

THE MIDDLE AGES a series edited by
EDWARD PETERS *Henry Charles Lea Professor*
of Medieval History, University of Pennsylvania

RHINOCEROS
BOUND: *Cluny*
in the Tenth Century

BARBARA H. ROSENWEIN



UP UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS
1982 · Philadelphia

invoked. An example of the way law determined form may be seen in Gerald's zeal for sobriety: "the blessed prince, who ate at the right time for restoration and not for pleasure, used to observe that precept of Scripture [i.e., the precept to be sober]."¹¹⁰ It was not the general spirit of the law that Odo had in mind. Rather, in Odo's account, Gerald understood the precept literally and gave it a concrete and unvarying meaning in his life. Sobriety meant specifically not eating before the third hour on ordinary days and observing fast days by postponing the meal until the ninth hour.¹¹¹ And when, because of other responsibilities, Gerald varied his routine and, for example, observed a fast on an alternate day, Odo was quick to explain that this was proper because "it was allowed a layman, especially one so just, to use licitly those things which are not licit to those whose profession forbids them."¹¹² Gerald did not, therefore, break the law but rather adhered to the one proper for his station: "But if a fast had occurred on a Sunday, he did not at all break it nor omit it for the occasion, but he kept the solemnity of the fast on the preceding Saturday."¹¹³

Behaviors justified and presumably determined by these norms were incorporated into a complex and orderly routine of daily living. It is not surprising that elements of church liturgy became a regular part of Gerald's schedule, because these were already ritualized expressions of piety. Every day Gerald completed the Divine Office, recited the entire psalter, and attended mass.¹¹⁴ He set out food for the poor and heard the *lectio divina* at his own table.¹¹⁵ After he took the tonsure, he intensified his liturgical activities:

For he was so intent on listening alternately to readings and prayers—now with others, now alone—that it is a marvel how he could have so much zeal for these things and also want to finish so great a number of psalms.¹¹⁶

Every act of Gerald's life came to be—and was depicted as such with approval by Odo—an act of devotion. Gerald found the laws that turned banal activities of everyday necessity into pious ritual:

He had noted to himself certain holy words which seemed to fit bodily duties. Thus, before he began to speak in the morning he said: "Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth and a door round about my lips" (Ps. 140:32) and there were other sayings of this sort which he adapted to particular actions, for

example when he awoke, when he got out of bed, when he put on his shoes, when he took up his clothes, or his belt, or certainly when he began a journey or anything else.¹¹⁷

Thus, all of Gerald's acts became part of a quasi-liturgical sequence. They were always planned, and they became invariable as well: "He so held to this manner of living in his external way of life that his servants knew how he would act at every season of the year."¹¹⁸ Even the unpredictable was anticipated and managed by a predetermined plan:

He never incurred a nocturnal emission without grieving. For, however often that misfortune of humanity happened to him while sleeping, a chamber servant used to bring him privately, in an adjoining place, of course, a change of clothes always prepared for this, and a towel and a vessel of water.¹¹⁹

Thus the expedient became, through use, a law of its own, taking its place among the many *regulae* which Gerald followed.

For Odo, therefore, virtue was demonstrated and maintained by constraints. The poor man was constrained, by his very position, to the life-style of humility enjoined by the Bible. The powerful man was not constrained by circumstance, but by knowledge. It was no accident that Odo depicted Gerald as a lover of Scripture, for in Scripture he would find the laws he needed to follow. These would "bridle the beast." In his "sermon to the powerful," Odo had spoken of the purpose and the limits of power. Now in the *Vita Geraldii*, he connected both of these to *disciplina*, that is, lawfulness. The passage by Gregory the Great that had inspired Odo's sermon in the *Collationes* was a comment on Job 39:10: "Will you bind the rhinoceros to the plow with your thong, or will he break the clods of the valleys behind you?" The rhinoceros, Gregory had explained, was an earthly prince; the thong was the bond of faith; the clods were unbelievers, including haughty men who violently afflicted the humble.¹²⁰ Now, in the *Vita Geraldii*, Gerald became the rhinoceros who, voluntarily limiting the use of his own power so that he could prevent the misuse of power by others, aided the church:

[Gerald knew] that the rhinoceros, that is, any powerful man, is bound with a thong so that he may crush the clods of the valleys, that is, the oppressors of the humble. . . . It was allowed, therefore, to a layman belonging to the order of

For what way of life could he show more pleasing to God than that in which he neither neglected the general good nor diminished any of the perfection of his own life-style? Indeed, what life-style has shown itself so very valuable and so very useful to many, yet was known to God alone?⁹⁹

Concern for the general good was a corollary of the biblical injunction of charity; the perfection of life was the norm of Christ and the saints. The animating principle of Gerald's life-style as Odo conceived it was scrupulous adherence to such models and directives. Had Odo himself made our observation in Chapter 2—that many in Gerald's position were men unused to their new status and their power—his injunctions could not have been more apposite. Odo countered normlessness with discipline (*disciplina*); its essence for Odo was lawfulness.¹⁰⁰ Every act was determined by (or rather understood as determined by) a divine directive. The laws existed primarily in the Old and New Testaments, but Odo thought that they might be found in any place God chose—in miracles, in customs, in nature, in history, and biography—all properly understood, of course.¹⁰¹ In the *Collationes*, Odo spoke of the disciplinary effects of Scripture—"the Lord's precepts . . . by their own laws curb us from evil deeds"—and also of the reassurance men needed that an obedient life was possible: "It is demonstrated to be easy by the examples of the fathers."¹⁰² Gerald was cast in their mold: "The law of the Lord always resounded in his mouth," Odo wrote, and "he seemed to do everything in the name of the Lord."¹⁰³

Odo meant this literally. He conceived of every aspect of Gerald's life as being regulated by divine law. There was no question that Gerald had deviated from the usual "warrior of Christ"; contemporaries might complain that Gerald was in fact deviating from a divinely appointed norm. On the contrary, Odo argued:

Truly, no one ought to be worried because a just man sometimes makes use of fighting, which seems incompatible with religion.¹⁰⁴

The fact is, Odo continued, there was a different, equally divinely inspired model that Gerald was following to the letter, namely, the just men of the Old Testament. These men went to war, but only in order to defend those who could not defend themselves:

Indeed, some of the fathers, although they had been the most holy and the most patient, nevertheless used to take up arms

manfully in adversities when the cause of justice demanded, as Abraham, who destroyed a great multitude of the enemy to rescue his nephew.¹⁰⁵

If Gerald's battles were on behalf of others, then this was because, by heeding the cry of the poor, Gerald did the work of the Lord.¹⁰⁶ Such was the testimony of Scripture—"as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me," says Christ in Matthew—and it was the lesson of St. Martin as well: "Therefore that night, after [Martin] had given himself up to sleep, he saw Christ clothed in the part of his cloak, with which he had covered a poor man."¹⁰⁷

In the case of Gerald's strange way of fighting, Odo quoted no source. He may have considered that the avoidance of bloodshed was an injunction that went without saying. But the necessary precedent existed in Sulpicius Severus' St. Martin, a model that Odo knew.¹⁰⁸ In this *Vita*, after St. Martin declares himself "Christ's soldier" and therefore unwilling to fight the enemy, a military victory ensues anyway, precisely because of Martin's sensibilities:

The enemy sent ambassadors of peace, giving up themselves and all their things. Hence who can doubt that this had truly been a victory of the blessed man, to whom it was granted lest he be sent to the battle unarmed? And although the good Lord could have saved his soldier even among the swords and javelins of the enemy, still, lest [Martin's] holy gaze be violated by the deaths of others, He removed the necessity for battle. For Christ was bound not to grant any other victory for his own soldier than that, since the enemy were beaten bloodlessly, no man should die.¹⁰⁹

If one considers that wielding a sword hilt forward has the net effect of not wielding a sword at all, even Gerald's weaponry recalls the example of Martin. But this need not be—and probably was not—the only source for Odo. We have already mentioned Nazianzen's sentiment that the sword remain unpolluted by blood. Odo's realization of this hope in Gerald as much as turned the words of the Greek father into an order fulfilled.

The scrupulous adherence to set and presumably divinely inspired standards ran like a *leitmotif* through the *Vita Geraldii*. The wellspring, not only of the principles of Gerald's behavior but also of their very form, was external law. For the most part the law was biblical, but other sources, some of them perhaps lost to us or at least unfamiliar, were also

fighters to carry the sword, so that he might defend the unarmed masses . . . and so that he might check either by the judgment of war or by the force of the judiciary those whom ecclesiastical censure was not able to subdue.¹²¹

The constraints on Gerald's power—the thongs that bound him—were, as the examples above have shown, the laws belonging to the order of fighters. Odo could not have made the pivotal position of the law more explicit. He equated Gerald with Noah, "a man of God who lived according to the law."¹²² Yet a modern perspective cannot help but notice an important difference. Noah's law had been "God's way," enjoined on all believers. Gerald's laws were at once more specific in object and more diverse in origin. As to object, Odo was careful to distinguish the laws proper to the order of fighters from the laws applicable to other *ordines* in human society.¹²³ As to origin, some of the laws Odo spoke about derived from Scripture, some from pious custom, some from the model of the Fathers and the saints. Yet for Odo the difference was only apparent. God was the ultimate and unitary source of all righteous laws. Hence Gerald's life, reflecting its creator, blended seemingly diverse directives into the harmonious and orderly whole proper for all men.

The result of this strictly regulated, lawful, and godly behavior was success. Gerald and his followers were always victorious. In one incident, Gerald conquered by reciting a psalm; in another his opponent, miraculously lured from a fortified position, sued for peace. In yet another miracle, his adversaries overestimated his troops and retired.¹²⁴ When forced to fight, Gerald's enemies went down to defeat in the clear manner of a prizefight: Gerald "broke the teeth of the wicked."¹²⁵

Gerald not only thrived militarily, but he also amassed a greater fortune than his fellow magnates, and inadvertently impoverished his enemies:¹²⁶ "Whoever had hurt him, as if he had committed a sacrilege, was certain not to allow himself to prosper."¹²⁷ Gerald maintained his independence against potential overlords, holding himself a servant of God alone.¹²⁸ The relationship between Gerald and God was, of course, the key to Gerald's success, which extended into the eternal order as well: Gerald's salvation was certain. Thus, Gerald's discipline won him life after death and power in the world. It was an unbeatable combination, and as Odo asked, "What life-style could be more valuable?"

It was Gerald's lawfulness that made his power work for him. Theoretically, every sort of power came from God. If a powerful man,

a worldly *potentior*, oppressed others, he was still, unknowingly, using his power to carry out the predestined plan. On the other hand, his temporal power would not save him eternally; his success was ephemeral; his power was partial and weak. Gerald's power was real, the result of God's grace. In this way, Gerald was the equal of an anointed king.

The primitive Germanic king had been the guarantor of prosperity, his key attributes being strength and success. Later, as we have seen, he acquired the additional power of protecting the church and carrying out Christ's precepts on behalf of the weak. Those who were not kings, however, had no such essential ecclesiastical function. With Gerald of Aurillac, Odo ascribed royal duties and royal powers to an independent fighter. He compared Gerald to kings David, Ezechias and Josias—"were they not powerful and bellicose?" he queried—thus in one stroke leveling kings with warriors.¹²⁹ There was another basis for the comparison: Odo likened Gerald to "Oswald, king of the English, whom God glorified by signs [because] he was zealous to glorify God by observing His commands."¹³⁰ The emphasis was no longer on anointment; it was on obedience. Adherence to divine laws was Odo's only hope for reordering the human condition, making it amenable to the working of God's grace even as it witnessed to that grace. There need be no essential difference between strong men and kings. Power was delegated directly by Christ, the Commander. He gave the orders. It was up to the strong men to listen and to carry them out.

Most men did not do so, and for them the very model of Gerald was meant to be salvific. Gerald, rising above the ineluctable hold of sin, could obey God's laws and therefore call upon the powers inherent in God's might. Through him, others would learn:

And let [Gerald's unruly neighbors] not think the observance of the commands of God hard or impossible since in fact it is seen that they were observed by a lay and powerful man.¹³¹

That most people did not learn went without saying; it was inevitable, given human nature. If the commands were to be followed, they would have to be imposed. Hence if Gerald's first redemptive function was as a paradigm for fighters, his second was as a rhinoceros trampling them down.

As caught in the prism of the charters, the world outside Cluny presented much the same unregulated features as it did in Odo's writ-

ings. There we see the same laments about the human condition, about sin, and, above all, about the need for redemption. Most of the deeds involved land transactions with the monastery, connected indissolubly with questions of salvation according to the testimony of the charters. It was clear that one form of spiritual discipline was gift-giving. There was nothing unique about the sentiments expressed in the Cluniac charters. They contained the same *formulae* as those which paraded through the extant cartularies from the Merovingian and Carolingian periods and through the charters of monasteries contemporary with Cluny. The gift set up a bond between the donor and monks. At Cluny, to be more precise, it set up a link between the donor, the monks, and SS. Peter and Paul, to whom the monks at Cluny were dedicated. In 928, for example, Bertasia, the step-mother of that Letbald who later entered Cluny, gave three *curtiles* to Cluny:

For the salvation of the soul of my lord [husband] Warulf, and my own, and for the souls of all our relatives and of all Christians, through the intercession of blessed Peter and Paul and other saints. May the good Lord deign to free our souls from the punishments below.¹³²

Toward the end of the tenth century, new and more stringent forms of discipline were perceived to be necessary. When old institutions of law and order in Cluny's immediate locale were disintegrating, the Cluniac abbot, in concert with other ecclesiastic officials, in effect proclaimed some of the laws they thought appropriate for the different grades of men in the vicinity. We have already discussed some of the implications of this Council of Anse of 994.¹³³ The series of positive injunctions and negative prohibitions that it drew up was based indifferently on biblical precepts, canon laws, and defunct Carolingian legislation. The cleric was not allowed to hunt. The layman was enjoined to observe the sabbath and go to mass. The count was forbidden to enter Cluny's "holy precincts." Men of "higher secular and military authority" or those living next to Cluny were forbidden to make off with Cluny's property. Each special station in life brought with it special laws. The ordinary layman was simply required to go to mass, but the highly placed layman had to honor Cluny's liberty as well; after all, he was the only one in a position to be tempted to violate it. Disobedience carried with it the threat of anathema. Obedience, on the other hand,

merited blessings, including those of a very tangible nature: powerful men were given some of Cluny's outlying lands to protect.

Thus, in Cluniac eyes, the world was unruly in the root sense of that term: ungoverned by rule. Unwittingly, of course, all was going according to God's plan. But for individuals to survive and surmount this well-merited and almost insurmountable disorder, there had to be a knowledge of and adherence to God's many laws. Keeping in mind the changes outlined in Chapter 2, we may say that the Cluniac emphasis on restraint, on lawfulness, on prescribed and ritual behavior, was the antidote to the social and political transformations of the tenth century. In Chapter 5, we shall argue that Cluniac discipline was, in fact, a response to—and the antithesis of—anomie. The Cluniacs saw men gaining new positions of power, institutions of peace and order changing, and the poor victimized. Their prescribed remedy was scrupulous adherence to norms that, in their view, were uniquely enduring. The Lord's precepts were thongs, restraining untutored wills.

If the Cluniacs rejected the world for the monastery, it was because the monastery offered just such harnesses. The following chapter will demonstrate the ways in which this idea informed the Cluniacs' perception of their own monasticism.

men sought to follow more clearly sanctioned paths as well. They took pains, as we have seen in Chapter 2, to legitimize their new positions. Those who would be kings—like Rudolf of Burgundy and Hugh Capet—sought election, certainly a norm in early Germanic society. Others appropriated titles: Alberic became prince of Rome; Lambert became count of Chalon. Moreover, many sought to justify their appropriation: Lambert attributed his new status to God; Geoffrey Greymantle claimed the grace of the duke of France as well.²⁵ These men wanted the blessings of the church. Raoul's penance at Reims is one example. The sponsorship of monasteries reformed by Cluny is another.

We have suggested that the support of Cluny was a socially constructive response to anomie. However, thus far, it looks as if it was constructive only in the negative sense of not being destructive. Support of Cluny was not suicidal, nor was it (in any immediately clear way, at least) deviant. On the contrary, Cluny was the model of the proper, traditional, hence normative monastery.

At this point, therefore, it is necessary to discuss briefly what some sociologists have already identified as functional responses to anomie.²⁶ These may be categorized under four general headings: normative reactions, quest for community, normalization, and adaptive social control. Normative reactions, as defined by Becker, is the attempt on the part of a group or institution to reaffirm old norms.²⁷ The quest for community is a way of circumventing the alienation engendered by anomie: it leads to subsocieties in which the anomie of the larger community is rendered less acute by the solidarity of the smaller.²⁸ Normalization, on the other hand, involves the attempt to turn deviation itself into a norm: new rules are elaborated that legitimize the hitherto illegitimate behavior.²⁹ Adaptive social control, as formulated by Nett, is less extreme than this: social institutions sometimes are able to integrate deviant behavior into the old norms. Close to this idea is that of Dubin's "typology of deviant adaptations" in which innovative substitutions for both norms and means are identified.³⁰

In the context of its donors' anomie, Cluny answered each of these purposes, and with regard to the last point, Cluny's solution suggests a paradigm of adaptive social control somewhat different from that of either integration or substitution.

It is the normative reaction at Cluny that is most striking. People in new positions of status and power supported a monasticism devoted to mastering old traditions and adhering to manifold laws. They

founded monasteries or renewed the endowments and religious lives of old ones. The Cluniacs imposed an *ordo* (their donors wanted them to do precisely this) that disciplined other monks to adhere to the exact rites that the Cluniacs themselves followed. Other monasteries followed idiosyncratic custom; at Cluny, custom was law. In this sense, Cluny's organization was the very antithesis of anomie.

If Cluny affirmed stability in the face of change, it also served to connect its donors with its solid bedrock of correct behavior. This association was implicit in any request the donor might make regarding prayers for his soul. In addition, the quest for community was explicitly met at Cluny, as at other monasteries, through systems of confraternities.³¹ These gave the laymen and bishops who joined them a vicarious part in the observances and prayers of the monks, linking them both to the monastic community and to the community of saints. Confraternities evolved into a particularly well-developed institution at Cluny during the eleventh century.

These were functional responses, but they were not particularly socially constructive. They point to a formalism for its own sake, or for the sake of a tradition-seeking clientele. In this sense, Cluny's significance was to give the semblance of order to those experiencing disorder. However, there was more to Cluny's adherence to old laws than this. Cluniac writings and daily round presented the possibility and the realization of disorder turned into order. Implicitly, this served to justify the fragmentation of power. We must recall that the mobility of the ninth and tenth centuries resulted in the sharing out—or, at any rate, the dispersal—of power into many hands. The Cluniac model of order made a virtue of this disintegration. God's directives, even for the monastery, were not to be found in one place, one law, one man; they were refracted, like the sun's beams. The world, in its own way, also had many sources of borrowed light. Here God acted like a puppeteer, synchronizing and coordinating the efforts of seemingly independent strong men by the taut strings of His many laws.

Taken at face value, this is an example of normalization at its most self-serving.³² It justified any seizure of power, any imposition of seigneurial rights, any appropriation of title, and any oppression engendered by these acts. But, as we have seen, this was not the point at all. The Cluniacs' form of legalism, both within and without the monastery, did not turn deviant behavior into the norm. Instead, it incorporated only certain, select aspects of the new behavior into a now transformed

value system. In this way, the Cluniac life-style and ideology together provided an instructive example of adaptive social control. Within the monastery, rules did not legitimize just any behavior. Above all, rules were used to mitigate war: the individual, warring within himself, became virtuous; the monastic community, bickering within itself, became orderly; the society of professed monks, each adhering to a different standard, became unanimous.³³ Odo's patience, the touchstone of his obedience to God's precepts, put an end to petty feuds within the monastery and overcame the armed opposition of the monks at Fleury.

All this was behind the formalism at Cluny because the Cluniacs believed that human willfulness would lead to violence if uncontrolled by the harnesses of God's laws. On the other hand, if God's laws were followed, violence and injustice would be contained and virtue and patience fostered. The mode of containment was neither utterly repressive nor indiscriminately all-embracing, but rather was carefully delimiting. The Cluniacs tried neither to stamp out the problems they saw in human nature nor to justify everything as proper, but rather to control and channel behavior. Because of their view of God's creative role, they did not condemn anything outright; they saw positive possibilities inherent in all things. The trick was to discipline the negative aspects. The rhinoceros had to be bound. Thus, within the monastery, individual idiosyncracy was not tolerated as such, but it might well be incorporated into the daily round as law. Violence, too, was not allowed as such; but coercion was part and parcel of Cluniac reforming activities. The use of power was not stamped out but was allowed in certain prescribed circumstances, as when the monks of Fleury were forced—for their own good—to follow the Cluniac way of life.

This view of social amelioration was the more complete (and perhaps the more efficacious) because it promised a reward in the end: success. Cluniac legalism was perceived as the way to tap the powers inherent in the Christian cosmology. As we have seen, when the monks adhered to the law, they always triumphed.

All this is still more clear in the Cluniac teaching on the delimiting of armed power. Once again their legalism mitigated the extremes of wanton violence on the one hand and passive victimization on the other. In the Cluniac perception of the well-ordered world, fighting was not banned but was circumscribed by conventions of motive, time, place, and form. This had immediate practical effect on Cluny's supporters, for one salient fact of Cluniac monasteries was their immunity from lay

domination.³⁴ The subtlety of this limitation on power may best be seen in the Mâconnais at the end of the tenth century, when the castellans, now with new seigneurial status, were forbidden by the Council of Anse to enter Cluny's central sanctuary but were given alternative, outlying lands to protect.³⁵

Ambition, too, was delimited by considerations of charity, considerations that were discoverable in divine precepts, as the example of St. Gerald was meant to show. With both violence and ambition now tamed, illegitimate, uncertain, or innovative forms of power on the one hand, and loss of power on the other, found justification in a new scheme of things. For, in the Cluniac view, although there was divine origin in all power and in all lack of power, at the same time each condition had responsibilities attached to it. These responsibilities were not built into the social fabric, known by men because stable conditions and norms of behavior implied them. On the contrary, they were built into the divine order of things, knowable from books and traditions independent of any particular social or political organization. Gerald of Aurillac did not need to be the vassal of anyone but God, but there his obedience had to be complete. Social anomie was tamed by God's good laws. Once again, the final justification for the restraint demanded by this program of behavior was the success promised when it was properly carried out.

In Merton's terms, Cluny offered a new institutionalized means toward the goal of gaining new power. It neither integrated deviant behavior wholesale, nor substituted new behavior for it, but rather delimited deviation. This adaptation may be viewed as bipartite: it involved the rejection of certain forms of antisocial behavior along with the extraction and fostering of many aspects of these same behaviors.³⁶

Sociological theory makes no claim, nor is it implied here, that this sort of process was deliberate or even conscious on the part of the Cluniacs or the clientele they served. The question of Cluny's significance—the problem of this book—is quite different from the question of Cluny's purpose—the problem of the monks and their patrons. Cluny's significance must be discovered from disparate kinds of written sources and an analysis of circumstances. The supporters of Cluny provide the connection between those circumstances and Cluniac ideals. These people admired and fostered Cluny's legalistic mentality when they called upon its abbots to reform the monasteries they set up. They demanded the Cluniac style of doing things. There is no reason to

Abtsviten" (Dissertation, Nürnberg, 1972), pp. 36-62; G. Arnaldi, "Il biografo 'romano' di Oddone di Cluny," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano per il Medio Edo e Archivio Muratoriano*, no. 71 (1959), pp. 19-37; idem, "La 'vita Odonis,'" *Spiritualità cluniacense* (supra, Chapter 1, n. 71), pp. 245-49.

4. John gives the date 939 in *Vita Odonis* 1.4, *PL*, 133: col. 45, but it has been disputed and changed to 938 by Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser*, 1: 359, and Arnaldi, "Il biografo," pp. 20-22.

5. Arnaldi, "Il biografo," pp. 35-36.

6. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 1.4, *PL*, 133: col. 45: "me infelicem dignatus est sibi socium sumere."

7. Arnaldi, "Il biografo," pp. 35-36. Sackur thinks that John was a simple monk at Salerno, Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser*, 1: 362, but Sitwell, *Odo of Cluny*, p. 44, n. 3, argues that he was an abbot, while Arnaldi, "Il biografo," p. 25, allows for the possibility of either prior or abbot. John refers to himself as prior of his monastery; John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 2.4, *PL*, 133: col. 62.

8. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 1.14, *PL*, 133: col. 49: "Nunc transcurram ocios ad contemptus rerum. Laudent ergo qui volunt expulsores daemonum, caratores cadaverum, caeterosque infamatos viros virtutibus. Ego inter omnes exiguis, Odonis mei primam patientiae laudabo virtutem deinde contemptum rerum, post haec animarum lucrum, restaurationem coenobiorum, vestimentum cibumque monachorum, pacem Ecclesiarum, concordiam regum et principum, custodiam viarum omnium, instantiam mandatorum, perseverantiam vigilarum et orationum, respectus pauperum, correptionem juvenum, honorem senum, emendationem morum, amorem virginum, consolationem continentium, misericordiam miserorum, intemeratam observantiam regularum, ad postremum specimen omnium virtutum."

9. Ibid., 1.29, col. 56: "Nosti consuetudinum Bernonis abbatis? . . . Heu, heu, si sciretis quam dure scit ille monachum tractare. Correptionem vero suam sequuntur verbera, et rursum quos verberat compedibus ligat, domat carcere, jejuniis affigit: et haec omnia perpessus, nec sic suam potest miser impetrare gratiam."

10. Cf. *RB* 2.11-15, *SC*, 181: 444.

11. John called the brethren "childish" in *Vita Odonis* 1.34, *PL*, 133: col. 58: "fratres . . . mente et actione juvenes."

12. Ibid.: "At vero vir pacificus Odo seorsum eos ducebat, et innocens quasi reus eorum pedibus se prosternebat veniam petens, non tamen metu humano, sed amore fraterno, nimis ut patientia corrigeret quos videbat divinam incurre ultiōnem. Compescabantur tandem aliquando ab ejus patientia: sed more labentis aquae protinus ad propria revertebantur vitia. Illum namque quem imitari debuerant, econtra insequebantur."

13. Ibid., 2.8-9, *PL*, 133: col. 66: "persecutoribus suis manus aperiret et palmas extenderet. . . . Quidam rusticus voluit eum propter lagunculam aquae occidere. . . . Quo auditio [i.e., that Alberic wanted to amputate the hand] dominus abbas Odo obnixius ne fieret exoravit, et rusticum illum incolumem atque indemnum absolvit."

14. Ibid., 2.6, col. 64.

15. Ibid., 3.8, col. 81: "Quorum adventu fratres cognito, sumptis gladiis alii ascenderunt aedificiorum tecta, quasi hostes suos lapidibus et missilibus coelorum jaculaturi. Alii muniti clypeis, accinctis ensibus monasterii observabant aditum, prius se mori fatentes quam eos introire sinerent, aut abbatem alterius ordinis susciperent. . . . At postmodum pater Odo cunctis ignorantibus ascendit ascellum, et coepit ire concite ad praedictum monasterium. Episcopi vero et qui cum ipsis erant comites simul cum suis currebant post eum clamantes: Quo is, pater? an fortassis queris mortem? anne vides quia parati sunt te interficere? qua videlicet hora accesseris ad eos morte morieris. Velisne eis de tuo interitu facere gaudium, et nobis exitialem luctum? has et hujuscemodi voces post eum mittentes. Sed, sicut Scriptura ait: Justus ut leo confidens absque terrore erit; accepto itinere eum nullomodo potuerunt declinare. Mira dicturus sum. Appropinquante autem illo et agnitus ab his qui eum prius noverant, hi qui tunc resistebant protinus commoti sunt et immutati, ita ut proculdubio dicere possim: Haec est mutatio dexteræ Excelsi. Revera extemplo projectis armis exierunt obviam ei, ejusque sunt amplexati vestigia."

16. On the new tenth-century combination of practical action and inward humility, see E. Auerbach, *Literary Language and Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*, trans. R. Manheim (New York, 1965), p. 163.

17. Jotsaldus, *De vita et virtutibus sancti Odilonis abbatis* 1.7, *PL*, 142: col. 902.

18. On the Council of Anse, supra, Chapter 2, p. 36, and Chapter 3, pp. 82-83.

19. On the nature of Carolingian monastic reform, cf. J. Semmler, "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 74 (1963): 15-82. On the historiography of the question, cf. B. H. Rosenwein, "Rules and the Rule at Tenth-Century Cluny," *Studia Monastica* 19 (1977): 307-20.

20. On Gallican customs before the Carolingian reforms, see the monastic customaries published in *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, ed. K. Hallinger, vol. 1, *Initia consuetudinis Benedictinae* (Siegburg, 1963) (hereafter *CCM*), pp. 3-92.

21. For this interpretation of Benedict's reforms, cf. Semmler, "Beschlüsse," and Rosenwein, "Rules." Benedict's liturgy may be assessed from documents in the *CCM*: the Gradual psalms, p. 314; special psalms, p. 528; Office of the Dead, pp. 336, 518.

22. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 1.23, *PL*, 133: col. 54.

23. Ibid., 1.15, col. 50: "Contigit interea dum diversorum librorum legeret volumina, ad beati Benedicti pervenisse regulam: et cursim eam cum vellat transire, impegit in eumdem locum, in quo praeceptum est monachis, ut dormire debeant vestiti; nam plane non intelligens eumdem sensum, per triennium jacuit vestitus, et necdum monachus, monachorum lene ferebat jugum. Istius sancti praecepta curabat obaudire." Cf. *RB* 22.5, *SC*, 182: 540.

24. Cf. *RB* 55.10, *SC*, 182: 620.

25. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 2.9, *PL*, 133: col. 66: "Fossum ludendo vocatus est." Cf. *RB* 7.63, *SC*, 181: 488.

26. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 3.9, *PL*, 133: cols. 81-82. Cf. *RB* 39.11, *SC*, 182: 578.

27. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 3.3, 4, *PL*, 133: cols. 78–79.

28. Cf. *RB* 35.9, *SC*, 182: 566.

29. For the episode and John's commentary on it, John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 2.23, *PL*, 133: cols. 73–76. Cf. *RB* 31–32, *SC*, 182: 556–61.

30. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 2.12, *PL*, 133: cols. 67–68. Cf. *RB* 42, *SC*, 182: 584–86; on the spirit of silence, cf. *ibid.*, 6, *SC*, 181: 470–72.

31. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 2.23, *PL*, 133: col. 74: "quia legaliter nolunt vivere a legis praecepto non verentur faciem cordis avertere."

32. Odo, *Sermo III*, *PL*, 133: col. 723.

33. Cf. *supra*, n. 30. Collections of biblical and patristic writings on silence were common. Cf., for example, *Defensor of Ligugé*, *Liber Scintillarum* (written c. 700) 16, *CCSL*, 117: 73–77. Cf. also A. G. Wathen, *Silence: The Meaning of Silence in the Rule of St. Benedict* (Washington, 1973).

34. Cf. *supra*, p. 86.

35. "Quae enim est gloria, si peccantes, et colaphizati suffertis? Sed si bene facientes patienter sustinetis, haec est gratia apud Deum. In hoc enim vocati estis: quia et Christus passus est pro nobis, vobis relinquens exemplum ut sequamini vestigia eius: qui peccatum non fecit, nec inventus est dolus in ore eius: qui cum malediceretur, non maledicebat: cum pateretur, non comminabantur: tradebat autem iudicanti se iniuste."

36. The episode is recounted in John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 1.33, *PL*, 133: cols. 57–58.

37. "Ut iumentum factus sum apud te; / Et ego semper tecum" (Ps. 72:23).

38. "Posuisti tribulationes in dorso nostro; / Imposuisti homines super capita nostra" (Ps. 65:11–12).

39. *RB* 7.40–41, *SC*, 181: 482.

40. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 1.23, *PL*, 133: col. 54: "Totum se dedit beatorum Patrum regulis et institutionibus; ex quibus nempe auctoritatibus diversas consuetudines sumpsit, unoque volumine colligavit."

41. Ardo, *Vita Benedicti*, *CCM*, p. 312: "ut ostenderet contentiosis nil frivola cassaque a beato Benedicto edita fore." For the *Concordia Regularum*, cf. *PL*, 103: cols. 713–1380.

42. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 1.32, *PL*, 133: col. 57: "ex quibus (cxxxviii psalmis) xiv nos dempsimus propter pusillanimorum animos, exceptis peculiariibus orationibus quas nostri frequentant fratres, quae videlicet modum psalterii videntur excedere. Similiter duabus missis identidemque litanis."

43. Angilbert, *Institutio*, *CCM*, p. 293.

44. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 3.1, *PL*, 133: col. 75: "cooperunt modum suum, consuetudinesque relinquere, ac propriis voluntatibus vitam suam propositumque corrumpere. Relinquentes namque nativa et assueta vestimenta, cooperunt fucatas, atque fluxas pallioque ornatas circumferre cucullas et tunicas . . . Ista et harum similia multa contra regulae jura faciebant." On custom as law, cf. *C*, 2 [no. 181]: 1088 (960): "Mos est lex, licet non scripta." The charter authorized granting ecclesiastical property to a layman. Cf. Constable, *Monastic Tithes*, p. 4.

45. *RB* 55.1, *SC*, 182: 618: "Vestimenta fratribus secundum locorum qualitatem, ubi habitant vel aerum temperiem dentur."

46. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 1.31, *PL*, 133: col. 56–57. For this and the following point, see Rosenwein, "Rules," pp. 315–16.

47. *Ibid.*, 1.35, col. 58.

48. *Ibid.*, 3.4, col. 79: "Horum tamen interitus multorum exstitit emendatio morum. Sic enim apud nos ordo monachorum cecidit; sicutque et correctus fuit et frequenter multis prodigiis corrigitur, ut auctore Deo perseveret."

49. Cf. *supra*, n. 42.

50. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 3.11, *PL*, 133: col. 83.

51. Jotsaldus, *Vita Odilonis* 2.13, *PL*, 142: col. 927.

52. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 1.27, *PL*, 133: col. 55: "ut fieret quod scriptum est: Omnia fac cum consilio, et post factum non poenitebis."

53. Cf. Hallinger's remarks on *consuetudines* in *CCM*, pp. xlvi–xlvii.

54. The first customary, *F*, is published in *Consuetudines monasticae*, ed. B. Albers, vol. 2, *Consuetudines cluniacenses antiquiores* (Monte Cassino, 1905) (hereafter *CM*), pp. 1–12; the second customary, *S*, is also in *CM*, pp. 31–61. On the dating, the latest assessment is Hallinger's, in his introductory notes in *CCM*, pp. xlvi–xlvi.

55. *F*, *CM*, pp. 2–3: "[Ad horam nonam] et tunc celebrent missam. Post missam vero eant ebdomadarii et cellarius et lector in refectorium, ut accipiant mixtum. Alii autem fratres sedeant in choro et sonetur iterum signum minus et cantent Nonam."

56. *S*, *CM*, p. 33: "Cum fuerit Nonae tempus sonet secretarius et facta oratione unus infantum inchoet letaniam et ebdomadarii vadant se (se?) vestire; finita letania dicatur missa. Post quam iterum sonet secretarius et faciant orationem sedeantque in choro et legant donec divestitus sit sacerdos. Interim vero accipiant mixtum ebdomadarii quoquine et lector. Redeunte autem sacerdote ad alios in choro, sonet tertio secretarius et Nona cantetur."

57. Cf., for example, *F*, *CM*, pp. 2–3.

58. Odo, *Vita Geraldii* 1.9, *PL*, 133: col. 648: "cedrus Paradisi."

59. *Ibid.*, 2.34, col. 690: "Incredibile non est quod nunc obsessos a daemonibus liberat."

60. *Ibid.*, 3.8, cols. 695–96: "Sed quoniam imperfectum Ecclesiae vident oculi tui, et lapides terrae ejus miserebuntur, precamur ut hi, qui pro soliditate morum lapides vocantur, nobis, qui merito nostrae pravitatis terra sumus, subvenire dignentur: ut nos qui non habemus indumentum justitiae, lapides amplectamur, ut eorum meritis nostram nuditatem contegere possimus. Hic ergo famulus tuus affectum miserendi, quem eidem charitas tua invisceravit, in nos dirigat, et de illa sempiterna Capitolii curia, qua jam inter consules coeli residet, in hac convalle lacrymarum quam evasit pie respiciat; singulorum preces exaudiat, omniumque necessitates apud te expediat, praestante Domino nostro Iesu Christo Filio tuo."

61. John of Salerno, *Vita Odonis* 2.12, *PL*, 133: col. 67: "Et hoc non aliqua fiebat apud eos in delusione, sed jure observantiaque sanctae regulae, sub quo videlicet cupiebant mori et vivere, nunquamque ab ea declinare."