spectabilis...".
(2) Vita auct. Hildeberto, PL 159, col. 363.
twenty-two he was made grand prior, because it was judged that from the point of view of good administration, the discipline of the house, and its future, he was the most suitable. (1) As it turned out, the choice was justified and it was said of him in office that administration did not weaken piety, nor fervour hinder good management. (2)

In this position he must have received that training that was to stand him in good stead as abbot. He was responsible for the discipline of the community, the temporal affairs of the abbey, and the various officials of the monastery, and he also had to represent the abbot in his absence. The age and feebleness of Odilo, and his frequent absences made Hugh's priorship a very responsible term. Unfortunately we have few details concerning this period, though he himself confessed to his severity when he was elected abbot and begged the monks to reconsider their decision lest he be too strict. (3) The only incident related by his biographers is about Durannus, later Bishop of Toulouse. When the latter was a monk of Cluny he was severely reproved by Hugh on a number of occasions for levity which marred an otherwise blameless character.

(1) ibid. col. 862.
(2) ibid.: "nec administratio religionem minueret, nec religio administrationem impediret."
(3) Ulrich, col. 731.
The prior threatened that Durannus would pay for this in the next life if he did not correct himself. The story goes that after his death the good bishop appeared to a monk of Cluny requesting prayers for release from punishments for his earlier faults, whereupon Hugh — he was by that time abbot — ordered seven monks to keep silence for a week. At the end of the week Durannus again appeared, only six parts freed from his torments because one monk had spoken. When this had been remedied the bishop appeared a third time to announce his release. (1)

Hugh's efficiency as a diplomat was also revealed in these years. In 1048 he went as Odilo's representative on the difficult errand of pleading with the Emperor Henry III at Worms for the rights of the monastery of Payerne which were being infringed in some way. He was not only successful in his mission, but he won the friendship and the respect of the Emperor who, with his court, was amazed at the maturity of the young prior. (2)

News of Odilo's death reached Hugh as he was returning from Worms. He hastened to Cluny where he had a calming effect on the disturbed community. Odilo had not named his successor but had replied when asked about it that he

(2) Ann OSB vol. iv, col. 526: "Teutonicis mirantibus in juvenili aedus aetate tantum morum maturitatem."
left the matter in the hands of God and to the election of the monks. (1) Hugh was nominated by the claustral prior, an aged monk, and the nomination was unanimously approved: only Hugh dissented. A few months after his election when he, along with the other abbots and bishops present at the Council of Rheims, was interrogated on the validity of his election he gave the honest answer that though humanly speaking he might have desired the office, in spirit he had resisted all ambition, and had done nothing to influence the appointment. (2)

On the 22nd February, 1049, at the age of twenty-four, Hugh of Semur was consecrated by the Archbishop of Besançon and installed as sixth abbot of Cluny which he was to rule for sixty years.

---

(1) Jotsaldus, Vita Odilonis, Acta SS. OSS vol. 1, col. 606. Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 1, col. 731, where the election of Hugh is fully described.

(2) Labbe, Conciliorum Collectio, vol. xix, col. 738: "Pro adipiscendo abbatiae honore, Deo teste, nihil dedi vel promisi: quod quidem caro voluit, sed mens et ratio repugnavit."
The term constitution is understood here in its widest sense of the principles and characteristics of life of Cluny in all its aspects of the daily round, structure of the community, and government of the monastery. Its main features were present before Hugh became abbot and were for a great part already defined in written tradition. But the increasing importance of the abbey's position in contemporary society, the significance of the abbot in the Church, the spread of Cluniac influence, greater fame, the demands made on Cluny by the ecclesiastics of the day, and the responsibilities entailed in an increasing number of dependent houses, had far-reaching repercussions on the life of Cluny itself. Although the purpose of this chapter is the examination of the internal constitution of the monastery, these external aspects which were so influential should be borne in mind, and though some of them will be dealt with in later chapters, here they must be largely assumed.

1. Legal basis of the constitution.

From the beginning, the constitution of Cluny had a firm juridical basis, and the sources of legal sanction
and further authoritative definition were well established and clearly recognised. The foundation charter, which determined the mode of life to be lived in the new monastery, was directed to furthering the one end of enabling the monks to serve God without interference according to the Rule of St. Benedict. (1)

St. Benedict had welded the best in the cenobitic and eremitic traditions into the practical ideal of his Rule that had been the norm in Western monasticism for the greater part of the five centuries that had elapsed between the death of the patriarch and the accession of Hugh to the abbacy of Cluny. The Rule, a relatively short piece of writing, is a remarkable combination of constitutional legislation and profound spiritual principles. (2)

St. Benedict aimed at establishing a "school of the Lord's service" and described his code as "this little Rule for beginners". (3) He thought his aim best achieved

(1) Bibl. Cl. col. 1., and Joan Evans, The Monastery of Cluny.

(2) The most accurate edition of the Rule is that of Dom. B. Linderbauer, S. Benedicti Regula monasteriorum, (Bonn, 1928) Dom C. Butler's edition, S. Benedicti Regula, (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1912, 2nd ed. 1927) is also one of the most useful editions as he indicates the sources on which St. Benedict drew. I quote throughout from the edition of Dom J. McCann, The Rule of Saint Benedict, (London, 1952) which is the most easily obtainable critical edition.

(3) Regula, prologus: "Constituenda est ergo nobis dominici schola servitii." and lxxiii: "hanc minimam inchoationis regulam descriptam..."
in a regulated community life within the reach of all who had the genuine desire to become monks. Accordingly, he legislated for a monastery that was a unit, "completely self-contained and self-sufficient, both economically and constitutionally."(1) He prescribed an order of the day that varied according to season, and divided the monks' time into fixed periods of liturgical prayer - the Opus Dei to which nothing was to be preferred - spiritual reading, and manual work. Allowance was made for the presence of young boys dedicated from childhood to the monastic life by their parents or confided for education to the monks. The principles of formation in a preliminary novitiate probation were also elucidated and a code of punishment included.

The abbot was made the pivot of the community and St. Benedict devoted considerable space to describing his necessary qualities, his duties, (particularly those relating to the care of the souls confided to him), and his election. Provision was made for an assistant or prior, but St. Benedict, fearing division, plainly disliked the idea of an assistant superior. Other officials were also provided for, such as deans, each to have charge of

(1) Knowles, The Monastic Order, p. 4.
ten monks in a large community, a cellarer responsible for the temporals of the monastery, an infirmarian and others. Such details as food and clothing were also discussed, but allowance was made for regional differences, or other circumstances that might arise.

Though the Rule itself contained much deep instruction, it presupposed the formative writings of earlier spiritual writers, especially the Desert Fathers, and in the spiritual reading of the monks the Institutes and Conferences of Cassian were given a place second only to Scripture. St. Benedict did, however, indicate the chief ways of spiritual progress: prayer, silence, and the "tools of good works", a list of principles based on the first duties of the Christian (for he begins with the ten commandments) and ascending by the stages of the virtues to "that perfect love of God which casts out all fear."(1)

It is sometimes forgotten that this Rule remained at the root of life at Cluny, and nothing could replace it. Deviations there might have been, and the horarium, for one thing, had evolved into something far different from what St. Benedict had envisaged, but the Rule had been

(1) Regula vii: "Ergo his omnibus humilitatis gradibus ascensis, monachus mox ad caritatem Dei perveniet illum quae perfecta foris mittit timoram ...."
the starting point of all development and therein was
to be found the nucleus of all future expansion, even
of the over-weighted liturgy. Moreover, part of the
Rule was read daily at Chapter, and we have the witness
of those who have listened to it day by day testifying
to its formative influence. (1)

In their customaries, Ulrich and Bernard frequently
refer to the Rule as the ultimate standard. The questions
Abbot William of Hirsau asked Ulrich about the Cluniac
observance all queried its relation to the Rule, and
Ulrich used the questions as the framework for his
treatise. Had Cluny not claimed to follow St. Benedict,
much of the criticism levelled against her in the twelfth
century would have been obviated, as deviation from the
Rule was the theme of many of the complaints.

The Rule had provided scope for development and
definition in certain matters, and legislation on these
was gradually incorporated into the different "customs"
that distinguished one Benedictine monastery from another.
A considerable written tradition existed at Cluny before
Hugh became abbot. The oldest Cluniac customary that
has been preserved is that made under Odilo, between the
years 996-1030. (2) It is known that this was a redaction

(2) Albers, vol. ii, Consuetudines C. 
of two older customaries, one dating 964-94, and the other 996-1030. (1) The former of these rested on a still more ancient text whose traditions went back, through Baume, (Alma Mater of the first abbot of Cluny), to Benedict of Aniane and even earlier. (2) All these customaries were very short compared with the later ones and were mostly composed of liturgical rubrics.

A considerably longer and more important Cluniac customary was the document now known as the Constitutions of Farfa, written between the years 1042-49 of Odilo's abbacy. (3)

Of all the Cluniac customaries, those of Ulrich and Bernard, written between 1079-1088, were the most important. (4) Of the two, Bernard seems to have written with greater authority, though whether at the direct command of Hugh is not absolutely certain. (5) He states

(1) Albers, vol. ii., Consuetudines B. and B'.
(3) See above, p. 30.
(4) See above, p. 30.
(5) Bernard, p. 134: "operae pretium judicavi, si vestra mihi auctoritas imperaret..." and later, (p. 135): "Hoc itaque opusculo... a vobis accepta jussione impleto..." From these statements it would appear that in all probability Hugh suggested the compilation.
as his reason for writing that he wishes to clarify certain points on which controversy had arisen, though he does not specify which matters were being disputed. (1)

Like Ulrich, whose writings he had certainly seen, he produced a compendious record of Cluniac custom in respect of liturgy, regular discipline, and the officials of the monastery. Ulrich compiled his customary at the request of Abbot William of Hirsau who wanted to reform his monastery on Cluniac lines.

In point of fact, both received a legal approbation and became the accepted statement of Cluniac Benedictinism, of which they are usually regarded as "the" expression. Henceforward, alterations or additions were merely interpolated into a collated text of Ulrich and Bernard and even as late as the seventeenth century when a codification of the principal Cluniac customs was required, it was decided to reprint the writings of Ulrich and Bernard. (2)

An analysis of liturgical statutes of the same period used Ulrich and Bernard as primary authorities onto which later statutes were grafted. (3) Further proof of their authoritative weight is found in the fact that these texts were given to monasteries that desired to adopt

(1) ibid.
(3) Arsenal ms. 687
the Cluniac way of life, and customaries that were written in Cluniac dependent monasteries, if not copies, were based on them.(1)

Their importance for the constitution of Cluny lay in the establishment of those characteristics of Benedictine monachism regarded as peculiarly Clunian. They did not introduce changes, nor did they state new principles, but they confirmed those already maturing, and incorporated oral and written tradition into a definitive statement. They also marked an important stage in that codification that is an essential part of the development of monastic constitution.

St. Benedict had made the abbot the supreme legislator of the monastery, though he was subject to the Rule. There is ample evidence of legislation by the abbots of Cluny and the customaries are full of references to the statutes of various abbots concerning matters for which the Rule had not provided. Such statutes usually became part of the written tradition of the order since they had legal sanction within the monastery until specifically revoked by a later abbot. Written custom is, indeed, little else but legislation of past abbots. Only a few of the statutes of Hugh remain and they mostly concern minor liturgical points. He is occasionally

(1) See introduction pp. 31-3 and cap. V p. 295 ff.
referred to in the customaries as having introduced or altered certain things, and Peter the Venerable appealed to the example of Hugh as well as earlier abbots who had made changes to justify his own reforms. Hugh, however, cannot be described as a legislator and he himself left no distinct mark on the legally defined constitution of the abbey. The profound developments that took place during his abbacy were not in the juridical order, at least as regards the monastery of Cluny itself.

Oral tradition also had some legal weight, though Ulrich and Bernard wrote so exhaustively as to leave little room for its exercise. It was, however, one of Bernard's main sources, for he describes in his preface how he examined writings, and the opinions of older and experienced monks.

This accorded with St. Benedict's idea of attaching a certain importance to the seniors in the community, for he decreed in the Rule that in important business the abbot should consult all the brethren called together in

---

(1) PL 189, col. 1025: "... Sanato Odone usque ad... Hugonem... plurima suis temporibus, urgente tamen necessitate, utili semper causa mutasse."

(2) Bernard, p.134: "... ex his quae didiceram et discere possem, sententias veriores atque discretiores, quibus videlicet probabiliores et melius ordinem scientes personae testimonium darent, in unum volumen redigerem."
council, and for lesser matters concerning the monastery he should consult the seniors and follow their advice, though decisions rested with him. (1) The institution of Chapter, which had become a daily occurrence, could be devoted in part, if necessary, to the discussion of community matters. Occasionally there is a reference to Hugh's consultation with the monks before introducing new liturgical customs. (2)

In relations with society, both ecclesiastical and secular, and especially as regards temporals, juridical sanction was found in charters, which were generally recognised as legally valid documents. They mostly recorded grants of land, but they could have considerable constitutional significance - as in the case of the foundation charter. (3) At this period, the only definition of the relations between Cluny and dependent houses was contained in charters of foundation or annexation. Accordingly, these documents were carefully preserved and copied into cartularies, the first of which

(1) Regula, v.

(2) eg. Bibl. Cl. col. 464 (decree re. the Pentecostal liturgy): "decervit cum communi fratrum consilio. . . ."

(3) Bibl. Cl. col. 1.
at Cluny date from Odilo's abbacy. When so much depended on charters, the temptation to forge and interpolate was strong, and examples are not wanting at Cluny, as in the interpolation of a clause permitting Cluny to mint its own money in a bull of Pope John XI, which became the foundation of the later approved claims.

Of equal importance to the charters were papal bulls, the value of which increased as the authority of the papacy became more widely recognised and accepted. Bulls confirming land grants, rights over monasteries, and privileges, were sought from each pope, and therein is reflected not only the growing power and importance of Cluny, but also the slow evolution of a system binding the order together. From a constitutional point of view, however, charters and bulls were more relevant to the order than to the abbey of Cluny itself.

(1) See Bruel, vol. i, Introduction, for a detailed treatment of the Cluniac cartularies.

To ensure Cluny’s entire independence the founder renounced all his own rights over the place, forbade anyone, whether king, count, or bishop, to interfere with the monastery or its possessions in any way whatsoever (except in the case of the election of an unworthy abbot whereupon the bishop could act) and commended the abbey to the protection of the Apostolic See. (1) The weakness of the papacy at that time, however, meant that papal protection availed little. Its invocation in the foundation charter was not so much a recognition of papal authority as another gesture of Cluny’s independence of any temporal control, further symbolised by the dedication of the monastery to Sts. Peter and Paul. (2) The abbey was, in a very real way,

(1) Bibl. Cl. col. 3: "Neque aliquis Principum secularum, non Comes quisquam, nec Episcopus quilibet, non Pontifex supradictae sedis Romanae,... invadat res ipsorum Dei servorum...."

(2) Ibid. "...habeantque tuitionem ipsorum apostolorum, atque Romanum Pontificem defensorem..." but the pope is included among those who must respect the rights of the monastery: "...non Pontifex supradicta sedis Romanae... invadat res ipsorum Dei servorum..." St. Peter was the recipient of the donation: "res iuris mei sanctis Apostolis Petro velicet et Paulo de propria tradito dominione... ut in Cluniaco in honore sanctorum ap. Petri et Pauli Monasterium regulare construatur."
St. Peter's possession, and contemporary recognition of this fact is reflected in the charters of donations, and Cluny's fame as a shrine of St. Peter, often regarded as an integral part of the Roman pilgrimage. Thus, when political disturbance prevented William of Warenne from completing his pilgrimage to Rome he turned aside to Cluny, there to fulfil his vow and pay homage to St. Peter.

As things turned out, this was to be a most important factor in establishing Cluny's juridical status. As the papacy grew in strength and sought more control over the episcopacy, the popes realised the value of Cluniac support and they co-operated in preserving and extending the privileges of the abbey. Accordingly, papal patronage was increasingly identified with exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, the steady development of which can be traced in the bulls it was customary to seek from each pope on his accession.

---

(1) eg. donations were frequently made with the formula "to St. Peter at Cluny": "tradidi Sancto Petro apud Cluniacum", "dono Deo et sanctis Apostolis Petro et Paulo ad locum Cluniacum": see Bruel, vol. iv nos. 2998, 3086, 3102, 3327, 3564, 3566, vol. v nos. 3744, 3750, to quote only a few of the many examples.

(2) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3561: "tunc divertimus ad Cluniacum monasterium, magnam et sanctam abbatiam in honore sancti Petri, et ibi adoravimus et requisivimus santonum Petrum."

(3) See G. Lebonélier, L'Abbaye de Cluny et le Saint Siège, where this development is traced in detail.
Duke William of Aquitaine could only stipulate non-interference on the part of the bishop as a temporal lord: he had no power to exempt the monastery from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the local ordinary, the Bishop of Macon. In any case, Cluny depended on the latter for ordinations and consecrations. But once the foundation charter had been confirmed by the pope, a mention of the bishop among those who were to respect the rights of Cluny was full of implications.

The first bulls were only a confirmation of the foundation charter, supported with the threat of excommunication for any who violated it. (1) Pope Gregory V's bull of 990 marked the beginning of an extension. He confirmed the acts of his predecessors but added a clause to the effect that no bishop was to ordain, consecrate, or even say Mass at Cluny unless invited by the abbot, who could invite any bishop he wished for episcopal ceremonies. (2)

(1) eg. Pope John XIII, 965-72, wrote to the bishops of Gaul asking them to co-operate in protecting Cluny's rights by excommunicating any who violated the foundation charter, (Bull.Cl. col. 5; PL 135, col.990).

(2) Bull. Cl. col.10 and PL 137, col.932: "nullus episcopus, seu quilibet sacerdotum in eodem venerabili coenobio pro aliqua ordinatione seu consecratione ecclesiae ... missarumque celebratione, nisi ab abbate ...invitatus fuerit, venire ad agendum praesumat; sed liceat monachis ipsius loci oujuscunque voluerint ordinis gradum suscipere, ubicunque tibi tuisque successoribus placuerit."
The Bishop of Macon, in whose diocese Cluny was situated, was affected in various ways by the proximity of so famous a monastery and a number of fierce quarrels ensued between him and the abbot over the question of Cluniac privileges. These were confirmed with ever greater precision and extension as protests, including physical attempts at violation, were made. In 1025 the bishop tried excommunication as a weapon whereupon Odilo obtained a bull from Pope John XIX in 1027 confirming all previous rights and adding that no bishop could place the abbey under an interdict or excommunicate any of its members wheresoever they were placed. If anyone had a case against Cluny, the matter was to be brought to Rome. (1) Thus the pope became the direct judge of Cluniac affairs and entire independence of the Bishop of Macon had been achieved. It has been said that never before had so favourable an utterance on behalf of religious at the expense of the episcopacy been made. (2) The privilege of

(1) Bull Cl. col. 8 and PL 141, col. 1135: "... sub nullius cujuscunque episcopi vel sacerdotis deprimatur interdictionis titulo, seu excommunicationis vel anathematis vinculo... neque ipsius loci fratres ubicunque positi,... excommunicationis vinculo teneantur astricti... Si qua vero competens ratio adversus eos quemquam moverit... judicium apostolicum... requiratur."

(2) Letonnelier, op. cit., p. 27.
sanctuary was also extended to the monastery, whereby anyone fleeing from ecclesiastical or secular authority could find refuge there.

The first bull received by Hugh as abbot came from Pope Leo IX in 1049 who claimed only to confirm what had previously been granted to the abbey, though the steady elucidation in detail was reflected in the insertion of a clause permitting the abbot to obtain chrism from any bishop he wished. (1) It may be noted that Cluny could afford to be independent of the local ordinary since former bishops who had become monks at Cluny could perform necessary ceremonies, or Cluniac monks who had become bishops could be asked to ordain monks when they visited the abbey.

Drogo, who became bishop in 1062, tried to claim rights over the church of S Maieul in the parish of Cluny. He made a visitation while Hugh was away, but the community resisted the entrance of the bishop, who returned thwarted and furious to Macon. (2) It was on this occasion that St. Peter Damian was sent to settle the

---

(1) Bull. Cl. col. 12, and PL 143, col. 607: "In qua praerogativa etiam chrismatis libera receptio a quoque velitis episcoopo consistit."

quarrel, after Hugh had appealed to Rome, and in 1063, at the Council of Chalon, specially summoned for the purpose, the privileges of Cluny were solemnly reaffirmed.(1)

By the time Pope Gregory VII ascended the papal throne a theory of privilege was clearly defined, and Cluniac exemption served as a legal model, so that when similar privileges were granted to other abbeys like Hirsau the formula "as at Cluny" was used.(2)

But the Bishop of Macon continued to agitate and an even greater drama took place in 1079.(3) Trouble had been brewing for some time, and early in that year Pope Gregory VII had written to his legate, Hugh of the Romans, complaining of the scandal created in the Church by the disputes between Archbishop Jubin of Lyons and Hugh of Cluny over a church in the archdiocese of Lyons.(4)

(1) ibid. See also De Gallica Profectione Domni Petri Damiani, PL 145, cols. 865-80.


(3) A careful account of the events connected with this will be found in Rony, 'Un proces canonique entre deux saints, S. Jubin de Lyon et S. Hugues de Cluny', in RM vol. xviii (1928) pp. 177-85.

Later in the year the archbishop went to Rome accompanied by his suffragan, Landry, Bishop of Macon. There, the latter objected to Cluny taking all his diocese whereupon the pope wrote to Hugh demanding that the see of Macon be respected, since it was governed by a zealous prelate. (1) On his return, Landry began to act against what he called the injustices of Cluny and interdicted some of the churches and chapels belonging to the abbey. Apparently, the Cluniacs had been refusing to pay the redemptio altarium, or customary payment to the bishop when a new incumbent was appointed, on the grounds that it was simony. Cluny owned so many churches in the diocese that the bishop was losing revenues of various kinds.

Things reached a climax when the papal legate Warmund, Archbishop of Vienne and former monk of Cluny, visited the abbey and while there was asked to ordain some monks. The canons took exception to what they considered an insult to their bishop and laid an ambush for Warmund. As the latter left Cluny he was attacked and stripped of his pontifical regalia to cries of "Death to him who violates the rights of the spouse of St. Vincent of Macon" referring to the Bishop of Macon. Hugh sent to Rome

(1) ibid. p. 369 and PL 148, col. 537. Landry seems to have been a protegé of the pope who had consecrated him bishop, see Rony, loc. cit. p. 178.
asking for protection of Cluniac privileges and a review of the situation and in 1080 Peter, Cardinal Bishop of Albano, arrived at Cluny and once again Cluny's exemption from all temporal and spiritual jurisdiction was asserted. The Bishop of Macon was suspended from office for a time and all those implicated in the insult to the archbishop were excommunicated. The pope wrote sternly to Landry asking him to respect Cluny's rights and inflicted on the canons the penance of walking barefoot to the abbey.(1)

A particular solemnity, on account of the circumstances of its promulgation, was attached to another confirmation of Cluny's privileges by the same pope. At the Lateran Council of 1080, the pope rose and proclaimed before the whole assembly the holiness of the abbot of Cluny and in the strongest terms declared that no one whomsoever could have any power whatsoever over Cluny.(2)

Pope Urban II, a former monk of Cluny, reaffirmed all the acts of his predecessors and placed the abbot and monastery beyond the power even of the papal legate unless he had received orders, by special mandate, to

(1) Bibl. Cl. cols. 511-14, (Charta Petri Albano).

intervene in Cluniac affairs. In 1097 the same pope visited the abbey in great pomp and solemnly defined the extensive boundaries of the property of the monastery, fulminating an excommunication against anyone who violated this land or its inhabitants.

It should be noted, however, that though Pope Urban II bestowed on the abbot the honour of wearing pontifical regalia on major feasts, there was no question of conferring on him episcopal order or jurisdiction even within the area ruled by the abbot.

The extension of the privilege continued even beyond this period. For instance, in 1144 the abbots were exempted from attending synods unless summoned by the pope. But the most significant development of Cluniac exemption took place in the eleventh century.

(1) Bull. Cl. col. 22, and PL 151, col. 291 ff.; "nec episcopus quilibet, nec legatus, nisi cui a nobis id ipsum specialiter injuctum fuerit, præter voluntatem tuam de vestris audeat negotiis judicare, salve tamen iure episcoporum, quod in eis hactenus habuisse noscuntur." The last phrase refers to the dependent monasteries situated in other dioceses, to which Cluniac exemption applied differently. This is discussed below, see p. 265.


(4) Bull Cl. col. 52; Letonnelier, op. cit. p. 30.
much of it under Hugh, due to the combined factors of the growth of the power of Cluny, the personality of Hugh, and the increasing efficiency of papal authority which co-operated in the extension of privilege at the expense of the episcopacy.(1)

3. Government and administration of the abbey.

As this is not a comparative study it may be noted here that—except where obvious or specifically stated—much of the system described in the following pages was not peculiarly Cluniac. The provision made in the Rule for administration and the delegation of power had formed the basis of the more complex hierarchy of officials that developed as the centuries proceeded, especially in the larger monasteries.(2) At Cluny a minutely organised system evolved, much of it in the eleventh century. But many of its characteristics were shared in common with other monasteries and most of the tendencies had their root in the general monastic administrative or contemporary feudal tradition.

(1) The way in which Cluniac privileges applied to dependent houses is discussed below, pp. 265ff.

(2) See Knowles, The Monastic Order, cap. xxv, pp. 427 ff. for a brief account of this development.
In those parts of the Rule concerning the abbot, St. Benedict gave to the Church one of the most outstanding treatises on the office of a monastic superior. Further comment would have been superfluous after so masterful an exposition and the Cluniac customaries add little more than details of the ceremonies attending the election of the abbot, the marks of respect paid to him, and the customs observed on the death of an abbot. (1)

The first two centuries of Cluny's history are an exceptionally good example of the importance of the abbot in every aspect of the monastic life and there is much to be said for the opinion that the greatness of Cluny lay in the greatness of its early abbots. (2) The qualities, duties, and responsibilities described in the Rule and customs should, indeed be examined in relation to the actual history of Cluny at different periods, for the character of each of the abbots and their particular reaction to the circumstances of their day were vital factors in Cluny's development.

(1) Ulrich, lib. iii, caps. 1, 2, and 32; Bernard, lib 1, caps. 1, and 25.

(2) See Butler, Benedictine Monachism, p. 196.
Hugh was sixth in a great and almost unequalled tradition. Despite his significance in other spheres, he must first and last be considered as Abbot of Cluny. So he is essentially portrayed by his biographers who plainly have St. Benedict's conception of the ideal abbot in mind as the standard by which Hugh is measured. This, too, is one of the keys to an understanding of Hugh for—as we are told—he was first and foremost a monk. (1)

The foundation charter stipulated that the monks of Cluny were to be free to elect their own abbot, in accordance with the principles of the Rule which decreed that the abbot should be elected by all the community, or by a minority if preferred. (2) The local bishop could only interfere if an unworthy person were elected.

The early abbots of Cluny seem to have succeeded by a system of nomination. In his testament, Berno nominated Odo as his successor to Cluny, though the phrase "with the consent of the brethren" is included. (3) Odo, towards the end of his life, appointed Aymard as co-abbot and the latter was officially elected abbot.

(1) e.g. Vita Hug. auct. Hildeberto, PL 159, col. 861: "Totus monachum loquebatur."
(2) Regula, cap. lxiv; foundation charter: Bibl. Cl. col. 1 ff.
(3) Bibl. Cl. col. 9: "Ego Berno... Odonem, una cum fratrum consensu mihi sucedere delegavi."
when Odo died. (1) Aymard appointed a co-abbot too, as he went blind ten years before he died, though the appointment was made with the approval and consent of the monks. (2) This was Maieul, and he, in turn, designated Odilo as his successor. (3) There is no indication that he did this with the consent of the community, though it can well be presumed.

This seems to have been the last case of direct nomination. Odilo refused to nominate a successor when asked, and after his death in 1049 Hugh, as prior, had to conduct the election. The elders or seniors seem to have been the influential party and Adalman, the claustral prior, voiced their wish to have Hugh as abbot. The latter dissented at first, but when the unanimous opinion of the monks was declared he accepted. The election was confirmed the following day by the Archbishop of Besançon who three days later, 22nd February 1049, blessed and installed Hugh as Abbot of Cluny. (4)

(1) ibid. col. 1618, Venerabilium Abbatum Cluniacensium Chronologia.
(2) ibid. col. 1619.
(3) ibid. cols. 1619-20.
(4) See above, p. 51f. and Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 1, where Hugh's election is fully described.
The fact that this election and all the ceremonies attending it were fully described by Ulrich in his chapter on the abbot of Cluny meant that it largely determined the method of future elections. All the professed of Cluny had the right to partake, but in fact their participation was limited to approving the decision arrived at by a minority composed of the more venerable brethren. (1)

In practice, the custom of nomination was not entirely excluded, and the election of a successor could be conducted before the death of an abbot, as in the case of Pons. According to Ordericus Vitalis, shortly before Hugh died he ordered the election of his successor. He did not nominate Pons, though it is recorded that he approved the election. (2)

St. Benedict thought of the abbot as Christ's representative in the monastery, father of his monks, a wise physician of souls, and dispenser and steward of

(1) Bernard, lib. 1, cap. 1, p. 135: "considente Conventu, spiritales fratres... non dubitantes de divina praesentia eligere debent...."

the household. (1) His primary duties were spiritual and he had to guide, reprove, persuade, rebuke, according to person and circumstance. The relationship of each monk with the abbot was a unique and personal one that ideally admitted of the fullest confidence, for St. Benedict encouraged the monks to lay all their thoughts before the abbot. (2)

Hugh fully accepted this personal responsibility for each monk in spite of the overwhelming number. It was a fundamental attitude in his disposition and he was constantly and acutely aware of it. He was aware, too, of the obstacles and limitations imposed by circumstances such as the growth of the order. In the last letter to his monks he asked their prayers because of his failures towards those souls entrusted to his care, stressing his responsibility before God for each one. (3) He realised that the increase of numbers had proportionately increased his responsibility which he feared he had neglected.

(1) Regula, cap. ii.

(2) ibid. eg. cap. vii: "Quintus humilitatis gradus est, si omnes cogitationes malas cordi suo advenientes ... per humilem confessionem abbatem non celaverit suum...."

(3) PL 159, col. 954: "Quanto major locorum fratrumque habetur numerus, tanto mihi peccatori pro eorum excessibus gravissimus tremor inscitur." See below p. 278 for the duties of the abbot as regards the order.
Examples can be quoted of this attitude in practice. He considered that the relationship persisted even after a monk had left the abbey, and urged Archbishop Bernard of Toledo, one of his former monks, to preserve the bond of love and obedience binding the bishop to his abbot. (1) His reasons for refusing to send monks to England at William the Conqueror's request was based on similar principle, for he was afraid of the added responsibility of having monks so far away. (2) There are other small indications in the customaries of the abbot's duties in this personal order, such as deciding when novices were to be admitted to profession, and instructing each one of them on the rigours of the monastic life. (3) The abbot also reserved to himself the hearing of the boys' confessions whenever he was in the monastery. (4)

Hugh's personal gifts were a great asset in this aspect of his office and are important for an understanding of his achievement. He was acutely perceptive and could read people at a glance - to the disconcertment of some. It can be said that Hugh's forte was dealing with persons,

(1) See below, p. 281 ff.
(2) ibid. n. PL 159, col. 927.
(4) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. iv, col. 737.
and men of discernment like St. Peter Damian and Pope Gregory VII recognised his spiritual force. Both of them were struck by his wisdom and his power in speech when they visited the abbey and heard him addressing the monks.(1)

But it was becoming increasingly difficult to respond adequately to those needs of the community for which he alone could be responsible, and though he never had any intention of delegating or abandoning any of this responsibility he seems to have sought other ways of making spiritual provision, particularly in the appointment of good confessors and encouraging holy men to come to Cluny. His main reason for entreating the hermit Anastasius to come to Cluny - and later to return there - was the edification of the community.(2)

(1) All the biographers relate the incident of Hildebrand's visit to Cluny where he is said to have seen Christ inspiring Hugh's pronouncements at Chapter; eg. Vita auct. Raynaldo, PL 159, col. 895 f.: "Confersus Dominum Jesum illi consedere vidit, et quasi in singulis judiciis ejus illi faveret... in quo perpendere possimus quae puritate et aequalitate culpas discutiebat..."
De Gallica Profectione Domni Petri Damiani, PL. 145, col. 874: "et in illius (Hugh) operis et exhortationis bibliotheca legunt qualiter monastice vivunt..."

(2) Vita Anastasii, PL 149, col. 428: "(Hugo) rogavit ut Cluniacum secum adiret, ubi et votum suum complere posset et exemplum bonae conversationis caeteris fratribus daret." Later Anastasius returned to his hermitage, but Hugh wrote to him, (PL 149, col. 429 and PL 159 col. 929): "ut... descendatis ad visitandos fratres, ut... desiderabilis presentia vestra corroboret et exhortetur eos..."
In the matter of government and administration - for which he was ultimately responsible - the Rule instructed the abbot to act with wisdom and prudence, and to consult the opinions of the community or the seniors when necessary. (1) It is interesting to note that one of the few specific points on which Hugh gave William of Hirsau definite advice was in the matter of taking counsel with the brethren. (2) All major decisions rested with the abbot, however, and his word was law in the monastery. (3)

The administrative framework provided by the Rule had been particularly well developed at Cluny. The abbot appointed most of the officials of the abbey, and even in the case of those who were elected he confirmed the choice. (4) An increasing amount of the government of the abbey was delegated to the officials, but to the end of his life Hugh was the supreme governor

(1) See above, cap. III, l, p. 61f.

(2) Constitutiones Hirsagiensis, Herrgott, p. 376, In his prologue, William describes how Hugh advised him to adapt the customs to local circumstances, "coadunato seniorum nostrorum consilio."

(3) See above, p. 60f; also Ulrich (col. 734), and Bernard (p. 137), say that when the abbot settles any doubt with regard to a custom, what he decides is held: "quasi pro lege."

(4) See below, pp. 89ff
of Cluny. His officials were clearly delegates and the hierarchical series of relationships culminating in the abbot was strictly preserved. However, this did not detract from the thoroughness of the delegation, and it is clear from the lives of Hugh and from the other sources of the epoch that he trusted those to whom he had confided offices and left entirely to them the immediate decisions concerning their charges. Indeed, the administration of Cluny had become too vast to be minutely supervised by the abbot and though the system did much to provide a machinery of control it also demanded much of the officials, both in competence and disposition if the independence, accorded to them of necessity, was not to lead to disintegration. It further demanded much perspicacity in their appointment, which Hugh was fortunate enough to possess.

It may be noted that no one, monastic official or otherwise, figured as Hugh's constant companion or personal assistant and for all his immersion in activity there remained something of the solitary about Hugh. The continual changes among his personnel contrast vividly with the stability of his own position.

His immediate entourage was composed of the important officials of the monastery, though he had a growing number
of his own helpers such as a chaplain who acted as his secretary. Ulrich was Hugh's chaplain for a time and it seems that he was unable to resist the temptation when writing letters for the abbot to insert passages of his own composition. (1) It has also been suggested that the abbot had a private chamberlain and financial resources organised separately from those of the abbey in general, but there is little evidence to support such a thesis for Hugh's abbacy. (2) The number of monks who accompanied him when travelling had increased somewhat, and included two or three of the officials of the monastery and a number of servants plus his own groom for the horses. (3)

The original simplicity that had characterised the Cluniac community, abbot included, was fast disappearing. Remnants of it persisted in such details as the abbot being appointed in his turn as weekly cook, though such customs were rapidly becoming a dead letter. (4) Ulrich

(1) See Acta SS, OSB, vol. vi, p. 790. Lambert and Odo are other names associated with the office and they signed charters in this capacity: see Bruel, vol. iv, nos. 3380 and 3667.

(2) See below, pp. 106 ff.

(3) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 12, 'De connestabulo': "Ad illos (equos) enim habet dominus Abbas proprium custodem."

(4) ibid. lib. i, cap. 1 "Ad coquinam cum fuerit notatus, cum alii non sint nisi sex, ille septimus solet esse." p. 138.
speaks with nostalgia of the days when the abbot was free to perform such services, which at the time of writing was no longer possible. (1) Opportunities for a display-loving abbot were increasing, but Hugh's character safeguarded him. He sought nothing beyond the simplicity of the ordinary monk, living the common life and following the community regime up to the end. (2) One of the things that astounded St. Peter Damian when he visited the abbey was that the abbot had no room of his own and slept in the common dormitory. (3) The abbot's house did not appear until the twelfth century. He did not dine with guests as the Rule suggested, but had his own table in the refectory. (4) This was made the subject of criticism in the twelfth century, and Peter the Venerable defended

(1) Ulrich, lib. 1, cap. 46, col. 691: "Nostram esse consuetudinem ut in Natali Domini ministerium coquinae domnus abbas et cellerarius cum decanis simul faciant... Nam postquam et haece vinea nostra extendit... tanti fratrum, tanti hospitum accurrunt... ut omnino non expediret, si tunc (abbatem) se lavatione fabarum occuparet."

(2) E.g., he insisted on attending all the Holy Week Services and only consented to retire some three days before his death on the Tuesday of Easter Week. Vita Hug., auct. Hildeberto, PL 159, cols. 888 f.

(3) De Gallica Profectione, PL 145, col. 874: "ne ipse abbas vel sospitato vigens, vel infirmitate gravatus, aliquam sibi cameram vel aliud quid praecipium consuetus sit vindicare."

(4) Regula, cap. lvi. 'De mensa abbatis.'
it on the grounds that either the abbot would spend all his time with the guests or they would invade the monastery.(1)

It goes without saying that in all things the abbot ranked first. The customaries each have a chapter on the marks of respect paid to him by the monks.(2) They were supposed to bow when meeting him and even at the mention of his name. He presided at all services in Church though he only acted as celebrant on the greatest feasts. The bell for any service went on ringing until he or his messenger arrived, to obviate the possibility of his ever being late. A similar regard for appearances resulted in the precentor never appointing himself as hebdomary so that he could always be free to rescue the abbot from the awkward situation that might arise if the latter, on account of ignorance or for any other reason, failed to perform any part that was assigned to him.(3) At night a lamp was always carried before him, and whenever he returned to the monastery after being away he was received in procession. The funeral of the abbot

---

(1) Letter to St. Bernard, PL 189, cols. 114, and 130.
(3) Bernard, lib i, cap. 14, p. 161 f.
was a very solemn affair, and the anniversary of an abbot also had a particular observance.

The growing fame of the Abbot of Cluny was reflected in the increasing ceremonial that attended him. Pope Urban II granted to Hugh the special privilege of wearing part of the episcopal regalia at Mass on the solemn feasts of the year, including mitre, dalmatic, and sandals. (1) This had been granted already to one or two other abbots and was not transferable to the next abbot. (2) Marks of honour continued to accumulate even after Hugh, and Pons received the same privilege of wearing the insignia pontificalia which was later granted as a permanent right of the abbot of Cluny. (3) There has, however, been some exaggeration in the dignity said to have been claimed by the early abbots of Cluny, and Hugh never used the title of arch-abbot as did his successor Pons who roused opposition by doing so. (4)

(1) Bull. Cl. col. 23; PL 151, cols. 291–3: "Tibi plane peculiari devotione concedimus, ut in processionum missarumque solemnibus mitra utaris episcopali..."

(2) eg. The abbot of Metz had received the privilege in 970, and Aethelstig of St. Augustine's in 1063. See Knowles, The Monastic Order, p. 579. L'Huillier, p. 353, says that Odilo had the use of the mitre, but I have come across no reference to this.

(3) Bull. Cl. col. 36.

(4) Gesta Simonis abb. S. Bertini, MG.SS. vol. xiii, p. 653.
By the time Hugh became abbot the office implied much more than the government of a single monastery that is envisaged in the Rule. The abbey of Cluny was only one aspect, albeit an important one. There was also the order, and commitments in the Church, especially in the case of Hugh who was constantly called upon to help with the work of reform. Therefore, much of his time, even when at Cluny, was taken up with business other than that directly concerning his immediate monastery.(1) He was also absent a good deal. Almost every year journeys were made to reform or receive monasteries, attend councils or synods, visit Rome, and Cluniac monasteries. Sometimes these travels entailed an absence of some months, and in one or two cases longer than a year. Thus, immediately after being made abbot, Hugh attended the Council of Rheims and from there accompanied Pope Leo IX to Rome. In 1050 he wrote to the Emperor Henry III saying that he was too busy to visit Germany, but the following year saw the abbot in Cologne baptising the young Henry IV. From there he was sent on a mission to Hungary by the pope and was

(1) Ulrich, (lib. i, cap. 46, col. 691) describing the number of monks and guests who come to Cluny at Christmas says of the abbot: "quibus singulis habet domnus abbas pro tam diversis negotiis respondere..."
captured by bandits on the way back which caused an absence of two years from Cluny. He made three prolonged journeys to Spain and was in Rome a number of times. Once, Pope Stephen IX detained him there and took him to Florence where the abbot stayed until the pope died in 1058. The following year he was again in Rome and after the Lateran Council of 1059 Pope Nicholas II appointed him legate to the South of France to promulgate the reform canons. The abbot presided at the councils of Avignon and Vienne in 1060. He made use of the opportunity that these journeys afforded to visit Cluniac houses on route or in the vicinity. Even when the sixty years of his rule are considered, the amount of travelling that Hugh undertook was considerable, especially during the first thirty years of his abbacy.

The office of Abbot of Cluny had come to demand competence and ability in a more than normal degree. It can be said that only Hugh's personal holiness, his qualities of character and ability, coupled with a very strong physique, enabled him to prevent the disintegration of Cluny during his abbacy. He had a heart and mind large enough to fulfil the many demands made on him

(1) PL 143, col. 879: letter of Pope Stephen IX to the monks of Cluny apologising for detaining their abbot.
while never swerving from his path, losing his proportion, or neglecting his duties. Accordingly he won the praise and admiration of his own monks and of all his contemporaries, who sought him as an adviser and helper. But the task had outgrown the capacity of any one man unaided by a proper machinery of government. An adequate fulfilment of the office could henceforward only be expected if a profound adaptation of the system took place. It was unfortunate for Cluny that this was slow in coming, and arrived too late to prevent the disintegration of the twelfth century.

(ii) The Major Prior

----------------------

St. Benedict legislated - with reluctance - for a prior, if circumstances demanded or if the community asked for one. His appointment was made to depend on the abbot who could also dismiss him if necessary.(1) At Cluny the need of a representative of the abbot had early made itself felt and a number of priorships developed, of which the most important was that of the major or grand prior. His office was clearly defined by the time Hugh became abbot and the position and its duties are minutely described in the customaries after

(1) Regula, cap. lxv.
the chapter concerning the abbot.\(1\)

He was appointed by the abbot after consultation with the seniors of the monastery. A special ceremony of installation was performed, beginning with his nomination in chapter when, after "suitable protests" he took his place next to the abbot, and ending with a blessing in church.\(2\) Thereafter, he ranked after the abbot in everything, sat at his right in the refectory and in his place when absent. Ulrich, however, found it difficult to understand why the precentor took precedence over the prior in church, although the latter had a place of honour.\(3\)

The prior's duties were comprised in the phrase "responsible after the abbot for all things spiritual and temporal of the monastery".\(4\) His responsibility

---

\(1\) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 2; p. 138 ff; Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 4, col. 737 f.

\(2\) Ulrich, col. 737: "Quem elegerit, si sapit, veniam petit, excusat se ad munus hujusmodi non idoneum esse."

\(3\) idem, col. 738: "Verum cum per omnia...vicem habeat D. abbatis, nescio unde contigerit, quod in sola ecclesia amisit eam...Quod qui voluerit laudet, a parvitate adhuc mea ignoratur quomodo sit dignum ut laudetur."

\(4\) idem, "post D. Abbatem de omnibus rebus et causis, quae ad monasterium pertinent, et spiritualibus et temporalibus se intromittit."
increased, especially in the moral sphere, when the abbot was away, but even then his powers were limited and, for example, he could not extend confraternity of the Cluniac chapter to anyone. But though he could act in a disciplinary capacity it is clear that in practice his duties were mostly administrative.

Indeed, it would be no exaggeration to say that in this field he had most of the responsibility. All the monastic officials answered directly to him and nothing was done without his consent, including such matters as deciding the weekly menu. (1) The charters reflect his manifold activities. He frequently figures as the chief Cluniac signatory for charters of donation. In others, recording various business transactions like the sale, exchange, and grants in benefice of land, it is clear that he had been the chief agent. (2) He also acted as judge in the monastic court for Cluniac tenants and their holdings. (3)

Apart from the possibility of being asked to undertake long journeys with or on behalf of the abbot, such as Hugh's own expedition to Germany as major prior, there

---

(1) See below, pp. 108-9.

(2) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, nos. 3115, 3159, 3188, 3203, 3238, etc.

(3) See below, pp. 130 ff.
were also the necessary visits to the deaneries, centres of administration, some of which were some distance from the abbey. (1) The deans who managed them were all directly responsible to the prior who had to go to them at least once a year, even if they were within only half a day's ride from the abbey and came to Cluny each week. The prior arranged for the disposal of produce in each deanery and decided what should be sold, what should remain for the upkeep of the deanery and what should go to Cluny. His entourage included two monks and an archer, or, if the journey was a long one, three monks and two archers, and presumably some servants since one of the monks was provided for the purpose of supervising them.

Lest the increasing responsibility and independence of the prior should lead to ostentation and display the customaries stress that he should at all times preserve the simplicity of a monk, noting particularly that in food and clothing he should not differ from the other monks. Nor was he allowed his own chaplain or secretary and whenever he returned to the monastery had to hand over all money and valuables to the camerarius.

(1) See below, p. 126
Something is known of those who occupied this position under Hugh, for some of them rose to positions of ecclesiastical importance and most of them are mentioned in the charters, though in these documents the word prior, being somewhat loosely used, must be received with caution. The evidence is insufficient to furnish all details of careers or even exact dates of priorships, but there is enough to support certain definite conclusions. (1)

In the first place, stability was not a characteristic of the office. In the sixty years of Hugh's rule there were some sixteen priors, if not more, and Ivo's seven-year term, 1087-94 was the longest. There is no example of a prior either dying in office or being deposed, but in every case he was sent to some important position, either as prior or abbot of a dependent monastery, or to promotion as a dignitary of the Church. This was not a planned policy. Hugh tried to resist the tendency and told William of Warenne that he was unwilling to lose the prior of Cluny except in exceptional circumstances which is borne out by his refusal to allow Guy to go to

---

(1) See Chaume, 'Les grands prieurs de Cluny', in RM vol. xxviii (1938) pp. 147-52, for a list of the major priors and details of their careers, based on evidence obtained from the charters.
Montierneuf as abbot, though eventually he was prevailed upon to release him. The situation arose from the fact that the responsibility of the office demanded a highly competent man and when such a one was available he received an eminently suitable training as prior for further responsibility in a wider field.

Competence — one might say administrative competence — was, indeed, the guiding principle by which the grand prior was appointed, and the office was reserved for the best man in this respect, as Hugh indicated on one occasion to William of Warenne. Youth or inexperience of the monastic life seem not to have weighed. Hugh was made prior at twenty-two and many of his own priors had been a comparatively short time in the monastery and owed their promotion to previous experience either in diocesan administration (as in the case of Pope Urban II who had been a canon of Rheims) or in the administration of feudal estates (as was the case with Hunald and Joceran,

(1) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3561, p. 695: "et nunquam (Prior) removeretur, nisi tam justa manifesta esset causa..." For Hugh’s refusal to let Guy go to Montierneuf, see Fragmentum Historiae Monasterii Novi Pictavensis, in Martène, Thesaurus, vol. iii, p. 1213.

(2) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3561, p. 695. Hugh promised to send to Lewes as prior "unum ex melioribus monachis suis de tota congregacione... preter majorem priorem de Cluniaco..."
both priors of Hugh). Nor did it follow that a prior had previously held important but lesser positions in the monastery. This happened occasionally but a gradual system of promotion was not the norm.

A few of the priors under Hugh may be mentioned. (1) Pope Urban II entered Cluny as a monk in 1076 and when he left two years later to become Cardinal Bishop of Ostia he had already occupied the position of grand prior. Gerald, Ulrich's companion from Ratisbon, also became Cardinal Bishop of Ostia after being prior of Cluny, and acted as Pope Gregory VII's legate to Spain. Hunald entered in 1063 and by 1072 was Abbot of Moissac having already been prior of Cluny. Warmund succeeded him and became Abbot of Déols two years later and in 1077 Archbishop of Vienne. Guy, prior from 1080 - 1081, Ivo, 1087-1094, and Henry, prior sometime before 1100, all became abbots: of Montierneuf, S Germain, and S Jean d'Angely, respectively.

So rapid a turnover of officials, and so frequent an hiatus (since in each case the prior left the monastery) was something that taxed the strength of Cluny during the abbacy of Hugh and made the maintenance of administrative continuity difficult.

(1) See Chaume, loc. cit. for further details of priors.
(iii) The Claustral Prior and his subordinates

The claustral prior's duties were similar to those of the deans of the Rule. St. Benedict had provided these as helpers for the abbot of a large community: responsible men chosen for their worthiness of life, each taking charge of a deanery or group of ten monks. At Cluny, instead of this group system there emerged the office of claustral prior and as the monastery grew, the office remained centralised and subordinates were appointed to perform specific duties.

The office was still developing during Odilo's abbacy and its holder was then being referred to as prior or dean of the cloister. When Hugh became abbot, however, the words "dean" and "deanery" were acquiring a very different connotation from those of the Rule and early customs, and in Ulrich and Bernard "dean" and "claustral prior" were distinct terms. The latter's function, position, and title were by that time clearly formulated.

(1) Régula, cap. xxi.
(2) Parfa, lib. ii, cap. 12, p.146: "prior vel decanus claustrensis."
(3) See below, pp.99 ff for the Cluniax deans.
In practice he was responsible for order and discipline in the abbey. Most of his duties were supervisory in nature: he watched to see that the monks genuflected properly, that their posture in church was correct, and that a sufficient number were praying before the side altars in between services. He toured the monastery at various times: for instance after compline to ensure that all doors were locked and that nothing was left lying about; after matins and lauds to see that the beds had been left tidy. At chapter he had the first say and complained of anything he had found amiss.

The customaries describe him as vicar in all things of the major prior, especially when abbot and prior were away, which was frequently the case, whereas the claustral prior's duties did not take him outside the monastery. On such occasions all the officials, even those concerned with temporal administration, had to obey him. He could so far replace the abbot as to admit visiting monks into confraternity with Cluny, but he could not admit anyone into chapter or community.

The claustral prior's main subordinates were the circatores to whom a chapter is devoted in the customaries of Ulrich and Bernard. Their task was to tour the

---

(1) Ulrich, col. 740: "...qui praeceipue pondus totius ordinis portat..."
(2) idem, "qui in claustro jugiter moratur..."
(3) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 7, col. 741; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 4, p. 144.
monastery at intervals: hence the name. They were advised not to be too regular in their patrols but to go at different times to different places so that the monks would never feel secure. (1) All negligences, major and minor, were carefully noted and denounced next day at chapter when the *circatores* gave their report after the claustral prior. They were particularly vigilant of the observance of silence and if they encountered anyone engaged in conversation the monks so discovered were expected either to say that they had permission and it was necessary for them to speak, or give an account of themselves. It is tactfully suggested that the *circatores* should avoid those parts of the house where the abbot or major prior might be and apropos of this custom Ulrich quotes the text of the servant not being greater than the master. (2)

Because of the inherent difficulties of this office, those monks were appointed whose lives were exemplary and who were impervious to influence or neglect of duty.

---

(1) Ulrich, col. 741: "...ut nec locus sit nec hora in qua frater ullus securus esse possit..." Bernard adds: "...istis per consuetudinem adeo religioso debent incedere, ut terrorem incitant spectatoribus suis et exemplum religiositatis ostendent..."

(2) Ulrich, col. 741: "...nequaquam veniant ubi eos (abatem et priorem) noverint esse; quia...Non est discipulus super magistrum."
on account of friendship or fear of criticism.(1)

The boys' masters also ranked among the claustral prior's subordinates: a further indication of the moral nature of the latter's office.(2) His assistants could also include, when necessary, special wardens appointed to supervise young monks who were difficult or needed particular attention.(3) Such guardians never left their charges out of sight.

(iv) The Deans

At Cluny the decani or deans were the major prior's chief assistants in the administration of Cluniaic lands and they were responsible directly to him.(4) The fact that the customaries state that if the abbot and prior were absent "even the deans" must obey the claustral prior seems to indicate that normally they were independent

(1) Bernard, p.144: "Eliguntur de totius Congregationis religiosioribus et serventioribus, qui nec malitiose pro privato odio unquam clament alios, nec pro privata amicitia...taceant negligentias..."

(2) See below, pp.190ff.

(3) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 9, col. 747-8,'De custodia juvenum'. Bernard, lib. i, cap. 28, p. 210-12,'De juvenibus custodiendis'.

(4) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 5, cols. 738-40; Bernard, (lib.i, cap. 2, p. 138) discusses the deans in the chapter on the major prior.
of the latter, though they presumably came within his jurisdiction while actually in the monastery.(1)

In fact, the deans did not live at the abbey but in their respective deaneries or granges, which formed the economic units of the Cluniac domain.(2) The available evidence indicates that though two or three monks might occupy a single grange, the norm (envisaged in the customaries) was one monk and a number of servants.

His duties were essentially administrative, comprised in the title "overseer of the deanery".(3) He was the Cluniac agent for all tenants in his area and all the affairs of the deanery, including transactions concerning land.(4)

But the remoteness of deanery conditions from the normal monastic life resulted in the customaries containing more about the conduct and personal life of the dean than about his duties. The prescriptions show an acute

(1) Ulrich, col. 741: "non solum omnes obedientiarii, qui in claustro sunt, obediant eius imperio, sed etiam ipsi ad quodcumque opus fuerit, decani."

(2) See below, p.125+ where the deaneries are discussed.

(3) Ulrich, col. 738: "sunt villarum provisores".

(4) eg. Bruel, vol. v, nos. 3714-16: charters drawn up by the Dean of Lourdon.
perception of the peculiar position of the dean and the difficulties and dangers inherent in the office.

It is prescribed that monastic discipline should be maintained as far as possible, in such things as observing the hour of compline as the day's term, and observing the great silence. Stringent regulations governed his behaviour towards women, and discretion in discussing the affairs of the deanery was also recommended. (1) The dean's relations with the servants were carefully regulated down to such details as insisting that those who served him at table should be properly clad. Certain customs were prescribed for travelling as to dress, the observance of silence, and the riding pace, for to go at a gallop was not allowed except in case of fire or other necessity. The deans were also warned not to acquire a spirit of proprietorship, and not to concentrate on profit-making. To guard against this they had to give a detailed account of their deaneries to the major prior on his annual visitation, hiding nothing, nor secretly storing away anything.

If the deanery was within half a day's ride from Cluny

(1) Ulrich, col. 740: "Si qua femina de alio loco talis supervenerit, cui hospitium negare non possit, nequaquam cum ea sedet ad unam tabulam; de manu quoque feminae nihil unquam accipit."
the dean visited the abbey on Saturdays, arriving before Vespers. Precautions had to be taken against what might have been a regular Saturday upheaval with the arrival of the deans and they were forbidden to speak or discuss their affairs with anyone when they arrived at the monastery.

If a dean fell ill he returned to Cluny and as long as he was in the infirmary he relinquished all responsibility for his deanery. Detachment was encouraged and if one of his servants sent him something "for old times' sake" the gift was used by the cellarer for the benefit of all the sick. (1)

By the middle of Hugh's abbacy the deans had become an established and integral part of the system and the idea of a monk living in secular surroundings had thus become an accepted characteristic of Cluniac Benedictinism. It was fraught, in some ways, with disturbing consequences. Perhaps it partly explains the nonchalance with which so many small priories - some with only two or three monks - were incorporated as a permanent feature of the order.

(v) The Camerarius or Chamberlain

The Rule recommended the appointment of monks to look

(1) *idem*, col. 740: "Si quis ejus familiaris pro antiqua familiaritate quidquam ei direxerit..."
after the property of the monastery in tools, clothing, and other articles. (1) From this had developed the office of chamberlain, which received its most significant development at Cluny under Hugh. (2) The official and also his duties (mainly concerning clothing and bedding) are described for the first time in the writings of Ulrich and Bernard. (3) He was the recipient of gifts in kind to the abbey and he appropriately distributed them: oxen to the deans, cows to the shed, and ornaments to the sacrist.

During Hugh's abbacy the office rapidly evolved to that of treasurer or financier of the monastery. This evolution whereby the financial aspect came to dominate is one of the most notable aspects of constitutional development within the abbey at this period. The transition was a natural process, achieved with such ease as to pass unnoticed in contemporary sources and only the charters unconsciously testify to the profound evolution that was completed by the end of the eleventh

(1) Regula, cap. xxxii, "De ferramentis vel rebus monasterii."

(2) There is no section devoted to this official in the Consuetudines Farfensis.

(3) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 11, cols. 751-3; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 5, pp. 145-7.
It happened so rapidly and coherently as to exercise considerable influence in the reorganisation of the Roman Curia under the Cluniac Pope, Urban II, 1088–99. Urban wrote to Hugh of his difficulties, including financial ones, and the abbot sent his chamberlain Peter Gloc to Rome where he worked with Urban to effect a much needed institutional reform.

The metamorphosis was due to the simple fact that gold and silver as movables had been included in the chamberlain's responsibilities, so with the increasing use of coinage, money in ever growing quantities became the chamberlain's concern and imperceptibly changed the nature of his office. His responsibility for clothing had a financial aspect, as all materials had to be bought.

The customaries of Ulrich and Bernard both refer to money as the concern of the chamberlain, especially that which


(3) A complete list of the clothing allotted to each monk is given in those chapters of the customaries that deal with the chamberlain's office. See below, p.135 for the financial aspect.
was returned from the deaneries, but it is clear from the charters that as the economy of the abbey developed and money operated on a larger scale, the chamberlain came more and more to the fore as one of the leading administrators, and by the end of the eleventh century he held one of the most important positions in the monastery - responsible not only for the temporal well-being of the community but for the economic prosperity of the abbey.

All money that was not earmarked for other purposes went to the chamberlain who supervised most of the expenditure. Other officials who needed money or supplies, such as the guestmaster, the almoner, the infirmarian, and the cellarer for some of his needs, applied to him. If the monks had any material necessities they went to the chamberlain, who not only provided new clothes at the times prescribed in the customs, but was also responsible for all mending. Mention is made of a junior chamberlain who could take over this charge and either the same or another subordinate had charge of the beds, including those for the guests.(1) It can be presumed that by the end of Hugh's

---

(1) Ulrich, col. 752: "Quoties loquuntur in claustro, camerarius vel eius junior...nunquam debet deesse; tune enim auditurus est a singulis quid ille aut ille opus habeat..." Bernard, p. 147: "Est etiam junioris Camerarii, ut ipse omnibus supervenientibus tam hospitibus quam aliis lectos distribuat..."
abbacy most of those duties that were not directly financial had become a sideline and were probably delegated to subordinates.

Practical evidence of the independence of the chamberlain in his own field is afforded in one of the twelfth century complaints made against Cluny. It was said that the abbot no longer had a list of the effects of the monastery as the Rule prescribed, but Peter the Venerable replied that the Rule allowed the abbot to share his burdens and anything else would have been impossible at Cluny. (1)

It has also been suggested that the later institution of the abbot's private chamberlain and separate camera or financial system had its origin under Hugh. (2) The argument is largely based on the use of the terms 'chamberlain of the abbot' and 'chamberlain of the abbey' viewed as distinct notions in the charters. (3) But such titles were so interchangeable and loosely used

(1) Peter the Venerable's letter to St. Bernard, PL 189, cols. 114 and 131.

(2) Sydow, loc. cit., traces the development of the chamberlain of Cluny and also postulates this emergence of the abbot's chamberlain, (p. 50 ff.) though he admits that the position is not clear.

(3) eg. Bruel, vol. v, no. 3827: "Bernardus Grossus, camerarius; Sequinus de Paredo, domni Hugonis abbatis cambellanus". In no. 3828, (a charter of the same period) Sequinas is referred to as "camerarius Cluniacensis"; and also in no. 3840. Dom Sydow quotes these charters, but the uncertainty probably arises from the confusion then apparent at Cluny, rather than the emergence of another office. See below, p.116
during this period as to make a precarious basis for the theory. There is occasional evidence of the presence of a chamberlain in Hugh's entourage when travelling, but nothing to indicate that he was a private official. On the contrary, instances can be quoted when it is certain that the chamberlain of the abbey accompanied Hugh, since in the early part of the abbacy the existence of any such private official would certainly have received mention in the customaries. Thus, it is related that before Hildebrand became Pope he and Hugh were once travelling together from a council and entered a church to pray. Hildebrand was distracted by Hugh's chamberlain who sat at the back of the church counting his money, till the legate could stand the rattle no longer and furiously turned him out.(1) Though the greatest developments in the office occurred in the later part of the abbacy, reference to a chamberlain's presence even then are too uncertain to allow the theory of a private official to be postulated more than tentatively, if at all under Hugh.

Nor is there any certain evidence of a separate abbot's camera, or indication that the money brought back from a journey or otherwise acquired by the abbot was

(1) Acta SS OSB vol. ix, p. 413, (Vita Gregorii).
not returned to the chamberlain of the abbey - if the latter had not travelled himself with the abbot to supervise finance.

(vi) The Cellarer and his subordinates

The duties allotted to the cellarer in the Rule were more varied and numerous than those belonging to the office at Cluny where the growth of the community and the commitments of the abbey increased the burdens of individual duties and necessitated a greater division of labour. (1) This is especially noticeable in the cellarer's office and its numerous subordinate offices, many of them created under Hugh, which reflect the ease with which the system could adapt itself to an ever-growing establishment.

The Cluniac cellarer was the caterer of the monastery and all food matters were his concern. (2) The importance of the office was judged to be such that he was appointed and installed in the same way as the major prior. (3) He was responsible to the latter but received from the chamberlain what he needed in the way of money or supplies,

(1) Regula, cap. xxxi, 'De cellarario monasterii qualis sit.'

(2) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 6, pp. 147-50; Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 18, cols. 760-2, 'De cellarario.'

(3) Ulrich, col. 760: "Cellarius eadem benedictione qua prior ordinatur et absolvitur."
so each Saturday evening these three officials discussed the menu for the coming week.(1)

If work pressed, the cellarer, alone of all the officials, was allowed to continue his task after compline. Ulrich describes him on one occasion after he had spent the whole day receiving dues in wine from the Cluniac vineyards requesting permission to eat after compline as there had been no time for a meal during the day. The permission was refused in accordance with Cluniac custom.(2)

Certain lands which had good pasture, cornfields, vineyards, cows, pigs, and hens, came under the cellarer's immediate jurisdiction and their products were allocated directly to his needs. He accordingly figures in the charters as an important administrator, acting with that independence that was given to the greater officials at Cluny. Thus, on one occasion, Hugh the cellarer arranged for lands to be bought or otherwise held by his uncles,

---

(1) idem, col. 761: "omnique Sabbato collationem facit cum priore et camerario, vel cum eorum vicariis, de singulis diebus venientis septimanae..."

(2) idem, col. 688: "Frater qui erat ad vesperas in claustro, si ante completorium comedere neglexerit, post completorium nullius rei gratia habebit licentiam comedendi...ego quadam vice cellerarium vidi tota die recipiendo vinum occupatem...post completorium quaerens...licentiam prandendi, prorsus nihil obtinuit..."
and at another time the same person involved himself in trouble with the monks of Trenarchino about some fishponds and a case had to be conducted in the court of the Count of Macon which decided in favour of Trenarchino.(1)

The cellarer supervised a number of lesser offices whose holders he could reprimand when necessary without recourse to the abbot. Chief among these subordinates was his vicar who replaced him in absence.(2) One monk had charge of the corn and supervised the mills and bakeries.(3) Another was gardener, presumably for the kitchen garden, and yet another was responsible for the wine.(4) There is evidence in the charters, where he is mentioned a number of times, of one official specially designated to supervise the salt mines which were being given to Cluny at this time.(5) There was also a


(2) Ulrich, col.761-2: "Primus (suffraganeus) qui per omnia vices agit ejus absentis, et de omnibus respondet de quibus solet et ipse respondere."

(3) ibid; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 7, pp. 150-1.

(4) Ulrich, lib.iii, caps. 19 and 20, cols.762-3; Bernard, lib.i, caps. 8 and 10, pp.151-3; 'De custodi vini' and 'De hortulano'.

(5) eg. Bruel, vol.iv, no.3181: "...coram domno Johanne monacho, qui eo tempore caldariis salinarum supradiicti monasterii preerat..."; and vol.v, no. 3776, in which "Johannes, monachus salinarius" witnesses a charter of donation of salt mines.
refectorian who had three helpers, besides the monks who were nominated as weekly servers, for the whole community took turn at this office.\(1\) Five or six weekly cooks were appointed who, during their week in office, missed some of the liturgical round in order to fulfil their duties.\(2\) If a meal was not ready in time they could remove the gong to prevent the monks being summoned too early to the refectory.\(3\)

\(\text{vii) The Precentor and his subordinates}\)

The person on whom all the responsibility of the services fell was the cantor or precentor, also called the armarius because he had charge of the books of the monastery.\(4\) Most of the duties belonging to his office were already formulated in pre-Cluniac custom, and though his work increased in quantity and importance, in essence it remained the same. Every aspect of the liturgy was

\(\text{(1) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap.21, col.763; Bernard, lib.i, cap. 11, pp. 155-6,'De Refectorario.'}\)

\(\text{(2) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 1, p.138, indicates that six were appointed; Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 3, col.737, says four was the number. But there are other examples of such discrepancies arising from changes that had occurred in the meantime.}\)

\(\text{(3) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 46, pp. 236-40,'De officio coquinae regularis.'}\)

\(\text{(4) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 10, cols. 748-51; Bernard, lib.i, cap. 14, pp. 161-4.'De praecentore et armario.'}\)
his concern and he answered to no one but the abbot. He decided what was to be sung or read in church, in the refectory, and at collation. He complained at chapter of any mistakes that had been made in church. If the abbot was away he took charge of everything in church, including precedence. He drew up the weekly list of those who were to officiate in different capacities during the services and was always ready himself to take over if anything went wrong.

The most important of these weekly offices were those of the weekly cantor and hebdomarius, to whom long chapters - mostly liturgical rubrics - are devoted in the customaries of Ulrich and Bernard. (1) The hebdomarius was celebrant at the major Mass one week, and of the matutinal Mass the following week. The weekly cantor officiated at office. His assistants, also appointed weekly, were the deacon, subdeacon, and gradual cantor. (2)

Owing to the amount of knowledge and skill required in the office of precentor no one could be appointed to the office at Cluny unless he had been brought up from childhood in the abbey, and it is unlikely that anyone

---

(1) idem, lib. i, capp. 21 and 22, pp. 181-4; Ulrich, lib. ii, capp. 29 and 30, cols. 714-25.

else would have had the requisite training. (1) The precentor also supervised the liturgical education of the boys. (2) He was responsible, too, for the books of the monastery and provided them when needed. He also arranged for their writing and copying. (3)

Like the other major officials, the precentor had a number of subordinates whose number increased and whose offices multiplied during Hugh's abbacy. The material needs for the liturgy were placed in charge of an official known as the apocrisarius or sacrist. (4) He provided anything that was needed for the services, such as sacred vessels, vestments, hosts and wine for Mass. He also looked after the candles and supplied them to the abbot, infirmarian, and refectorian. To cover expenses, the profits of one of the deaneries and some other tithes in corn and wine were allocated to the sacristy and the sacrist also received any offerings in money or kind made to the church. As a result, he came to deal frequently with money and one anecdote tells of a monk who had

(1) Ulrich, col. 748-9: "Haec est obedientia quam ex more nullus meretur, nisi nutritus."

(2) See below, p. 195

(3) Farfa, lib. ii, cap. 27, p. 167.

(4) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 12, cols. 753-7; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 51, pp. 245-7.
filled this office appearing after death to ask for penance to be done because he had wrongfully spent two solidi. (1)

The sacrist had someone to replace him if necessary and he also supervised a number of lesser officials appointed to look after the church. These were probably conversi, such as the porter, responsible for the door of the church who even slept at his post, and in between times polished candlesticks and swept the ambulatory. (2)

In Bernard's customary, mention is made of a weekly sacrist appointed as an extra helper. (3)

(viii) Other officials: infirmarian, guestmaster, almoner and others. (4)

The ordering of a vast community like Cluny provided work for an increasing number of officials. Some of these were already provided for in the Rule and had long been

(1) Vita Hug. auct. Hugone monacho, Bibl. Cl. col. 448.

(2) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 55, p. 250.

(3) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 52, pp. 247-8, De hebdomadario sacrista.

(4) Bernard's first book and Ulrich's third are devoted to describing in detail the duties of the officials of the monastery, greater and lesser. A good account of the minor officials may be found in Valous, Le Monachisme clunisien.
familiar in most monasteries.

The infirmarian was responsible for the infirmary where the sick and elder brethren were housed. This was a heavy task at Cluny where the infirmary quarters were large and the number of inhabitants was constantly on the increase. Numerous servants helped to look after the sick, and included a number of seculars.

The guestmaster's duties had also increased at Cluny and he had an array of helpers to look after all who came to the monastery on horseback: those who arrived on foot went to the almonry. A constable was appointed to the guesthouse to look after the horses of the guests and see they (the horses) were properly shod when the guests were ready to leave. The guestmaster was not allowed to admit anyone who came on a mere pleasure jaunt or for the purpose of criticising the Cluniacs, or to conduct business with a view to making profit, which excluded the possibility of merchants staying at


(2) See below, p. 77

(3) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 26, col. 769, 'De famulis domum infirmorum pertinentibus': 'tres sunt ex more...'

(4) idem, lib. iii, cap. 22, cols. 764 ff.; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 9, pp. 152-5.

the abbey. These classifications reflect the number of those who sought shelter at the abbey; they included the poor, pilgrims, and all kinds of travellers with their various destinies. The poor and pilgrims were looked after by the almoner who also went through the town once a week enquiring for the poor and sick so that he could distribute alms to them.(1)

Thus, at Cluny there was no lack of an ever increasing division of labour for the adequate fulfilment of duties. It was fortunate for the Cluny of Hugh's abbacy that men of competence were found to occupy positions such as that of major prior or chamberlain where ability was indispensable. But there are indications that towards the end of the abbacy such competence was no longer forthcoming and there are examples of the doubling of important offices. Thus, Seguinus was both prior of Marcigny and chamberlain of Cluny for a number of years in the early twelfth century.(2) Similarly, one charter refers to a certain Hugh who occupied the offices of chamberlain and cellarer at the same time, also in the early years of the twelfth century.(3)

(1) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 24, cols. 765-7; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 13, pp. 157-61.
(2) See below, p. 324.
(3) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3575: "Hugo...qui illius temporis curriculo cellarii camereque Cluniacensis curam gerebat."
The rapid turnover in the office of major prior has already been noted, and though this was less obvious in the offices of chamberlain and cellarer, there was an increasing tendency to lose the best administrators which created difficulties in maintaining a sound tradition and made the training of others almost an impossibility, so that newcomers to office had only their own experience and the meagre guidance of the customaries to guide them. Without a highly competent personnel, administrative soundness could hardly be hoped for, and this was an added threat to the already precarious economy of the abbey.

4. The Economy of the Abbey

(i) The Economic System in general

St. Benedict legislated for a self-supporting community whose closed economy was adequate to the simple needs of the early communities. Cluny had been founded with the same idea, but the accumulation of property, growth in numbers, and building extensions, together with the general economic and social trends resulted in a more complex economy. Contemporary tendencies favoured this development during the tenth and eleventh centuries. Monasticism was in every respect an integral part of
contemporary society and it is significant that many of Cluny's best administrators, including the early abbots, came from important feudal families whose economic concerns resembled those of the abbey, where the same principles of administration could therefore be applied.

A detailed economic survey would necessitate the Cluniac lands being examined in relation to the various regions in which they were situated, but the general principles underlying the economic administration can be elucidated without so exhaustive a study.

The charters provide ample material for reconstructing the Cluniac system, and some evidence is available in the customaries, though Ulrich and Bernard describe traditional practices in a way that simplifies and somewhat obscures the transition and developments of the period. But even their writings reflect some of the problems that were beginning, even in Hugh's abbacy, to threaten the stability of Cluny.

Duby, examining the question in its regional context, has distinguished three stages in the economic development of Cluny during a period of eighty years, inclusive of Hugh's abbacy. (1) Only in the very earliest years after

(1) G. Duby, 'le budget de l'abbaye de Cluny entre 1080 et 1155', in Annales, Economies Sociétés, Civilisations, 1952.
the foundation was a closed economy practised. But although the main aspect of administration continued to be the exploitation of the abbey's lands or domain, money was increasingly used and by 1080 had long been an integral part of the system. In the latter part of the eleventh century the accent was on expenditure, especially in buildings and almsgiving and though the resources of the abbey continued to increase, there was little development in the actual exploitation of the domain. Gradually this period merged into another of neglect in the management of estates and by 1125 the economic crisis of the twelfth century was nearing its height.

(ii) The Domain

The position of the Cluniac lands, which reached their greatest extent under Hugh, can be largely determined from the charters of donation.\(^{(1)}\) The domain was situated mainly in the Macon area at first, but as time went on lands were acquired in all parts of central and southern France. Every type of property was owned: vineyards, small pieces of cultivated land, cornfields, pasture land, woods, windmills, fishponds, and even salt mines are

---

\(^{(1)}\) See Valous, *Le domaine de l'abbaye de Cluny*, pp. 142 ff., where the author has analysed the charters and determined the position of Cluniac property in the tenth and eleventh centuries.
frequently mentioned in the charters.

But it is possible to exaggerate even the wide extent of Cluniac possessions if the number of charters alone is judged. Terminology is also a problem and words like "villa" which differed in meaning according to the region can confuse: it is not always clear whether an economic unit or term of location is implied. Thus, the statement "all in such a villa" might mean a small strip of land or a considerable estate. In any case, most of the donations in the Macon region consisted of small holdings owing to the parcelled nature of land in that area. Many charters were mere confirmations of previous grants, or ratifications of wills by the descendants of testators. It sometimes happened, too, that wills were not honoured by descendants so that Cluny occasionally failed to acquire land that the charters record as belonging to the abbey. There were also many conditional donations that brought hardly any economic profit, and in some there was a vagueness or reservation in phraseology - as in the phrase salve nostra fidelitate that could redound to the detriment of Cluny. (1)

(1) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3409 whereby a church, castle, and lands in Spain are handed to Cluny and held henceforth of the abbey: "et castellani qui tenuerint illa castra pro nobis sint homines abbatis Cluniacensi...salva nostra fidelitate et posteritate nostra."
The reasons for the many donations to the abbey were often similar to those that caused the expansion of the order. (1) Others can be added. The custom of dividing lands between heirs was advantageous to a monastery, whose estates remained intact, and the disintegration of estates could be prevented by granting the overlordship to the abbey. The custom whereby novices brought a dowry, usually in land, also contributed to the extension of the domain. (2) The crusades were another factor, and crusaders often handed their lands to the monastery either conditionally in the hope of redeeming them later, or in exchange for the necessary equipment for the expedition. (3) Most economic historians agree, however, that society during this period did not recognise a purely economic relationship and particular reasons explain the frequency of monastic benefactions. (4) One of the most

(1) See below, p. 121 ff. where these causes are analysed.

(2) See below, p. 175 ff.

(3) eg. Bruel, vol. v, no. 3703: "Ego, Acardus, miles... ire in Iherusalem, ad belligerandum contra paganos et Sarracenos pro Dec...intentione permotus, cupiensque illo ire armatus...quandam possessionem meam...pono in convadium...acciipiens ab eis (monachis) duo milia solidorum Lugdunensis monete et quatuor mulas..." See also 3737 and 3755 for similar examples.

(4) Schreiber, Bloch, and Duby, and Valous are all of this opinion.
dominant reasons, and the one most frequently stated, was the desire of securing a share in the prayers of the monks, especially after death, by burial in the monastic churchyard. (1) There was, as someone has said, an element of the market-place in medieval popular religion.

The variety of holdings and the conditional donations, some granting a general overlordship rather than immediate rights over the land, meant that Cluny, like other large monasteries, was drawn into the network of those social relationships now described as feudalism. It roused criticism in the twelfth century and accusations were made against Cluny for holding land like seculars. Peter the Venerable answered by saying that the monks prayed for all their benefactors. (2)

In the charters of the first two centuries of Cluniac history the monks figure as competent administrators tenacious of the rights of the abbey which they were efficient in protecting. The questioning of the abbey's rights over particular pieces of land was frequent, but the Cluniac8 always pursued their claims to the last and usually with success. Many examples could be quoted like that of the son of a testator who had bequeathed

(1) See below, p.241

(2) Letter to St. Bernard, PL 189, cols. 115 and 141.
lands to the abbey pleading ignorance of his father's will. Cluny granted him fifty solidi as compensation, but maintained the claim to the land.\(^{(1)}\)

A tendency to group the lands of the domain is also discernible. On account of the fragmentary nature of the donations most of the Cluniac lands were somewhat scattered. To facilitate administration attempts were made to acquire adjacent properties by means of sale, purchase, or exchange of land.\(^{(2)}\) Cluny also accepted lands temporarily, perhaps in the hope of permanent acquisition.\(^{(3)}\)

(iii) Money

All this implied much money circulation. Money was also fast replacing dues in kind and even the yield of lands directly administered by monks was sold in greater quantities towards the end of the century than previously,

---

\(^{(1)}\) Bruel, vol. v, no. 3754: "...patris datum nesciebam."

\(^{(2)}\) Examples of the purchase of land by Cluny may be found in the following charters: Bruel, vol. iv, nos. 3067, 3071, 3072, 3095, etc.; examples of sales and exchanges: ibid. nos. 3113, 3138, 3148, 3150, 3187, 3205, 3213, etc.

\(^{(3)}\) eg. as was the case with the lands of crusaders who, if they returned could redeem their land: see Bruel, vol.v, no. 3705: "Si mortuus fuero, istud quod nunc pro cumvadio habetur, jam tunc non orovadium, sed possessio... monasterii erit jure perpetuo. Si...reverti potuero... nichilominus possessio ista ad jam dictum coenobium... pertinebit."
and the customaries of Ulrich and Bernard describe this as a natural part of the economic system of the deaneries. (1)

The right of minting money belonged at that time to the local counts, so it was natural that Cluny would look for the same right once a vast and complex administration developed. The privilege of minting Poitou money had already been granted to the abbey by Duke William of Aquitaine, but in granting the profits to Cluny he had not in any way abdicated his own rights. (2) A specific Cluniac coinage was even more desirable. One of Pope Stephen IX's bulls confirmed the right to mint money, but whether this referred to Poitou money or not is uncertain, as the basis of the confirmation is doubtful. It is possible that the bull actually granted some rights for the first time for there is some ambiguity in the wording. (3)

The clause granting the right to mint Cluniac coinage was

(1) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 5, cols. 738-40; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 2, p. 139.

(2) For this whole question of Cluniac minting, see A. de Berthelemy, 'Numismatique clunisienne', in Revue numismatique, 1905, pp. 14-27.

(3) ibid.; PL 143, col. 879 and Bull. Cl. col. 14: "concedimus quoque tibi et ipsi venerabili loco, et confirmamus apostolica auctoritate habere, quandocunque, vel quandiu vobis placuerit, peroussuram proprii numismatis vel monetae quemadmodum privilegiis venerabilium praedecessorum nostrorum comperimus vobis concessum et confirmatum esse."
only interpolated into Pope John XI's bull in the early years of the twelfth century and the first Cluniac coins appeared about the same time. (1) There is, therefore, the possibility that Cluny based her claims to mint her own money on a forged interpolation, though the valid bull of Pope Stephen IX could equally well have served to support a claim.

(iv) Administration of the Domain

The subdivision of labour within the abbey had its counterpart in the administration of the scattered Cluniac lands. The system falls into two divisions: direct administration by monks and indirect administration through seculars.

The monks supervised all the lands in the immediate vicinity of the abbey (mostly small holdings) and in the deaneries or granges which formed the main economic units of that part of the domain directly controlled by monks. (2) The deaneries were little more than large farmsteads well situated for the administration of the lands grouped about them. Many of them appeared newly under Hugh and the

(1) Barthelemy, loc. cit.

(2) See above, p.99 'Cluniac Deans'
growth of some can be traced— as in the case of Berzé and Lourdon. (1)

The major prior visited all the deaneries once a year, about harvest time, to allocate the produce. Once provision was made for the deanery itself, the rest of the profits went to Cluny. The produce of distant deaneries was sold, but otherwise produce was taken direct to the monastery. The deanery had a life of its own and the dean was often responsible for a large number of seculars of various classes holding lands under all conditions and tenures. The records reflect how integral a part of rural life the granges could become. One incident is related, of a quarrel between the dean and his tenants which reached such a pitch that blows were exchanged. The tenants complained to the abbot of Cluny and, including a charge of murder in their case, appealed for a new dean. (2)

As the liturgical life of the abbey became increasingly exclusive of all other activity and as Cluniac lands became

(1) See L. Raffin, 'Une fortresse clunisienne: le Chateau Lourdon', in Millénaire.

(2) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3430: "Notum sit...vestre paternitate, ob prioris seviciam in cella Castellati tantam discordiam crevisse, quod etiam omicidia apud eumdem fieri vilescent, et in ejusdem manibus plures conversos vulneratos, et alia flagitiosa facinora patrari ab eo vilipendatur..."
more scattered direct monastic administration became difficult. It is also possible that the lack of good administrators in the community towards the end of Hugh's abbacy aggravated the position. Seculars gradually intruded into the Cluniac administrative system till they held a predominant place. This was hastened by the number of conditional grants to the abbey whereby the secular donor placed himself in a direct relationship with the monastery by yielding the final ownership and promising certain dues each year, but retained the immediate holding on lease.

It is noticeable that the term praepositus, formerly reserved to a monastic overseer, is increasingly used of seculars, and almost exclusively so towards the end of the eleventh century. There are no direct references to secular praepositi in the customaries, a further indication that the custom developed later rather than earlier in Hugh's abbacy. Peter the Venerable found it necessary to decree that no clerk or layman who did not belong to the community could act as praepositus or procurator for the cellarer on account of the losses to Cluny.

(1) eg. Bruel, vol. v, no. 3777, "Andreas, praepositus de Castro Leone..."

(2) Statute no. 45, PL 189, col.1038; Bibl. Cl. col.1366.
Apart from contracts accepted by the abbey in the shape of conditional donations, the Cluniacs themselves made use of customs then prevalent in contemporary society to grant pieces of land of varying sizes and on different conditions. The granting of "precaria" or leases for a certain number of years had begun in the tenth century, but by Hugh's time a lease for life had become so normal a procedure that some donations to the abbey towards the end of the eleventh century contained a clause to the effect that the land was not to be given in benefice or leased in any way. Land granted by the abbey could remain in the holding of the same family if the heirs paid a sum to the abbot on their accession, though it was sometimes expressly stated in a charter that land could not be handed on without licence from the abbot.

In contemporary secular society the lease of land usually carried with it certain military duties, but with Cluny it was mainly an economic relationship. Holders of Cluniac land did become in some way, however, "men of the abbey", though their non-economic duties were

(1) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3094: "Rogo autem...ut haec terra nunquam alicui detur in beneficium sed semper sit in usibus fratrum."

(2) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3250: "post mortem...nulli filiorum aut heredum suorum eam (vineolam) dimittere illi liceat."
mainly negative, such as not to violate the rights of
the abbey and to protect its interests. (1)

A considerable estate might be granted "in fief". Such
lands formed an economic unit similar to the monastic unit
of the deanery, but in the case of a secular owner it was
called a seignury. It has been estimated that there were
some eighteen of these seigneurs, men of considerable
rank in society, who owed obedience to the abbot of Cluny
in view of his overlordship of their lands. (2) The
seigneur, in turn, leased the lands of his estate, so
that it might happen that the immediate tenant of a piece
of land was three or four degrees removed from direct
connection with the abbey itself. The custom worked the
other way round as well, since overlordship of land already
subinfeudated a number of times was sometimes granted to
the abbey. (3)

(1) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3409: "et castellani qui tenuerint
illa castra pro nobis sint homines abbatis Cluniacensis
et sint fideles Sancti Petri et monachorum ejus de rebus
illorum..." See also, Duby, Le Société dans la region
maconnaise, p. 183.

(2) idem, 'Le Budget de l'abbaye de Cluny', p. 159.

(3) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3368, which records the grant of
a church to Cluny: "laudante Petro...qui hanc ecclesiam
de nobis ad fedum tenebat, et filius suus, et laudante
Guazelmno (et aliiis...),...qui de Petro aupradicto...hanc
iterum tenebant ad fedum, et laudantibus his subtitulatis
...qui de Guazelmno et de illius filiis hanc ecclesiam
rursus ad fedum habebant."
But for two centuries the greater part of the domain consisted of small holdings, most of them held directly of the abbey, by peasants of slightly varying social status.\(^{(1)}\) The lowest classes of serfs were gradually improving their position though they were still bound to the land and in some cases their dues still had the title *redemptio capitis*.\(^{(2)}\) Their growing independence dates from the eleventh century and in the list of the customs of the inhabitants of the small town of Cluny drawn up in the twelfth century, Abbot Stephen of Boulogne ascribed many of their liberties to the time of Hugh.\(^{(3)}\)

The efficiency of the early administration is reflected in the fact that the abbey could provide its own legal sanction, for side by side with the increasing mediation of land a code of monastic law developed to preserve the rights of the monastery. The nearest court in which pleas could be held was that of the Count of Macon, but in the eleventh century on account of his decreasing power and the strength of Cluny, fewer cases were taken to Macon.

\(^{(1)}\) The various grades of Cluniac tenants are defined by R. Houdayer, 'L'exploitation agricole des moines de Cluny', in *Millénaires*, pp. 235-46.

\(^{(2)}\) eg. Bruel, vol.iv, no. 3367: "Censum etiam quem pro redemptione capitis sui omni anno predicti servi monachis solverent...octo denarios et octo panes et quattuor sextarios vini."

\(^{(3)}\) edited by L'Huillier, p. 414.
By the time of Hugh most cases of importance between the abbey and its tenants were tried in the monastic court, established in the tenth century, consisting of a tribunal of five monks and assemblies of the feudatories of the abbey occasionally called as witnesses.(1) The abbot or major prior presided and the court met at Cluny or in one of the granges, such as Lourdon.(2) The institution was criticised by the Cistercians, and Peter the Venerable defended it on the grounds that there was no law forbidding monks to protect their own property.(3) There are frequent references in the charters, especially those of the end of the eleventh century onwards, to the "monastic law" in connection with land and there was an increasing tendency, in accordance with this, to replace the threat of excommunication by a money fine for violating a charter.(4) The whole legal process of some cases has been fully recorded. One charter describes how the prior summoned a certain praepositus, Humbert, for occupying more land than had been granted in fief, and for building on his own

---

(1) See Duby, La société dans la région maconnaise, pp.168-9, where the author says that the court was certainly functioning c 990. For examples of pleas, see Bruel, vol. iv, nos. 3400, 3503, 3178, 3262, 2255, etc.

(2) eg. Bruel, vol.v, nos. 3821, 3666, 3178, 3262.

(3) Letter to St. Bernard, PL 189, col. 147.

(4) eg. Bruel, vol.iv, nos. 3125 and 3130; vol. v, no. 3775: "pro lege monacho tres solidos solvat."
land without the consent of the abbot. He had to forfeit all he held of the abbey and plead mercy before receiving back part of the land. The transfer was symbolically effected by exchanging a stone. Finally, Humbert had to provide men who would stand surety against further infringement of the agreement.\(^{(1)}\)

\(\text{(v) The Cluniac Budget} \)

The Cluniac budget cannot be determined with exactitude at this period since no general accounts were kept. The evidence is fragmentary and obtained from details in the charters. Only under Peter the Venerable was a list of the censae due from the Cluniac monasteries drawn up, and not until the abbacy of Abbot Henry V, 1199-1207, was a system of overall and audited accounts introduced, whereby the major prior had to give an account of the finances twice a year to the abbot and once a year to the chapter.

The main resources of the abbey were the profits and dues in kind or money from the Cluniac domain. Payments were usually made annually and on a prescribed date, perhaps an anniversary or feast, the 29th June being one of the most popular dates.\(^{(2)}\) The contributions varied

\(^{(1)}\) ibid, vol. v, no. 3685.

\(^{(2)}\) ibid, vol. iv, no. 3081: "singulis annis censualiter in beatorum festivitate apostolorum III denarios persolvam." Similar examples may be found in nos. 3067, 3081, 3111, 3122, 3123, 3125, 3127, etc.
from considerable amounts of money to a few pence from the smaller holdings. Sometimes a tenant had the choice of payment in kind or money, but in every case the dues were defined and fixed by charter.\(^{(1)}\)

Cluny enjoyed certain revenues from ecclesiastical sources, such as canonical prebends and the tithes and other revenues of certain churches, another source of grievance in the twelfth century, and even earlier on the part of the bishops.\(^{(2)}\) Pope Urban II granted to the Cluniacs the right to any ecclesiastical revenues they could recover from lay hands and on another occasion he told Lanfranc to send his Roman dues to Cluny.\(^{(3)}\)

Some of the richest families of Europe were among the benefactors of Cluny, and they gave alms liberally. Hugh said that no gifts had equalled those of King Alphonsus of Spain who had doubled the annual cens\(\text{u}\)s promised by his father, to help in the building of the great

---

\(^{(1)}\) Ibid.

\(^{(2)}\) eg. PL 159, col. 849: an agreement regarding canonical prebends with the canons of Orleans and Chartres; Bruel, vol. v, no. 3674: "ego Hugo de Berziaco...cedo... aecolesiam parrochialam de Berziaco, cum sepultura et cimiterio, et censu domorum que sunt in cimiterio, oblationibus quoque tam pro vivis quam defunctis, medietatem quoque decimarum panis et vini totius parrochie..." this is but one of the numerous churches ceded to Cluny on similar terms.

\(^{(3)}\) See L'Huillier, p. 357; PL 151, col. 441.
basilica. (1) Some Cluniac monasteries also paid an annual sum to Cluny, though at the time this was probably only a minor source of revenue. (2)

Cluniac expenditure became increasingly decentralised. Some of the resources were already earmarked for certain purposes and the tendency to allocate to various officials like the cellarer, infirmarian, and sacrist was beginning. An allocation was also made to the refectory, usually in the form of the provision of food for certain days, usually fixed anniversaries. For example, the deanery of Lourdon had to provide the full refection of the brothers on the anniversary of Gerard of Vienne, one of the benefactors of Cluny. (3) Hugh himself asked that the grange of Berzé should furnish the community menu on his own anniversary and that of Peter Gloc, who apparently had been of great service in Cluniac administration before going to Rome to help Pope Urban II. (4) But all the income and dues, even of the deaneries, were not so allocated.

(1) PL 159, col. 946: Statuta S. Hugonis pro rege Hispianiarum, tanquam insigni benefactore: "qui tanta ac talia bona nobis fecit...ut neminem...ei comparer possimus."

(2) See below, p. 309

(3) See Bruel, vol. v, nos. 3742, 3373, and 3776.

(4) PL 159, col. 953: "(Petro)...qui pro hujus loci utilitate plurimum laboravit."
The expenditure of the abbey was extremely heavy. The monks themselves led a simple life, though their personal effects were increasing, judging from the list provided by Ulrich, and the twelfth-century accusations with regard to bed coverlets.\(^{(1)}\) No wool was produced in the Macon area and the Cluniacs seem to have excluded sheep-rearing from their economic activities, concentrating mainly on wine, so all clothing materials had to be bought. This entailed considerable expense in a large community where all the monks received a new habit every year and a new cowl every second year.\(^{(2)}\) Other extras not produced on Cluniac lands, such as food that might be wanted in the infirmary, had to be bought. To this last item were allocated all money gifts of less than ten solidi.\(^{(3)}\)

The heaviest expense under Hugh was building, notwithstanding special donations towards this, such as those of the King of Spain. To this must be added the enormous expense of the upkeep of the church and the splendour of the Cluniac liturgy. It would be interesting

\(^{(1)}\) Ulrich, lib iii, cap. 11, cols. 751-3 for a list of the effects. See PL 189, col. 113 (Peter the Venerable's letter to St. Bernard) for the accusation about the beds.

\(^{(2)}\) Ulrich, col. 752: "quidquid ad vestium pertinet... semper et ex toto est comparandum."

\(^{(3)}\) idem, col. 751.
to know if the Cluniacs produced their own candles, for if not these would have been a considerable item.

Almsgiving at Cluny was very liberal. Apart from the number of guests who were freely entertained, the large almonry was always full, and at certain times of the year, especially at the beginning of Lent, alms were generously distributed to the poor. Ulrich indicates that a very large number benefited in this way.\(^{(1)}\)

The abbey continued to pay a nominal cense of five solidi to Rome, as prescribed in the foundation charter. Sometimes this was implemented by other contributions prescribed in some charters of donation, in acknowledgement of papal protection.\(^{(2)}\)

Normally the income was enough to satisfy the greatest needs, though Ulrich noted that there were occasions when it did not suffice.\(^{(3)}\) Another reference in one of Hugh's biographies tells of how the community was once in such

\(^{(1)}\) *idem*, col. 753: "hoc ipso anno: illi qui pauperes recensuerunt testati sunt septemdecim millia fuisse, quibus et in Christi nomine ducenti quinquaginta baccones divisi sunt." Even allowing for the exaggeration Ulrich's implication is clear.

\(^{(2)}\) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3409: "et reddat per quinquennium X solidos aureos, sicut continent privilegia a pontificibus Romanis Aggerensi aecolesiae concessa".

\(^{(3)}\) *Ulrich*, col. 751-2: "frequenter accidit ut de omnibus rebus annuatim nascentibus nihil omnino habeamus ad subsidyum vitae temporalis, praeter quod de denariis est comparatum."
straits that messengers had to be sent to Hugh, who was away at the time. (1) Such references point to the fact that an increasing expenditure failed to take account of an inadequate income and that the system was beginning to crumble even before the end of the eleventh century. Valous has rightly said that the monastery was rich in appearance rather than reality. (2)

External factors hastened economic instability. In an economic order where land had been the predominant feature, Cluny had had no difficulty in adaptation, and was helped by the intimate relations of the community with the great feudal families. But one of the features of the economic system prevalent in France towards the end of the eleventh century was that the large seignury had less profit than the smaller, and Cluny itself only received a fraction of the profits from the many sub-infeudated lands. The neglect of the domain in the twelfth century and the squandering of resources in the contested abbacy between Pons and Peter aggravated the economic decline which reached its climax in the complete economic collapse that Peter the Venerable had to face.

(2) Valous, Le temporel et la situation financière, p. 4.
5. The Horarium at Cluny

(i) General remarks

It is difficult, if not impossible, to reconstruct with accuracy the horarium at Cluny during the abbacy of Hugh. There is a wealth of detail pertaining to the subject in the customaries which are the main source of information on this point, but nowhere is a systematic account of the daily round provided. Seasonal and ferial changes were frequent so that no horarium would apply to more than a fraction of the year. The writers of customaries assume familiarity with the normal monastic day and concentrate on deviations from this, and certain times (particularly the earlier part of the day and some seasons like Lent), receive more attention. No clock times are given. In the Rule the monks' day was apportioned according to sunrise and sunset, but by the eleventh century, particularly at Cluny, the only fixed point was the beginning of the day. Dawn might also be a determinant, but apart from this, duties succeeded one another regardless of time and the horarium could be accelerated or retarded at will.

An exaggerated impression of greater congestion than

(1) See Knowles, *The Monastic Order*, cap. 26, pp. 448 ff. where the difficulties of reconstruction and the general principles governing every monastic horarium are summarised.
was actually the case might be created in the mind of the modern reader of the customaries by the welter of liturgical detail, apparently confused with treatment of the horarium. Also, as Professor Knowles has pointed out, it is difficult to estimate the length of services and the liturgy might well have been performed with an ease born of certainty and skill and consequently with comparative rapidity. (1)

The present state of liturgical studies may also be mentioned in connection with the horarium, as liturgy was the predominant feature of life at Cluny. Ideally, the horarium of Hugh's time should be viewed against the background of Cluniac liturgical development and, indeed, Benedictine liturgical history as a whole. But as the importance of liturgical history has only recently been recognised, the study is still in its beginnings and the field bristles with problems and controversy. (2) Treatment of the liturgy is therefore limited here to its relation with the horarium rather than its internal structure, development, and affinities with contemporary tendencies, which could well form the theme of a substantial monograph.

(1) ibid. p. 451.
(2) Dom Philibert Schmitz draws attention to the want of a study of Benedictine liturgical development in Histoire de l'Ordre de S Benoît, vol. iv, p. 149.
Some work has been done on the reconstruction of medieval monastic timetables and we are fortunate in having those drawn up by scholars like Abbot C. Butler and Professor Knowles. (1) Two examples of the Cluniac horarium, including one of Hugh's abbey, are reproduced at the end of this thesis, but before discussing some aspects in more detail, three facts that have sometimes received insufficient attention may be emphasised.

In the first place, the Cluniac horarium was not the unique phenomenon that has sometimes been supposed, but was typical of most monasteries of the tenth and eleventh centuries. Most of its features were non-Cluniac, many of them pre-Cluniac, in origin. The Rule prescribed the fairly equal division of the monks' day between the Opus Dei, spiritual reading, and manual work, but accretions, mainly liturgical, gradually encroached on the time previously given to manual work. By the end of the eighth century daily Chapter was established and when Benedict of Aniane's ordo became the norm in the early ninth century Mass was given an essential place. Extra Offices, groups of psalms, and other prayers also accumulated and by the tenth century all the main features of the Cluniac timetable had emerged.

Secondly, no substantial changes or additions to the timetable were made during Hugh's abbacy. The major developments had already taken place and though minor alterations were still liable to be made (they are discernible, for example in the difference between the horarium of c980 and c1080), henceforward the tendency was to cut down. Developments within the liturgy continued, but did not influence the general pattern of the day.

But - and this brings us to the third point - the horarium was profoundly affected by an accumulation of other factors, chief among which were the growth in the community and building extensions. Thus, services that included processions of any kind were much prolonged and the slowing-up process of movement en masse was inevitable as the community became more unwieldy and composed of a disproportionate number of old and infirm. Ulrich remarks on the increasing amount of time spent in church, refectory and at Chapter because of the size of the community.(1)

The liberal anniversary observances were also beginning

(1) Ulrich, col. 668: "quia multitudo fratum acervavit; a quibus dum ad utramque missam offertur, dum pax datur et accipitur, dum in capitulo de uno aut altero hoc et illud reclamatur, dum tantis in refectorio servitur, non minima pars expenditur diei; quae tamen singula ordine nostro salvo et integro remanere non possunt."
to take toll. (1)

This, and the splendour that characterised Cluniac liturgy, distinguished the Cluniac horarium. St. Anselm is said to have declined to enter Cluny on account of the distraction ordinis that prevailed there and after St. Peter Damian had stayed at Cluny for a week in 1063 he expressed amazement that the monks could support so heavy a burden as their daily round entailed which, he said, hardly gave them half an hour to themselves. (2)

(ii) The Liturgy

The canonical Hours of Nocturns, Matins, Prime, Terce, Sext, and None, Vespers, and Compline, retained their primary place in the horarium but except for Nocturns and Matins they were rarely performed at the customary hours because of the delay caused by the multifarious accretions. In its main structure the Office of the Day resembled that of the Rule, but the increasing number of

(1) idem, col. 647: "Nunc autem cum nullo sit dies qui vel multis careat defunctis."

(2) Vita S. Anselmi auct. Eadmero, lib. i, cap. 1, PL 158, col. 53, Bibl. Cl. col. 483 (letter of St. Peter Damian to St. Hugh): "...tanta praeest in Ecclesiasticis officiis protelabatur instantia: ut in ipso canori, sive leonis aestu, cum longiores sunt dies, vix per totum diem unius saltam vacaret horae dimidium, quo fratribus in claustro licuisset miscere colloquium... dum in persolvendo continui ordinis penos totum, non modo diurni sed et nocturni temporis spatium profligatur."
days on which the "full office" of twelve lessons was said, the doubling of offices, and the general lengthening of lessons caused a protraction of what St. Benedict envisaged.

It is possible to reconstruct the Cluniac calendar and as regards the actual number of feasts observed it was fairly typical of the eleventh century. (1) Feasts were graded according to whether four, eight, or twelve lessons were read at the night Office, and from the Farfa customs it is known that forty-seven days were observed with the full Office of twelve lessons. (2) Hugh added the following feasts to the Cluniac calendar: St. Odilo, 2nd January (introduced in 1049), the translation of the relics of St. Consortia, 22nd June, (1099-1109), St. Gerard of Toul, 23rd April, (1069), the Consecration of the High Altar in the new basilica, 25th October, (1095) the reception of the relics of St. Marcel, 6th January, (1109), the Feast of the Blessed Trinity, (before 1088). (3)

(1) See Valous, Le Monachisme clunisien, vol.i, pp. 397 ff. where a reconstruction of the calendar may be found.

(2) Farfa, p. 35: "Sunt autem apud nos per totum annum quadraginta et septem plena officia quod antecessores nostri, seu iste dominus abbas (Odilo) quae superest, decreverunt."

(3) Valous, Le Monachisme clunisien, pp.421ff. where additions to the Cluniac calendar are noted. The feast of the Blessed Trinity had been observed in the diocese of Liège since the tenth century; neither Ulrich nor Bernard specifically refer to its introduction to Cluny by Hugh, though in the Farfa customs there is no mention of the feast, but only the octave of Pentecost, (lib.i, cap.76, p.78) whereas Barnard, (lib.ii, cap.25, De festo Sanctissimae Trinitatis), says: "Octavus dies Pentecostes, non tam pro octava, quam Sanctissimae Trinitatis celebratur", and Ulrich also has a chapter on the feast: lib.i, cap. 26, col. 673.
The addition of saints' days led to doubling the Office of the Day when feasts or vigils coincided or occurred on Sundays, for no Office could ever be omitted. Double Offices were already a feature of the tenth century for Maieul noticed that many monks found the observance burdensome and substituted two psalms for one of the Offices in certain instances. (1)

Normally if Sundays became too overloaded part of the Office was left until the next day, but this led to the displacement of the Sunday Office altogether in some cases. This is known from Peter the Venerable's statute decreeing that the Sunday Office might not be displaced by that of a saint, and though in Hugh's time most feasts of twelve lessons occurred between June and September, the basic rhythm of the liturgical cycle was in some danger of being stifled. (2)

The length of lessons at Cluny was notorious. (3) Different books of Scripture or Commentaries were appointed to be read at certain times of the year, and if not completed in church they were finished in the refectory. For example,

(1) Ulrich, lib. 1, cap. 4, col. 648.


(3) See Ulrich, col. 643, who quotes William of Hirsauc's first question as: "Audio lectiones vestras in hime et in privatis noctibus multum esse prolixas."
the whole of Genesis was read during the night Office of one week. (1) The lector used his own discretion as to length, though if he made a lesson too short the older monks would complain at Chapter. (2) In any case, the lesson had to be sufficiently long to enable one monk with a small lantern to tour the church and see that no one was dozing. (3)

Apart from Mass, which held a distinct place, most of the liturgical accretions, consisting of extra Offices, groups of psalms or other prayers, litanies and processions, accumulated round the nucleus of the Office of the Day. Daily Chapter can also be included among the liturgical functions. It took place before or after Terce according to season, began with the proclamation of the date, reading of the Martyrology and part of the Rule on which the abbot commented or preached some other homily. Then came accusations, and confession of faults followed by the discussion of any community matters that arose. The exercise concluded with the recitation of thirty psalms.

(1) ibid: "...in illa una septimana Genesis perlegatur."

(2) idem, col. 645: "Et cum quidam frater...terminasset breviores, prohibitus est in capitulo a senioribus nostris."

(3) idem, col. 643: "Cavendum tamen est ne aliquando fiant ita breves ut ille frater, qui circam facit cum absconsa, non posset per totum chorum et extra circuisse, exploratus scilicet si quis forte obdormierit inter legendum."
Two Masses had for long been the norm: the Morrow or Chapter Mass (Missa Matutinalis) and the solemn chanted or conventual Mass (Missa Major). The latter was celebrated with particular solemnity at Cluny even on ordinary days. There were at least seven and often ten collects, and whether Ulrich's comment that the precentor could sing as many offertory verses as he liked was a dig at the protraction of the services or not, it is indicative of the leisureliness of the ceremony.\(^{(1)}\) He also says that at the time of writing the number of professed monks was so great that only one side of the choir took part in the offertory procession and the Kiss of peace, and at the Mass for the Dead, only ten monks.\(^{(2)}\) Any who had performed these ceremonies and who wished to communicate could, though only a very small number seem to have done so for only three or sometimes five hosts seem to have been consecrated.\(^{(3)}\)

Each priest could also say his own Mass, served by two

---

\(^{(1)}\) Ulrich, lib. i, cap. 6, col. 652: "De versibus offerendis nihil aliud referre novi, nisi praecentor secundum quod sibi videtur imponit, nunc unum, nunc omnes, maxime propter offerentes."

\(^{(2)}\) ibid.: "Nam per tres dies septimanae quotquot sunt de sinistro choro ab his offertur, pax datur, et accipitur... per alios tres a dextro..."

\(^{(3)}\) ibid.: "et quibus visum fuerit ab his (quibus pax datur) corpus Domini sumitur, propter quod etiam tres hostiae consecratur."
conversi, at the prescribed times or, with permission, at another time. Private masses were usually said after Chapter, during the period when the monks were allowed to talk in the cloister, though Ulrich and Bernard both remark that so much more time was spent in church, at Chapter and in the refectory because of the growth in numbers, that it had become impossible to finish a private mass in the diminished period of talk. (1)

The most important of the extra offices was the Office of the Dead, consisting of Vigils (three or nine psalms with an equal number of lessons), Lauds (five psalms) and Vespers (five psalms) with appropriate versicles. The full office with nine lessons was said on the death of a monk and at first on all anniversaries. But this had to be mitigated and Hugh introduced instead a general commemoration on 31st January of all deceased Cluniacs and appointed the Tuesday after Trinity Sunday as a day of special commemoration for all those buried in the monastic cemetery. (2) Nevertheless the full Office of

(1) Bernard, p. 324: "Olim tantum solebat esse spatium ipsius locutionis, ut Sacerdos qui Missam privatam volebat cantare interim eam finire posset, quod tamen modo raro contingit; quia multitudo Fratrum acrevit."

(2) Bernard, p. 334; Ulrich, col. 673: "Quotquot defunctorum in loco nostro sunt sepulci, pro his domo abbas specialiter constituit ut eorum recordatio hae vice (in secunda feria post octavas Pentecostes) studiosissime fiat."
the Dead became almost a perennial feature of the timetable because of the large number of Cluniacs and Ulrich says that there was scarcely a day on which it was not said for someone.\(^{(1)}\)

A much shorter Office was that of All Saints consisting of Matins (seven or eight psalms and lessons) and Vespers (four psalms). It probably dates from the time of Benedict of Aniane and was said daily.\(^{(2)}\)

The Office of Our Lady was introduced into many monasteries in the eleventh century but Cluny, for a change, was slow to follow suit. Hugh decreed that the Hours should be said in the infirmary, but later they must have been recited in choir, for Peter the Venerable had to restrict the performance again to the infirmary.\(^{(3)}\)

Most of these offices had originated in the addition of psalms and prayers to express a particular devotion or for some special intention, especially for benefactors who usually had a particular place in the prayers of the monks and who sometimes specified which prayers they wanted said.

Most of such additions were already present long before

\(^{(1)}\) idem, col. 652: "tanta est multitudo illorum qui omnes professi sunt congregationis nostrae ut rarissime his defunctis careamus, pro quibus septem officia simul cum septem missis sunt agenda."


\(^{(3)}\) Statute no. 60, Bibl.Cl. col.1370 and PL 189, col. 1041.
Hugh became abbot though minor details were still liable to accumulate. Hugh decreed that a special collect at Mass, and a psalm at Terce, should be said for King Alphonsus of Spain. St. Peter Damian also asked for the prayers of the monks and Hugh promised him that the community would say one psalm for him each day.

The collects of Mass at Cluny always included one for Kings and princes. The anniversary of the Emperor Henry III was solemnly observed and the reigning Emperor always prayed for. This led on one occasion to trouble with the Archbishop of Lyons, who in 1094 complained that Hugh had publicly prayed for the Emperor despite the decree of excommunication promulgated by Pope Gregory VII. When reprimanded, Hugh apparently replied that he had not specified which Emperor he was praying for, though no doubt the Archbishop was right when, describing the whole affair in a letter to Countess Matilda of Tuscany, he said he was convinced that the abbot had the Roman Emperor in mind.

Four short psalms, the familiare, named from the intention for which they were said, were recited after each Office and at Cluny, in Dent, two psalms were said prostrate

(1) Statuta pro Alphonso rege Hispaniarum, PL 159, col. 645-6.
(2) Bibl. Cl. col. 479.
after the Office of the Day. Other groups of psalms, such as the penitential and gradual, the first and last thirty psalms, were also features of the horarium and most of them were said at some time during the earlier part of the day, before or between different offices. (1) Versicles and collects were also added, and at Cluny they seem to have been particularly numerous. (2) The trina oratio, a private prayer said on entering the church for the night Office, was optional in content: Ulrich was taught to say three groups of psalms followed by a collect, though sometimes there was only time to say one Pater. (3) There were also prescribed prayers — both public and private — to be said whenever a monk died at Cluny, such as thirty Masses said by six priests. When a Clunian monk died elsewhere, priests offered Mass, and the other monks recited thirty psalms or an equal number of Paters. (4)

(1) See the horarium, after p. 363.

(2) Ulrich, lib. i, cap. 5, col. 648 ff.: 'De collectis et versiculis quae psalmos sequuntur et quantitate letaniae.' Ulrich begins the chapter with William of Hirsau's statement: "...audio, ut supra psalmos... innotueris et collectas et versiculos collectas praeventientes, sine quibus tanta psalmodia et in tot membra divisa non finitur."

(3) Ulrich, col. 667: 'unus tamen seniorum novitium me docuit ut septem psalmos dicere... tres orationes; verum quisque quod voluerit oret."

(4) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 29-31, col. 771 ff; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 24, p. 190 ff.
The monks were also expected to make private visits to the various altars of the church in between times, and the claustral prior reported to the abbot if too few did this. (1)

Processions were also a feature of monastic liturgy by this time, and they were incidental to many of the services, especially at Cluny. There was always a procession after Nocturns to the church of the Blessed Virgin where Matins of All Saints was recited, and on Sundays a solemn procession after the first Mass. (2) Litanies had also been introduced and that of the saints was said after Prime. From the beginning of Lent until November three monks went daily after the evening meal to wash the feet of three of the poor in the almonry. (3) The general Mandatum performed in community took place each Saturday at Cluny except when one of the principal feasts of vigils occurred on a Saturday, whereupon the Mandatum was transferred to Thursday. (4)

The liturgical round was more protracted at certain

---

(1) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 3, p. 143: "Si enim pauci inventi fuerint (qui orationes ante altaria faciunt) ipse clamabit in Capitulo."

(2) Ulrich, lib. i, cap. 10, col. 653, 'De processione Dominicali'; idem, col. 646, for the procession after Nocturns.

(3) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 48, p. 241; Ulrich, lib. ii, cap. 37, col. 730.

(4) Ulrich, col. 664. Odilo arranged this for the five major feasts, Hugh added six more.
times than at others. Lent was particularly weighted and it has been estimated that some 180 psalms were said in addition to the Office of the Day, an achievement that exceeded even that of the Desert Fathers. (1) Ulrich wryly remarks that St. Benedict's injunction to add something to the customary observance during Lent was well observed at Cluny. (2)

To emphasise their distinction, the greater feasts of the year were celebrated with more and more splendour and elaboration, and most of the internal liturgical developments of Hugh's abbacy are concerned with this. (3) A few examples may be quoted: Hugh introduced extra antiphons on the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, integrated the Veni Creator into the Cluniac Pentecostal liturgy, decreed that the Mass of Our Lady should be said on Saturdays if no other feast occurred and, according to Ulrich, he wanted to solemnise the hymns of Easter week. (4)

(1) See art. Bénédictine (Règle), col. 318, DDC.

(2) Ulrich, lib. 1, cap. 3, col. 646: "Sanctus Benedictus praecipit ut in Quadragesimali quid addatur ad pensum solitae servitutis; quod nec dissimulatur a nobis."

(3) Ulrich, (col. 672) speaking of the need for more solemn melodies for the hymns of Easter Week says: "et si persona esset idonea, quae id domno abbati suggeret et suaderet, fortassis emendari juberet, sicut et de multis aliis jam fecit."

(4) See Ulrich, cols. 672 and 681; Bibl. Cl. col. 464; Bernard, p. 347.
Such minor developments contributed in their own way to the protraction of the services especially on major feasts. The patronal feast of the abbey, Sts. Peter and Paul, 29th June, seems to have been one of the worst days and Ulrich noted by the sundial on one occasion that None of one day was being said at the time of Compline the next. (1) One anecdote current at Cluny, recorded by Peter the Venerable, relates how a sacrist, Bernard, overslept after the heavy observance of 29th June and was roused by an irate St. Paul, who complained of being deprived of his due honour and asked that the monks be summoned to perform his office as solemnly as that of St. Peter the day before. (2) The story goes that the sacrist hurried to ring the rising bell and when he arrived in the church found a "white-robed host" performing the Office (though whether this was to appease St. Paul or shame the monks is not related).

Certain aspects of the liturgy such as its pace and quality, will always for the most part elude the historian. There are, however, a few valuable references on these matters in the sources. The most significant remark is

(1) Ulrich, col. 688: "Venit mihi aliquando in mentem ut ipsam horam solis radio notarem, quem sequenti die quando cantavimus nonam in eodem vidi esse loco; ita ut momentum praecedentis completorii a momento nonae sequentis nihil esset divisum."

(2) Bibl. Cl. 447, col. (De Miraculis).
Peter the Venerable's statement regarding the observance of a moderate pause between verses in the psalmody which he said was not to apply at Cluny where time would not allow for it. (1) Apart from revealing much about the breathlessness of the liturgical round the reference supports the theory that most of the stress was on finishing the prescribed amount. The same principle underlies the custom whereby monks saying the office on a journey had to begin again if interrupted, and if the deans were still within sound of the bell when the monks were summoned to Office they had to defer their departure and return to the church. (2)

On the other hand, Ulrich's comments suggest anything but a tendency to haste. He specifically remarks on the way that all versicles and antiphons were sung at Cluny and mentions the acceleration of the Office on manual work days as something exceptional. (3)

Growth in numbers would also create difficulties in the way of achieving a fluent execution, especially when an adequate training was lacking. (4) These might have been

(1) Statute no. 1, Bibl. Cl. col. 1355 and PL 189, col. 1026.
(2) Ulrich, col. 739.
(3) idem, col. 645: "Nulla est antiphona tam parva quam non plena toni sui definitione finiamus." Col. 676: "Erga nona quoque magis quam in aliis diebus acceleratur."
(4) See below, p. 178 ff.
evaded by leaving the onus to a highly trained few —
though there are other indications that some of those partaking were not always au fait. (1) The fact that this was a time of development within the liturgy also complicated things and it seems that at Cluny there was some feeling on the subject: for example, Ulrich refers to the disagreements of the Gauls and the Teutons as to the subject of tropes and proses of which the latter party sound to have been rather fond. (2) All things considered, it can also be supposed that the precarious condition of Cluny towards the end of Hugh's abbacy, when disintegration was in sight, cannot but have had serious repercussions on the quality of the liturgical prayer at Cluny.

Be that as it may, the liturgy remained the distinguishing mark of the Cluniac horarium and it can probably be said that it represented the most elaborate ritual prayer that the West has ever witnessed.

(iii) Other Activities

All other activities at Cluny emanated from the liturgy

(1) See below, p. 189f.

(2) eg. Ulrich col. 672: "Quamvis autem omnes Galli non magnopere curent de prosis Teutonicorum, tamen beato Patre Odilone adnitate et de nostratibus asserente, haec sola, Sancti Spiritus adsit nobis gratia obtinuit ut in nostro loco in isto dei (Pentecostes) cantaretur."
and were, so to speak, made liturgical. By the time Hugh became abbot, manual work had virtually disappeared as a regular feature of the horarium and had to be specifically reintroduced by Peter the Venerable. (1) The customaries of Ulrich and Bernard devote a chapter to manual work days as something extra-normal for which a special order of the day was arranged so as to make time for the work by cutting out some of the accretions. (2) Whether such days were a mere gesture to tradition or arranged when help was genuinely needed in the garden or kitchen is not quite clear. (3) The monks went in procession to the scene of the work, either to weed, pick beans, or make bread, and what had been omitted from the day's

(1) Statute no. 39, Bibl. Cl. col. 1365 and PL 189, col. 1036.

(2) Ulrich, lib. i, cap. 30, col. 675 ff; Bernard lib. i, cap. 75, p. 280 ff.

(3) Professor Knowles is of the former opinion, to which Ulrich's facetious statement about the kind of work would seem to point: col. 676: "non erat aliud quam fabas novas ... egerere, vel in horto malas herbas et inutiles,... eruere; et aliquando panes formare in pistrino." Bernard, p. 280, would seem to suggest the same: "Ab octavis Pentecostes usque ad Idus Septembris, quacumque die placet D. Abbati vel Priori, excepto in duodecim Lectionibus ibunt Fratres semel aut bis ad opera manuum." But had it been no more than a ceremonial affair it is unlikely that the monks would have gone twice in one day and it is possible that the community lent a genuine extra hand: "Si visum fuerit domino abbati ut amplius operentur, ampliatur quoque psalmodia," (Ulrich, col. 676) - here, it would seem that the work is the determinant.
liturgical round was completed while at work. Eventually the abbot called the monks together and preached a short sermon after which they returned to the church in procession.

But a number of monks, especially the officials, were very busily engaged in between services, and though the cooks are the only ones mentioned as being dispensed from part of the Office and conventual Mass, others must have found the time somewhere for performing their duties.(1) St. Peter Damian's companion who wrote the full account of the journey to Cluny ascribed the development of the complicated sign language which covered almost everything a monk would want to ask for, to the impossibility of finding time to discuss necessary business.(2)

As regards literary output, the abbacy of Hugh was singularly barren, though the picture of an intellectually disinterested body of monks is too often painted. Some of the monks had received the best education of the day, but to them were given administrative positions which fully occupied them. Writing was not incompatible with the spirit of Cluny but impossible on account of the

(1) See Knowles, The Monastic Order, p. 452: "And in every house, and at all periods, there must have been a fair proportion of monks excused from some, at least, of the choir duties."

(2) PL 145, col. 874: "ita enim in ecclesiasticis atteruntur officiis ut vix claustrensi et honesta locutione, nisi signis, possit alter alteri aliquid intimare."
horarium and the few indications of literary work that there are, such as the customaries of Ulrich and Bernard, and the letters of Hugh, point to what has been lost to the historian in the absence of other literary expressions of the spirit of Cluny.

Cluny must have had an adequate scriptorium, however, for the production of liturgical and other books and for preparing the numerous charters. Under Odilo, a monk engaged in copying a borrowed book or engaged in similar work was allowed to omit some of the Office and part of the two Masses, though there is no mention of this custom in Ulrich or Bernard's writings. The names of some monks who were outstanding in the work of copying and illuminating have been recorded, and even if examples of their work have not survived, the tributes can be accepted as valid.

Albert, Peter, and Durannus are three names specially associated with craftsmanship and Hugh awarded the last named a particular anniversary observance because of his artistic accomplishments.

Cluniac architecture was essentially an adjunct to the liturgy and not a primary aspect of Cluniac life. Hugh's

(1) Farfa, pp. 150 and 157.
(2) M.F. Cucherat, Cluny au onzième siècle, (2nd ed. Macon, 1850) p. 127; Bibl. Cl. 1645.
own taste is reflected in the buildings of his abbacy, especially the great basilica which was the most perfect expression of the Cluniac spirit, and can only be understood in the light of the liturgical mind that conceived it. The whole design reflected its liturgical inspiration even to the smallest details of capital motifs illustrating the natural and ecclesiastical year and the plain chant modes. In the small chapel of Berzé, a few kilometres to the south of Cluny, are preserved some of the few remaining examples of the Cluniac wall painting of Hugh's abbacy, and they are considered to be among the best memorials of Romanesque murals. They were probably executed by the same artists who were working on the church at Cluny so that an idea of what has been lost can be estimated.(1)

It is not known how much of the work was done by the monks, though they must have approved and directed it if they were not ultimately responsible for designs as well, and it is thought that Gunzo and Hezelon, two of Hugh's monks, had something to do with the planning.(2)

(1) See above, p. 4 f. and notes.

(2) Gunzo, who had been Abbot of Baume, is described in the vitae as being one of the prime movers in persuading Hugh to build the new basilica: see Vita Hug., auct. Gilo. L'Huillier, p. 605, and Peter the Venerable's letter praising the three canons of Liège, PL 189, col. 279: 

"(Hezelo) multo tempore pro Ecclesia, ad quam venerat laborans...non solum audientium mores instruxit, sed corporalem novae Ecclesiae fabricam...construxit."
In assessing the cultural activity of Cluny the liturgy must be taken into account for in it all the arts found an expression. And if some were already turning away from Cluny on account of the _districtio ordinis_ that characterised the horarium, there were still many who sought it as their ideal and were moulded by its influence into men of God.

6. The Cluniac Community 1049-1109

(i) Numbers

One of the outstanding features of the abbacy of Hugh was the growth in the size of the community. A rise in numbers had occurred under Odilo who was described by his biographers as "father of a whole crowd of monks of all ages and conditions". (1) In the Farfa customs there is a list of sixty-four monks to whom books were distributed at the beginning of Lent between 1042 and 1049, and if allowance is made for those who could not read (elsewhere in the same customs we learn that there were then at least twenty-seven _conversi_) it can be estimated that by the time Hugh became abbot there were about one hundred monks. (2)

(1) _Vita Odilonis auct. Jot saldo_, PL 142, col. 906.

(2) _Farfa_, lib. ii, cap. 51, pp. 185 ff. The number of _conversi_ can be estimated from the description given for the processions: see _Farfa_, lib. i, cap. 53, pp. 43-4, and below p. 100 ff.
But a far greater expansion occurred under Hugh and it is generally agreed that at his death the community numbered about three hundred.(1) The only number provided in the customaries of Ulrich and Bernard—who both consider the enlarged community as the factor most affecting the horarium—is Ulrich's comment on two hundred monks being present at the Mandatum.(2) Even allowing for some inaccuracy it seems that the community had practically doubled in less than thirty years.

The most accurate figures are probably those obtained from architectural evidence. It has been estimated that the buildings existing in 1043 provided accommodation for 400–450 persons: one hundred monks, fifty-two sick or retired persons (probably monks), twelve poor men in the almonry, a hundred famuli or lay brethren, a number of serfs and other servants, forty men and thirty women in the guest house, and a hundred wayfarers in the hospice attached to the abbey.(3)

Even larger buildings became necessary, and the story goes that Hugh was undecided about extensions until an old monk Gunzo, retired Abbot of Baume, went to the abbot and

(1) See D'Huillier, p. 402. This is the number generally agreed upon.

(2) Ulrich, lib.i, cap. 12, col. 660: "Fratrum autem tanta multitudine collecta, nimirum plus aliquando quam ducentorum..."

(3) See Conant, loc. cit, p. 9, where these figures are supplied.
recounted a vision wherein St. Peter had appeared to complain of the straitened conditions of his monks. The decision to build thereupon was taken. (1) Hugh enlarged the dormitory, built an infirmary hall of moderate size, the infirmary church of Notre Dame, and the new basilica which was the largest church in Christendom until the rebuilding in the sixteenth century of St. Peter’s in Rome, the plans of which had to be enlarged by a few metres to ensure that Cluny would not be larger. (2) The transfer to the new buildings was, according to Hugh’s biographers, comparative to moving out of prison, which indicates how rapidly the community had outgrown the quarters that had sufficed in Odilo’s abbacy. (3)

Numbers continued to rise in the twelfth century and reached at least four hundred under Peter the Venerable who was forced to alter the customary procedure of receiving the abbot in Chapter on account of the unwieldiness of the community. He decreed that instead of descending from the upper tiers to the ground level, all were to

(2) See Conant, loc. cit.
remain in their places and merely to rise and bow when
the abbot entered. (1) Piecemeal enlargement of buildings
continued and some idea of the final pile may be obtained
from the knowledge that when Pope Innocent III, King
Louis IX of France, and the Emperor of Constantinople
came to Cluny in 1245 two thousand visitors were housed
without disturbing the monks.
It may be noted, however, that numbers were increasing
everywhere: La Charité-sur-Loire, for example, once
accumulated fifty-five novices in the course of four years,
and within a short time after its foundation numbered over
a hundred in community, despite numerous foundations. (2)
Nevertheless, Cluny was certainly one of the largest
communities, especially when to the figures already quoted
is added the number of those who were sent out to found or
reform other monasteries. It is not always known exactly
how many monks were sent in this way, but judging from the

(1) See statute 55, PL 189, col. 1040 and Bibl. Cl. col. 1369:
"Quorum major in eo tempore ccc vel cccc fratribus erat."
See also Knowles, 'The Reforming decrees of Peter the
Venerable' in Petrus Venerabilis, p. 15: "There is a
curious vagueness in the phrase, as if the numbers were
rising too rapidly for an up-to-date estimate."

(2) See Dom U. Berlière, 'Le nombre des moines dans les
anciens monastères' in RB, vol. xli (1929) pp. 231-61;
contingit ut non aliquanti super centum fratres quotidie
inveniantur...Hoc anno (abbas) venit, et uno die lv
novitiis habitum nostrum vel benedictionem dedit..."
evidence that is available, they must have reached a considerable total.

A few known examples may be quoted. Sixteen went to S Germaine of Auxerre in 1097.\(^1\) Two went to Nogent-le-Rotrou in 1081 and nine to Montierneuf the following year.\(^2\) A few went to Maillezais in 1061 and others to S Martial of Limoges the following year.\(^3\) A considerable number went to Spain, and in many cases the names of many monks who left Cluny are known. They included the sixteen or more major priors under Hugh and many others like Ulrich and a companion who went to Rüggisberg in 1070; Fulcherius and Peter who founded Berze; Godfrey of Semur (Hugh's brother), who went to Marcigny; and Raynald, the abbot's nephew, who became abbot of Vezelay.\(^4\)

The list is endless and the impression is that the Cluniac community was continually disposed to provide monks, not only for monastic purposes, but for ecclesiastical

---

\(^1\) GC vol. xii, col. 366 e.


\(^3\) See Lacourie, Histoire de Maillezais and Lasteyrie, L'Abbaye de S Martial de Limoges, p. 84 ff.

reform in general, as is shown by Pope Gregory VII's letter asking Hugh to send suitable monks for bishoprics. (1) It was on this occasion that two future popes, Urban II and Paschal II were sent to Rome, in accordance with Hugh's usual custom of sending of his best.

Thus, fluctuation in personnel was constant. There was, too, a continual flow of visiting monks from Cluniac houses or other monasteries, to say nothing of the number of novices who came to Cluny to make profession.

Many of the visiting monks became temporary members of the community, especially if they had come to learn the ordo prior to introducing it into their own monasteries. For instance, William of Hirsau sent three sets of two monks for a long sojourn at Cluny. (2) Such monks could be admitted to the community at once, even if the abbot was away, for so usual a procedure had this become at Cluny that it was incorporated into the customs. (3) Others, who came only to visit or seek confraternity were briefly instructed in the Cluniac observance before being

---

(1) Reg. p. 624, no. 5056

(2) Constitutiones Hirsugiensis, Herrgott, p. 376: "duos ex nostris fratribus, atque iterum alios duos, tertio nihilominus duos Cluniam diximus...."

admitted to the monastic precincts. (1).

The Cluny of Hugh's abbacy was not conducive to stability. Indeed, transfer received legal approbation in the clause permitting Cluny to accept monks from other monasteries and the Cluniac themselves allowed for similar cases to arise, and there was an accepted form for a commendatory letter given to a monk seeking the monastic life elsewhere. (2) Some did avail themselves of the opportunity, though not always successfully, like the monk who asked to join St. John Gualbert but, being found wanting in humility and imperfect in motive, he was forthwith dispatched back to Cluny. (3)

(ii) Composition of the community

From the abundant scattered evidence of the actual composition of the Cluniac community it is possible to deduce some of the reasons for the rise in numbers and the policy governing the reception of candidates.

It may be said at once that no standard, spiritual or

(1) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 22, col. 764-5.


(3) MG. SS. vol. xxx (2), p. 103, (Vita s. Ioannis Gualberti Anonym)
any other, was demanded in a person presenting himself. Undoubtedly many genuinely desired the monastic life, but there was a tendency to accept anybody and everybody. Looked at from the eleventh century standpoint, however, this was quite normal, since monasticism was very much the ark of salvation for all.

The development of the privilege permitting the reception of any monk or canon seeking the monastic life at Cluny into what became almost an obligation to receive anyone presenting himself at the gate illustrates this. Pope John XIX's bull of 1027 described the monastery as a haven of refuge for all, the gate of salvation from which no one was to be repulsed, where charity was to be shown to the innocent and hope to the guilty, and even the excommunicated were to be received for whatever cause they came whether seeking a place for Christian burial, or for some other reason appertaining to salvation.(1)

Similar clauses recurred in the bulls received by Hugh and the underlying principle was formulated in Alexander II's bull of 1063 which said that it was meet that in a religious house fraternal charity should be extended to the good and

(1) Bull. Cl. vol. 8, and PL 141, col. 1055.
mercy shown to the sinner seeking refuge. (1)

Practical examples of Cluny's obligations are not wanting. Sometimes the pope sent men to Cluny to do penance or to prove their obedience. For instance, when Gerbaldo, who murdered the son of the countess of Flanders, repented and made a pilgrimage to Rome to ask for a penance, Pope Gregory VII sent him to live as a monk of Cluny instead of losing his hand. (2) The deposed Bishop Manasse of Rheims was also sent to Cluny by the same pope to prove his obedience. (3) When Bishop Robert of Sahagun in Spain, a former monk of Cluny, became involved in a controversy with the pope, Gregory deposed him and wrote a severe letter to Hugh saying that he was sending Robert to the abbot to deal with his disobedience. (4) At least one contemporary source says that Hugh's successor, the enigmatic Pons, was originally sent to Cluny to cure his ambition for a bishopric. (5)

---

(1) Bull. Cl. col. 17 and PL 146, col. 1293: "Quia et justum sic est, ut in domo pietatis et justo praebetur dilectio sanetae fraternitatis, et ad veniam confugienti peccatori non negetur medicamentum indulgentiae et salutis."


(5) Simonis Gesta Abbatis S. Bertini, MG. SS, vol. xiii, p. 653. It may be noted that the monks of S. Bertin were very prejudiced against Pons.
Ecclesiastics who failed to understand the monastic vocation might thus unwittingly undermine the monastic ideal, and the pressure brought to bear is reflected in such canons as that of the Council of Vienne in 1060 which decreed that any abbot who refused to receive back an excommunicated monk would be suspended from the *communio fratrum*. (1) But within monasticism, too, a similar attitude prevailed: Hugh himself wrote to Philip of France that there was no better way of conversion and attaining true repentance than by monastic profession, which was typical of the contemporary conception of monasticism. (2)

The resultant eclecticism was already receiving severe criticism, however, and Ulrich for one regarded it as the chief cause of decay in the religious spirit and attributed the decline of many monasteries to this policy. (3) In the preface to his customary he addressed William of Hirsau strongly and at length on the matter. (4) Cluny is not

---


(2) PL 159, col. 931: "poenitentiam, vel conversionem, nec faciilius, ut credimus, nec certiori via potestis apprehendere, quam...monachica professione."

(3) Ulrich, col. 637: "...ex qua sola praecipue omnia sunt monasteria destructa quae destructa sunt vel in Teutonica vel in Romana lingua."

mentioned by name, but Ulrich's insistence makes it clear that he is speaking from his own experience which, for the most part, was provided by Cluny. He particularly deplored the custom whereby children who were in some way unacceptable to the world were dumped on monasteries by irresponsible parents, and he regretted the presence in the monasteries of any except those who had come as the result of their own mature decision to follow Christ. In saying that any other policy resulted in the weak gaining the upper hand in monastic government Ulrich seems to imply moral as much as physical weakness.

St. Benedict envisaged the presence of the weak as well as the strong, those of hard hearts and rude minds, freeborn and former slaves, and the code of punishment he provided in the Rule signifies that he did not expect ready-made saints to present themselves. But it is obvious from Peter the Venerable's reform statutes that things had gone too far at Cluny for he says: "Yokels, children, old men, and idiots have been taken in such numbers that they are now near to forming a majority". But it is obvious from Peter the Venerable's reform statutes that things had gone too far at Cluny for he says: "Yokels, children, old men, and idiots have been taken in such numbers that they are now near to forming a majority". But it is obvious from Peter the Venerable's reform statutes that things had gone too far at Cluny for he says: "Yokels, children, old men, and idiots have been taken in such numbers that they are now near to forming a majority".

(1) See Regula, cap. 2, (Qualis debeat abbas esse), mentions "capacibus discipulis...duris corde vero et simplicioribus"; "Non convertenti ex servitio praeponatur ingenuus..."; "negligentes et contemmentes"; "improbos...et duros ac superbos, vel inobedientes".

(2) Statute no. 35, PL 189, col. 1035 and Bibl. Cl. col. 1364. See also Knowles, 'The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable', p. 11.
Earlier, accusations had been made about receiving monks without commendatory letters or allowing them to return to the monastery more than the three times allowed in the Rule, and Peter had defended the practice on the grounds of charity, but his later decrees prove that his defence was rather far fetched. (1)

The only persons refused admission were those whom Abbot Hugh considered to have important work in the Church. In 1072 he sent the Archbishop of Mainz back to his see after a few months at Cluny telling him to continue to work in this diocese. (2) Similarly, when Lambert of S Bertin wanted to enter, Hugh drew up a special statute recognising him as a Cluniac monk, but much against Lambert's wishes asked him to return to Flanders to reform his abbey. (3) Abbot Walter of S Martin of Pointoise also sought admission but was not allowed to stay when the Archbishop of Rouen wrote to Hugh requesting Walter's return. (4)

(1) In a letter to St. Bernard, PL 189, col. 113.
(2) Lamberti Annales, MG.SS. vol. v, p. 191.
(3) PL 159, cols. 945-8: "rogatus a nobis propriam compulsus est repetere abbatiam, ea scilicet intentione ut in nostra obedientia...devote permaneat, et ut monachus noster ac professus ab omni congregacione ametur et excolatur."
(4) See L'Huillier, p. 225. No reference is given.
Only ecclesiastical duties were regarded as a possible bar to reception, for Hugh definitely encouraged men of society to enter. He even tried to persuade King Philip of France to come to Cluny and the persuasive and affectionate manner in which he wrote to Philip shows that king and abbot were on intimate terms. Apparently the king had enquired about kings becoming monks, for Hugh took up the question in a letter of 1108, strongly urging Philip to abdicate his kingdom and become a monk. He reminded him of the fate of William II of England and quoted the examples of one of the Merovingian kings who became a monk. (1)

This attitude was not general, however, for long before this Pope Gregory VII had reprimanded Hugh for receiving the Duke of Burgundy and his knights as monks. The pope said that good rulers were hard to come by and that many Christians had been left unguarded when Hugh carried off the Duke. (2) Other distinguished nobles also entered such as Guy, Count of Mâcon with thirty knights in 1077. (3)

A number of bishops also entered. In 1049 when the Bishop of Embrun was deposed for simony at the Council of

(1) PL 159, col. 930.
(3) GJ vol. iv, col. 1131.
Rheims he returned with Hugh to Cluny and often accompanied the abbot on his journeys.\(^{(1)}\) Other bishops retired to Cluny to die, among them Geoffrey Archbishop of Lyons in 1061.\(^{(2)}\) Both Bishop Henry of Soissons and Bishop Godfrey of Angers witnessed charters as Cluniac monks, the former in 1093, the latter in 1105.\(^{(3)}\) Aged abbots of other monasteries also retired to Cluny, such as Abbot Gunzo of Baume, and Drogo of Maillezais.\(^{(4)}\) The Abbot of Der, a non-Cluniac, publicly relinquished his abbacy at Rheims on account of his irregular ordination and went to Cluny.\(^{(5)}\)

Many priests became monks at this time, and the tendency is reflected in the canon promulgated at the Roman synod of 1078 forbidding priests who became monks to dispose of their churches which were to be handed over to their bishop.\(^{(6)}\) Mention of priest-novices is made in the

---

\(^{(1)}\) William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, lib. iii, PL 179, col. 1244.

\(^{(2)}\) GC vol. iv, col. 88.

\(^{(3)}\) Bruel, vol. v, nos. 3672 (S. Heunrici, olim Suessionensis episcopi, tunc Cluniensis monachi), and 3827 (Ex parte quoque Cluniacensium interfuerunt Gaufredus, olim episcopus Andegavensis...).

\(^{(4)}\) See above p. 159 and n.; Lacurie, Histoire de l'Abbaye de Maillezais, p. 21.

\(^{(5)}\) Gesta episcoporum Tullensium MG.SS. vol. viii, p. 644.

\(^{(6)}\) See Schreiber, Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters, p. 62.
Penitents also sought the cloister. At Cluny they included the two murderers of Hugh's own brother who fled to Cluny for protection: one of them left later, but the other seems to have persevered and became a good monk. Another pair of criminals were suddenly struck with remorse, repented, and fled to Cluny, as recorded in the charter whereby they handed over all their possessions to the monastery.

Hugh particularly encouraged those of good influence to enter: an understandable policy in view of the necessity of receiving many of a far different quality. The saintly hermit Anastasius was twice persuaded to join the community and when Morandus, a person of similar quality, visited Cluny on his pilgrimage to the Holy Land he succumbed to Hugh's entreaties and promised to enter at Cluny if he returned safely from his journey.

Many of those who came to Cluny were already highly trained especially in the case of canons who came from the famous ecclesiastical centres. Three outstanding men, (1)

---

(1) See below, pp. 138 and 199f.
(3) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3274.
(4) See above, p. 80 and n. 2; Vita B. Morandi, Bibl. Cl. cols. 501-7.
Hezelo, Algerius, and Ezelon came from Liège and Peter the Venerable praised them highly in a letter to the Archbishop of that See. (1) Algerius was already famous for his writings on the Eucharist. (2) Urban II came from Rheims where St. Bruno had been his master, and Ulrich and his companion Gerald, later Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, came from Ratisbon. (3)

Thus, the community was somewhat cosmopolitan in character. Ulrich, for instance, distinguished between the Gauls and Teutons and commented, among other things, on differences in language, which was one of his own difficulties in learning the ordo. (4) Though there is only scanty evidence of the presence of men similar in ethnic background to Ulrich, there is just the faintest suggestion of occasional divisions on account of this. (5)

Though the foundation charter stipulated that the desire to seek God by the monastic life was the sole condition demanded of a candidate, by Hugh's time all were expected to bring a dowry in land or money. This is evident not

(1) PL 189, cols. 279 f.
(3) Vita Udalrici, MG. SS. vol. xii, pp. 253.
(4) Ulrich, col. 644: "Sed qui est in loco tali pro diversitate linguæ quasi barbarus..."
(5) eg. differences in opinion about liturgical matters, see above, p.155...
only from the innumerable charters recording such gifts but the occurrence of agreements about the reception of those without possessions.(1) Thus, in the bond between the canons of Chartres and the monks of Cluny whereby mutual remembrance in prayer was promised, it was agreed that any canon desirous of the monastic life should be received even if he were without possessions.(2) A similar clause was inserted into the pact made with the canons of Orleans.(3) Some charters record the donation on behalf of another wishing to enter, perhaps a brother or son, and sometimes three or more in a family contributed to the dowry.(4) It is also obvious in the customs that a novice was expected to bring goods, for their disposal is arranged: the abbot (or in his absence the major prior) had first choice of horses and clothing. Anything else, presumably money and moveables, went to the camerarius who received everything if both abbot and prior were away.(5)

(1) For examples of dowries, see Bruel, vol.iv, nos. 2971, 3002, 3006, 3034, 3053, 3077, 3100, 3101, 3106, 3136, 3140, 3165, 3167, 3184, 3199, 3202, 3208, 3221, 3222, 3274, 3277, 3302, 3371, 3408, 3434, 3522, 3527, etc.

(2) PL 159, col.849: "si vero alicui canoniciorum placeret monachum fieri, si nihil dare vellet vel posset, gratis recipierent."

(3) Ibid.

(4) eg. Bruel, vol.iv, no. 3100: "...nos fratres uterini, Artaldus, Girardus, et Hugo, donamus...pro jam dicto fratre nostro Girardo qui...semitipsum tradidit Deo sub habitu monastice religionis..."

(5) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 5, p. 145.
Many gave land to the monastery early in life on the condition that they would later be received as monks and at Cluny, as elsewhere, innumerable old and sick retired to Cluny, who had secured a place for themselves in this way.\(^{(1)}\) The large infirmary quarters which were extended under Hugh and rebuilt under Peter the Venerable are thus explained.

Widowers and even married men went into the cloister, and in the case of the latter class the wife usually became a nun at the Cluniac convent of Marcigny.\(^{(2)}\) A number of monks were related to each other, which is evident from charters signed for newly arrived candidates by their relatives in the community.\(^{(3)}\) The abbot himself had a brother and two or three nephews and great nephews at Cluny.\(^{(4)}\) In other respects, too, a monk would "bring the family with him", so to speak. The intimate relationship of family members to the monastery is illustrated by the charters.

\(^{(1)}\) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3291: "\(\text{Hoc donum} \) in tali convenienta ut si monachus effici voluero, pro hoc me recipiant, aut si aliter mortuus fuero, pro hoc me sepeliant, aut Cluniaco aut apud Carroloam."

\(^{(2)}\) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3537; vol. v, no. 3681.

\(^{(3)}\) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3034, (Charter whereby Hugh the Cellarer receives land from his uncles): "\(\text{Item Letaulds avunculus meus, accipiens habitum beati Benedicti in loco supradicto, omne quod habebat in eadem villa dedit nobis} \)"; no. 3077 (two brothers Joceran and Bernard le Gros enter).

\(^{(4)}\) See genealogical tree, Richard, Cartulaire de Marcigny, pp. 240--1.
connections with the feudal nobility, the dowry system, and the mode of economic administration, meant that the families of many of the monks were easily drawn into the monastic structure.

Thus, in every way, Cluny was a true microcosm of society in the eleventh century, and this largely determined the structure of the community.

(iii) Length of Novitiate

The Rule prescribed a year's novitiate. (1) This seems to have been observed at Cluny at least until the end of Odilo's abbacy, judging from the customs of that time which describe the novices as segregated from the community for a year from the time of entry. (2)

But things changed under Hugh. The most telling evidence of this is a letter from Pope Gregory VII to the abbot wherein the Pope complained of the reception of the Duke of Burgundy and reminded Hugh of the prescription of St. Benedict regarding a year's probation and St. Gregory's decree concerning a three-year preparation in the case

(1) Regula, cap. lviii, 'De disciplina suscipientorum fratum'.

(2) Parfa, lib. ii, cap. 2, p. 140: "Nam et ipsi novitii primo anno non loquantur cum ullo homine sine sua custodia, nec cum ipsis fratribus qui clausstrenses sunt, nisi cui jussum fuerit."
of a miles. (1) Moreover, the twelfth-century state of affairs, when the Cluniacs were openly accused of shortening or even omitting the novitiate and Peter the Venerable had to legislate for at least a month's probation, must have developed gradually. (2)

There is no explicit statement of the policy during Hugh's abbacy. Nor is the impression of haste conveyed in those parts of the customs concerning novices. Indeed, in the absence of further precision the amount novices were expected to learn presupposes a novitiate of normal length.

But two factors modified this. The first was the rapid promotion of talented subjects. Though there is no evidence of rushed professions for this purpose, the practice indicates a growing disregard of the principle of probation, and from the decree of the Council of Toulouse in 1056 forbidding the election of anyone under thirty to the

(1) Mon. Greg. p. 350 and PL 148, col. 526: "Quid tibi dicunt B. Benedictus...ut per annum probetur novitius (gregorius) vero prohibit ut ante triennium miles non efficiatur monachus."

(2) See Dialogus inter Cluniacensum Monachum et Cisterciensem, Martene, Thesaurus, vol. v, p. 1591; Peter the Venerable’s letter to St. Bernard, PL 189, cols. 113, and 117-18; Statute 37, PL 189, col. 1035 and Bibl. Cl. col. 1564. See also, Knowles, 'The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable' p. 11.
position of abbot or bishop, it would seem that the
attitude was prevalent.(1)

The second factor, more directly affecting the
novitiate, was the conception of profession at Cluny.
All Cluniac monks, wherever their monastery, were expected
to make profession at Cluny in the presence of the abbot,
which was implied in the Cluniac profession formula.(2)
Only then was the full status of a Cluniac monk attained
and only then could anyone fully participate with the
community at Chapter and services in Church.(3) Normally
this ceremony marked the term of probation.

But the difficulties inherent in the system led to a
separation of the solemn promise or profession made by
the novice and the blessing by the abbot, which were one
ceremony in the Rule, usually called the benedictio.

(1) See Hefele and Leclercq, Histoire des Conciles, vol. iv (2)
p. 1122. Peter the Venerable also decreed that no monk
was to receive the habit before the age of twenty because
of the increase in numbers of the immature: see Statute
no. 36, PL 189, col. 1035 and Bibl. Cl. 1364.

(2) Ulrich, col. 713: "Ego frater promitto stabilitatem
monachi, et conversionem morum meorum, et obedientiam
secundum regulam Sancti Benedicti coram Dei et sanctis
ejus in hoo monasterio quad est constructum in honore
BB. apost. Petri et Pauli; in praesentia domini
N. abbatis."

(3) idem, cols. 713-14: "Ergo ab illo die nequaquam ulterior
a capitulo (i.e. congregatio) separatur..."
Profession was always in theory reserved to Cluny and an unofficial profession probably became the norm in many dependent monasteries, though it had to be legally ratified at Cluny.(1) But the abbot could give the blessing when he visited Cluniac monasteries if on account of distance or illness a novice's visit to Cluny was delayed.(2)

This separation of blessing and profession led to confusion as to what constituted the status of novice. The blessing still retained some significance as an initiatory ceremony, reflected in the fact that the term was still used indiscriminately for blessing, profession, or both together, according to where it was performed or who underwent the rite. But once it ceased to confer full monastic status it no longer marked the term of probation and so could be given earlier. But its retained association with monastic profession meant that the recipient was virtually regarded as ready for profession, and in this way the earlier conveyance of the blessing prepared the way for the acceleration of profession.

(1) See below, p.296 ff.

(2) Idem, col. 700: "Quidam (novitii) de cellis nostris, et vel pro infirmitate, vel loci longinquitate benedictionem jam a domino abbate acceperunt, professione interim dilata, et ad nostrum locum usque reservata." See below, p.
Obviously this theory was not formulated but the principle can be seen in practice. In fact, persons arrived at Cluny in a variety of stages relating to full initiation as Cluniacs and the length of probation and the significance of profession at Cluny differed for each accordingly. The custom whereby the abbot decided when profession or blessing was to take place is a further indication of flexibility. (1) Candidates can be divided into those with previous experience of the monastic life in Cluniac or other monasteries and those with no such experience. Only of the latter class is it said in the customaries that they underwent a year's probation (which seems to have been irrespective of when they received the blessing) and even then the modifying phrase "unless the master is satisfied that the novice knows all" is added. (2) This suggests that others had less than a year. En passant it may be noted that nutriti seem to have made profession when they came of age without ever ranking as novices. (3)

(1) Bernard, p. 166: "Cum autem eos benedicere domno Abbati placuerit..."

(2) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 15, p. 165: "Nullo modo quis loquitur eorum ante benedictionem, cum quolibet de saeculo, nec etiam post benedictionem, per totum annum annum, nisi habeat Magistrum, qui omnia quae dixerit audiat."

(3) See below, pp. 190 ff.
The following categories of those coming to the monastery are discernible. Most of them are described by Ulrich and Bernard:

1. Those who came straight from the world. They were examined by the guestmaster when they arrived and then the abbot or major prior was summoned. Clerks were given the habit immediately, but laymen were tonsured and received the habit during the Major Mass. Such novices seem to have handed over their possessions or presented a dowry at the same time. The example may be quoted of an old man, Raynald, who presented himself to Hugh at Berzé as a candidate for the monastic life, renounced his possessions and was immediately tonsured by the abbot. Ulrich says that particular care was taken to instruct these novices in the monastic life, which implies that they were the only ones regarded as novices in the ordinary sense.

2. Monks who came from non-Cluniac monasteries. They

(2) Bernard, p. 164; Ulrich, col. 702.
(3) Bruel, vol. v, no. 3873: "Rainaldus, homo senex et miles... reddidit se pro monacho apud Berziacum villam in manibus Hugonis... et ibi totundit eum domnus abbas in signum et probamentum monachatus."
were admitted directly to the community after spending one night in the guest house and seem to have by-passed the novitiate altogether. (1) They took the rank that the abbot appointed until they were formally professed as Cluniac monks and then they ranked last in community.

3. Monks who came from Cluniac abbeys who had already made profession and been blessed by their own abbot. These only came to Cluny to ratify their profession as Cluniac monks and are described by Ulrich as "like to us in all things", so they were admitted without delay to the cloister and ranked according to their monastic profession. (2)

4. Monks from other Cluniac monasteries who had already been blessed by the abbot of Cluny. They spent one night in the guest house and are then described as taking rank last among the monks, so presumably they were admitted to the community immediately and not to the novitiate. (3) Probably

(1) Ulrich, col. 701.

(2) Ibid: "Habentur a nobis per omnia in vita et post vitam as si apud nos fuisserent, et isti cum primum venerint, fiducialiter et absque mora intrant."

(3) Ibid.
they were professed almost at once.

5. Novices who came to Cluny from Cluniac monasteries for both blessing and profession. There is no direct reference to them in the customaries, but as they had already been novices in their own monasteries (and in some cases had probably made an unofficial profession) it may be supposed that they were admitted immediately to profession.

The fact that so many monks were exempted from any novitiate at Cluny probably paved the way for the disappearance of the probationary period altogether, even in the case of laymen, by the first half of the twelfth century.

(iv) The Training of Novices

Considerable space in the customaries of Ulrich and Bernard is devoted to those who were actually classed as novices, and however short their probation it seems to have been intense. (1) The novice master exercised the strictest supervision over them and they were never left alone even when going from one part of the house to another. (2)

(1) Ulrich, in the second book of his customary, treats of the discipline of the monastery from the point of view of the instruction of the novices, and though his book is edited under the title 'De disciplina regulari', (cols. 699 ff.), Ulrich, describes it, (col. 640): "Secunda (pars est) de eruditione novitiorum."

(2) Ulrich, lib. ii, cap. 2, cols. 701-2, 'Quodmodo se habeant in cella novitiorum.' Bernard, p. 166.
The segregation of novices prescribed in the Rule was observed at Cluny: there was always a separate dormitory and, when numbers warranted, separate quarters for eating, sleeping, and working where, except in Church, they could be completely separated from the community.(1) There are examples of charters drawn up in this novices' cell.(2)

The daily round was similar to that of the community and the same customs were everywhere observed.(3) After the Rule had been read at Chapter the novices left and went to the cloister to study the ordo. During this time they could also be called upon to prepare the corn for making hosts. They attended all services in the church but did not take an active part.

They seem to have been subject to the most stringent discipline. Any monk could report a novice to the master and even slight breaches of Rule or custom merited severe penances. The novices had their own Chapter of faults where penances that were formerly only imposed by the

(1) Idem, col. 701: "quod si tanti sunt ut dignum videatur, tunc...pro se habebunt cellam suam, ubi non solum dormiant, sed et etiam comedant, et jugitar maneant a conventu separati." Bernard presupposes these separate quarters, p. 166: "In cella sua eodem ordine...qua fratres reficiunt, legunt, loquuntur, scribunt...."

(2) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 2998: "Facta est hec verpicio Cluniaci, in cella novitiorum." See also the plans of the monastery reproduced at the end of the thesis.

(3) See n.0)above.
abbots were inflicted but whether such disciplinary changes indicate the need of further precautions or were part of the general increase of delegation, is hard to tell. (1)

Particular stress was laid on silence and the slightest mistake at office was regarded as an infringement of this. (2) Ulrich says that one word spoken in church, dormitory, refectory, or kitchen would not escape punishment, and novices had to take care that not even the noise of a pen be heard. (3) It was to safeguard silence that the elaborate sign language developed whereby almost anything a monk would want could be signified. The signs are described at length in the customs as part of what the novices had to learn because of the rare opportunities of speech. (4)

(1) Bernard, p. 166; "Datque etiam delinquentibus aspera judicia, quorum prius nihil agebat, nisi ex praecepto Abbatis, aut Prioris."

(2) Ulrich, lib. ii, cap. 3, col. 703, 'De silentio, et in quibus officinis': "de hoc non alius quam plane silentium censetur infregisse."

(3) Ibid.: "Si vel unum verbum quoque audiente loquitur, non facile veniam absque judicio meretur..."; Bernard, p. 179: "Nec pergamen, nec ipsa penna, quidquid sonitus ullo modo emittat."

There are a few indications that the principle of determining the length of the novitiate according to person was applied to the actual manner of training. For instance, priest-novices received particular attention and extra care was taken in instructing them in the Cluniac observance, with much insistence on the respect and honour that was shown to the Blessed Sacrament at Cluny. (1) The dispositions of priests were well tested and they were also examined as to the manner of their ordination before they could get permission to say Mass. (2)

On the other hand, allowances would be made for other novices who were well disposed but thought themselves incapable of asceticism, which is illustrated by the story told of Guy, Count of Macon, who found the rough monastic dress unbearable at first. Hugh allowed him to wear softer garments under the habit until the count accustomed himself to the new life and became a model of observance. (3) Other indications of a personal approach

---

(1) Ulrich, lib. ii, cap. 28, col. 714: "Praecipue qui sacerdos erat antequam veniret, omnino ab officio prohibetur, usque dum saepius prospiciat quam multipli studiorum tractetur a nobis."

(2) Ibid: "Diligenter examinat quomodo sint ordinati, qualis sit eorum scientia, qualis conscientia, et per aliquod tempus probat eorum conversationem, antequam eis hujus ministerii licentiam permittat."

may be found in the custom whereby each novice could choose his own confessor and in the fact that each one was personally examined by the abbot before profession and warned by him of the rigours of the monastic life, as the Rule prescribed.(1)

But other factors rendered much of this provision for training ineffective and though a lowering of the moral temperature is hardly discernible in Hugh's abbacy there were a few signs which— in the light of the so-called decline of the twelfth century— may be regarded as indicative.

Most revealing is Bernard's statement, quoted as one of his main motives in writing his customary, that as a result of controversies about customs novices emerged from Chapter more confused than when they entered.(2)

An example is provided by Ulrich who tells of the time he asked an experienced monk about the addition of Alleluia at all offices between Easter and the Ascension


(2) Epistola Bernardi, Herrgott, p. 134: "Quaedam de Consuetudinibus saepissime oriebantur controversiae, diversis diversasentientibus: ita ut plerumque Novitii haec audientes, incertiiores de Capitulo discendent, quam accessissent..."
which was apparently not prescribed in the Cluniac rubrics, nor was provision made for it in the antiphonary. (1) Ulrich received the unexpected answer that the monk had presumed it to have been introduced by Ulrich to Cluny. (2)

It can be said that neither the numbers, nor the horarium, nor the unrest accompanying the expansion of the order, nor accelerated professions, were conducive to the solid formation of the novices. To this must be added the fact that an increasing number of candidates were, in any case, incapable of responding to the training required for following the full Cluniac observance.

(v) The Nutriti

The custom of oblation had long been recognised as true monastic profession, vicarious but valid for life, in the case of the child presented to a monastery and the system was, indeed, one of the main sources of monastic recruitment. (3)

(1) Ulrich, col. 666: "...cum ad omnes horas usque ad Ascensionem Domini semper alleluia cantetur; tamen in nullo reperiri antiphonario praenotatum..."

(2) ibid: "Quaesivi curiosus a quodam juvente perspicacis ingenii, et qui jam per viginti quique continus annos in claustro morabatur...quod ipse mihi retulit, illud hic a me refertur."

At Cluny as elsewhere, the child-oblates were an integral part of the community and frequent references are made to them in the customaries. (1) A number of charters record oblations in the traditional manner, such as that by Count Theobald of Francia who brought his son to Cluny to be "initiated into the sacred mysteries of regeneration" and to have religious rather than wealthy parents. (2) St. Peter Damian entrusted his nephew to Hugh as "parent and master". (3) Dowries usually accompanied these oblations.

Abuses caused the custom to be less highly regarded than formerly, however, and a changing attitude is indicated by Ulrich's vehement denouncement of those who regarded monasticism as little more than a dumping-ground for children who were in any way unacceptable to the world on account of physical or other deformity. (4)

(1) Ulrich, lib.iii, cap. 8, cols. 741-7, 'De pueris et eorum magistris'; Bernard, lib. i, cap. 27, pp. 200-10, 'De pueris'. Unless stated, the information about the boys quoted in this section may be found in these chapters of the customaries, though other references abound in both works.

(2) D'Achery, Spicilegium, vol. iii, p. 409.

(3) Bibl. Cl. col. 479.

(4) Ulrich, col. 635: "Si quis eorum (filiorum) claudus erit aut mancus, surdaster aut caecus, gibbosus aut leprosus, vel aliquid quid hujusmodi quod eum aliquo modo saeculo facit munus acceptum, hunc quidem impensissimo voto ut monachus fiat offerunt Deo, quanquam non propter Deum, sed...ut seipsos expediant ab eis educandis et pascendis." See above, p. 69f.
At Cluny a distinctly new approach is discernible, especially under Hugh, which contrasted with the eclecticism in the reception of adult candidates. There was a policy as regards the reception and the number of boys and the traditional significance was no longer attached to the rite of oblation.

Though the customary formula, implying a perpetual dedication, remained unchanged, it was no longer regarded as valid for life unless ratified by the boy himself when he came of age—fifteen years being accepted as the legal age, or later in the case of a more immature person. (1) If a boy so wished he could then confirm his earlier profession and receive the blessing of the abbot, which, as always, was in any case deferred until then. (2)

Hugh was most insistent that the decision to remain in monastic life should be personal, and clauses to this effect were frequently inserted into charters arranging for a child to enter at Cluny, especially when it was a

(1) Ulrich, col. 742: "Ego frater N. offero...hunc puerum nomine N. vice parentum ejus...ita ut ab hanc die non liceat illi collum de sub jugo excutere regulae; sed magis ejusdem regulae fideliter se cognoscat instituta debere servare...". Ibid.: "Benedictio ejus differtur usque ad legitimam aetatem, id est, si non amplius, vel usque ad quindecim annos aetatis."

(2) Ibid.
case of providing for someone whose father wanted to be a monk. (1) Sometimes a term of years was specified at the end of which a boy was expected to make his own choice. (2) Examples are not wanting of boys who were educated at Cluny and later went their own way. Thus, Jarentus, son of Araldus and Agnes of Vienne passed his childhood at Cluny under Hugh where he was taught by the best masters. He left Cluny to devote himself wholly to worldly pleasures, but was later converted to the monastic life and entered at Chaise Dieu, a non-Cluniaæ monastery, became prior and was eventually elected Abbot of S Bénigne of Dijon. (3)

Hugh also reduced the number of boys to six. (4) From their prominence in the customaries it would seem that there were more of them, but Ulrich is not likely to have

---

(1) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3136; "Ego Bernardus...seculum deserere cupiens, talem donationem...facio...pro me neonon et pro parvulo filio adhuc, si Deus voluerit monacho futuro...super tali conditione pro predicto puerulo, ut interim a monasterii stipendiis nutriatur, donee ad etatem eam pervenerit qua in monasterio recipi valeat."

(2) ibid. no. 3021: "Parvulum suum...pro quo nos est deprecatus recepimus, ita ut...si vellet se congregatione incorporari, sine ulla contradistione recipetur. Sin autem quoadus-que recipi voluntarie rogaret, proprio in predicta obedientia relinquetur arbitrio."

(3) Chronicon S. Huberti Andeginensis, MG.SS. vol.viii,p.605; Hugonis Chronicon, lib.ii, MG.SS. vol. viii, p.413

(4) Ulrich, col. 742: "Pueri autem qui sunt in conventu nostro, non ultra senarium pro- tendunt."
mentioned the reduction without qualifying the statement had it not applied to the Cluny of his time. There are also examples of refusals to accept children and sometimes a boy was sent to wait elsewhere for a number of years before going to Cluny.\(1\) There is even evidence of a "waiting list", for one charter records a covenant between the prior of Cluny and the father of a boy called Gerard. One hundred Limoges shillings were paid for the child to be sent to Sauxillanges until either two boys left Cluny or one boy died.\(2\) The children who were sent to other Cluniac monasteries include Peter the Venerable, who went to Sauxillanges. Hugh had persuaded Peter's mother to present him as an oblate in the first place and it is unlikely that Hugh would have refused to have him at Cluny had there been a place - unless there was some special reason for the choice of Sauxillanges which is not indicated in any of the sources.\(3\) It would seem, therefore, that at least under Hugh the number of boys was kept to six.

Every provision was made for them and they received close personal attention in every aspect of their lives.

---

\(1\) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3021: "recepimus (parvulum suum) ita sane ut apud quandam obedientiam nostram que dicitur Bisurniacum usque ad X annos... commoraretur..."

\(2\) Bibl. Nat. ms. latin, no. 12,665, f.1 ro.

\(3\) Vita Petri Venerablis, PL 189, col.17.
There were at least two masters, and more if necessary and teaching was done by the most competent monks in the community, such as the precentor who taught the boys the liturgy. (1) The abbot and major prior both took a direct interest in them and twice a week the children went to confession to the abbot; or, in his absence, to the major prior. (2) Hugh is described as taking advantage of St. Benedict's injunction that kindness be shown to the boys to pay extra attention to them. (3)

Their material needs were well cared for and the camerarius and cellarer frequently visited them to ensure they lacked nothing and if a boy needed extra sustenance it would be brought to him in the cloister. It was arranged that they should always have each other's companionship: if one had to go to the infirmary another went with him, and a new arrival was always accompanied by two others to what must have been the terrifying experience of his reception in the community Chapter. They saw more of the community than the novices and in

(1) Bernard, p. 203.

(2) Ulrich, col. 747: "Vicibus duabus in septimana veniunt ad confessionem, quam non recipit nisi dominus abbas, vel prior major, vel ille qui tenet ordinem."

(3) Peter the Venerable, De Miraculis, Bibl. Cl. col. 459.
the refectory they sat among brethren who would keep an eye on them. (1)

The boys were subject to a very strict discipline, of which corporal punishment was a distinguishing feature. Like the novices, they were constantly supervised and were flogged if necessary. For instance, they were accompanied to bed by their master who shepherded them with a lantern in one hand and a rod in the other. (2) If they fell asleep at office and were noticed by their elders they were also punished with the rod and they purposely sat facing east in choir so they were always well in view. (3)

They followed most of the community round, except for extra rest between the early Offices of the day. They only arrived in Church in time for Nocturns and went to bed immediately after Compline. They also performed community duties such as taking their weekly turn in the kitchen. They had designated functions in the performance of the liturgy such as singing the invitatory, and intoning antiphons and responses on certain occasions, and Office

(1) Ulrich, col. 744: "ante tales fratres positi, qui non dissimulat, si quam viderint negligentiam eorum..."

(2) Ulrich, col. 747: "tenente magistro virgam in dextra manu et candelam in laeva...cito collocantur."

(3) Idem, col. 743.
was never begun until they arrived. (1) They read the Martyrology at Chapter, recorded anniversaries, and noted that the prescribed amount was performed on anniversaries or on the death of Cluniacs and others. Accordingly they prepared the brief concerning all this, which was read at Chapter. (2)

Obviously, monks brought up in this way formed one of the most stable elements of the community and once professed they became "the" authorities on liturgy and observance—hence the custom of appointing only a nutritus as precentor. Ulrich admitted that he had probably failed to understand many things because he had not been a nutritus at Cluny. (3) Jealousy seems to have crept in later, however, for it was necessary for Peter the Venerable to decree that if they were suitable the pueri scholares were to be appointed to offices. (4) Perhaps by that time the curtailment of their number was having its effect and as a very small and

(1) Idem, cols. 745-6.
(2) Farfa, p. 167; Ulrich, col. 746.
(3) Ulrich, col. 644: "Sed qui est... nec a pueritia nutritus non facile fieri potest ut ita sciat omnia siout ille qui est indigena, et qui ab infantia inter talia crevit."
(4) Statute no. 66, PL 189, col. 1043 and Bibl. Cl. col. 1372. See also Knowles, 'The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable', p. 18.
exclusive group exceptionally well versed in everything
their very presence was causing annoyance among their
more numerous and less efficient brethren.

Whatever the case later, during Hugh's abbacy they
seem to have received much attention and were regarded
with affection. Amid all the changes that were taking
place, Ulrich and Bernard saw in them one of the most
praiseworthy aspects of life at Cluny and stated as
their considered judgement that no prince in a palace
could be better brought up than a boy at Cluny.(1)

(vi) Structure of the Community: Cantors, Priests,
Conversi, Servants.

The Cluniac household was composed of distinct classes:
 servants, novices, boys, and the main and most numerous
element: the professed monks. Among the last named there
were certain definite divisions which were determined with
reference to the liturgy, where differences arose in the
various degrees to which monks participated. The ranks

(1) Bernard, p. 210; Ulrich, col. 747: "Et ut tandem de ipsis
pueris concludam, saepenumero videns quo studio die
noctuque custodiantur, dixi in corde meo difficile fieri
posse ut ullus regis filius majore diligentia nutriatur
in patalio quam puer quilibet minus in Cluniaco."
are clearly indicated in the customaries where the five main classes of boys, priests and levites, cantors, conversi, and novices, are frequently mentioned.(1) Ability to sing and knowledge of the ordo was the distinguishing mark of the two main sections of the community, the cantors and conversi, who are frequently referred to under the simple titles of "those who sing" and "those who cannot sing". (2) The abbot determined the respective ranks after profession. (3) The onus of the liturgy at Cluny fell on the cantors and the monastic officials were probably drawn from their ranks. They also had a distinct obit notice. (4) In church — but only there — a distinction was made between priests and cantors not in orders, the former being eligible for certain offices in choir that were denied to the others. When not fulfilling a

(1) eg. Bernard, p. 175, describing the hand towels that hung in the cloister: "unum est pueros...duo Sacerdotibus et Levitis,...duo alia Cantoribus aliis, et Conversis."

(2) e.g. Farfa, p. 24: "Conversi, qui nesciunt cantare."

(3) eg. Ulrich, lib. ii, cap. 28, col. 714: "Abbas secundum gratiam, quae singulis est data, jubet eos de caetero in ecclesia servire, scilicet, ut legant, et cantent, qui hoc sciunt; et qui aliud non valent, candelabra et thuribula portent."

(4) Farfa, p. 206, 'Pro defunctis fratribus breve': "Obit A. cantor nostrae congregationis monachus..."
particular office, however, the priests at Cluny ranked according to their monastic profession. The number of priests was increasing and it has been estimated that of the sixty-four cantors known from the Lenten book list of the end of Odilo's abbacy, fifty-two were priests. (1) Priests continued to flock to monasteries like Cluny during Hugh's abbacy and the tendency seems to have caused Pope Gregory VII some anxiety, for he complained of it in a letter to Hugh. (2) By that time it was also accepted that the highest offices in the community should be occupied by priests.

Monks who were not cantors were referred to as conversi. The term conversus originally signified one who came to the monastic life in maturity, as distinct from a nutritus, brought up from childhood in the monastery. In this sense the community might still be divided into nutriti and conversi, but the term conversus had another connotation at Cluny and though the conversi were indeed probably all monks who had entered as adults, the cantors were not necessarily all nutriti, and they included some who

(1) See Dom Wilmart, 'Le couvent et le bibliothèque de Cluny', in RM, 1921, pp. 89-124, where the list (Farfa, pp.135-6) is re-edited. Dom Wilmart draws his conclusions from the way in which the names of the monks are written.

entered late.

As the monastic ordo became more liturgical and the liturgy itself developed, it became increasingly difficult for those who entered as adults to learn all that was implied in the full observance, and the term conversi became equated with illiterati or idioti. As early as 816 the synod of Aachen made provision for this class and when it was decreed that monks were to learn by heart the psalms, hymns, and canticles, seculars who entered were allowed to learn less according to their ability. In the Farfa customs, and those of Ulrich and Bernard too, the terms conversi, idioti, or illiterati are interchangeable, and all signify those who took a lesser part in the liturgy. The rank of conversus could in some cases mark a transitional stage between profession and promotion to cantor, for there is evidence of such promotion taking place.

(1) See Berlière, L'Ascèse bénédictine, p. 15.

(2) For examples of the use of the terms see Ulrich, lib.ii, cap. 10, col. 706, (pueris, cantoribus, idiotis) and lib.iii, cap. 8, col. 744: "(Pueri) inter idiotas et cantores."

(3) Ulrich, lib. ii, cap. 30, col. 720: "Si dominus abbas propter aliquam rationalibem causam quemlibet conversum levaverit in capitulo et in refectorio..." See also E. Hoffmann, Das Konverseninstitut des Cisterziensordens, (Freiburger historische Studien, 1, 1905), for an account of the history of the term and institution of conversi.
There could have been no other reason for this save that a conversus had managed to learn the full ordo. This is understandable since even a literate convert to the monastic life could hardly have mastered the ordo in a year's novitiate, and acquired that knowledge and skill demanded of a cantor.

The terms monachus and conversus were not opposed and though the conversi ranked as a body after the cantors they were monks in the fullest sense. They attended Chapter, one of the marks of a full member of the community. They used the same profession formula, and followed the same horarium, even attending the office, though they could not take full part. The elaboration of ritual provided innumerable small tasks like carrying the cross, candles, thurible and other actions performed by acolytes. It is not unlikely that the need to give the conversi an "active" part in the liturgy was one factor in the elaboration of ritual at Cluny. Some of them served the private masses of the priests in the community and arranged what was necessary in the way of vestments and vessels on these occasions. Occasionally special provision was made for the conversi, as for instance, in the obligations of the community on the

(1) Ulrich, col. 734; Bernard, p. 223.
death of a Cluniac. As an alternative to the prescribed number of psalms, Paters could be said instead. (1)

A greater distinction seems to have been made under Peter the Venerable, when specific tasks were allotted to them, such as replacing the servants who formerly helped in the infirmary. (2) Under Hugh, however, they were in every way like the other monks, except as regards rank and their functions in church. They seem to have worn the same habit, and though by Peter the Venerable's time they were bearded, and no longer tonsured, there is no evidence of this distinction under Hugh. (3) On the contrary, there is at least one example of a conversus entering as an old man and being tonsured by the abbot. (4)

There was, therefore, no connection between the Cluniac conversi and the Cistercian conversi, the equivalent of the modern lay-brethren, with their own ordo wherein prayer and work were ordered to their capacity and a lesser status than membership of the community Chapter was enjoyed.

The Cistercian conversi were mostly drawn from the lower classes and it was to make provision for these to dedicate

(1) eg. Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 31, col. 778.
(2) Statute no. 24, Bibl. Cl. col. 1361 and PL 189, col. 1033.
(3) ibid: "conversi barbati".
(4) See Bruel, vol. v. no. 3373.
themselves and their work within monasticism that the system developed. Such classes were virtually debarred from entry to Cluny because of the necessity of a dowry.

Ulrich's views may, however, be mentioned for his advice to William of Hirsau is significant in view of later developments. In the preface to his customary, he delineated a scheme for incorporating good servants to the monastic state. (1) He suggested, for instance, that William should give them the monastic habit and allow them to share the cloister. (2) It is hard to tell how far Ulrich's influence was decisive, but William did, in fact, institute what were known at first as fratres exteriores, and some scholars ascribe to him the decisive emergence of the conversi system. (3) He adapted the Rule and prescribed simpler prayers than the Office. They lived in the monastery, but followed a different horarium from the community proper. They spread rapidly in Germany, and Pope Urban II is said to have encouraged the system. (4) Thus Cluny, through its two sons Ulrich and Urban, indirectly

---

(1) Ulrich, Epistola nuncupatoria, col. 637.

(2) ibid.: "Vellem utique ut non amplius permetterentur extra claustrum commorari; daretis eis habitum nostrum."


(4) See Hallinger, op. cit., p. 531.
contributes to a significant development in monasticism.

Though the servants at Cluny were in no way part of the community they were an integral part of the Cluniac "familia" or household, to which they belonged in a very real way as a result of the contemporary social structure. Many of them were "given" to the abbey with the land to which they were bound and they remained attached to Cluny, being unfree to leave at will. (1) Many charters record transactions concerning servants for whom money was frequently exchanged. (2) Many of them settled near the abbey and whole families, which formed the nucleus of the "burg" of Cluny, became an irremovable part of the establishment. (3) On Sundays and feast days they attended the services and the abbey servants had a special place in processions. (4)

It is not known how many actually lived within the monastic precincts but they must have been numerous, judging from their work. The abbot and major officials each had their own servants and mention is made of some in the kitchen


(2) For examples, see Bruel, vol. iv, nos. 3003, 3087, 3114, 3206, 3212, 3307, 3339, etc.

(3) See above, p. 130

(4) Farfa, lib. i, cap. 53, p. 44.
and infirmary. The arrangements for distributing what was left from the monastic refectory indicates the variety and number of servants, for each set received something on a certain day: Sunday the cooks, Monday the hunters, Tuesday the odd-job men, Wednesday the swineherds, Thursday the cowmen, Friday the gardeners, Saturday the woodcutters.(1)

The system brought its dangers and was criticised in the twelfth century. Though Peter the Venerable defended the institution and said that servants were selected with discretion and enabled the monks to spend longer in Church, his decrees reflect the abuses that had crept in for, among other things, he emphasised the necessity of selection, forbade their presence in the infirmary, legislated against the pilfering of food for their families in the town and decreed that no prior could transfer a favourite servant at will.(2)

The customaries of Hugh's abbacy reflect the precautions that had already been taken and there were strict injunctions, for instance, as to how monks in the infirmary

(1) Bernard, lib. i, cap. 74, no. xxxi, p. 273.

(2) Statutes 24, 25, 46, and 48: PL 189, cols. 1033 and 1038; Bibl. Cl. cols. 1361, 1366-7. See also Peter's letter to St. Bernard, PL 189, col. 145.
were to watch their conversation before servants. (1)
Ulrich's warnings to William of Hirsaü against the
presence of female servants, and his general wish that
servants should be in some way integrated into the
monastic state suggests that he was speaking from his
experience of Cluny. (2)

Thus in one capacity or another, albeit not always as
monks, everyone could find a place at Cluny, and Hugh's
biographers saw typified there the state described in
the scriptural text wherein "the wolf shall dwell with
lamb and the leopard shall lie down with the kid". (3)

(1) Ulrich, lib. iii, cap. 25, cols. 767-9.

(2) Idem, col. 637: "Infirmiorem sexum, quod prius non
erat, de habitazione vestra longius remotum exclusistis..."

(3) Vita Hug. auct. Hildeberto, PL 159, col. 884: "Lupus
habitavit cum agno, et pardus cum haedo confidenter
accubuit." (Isai. xi, 6.)
CHAPTER IV  THE EXPANSION OF THE ORDER OF CLUNY 1049-1109

One of the most striking features of the abbacy of Hugh was the expansion of the Cluniac Order. "Order" is here understood as a group of monasteries juridically linked, and though the way for Cluniac expansion was often prepared by the operation of Cluniac influence in an extra-juridical manner, the main reform activity of Hugh's rule took the form of annexations to or foundations within the Cluniac system. (1)

1. Extent of the Order

A precise indication of the extent of the expansion would require an account of all the Cluniac monasteries, and here the want of an adequate list is particularly felt. (2) However, the most important houses are known and it is unlikely that the omission of a few small priories would make much difference. Once a foothold in the form of a large or important monastery had been established in a region, the tendency was for small foundations or annexations to take place in the vicinity. The development of some of the Cluniac monasteries themselves was also an essential aspect of the expansion

(1) See below, p. 258 where the term order is discussed.

(2) See bibliographical note on maps and lists of houses, p. 355.
of the order, for many rapidly acquired numerous dependent houses. La Charité, founded in 1056, may be quoted as an example. By the end of Hugh's abbacy this priory had acquired possessions and dependent monasteries in the dioceses of Auxerre, Sens, Bourges, Orleans, Nevers, Soissons, Meaux, Troyes, Chartres, Rouen, and England.(1) So rapid was the development of S Martin des Champs, Paris, that it is sometimes described as the Cluny of the north, and Moissac in the south similarly acquired numerous dependencies after being annexed to the order in 1053.

The greatest expansion took place under Hugh, and during his abbacy the order reached its definitive extent, except for a few later additions of minor importance. In 1049 Cluny's dependent houses were situated mostly in the south of France and the only dependencies outside this region were Romainmoutier, Payerne, and S Maieul in Pavia.(2) By 1109 houses were established in parts of France hitherto closed to Cluniac influence, England, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Germany and what is now Belgium,

(1) La Charité, cart. p. 361, (Bull of Pope Paschal II, 1107, confirming possessions).

and though there was as yet no division into provinces the later territorial divisions had already emerged. Hugh himself summarised the extent of the growth in a last letter to his monks when he described Cluny as having expanded "not only in this region, but also in Italy, Lorraine, England, Normandy, France, Aquitaine, Gascony, Provence, and Spain". (1)

The advance can be traced in the charters which record the addition of individual houses and in the bulls confirming Cluniac possessions. Every bull obtained by Hugh reflected the steady infiltration into new areas. Pope Gregory V's bull to Odilo in 990 confirmed houses in Macon, Chalon, Autun, Clermont, Viviers, Troyes, Arles, Gap, Valence, Provence, Vienne, and Lyons. (2) Stephen IX's bull of 1058 added to these, priories in the dioceses of Saintes, Embrun, Besançon, Tours, and Poitiers. (3) By Pope Gregory VII's pontificate, annexations had been made over a still wider area and a definite expansion beyond France was beginning: priories

(1) PL 159, col. 951: "...neoc solum in hac nostra regione verum, etiam in Italia, Lotharingia, in Anglia, Normannia, Francia, Aquitania, Guasconia, Provincia, atque Hispania ipsum (Cluniaeum) dilatavit."

(2) Bull. Cl. col. 10, and PL 137, col. 932.

(3) Bull. Cl. col. 14, and PL 143, col. 879.
were confirmed in the dioceses of Limoges, Angoulême, Paris, Soisson, Toulouse, Grenoble, Toul, Lausanne, Geneva, Constance, and Pavia, mostly hitherto unmentioned in Cluniac bulls. (1) The next definitive list, far exceeding in length any previous record, appeared in Pope Urban II's bull of 1088. (2) He also confirmed separately the Cluniac abbeys and most important priories which were themselves centres of Cluniac expansion. (3) Pope Paschal II's bull of 1100 marked the ultimate extent of the order and thereafter additions were made within areas already penetrated. (4)

The main concentration of monasteries was in France where Cluny exercised the predominant monastic influence throughout the period 1049-1109. Nevertheless the regions of France were penetrated in a varying degree and four major groupings are discernible. (5)

The first and most important group centred in Cluny

---

(1) PL 148, col. 661, and Bull. Cl. col. 18.
(2) PL 151, col. 410, and Bull. Cl. cols. 22 ff.
(3) PL 151, col. 291, and Bull. Cl. col. 23.
(4) PL 163, col. 51, and Bull Cl. col. 32.
itself and occupied the Rhône-Saone basin including the upper valley of the Loire as far as Nevers. Nearly all the houses annexed to Cluny between the foundation and 1049 were situated in this region except for a few in Auvergne of which Sauxillanges was the most important. The majority of priories were founded or annexed before Hugh became abbot, though one or two of note were added, such as La Charité-sur-Loire, one of the most important Cluniac centres, Marcigny, and the Abbey of Gigny.

The second area can be described along a diagonal line from Cluny across the Massif Central to the Pyrenees - along the main crusading routes to Spain. Many important abbeys or priories were situated in this region and all of them were founded or annexed under Hugh, such as Layrac in 1062, Moissac in 1067, Auch in 1068, Lezat in 1073, Figeac in 1074, Eysses and Eauze in 1088, and S Saturnin of Toulouse, 1074-1105. From this direction Cluny infiltrated the Iberian peninsula.

Notable centres were also established for the first time in the Paris basin, though a few minor additions remained to be made in the twelfth century. S Martin des Champs, one of the greatest houses of the order, was founded in 1079. Other important foundations were Longpont in 1061, Crépy en Valois 1076, S Leu d'Esserent 1081, Nogent le Rotrou 1081-2. Longueville, founded in 1093 in Normandy, and Abbeville founded in 1100 may also be mentioned with this group.
The fourth French region particularly receptive of Clunia\textsuperscript{c} influence, though in a lesser degree, was that of the Charentes. The majority of Clunia\textsuperscript{c} monasteries there were founded under Hugh, among them S Eutrope de Saintes annexed in 1081, and the important abbeys of S Martial of Limoges annexed in 1062, Maillezais annexed c. 1062, and Montierneuf, St. Cyprian and St. Nicholas in Poitiers. S Jean d'Angely, another important abbey in this region already belonged to Cluny in 1049.

Outside these areas Cluny had little influence and though less than half the number of houses that actually belonged to the order have been noted on the map at the end of the thesis, sufficient indication of the areas within which Cluny expanded is given. Other monasteries and later additions were mostly grouped about the monasteries there located.

Perhaps the most significant expansion of Cluny was that which took place in Spain. Infiltration began under Odilo, but the tendency matured under Hugh into what has been described as a veritable invasion of the peninsula.\textsuperscript{(1)}

But it may be emphasised that actual annexations to the order were few in comparison to the significance of Clunia\textsuperscript{c}

\textsuperscript{(1)} See Perez, \textit{Los Monjes espa\~{n}oles}, vol. ii, p. 420.
influence in Spanish ecclesiastical life as a whole, especially through bishops who were formerly Cluniac monks, and in particular spheres like that of the liturgy in the transition from the Mozarabic to the Roman rite.

Sanchus of Navarre, 970-1035, sent the monk Paternus to Cluny in 1025 with one or two companions to imbibe the reform spirit. On their return they became leaders in a new era of monasticism in the peninsula. Paternus was made abbot of S Juan de la Peña from whence the new ideas spread throughout Navarre. (1) During Hugh's abbacy the first monasteries to be annexed to the order were handed over by King Alphonsus VI who gave S Zoyle in Carrion in 1076 which in turn controlled a number of dependent houses. Annexations continued from this time onwards throughout the twelfth century, but Hugh's abbacy was the time of the most significant extension of the order and his own three journeys to Spain did much to promote Cluniac influence. (2) The foundation of Rates by La Charité in 1100 marked the first foundation in


Portugal. But Cluny's main influence in the peninsula was mainly exercised through the adoption of Cluniac customs by monasteries which retained their independence. Thus Sahagun, the centre of the most intensive Cluniac observance, impregnated the monasteries of Leon and Castile with the same spirit without ever being incorporated in the order.

Expansion followed a similar pattern in Italy, and though again Hugh's abbacy was the most important period of annexations, developments were hardly what might have been expected from previous tendencies. Cluniac traditions were strong in Italy for in the tenth century Odo had been asked by Alberic to reform the Roman monasteries and the Cluniacs had exerted considerable influence there without establishing juridical links. S Maieul in Pavia was the first dependent foundation, 962-73. Odilo had made nine journeys to Italy and had come into contact with a number of Italian houses, including those of Rome. Ultimately some thirty dependent priories were incorporated to the order in Italy, most of them between 1049 and 1109.(1) They were all in the Lombard region and except for Pontida, founded in 1076 and St. Benedict's, Polirone, annexed in 1076,

(1) For a list of the Italian monasteries, see L'Huillier, 'I priorati clun. in Italia', p. 24.
none were of great importance. The main group of Italian houses was confirmed by Urban II in 1095. (1)

A Cluniac foothold in Switzerland was gained when Payerne and Romainmoutier were annexed in the tenth century. After a considerable pause a new period of Cluniac acquisitions began with the foundation of Rüggisberg in 1070, which was followed by the direct submission of a handful of others, seven of them during Hugh's abbacy, including St. Alban's in Basle. (2)

Rüggisberg may be regarded as the first foundation in German-speaking territory, though Abdinghof, an insignificant priory to the north-west of Germany, annexed in the tenth century, preceded it. Cluniac infiltration in this region was mostly indirect, by way of the powerful reform centre of Hirsau. When Abbot William of Hirsau wanted to reform his monastery he was advised by Hugh to adapt rather than adhere to the letter of Cluniac custom, written for him by Ulrich. (3) There was never any suggestion of Hirsau's incorporation as a dependent house. It has been well said of monastic reform in Germany that,

(1) PL 151, col. 410.

(2) See Egger, Geschichte der Cluniacenserkläröster in der Westschweiz.

(3) See below, p. 252.
though inspired by Cluny it "quickly moved along specifically German lines and produced specifically German fruits from roots deep in German soil". (1) A few small priories, none of note, belonged to Cluny and were situated mostly in Swabia and the Black Forest.

This marked the boundary of penetration eastwards.

Until recently it was thought that the Polish Benedictines founded in the eleventh century were Cluniac but it has been conclusively proved that this is legendary and historically inaccurate. (2)

Six small priories in the diocese of Liège belonged to the order and four of them were annexed under Hugh: S Pierre d'Aywaille in 1038 (dependent on Marcigny), S Simphorien au Bois in 1091 (later called S Severin en Condres), S Saulve de Valenciennes in 1103, and S Victor of Huy at the beginning of the twelfth century. (3)

All Hugh's biographers refer to the abbot's work for monastic reform in Flanders. Yet the only abbey that enjoyed any juridical relationship with the Cluny of Hugh was S Bertin, which became partly dependent when Abbot


(3) Halkin, 'Les Frierués clunisiens de l'ancien Diocèse de Liège.'
Lambert introduced the Cluniac observance between 1095 and 1102. Even this was only temporary and the ties were relaxed under Pons. (1) The majority of annexations in what is now Belgium were made in the twelfth century, but the way was prepared under Hugh when the region became open to influence through the medium of customs. This first preparatory phase of Cluniac expansion took place towards the end of the eleventh century. (2) The Abbey of Anchin was the first centre to adopt Cluniac customs, about 1080. Afflighem imitated Anchin between 1083 and 1087 and S Martin de Tournai followed suit in 1092.

England also saw the first of its Cluniac priories during Hugh's abbacy. An opportunity presented itself when William the Conqueror wrote to the abbot asking him to send monks to his newly acquired territories, but the offer was declined. (3) Hence Norman monasticism wielded the prevalent influence that might have been Cluny's and by the time Cluny did establish an English centre the new orders such as the Cistercians were already on the horizon and the field for Cluniac expansion was limited.

In any case, Cluny's influence in England differed from that

---

(1) *Gesta Abbatum S Berthini Sithiensium* MG. SS. vol. xiii, p. 652.
(2) See J. Stiennon, 'Cluny et S Trond'.
(3) PL 159, col. 922.
elsewhere in that it was not prepared by previous acquaintance with customs but took the form of direct foundations. Nor did Cluny enter England on the same reform mission that characterised most of the expansion.

The foundations fall roughly into three groups: those founded directly from Cluny, houses dependent on La Charité, S Martin des Champs and Longueville, and priories dependent on English houses. The first and most important priory was that of Lewes founded in 1077. Montacute and Lenton, founded in 1100 and 1108 respectively were the only other foundations under Hugh directly dependent on Cluny. Ten other indirectly dependent priories were founded during this period: Wenlock in 1079, Castle Acre and Bermondsey in 1089, Pontefract and Daventry in 1090, Northampton, 1093-1100, Barnstaple and East Holme in 1107, and St. Helen's, Isle of Wight, 1071-1086. Ultimately some thirty-eight or thirty-nine priories were founded in England, before 1222, most of them later than Hugh's rule. But whether viewed from the standpoint of the Order of Cluny, or that of English monasticism, Cluniac developments in England were

---

relatively unimportant. As Professor Knowles points out, the Cluny of St. Hugh gave nothing permanent to England, and the Cluniac contribution came later, in the twelfth century, through Cluniac monks who as individuals came to occupy positions of eminence.(1)

An interesting aspect of Cluniac expansion, if also obscure for the historian, is that of the presence of Cluniacs in the Byzantine Empire where a small number of priories was founded. The only direct references are two letters of Peter the Venerable, one to the Emperor John II Comnenus, the other to the Patriarch of Constantinople concerning the restitution of the monastery of Civitot given by the Emperor Alexius I Comnenus to Cluny and La Charité.(2) Peter complains of the monks having been driven out and dying off. Alexius died in 1118 so the priory must have been founded before that date and it has been suggested that the Emperor learned of Cluny from the French crusaders.(3) In the twelfth century there were a number of short lived attempts at foundation

(2) PL 189, col. 261. See map for position of this monastery.
and Prince Tancred of Galilee founded a Benedictine house, probably of Cluniac observance on Mount Tabor, which was destroyed in 1113, though there is no proof that this was dependent on Cluny or any other house of the order. (1) Some writers mistake houses that had adopted Cluniac customs for dependent monasteries of the order, so that the extent of Cluniac influence in the Byzantine Empire has been somewhat exaggerated. (2)

Knowledge of the extent and nature of Cluniac influence remains therefore somewhat nebulous and the most that can be said is that there was at one time an invitation from the Emperor to the Cluniacs as a result of which Civitot was founded, and that perhaps the crusaders also attempted to establish dependent houses. Cluniac influence is more likely to have operated through the observance of customs rather than dependent houses. There was undoubtedly some Byzantine contact and a certain interchange of influence.

(1) See J. Evans, Romanesque Architecture of the Order of Cluny, p. 48, where Civitot, Tabor, and Palmareia, 1170-80, are the only three houses in Asia Minor mentioned in the author's list of Cluniac monasteries.

(2) See Dom Romanus Rios, 'Benedictine contacts with the Eastern Church, in Eastern Churches Quarterly, vol. iv, (1941) pp. 250 ff. where an interesting account of Benedictine contacts in the Byzantine Empire during the eleventh century is given, but the writer's statements on the type of Benedictinism that prevailed should be received with caution.
This is noticeable at Cluny itself, as for instance in liturgical and artistic developments. From the Byzantine point of view, it is not unlikely that Cluniac life, especially on account of its liturgical and ritualistic character, appeared eminently suited to adaptation for the East European world. Whether or not these suppositions are valid, it is clear that Cluniac influence was neither of the same nature nor importance as the expansion in Western Europe.

2. Causes of the Expansion

Though each monastery was founded or annexed in particular circumstances, and regional expansion took place under different conditions, it is evident that a coincidence of factors in the second half of the eleventh century caused not only the extension of Cluniac influence as a whole but determined the medium through which it was mostly exercised, namely the spread of the Cluniac Order by the foundation and annexation of monasteries. These factors may be divided into those present in European society and the reasons explaining Cluny's response to contemporary trends.
(1) Factors in contemporary society

The most significant movement in eleventh-century Europe was the so-called Gregorian Reform. The use of the word "reform" in this connection, and its frequent association with Cluny, necessitates a precise understanding of the concept.

It has been well described as "primarily a spiritual renewal". (1) It is at once a beginning, a process, and an achievement, originating in a recognition of the inadequacy of accepted standards and a reconsideration of principles in terms of the spiritual needs of the age. The beginnings are scattered and isolated and there is an almost imperceptible development of thought and interchange of ideas. They become the leaders who formulate these principles in contemporary language and communicate them in a manner applicable in every sphere and at all levels of society. A permeation of the whole is aimed at by means of those external manifestations which, as Professor Knowles intimates, appear to contemporaries and historians as the most striking aspect of such a movement. (2) The outward expressions are

(1) Knowles, 'Peter the Venerable', p. 133.

(2) ibid: "(The reform) manifested itself to contemporaries and to later historians most clearly in the revival of papal organization and in the contest between Papacy and Empire."
usually directed to the removal of abuses and the harnessing and organisation of resources.

Such a movement was in full flood in Hugh's abbacy. One of its characteristics was the increasing efficacy with which papal authority was exercised, and though the popes did little directly to extend the Cluniac system, papal protection grew in significance and without the readiness of the papacy to define and confirm rights and privileges, Cluniac developments might have been impeded. As it was, the popes of the reform era saw in monastic exemption a means of extending their influence in dioceses hitherto closed to the reform process, and in Cluny particularly they found their most powerful ally. As the relations of Cluny with the papacy have frequently been misunderstood the situation during Hugh's abbacy may be summarised.

Leo IX, 1049-1055, was elected pope only a few months after Hugh's accession as abbot. At the Council of Rheims in the same year Cluny, in the person of her abbot, had an honoured place for Hugh was chosen to preach to the assembly. (1) The pope recognised in him a firm supporter and took him to Rome. At the Lateran Council of 1050 Hugh ranked second among the abbots, precedence being given

to the Abbot of Monte Cassino. From Rome, Hugh went as papal legate to Hungary, where he arranged a successful treaty between the King of Hungary and the Emperor Henry III. (1)

In the absence of further evidence it is fair to presume that relations under Pope Victor II, 1055-7, were good. Hugh was personally known to the next pope, Stephen IX, 1057-9, whom as Abbot of Monte Cassino, he had met at the Lateran Council. The abbot seems to have been a close companion of the pope who wrote to the monks of Cluny apologising for keeping their father in Rome, but said that he needed him there. (2) Hugh was present when Stephen died in Florence in 1059 and comforted the pope on his deathbed. (3)

During the pontificate of Nicholas II, 1059-61, the abbot was in the forefront of reform activity and at the Lateran Council of 1059 he and Cardinal Stephen were appointed legates to promulgate the reform canons in France. They held a number of provincial councils: in 1060 Hugh presided at those of Avignon and Toulouse about which

---

(1) See L'Huillier, p. 70 and Vita Hug. auct. Gilo, L'Huillier, p. 582.
(2) PL 143, col. 879.
unfortunately little is known. Like the other popes, Nicholas encouraged monasticism but showed no particular favouritism to Cluny beyond a readiness to confirm privileges and possessions.

The trouble between Hugh and the Bishop of Macon that arose during the pontificate of Pope Alexander II, 1061-75, was something of a test-case as regards papal reaction. At Hugh's request Peter Damian was sent to settle the question but in the meantime the Pope confirmed all Cluny's privileges. The favourable opinion Peter Damian seems to have taken back to Rome would have had much weight with Alexander who regarded the former with respect.

Pope Gregory VII's pontificate, 1073-85, has received the most attention. Some historians regard Gregory as an opponent who attempted to curtail Cluniac influence; others see pope and abbot as allies in the mission of extending the Cluniac system. The presence of Hugh at Canossa has confused the issue even more. The chronology of events and the personalities of pope and abbot need to be well understood if a balanced picture is to be obtained.

It is unlikely that Gregory was ever a monk of Cluny, but Hugh was well known to him from his visit as Hildebrand

(2) See above, p. 68 f.
to Cluny and from the journeys that they made together to provincial councils, from which one or two anecdotes survive.(1) One concerns the behaviour of Hugh's chamberlain referred to earlier, and the other the disagreement over the deposition of a certain bishop. Hildebrand, as legate, had effected the deposition but Hugh secretly disagreed with it. The former perceived Hugh's disapproval and while journeying away from the Council explained that his course of action was taken because the bishop was guilty of simony.(2)

Things followed much the same pattern, though in a wider sphere when Hildebrand became Pope. He was firm in reproving the abbot for anything with which he disagreed, and Hugh for his part offered no excuses and often, with that trace of obstinacy that sometimes characterised him, pursued his path, confident either of his own righteousness, or Gregory's friendly attitude beneath all. Both were single-minded men allied in the same cause, if they

---

(1) For a thorough examination of the available evidence and an account of opinions that have been brought forward on the question of Hildebrand's supposed "Cluniac connections", see G.B. Borino, 'Ildebrando non si fece monaco a Roma', in Studi Gregoriani, vol. iv, pp. 441-56.

(2) See above, p. 107 and William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum Anglorum, lib. iii, PL 179, col. 1244. The Bishop's name is omitted.
occasionally differed in opinion as to how that cause was best advanced. A number of clashes occurred and misunderstandings arose, but each recognised the worth of the other, and Hugh's respect for Gregory's authority and the latter's admiration of the abbot's sterling quality, enabled them to persevere in a firm if tried friendship.

Gregory announced his papal election to Hugh immediately.(1) The following year they were already at variance when Hugh ignored Gregory's request that he should go to Rome and was accused of neglecting his duty.(2) Another delicate situation arose in 1079 when the pope was annoyed by the reception of the Duke of Burgundy and the scandal caused by the quarrels between Hugh, the Archbishop of Lyons, and the Bishop of Macon.(3) The impartiality of Gregory is shown in the instructions to his legate Hugh of Die, wherein he expressed sympathy for the Bishop of Macon whom he likened to a simple dove faced with the cunning of the serpent in the abbot, though he added that he favoured

(2) ibid. p. 81: "In hoc enim dilectionis vestrae flamam desiderae deprehendemus, quod consolationem vestrae visitationis, totiens quaesitam, invenire non possumus."
(3) See above, pp. 69 ff. and pp. 78-9.
Neither party. (1)

The pope's banishment to Cluny of the legate Robert, a Cluniac, is sometimes interpreted as an attempt to check Cluniac influence in Spain. But in the same letter to King Alphonsus in which Robert's banishment was announced, Gregory speaks in the highest terms of Hugh, which makes the theory untenable. (2) It appears that about the same time attempts were being made in Rome to undermine papal respect for the Abbot of Cluny, for the pope wrote that he would take no notice of criticisms being made about Hugh until he had discussed affairs with him in person. (3)

The end of the pontificate was marred by no discord and the pope's public acclamation of the greatness of Cluny and the holiness of her abbots at the Roman Council of 1080 was perhaps made with the troublemakers in mind. (4)

Despite occasional differences, however, a steady cooperation characterised the pontificate and Gregory

---

(1) Reg. vol. i, p. 637, no. 5183: "Episcopo multum condolentes, videntes in illo columbae simplicitatem, in abbate autem serpens astutiam; neque ad dextram neque ad sinistram amplius declinare volumus..."


(3) Ibid. p. 428: "Neque illi qui de multis adversum vos negotiosis murmurant, ante tempus fraternae locutionis ad suspiciandum aliud poterant nobis scandalum generare."

(4) Bull. Cl. col. 21.
evidently relied on Hugh. He enlisted him against Berengar, asked for monks suitable to be made bishops, made Hugh legate on a number of occasions, including a mission to Spain, and asked for someone to preach to the Moors there.\(^{(1)}\)

But the friendship between pope and abbot was not based solely on alliance in work, which is obvious from the way Gregory wrote to Hugh telling of his sufferings and labours, bemoaning that they bore so little fruit and begging Hugh for a remembrance in prayer.\(^{(2)}\)

Rightly or wrongly, Cannossa has become the focus point of discussions about Cluny's place in the struggle between Empire and Papacy. But Hugh was present at the meeting in a unique capacity, because of his personal relations with pope and emperor. He was godfather of Henry IV and as one of the few on intimate terms with both parties the abbot could be enlisted as a mediator. Though the precise nature of the part he played is not known, it is clear that he was not there as a partisan. There was certainly no declared support of the emperor for the latter considered


\(^{(2)}\) eg. Mon Greg. p. 163 and PL, 148, col. 506: "Vos autem certa fide imo et oratione, Dei omnipotentis misericordiam implorate, ut mentes nostras secundum suam voluntatem dirigat, et in magna tempestate nos gubernans ad portum suae pietatis perducat..."
Hugh had neglected him in by-passing the emperor's camp to reach the pope. (1) Most of the sources describe Hugh as being summoned by Gregory to effect a reconciliation and the emperor, on his side, also enlisted Hugh to plead his case with the pope. (2) It is possible that Hugh did not hold so extreme an attitude as Gregory, for his excuse to Henry for going to the pope first was the desire of lessening Gregory's severity. (3) Later, when Henry imprisoned the papal legates, Hugh wrote in no uncertain and accused the emperor of perjury by breaking his oath to the pope - hardly a measure of diplomacy. (4) Apart from the usual confirmation of Cluniac possessions, the only examples of immediate interest in the Cluniac order are the requests that the Abbey of Gigny should be reformed by Hugh, and that he should provide an abbot for St. Benedict's, Polirone. (5) The extension of Cluniac influence through

(1) *Vita Hug.* auct. Raynaldo, PL 159, col. 903: "(Hugo) ad summum pontificem divertisset, rex hoc comperto legationem ad eum misit, reprehensibilem eum judicans quod pro mortali homine praetergressus fuisse." 

(2) *Vita Hug.* auct. Raynaldo, PL 159, col. 903: "Ad (Henrici imperatoris) reconciliationem cum a summo pontifice... evocatus fuisse..." PL 159, cols. 933 ff.: two letters of the emperor to Hugh.

(3) PL 159, col. 904.

(4) MG. SS. vol. v, p. 297.

(5) Bull. Cl. col. 20 and PL 148, cols. 667 and 713.
things like the appointment of Cluniac bishops sprang less from the desire of promoting Cluniac interests than the forwarding of Church reform in general.

Hugh had visited Monte Cassino when the next Pope Victor III, 1086-8, had been abbot there and confraternity was established between their respective abbeys on that occasion. (1) There is no record of their later relations.

The climax in relations with the papacy was reached in the pontificates of Urban II, 1088-99, and Paschal II, 1099-1118, both former monks of Cluny. But though every protection of Cluniac privileges was made available there was comparatively little promotion of the Cluniac system. But to contemporaries it must have seemed that the wheel had come full circle and Cluny and the Papacy were now synonomous and indeed many regarded the abbey as a second Rome. In one letter to Urban the abbot said that many who wished to see the pope but were unable to go to Rome went to the abbot of Cluny instead. (2) The pope visited Cluny in 1095 to consecrate the new basilica and showed his predilection in his itinerary by the number of Cluniac monasteries he visited, including Marcigny, Souvigny, and

(1) (Chronicle of Monte Cassino) MG. SS. vol. vii, p. 741.

(2) PL 159, col. 929: "Multi...cuiunt dignam vestram adire praesentiam, sed impediantur variis difficultatibus...ad nos veniunt, quasi ad domesticos vestros."
Sauxillanges. He also gave to Cluny the monastery of S Pierre of Binson that he had inherited from his parents, and handed Beaulieu over to be reformed. But his encouragement of monasticism extended to all the renowned abbeys of Europe, such as Monte Cassino, S Victor of Marseilles, Marmoutiers and included the patronage of new experiments like Citeaux. Interest in Church Reform in general explains arrangements like those whereby Cluny was empowered to keep any tithes it managed to recover from lay hands. But the abbey gave much to Rome in the administrative sphere when Hugh sent Peter Gloc who did so much in the reorganisation of the Curia under Urban.

The position was the same under Paschal II who wrote to Hugh announcing Urban II's death and his own election. He too visited Cluny in 1106 and continued the tradition of his predecessors in confirming Cluny's privileges and defining her rights over dependent houses.

As the eleventh century advanced an increasing number of bishops encouraged monasticism. For instance, it is

(1) PL 151, cols. 450 and 468.
(2) ibid, col. 441.
(3) See above, p. 104.
(4) PL 163, col. 31.
(5) PL 163, cols. 51, 53, 204, 201.
recorded how soon after 1075 the Bishop of Cologne established three reformed monasteries in his diocese and his example was followed by many bishops of Gaul, who asked monks from Cluny, Siegburg, or other renowned centres to reform the monasteries of their dioceses. (1) It is also said that the Bishops of Lyons, Bourges, Chalon-sur-Marne, Amiens, Soissons, Meaux, Autun, Macon, and Grenoble, agreed that monasteries with less than twelve monks or those unable to support at least that number should be given to Cluny or Marmoutiers. (2) Such measures explain the acquisition of so many small priories and during Hugh’s abbacy houses were in fact annexed in all the above dioceses.

Many monks became bishops in the second half of the eleventh century. The following sees, many of them metropolitan, were occupied by Cluniacs during this period: Vienne, Auxerre, Lyons, Sisteron, Saintes, Uzerche, Chartres, Limoges, Auch, Toulouse, Valence, Toledo, Compostella, Quercy, Braja, Coimbra, Sahagun, Salerno, and possibly others. (3)


(2) See Evans, *The Monastery of Cluny,* p. 26, where it is said that the decision was taken at the Council of Meaux in 1082. There is some confusion about the provincial councils of Meaux at this time (see Hefele and Leclercq, *op. cit. vol. iv, 2*) though I can find no record of such a decree at any of the councils of Meaux of the 1080s. Perhaps the author intended to refer to another council.

(3) The list could probably be extended were this specific question to be investigated.
Sometimes Cluniacs succeeded one another in office as at Sahagun where Robert succeeded Bernard when the latter transferred to Toledo in 1078. Transfers like this were also not uncommon, and another example is Jerome Bishop of Valence, transferred to Salerno. To this number of dignitaries must be added two popes and two if not three occupants of the See of Ostia.(1)

Cluniac influence in the dioceses was exercised in a number of ways. The Abbot of S Martial of Limoges was allowed a voice in the election of the bishop and in 1096 used his privilege to get the prior of the monastery elected.(2)

Hugh was personally known to many of the bishops from his frequent appearance at local councils up and down France. He often presided on such occasions, as at Bordeaux in 1067, Langres in 1068, and Toulouse and Avignon in 1060. He was frequently approached for advice in matters concerning diocesan reform, as when the Bishop of Toulouse consulted him about establishing canons.(3) When the former Cluniac Bernard became Archbishop of Toledo, Hugh wrote to him about the duties of a bishop, stressing particularly the pastoral nature of the office and advising him to surround

---

(1) Ulrich's companion, Gerald, was made Cardinal Archbishop of Ostia and Urban II had also occupied the See.

(2) See C. de Lasteyrie, L'Abbaye de S Martial de Limoges, p. 87 f.

(3) GC. vol. xiii, instr. col. 7.
himself with regular canons or monks. (1)

The drive against simony and the attempt to reclaim ecclesiastical property from lay hands was also a factor in the expansion of monasticism. The Lateran Council of 1078 forbade the retention of ecclesiastical property by the laity on pain of excommunication. Such decrees did have some effect and many, anxious to make a bargain while they were about it — made restitution in the form of benefactions to monasteries. Occasionally goods were handed back to a bishop only on the condition that something was given to a monastery. An example of this is a church given to Cluny by the Archbishop of Rheims who, in the charter of donation, deplored the carelessness of his predecessors in allowing property to fall into lay hands and said that he had recovered the said church on condition that it was given to Cluny. (2) The great number of parish churches and chapels acquired by the abbey at this time, mostly from seculars, is largely explained by the advance of this aspect of the reform. There are even examples of Cluny purchasing churches. (3) The right of enjoying any tithes removed from lay hands was a further incentive to seek the recovery of such property and revenues.

(1) Ferotin, 'Une lettre inédite de S. Hugues'.
(2) Bruel, vol. v, no. 3661.
(3) ibid. vol. iv, no. 3042, for an example.
It is evident from the charters that the laity were "simony-conscious". It was becoming quite the fashion to deplore simony, either genuinely or otherwise, and outré to hold ecclesiastical property. There is frequent mention of the way monasteries have been bought and sold and "lay abbots" sometimes signed charters in this capacity when they eventually returned the house to monastic hands. Such was the case of Moissac whose abbot, as he styled himself, had bought the abbey from William of Toulouse for 30,000 solidi. (1) Beaulieu was given to Cluny by Pope Urban II because of relaxed discipline under a lay abbot. (2) The renunciation of all rights over ecclesiastical property by the Counts of Poitou and Toulouse, prepared the way for the notable Cluniac expansion in that region.

But professions of repentance cannot always be taken at their face value as the case of Count Ademar of Limoges illustrates. In a long preamble to the charter donating the Abbey of S Martial to Cluny, he waxed eloquent on the need of extirpating simony so strongly condemned by Pope Leo IX, and expressed his desire for the reform of the abbey. But at the end of the charter he slipped in a clause redounding to his own financial profit to the tune of two hundred solidi

(1) ibid. no. 3392: "Ego Gaubertus, abba nominatus... emptione magni pretii xxx solidiorum abbatium Moysiacensis cenobii comparaverim."

(2) Bibl. Cl. col. 524.
a year and certain rights of purveyance. From other known circumstances of the donation it would seem that economic profit was the more probable motive. (1)

The advance of reform and monasticism went everywhere hand in hand, and it has been said, without exaggeration, that the Gregorian Reform was in origin and direction mostly the work of monks who put monasticism before the laity as the universal way of salvation. (2) There was an unrest and dissatisfaction with the world, particularly among the higher ranks of society, which was sometimes voiced by contemporary chroniclers, like Berthold of Zweifalten who described how men were oppressed with the menace of war, gave their property to monasteries, or built new ones, and many left the world to devote themselves entirely to God. (3) The spectacle of dukes and counts entering the cloister followed by their retinue was common and the presence of the Duke of Burgundy and Count of Macon at Cluny was nothing remarkable in the eleventh century. The attraction of the monastic life explains the rapid growth of so many newly founded communities and the rise in numbers of those already established.

The reform of existing monasteries was also a

(2) See Knowles, 'Peter the Venerable', p. 133.
(3) MG. SS. vol. x, p. 102.
characteristic of the age and in this respect too the laity were "reform-conscious", and often stated it as their motive in relinquishing rights. In this connection the word reform needs to be understood in its context. Sometimes, if the Rule had been abandoned and a mere natural life was the norm, a radical spiritual renewal was needed, as at Beaulieu, which Urban II gave to Cluny because its laxity was leading to the loss of souls.(1) Sometimes it was merely a case of adapting the observance by accepting new customs or improving administration. In many cases the renunciation of lay-rights over a monastery was enough to be regarded as reform.

Monks themselves occasionally expressed a desire for reform, usually by electing an abbot who could provide the necessary direction. The monks of Figeac elected Hugh as abbot and asked him to reform their house and another time some canons asked him to help them to reorganise their life.(2) Sometimes Bishops or founders stipulated that if a community could not produce a suitable abbot or prior from their own ranks, someone from one of the recognised reform centres was to be elected. Thus the Abbey of La Trinité of Vendôme had to apply to Marmoutiers or Cluny if such a situation arose.(3)

(1) Bibl. Cl. col. 524.
(2) Bruel, vol. iv, nos. 3321 and 3469.
(3) PL 148, col. 729.
A characteristic expression of lay piety in the eleventh century was the desire to use worldly goods as a means of salvation. This affected the monasteries, whose charters illustrate that the end of the world, fear of judgement, desire of salvation, entered the daily life, private and social, of the eleventh century layman. The foundation of a monastery had for long been a recognised expression of devotion, or a means of reparation, like S Foi of Morlaas founded and given to Cluny to make amends for an incestuous marriage. (1) Another example is that of a certain Humbert who wanted to make satisfaction for his sins and was advised to found a monastery, whereupon he gave enough land to Cluny for a small priory to be built. (2) Monasteries were also founded in fulfilment of a vow or because some other promise could not be fulfilled, as in the case of the priory of Thetford, founded by Roger Bigod, because his family persuaded him that he was too old to go to Jerusalem as he had vowed. (3)

Much store had always been set by the prayers of monks who were regarded as an integral part of society on account of their intercessory influence. Something of the confidence with which people looked to them for protection

(1) S Foi, cart. xix.
(2) Bruel, vol. v, no. 3665.
is reflected in Cluniac customs such as the procession with the relics of the monastery to those places threatened with the ravages of feudal warfare. (1) Cluny had also provided practical protection of the people by the promotion of the pactum Dei and the truce Dei.

The importance of the liturgy of the dead in lay piety may be emphasised as a most influential factor in monastic benefactions. Donations were nearly always accompanied by a request for prayers, and burial in the monastic churchyard was frequently stated as a condition of donation to a monastery. Cluny had led the way in popularising this devotion by such means as Odilo's institution of the commemoration of All Souls on 2nd November. There was a special rite for the reception of laymen for burial at Cluny and the number of obligations that had been undertaken in respect of benefactors obliged Hugh to institute one general commemoration on the Tuesday after Trinity Sunday for all who were buried in the monastic churchyard. (2) Charters usually enumerated persons whom the benefactor wished to be prayed for and it was sometimes asked that a considerable list should be entered in the necrology of

(1) Ulrich, col. 675: "...Cum sanctorum reliquis ad aliquam villam nostram destinamus, ut saepe contingit, pro timore praedarum et rapinarum..."

(2) See above, p. 147.
the monastery. (1)

Those who have analysed monastic charters agree that genuine piety played a lively part in eleventh century donations to religious houses. (2) Economic considerations alone rarely weighed, though benefactors did sometimes expect temporal as well as spiritual results. Thus, if the overlordship of property was ceded to a monastery, particularly so famous an abbey as Cluny which would invest the donor with the immediate possession of the land, little had been lost, and the disintegration of a fief through subinfeudation or the custom of dividing land among heirs could be prevented.

The favourable disposition of the rulers towards monasticism was another influential factor in the monastic revival and it is significant that in all the areas of its expansion, Cluny was directly encouraged by the secular power. It has been said of the directions taken: "Elles soulignent d'une façon toute particulière chacun des faits importants de l'époque." (3) William the Conqueror

(1) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3312: "...ut faciatis scribere in vos tro martirlogium:" (there follows a list of thirteen members of the donor's family with the dates of their decease).

(2) Duby, Schreiber, Valous, and M. Bloch are all of this opinion.

(3) Berthelier, 'L'Expansion de Cluny', p. 326.
looked to Cluny for monks when he came to England and though foundations were not made until later, these were on lands given by knights who had acquired their property at the Conquest. King Philip of France gave the important priory of S Martin des Champs to Cluny. It was the same in Spain, where the main reform impetus came from the rulers, first in the sending of Paternus to Cluny by Sanchus, and then by the encouragement of King Alphonsus who gave the first monastery actually to be annexed in the peninsula, S Zoyle. King Henry of Portugal gave to La Charité the first Cluniac monastery in that region, Rates. One chronicler describes how the Count of Flanders was so impressed by the reform of S Bertin that he took monks from there and placed them in S Vaast and S Pierre of Ghent. King Louis of France noticed the improvement and obliged the abbey of S Medard of Soissons to adopt the Cluniac observance. (1)

Regional and territorial boundaries were subservient to the basic *communitates* of Europe, and the ease with which men passed from one region to another paved the way for the widespread dissemination of reform ideas. This is illustrated by the expansion of Cluny, for it can hardly

have been mere coincidence that this took place within the area where the rulers recognised a common heritage. It was only when, and in so far as, other territories entered this orbit that infiltration was made possible. The limited eastward expansion reflects this, and Ulrich implies more than once that the Teutons, as he calls them, found it difficult to integrate themselves at Cluny. To the end, Hugh hesitated to send monks to England, and as late as 1104 he declined to found Thetford but confided it to Lewes.(1)

But even the coincidence of factors that has been described does not explain why Cluny rather than any other monastery extended its influence so rapidly, though some of the reasons have already been indicated.

(ii) Causes within Cluny

The situation of Cluny had some significance, though less than is sometimes supposed. It was neither easy of access nor near an important highway, for it had been chosen on account of its remoteness and calm solitude. But the absence of any important cathedral city or large monastery in the vicinity meant there was no rival influence and it was well

(1) See L'Huillier, p. 345.
situated for expansion in all directions. The weakness of political power in the Maconnais also contributed to the stability of the monastery: the region was a neutral zone between the empire and the area within which the French royal power directly operated, and the local rulers were enfeebled by the gradual break up of seigneurial estates. (1)

The beginning of Hugh's abbacy coincided with the open declaration of a reform policy by the Church. But from the time of its foundation Cluny had been wholly committed to all this implied, and the ideals receiving new emphasis had been Cluny's from the beginning. An abbey with so solid and proved a tradition of integrity was bound to appear as a pillar of support in the fluctuations and upheavals of a reform era, and it was natural that when monastic reform was considered men would draw on the rich experience of Cluny. Many charters mention the fame of Hugh and Cluny in connection with the work of reform as a consideration that has led to the donation of a monastery to Cluny. (2)

(1) See Duby, La Société dans la région maconnaise, p. 89.

(2) eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3402: "Visum est ergo nobis querere consilium...domni Hugonis...regentis...Cluniaco congregatorum. Per hujus loci abbates cum pleraque monasteria restaurata sint et meliorata...affectavimus nos quoque simile beneficium eorum sanctitatis obtinere."
Cluniac exemption was also important in the expansion of the order, for the donation of a monastery to Cluny was one of the best ways of ensuring independence of all control save that which was entirely monastic - though the same exemption was not necessarily enjoyed by a dependent house.(1)

Certain features of the way of life that was well established at Cluny responded to contemporary tendencies. This was especially true of the liturgy. Besides popularising the liturgy of the dead, Cluny was instrumental in disseminating the Roman rite, and this was one of the strongest reasons for papal encouragement of the Cluniacs in Spain where the transition from the Mozarabic rite to the Roman began under Cluniac auspices. King Alphonsus VI legislated on the subject acting on Hugh's instructions.(2)

It may be added that the people were not so easily weaned from so familiar a liturgical tradition.

Cluny had much to offer in the sphere of government and administration. A practical illustration of this can be found in the monastery of S Martin of Tournai. This house was in difficulties because, unknown to the community, the abbot had squandered the abbey's resources. When it was discovered, the monks demanded that a chamberlain and

(1) See below, pp. 265ff.

(2) PL 159, col. 939: "De Romano autem officio quod tua jussione accepimus..."
subordinates be appointed and the Cluniac system adopted for the proper administration of the monastery. (1) Even more significant was Peter Gloc's work for the reorganisation of the Roman Curia. (2)

The longevity of the abbots was not without influence on the stability of Cluny and their qualities make the line outstanding by any standards. The first five spanned two centuries and thirty-four pontificates, and even Hugh knew nine popes, two of them his own monks. Chaume, who studied in detail the Cluniac charters to the end of Odilo's abbacy, says that it is impossible to attribute the growth of Cluny to anything else but the personal relations of the abbots with their contemporaries, and that this explains not only the expansion in general, but each of its details. (3) This was also true of Hugh's abbacy.

Hugh especially responded to the tendencies of his age, for he was a powerful promoter of reform. His formation as a Benedictine in the Cluny of Odilo gave him that essential view of the destiny of the individual and the value of monasticism that was one of his guiding principles.

(1) Liber de restauratione S Martini Tornacensi, MG. SS. vol. xiv, p. 313.

(2) See above, p. 104 and n.2.

His personality was one that attracted and he directed this influence to a formative contact with an undoubted bias towards monasticism. All the biographers stress the way he inspired many to enter the cloister and Raynald says of him that his charity attracted large numbers who all thought themselves lucky to live under to great a father. (1) He won and kept the loyalty of those who placed themselves under his guidance, and opposition was rare during his abbacy, and when it did occur, usually took the form of an initial rebellion in a dependent monastery against the imposition of a new system, and then rather against those who had effected it rather than Hugh himself. (2) Cluny itself is the greatest witness to his leadership, for despite the presence of many disturbing features he prevented the disintegration which might easily have come earlier. The open opposition at Cluny and elsewhere under Pons, is another indirect testimony to the power of Hugh and to the importance of the personal impact of the abbot at this period.

It has been noted that Hugh's relations with popes, emperors and kings rested on a personal and not an official basis. The abbot's detachment from human respect enabled him to persist in an equitable friendship with all parties

(2) See below, pp. 254 ff.
in the complexities that characterised the epoch. He was, therefore, frequently approached as arbiter: to arrange a treaty between the Emperor and King of Hungary in 1051; to witness a pact between Henry of Portugal and Raymond of Gallicia with Alphonsus VI concerning the succession; and at Cannossa.\(^{(1)}\)

It was the same with the lesser lords of society, many of whom were connected with the Cluniac community by family ties.

It goes without saying that Hugh was friendly with the religious personalities of the age, who were sometimes instrumental in promoting Cluniac influence. A firm friendship existed between Sts. Hugh and Anselm and the abbot solemnly commended the Cluniacs in England to the latter's protection.\(^{(2)}\) When Roger Bigod wanted to found Thetford he applied to Cluny on Anselm's advice.\(^{(3)}\)

Cluniac influence was also exercised through Hugh's disciples, especially the Cluniac bishops, abbots, and priors, and people like Ulrich, Morandus, and Anastasius. The work of Ulrich in Germany has already been intimated. Apart from the significant redaction of Cluniac customs, he founded Ruggisberg, Ulrich Zell and possibly other Cluniac

---

\(^{(1)}\) See above, pp. 225 and 230; PL 159, col. 944 (Copy of the pact between Henry and Raymund sent to Hugh).

\(^{(2)}\) PL 159, cols. 210 and 241: letters to St. Anselm.

\(^{(3)}\) See L'Huillier, p. 345.
priories in that region, besides evangelising the
neighbouring people. (1) Anastasius accompanied Hugh on
reform missions to Aquitaine and Toulouse where many were
won to the monastic life by their example and preaching.
Anastasius was also sent to Spain to preach to the Moors.
The sight of the Pyrenees was too much for this lover of
solitude, however, and he eventually returned to the
eremitical life in a tiny cell high up in the mountains. (2)
Morandus was another who inspired many to renounce the
world and devote themselves wholly to God. (3)

Dependent houses were a most important factor in
furthering Cluniac expansion which often took the form of
annexations to a dependent monastery. The acquisition of
one house in a diocese was frequently the starting point
for a whole series of annexations. Thus, S Mont, founded
in 1050, was the first Cluniac priory in Auch, but
ultimately Cluny had forty-seven dependencies there, all
but two of them acquired under Hugh. (4)

(1) Vita Udalrici, MG. SS. vol. xii, pp. 249-67.
(2) Vita Anastasii, PL 149, cols. 425-33.
(3) Vita Morandi, Bibl. Cl. cols. 501-6.
(4) S Mont, cart. p. 117.
3. Policy of Cluny as regards Expansion

Cluny's Weltanschauung had as its object the good of souls. (1) This caused the commitment to reform that characterised Cluny from the beginning. Cluny conceived her apostolate in terms of monasticism, but not necessarily Cluniac monasticism, and her extroversion was directed to a spiritual influence rather than the imposition of a system. It can be said that the desire of personal expansion was entirely absent. This is particularly noticeable in the earlier period when so much was done for monastic reform without any attempt on the part of the abbots to effect submission to Cluny.

Hugh was committed to similar ideals, though they were expressed somewhat differently during his abbacy when it was considered that reform was more effectively achieved within a system. But this is not the same as saying that an expansion of the order was desired and the abbot had no ambitions as regards this.

Every acquisition was the result of a deliberate decision after application was made by the donor and a

number of charters refer to an earlier consultation with Hugh. (1) The circumstances of the case were judged according to certain fixed principles and not requirements of diplomacy.

In fact, Hugh deliberately neglected a number of opportunities of extending the order and these refusals reflect his mind. He discouraged Hirsau's dependence on Cluny and advised Abbot William to adapt the Cluniac observance to conditions in that region. (2) His refusal to send monks to England when first asked, and his later unwillingness to found Thetford came from his dislike of so far-flung a province. (3) He also discouraged the Countess of Flanders who wanted Cluniacs in her territory. (4)

(1) eg. PL 159, col. 942: "Mittimus litteras nostra...ut notificetis nobis quid super hoc velitis facere. Nolumus enim usque pactioem ex hac re facere, donec rescierimus si nos velitis in hac petitione exaudire" (i.e. donation of cell of St. Christopher).

(2) S. Wilhelmi Constitutiones, Herrgott, p. 372: "...quae ad morem patriae, loci situm, & aeris temperiem accommodata essent."

(3) PL 159, col. 927 (to William the Conqueror): "...in partibus illis...ubi nullum viderent nostrum monasterium...ad cujus portum applicare valerent vel constringi possent?"

(4) Martene, vol. i, p. 509 and PL 159 col. 939: "plurimum praesummo, idcirco pro religione in partibus nostris per vos construenda, nunc scriptis, nunc internuntiis..."
It is also said that Hugh was undecided about making the first foundation in the Duchy of France, namely Longpont, and prayed much before agreeing to it. (1) From the Figeeac charters it appears that when the monks had elected Hugh as abbot they had some difficulty in persuading him to accept the monastery as a dependent house. (2)

Hugh was not vacillating by nature, but he did hesitate in the matter of distant foundations. A telling anecdote is related by Ulrich's biographer who describes how the same monks tried to persuade Hugh to extend the order in foreign territories on the pretext that it was to Cluny's good. There is some obscurity in the facts of the case: one would like to know where the proposed "exteras nationes" were situated — possibly Germany. The abbot had decided to take the step and send monks, but Ulrich, convinced of the unwisdom of the move, managed to make Hugh change his mind. (3)

(1) See L'Huillier, p. 106.

(2) Bruel, col. iv, no. 3469: "Qui (Hugo) in primis istud omnimo pertimescens et nullatenus adquiescens, postmodum suasionibus et impinctionibus...locum suscepit."

(3) Vita Udalrici, MG. SS. vol. xii, p. 260: "Illis etenim diebus beatus Hugo pro monasterii sui utilitate, communi fratrum decreto, exteras nationes decreverat expetere. Quod ne fieret, (Udalricus)...beato magistro humiliter suasit; nec illum, licet aliorum votis contrarium esset, ad consentiendum sibi difficilem habuit..."
There is other evidence that suggests that some Cluniacs were ambitious either for themselves or the order — in contrast to the policy of the abbot and some of the more singleminded monks. Ulrich, for instance, was the victim of jealousy on the part of some of Hugh's immediate entourage on one occasion, and Hunaldus tried to make him appear disobedient to the abbot. (1) The same Hunaldus, as Abbot of Moissac, ousted some canons from Toulouse and installed monks instead. This led to trouble with the Count of Toulouse and the canons returned. (2) Another example of the same sort of thing was the annexation of the monastery of Baigne by the monks of S Eutrope de Saintes. The Baigne community appealed to Hugh who declared the annexation invalid. (3)

The circumstances attending the annexation of S Martial, Limoges, deserve recounting in full to show how complex a situation could arise. Viscount Ademar of Limoges had inherited this monastery and was in need of money, so he intrigued with a certain Cluniac seigneur, Peter, who promised the Count money for giving the monastery to Cluny. Thereupon the charter of donation that sang the praises of

(1) ibid. p. 257.
(2) GC vol. xiii, instr. 11.
(3) See L. Brubat, Le Monachisme en Saintonge et en Aunis, (La Rochelle, 1907) p. 365.
reform and emphasised the need of extirpating simony (and incidentally ensured a regular income for the Count) was drawn up. (1) When the community discovered what had been done without their consent they refused to let the Cluniacs enter. The abbot of the monastery died and this was the signal for open rebellion. Ademar went to the abbey on pretext of conducting an election - which reflects the power exercised by lay-abbots. Meanwhile the abbot of Cluny hid himself in the town with a handful of monks. Three candidates were appointed by the community. One of them got wind of what was going on and openly denounced the comedy. He was literally thrown out by the count. The other monks who were opposed to submission fled the abbey and the Cluniacs took possession. Gradually the others filtered back and hostilities broke out again and there was a veritable civil war in the monastery. St. Peter Damian was visiting Cluny at the time and Hugh asked him to do something about the abbey of S. Martial. Damian went to Limoges and threatened to excommunicate any disturbers of the peace, which seems to have established order. Henceforward the abbey prospered under Cluniac rule. (2)

Resistance usually resulted from the disinclination of


a community to alter the status quo. When Lambert tried to introduce the Cluniac observance at St. Bertin soldiers had to be called in to quell the tumult that arose. (1) When Hugh installed a new abbot at Beaulieu the monks expelled the latter with secular help provided by their former lay-abbot. Only when the bishop excommunicated all concerned in the affair was order restored. (2)

Such cases were comparatively rare, however, though the process of incorporation was delicate and something unique to each house. Generally speaking, foundation was simpler than annexation, though years might elapse between the donation of land and the establishment of a monastery. Montierneuf's foundation charters date from 1076 whereas monks only went there in 1082; S Flour took thirty-five years to establish. (3) The usual method was to send a colony of monks from Cluny or other dependent houses. The number sent differed according to the size of the newly


(2) See introduction to Beaulieu cart.

acquired monastery. (1) In the case of annexations, Cluniacs might be sent to take over the key positions. The custom whereby monks were sent to Cluny to learn the ordo prior to introducing it to their own monastery was followed less in the case of dependent priories than of abbeys like St. Benedict's Polirone and St. Bertin, or other monasteries less fully within the system. (2)

Disinterestedness in personal expansion of acquisition continued, despite the fact that during Hugh's abbacy foundations or annexations of monasteries implied incorporation to a system. In reality this new attitude conditioned expansion and in some cases limited it and donors were always made aware of the implications of their acts. The end remained unchanged: a more successful reform. This objectiveness is reflected in such arrangements as those made for a priory in Avignon. Hugh agreed that it could remain in the care of the Bishop if it improved under his auspices. (3) Only if conditions deteriorated was it to be incorporated to the order. This new "conditional mode" of reform was the result of new developments in the structure of the Order of Cluny.

(1) See above, pp. 65 ff. for examples of some of the groups sent from Cluny by Hugh.
(2) See above, pp. 165 ff. and below, p.271 ff.
(3) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3466.
CHAPTER V THE STRUCTURE OF THE ORDER 1049 - 1109

1. The term "Order"

There has been much discussion about the use of the word "order" in connection with the Cluniac system before a written constitution appeared. The controversy is largely the result of confusion in terminology and neglect of the stages in Cluniac constitutional development, whereas distinct definition is required in both fields.

In a monastic context, "order" can be defined as a regular manner of life. The word still retains its essential significance despite its being somewhat loosely used to describe a group of religious houses following a common observance and bound by a juridical or constitutional link. The familiar phrase "Order of St. Benedict" takes no account of particular congregations, federations, or differences in custom. In the same sense Dom Berlière wrote: "L'ordo, c'est la règle, c'est le cadre, c'est la lettre, c'est l'esprit de l'observance monastique, c'est l'ensemble de la discipline et de la formation religieuse." It is frequently used with this meaning in the Cluniac

---

(1) Some restrict the term to those professing solemn vows. Other constitutional modes are more correctly described as congregations, societies, or associations. See 'Ordres religieux', DDO, vol. xxxv, col. 1168 ff.

customaries: for example, in Bernard's title Ordo Cluniacensis, and his summary of the claustral prior's duties in the phrase "he, especially, is responsible for the order of the monastery".(1)

While bearing this meaning in mind, the term "Order of Cluny" is used here of those monasteries which, besides an observance similar to that of Cluny, were also juridically linked to the abbey. It is the concern of this chapter to examine the nature of this link during Hugh's abbacy.

2. The Cluniac Concept of the Order

The idea of the Cluniac community as an organism, and the juridical proprietary rights formulated in feudal law, formed the basis of any theoretical idea of the order that existed. But it was in practice that they integrated to produce those features that were to characterise the later defined constitution.

The notion of the Cluniac houses as an organism rooted in the community at Cluny clearly emerged under Hugh. It originated in the congregatio and monasterium of the Rule, wherein there was an inherent idea of a moral person: a corpus that could act in its representatives or in the

(1) Bernard, p. 141: "Qui praecipue pondus totius ordinis portat."
person of the abbot. Thus, it was to the monastery that donations were made, and it was the monastery that acquired property. (1)

All monks were, in fact, members of the community at Cluny and were made so by their profession which necessitated presence at Cluny, at least for the ceremony. (2)

This profession was the distinguishing mark of the Cluniac monk. The use of the term *noster professus* as opposed to the *monachus extraneus*, (*nostri professi* being frequently used to denote Cluniac monks) indicates how basic a principle profession at Cluny had become. (3) It is even thought that the occurrence in one of Hugh's letters of the word *professor* in the sense of one following a certain manner of life (in this case Cluniac monk) is perhaps the earliest example of such a use. (4)

Similarly, dependent houses were regarded as an


(2) See above, p. 180 f. and below, pp. 296

(3) For examples, see Ulrich, col. 661 (where, speaking of monks coming to the monastery in Holy Week, he distinguishes *noster professus* from *monachus extraneus*); and col. 761 (those who elect the abbot: *qui sunt Ecclesiae nostrae professi*).

(4) Ferotin, 'Une lettre de S. Hugues', p. 685, n.1. Hugh says: "Clericos vel si fieri potest nostri ordinis professores...", when advising Archbishop Bernard of Toledo to institute a community of monks or canons in his Cathedral.
extension of the abbey of Cluny. Each priory was a member of the coenobium or congregatio of Cluny. All these words have an organic connotation and they occur frequently, especially in late eleventh-century documents such as the bulls of Popes Urban II and Paschal II. For example, Urban II gave Beaulieu to Cluny to be governed "tangnam Cluniacensis coenobii membro" and Paschal II confirmed another monastery "quod est de congregazione S. Petri Cluniacensis". (1)

Even the laity regarded dependent houses as an extension of Cluny and the formula of donations often reflects this. For instance, lands were given "to Cluny at N", or "to St. Peter of Cluny at N", or "to the Abbot of Cluny at N". (2)

The concept of proprietorship in feudal law added to the organic notion of the Cluniac Order the idea of a juridical link between Cluny and her dependent houses. This was a natural development, since it was by charter that monasteries were given to Cluny, or lands donated for new foundations and Cluny based her claims over dependent houses on such charters. These gave a certain juridical

---

(1) PL 151, col. 468; PL 163, col. 213.

overlordship of the place and also, according to contemporary custom, its inhabitants. The frequent reference to monasteries as Cluniac "places", _locas subdita_ implies this legal proprietorship. (1) Further, the word _ius_ the term used of ownership or overlordship, was often used to describe the relationship between Cluny and dependent houses: Hugh usually referred to the order in terms of monasteries _nosto jure subditis_; most houses were handed over "_jure perpetuo_" to Cluny; a Cluniac dependent monastery was denoted by the phrase _quod juris est monasterii Cluniacensis_. (2) It is also possible that the development of a code of monastic law to protect Cluniac property hastened the emergence of the juridical aspect of the connection between Cluny and the houses of the order. (3)

This emphasis on the juridical aspect of the Cluniac structure is discernible in the new attitude towards the donation of monasteries to Cluny. Henceforward such an act implied incorporation to the system and was recognised as permanent in nature. This was not formerly the case, for

(1) The phrase occurs twice in Pope Urban II's bull confirming possessions and privileges: PL 151, col. 485.

(2) See PL 159, col. 945; Bruel vol. v, no. 3813; Vita Hug. auct. Hildeberto, PL 159, col. 881: "...Cavariacum, quae juris est monasterii Cluniacensis."

(3) See above, p. 130 f.
monasteries - even those donated by charter - frequently relaxed their ties with Cluny before the time of Hugh.

During his abbacy, however, a juridical right ceded by charter was maintained and defended. There are many examples of litigation in pursuit of claims, such as the long drawn out case with the Bishop of Chartres about the cell of S. Denis which in the end was confirmed to Cluny. (1)

The regularity with which papal bulls were obtained, whether to confirm individual monasteries when trouble arose, or as a general confirmation of all Cluny's possessions, also reflects the new attitude. The bulls might well be described as the conscious delineation of the juridical extent of the order.

The new implications of donating a monastery were clearly understood by donors, and conditions were frequently laid down by Hugh to ensure an adequate control - such as right to appoint abbots or priors. (2) On the other hand, the greater emphasis on the juridical nature of foundation or annexation led to more hesitancy in accepting houses, and deliberation over every addition. (3)

(1) PL 163, col. 221 and Bibl. Cl. col. 546 f.
(2) See below, p. 284.
(3) See above, pp. 151ff.
It is difficult to say how far this new and significant development sprang from Cluny's desire to secure and safeguard the relationship with dependent houses viewed as an organic reality, or how far contemporary juridical developments were influential in forming the ideas of Cluny in her relations with dependent houses. It was the intermingling and interaction of such currents of thought that produced system and institution in Europe.

The idea of the order as a juridical entity or institution was not present in the eleventh century. By the early twelfth century things had moved a stage further and the institutional and juridical aspect was being increasingly emphasised. But in the eleventh century the organic aspect was predominant. The structure of the order was being created in practice, which invalidates the theory that the constitutional developments of Cluny represented the conscious evolution of a preconceived idea. The ultimate constitution was partly the result of systemisation made in practice, and the rest was borrowed, mainly from Citeaux.

(1) Eg. King Henry I confirmed Lenton to Cluny: "sub prioratu ac dispositione Cluniace institutionis", (Brue1, vol. v. no. 3813.)
Hugh's abbacy was by no means the final stage in constitutional development. Only the outlines of a system, still nebulous and erratic in detail, were present. But the period was important in that certain constitutional tendencies were consciously systemised and in practice, too, certain features of the later constitution were beginning to emerge.

The papal bulls provide the best evidence of any formulation or written constitution that existed. The charters are the other main source for examining the structure in the eleventh century - and they indicate how varied the connection between Cluny and dependent monasteries was. The Cluniac customs are, significantly, only concerned with the Abbey of Cluny itself. Any reference to the order is entirely incidental, and the only suggestion that the monastery was the centre of a vast network of dependent houses is found in references to such things as all the novices coming to Cluny for profession. This does, however, emphasise the fact that Cluny was the focal point of the order.

3. Juridical Status of Dependent Monasteries

It is impossible to make a general statement about the juridical status of the Cluniac monasteries, and it may be stressed that it was unique to each house, on account of
the varying degrees of ownership ceded in the charters. Though Cluny sought, so far as was possible, complete dominion over dependent houses, there were frequent limitations in one direction or another.

(i) Status vis-à-vis Secular and Ecclesiastical Control

Complete freedom from secular control was the sine qua non of accepting a monastery, and it was usually assured in the foundation or annexation charter. Occasionally, however, a donor liked to retain the advocatio or defensio, an official protection of the monastery, especially in temporals and against secular interference. Thus, King Alphonsus of Spain retained the defensio of the monastery of St. John the Baptist ad Heremitas when he gave it to Cluny.(1) Duke Godfrey of Aquitaine maintained a lively interest in the temporal wellbeing of Montierneuf which he had founded, and used to visit the kitchen and cellars to ensure that the monks had adequate resources.(2)

There were advantages, if a secular was well disposed, but on the whole, Cluny opposed such customs and donors

(1) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3508: "et nullus omi super eos potestatem abeat, nisi solus abba Cluniacensis...et ego regem ad defensionem."

frequently specified *advocatio* among the rights they renounced.\(^1\) Moreover, independence of secular control was recognised by contemporaries as characteristic of Cluny and priories were sometimes ceded on condition that Cluny would not allow them to fall into any other hands.\(^2\)

Even so, secular interference was part of the legacy of some abbeys and it was not always easy to eradicate the tradition. Moissac is an example. The abbey had fallen into the hands of lay-abbots who persisted in claiming the title, and even after Cluny had taken over, they continued to enjoy part of the revenues of the abbey. It was some time before they could be prevailed upon to renounce these customs, and eventually the Abbot of Moissac paid for the recovery of the rights of the abbey.\(^3\)

It may be added that control over the appointment of abbots and priors was an effective way of securing throughout

---

\(^1\) Eg. PL 159, col. 942, (S. Christopher de Magno Vico): "Si vobis placuerit suscipere, nullum jus, seu advocacionem, nec ego, nec posteritas nostra, volumus retinere."

\(^2\) Eg. Bruel, vol. v, no. 3658 (S. Paul de Laci, Lombardy): "...nulius abas de prefato monasterio...abeat virtutem nec potestatem nostras porciones de predicta pedia terre... submitere in aliam potestatemullo modo sed semper permaneant in regimen prefati monasterii Cluniacensi; neque de eadem pedia de terrae. et ecclesia, vel rebus...non habeant virtutem et potestatem vendendi, donandi, alienandi, preciandi, comutandi, libelandi, neque investituras faciendi neque in beneficium dandi ullo modo, ut ususfructus et reditus debeant minui ad predictam ecclesiam."

\(^3\) PL 159, cols. 964-6.
the order Cluniac policy towards secular control. Further, the fact that abbots and priors were frequently members of the feudal nobility eased the transition from secular to complete monastic control. (1)

The immunity from episcopal control enjoyed by Cluny was somewhat modified in the case of the dependent houses, largely because the bishops had become aware of the implications of exemption, and were jealous of their rights and of their revenues.

Some of the Cluniac privileges were rather ambiguous and might have been interpreted as applying to the priories as well. This was the case with phrases like that protecting Cluniac monks "wherever situated" from excommunication. (2) Similarly, the protection afforded to Cluniac property might easily have been claimed for the priories, viewed as an extension of the abbey. But towards the end of the eleventh century privileges were significantly qualified by phrases in favour of the episcopacy which could be variously interpreted and made to cover a multitude of claims. For example, the privilege of Pope Urban II forbidding papal legates or bishops to

(1) See below, pp. 234ff.

(2) Bull. Cl. col. 8; PL 141, col. 1135, Pope John XIX, 1027: "Fratres ubicunque positi."
act in Cluniac affairs without special mandate was qualified with the phrase: "Salve tamen iuro episcoporum quod in eis haec tenus habuisse noscuntur". (1) Another bull of the same year, 1038, repeated the clause forbidding bishops to act against Cluniac monks or monasteries without consulting the Abbot of Cluny but added that any case of doubt was to be referred to the Holy See. (2) The same pope extended to the Cluniac priories the privileges of exemption from interdict and excommunication, but when they availed themselves of the privilege, the doors of the monastery were to be shut and the people of the diocese were to be refused admission. (3) The Abbot of Cluny was allowed to nominate priests for the churches and chapels belonging to the abbey, but the cura animarum had to be obtained from the bishop. (4)

The rights of the bishop over a dependent monastery were usually defined in the charter of foundation or annexation. They varied considerably. As the eleventh

(1) Bull. Cl. col. 22; PL 151, col. 291.
(2) PL 151, cols. 291-3: "Si quid autem causae in eos habuerint, tuosve successores appellant. Quod si per vos lis mequiverit definiri, ad sedem apostolicam referatur."
(3) Bull. Cl. col. 28, and PL 151, col. 493.
(4) Bull. Cl. col. 30, and PL 163, col. 52.
century proceeded, complete immunity was rarely ceded and qualifying clauses began to appear regularly during Hugh's abbacy. Sometimes the reservation was general, couched in the phrase "saving the right of..." followed by the name of the bishop.(1) Sometimes more specific rights were reserved, particularly in the retention of revenues like synodals or an annual cens.(2) In the case of abbeys the bishop of the diocese in which the abbey was situated usually reserved the right to consecrate the abbot and the same was confirmed by papal bull. An occasional Cluniac priory might enjoy few of the usual privileges, like S. Nicolas at Acy, given to S. Martin des Champs on condition that no office would be said in the priory when an interdict was proclaimed in the district, no excommunicated monk would be received, the Bishop would perform all ordinations, and the whole care of the parish was to remain in the hands of the archdeacon and canons.(3) In short,

(1) eg. Bull. Cl. col. 25, Urban II gives Binson to Cluny: "Salvo episcopalis reverentiae debito permaneatis." Ibid. col. 26, confirmation of S Denis de Nogent le Rotrou, "Salvo Carnotensis Episcopi...."

(2) Eg. Bruel, vol. v, no. 3667, Berzé confirmed by the Bishop of Macon: "Cum presbiteratu suo, cimiterio, baptisterio, oblationibus, et decimis...retentis tantum in usus suos iure sinodali et parada annuali."

most bishops retained some connection with a church or
monastery given to Cluny, if only a token cens.

On the other hand, some houses, especially the abbeys,
enjoyed extra privileges like that of Limoges, whose abbot
had a voice in the election of the bishop, and with the
canons ruled the diocese during a vacancy.(1)

But whatever the particular privileges of a house, or
whatever the degree in which dependent monasteries shared
the privileges of the order, no abbey or priory enjoyed
either the privilege or independence that characterised
the Abbey of Cluny itself.

(ii) Types of Houses

Highest in rank, and most independent of Cluny, were
the abbeys which succeeded in retaining their abbatial
titles: Vezelay, S. Gilles, S. Jean d'Angely, Moissac,
Maillezais, Limoges, S. Cyprian of Poitiers, Montierneuf,
Figeac, S. Germain d'Auxerre, Mozat, and S. Bertin.(2)
Nearly all were either founded or annexed during Hugh's
abbacy and were insured against reduction to the rank of

(1) Baluze, Miscellanea, vol. vi, p. 338, Urban II's bull
confirming privileges of S. Martial.

(2) Bull. Cl. col. 32 and PL 163, col. 51: Bull of Pope
Paschal II confirming monasteries to Cluny, including
these as abbeys.
priorities by conditional clauses in the charters or bulls of incorporation, and the direct connection with Rome which most of them maintained. (1) Other abbeys, such as Déols, and Uzerche, came partially within the Cluniac orbit by electing Cluniac abbots, but they were never incorporated in the system. (2) The extent to which Cluny exercised control over the abbeys was determined by the amount of power the Abbot of Cluny had in the election of the abbot, and this varied considerably. (3) In some cases only the slenderest thread bound an abbey to Cluny. S. Gilles, for example, was only temporarily annexed to the order, so that the abbey could be reformed under Cluniac auspices. The monks applied for a bull to safeguard their future independence and to limit Cluny's power over them. (4) Apart from this no mention of Cluny or Abbot Hugh is made in the abbey's cartulary. With other monasteries, such as Moissac

(1) ibid.: after the list of abbeys is added: "Salve nimirum iure Sanctae Romanae ecclesias."

(2) Warmund, Abbot of Déols, 1074-8 and Gerard, Abbot of Uzerche, 1068-95 were both Cluniacs.

(3) See below, p. 284.

(4) Mon. Greg. p. 544: "Quod nos abbati Cluniacensi non dedimus locum Sancti Egydii, qui iuris Sancti Petri est, nisi ad ponendum ordinem et religionem, et ad eligendum abbatem vice nostra...Quodsi ipse aliquam contra iusticiam vobis intulerit oppressionem, recurrite ad nos...Post hanc vero primam electionem, liberam deinceps habeatis abbatem eligendi licentiam."
and Vezelay, things were different and there was more contact.

As long as there was any connection at all, however, the abbeys were regarded as part of the order. Ulrich says of those monks who had made profession in the hands of their own abbots, that they were regarded in all things as if they belonged to Cluny, where they were admitted immediately to chapter and took rank according to their profession. (1)

But on the whole, there was a certain insecurity about the place of the abbeys in the system, and there, if anywhere, submission to Cluny was resented on account of tension between the independence they possessed and the control, however limited, of Cluny. Their privileges and liberties made the way easier when it came to breaking away, and S. Bertin, Vezelay, and S. Gilles, ceased all connection with Cluny in the twelfth century.

But the presence of the abbeys in the order - with their numerous dependent monasteries whose connection with Cluny was remote in the extreme - shows how very vague the boundaries of the Cluniac "system" were.

An attempt to systematise and establish effective control over dependent monasteries can be seen in the

(1) Ulrich, col. 700: "...habentur a nobis per omnia in vita et post vitam ac si apud nos fuissent."
reduction of many abbeys to the rank of priories, which could be more fully incorporated in the order. This significant constitutional move was made by Hugh.

It is evident from the annals of some of the affected monasteries that the reduction was a specific act on the part of Cluny, for it is recorded as an event, occurring at a particular time. The list of abbots and priors of Sauxillanges affords a good example. The tenth abbot, Hugh de Mercoeur is referred to as abbot and prior, and St. Hugh of Cluny is named as eleventh abbot with the entry that he reduced the abbey to a priory in 1062. (1) A similar entry occurs in the list of abbots and priors of Ambiére. (2) The annals of Notre Dame de Charney go so far as to say that all abbeys of the Cluniac Order lost their titles, as did their own abbey in 1088 when it was given to La Charité. (3) This was exaggerated, however, and twelve abbeys managed to escape the process by hastening to obtain papal protection and confirmation of their privileges. Nor did the reduction necessarily occur at

(1) Bibl. Nat. ms. lat. no. 12, 665, p. 2 f.: "Qui mitram et baculam pastoralem amovit et abbatiam Celsiniensem ad prioratum reduxit."

(2) C. Bouillet, Histoire du Prieuré de S. Martin d'Ambiére, (Roanne, 1910), p. 21: "Tandem vero a S. Hugone Cluniacensis Abbate in cellam redactum est..."

(3) Arch. Nat. L 876, no. 3, Annales, 750-1657, s.v. 1088.
the time of annexation, for some abbeys, such as Sauxillanges, had long been Cluniac.

One of Paschal II's bulls marked the end of the process. It stated that all priories and cells which at the time had no abbot except Hugh were never again to elect their own abbot.\(^{(1)}\) A list of monasteries followed to which the clause particularly referred (they were the most important houses of the order), and though many monasteries which had never been abbeys were mentioned, such as La Charité and S. Martin des Champs, others had clearly been degraded at some time during Hugh's abbacy to the rank of priory. They included: Charlieu, Romainmoutier, Paray, Payerne, S. Eutrope de Saintes, Souvigny, Gigny, Nantua, S. Lizier, and others.

Priories immediately and entirely dependent on Cluny were the most important section of Cluniac monasteries. They were of all sizes and conditions, and except for their juridical rank many of the smaller ones were little more than granges.

\(^{(1)}\) Bull.Cl. col. 32 and PL 163, col. 51: "Ad haec adjicimus ut in omnibus prioratibus et cellis quae nunc sine proprio vestro abbate regimini subjectae sunt, nullus unquam futuris temporibus abbatem ordinare praesumat."
Cluny was also directly responsible for a few other establishments. Among these "miscellanea" may be included hospices, such as that founded for the poor in the town of Cluny which the founder committed to the abbey for supervision.\(^{(1)}\) Another was the house in Rheims given by a canon of the town for the purpose of providing lodging for Cluniac monks who were travelling. The donor had remarked that other monasteries had such houses, but Cluny was without one in Rheims.\(^{(2)}\)

Priorities directly dependent on Cluny had, in turn, monasteries dependent on them: houses that were only indirectly or mediatly connected with Cluny. These monasteries were usually given directly to the priory or founded from it independently of action on the part of Cluny.\(^{(3)}\)

Sometimes a priory was given to a Cluniac monastery purposely

---

\(^{(1)}\) Bruel, vol. Iv, no. 3406: "Jozerannus...domum suam...tradidit...ut undeque commeniatium paratum sit pauperum receptui ospitum, ubi introdusuntur,...jaceant, et humanitate hospitali pro modulo inibi statuto curentur..."

\(^{(2)}\) ibid. no. 3366: "Cum in urbe Remorum suas habere mansiones pleraque genobia considerassem...ecclesie Cluniacensi nullem in urbe predicta mansionem habenti, domum meam...tradere deliberavi...quod predicti monasterii frater...diversis e partibus redeuntes et hospitalentur."

\(^{(3)}\) Eg. Bruel, vol. v, no. 3736:St. Stephen's, Verona, to Cremona: "Ut sit in dispositione prioris Sancti Gabrihelis...ut mittat priorem et monachos quos voluerint." La Charité, cart., no. xl, p. 106: Rates given to La Charité: "Plenam potestatem faciendii in ea quidquid voluerint."
to ensure connection with Cluny. Thus the small priory of S. Martin was annexed to Polirone "for as long as Polirone remained Cluniac", otherwise S. Martin's was to become directly dependent on Cluny. (1) In contrast to this, there are a few examples of a deliberate limiting of Cluny's power over such mediately dependent houses where dependence on Cluny was not wanted, and a guarantee against it was made a condition of donation. S. Cybard was given to S. Jean d'Angely on this understanding. (2) Goudargues was ceded to Cluny but on condition that it remained under the direction of the prior of S. Saturnin of Toulouse. (3) In the case of all these mediate dependencies, connection with Cluny was remote and also depended on how close was the contact between Cluny and the immediately dependent monastery, for even this varied.

Thus, the unit of the Cluniac system was still the dependent abbey or priory with its own obediences and cells. There was as yet no division into provinces, though a preparation for this may perhaps be seen in the way monasteries were listed regionally, mostly according to dioceses, in the papal bulls.

Apart from these main types of houses, which emerged naturally, there was no hierarchy. Certain key points like LaCharité and S. Martin des Champs were emerging

(1) Ann OSB, vol. v, p. 266.
(2) S. Jean d'Angely, cart. vol. ii, p. 187.
(3) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3404: "Sit etiam semper sub tutamine et sub regimini prepositi Sancti Saturnini."
and it is clear that Hugh regarded the former as the most important monastery of the order as he considered its priorship ranked after that of Cluny. Later, La Charité ranked first among the five primary "daughters" of Cluny, the other four being Lewes, S. Martin des Champs, Souvigny, and Sauxillanges, but under Hugh they enjoyed no such title. The later lists of precedence would suggest, however, that the importance of a monastery was largely determined by the size of the community.

4. The Abbot of Cluny

What the abbot of the Rule was to the community, that in theory the Abbot of Cluny was to the order, and his personality remained decisive of policy and development throughout the eleventh and for part of the twelfth centuries. He figures almost inseparably from the name of Cluny in the documents of the period. Mention of him in the cartulary of a dependent house is sometimes the only indication of a link with Cluny, and even papal bulls confirming the privileges and possessions of Cluniac

(1) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3561, p. 695, Hugh promised one of the best men of the order for Lewes: "...preter majorem priorem de Cluniaco et priorem de Caritate."

monasteries are addressed to the local abbot and prior, reference to Cluny being made in the qualifying phrase 'saving in all things obedience to the Abbot of Cluny'. (1)

Strictly speaking, the Abbot of Cluny was responsible for a dependent monastery in the same way as for the monastery of Cluny. He was sometimes included in local lists of abbots and priors with little or no suggestion of his being resident elsewhere. (2) In practice it was impossible to realise this position. But he frequently concerned himself with the affairs of the priories, and problems large and small were referred to him for solution, especially as regards monasteries in the vicinity of Cluny, or houses in constant contact with the abbey. A few examples may be quoted. In 1106 Hugh travelled to Rome to obtain justice from the Pope on behalf of the abbey of Vézelay whose abbot had been murdered by one of the townsfolk. (3) On another occasion the prior of S. Lizier wrote asking Hugh either to intercede with the pope or give some advice on how to cope with the Bishop of Tarbes.

(1) eg. PL 163, cols. 50–1, Paschal II's confirmation of Souvigny's rights: "Salva in omnibus abbatum Cluniacensium obedienta."

(2) Examples of this may be found at Ambierle , (Bouillet, Histoire d'Ambierle, p. 21) Sauxillanges, (Bibl. Nat. ms. lat. no. 12,665, f.2 ro.), and Paray, (Cart. p.14.).

who was proving troublesome in the exaction of a tribute. (1) On a lesser scale, Hugh engaged in minor land processes for priories like Paray and Marcigny. (2)

Those outside the order also applied to the Abbot of Cluny in matters concerning priories or Cluniac monks. The popes in particular referred Cluniac cases to him. Pope Gregory VII told his legate, Richard of Marseilles, that an affair concerning Moissac was to be referred to the Abbot of Cluny. (3) Similarly, Pope Paschal II wrote to the Bishop of Poitiers reprimanding him for consecrating the abbots of St. Cyprian and Maillezais who had been elected without Hugh's consent. Both elections were declared invalid until submitted to Hugh. (4)

The Order of Cluny was for the abbot one large and far-flung community, composed of his own monks. It is one of the remarkable features of the Cluniac Order under Hugh that this concept persisted despite conditions militating against such a principle. But Hugh recognised the personal relationship between himself as abbot and all

---

(1) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3645.
(2) Eg. Paray cart., no. 27, p. 20, and no. 192, p. 96.
(4) PL 163, col. 81.
Cluniac monks as of prime importance and he extended the ideal of the Rule to his relations with all Cluniac monasteries and monks. It is reflected in his letters, such as that refusing monks to William the Conqueror because of the added responsibility of sending monks so far, and that to Bernard, Archbishop of Toledo, who had written to him for permission to accept the office to which he had been elected. Hugh urged the bishop to retain the bonds of love and obedience that still bound him to his former abbot. (1) This disposition characterised Hugh in all his activities in the order and it was given vocal expression in the letter written to his monks shortly before he died, wherein he asked their prayers on account of his weighty responsibilities for so many monks, each of whom he would have to account for to God. (2)

The Abbot of Cluny could enter and assume full control in a dependent house at any time, in virtue of being its abbot. Hugh seems only to have used this prerogative if appealed to for help or if it was necessary for the wellbeing of a monastery, as on the occasion when he heard that silence

---


(2) Ibid, col. 951: "Quanto major locorum fratrumque habetur numerus, tanto mihi peccatoris pro eorum excessibus gravissimus tremor incititur..."
was being neglected at S. Marcel at Chalon, whither he hastened to restore discipline. (1) The biographers quote a number of similar examples where he deliberately intervened in the life of a priory but, generally speaking, he left things to the prior.

Nothing even remotely resembling a system of visitation existed under Hugh and there was nothing regular or organised in his visits. Evidence of a visit from the Abbot is usually found in cartularies, where references are made to transactions in his presence, or he figures among the signatories. Hugh seems to have used the occasions offered by his reform missions in France, Spain, and Italy, to visit houses that lay on or near his route. A few priories like La Charité, Paray, Marcigny, and others near Cluny were visited more frequently and seem to have been favourite haunts of Hugh. But there is no evidence of any journey undertaken specifically for the purpose of visitation. Situation was an important factor in the amount of contact maintained and many houses, including those in Switzerland and England, seem never to have been visited in all the sixty years of Hugh's abbacy.

Yet much - perhaps most - of the abbot's time was taken up with the Cluniac houses and the biographies of Hugh and

cartularies show that considerable contact with some houses was maintained. Most of Hugh's activities as regards the order, however, were directed to the personal and the particular contact. He rarely acted as legislator, administrator or even governor, in a wide context, and in the one or two instances wherein he drew up a statute to be observed in all Cluniac monasteries, the reference tends to be vague and there is no evidence of a systematic attempt to promulgate the decree - usually a liturgical innovation. (1) Peter the Venerable was the first Abbot to place himself in an effective position vis-à-vis the whole order, if only by assembling all the abbots and priors. Hugh was still the abbot acting personally in the absence of any machinery of control to convey his influence equally to all monasteries.

Yet the impact of his personality was felt throughout the order, which was not so with his predecessors. It is the most significant proof of the beginnings of a system, and it was achieved by controlling the appointments of abbots and priors.

(1) Eg. Statute arranging for a special commemoration of King Alphonsus: PL 159, col. 945: "...in nostro loco, vel in aliis nostro juri subditis acta fuerint."
5. Abbots and Priors of the Order.

(1) Appointments

The link between Cluny and dependent monasteries was made effective by controlled appointments of the abbots and priors of monasteries directly dependent on Cluny. This was one of the most consistent features of Hugh's policy and it was also one of the most clearly formulated aspects of the constitution.

The rights of the Abbot of Cluny and his successors as regards the election or appointment of abbot or prior of a dependent house were usually defined in the annexation or foundation charter. Such clauses were most probably inserted as a condition demanded by the abbot of Cluny. There is at least one example, that of Lezat, where Hugh refused to accept the monastery unless he could control the election of the abbot and the reason given was the desire to maintain reform once it had been established.


(2) Ibid. no. 3454: "(Hugo)... in primis nullo modo nostrre assentiens petitioni nisi ei electionem seu ordinationem abbatis... traderemus... Hoc autem ideo se facere dicesbat, ne et ipse in vacuum laborare videretur, et semel recuperatus locus iterum ad pejora laberetur."
Figeac was annexed when the monks elected Hugh as their abbot, but the latter obtained yet a further charter securing for Cluny the future ordaining of the abbot. (1) All papal bulls confirming individual monasteries to Cluny also confirmed this right and the policy became a defined feature of the Cluniac system when Paschal II's bull decreed that henceforward no cell or abbey belonging to Cluny and recognising Hugh as abbot was to elect its own abbot. (2)

The policy of reducing abbeys to the rank of priory is explained by the fact that right to appoint priors was unquestioned. As regards abbots, Cluny's powers were more limited and they varied. Right to an unqualified abbatial appointment was rare — where it had existed, the abbey had been reduced to a priory. The abbot of Cluny appointed the abbot of S. Martial's, Limoges, and also the abbot of S. Bertin, Flanders. (3) Otherwise direct appointments were usually confined to particular cases and for particular reasons, as when Hugh was asked to appoint

---

(1) Ibid., nos. 3469 and 3470.
(2) Bull. Cl. col. 32 and PL 163, cols. 51-3.
(3) PL 159, col. 939, (St. Bertin) and PL 151, col. 463 (S. Martial, bull of Urban II): "Obeunte abbate nullus ibi... praeponatur nisi quem praefatus Cluniacensis abbas illic vel successores ejus secundum Dei timorem elegerunt."
an abbot to S. Gilles to restore the monastery to its pristine fervour. But thereafter the monks were to elect their own abbot. (1)

In most of the other abbeys the Abbot of Cluny's powers were limited to counsel and consent in varying degrees. He presided at the election of the Abbot of Maillezais and S. Jean d'Angely and at Moissac he had to approve the nominee of the chapter. (2) But the frequent election of monks of Cluny to abbacies suggests that Hugh's influence was not entirely passive. (3)

His authority was rarely questioned, but if it were Hugh insisted on his rights even to the point of litigation and usually he was successful. At Vezelay the Count of Nevers once tried in vain to interfere in an election and at Mozat the monks themselves rebelled against Hugh's exercise of authority, but by force of his personality the rebel element was quelled. (4) At S. Cyprian of Poitiers

(1) Mon. Greg. p. 544 (Gregory VII to the monks of S Gilles): "Post hanc vero primam electionem, liberam deinceps habeatis abbatem eligendi licentiam."


(3) See below, p.

there was a protracted controversy because Hugh refused to recognise the abbot elected without his consent. The abbatial seat was vacant for four years, after which Pope Paschal II intervened in favour of Cluny. (1) A similar case occurred at S. Jean d'Angely in 1104 but it was settled in a much shorter time and resulted in the election of Henry, Prior of Cluny. (2)

It was recognised that all priors and abbots held office in virtue of their appointment by the abbot of Cluny. A phrase to this effect often occurs with mention of a prior in the charters and affords practical evidence that Hugh did concern himself with appointments in dependent priories. (3)

It is also evidence that priors were frequently appointed from the community of Cluny. Sometimes donors or founders requested someone from Cluny. They might even name someone, as did Duke Godfrey of Aquitaine who asked for the prior of Cluny, Guy, as abbot of his

---

(1) PL 172, coll. 1367.
(2) S. Jean d’Angely, cart. vol. i, p. 398, no. cccxxxvii.
foundation of Montierneuf. (1) Pope Gregory VII asked for a monk from Cluny to be appointed Abbot of Polirone, and Urban II similarly requested an Abbot for Beaulieu. (2) It has been noted that all Hugh's major priors later became abbots or priors elsewhere, and they were but a few of the many monks who left Cluny for the same reason. (3)

It may also be noted that some of the appointments were made from members of the feudal nobility who would be acceptable. Hunaldus, Abbot of Moissac, is a good example of this tendency. He came of the family of Bearn, one of the leading families of the Midi, and his relations with the great feudal houses resulted in large-scale donations of lands and monasteries to Moissac, many acquired from members of his own family. (4) Hugh also appointed some of his own relatives, including his nephew Raynald as Abbot of Vezelay, and another nephew Geoffrey, as prior of Marcigny. (5)

The list of abbots and priors of Sauxillanges contains for Hugh's abbacy the names of two members of Odilo's family,

---

(2) PL 148, col. 718 f. and PL 151, col. 468.
(3) See above, p. 93 ff. and p. 164.
(4) Rupin, *op. cit.*, p. 57.
and two of the house Vergy, the family of Hugh's mother. (1)

The appointments of Hugh's abbacy undoubtedly reflect the honesty of intention behind the insistence in controlling abbacies and priorships. On the whole, the nominees create the impression of a race of gifted men of integrity. Hugh's declaration to William of Warenne that after the best monks of the order had been appointed as major prior of Cluny and prior of La Charité, Lewes would be considered next, was an indirect statement that he was guided in this matter by quality. (2) Contemporary praise of many of Cluny's sons abounds: Gerard of La Charité, Lanzo of Lewes, </p>

Few appointments were permanent and changes were frequent. This can be seen both in the careers of individual priors and from the lists of the various houses. Domène had ten priors under Hugh, Longpont four in fifteen years. 

---

(1) Bibl. Nat. ms. lat., no. 12,665, f. 2 ro.

(2) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3561: "Unum ex melioribus monachis suis de tota congregacione... preter majorem priorem de Cluniaeo et priorem de Caritate."

(3) Ulrich praised Gerard in the preface to the Consuetudines, PL 149, col. 655-6. William of Malmsbury said that Lanzo's merits transcended all description, (De Gestis Pontificum Anglorum, PL 179, col. 1551-2). Adaldrus accompanied St. Peter Damian to Cluny and won the latter's admiration, see PL 145, col. 872.
years, and Sauxillanges six between 1063 and 1078, keeping
the seventh for seventeen years before losing him to Mozat.(1)

Things seem to have been more stable in the most
important centres, for Gerard was prior of La Charité for
thirty years, and the first prior of S. Martin des Champs
held the position for life.(2) Abbots were presumably
elected for life, though occasionally they were made
Bishops and some resigned in old age and returned to Cluny
to die.

But changes and transfers were defeating the aim
of control. Already under Hugh there was occasional
dissatisfaction and some recognised the danger. When
Warmund, Abbot of Déols, became Archbishop of Vienne, he
insisted on retaining his abbacy. The monks, dissatisfied
with the position, elected another abbot, Walter, but Pope
Gregory VII quashed the election.(3) When Goderannus
became Bishop of Saintes, he also retained the abbacy of
Maillezais, though there is no record of dissatisfaction
on the part of the monks of Maillezais.(4) Lewes was the
first to obtain protection against the system of removing

(1) Domene, cart. p. xiv, no. 1; L'Huillier, p. 493 (Longpont);
Bibl. Nat. ms. lat. no. 12,665, f. 2 ro. (Sauxillanges).
(4) See Lacurie, Histoire de Maillezais, p. 104.
the priors at will, either to do business elsewhere for
the abbot of Cluny, or to take up a new appointment.
Lanzo, prior of Lewes, had been away for a year when
William of Warenne, founder of the priory, wrote to Hugh
and extracted a promise that the prior of Lewes should
be appointed for life and left in peace to govern the
priory.(1)

(ii) Responsibilities

Once an appointment was made there was no systematised
contact between the Abbot of Cluny and dependent abbots or
priors, either as individuals or in groups. The first
General Chapter took place in 1132, when Peter the Venerable
called his reforming chapter. If small groups of priors
did come together on occasion, it was usually for some
event like a provincial council, or to visit the Abbot
of Cluny if he were staying in the vicinity.(2)

As the most capable men of the order the priors were
sometimes called upon to act in the interests of the order
beyond those of their own houses. Hugh often delegated

(1) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3561: "...et nunquam removeretur nisi
tam justa et manifesta esset causa."

(2) Eg. Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3466, where it is recorded that
Hugh consulted the following about ceding a priory to the
Bishop of Avignon: "...cum consilio fratrum nostrorum
Bertranni...prioris Sancti Saturnini...et Pontii,
Ganoqobiensis modo apud Valentiolam decani, vel aliorum
qui nobiscum tunc erant."
business to an abbot or prior, or appointed one as his representative or legate. Warmund, when Abbot of Déols went to England for Hugh, though the motive of the mission is not known. (1) The year that Lanzo was away from Lewes was presumably due to a similar reason. (2) Some charters record that an abbot or prior represented Hugh, as the Abbot of S. Jean d'Angely at the foundation of Montierneuf. (3)

Once a prior was appointed, Hugh seems to have respected the delegation and left the nominee to govern his monastery without interference. An example of this respect is afforded in the custom whereby the opinion of the local prior was considered when a brother fled from a dependent monastery to Cluny. The matter was only decided after the prior had been called in and if he considered it advisable, the monk would be made to return to the same cell whence he fled. (4)

The power of local abbots and priors was complete as regards monasteries subject to the dependent houses, and they acted towards them in much the same way as Cluny towards the immediately dependent houses. Not only were

---

(2) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3561, p. 694: "Lanzonem...quem toto anno apud Cluniacum retinuerat..."
(3) S. Jean d'Angely, cart. vol. ii, no. xxiv.
foundations or annexations carried through under the local prior's supervision, with more or less reference to Cluny, but he seems, in his turn, to have controlled the appointment of his dependent priors. There are examples of this right over a mediatel\- dependent Cluniac house, being given to a prior and it was defined in a way similar to the right of the Abbot of Cluny over monasteries directly dependent on Cluny, and also confirmed by papal bull. Examples of actual appointments are also numerous, a few of which may be quoted. The Abbot of S. Jean d'Angely was asked to appoint the first abbot of S. Cybard from his own community but thereafter from the community of S. Cybard if a suitable person could be found. If not, a monk from S. Jean d'Angely or even from Cluny was to be appointed. (1) The appointment of the prior of Castleacre was permanently entrusted to the prior of Lewes, and that of St. Stephen of Verona to the prior of St. Gabriel of Cremona. (2) Abbot Ademar of Limoges appointed one of his own monks to Uzerche. (3) One of Pope Urban II's bulls confirming the possession of Moissac shows that abbot and priors dealing with their own

(1) S. Jean d'Angely, cart. no. cccxxiiii, p. 394.

(2) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3561: "Prior et monachi de Acra semper subditi sunt et in libera ordinatione prioris Sancti Pancratii." Ibid. no. 3756, of St. Stephen's: "...ut (prior S. Gabrielis) mittat priorem et monachos quos voluerint."

(3) See Lasteyrie, S. Martial de Limoges, p. 87, n. 1.
subject priories followed the same policy as Cluny towards themselves.

A number of abbeys were listed wherein the counsel and consent of the abbot of Moissac was needed in abbatial elections, and the appointment of the priors of all other dependent monasteries was reserved entirely to the abbot of Moissac. (1)

Obviously abbots had more power in this matter than did priors, since the former often controlled other abbeys to a greater or lesser degree, whereas no Cluniac priory had dependent abbeys. But there is no reason to suppose that dependent houses did not entirely control appointments in their own subject monasteries, since it seems that the nucleus of newly founded communities subject to dependent houses was provided not by Cluny but by the dependent house, and all other evidence supports the same theory.

6. Life in the Cluniac Dependent Monasteries

(1) General remarks

Since the Abbot of Cluny only interfered if need arose or if he was called upon by the local prior, visible contacts with Cluny might well be few once a prior had been appointed.

(1) Baluze, Miscellanea, vol. iv, p. 391.
But the fact of belonging to the order meant that Cluny had a profound effect on the ordinary life of a priory at least as regards its main principles and pattern. At the same time, a certain flexibility existed that allowed for adaptation in detail.

The best indication of how far Cluny imposed her way of life on dependent houses is found in the customaries, though cartularies, liturgical manuscripts, and other archives of local priories can also provide valuable insight into the implications of belonging to the order.

The importance of the Polirone customary in proving that Cluny was content, once the main feature of her way of life and spirit had been implanted, to leave the working out of detail and adaptation to local needs cannot be underestimated. Though the writer incorporated much of the material in Ulrich and Bernard, especially in connection with the liturgy and functions of the various officials, many customs are referred to which only applied to Polirone, and St. Hugh had given specific directions in one or two instances for adapting the ordo, and had prescribed, for instance, a mitigation of certain fasts on account of the climate. (1)

(1) See S.J.P.Van Dijk, 'The Customary of St. Benedict's at Polirone', in Miscellanea Liturgica in honorem L.Cuniberti Mohlberg, vol. II, pp.451-65. For an example of such a reference see f. 130 vo.: "abbas Albericus in communi capitulo hoc quod diximus de ieiunio quattuor temporum interdixit preci piens ut secundum morem terre huius faceremus, dicens se de hac re a sanctissimo patre hugone cluniacense abbate licentiam petituram."
This accorded with Hugh's general policy and it is also the spirit of the Rule itself. Another echo is found in Hugh's advice to William of Hirsau against an unqualified transplanting of customs and urging adaptation to local conditions.  

It is not improbable that numerous priories, especially the smaller ones, had no written customaries but depended on oral tradition. The very fact of the existence of exact copies of Ulrich and Bernard in dependent houses supports rather than undermines this theory, since such copies could not apply in all their details to dependent monasteries. One wonders whether the phrase "adoption of Cluniac customs" is often interpreted in too literal a sense.

(ii) Profession at Cluny

The custom whereby all monks had to make profession at Cluny meant that every member of the order experienced at least once in his lifetime the personal impact of the life of the great abbey. Strictly speaking, all novices, except those who had an abbot of their own and belonged less fully to the Cluniac system, were expected to go to Cluny at the end of their novitiate. This created difficulties and

(1) See above, p. 252.

(2) See above, pp. 180 ff.
the custom was not always strictly observed. Abuses were also creeping in and delayed professions were already, under Hugh, a feature of some of the Cluniac houses. Ulrich refers to Hugh visiting La Charité where, on account of his not having been there for four years, fifty-five novices were waiting to be blessed. (1) This is surprising in a monastery like La Charité which was in close contact with Cluny, and the reason for delay in sending them to Cluny for profession is not given. All that follows is a statement to the effect that the profession of the novices was reserved to Cluny, where the prior sent as many as was possible each year. (2) Whether this policy of delays affected the life of a dependent priory is not known, but it is probable that after an initial training period, novices were admitted to an unofficial profession and thence to a full community life in the dependent monastery, regardless of whether they had visited Cluny or not. (3)

Unfortunately the sources provide no answer to this question which bears so directly on the implications of belonging to the order. The most telling evidence of

(1) Ulrich, col. 638: "Uno die Iv novitiis habitum nostrum vel benedictionem dedit..."

(2) ibid.: "...quanquam prior singulisannis pro benedictione quantis potuit misisset."

(3) See Knowles, 'The Reforming decrees of Peter the Venerable', p. 11: "A kind of unofficial profession seems to have been allowed."
how far things went is one of Peter the Venerable's statutes which decreed that all should make their profession at Cluny within at least three years of receiving the habit. The reason given is that priors have delayed sending monks for as many as twenty years for reasons of economy. (1) This adds weight to the supposition that there must have been an unofficial profession, apart from the formal one at Cluny, which is further borne out by the addition of a clause to the effect that no one could be ordained, officiate, or be given any responsibility outside the cloister until after his profession at Cluny. (2) This is a good indication of what had been happening.

It can be said, therefore, that profession at Cluny had become a formality which did not vitally affect the personal life of the ordinary monk in the dependent priory. In any case, dependent priors received, formed, and usually kept their own monks, and the same was true of the priories only indirectly subject to Cluny, where the presence of novices is occasionally indicated in the sources. (3)

As with the community at Cluny, so in the order, there

(1) Statute no. 38, PL 139, col. 1036.

(2) Ibid.: "Nec interim sicut Cluniaeensi exigit, et ad ordines eclesiasticos ascendat, et missam ante ordinati cantent, aut extra claustrum alicujus obedientiae administrant."

(3) eg. the customary of Polirone includes in the prescriptions for deceased monks, prayers: "pro noviciis vero in obedientiis nostris..." (f. 163 ro.)
was a considerable movement of monks, especially of those qualified for promotion as abbots and priors. The career of Archbishop Bernard of Toledo may be quoted as not untypical of the policy in this respect. He entered at S. Orens in Auch, probably about 1070 and was sent shortly afterwards to Cluny where he remained until 1078, during which period he was chamberlain of Cluny for a time. He then returned to be prior of S. Orens for two years, whence he was transferred to Spain as abbot of S. Fagan. Almost immediately he was elected to the See of Toledo. (1)

If the ordinary monk in the dependent monastery was less liable to be transferred or experience the upheavals that were part of the life of so many Cluniacs, the principle of belonging to Cluny remained.

(iii) Horarium

It is a pity there was no Ulrich in a dependent priory to record for posterity details of the daily life of the house. As it is, the historian is poorly informed on the subject.

It may be presumed, however, that the horarium of Cluny and its dependent houses was similar in outline. Nor would Cluniac houses have been distinguished by following an

observance similar to that of Cluny, as much of it was common to most monasteries of the time. (1) Statutes introducing changes or additions at Cluny were usually intended to apply to the houses of the order and Peter the Venerable, legislating in the twelfth century certainly presupposed a common observance. The Polirone customary also indicates that the horarium—with all its accretions—differed little, at least in the larger monasteries, from that of Cluny.

Nevertheless, many factors protracting the horarium at Cluny were entirely absent from the dependent monasteries. Much depended on the size of the house. The larger monasteries—such as Polirone—could more easily sustain the onus of the full liturgical observance than could a priory with a handful of monks. Liturgical statutes usually took into account the number of monks and legislated accordingly. For instance, the obligations as regards deceased monks and abbots were mitigated for the smaller priories where there were fewer priests who could say the prescribed number of Masses. Where only two or three monks formed a community alms could be substituted for the prescribed prayers. (2)

(1) See above, p. 140.

(2) Ulrich, col. 776. PL 159, col. 928: "Sed in cellis ubi non plus quam quinque aut tres commorantur, si tot pauperes reficiores nequeunt, saltem vel quot sunt fratres, tot pascantur."
Priorities of only two or three monks could hardly have followed the normal observance. This is proved by Peter the Venerable's decree that if possible a prior and twelve monks were to form the community of a dependent house and in any case the full regular life was to be observed. He adds the significant remark that the reason for the decree is self-evident.(1)

Even in the larger monasteries where the full timetable was followed the pace was more leisurely than at Cluny and it is unlikely that there was the same congestion. This is apparent in Peter the Venerable's decree that a moderate pause was to be observed between the verses of the psalms, which applied to the Cluniac monasteries and not to Cluny itself where time would not allow for it.(2) True to the tendency of the time, some monasteries observed liturgical customs that had been mitigated or omitted at Cluny because of rising numbers. An example may be seen in the reintroduction at Polirone of the custom whereby a monk who had received Extreme Unction was visited by the community who bade him farewell. This had to be omitted at Cluny on account of the size of the community.(3)

The horarium of each community had certain unique

(1) Statute no. 41, PL 189, col. 1037 and Bibl.Cl. col. 1366.
(2) Statute no. 1, PL 189, col. 1026 and Bibl. Cl. col. 1355.
(3) Polirone customary, f. 78: "Apud nos, quia non est tanta multitudo fratum...tотus conventus accurrunt."
customs and characteristics, acquired according to the locality. This is seen especially in the liturgy which affords one of the best examples of how Cluny exercised a general influence which left much scope for local variation.

The dependencies observed in the main the calendar of Cluny. Feasts instituted there were usually extended to the order as, for instance, the feasts of the early abbots, Hugh's institution of a general commemoration of deceased monks and benefactors of Cluny, Peter the Venerable's introduction of the feast of the Transfiguration. But the calendars of dependent monasteries also included their own patronal feasts and also the saints' days observed in the locality. (1) There is even an example of a liturgical manuscript made for Cluny being altered to incorporate some of the local saints when it was taken to another monastery. (2) The story is told of the prior of La Charité opposing the singing of the office of St. Nicholas in a dependent house because it was a non-Cluniac custom. One night the community was wakened by the sound of the prior

(1) See Dom J. Hourlier, 'Remarques sur la notation clunisienne' in Revue Gregorienne, vol. xxx (1951) p. 234, where an example may be found in the description of a twelfth-century gradual of a dependent house which provides for all the main Cluniac feasts, plus a number of local Auvergne feasts.

(2) Bibl. Nat. ms. lat. no. 12601. I am informed of this by Dom J. Hourlier who has prepared an article 'Le Bréviaire de S. Taurin' on the subject, (unpublished).
singing aloud the said office in his sleep encouraged, it is said, by St. Nicholas belabouring him with a crozier. The monks retained their custom. (1)

Each monastery also had its own benefactors to pray for, and anniversaries to observe, which further distinguished the observance in details. St. Hugh himself decreed that the anniversary of the first prior of S. Martin des Champs was to be solemnly observed there and drew up a statute for S. Martin’s. (2) At Montierneuf the anniversary of the founder, Duke Godfrey of Aquitaine, was also solemnly observed and a daily commemoration made in the form of a psalm after each of the Hours and a special collect at Mass. (3) The Polirone customary records that Abbot William drew up specific customs concerning the commemoration of the deceased monks of Polirone. (4)

It may be surmised that where the full liturgical round was not observed, the time gained was spent, as the Rule prescribed, in manual work and reading. It is also likely that in some of the priories manual work was necessary for self-support.

(2) S. Martin des Champs, cart. vol. i, p. 173.
(4) fo. 168 ro.
As with so many other aspects of the constitution of the order it may be emphasised that generalisations must give place to details of the actual state of affairs which was different in every priory.

(iv) Government and Administration

The same applies to the government and administration of the dependent monastery. The Cluniac administrative institutions were easy to transplant. Not only were they highly systematised, but their affinity to feudal institutions facilitated adaptation to local conditions. The degree of imitation varied according to the size of the monastery, for the same complexity was not necessary everywhere. Charter signatures show, however, that in the larger monasteries there were monastic officials similar to those of Cluny. The Polirone customary incorporates Ulrich's chapters on the officials almost word for word. In Spain, too, the Cluniac administrative system and its nomenclature was widely adapted, even in non-Cluniac monasteries such as Sahagun whose customs in this respect seem to have been based on Ulrich. (1) It was economic collapse that led the monks of Tournai to ask

(1) See Perez, Los monjes españoles, vol. ii, pp. 434 and 444; Vignau, Índice de los documentos del monasterio de Sahagun, (Madrid, 1874).
that Cluniac customs be adopted and officials appointed in whose hands the administration would be safe. (1)

The abundance of charters makes the economy of the dependent priories the easiest aspect to reconstruct. Details varied according to the size of a monastery and its situation, but in general it may be said that, like Cluny, each house was an integral part of society in its region, and partook of the economic features of its surroundings.

An agricultural economy was the norm, though some priories enjoyed money revenues drawn from a variety of sources including, in the case of Morlaas, a tithe of the proceeds of the local fair and five solidi from the races. (2) This priory was, in fact, an important money centre. (3) S. Jean d'Angely and Souvigny both obtained the right to mint their own money before Cluny. (4)

The resources of most monasteries increased during the eleventh century, and incorporation to the Order of Cluny marked the beginning of an important expansion for some.

---

(1) Heriman, Liber de restauracione S. Martini Tornacensis, MG. SS. vol. xiv, p. 307: "Non more antiquorum gravia et importabilia onera imponenda probaret, sed institutis et regula Cluniacensis cenobii contentus esset."

(2) S. Foi de Morlaas, cart. p. 7: "de cursu equorum."

(3) Ibid. p. 35, no. xxix.

(4) S. Jean d'Angely, cart. vol. ii, no. xxxii; see also art. Cluny, DHGE, vol. 13, col. 44 and Barthélemy, loc. cit.
Save for the greatest monasteries of the order like La Charité, and S. Martin des Champs, the domain of Cluniac dependencies was much more compact than at Cluny and its administration was, therefore, simplified. The same process of organisation and exploitation was going on everywhere and if necessary the Cluniac system of granges was introduced. From charters in the cartulary of Barbezieux the development of one grange can be traced in all its stages from the acquisition of a small piece of land to the steady addition of other lands and then the establishment of a centre of administration. (1)

Seculars were also employed by some monasteries with extensive lands to supervise administration. One praepositus of Maillezais petitioned the Abbot to allow him to exploit the land to the utmost, by sale and exchange if necessary, a policy which the previous abbot had opposed. The permission was granted. (2) The record of a plea by the prior of St. Stephen of Nevers against one of the monastery's praepositi for infringing the rights of the

(1) Barbezieux, cart. pp. 26 ff., nos. lxxi-lxiv.

(2) Lacurie, Histoire de Maillezais, p. 210, no. xix.
monastery shows that, as at Cluny, abuses could easily creep in. (1)

Complete autonomy was granted to the priors in the administration of their resources. Hugh specifically granted this freedom to the prior of Pontida and also asked him to be responsible for all the Cluniac lands in that region for their better administration according to local custom. (2) In all local cartularies the prior figures as director of affairs.

Dependent monasteries were expected to be self-supporting and Cluny seems to have made no economic provision for them. There is little evidence of destitution, but the few examples that there are show outsiders coming to the rescue. The Bishop of Clermont noticed the poverty of Sauxillanges on one of his visits and gave the monks revenues from a church in his diocese. (3) A thirteenth-century chronicle describing the foundation of S. Martin des Champs says that the first monks had to ask Hugh to recall the colony on account of

(1) Peter the Venerable, De Miraculis, PL 139, col. 866.

(2) Bruel, vol. iv, no. 3618: "Dedit potestatem et tribuit auctoritatem Ugo abas...priori...Saneti Jacobi de Potia... de illis rebus quas obvenerent vel obvenire abent per cartas...commutacionem faciendi et legalem ordinationem vel secundum morem ipsius loci."

(3) Bruel, vol. v, no. 3719.
their destitution. The Abbot told them they were wanting in Faith, and bade them stay. King Philip of France, the founder, later increased the endowments to ensure economic stability for the monastery. (1) Though founders usually endowed a new monastery with sufficient for its immediate needs and continued to take an interest in the temporal welfare, few can have equalled the zeal of Duke Godfrey of Aquitaine in his care for Montierneuf. (2)

Though many charters concerning dependent priories were preserved at Cluny, there is comparatively little evidence of direct action on the part of the abbey in the economic affairs of the dependent monasteries and mention of Cluny and its Abbot - if it occurs at all - is nearly always a mere legal formula.

Occasionally arrangements were made to exchange land with a dependent priory or to cede certain rights, but such acts were clearly objective economic transactions with no reference to any other relation between the monastery concerned and Cluny. This is well illustrated in disputes about property, usually on account of ambiguity in a charter. An example may be found in the controversy that arose when a church, previously given to Cluny,

(1) See l'Huillier, p. 299.
(2) See above, p. 266.
was re-donated to S. Jean d'Angely by the heir of Cluny's benefactor who refused to honour his father's will. Cluny objected and eventually regained possession of the church, but only after paying two hundred solidi to the abbey of S. Jean.\(^{(1)}\)

In this and similar transactions there is nothing to distinguish Cluny's dealing from those with other ecclesiastical or secular proprietors. Most priories probably gained rather than lost by this independence. They were free to establish a sound economy without partaking of the disturbing features that were beginning to characterise Cluny's economy by the end of Hugh's abbacy. Moreover, the compact domain of most monasteries was more easily administered than the scattered resources of larger establishments. The precise state of the economy was also more easily estimated. In short, at this period the smaller establishment was at an advantage in the economic sphere.

(v) Cens

There was as yet no general custom whereby an annual payment was made to Cluny. Some priories did pay a cens according to an agreement in the charter of foundation or

\(^{(1)}\) S. Jean d'Angely, cart. vol. i, p. 236.
annexation to the order, or in return for some concession such as the promise made by Hugh never to interfere in the life of the priory of Lewes, for which William of Warenne arranged for fifty solidi a year to be sent to Cluny from Lewes. (1) The tributes varied. S. Eutrope de Saintes sent five solidi a year, Moissac ten solidi from certain lands, Rimesengen one ounce of gold. (2) S. Stephen's of Verona sent ten solidi a year to remain under S. Gabriel's, Cremona. (3) Such examples, though not infrequent, were in no way general. There is no evidence of any payment from many of the priories, though some may have paid without record being kept. No doubt these customs created the precedent for the later general levy. But during Hugh's abbacy there was no inclination to draw from the resources of dependent monasteries. The only example of a request is learned from a letter of the prior of S. Lizier to Hugh from which it appears that the abbot had asked for a good mule. The prior was unable to supply it, so he sent fifty solidi instead. (4)

(1) Bruehl, vol. iv, no. 3561.
(3) Bruehl, vol. iv, no. 3448.
(4) ibid. no. 3646.
Finally, archeological and architectural evidence throws interesting light on the sort of thing that was happening in the dependent monasteries. It was an important building period for many of them, especially the larger houses, including Moissac, Layrac, S.Gilles, Uzerche, Beaulieu, La Charité, S. Martin des Champs, Montierneuf, S.Cyprian of Poitiers, Limoges, S.Eutrope de Saintes, Paray, Marcigny, Vezelay and S. Stephen of Nevers. These buildings reflected a movement wherein provincial and local characteristics merged to produce what can be called a Cluniac style. (1)

This was a true reflection of the experience of the Cluniac Order under Hugh. It had reached its defined extent during his abbacy and was in the process of creating a system to equalise and make adequate the relation between Cluny and the dependent monasteries. The Order was already recognised as an organic and juridical reality, none the less real because to us it seems nebulous and inconsistent in detail.

This flexibility in non-essentials, which was part of the Cluniac spirit under Hugh, enabled each monastery to pursue, for the most part, its own destiny.

(1) See J. Evans, Cluniac Art of the Romanesque Period, especially p. 16 from where this conclusion is taken.
One of the novel features of Hugh's abbacy was the foundation in 1055 of Marcigny in the diocese of Autun, the first house of Cluniac nuns. It marked the beginning of a new development within the order which was welcomed by Hugh's biographers and contemporaries, who saw in the institution an important contribution. The abbot himself took considerable pride in the achievement. He made no secret of his affection for Marcigny and was most anxious that his successors should maintain an interest in the place.

Marcigny also marks a stage in the development of religious life for women, though it is difficult to indicate its full significance as this whole field has been somewhat neglected by historians. Dom Philibert Schmitz draws attention to the want of an adequate work on the subject and his own work on the Benedictine nuns makes him a pioneer.

---

(1) The date of foundation is sometimes disputed and variously given as 1061 or 1063. In his recent edition of the cartulary of Marcigny, Professor Richard says there is no reason for doubting that communal life began at Marcigny c.1055; see J.M. Richard, Le cartulaire de Marcigny-sur-Loire, p. ix. He bases his conclusion on the fact that the consecration of the first church took place in that year.

Good monographs are rare and they are usually devoted to biography or chronology. The few works purporting to deal with the subject in a general way devote a disproportionate space to incident and the above-mentioned themes. Attention to the principles underlying developments in rules and constitutions is markedly absent and even where attempts have been made to trace this development in one or other aspect of monasticism, mediaeval developments have been virtually ignored.

The greatest obstacle is shortage of material. Ecclesiastical legislation on the subject was mostly directed against abuses and other sources are hard to come by. Altogether, the reconstruction of the mediaeval nunnery is a difficult task, though something of its development can be indicated.

It was only in the seventh century that the Benedictine

---

(1) The only general works in English on the subject are L. Eckenstein, Woman under Monasticism, (Cambridge, 1896), which is disappointing, and Eileen Power, Medieval English Nunneries c. 1275 to 1535, (Cambridge, 1922), which in no way indicates development, being a localised social study.

(2) The historical surveys included among the papers read at the annual French congress, published under the title Problèmes de la Religieuse d'aujourd'hui, (Editions du Cerf, 1950 - translated as the Religious Life Series, ed. C. Pepler, O.P., Blackfriars, 1950) are very inadequate and of unequal value, especially as regards Mediaeval developments.
Rule was definitely adopted by nuns.(1) The ideal of consecrated virginity had been present in the Church from the start, and remained at the core of all constitutional development. A number of very early rules appeared and other codes continued to be written throughout the middle ages, but those of St. Augustine and St. Columban remained very popular. The seventh and eighth centuries witnessed a great flourishing of the Benedictine life among women when many famous abbeys were either founded or adopted the Benedictine Rule, and outstanding personalities like Hilda, Walburga, and Lioba, enriched the monastic tradition.(2) But Benedictinism never held the same unrivalled place among women that it held among monks.

The decadence of the ninth and tenth centuries affected the convents too, and by the tenth and eleventh centuries they had become a social institution. Their development was bound up with the status of women in feudal society, the only alternatives for a girl being marriage or the cloister. Many convents, like the nine abbeys existing in England at the time of the Conquest, became preserves of the upper class.(3)

(2) Dom P. Schmitz's volume gives the best survey of this development.
Before Hugh's abbacy, Cluny had not been directly concerned with nuns, though they were not entirely absent from the scene. In 930 Odo restored a convent of nuns at Bauxières, and Odilo's mother became a nun at S. Jean d'Autun, one of the celebrated abbeys of the time. But Hugh's was the first definite Cluniac move towards monasticism for women and thereafter convents were a permanent feature of the order.

The archives of Marcigny shared the same fate as those of Cluny. Most of them were destroyed, either in the sack of the monastery by the Huguenots in 1562 or at the French Revolution. Of the few documents that escaped, none are dated earlier than the second half of the twelfth century.

Professor J. Richard of Dijon has recently succeeded in reconstructing from copies and translations the lost cartulary of the monastery. Some of the charters of Cluny itself also concern Marcigny, so that some knowledge of the eleventh century economy is available. The charters also provide information about members of the


(2) Richard, op. cit. There is a good introduction discussing the manuscripts used and any doubt in the text is indicated.

(3) egs. Bruel, vol. v, nos. 3825, 3826, 3827, 3828, 3829, 3833, 3834, 3862, 3866.
community at Marcigny, as grants of land usually accompanied entry to the monastery. But details of life in the convent are disappointingly few.

Two of Hugh's letters are very important for the early history of Marcigny. One was written to the monks of Cluny, intended for publication after his death, specifically asking that care and attention be given to Marcigny and containing prescriptions for the maintenance of fervour there. (1) The other was written to the nuns, also shortly before he died, exhorting them to fulfil their ideal. (2) Other Cluniac sources, such as the biographies of Hugh and the writings of Peter the Venerable, have a few references to Marcigny, which furnish an occasional valuable detail for the historian. (3) There exist, besides, two seventeenth century lists: one of the members of the community from the foundation onwards, the other a list of the monks appointed as priors to supervise the monastery. Both lists have been edited, but the former must be used with care, as names of benefactresses who were never members of the community have been

---

(1) PL 159, cols. 949 - 52; and Bibl. Cl. cols. 493 - 495.
(2) PL 159, cols. 947 - 50; and Bibl. Cl. cols. 491 - 493.
(3) These references will be found in appropriate places throughout the chapter.
included. On the whole, the charters are a safer
guide as to who entered at Marcigny. The Index Priorum
is a more accurate compilation, and it can also be checked
by the charters.

Apart from one or two Cluniac charters and an occasional
thin reference in other sources, such as the Vita of
Ulrich, there is no documentation on other Cluniac convents
founded during the abbacy of Hugh. The full development
came in the twelfth century, and sources are rather more
abundant from that time onwards.

The foundation of Marcigny was made in 1055 by Hugh
on land provided by his brother, Count Geoffrey II of
Semur. In his letters, Hugh indicates that he was
anxious to provide for women who desired the monastic life
because at that time there was no suitable place where
they could retire for this purpose.

(1) M.F. Cucherat, Cluny au onzieme siecle, (1850, Macon),
pp. 262 ff. I have used the second edition. The texts do
p. xv, ff. for a critical discussion of these texts.

(2) See below, p. 264 ff.

(3) Marcigny, cart. p. 3, no. 3.

(4) PL 159, col. 949: "...et si qua femina vita saeculari
abrenuntiata Deo servire voluit, non sibi opportunum locum
ad hoc facile inveniunt."
reformer, or does it represent the real state of affairs?

Hugh might well have been referring to the area of Cluny only, but his statements do seem to have a wider application. He says plainly that before the appearance of Marcigny, convents were not highly esteemed. Moreover, the anxiety he showed as to Marcigny's future indicates some reason for uneasiness. He begged both the monks of Cluny and the nuns themselves to maintain the high standard he had set them. It was perhaps the institution of monasticism in its full rigour that marked a departure from the norm of the day. This suggestion is borne out by the way contemporaries expressed amazement at the strictness of the life led by the nuns of Marcigny. The Cistercians at first tended to doubt the wisdom and possibility of so strict a life for women, and later contrasted the life of the Cluniac nuns with that of the monks to the detriment of the latter. They opposed at first the incorporation of convents to the order, and criticised Cluny on this point, but later they, too, made provision for Cistercian nuns.

(1) PL 159, col. 954: "Id est enim usque ad nostra tempora feminarum congregatio minime haberetur in hujus loci consortio."

(2) See C. Boyd, A Cistercian Nunnery in Mediaeval Italy, (Harvard, 1943), pp. 72 ff.

(3) See Dialogus inter Cluniacensium monachum et Cisterciensem, Martene, Thesaurus, vol. v, col. 1633. The abbot of Cluny is there criticised for having convents of women under his care.
Whatever the case, Marcigny proved a great success and flourished from the beginning, increasing considerably in numbers from a very few to a fairly sized community.(1) Hugh commented on the progress made by the foundation in the first period of its existence and remarked on the spiritual and temporal favours that were abundantly evident from its foundation.(2) Numbers reached almost a hundred by the twelfth century, as Peter the Venerable indicates in one of his letters.(3)

In order to make provision for the temporal and spiritual needs of the community, Hugh instituted a priory of monks alongside the convent. It was not a double monastery of the type that had existed before, for the two were quite separate establishments. Moreover, the juxtaposition of both within the order created an entirely new situation.

Marcigny was subject to Cluny in the same way as other monasteries of the order and was an integral part of the structure. Papal confirmation of the possessions and privileges of the monastery made reference to its position

(1) PL 159, col. 954, Imprecatio: "...istas tamen prius quidem non multas, postea vero adeo multiplicatas, nostris diebus ad sacrae religionis habitum susceptimus, locumque aedificavimus."

(2) PL 159, col. 947: "...et spiritualibus promotit incrementis et temporalibus beneficiis aliquantis per ampliavit."

(3) PL 189, col. 218.
within the order and reserved the rights of the Abbot of Cluny. (1) Hugh referred to the officials of the priory of monks as his representatives and frequently visited the monastery, once with Saint Anselm. (2) One charter records the solemn handing over of a dowry to Hugh at a profession ceremony which indicates that he probably presided at the profession of the nuns. Presumably this took place at Marcigny since the nuns had a rule of strict enclosure, but the inclusion of a reference to Cluny conjoined with Marcigny as the place of profession shows that if profession was not actually made at Cluny it marked membership of the order. (3) Also, when Hugh wrote asking for prayers after death he addressed the letter to his sons and daughters: filii filiaeque. (4) As regards prayers for the deceased, Bernard, in his customary, says that in this matter the nuns enjoyed the same privileges as the monks. (5)

(1) Bull of Urban II, PL 151, cols. 442-3 and Marcigny cart. p. 144, no. 269: "ad cujus (Hugonis) curam ex Cluniacensis coenobii jure locus vester pertinet." After confirming Marcigny's possessions, the phrase "salva in omnibus debita abbatum Cluniacensis reverentia" occurs.

(2) Vita Hugonis auct. anon. PL 159, col. 913.

(3) Brue1, vol. v, no. 3325: "in presentia domni patris nostri Hugonis abbatis die qua me benedixit idem pater in monachum, et professionem feci ad Cluniacum et ad Marciniacum."

(4) PL 159, col. 954.

(5) Bernard, p. 233: "De sanctimonialibus autem Marciniæsibus, quia per omnia sicut de fratre nostro agimus."
Besides his initial effort in the foundation of Marcigny, Hugh fostered the foundation in every way, devoting much of his attention to the promotion of a high ideal and the securing of spiritual and temporal stability. He himself spoke of the constant care that he had bestowed on Marcigny and as a final gesture he wrote what he termed a memorial in which he exhorted the nuns to fulfil the holiness of their state. He asked that this should be read in chapter five times a year on the great feasts.(1)

The priory of monks was like any other Cluniac priory, except for its responsibility and duties towards the nuns. The two weightiest offices in this respect were those of the prior, who was mainly responsible for temporal administration, and the claustral prior who provided for the spiritual needs of the nuns.

The monks were entirely responsible for the temporal administration and in all transactions acted as agents for the nuns, whose names never appear in the charters, except those concerning dowries.(2) This contrasts with other convents of the day whose abbesses acted naturally in an administrative capacity. Among the charters of Marcigny is one drawn up by the abbess of S. Jean d'Autun arranging

(1) PL 159, cols. 947 - 950 and Bibl.Cl. cols. 491-493.

(2) Three or four monks usually signed Marcigniac charters. For examples, see cart. nos. 46, 56, and 58.
for the conveyance of the dowry of one of her nuns who
wanted to transfer to Marcigny. The document is signed by
nine of the sisters of S. Jean's, whereas no nun of
Marcigny is mentioned, even as signatory, in any of the
charters.(1)

Since the charters are the most abundant sources, the
temporals of the monastery are the aspect most easily
reconstructed. The flourishing condition of the priory has
already been noted. Hugh's family ensured its adequate
endowment from the Semur domain and other benefactors,
including the Duke of Normandy, were not wanting.(2) Dowries
also increased the possessions of Marcigny and as the
community was drawn from a wide area, the domain of Marcigny
had the same scattered character as that of Cluny, La Charité,
and S. Martin. It included holdings as far away as England,
Spain, the Ardennes, and many regions of France.(3) Pope
Urban II's bull to Marcigny in 1095 confirmed churches in
the dioceses of Autun, Macon, Lyons, Clermont, Die, Valence,
Poitiers, Saintes, and Najera.(4) From 1100 onwards, the
tendency to regroup lands for more convenient administration

(1) ibid. no. 175, p. 103.
(2) ibid. no. 3 and pp. 254 ff. (Table chronologique des
chartes) for a record of benefactions.
(3) ibid. introduction, p. xvi f f .
(4) PL 151, cols. 442-3 and cart. no. 269, p. 144.
is discernible, and some exchanges were made with Cluny for this purpose. In one case a donor of land arranged for his gift to be received by Ambierle which would, in return, cede certain revenues to Cluny. The land happened to be situated near Ambierle, but nowhere near any Marcigny centre of administration.

(1) On another occasion some monks of Cluny petitioned Hugh to exchange lands with Marcigny for their better supervision and exploitation.

All lands were free of secular control, and entirely the property of the priory. Nevertheless, Marcigny seems to have suffered some depredation from local seigneurs, particularly a certain Bernard de Chavroches, who finally renounced all his claims before an ecclesiastical gathering at Marcigny at which St. Peter Damian, who was then visiting Cluny, presided.

(3) Later, the boundaries of the immediate territory of Marcigny had to be solemnly defined again by ecclesiastical authority in the persons of the Archbishops of Lyon and Vienne, and the Bishop of Autun, against the

(1) Cart. p. 30, no. 35: "vero quia remotior, eo praedictis sororibus erat importunior, fratribus vero Cluniacensibus eo opportuna quia obedientie eorum Monte Bertaldi adjacens existebat... Placuit autem ipsis, ut illos viginti solidos, qui inde proveniebant, sibi retinerent, et loco eorum alios viginti ejusdem monetae apud Ambertam quotannis persolvendo statuerunt..."

(2) Bruel, vol. v, no. 3742.

(3) Cart. p. 90, no. 121.
claims made by Count Geoffrey III of Semur who refused to honour the endowments made by his predecessors.\(^1\) A bull was obtained from Pope Urban II which promised protection of the priory and granted immunity from excommunication and interdict for all the inhabitants.\(^2\)

Marcigny was not entirely without its misfortunes. Peter the Venerable refers to severe economic difficulties about the time of his mother's entry to Marcigny, when the nuns scarcely had enough for the needs of the large community.\(^3\) In the early twelfth century repercussions of the vicissitudes of Cluny were felt. The fourth prior, Seguinus, was called to Cluny to act as camerarius and a confused situation arose between 1100 and 1107, since he continued to hold the office of prior of Marcigny. Eventually, because Seguinus was so fully occupied with his office of chamberlain, a vicar was appointed to represent him at Marcigny who is variously referred to in the charters as socius, gubernator, or procurator.\(^4\) Seguinus is referred to as proprior which reflects the irregularity of the position.\(^5\)

\(^1\) ibid. p. 13, no. 14.

\(^2\) PL 151, cols. 442-3 and cart. p. 144, no. 269.

\(^3\) PL 189, col. 218: "Erat et augusta (angusta?) loci possessio et redditus agrorum vix parvo numero sufficiebant."

\(^4\) Index Priorum. Cucherat, p. 263: "propter suum camerarii Cluniacensis officium saepius distracto..." See also cart. nos. 108, 110, pp. 79 and 81.

\(^5\) eg. cart. p. 164, no. 285: "domno Seguino, domni abbatis camerario et loci ipsius propriore."
The spiritual direction of the nuns was entirely in the hands of the claustral prior and Hugh took care to choose an experienced and spiritually-minded person for this office. Some of the claustral priors of his abbacy are known. They included Rencho who was praised by all Hugh's biographers as a learned man of God, Hugh who was abbot of Cluny for a few months in 1122, and Raynald, later abbot of Vezelay.\(^1\) Ulrich was also prior of Marcigny for a time until worn out with night watches and writing, he fell ill and asked to be released from his office.\(^2\)

Some information about the members of the community at Marcigny during Hugh's abbacy is available. They were all members of the feudal nobility, and represented most of the leading families of France, including the houses of Burgundy, Bourbon-Lancy, Aquitaine, and Macon.\(^3\) Adelaide of Blois, William the Conqueror's daughter and mother of King Stephen, also entered there as a widow, and it is likely that

\(^1\) Vita Hugonis auct. Gilo, D'Huillier, p. 586: "Preterea magistrum eis prefecit sapientem, Renconem virum Dei philosophum..."; Index Priorum, Cucherat, op. cit. p. 263.

\(^2\) Vita Udalrici, MG.SS, vol. xii, p. 262: "missus enim ad... Marciniacum, ut ibi praeesset sacer viri Christi virginibus... per longas vigiliae noctium, per scribendi laborum continuum, gravissimum capitis dolorem incurrabat... misericordiam petens a commesso sanctimonialium regimine absolvitur."

\(^3\) Peter the Venerable, De Miraculis, Bibl. Cl. col. 1280: "ibi nobillum mulierum multitudo." See also cart. p. 73, no. 102 and p. 26, no. 30.
St. Anselm's sister was a nun there. (1) The daughter of Malcolm, King of Scotland, is sometimes described as a nun of Marcigny, but though she was a benefactress there is no evidence that she ever entered. (2) All were expected to bring a dowry in land, and reference to this necessity is sometimes made in the charters, many of which are records of dowries. (3) Grants were sometimes made by benefactors on condition that if a wife or daughter wanted to enter later she would be received. (4) Many members of Hugh's own family entered, and his mother and one of his sisters were among the nucleus of the founding community. (5) Undoubtedly the desire of providing for them was one of the motives in the original foundation. Most of the nuns had relatives at Cluny. Bernard, at Cluny, seems to have agitated for his sister's transfer from S. Jean d'Autun to Cluny and, at her request as well, arranged for the move to be made, providing a monetary compensation to the abbess of S. Jean's

(1) ibid. p. 102, n. 2: L'Huillier, p. 400.
(2) Cart. p. 102, n. 2.
(3) Brueel, vol. v, no. 3742: "...domina una recipetur, nichil ibi tribuens, nisi quod juxta morem aliarum dominarum honeste esset induta..."
for the conveyance of the dowry. (1)

One of the characteristics of the community was the large number of widows or married women who had agreed with their husbands to enter the religious state. (2) The large number of charters recording such agreements, whereby the husband went to Cluny or some other Cluniac monastery such as Paray, indicates that this was not an uncommon event. Occasionally, but rarer, provision was made for the wife of a crusader to enter. (3) It is probably not an exaggeration to say that the greater part of the community was composed of this class. The entry of a wife or widow was frequently attended by the entry of a daughter. (4)

There is no doubt but that Marcigny was a convent of mature women who, at least during Hugh's abbacy if not later, had a strong sense of vocation. In one of his letters Hugh formulated the policy governing the reception of candidates. His precision in the matter contrasts vividly with the practice at Cluny. He insisted that no young or inexperienced person should be admitted and laid

---

(1) Cart. p. 103, no. 175: "ejus frequente petitione humilique fratri sui Bernardi Cluniaeensis monachi deprecatione ipsi concedimus ut, Marciniacum petens, ibi pro salute animae suae vigilet..."

(2) For examples, see cart. nos. 20, 21, 24, 28, 29, 103, 116, 166, 171, 181, etc.

(3) Eg. cart. p. 79, no. 109.

(4) Eg. cart. nos. 24 and 109.
down that no candidate less than twenty years of age, if not more, was to be received. (1) He further prescribed that no one should be accepted in whom it was not possible to "test the spirit, to see whether they come from God". (2) Here Hugh directly adapts the rule laid down by St. Benedict for receiving candidates to the monastery. (3) He forbade anything to the contrary in the strongest terms and stated as his reason the greater good of the monastery in stability and worth of the community. (4)

From this and from what is known about life at Marcigny, it can be inferred that no children were received there, as was the custom in other convents where young girls were accepted in the same way as boys by the monks. Anna, the nun who was transferred from S. Jean d'Autun to Marcigny had been brought up in the former convent. (5)

It is also known that provision was made at Marcigny

(1) PL 159, col. 949: "nunquam ad habitum sanctitatis puerilis aetas recipiatur, nec alia quam in qua possit probari spiritus si ex Deo sit, et si non ultra, tamen omnino vel usque xx annum, jam pervenit."

(2) Ibid.

(3) Regula, cap. lviii: "Noviter veniens quis ad conversationem, non ei facilis tribuat ingressus; sed si eit ait Apostolus: Protate spiritus, si ex Deo sunt."

(4) PL 159, col. 949: "Et hoc decretum et praeceptum, ut eo majorem aestimationem et stabilitatem obtineat."

(5) Cart. p. 103, no. 175: "Anna... quam parvam receperamus..."
for two types of life: the cenobitic and the eremitic. Allusion is made to a lex given to the community by Hugh, but whether this refers to customs filling out the Rule of St. Benedict, or to a specific code is not known.  

The cenobites are described as living at Cluny from which it can be inferred that the Cluniac ordo was the norm, which could also be inferred from the presence of the priory of monks. It may also be noted that Peter the Venerable describes the nuns as living an arduous life devoted to manual work, psalmody, and prayer. Whatever the details of their ordo it was certainly Hugh who indicated the main lines of the life to be lived at Marcigny, and the little evidence available allows some understanding of its principles.

Profession was for the nun, as for the monk of Cluny, the basis of the monastic life. In his exhortation to the nuns, Hugh stressed the personal and permanent nature of the bond created by profession, speaking of it in the traditional terms of Christ as Spouse of the soul. Likening the nuns

(1) Vita Hugonis auct. Raynald, PL 159, col.899: "Quibus et coenobitarum et anachoretarum instituit legem."

(2) ibid. "unum quo Cluniacum imitantur, alterum quo heremitum aemulantur."

(3) De Miraculis, Bibl. Cl. col.1280: "Omnes tamen in commune, viri constantia feminine molliceam supergressae...opere manuum, psalmodia, oratone assidua."
to the virgins of the parable he urged them to an entire commitment to what they had vowed. (1) It is interesting to note in this connection that St. John the Evangelist, under the invocation of his virginity, was one of the chief patrons of the monastery, which was dedicated to the Blessed Trinity. (2)

Profession at Marcigny also implied a certain "apartness": Hugh likened the nuns to the sacred vessels with which only the priest comes into contact. (3) For his reason he instituted enclosure of the strictest nature at Marcigny, to obviate all occupation with mundane things, and danger of arousing desires for what had been left behind. (4) This was an essential aspect of dedication at Marcigny, and was linked to it in the minds of contemporaries. Pope Urban II, in his bull confirming the possessions and privileges of the abbey, described the nuns as enclosed and dead to the world so as to be entirely occupied in mind and soul with God. (5) At the time, enclosure was not

(1) PL 159, col. 947.

(2) Cart. p.9, no.7: "...constructa in nomine summæ et individuae Trinitatis...dominae Mariae Dei genetricis...sanctique virginis Ioannis Evangelistæ..."


(4) ibid.

(5) PL 151, col. 442 and cart. p.144, no. 269: "...quia pro Dei timore clausææ, et saeculo jam estis emortuææ...ad aeterni Sponsi semper desiderabilem visionem totius mentis et animæ viribus anhelitis."
normal and Peter the Venerable indicates that it was something of an innovation that contrasted with the life of other nuns who freely roamed about on foot or horse.\(^{(1)}\) It is not unlikely that Hugh gave an impetus to the introduction of strict enclosure.

There was no exception to the rule of enclosure and its severity was commented on by contemporaries who thought it the outstanding characteristic of the life of Marcigny. Allusion to it is frequently made in the charters bestowing dowries to the convent.\(^{(2)}\) Peter the Venerable tells the story of a fire which threatened the convent. People from the nearby village urged the nuns to leave the buildings, and when they saw their entreaties were having no effect, resorted to the papal legate who was conveniently handy. He came and ordered the nuns in virtue of obedience to the pope to leave the cloister. Unabashed, the prioress, Griselda, replied that far from ordering them to come out when they had been ordered by Hugh to remain enclosed (and only a revocation of the command by the abbot himself could be considered), the legate should do something about the fire. Meekly he stepped back and commanded the fire to stop, which it did.\(^{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) De Miraculiis, Bibl. Cl. col. 1231: "Hac ipsae sibi idcirco more alliarum sanctimonialium equitandi vel deambulandi licentiam praeepto Abbatis sui interdixerunt."

\(^{(2)}\) Eg. cart. p. 27, no. 30: "...pro angustia claustri propter quam relinquuo latitudinem totius mundi."

\(^{(3)}\) De Miraculiis, Bibl. Cl. col. 1231.
Another interesting example of the severity of the Marcigny Rule may be found in the contretemps between Hugh and St. Anselm, probably arising from the desire of the latter to obtain his sister's transfer to St. Sepulchre's, Canterbury, newly founded by the saint. Hugh would not hear of it, however, and made no secret of his contempt at the suggestion.\(^{(1)}\)

The nuns seems to have had a prioress. The title of abbess was given to Our Lady and in token of this a place of honour was left vacant in the oratory and in the refectory.\(^{(2)}\) There is also reference to a cellarer. Peter the Venerable's mother occupied this office and her son recorded her fidelity and kindness in fulfilling her charge, though he also adds that with all her efforts she failed to please everybody.\(^{(3)}\)

\(^{(1)}\) Direct reference to the request is wanting, but the evidence of a letter of Anselm to his nephew strongly supports this theory. (See lib. iv, op. CXIV, PL 159, col. 261.) Immediately after referring to his sister's reception at Marcigny as a result of his request to Hugh occurs the following: "Litteris igitur et nuntio nostro petii ab abbate Cluniacensi et monachis ejus ut sororem nostram ad hoc mihi concederent, quanto humilis et studiosus potui. Sed ipsi nullatemos assensum praebere voluerunt, imo commoti sunt adversam me, et magnum sibi me fecisse dedecus existimaverunt. Ego autem nondum desistam conari, ut hoc aliqua ratione possim quod incoepi perficere." L'Huillier (p. 446, n. 2) rightly suggests an omission between the two passages and it is hard to find an alternative to a request for transfer.

\(^{(2)}\) Cucherat, op. cit. pp. 220 and 229. It is not known when the title was given to Our Lady. If in the eleventh century it is one of the earliest examples of the custom.

\(^{(3)}\) Ep. ii, 17, PL 139, cols. 203-23.
Apart from these few details, the life of Marcigny during the abbacy of Hugh remains as hidden as the founder intended.

Evidence of other Cluniac convents founded during Hugh's abbacy is scanty, and we are better informed for the twelfth century. Marcigny had certain priories dependent on it, as had the other subject houses of Cluny, but these were priories of monks, rather in the nature of centres of administration. It may be noted that the Cluniac convents did not necessarily depend on Marcigny, but, like any other Cluniac cells, were subject either directly to Cluny or to some other dependent monastery. Ulrich founded the convent of Boleschweil, presumably along Marcigniac lines, after he was sent to Germany, though there is no other record of the convent belonging to the order. A number of priories were founded in Italy, two of them during Hugh's abbacy: Cantu in the diocese of Milan, founded in 1086, and Cernobbio, a cell of Cantu, in the diocese of Goma. It is not known whether it was intended that all convents should follow the same ordo as Marcigny but details

(1) Marcigny cart. introduction p. ix.

(2) Vita Udalrici, MG. SS. vol.xii, p. 262.

(3) Bruel, vol. iv, no.3612. See also Dom P. Schmitz: "Un conflit entre monastères de Clunisiennes, d'apres la correspondance inédite de Pierre le Venerable", in RB vol. xlix (1937) pp. 366-75.
provided by letters concerning a dispute during Peter the Venerable's abbacy between two Italian houses indicate differences between Marcigny and other convents. (1) Apparently the prioress of Cantu was responsible for the appointment of the prioress and other officials of the convent of Cernobbio, and the nuns of the latter convent made complaints to Cluny about their subjection to Cantu, objecting to the transfer of possessions and even of nuns. Peter asked the priors of Cluniac monasteries in the region to settle the matter. The foundation charter of Cantu indicates that monks and nuns were there at first. But another deviation from the Cluniac norm took place in that Cantu became an abbey in the twelfth century.

Mention may also be made of a customary edited by Albers which he ascribed to a Cluniac convent, not specified, in Italy. (2) He also says it was written in the tenth or eleventh century. (3) There is, in fact, nothing in the customary indicating Cluniac influence. References to an abbess, the presence of young girls as a regular feature of the community, and evidence that the nuns could go out all contrast with Marcigniac customs. Though it may have belonged to Como or Cantu, the uncertainty about its date

(1) ibid., The letters are there edited.
(3) Ibid, p. xxiv.
and origin makes speculation unwise, especially as the observance it depicts might have been the norm in any convent of the day.

Other priories are sometimes classed as Cluniac convents under Hugh, including S. Victor of Huy and S. Miguel of Zamora in Spain. There is no evidence that either of these was occupied by nuns in the eleventh or early twelfth centuries. (1) A convent was founded by the abbot of Afflighem on the same lines as Marcigny, but not incorporated with the order. (2)

During Hugh's abbacy Marcigny remained the most important example of the new departure. However inadequate the reconstruction of the development in its early stages, it may, nevertheless, be recognised as part of Hugh's creative contribution. It was also part of the enduring legacy of his abbacy and flourished when Cluny itself was in regress. Marcigny is interesting, too, as a meeting ground of Cluniac connections. Like Cluny itself, the priory was a microcosm of European society in the eleventh century. Finally, when more work has been done on the development of religious life for women, it is not unlikely that Marcigny will be viewed as having considerable significance.

(1) See cart. introduction, p. xix.
(2) See L'Huillier, p. 428.
So much of the history of Cluny remains to be studied that in many ways it is too early to make a definitive statement about the abbacy of Hugh. In any case, the Cluny of 1049 - 1109 had so many facets and was involved in so many contemporary interests that the complexity of the scene makes summary difficult. The period was full of movement, effecting a profound change that is something of an enigma to the historian. Achievement, splendour and renown, were coupled with the emergence of disturbing symptoms which foreshadowed the disasters of the twelfth century.

Constitutionally, the abbacy was decisive for the monastery of Cluny itself. The writings of Bernard and Ulrich, which formulated constitutional trends long maturing, became henceforward the authoritative expression of Clunian custom. The administrative machinery there described was a masterly response to the governmental needs of a great establishment and provided for an adequate delegation of responsibility without derogation from the position of abbot. The adaptability of the system is illustrated in the most significant development of the
time, the easy transition of the chamberlain's office to that of treasurer, as well as the creation of minor offices where needed.

A remarkable exterior expansion took place during the years 1049-1109. The tremendous leap in numbers, (almost fourfold if all who went out from Cluny are included), witnesses to the power of attraction exercised over contemporaries, and so does the increase in economic resources bestowed by an ever growing number of benefactors in the second half of the eleventh century. The élan was reflected in the building achievements of the abbacy, particularly the great basilica, a veritable expression in stone of the spirit of Cluny.

It is according to this spirit that Cluny in the last resort must be judged. Here, the want of a profound study of the indications of its spiritual doctrine - as expressed, for example, in the liturgy - is particularly felt. The requisites for a firm foundation can be said to be there, however, in the legacy that the Cluniacs of the second half of the eleventh century inherited: the teaching of the Rule, the writings of the early abbots, a rich liturgical life, and a long, strong, and proved tradition of fidelity to the ideals of the founders. The few developments in this inherited doctrine were mainly of a liturgical nature:
an increasing devotion towards the Eucharist, reflected in the development of the Mass liturgy; an attempt to bring into greater relief the focal points of the liturgical cycle by additional ceremony at Christmas, Easter and Pentecost; the introduction of the new feast of the Blessed Trinity; and the forwarding in a liturgical direction of devotion to Our Lady, by introducing customs like the Saturday Mass of the Blessed Virgin.

Such indications are favourable, and Cluny's very engagement in the practical work of reform, (the acceptance of monasteries for this purpose, the recovery of ecclesiastical goods, the activities of Hugh as papal legate), show that there was a sensitiveness to the spiritual strivings of the age. There was an awareness, too, of critical doctrinal issues, such as that centring in Berengar with whom Hugh was concerned on at least one occasion. (1) A treatise, unfortunately lost, was written in the same cause by Jotsaldus, Odilo's biographer and a monk of Cluny. (2)

Formulation of the spirit that animated Cluny was, however, rare and probably restricted by the highly-geared horarium and the fact that those who might have written

(1) PL 148, col. 506: Pope Gregory VII, in a letter to Hugh refers to enquiries made by the latter about Berengar and said he was sending instructions to the abbot about the matter.

(2) See L'Huillier, p. 159.
were fully occupied in positions of responsibility at Cluny or in the order.

Though a reputation for fervour might have persisted after spiritual vitality had somewhat evaporated, Cluny still stood high in the opinion of men of spiritual discernment. Negatively, too, the absence of any criticism that bore upon essentials is indicative. St. Peter Damian, inclined to comment at first at what he considered moderation in food and clothing, retracted his opinion after spending a week at the abbey and left full of admiration of the virtues he had seen practised and the sanctity of so many of the monks, some of whom reminded him of the Desert Fathers. (1) Shortly before 1079, similar tribute was echoed by the papal legate Bernard, Abbot of Marseilles, in his reply to the enquiries of William of Hirsau about the proposed reform of this monastery. The latter was advised that he would find no sounder observance than that of Cluny, since from there emanated any monastic fervour to be found in Gaul. (2)

The testimony of contemporaries is further borne out

(1) De Gallica Professione, PL 145, col. 873: "...multos Paulos, plurimos Antonios qui etsi solitudinis habitacionem non incolunt, anchoritarum praemium imitatione operum non amittunt."

(2) S. Wilhelmi Constitutiones, Herrgott, p. 375, Prologus: "sed inter omnia Cisalpinae Galliae Monasteria...Cluniacense coenobium potissimum vobis suadeo eligendum."
by the fact that men of ability and spiritual worth were still attracted to Cluny. Looking back over the history of Cluny, Peter the Venerable could cite numerous examples of holy men at Cluny, many of them monks under Hugh.\(^{(1)}\)

For the greater part of the abbacy the spiritual resources of the community proved themselves in the numbers and quality of those whom Cluny sent out. L'Huillier says well "...les moines clunisiens arrivèrent à former une véritable race capable d'exercer une influence profonde, et par conséquence durable et féconde".\(^{(2)}\)

The person of the abbot reflected all that was best at Cluny, and the title often accorded him, St. Hugh the Great, aptly summarises what he was and what he achieved. Not the least part of this achievement is what Cluny gave to the Church in the array of priors, abbots, bishops, cardinals, and even popes: leaders whose potentiality had early been detected by Hugh and directed towards its full flowering.

The extroversion of Cluny was the most significant characteristic of its spirit under Hugh. This gave rise to those external features, such as the developments in the order, that give Cluny its place in monastic constitutional history. The tendency had been there from

\(^{(1)}\) *De Miraculis*: a collection of such examples edited in PL 189 and Bibl. Cl.

\(^{(2)}\) L'Huillier, p. 13.
the time that Cluny became a leader in the monastic world, and almost from the foundation in the person of her abbots. But in no previous abbacy was the giving more abundant, sustained, or systematised, than under Hugh. Clearly, Cluny still had a message for its age, and was still possessed of power to impart life, to mould, and to endure.

It was in the order of Cluny that this power operated most strongly. One of its best examples is, perhaps, the foundation of Marcigny and the introduction of Cluniac nuns, since this was an entirely new departure wherein Hugh acted untrammeled by other factors. Accordingly he could make it an uncompromising expression of his ideals. The enduring fervour of the community is also a tribute to Cluny, since it was nourished by the spirit of the great abbey. Similar witness is given by the numerous monasteries that benefited spiritually from Cluny's influence, as well as those new foundations where the best in the Cluniac tradition was preserved.

In no respect was the fecundity of Cluny more striking than in the widespread and numerous foundations and annexations of monasteries, so that the order reached its greatest and definitive extent under Hugh. Here again, one cannot make a general statement when so many houses are involved, but the impression is that during this period
contact with Cluny was on the whole beneficial and contributed much to the general restoration of monasticism. It was less Cluny's will to reform outside of herself than the force that was brought to bear on her that caused the expansion.

Hugh's abbacy was also a definitive time in the constitutional formation of the order, not least in the momentous decision to retain a juridical bond of connection with dependent houses. This resulted in those gropings towards a system to make this idea effective: the recognition of all monks as members of the community of Cluny, the reduction of many abbeys to the rank of priory, the controlled appointment of abbots and priors. Though much perfecting remained to be done the foundations of the future organisation had been well laid.

Finally, there is the amount achieved by Cluny outside the order, as the ally of the papacy in the work of reform and by those who went out from the order to positions of responsibility in the Church, culminating in the two Cluniac popes, Urban II and Paschal II.

But the contribution of Cluny was made mainly through monasticism. It has even been suggested that in undertaking so much of the practical work of reform Cluny indirectly
contributed to the rise of the new orders. (1) Certainly the way for their ideals was prepared and they were enabled to consolidate their first energies without being drained, since the burden entailed in the purification of the existing order was shouldered by older establishments like Cluny. It is not without interest to note, in support of this theory, examples like the encouragement given to the first Cistercians by Bishop Hugh of Auxerre, a nutritus and monk of Cluny and nephew of Abbot Hugh. (2)

Cluny also promoted other aspects of Church reform, such as the spread of the Roman rite, especially in Spain where the most conscious work in this respect took place. This liturgical life in turn played its part in the formation of a new lay piety. And if the monasticism represented by Cluny became more and more immersed in the society surrounding it, it played its part in knitting that society into the reality of mediaeval Christendom.

Thus, the contribution of Cluny under Hugh was immediate and practical: Cluny, as it were, stood in the gap.

(1) See Schreiber, Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters, p. 156 where the author says with regard to the successful struggles against the Eigenkloster: "Cluny und seine Priorate hatten für Alberich und Stephan Harding, ebenso für Norbert von Xanten und Hugo von Prémontré eine unschätzbare Vorarbeit geleistet."

(2) His Vita is edited in Acta SS. II August, p. 552 ff.
But she did not emerge unscathed. Even disregarding the fact that the defects of the twelfth century must detract somewhat from the glory of the preceding age, there are other indications that all was not well even under Hugh. Moreover, the later situation must have had its beginnings, though the fact that it was largely brought about by an accumulation of factors emerging at different times makes it difficult to point to the beginnings of weakness. Professor Knowles has suggested the establishment of a terminus ad quem, the débâcle of Pons, 1109-1122, and a terminus a quo, between St. Peter Damian's visit, 1063 and that of William of Warenne in 1075, during which period things began to go downhill.\(^1\) These dates find further support in that about 1080, when Ulrich and Bernard were writing, certain disturbing symptoms were definitely, and for the first time, recorded.

The horarium, for one thing, was not conducive to spiritual vitality. Attempts to curtail the ceaseless round of liturgical services and vocal prayer had not been successful or sufficiently far reaching, and under Hugh was felt the cumulative effect of a growth in numbers,

\(^1\) See Knowles, "Cistercians and Cluniacs," p. 9.
larger buildings, commitments towards deceased and
benefactors liberally undertaken in a more spacious age,
and the other accretions of years. It would seem, too,
that Cluny was bound by a false perfectionism whereby the
stress was on getting through the prescribed amount, to
the detriment of assimilation. Something of the weariness
caused by this state of affairs can be discerned in the
"asides" of Ulrich.

Added to this, an increasing number of the community
were incapable of partaking fully in the liturgical round,
or responding to the necessary training, and hence there
was conflict between the basic pattern of life and the
capacity of many of those professing to follow it, which
may be seen as an unconscious drain on the strength of the
community. It also meant the increasing employment of
seculars, both in administration as supervisors of the
domain, and in the ordinary service of the abbey or on
its lands. The horarium was, moreover, inconsistent with
contemporary monastic trends like the pruning of the
timetable to closer conformity with the Rule, the
reintroduction of manual work, and the incorporation of
tendencies proper to the age in the realm of thought and
learning. Such features were seen at their strongest in
the new orders. Even in the liturgical sphere, wherein
Cluny might have been regarded as the examplar, the monastery borrowed and did not create. (1)

Hugh's abbacy seems to have witnessed the beginnings of neglect in the training of novices, pernicious to the wellbeing of any community. The half dozen boys were still an exception here, though by the twelfth century, decrease in numbers of the nutriti must have been having its effects. It is also significant that apart from those few who had been at Cluny during childhood, most of the distinguished Cluniacs of the era, including Morandus, Anastasius, Ulrich, Gerard of La Charité, Paschal II and Urban II, had all received a training and passed most of their formative years elsewhere than at Cluny, sometimes at the distinguished ecclesiastical centres of the day such as Rheims, where Urban II had as his master St. Bruno. Peter the Venerable, often quoted as entirely a product of the Cluniac system, had lived mostly in Cluniac dependent houses before coming to the fountain head as abbot. Similarly, some of Cluny's most capable administrators, like Hunaldus of Moissac and Joceran le Gros, both priors under Hugh, brought to the abbey previous experience of large feudal estates. Hugh himself is the great exception in all this,

(1) This is true of all the liturgical innovations of Hugh's abbacy. It is also true of other developments, such as the chant: see J. Hourlier, 'Remarques sur la notation clunisiennne', in Revue Gregorienne, vol.xxx (1951) pp. 231-40.
but the question arises: was Cluny still a "school of Divine Service" or did it demand that a schooling be already possessed before it was possible to benefit from what Cluny had to give?

Perhaps the most severe threat to the spiritual consolidation of the community under Hugh was the rapid expansion of the order with the attendant unprecedented effusion of the monastery's best men - at cost, it would seem, to Cluny's own stability. The excitement of new foundations and annexations (or had this become by now part of the day's work?), the bustle and activity of building, in short, all the "movement" of the abbacy, both in head and members, made it a critical time, placing a tremendous and sustained strain on the inner resources. This was further aggravated by all the comings and goings incident to the position of the monastery as the second centre of Christendom and head of an ever growing organism.

Signs that the unrest had penetrated the inner sanctuary would seem to be found in the precipitous way the moral temperature fell after Hugh's death. In any case, the size of the community and its constant fluctuations militated against the stability characteristic of the Benedictine monastery and made the preservation of a monastic family difficult. Cluny had lost what Philippeau
calls sa primitive intimité familiale.(1)

This could be seen in the abbot. His frequent absences and numerous commitments beyond the pale of his own community diverted much of his attention away from Cluny itself. Moreover, any cohesion that existed at Cluny rested in him and much of the responsibility accepted by him was of a highly personal kind that depended for its success on his own personal integrity and outstanding ability. Was it the tragedy of his abbacy that he failed to foresee the hiatus that would appear at his death not only because no worthy successor would be forthcoming, no one having been with him sufficiently long to "know the ropes", but because the task was beyond the power of a single ruler without a highly developed organisation to make his position vis-à-vis the order effective?

Again, was it necessary to insist on a juridical link with all monasteries founded or reformed once they were visibly flourishing when the only result was an added burden on Cluny? A suggestion to the contrary is found in the fact that after Hugh's abbacy some monasteries broke away of their own accord, often due to the impetus of a former monk of Cluny, as S. Jean d'Angely in the twelfth century

(1) Philippeau, 'Pour l'histoire de la Coutume de Cluny', p.149.
under Abbot Henry, one of Hugh's former priors. (1)

Even the cohesion magnificently preserved by Hugh was precarious and externally the fabric was visibly weak towards the end of the abbacy when, judging from the doubling up of offices like the chamberlain and cellarer, there seems to have been a lack of even the minimum capable personnel. The rapid turnover of officials probably taxed administrative continuity, especially when change was due to the departure of an official to a position elsewhere than at Cluny.

The point at which the weakness was most tangible was in the economic sphere. The scattered domain of the abbey was disadvantageous and there are signs of neglect in exploitation despite an increasing expenditure on buildings, upkeep of the abbey, and fabulous almsgiving and hospitality. Things were very departmentalised and integration was wanting. This was due, not to a faulty administrative system as much as to the lack of a general supervision of the whole that might have been provided by the abbot had he been less fully occupied. As it was, delegation tended to be abdication, so that the economic position was not easily estimated.

Moreover, the economic interests of the abbey drew her

(1) S. Jean d'Angely, cart. vol. ii, no. 37.
more and more into a secular relationship with society in which she was becoming more of a part every day, in a way that was foreign to the ideals of the founders. This had the weakening effect of a tendency to mitigate any austerity there was, which seems to have begun during Hugh's abbacy, since in Peter the Venerable's tightening up on things like food and clothing, he appeals to the time before Hugh's abbacy. (1)

There is, too, the thorny question of the apparently consistent policy of the appointment of young monks, or at any rate, those who were not long professed, to positions of responsibility. There is no doubt about their capability and integrity but some of them had hardly had time to steep themselves in the Benedictine tradition, or even that of Cluny itself. There will always be the religious prodigy like Hugh, and it is fair to say that Cluny was endowed with a remarkable number of exceptional personalities. But such a policy, coupled with the rapid turnover of officials, was bound to have a profound effect on the direction of the community, one way or another. When the abnormal situation of Cluny under Hugh is taken into account, this policy, not of itself necessarily detrimental, may have

(1) Statute 18, Bibl. Cl. col. 1359; PL 189, col. 1031.
contributed to the disintegration of the spirit of Cluny.

Thus, though visible defects were few, and for the most part it is knowledge of the later situation that causes questioning, a certain dissipation of spiritual and temporal vitality seems to have taken place as Hugh's abbacy proceeded. The sustained extroversion prevented the withdrawal necessary for replenishing and by the time the strain on the resources of the abbey had somewhat lessened Cluny was too spent to renew herself from within.

There is nothing to suggest, however, that all that was happening at Cluny necessarily had repercussions in the dependent houses which were less bound up than is sometimes supposed. In many ways they were better off for being smaller, less famous, and with a more compact economy, while implications of belonging to the Cluniac order that might have been disturbing could usually be avoided. Nevertheless their dependence on Cluny in things like the appointment of priors made their position precarious, as in this matter the instability of Cluny might have been communicated, which William of Warenne was quick to see and from which he safeguarded Lewes. (1) There was, too, the questionable policy of the foundation and annexation of very small priories, which might have been

(1) See above, p. 290-1.
avoided by reorganisation of land. As an organism, the order was as yet far from functioning perfectly, but this was sometimes advantageous to the dependent houses, taking its toll rather on the mother abbey.

Notwithstanding the twelfth century disturbances, one wonders if it could have been otherwise. Professor Knowles' suggestion that it was the misfortune rather than the fault of Cluny seems to be answer to the enigma since, at the turn of the century, external factors over which Cluny had no control were also having their effect, such as the attraction of the new orders for those who might earlier have gone to Cluny; economic tendencies that jeopardized the economy of large establishments; the rivalry of Citeaux, and other later developments that carry us beyond our immediate field. (1) A question more pertinent to Hugh's abbacy is whether Cluny's outpouring, the indirect cause of much of the weakness, could have been restricted or at least more controlled.

This brings us to the problem of the destiny of Cluny under Hugh and it is bound up with deeper issues than begin or end with the abbey or its abbot. If Cluny was at that

(1) See Knowles, 'Cistercians and Cluniacs', where the question of the factors operating in the twelfth century is discussed.
time playing a different role from that usually conceived of as Benedictine this was partly the result of the coincidence of two facts: the emergence of the priesthood as an integral part of monasticism at a time when the Church was undergoing a crisis primarily ministerial. Even without the disintegration, Cluny's position in the Church would have changed with the emergence of orders like the Premonstratensians and other forms of canonical life which had a definite ministerial direction, and orders like Citeaux which had a more purely contemplative form. The need for both was already apparent in the eleventh century, and only when adequate response was made could Cluny again find her balance in the older monastic tradition.

From this point of view the twelfth century can be viewed as a transition period - a sad contrast, it is true, to what had gone before, but a time, too, of stocktaking and integrating those features that had changed forever the face of Cluny. Hence it is possible to speak of the spiritual exhaustion of Cluny rather than a decline, from which it recovered to a quieter place in the contemporary scene.

Cluny, in a sense, had greatness thrust upon her, in the shape of the demands made on her. She can hardly
be blamed for thinking in terms wider than those of her own perpetuation. Indeed, under an abbot less than Hugh disaster might well have come quicker and have been more pronounced. It is certainly hard to imagine that more would have been achieved or more effectively given. But between 1049 and 1109, under one of its greatest abbots, Cluny had come to grips with the perennial problem, and this in an acute form, of when and how to give, when and how to conserve, and who can say where the balance should, or could, have been struck?
Bibliographical note on maps and lists of Cluniac houses

Lists of Monasteries

No official list seems to have been made before the introduction of General Chapters. For the earlier period lists must be compiled from charters and papal bulls, especially those bulls confirming Cluniac possessions, which are occasionally given in some detail. The bulls have been assembled in the collection of P. Simon, Bullarium Cluniacensium, ( Lyons, 1680), but as no copy of this rare book seems to be available in this country the following reference to bulls also printed in the Patrologia Latina are given, though in some, (eg. of Paschal II's bulls) the list of monasteries has been omitted or shortened.

Pope John XI: PL.132, cols.1055 and 1058.
" Leo VII: PL.132, cols.1068, 1069, 1074, and 1082.
" Agapetus II: PL.133, cols.133 and 900.
" Benedict VII: PL.137, col. 332.
" Gregory V: PL.137, col. 932.
" John XIX: PL.141, col.1135.
" Leo IX: PL.143, cols.607 and 658.
" Victor II: PL.143, col. 803.
" Stephen IX: PL.143, col. 879.
" Alexander II: PL.146, col.1293.
" Gregory VII: PL.146, col. 661.
" Urban II: PL.151, cols.291, 410, 485, and 493.
" Paschal II: PL.163, cols. 51, 55, 56, and 204.

Lists pertaining to General Chapters and Visitations from the thirteenth century onwards are more frequent, such as the list of precedence edited by Dom Anger, 'Les préséances dans l'ordre de Cluny', in RB, xxvi (1924) pp. 347 - 50. The longest list is that of the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, (ed. Dom M. Marrier, Paris, 1614, cols. 1705 - 1752) compiled from fourteenth and fifteenth century documents. Recent work on the identification of monasteries was begun by Dom J.M. Besse in the series Archives de la France Monastique: Abbayes et Prieurés de l'ancienne France, (Ligugé and Paris, 1905-). L. Lecestre, Abbayes, Prieurés, et Couvents d'hommes en France, (Paris, 1902) provides a list of the 88 Cluniac monasteries (50 of the strict observance and 38 of the primitive observance - a division that occurred later in the history of the order) from the Commission of Regulars in 1768. Dr. Joan Evans has also

Some regional studies are the best guide to the Cluniac monasteries in a particular area. The following may be quoted:


**ITALY:** L'Huillier, 'I Priorati cluniacensi in Italia', in Brixia Sacra, iii, 1912.


**SWITZERLAND:** Dom B. Egger, Geschichte des Cluniazenserkloster in der Westschweiz, (Freiburg, 1907).

Maps.

The making of these is limited by the difficulties in identifying and locating Cluniac houses. The following are the most useful:

The articles of Dom Cousin (loc. cit.) and Mlle.Berthelier, (loc. cit.) include maps, mainly of France. There are also maps of some of the Cluniac provinces, again mainly those of France, at the end of Dr. Joan Evans' *The Romanesque Architecture of the Order of Cluny*. 
Maps of Benedictine monasteries can also be found at the end of the first volume of Dom P. Schmitz's *Histoire de l'Ordre de S. Benoît*, (Maredsous, 1942). The diocesan maps, (Gallia Sacra, Germania Sacra,) in R.L. Poole's Historical Atlas of Modern Europe, (Oxford, 1902), are also useful in a study of Cluny in the eleventh century. A map of the English Cluniac houses can be found facing p. 48 of R. Graham, *English Ecclesiastical Studies*, (London, 1929) and another fairly comprehensive map is provided by Dr. J. Evans in *Monastic Life at Cluny, 910-1157*, (Oxford, 1931). Maps of Cluniac houses should be used with caution owing to earlier exaggeration in the numbers of houses, the necessity of distinguishing between priories and churches in Cluniac hands, and the difficulty of identifying some of the priories that have long since disappeared without trace.
SOURCES

l. Manuscripts

Archives nationales: L.868, (seventeenth century documents and copies relative to the history of Cluny for a proposed new Bibliotheca Cluniacensis which never materialised).

L.875, (charters relating to Barnstaple).


L'Arсенал: 687, (Collectio generalis statutorum in ordine Cluniacensi variis temporibus. An eighteenth century classification of liturgical statutes from the time of Ulrich and Bernard onwards.)

Bibliothèque Nationale: Ms. latin 2208, (2), (St. Gregory's Moralies containing an early twelfth century copy of Ulrich's Consuetudines, with annotations, f. 173ro.-185vo., probably from S. Martial, Limoges.)

Ms. latin 12,635, (copies of documents relating to Sauxillanges.)

Bodley, Ms. D'Orville: 45, (The Moissac Psalter, with leaves of a calendar belonging to the same abbey.)

From private sources:

Dom B. Albers, Collation of Herrgott's text of Bernard's Ordo Cluniacensis with another ms. of Bernard, Cod. S. Maria Monte Reggio, no. 29, with notes. Preparation for an unpublished volume of the Consuetudines Monasticae. By courtesy of Professor F. Wormald.


2. Printed sources

ANASTASII, Vita, PL 149, cols. 423 - 436.

Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana, Brussels and elsewhere, 1643 onwards.


BERNARD of Cluny, Ordo Cluniacensis, in Herrgott, Vetus Disciplina Monastica, pp. 133 - 364.


Bullarium Sacri Ordinis Cluniacensis, ed. P. Simon, (Lyons, 1830).


De Gallica Profectione Domni Petri Damiani, PL 145, cols. 865 - 30.


auct. Hildeberto Cenomansensi Episcopo, Bibl. Cl. cols. 414 - 39; PL 159, cols. 837 - 92; Acta SS. April, iii, 541 - 56.
auct. Reynaldo Abbate Vezeliacensi, PL 159, cols. 893 - 905; Acta SS. April, iii, 656-61.

Index Priorum Marciniaci, in M.F. Cucherat, Cluny au onzième siècle, (2nd ed., Macon, 1850).


Monumenta Germaniae Historica, ed. G.H. Pertz and others, Scriptores, (Hanover, 1826 - 1913).


Peter the Venerable, Statuta Congregationis Cluniacensis, PL 159, cols. 1023 - 48; Bibl. Cl. cols. 1553 - 77.


3. Cartularies

Barbezieux: 'Cartulaire du Prieuré de Notre Dame de Barbezieux', in Archives historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis, xli (1911).


Cluny: v.s. A. Bernard and A. Bruel, Recueil des Chartes de Cluny.

Dome: Cartulare Monasterii de Dona, (Lyons, 1859).


S. FLOUR: Cartulaire du prieuré de Saint Flour, ed. M. Boudet, (Monaco, 1910).

STE. FOI de MORLAAS: Cartulaire de Sainte Foi de Morlaas, ed. L. Cadier, (Paris, 1834).


Besides these, some of the monographs on Cluniac dependent houses listed below contain pièces justificatives.
MODERN WORKS

ALBERS, Dom B. 'Le plus ancien coutumier de Cluny', in RB, xx (1903) pp.174-184.

ANGER, D. 'Le nombre des moines à Cluny', in RB (1924) xxxvi, pp. 267-271.


" Les monastères de l'ordre de Cluny du XIIIe au XVe siècle', in RB (1892) pp. 97-112.

" Le nombre des moines dans les anciens monastères', in RB, xli (1929) pp. 231-61; xlii (1930) pp.19-42.

" L'Ordre monastique des origines au XIIe siècle, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1921).


BOISSONNADE, P. 'Cluny, la Papauté, et la première grande croisade internationale contre les Sarrasins d'Espagne', in Revue des questions historiques, cxvii (1933) 257-301.

BORINO, G.B. 'Uebbrando non si fece monaco a Roma', in Studi Gregoriani, iv (1952) pp. 441-56.

BOUILLET, C. Histoire du prieuré de S. Martin d'Ambière, (Roanne, 1910).


BRUEL, A. 'Note sur la transcription des actes privés', in Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes, xxxvi (1875) pp. 445-446.


CHAUME, M. 'Les grands prieurs de Cluny', in RM, xxviii (1938) pp. 147-152.


CONANT, K.J. 'Mediaeval Academy excavations at Cluny', in Speculum, xxix, (1954) pp. 1-45 with plates. A bibliography of previous articles on the same theme may be found on p.1, n.1.


COTTINEAU, Dom L.H. Répertoire topo-bibliographique des Abbayes et Prieurés, (Macon, 1937).


CUCHERAT, M.F. Cluny au onzième siècle, son influence religieuse, intellectuelle et politique, (2nd ed. Macon, 1850). The first edition does not contain the pièces justificatives printed in the second.
CUCHERAT, F. 'Semur en Brionnais depuis l'an 860 jusqu'à nos jours', in Mémoires de la Société Éduenne, xvi (1888) pp. 95-175.


Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie, ed. F. Cabrol and H. Declercq (Paris, 1903-).

Dictionnaire de Droit Canonique, ed. R. Naz (Paris, 1935-).


Dictionnaire de Spiritualité, ed. M. Viller (Paris, 1932-).

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, ed. A. Vacant, E. Mangenot, and E. Amann (Paris, 1903-).


"La Société aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles dans la région Maconnaisse, (Paris, 1953).

EGGER, Dom P.B. Geschichte des Clunizenserklöster in der Westschweiz, (Freiburger historische Studien, iii, 1907).

"Die schweizerischen Cluniacenserklöster zur Zeit ihrer Blüte', in Millénaire, pp. 374-36.


GAMS, Dom P.B. Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae, (Leipzig, 1931).

GAY, J. 'L'Abbaye de Cluny et Byzance au début du XIIe siècle', in Echoes d'Orient, xxxiv (1931) pp. 84-90.

GOIFFON, Saint Gilles, son abbaye, son grand prieuré, sa paroisse, (Nîmes, 1882).


" English Ecclesiastical Studies, (London, 1929), especially the following: The Relation of Cluny to some other movements of Monastic Reform, pp. 1-29, and Life at Cluny in the eleventh century, pp. 30-45.


GUILLOREAU, Dom L. 'Les prieurés anglais de l'ordre de Cluny', in Millénaire.


HAUVILLER, E. Ulrich von Cluny, (Münster, 1896).


HOFFMANN, E. Das Konverseninstitut des Cisterzienserordens, (Freiburger historische Studien, I, 1905).

HOU RLIER, J. 'Remarques sur la Notation clunisiennne', in Revue gregorienne, xxx (1951) pp. 231-40.


" 'The Reforming Decrees of Peter the Venerable', in Petrus Venerabilis, 1156-1956 (Studia Anselmiana, xl, 1957 Rome).


L ABBE, P. Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, ed. J.D. Mansi, (Florence and Venice, 1759-98).

LACURIE, Histoire de l'Abbaye de Maillézea, (Fontenay le Comte, 1852), with pièces justificatives.


LEHMANN, R. Forschungen zur Geschichte des Abtes Hugo von Cluny, (Göttingen, 1869).
LETONNELIER, G. 'L'Abbaye de Cluny et le privilège de l'exemption', in Millénaire, pp. 247-263.


L'HUILLIER, Dom A. 'I p r i o r a t i cluniacense in Italia', in Brixia Sacra, iii (1912).

Vie de S. Hugues Abbé de Cluny, 1024-1109, Solesmes, 1933).

LUCHAIRE, A. Manuel des Insititutions françaises, (Paris, 1892).


MORTET, V. 'Note sur la date de rédaction des coutumes de Cluny, dites de Farfa', in Millénaire.

NEUMANN, R. De Sancto Hugone Abbate VI Cluniacense, (Vratislav, 1870).


RAFFIN, L. 'Une forteresse clunisienne: Le Chateau de Lourdon', in Millénaire.


RUPIN, E. L'Abbaye et les Cloîtres de Moissac, (Paris, 1897).
SABBE, E. 'La Réforme clunisiéenne en Flandre au début du XIIe siècle', in Revue belge de Philologie et d'Histoire, ix (1930) pp. 121-38.


SCHMITZ, Dom P. arts. Bénédictine (Règle), S. Benoît, Bénédictines, etc. in DHG, DDC, and DS.


" Un Conflit entre monastères de Clunisiennes d'après la correspondance inédite de Pierre le Venerable', in RB, xlix (1937) pp. 366-75.

SCHREIBER, G. Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters, Münster, 1948, containing especially:
II, Cluny und die Eigenkirche, pp. 81-139;
III, Zur cluniasischen Reform, pp. 139-51;
IV, Kirchliches Abgabenwesen an französischen Eigenkirchen.


STIENNONG, J. 'Cluny et Saint-Trond au XIIe siècle', in Anciens Pays et Assemblées d'États, viii (Louvain 1955).


VALOUS, G. de, Le domaine de 'Abbaye de Cluny aux Xe et Xle siècles (Paris, 1923).


VAN DIJK, S.J.P. 'Medieval Terminology and Methods of Psalm singing', in Musica Disciplina, vii (1952). (Rome)


WERNER, E. Die gesellschaftlichen Grundlagen der Klosterreform im II Jahrhundert, (Berlin, 1953).

WILMART, Dom A. 'Le Couvent et la bibliothèque de Cluny vers le milieu du XIe siècle', in RM (1921) pp. 89-124.


WILLIAMS, W. Monastic Studies, (Manchester, 1938).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Matins</th>
<th>Matins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.30 a.m.</td>
<td>NOCTURNS</td>
<td>Thirty last psalms</td>
<td>Office of the dead</td>
<td>Matins of All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Lectio</td>
<td>NOCTURNS</td>
<td>Matins of All Saints</td>
<td>Deus Auribus or Verba mea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>MATINS</td>
<td>MATINS</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>Lectio</td>
<td>PRIME</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>PRIME</td>
<td>PRIME</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Lectio</td>
<td>PRIME</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>TERCE</td>
<td>Oratio</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>TERCE</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 noon</td>
<td>SEXT</td>
<td>SEXT</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15 p.m.</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Psalms for familiars</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Psalms for familiars</td>
<td>Psalms for familiars</td>
<td>Psalms for familiars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Lectio</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
<td>2 psalms (prostrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>VESPERS</td>
<td>VESPERS</td>
<td>Vespers of All Saints</td>
<td>Vespers of All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>COMPLINE</td>
<td>COMPLINE</td>
<td>(?) Psalms for familiars</td>
<td>Psalms for familiars</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These timetables are reproduced from Knowles 'The Monastic Horarium', p. 721 f. Clock times, which can be estimated for the Rule, do not apply to Cluny.
† Lent had the most weighty liturgical observance.
‡ Reconstructed from Ulrich, especially ib.1, cap.5, col.646 f.
§ 2 psalms (prostrate) only said in Lent.
¶ Said during the procession.
Plan of the Abbey of Cluny, 1043.

Plans by Professor K.J. Conant, from
Plan of the Abbey of Cluny, 1085.

Plan of the Abbey of Cluny, 1157.


Plates VII, IX and X are reproduced here.