11-1-1970

The Cluniac Reform, 910-1157, with Special Emphasis on the Development of the Cluniac Order

Wallace Behrhorst
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, wbehrhorst@cox.net

THE CLUNIAC REFORM MOVEMENT, 910-1157, WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CLUNIAC ORDER

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

---

by

Wallace Fehrhorst

June 1950

Approved by: Advisor

Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

The purpose of this paper is to give the history of the development of the monastery of Cluny with special emphasis on the development of the Cluniacs as an Order. For that reason the paper will not cover the entire field of Cluniac history and influence. To give a complete study of the topic would involve a study of fields beyond the scope and purpose of the present work. The author would propose other phases that would prove quite fruitful for further work. Among these topics would be: 1.) the regular church reform of Gregory the Seventh and its connection with the Cluniac reform; 2.) the German emperors and the Cluniac reform; 3.) a detailed study of the charters granted to Cluny by both secular and ecclesiastical lords; 4.) the spread of Cluniac influence beyond the territory of France; 5.) the development of later Benedictine groups as they were influenced by the principles of Cluny.

The author was unable to obtain certain works that would have contributed materially toward rounding out the present work. Among these are: Adolph Harnack, Das Moenchtum, Seine Ideale und Seine Geschichte; G.F. Duckett, Charters and Records of Cluny; E. Sackur, Die Cluniacenser in Ihrer Kirchlichen und Allgemeingeschlichtlichen Wirksamkeit; L.M. Smith, "Cluny and Gregory VII," in English Historical Review, XXVI, 1911; A. Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands;

W. Martens, Gregory VII. The work by Martens and the one by Smith stress particularly the work of Gregory VII and the Cluniac reform; therefore, they would be highly significant for any study of Cluny and Cluniac activity.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Within the course of the past year several volumes dealing with Trappist monks have appeared on the American book market. These works have established themselves as best sellers among present day literary productions. Moreover, in the newspapers throughout the country there have appeared notices of individuals and families who have deserted the full activity of everyday living to devote themselves to the practice of asceticism within monastery walls. In an age that views the whole monastic ideal as somewhat foreign to its daily line of thinking, such activities and such works are received with varied feelings of curiosity, amused interest, and serious consideration. Yet, regardless of what the reaction might be, that such things have occurred is evidence that the idea of monasticism has not died out completely. There still remains within the consciousness of even the modern man the conviction that the ascetic life, by the very ideal that it presents, is the good life and earnestly to attained. It is not the purpose of this paper to criticize the theology that lies at the base of such endeavors, to conclude whether the pursuit of the monastic ideal is sound and healthy. What should be recognized, however, is the fact that man, even in a stage of civilization that is considered to be the highest

that man has ever constructed, still abides by the age old ideal of monasticism. Man still pursues a formula, comparatively austere in nature, that he hopes will provide for him that life that will assure him satisfaction and perhaps rewards beneficial for his other world status. Nor is such an innovation the fruit of Twentieth Century thinking alone. It is rather the product of man of any age and any period - man in his search for that which will permit his conscience to rest at ease in the knowledge that something is being done to itself for that day which follows tomorrow. Some will laugh, and some will severely critize the whole idea of monasticism and the ideal it hopes to achieve. Scoff and snear and ridicule as they will the simple truth cannot be denied that the ascetic life is part and parcel of man's nature. And if centuries of past history can be used as a standard for what will happen tomorrow, we may be fairly certain that the monastic ideal will be one of the elements of society and civilization when the next century has run itself out.

The present work will deal with one of the many reform periods that has swept through the field of monasticism, the Cluniac reform movement of the Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Centuries, emanating from the monastery of Cluny in a province of southern France. Specifically, it will cover the period from Abbot Berno, ca. 900, to the death of Peter the Venerable in 1157. The movement does not stop with Peter since the Cluniacs survived as a body until 1792 when the

French government disbanded them. However, after Peter, the movement lost much of its influence and was replaced as the reforming force in the regular church by younger and stricter monastic systems. It is the purpose of this paper to trace only the development of the movement and then to dwell upon the significance of the work which it produced. One phase in particular will be emphasized, that being the development of the Cluniacs as an Order in itself as a measure to assure reform efforts. By this we mean that while claiming the heritage and tradition of historic Benedictinism, actually what Cluny developed was beyond and above the basic principles that St. Benedict had seen fit to adopt as the guide lines and instruments for the realization of the monastic ideal. Previous to the era of Cluny any group that divirged from the letter of the Benedictine Rule was considered more or less a sect. Strictly speaking, Cluny should by all rights be placed in such a class, as a renegade group, a spurious growth on the tree of Benedictine tradition and practice. Yet by virtue of its development and the emphasis it laid on specific aspects of monastic life and polity, Cluny advanced past that stage to the point where in essence and spirit it became a group distinct and independent; Cluny became an Order, not merely a branch or phase of Benedictinism.

Yet the development of such a program did not take place with the outset of the movement, but rather it followed a process of growth covering a century and a half. It is this

process of growth and development that we seek to trace. And to accomplish this purpose we shall discuss the lives of the great abbots of Cluny since the character and make-up of the individual abbots seems to have determined the character and direction of the movement itself.

This paper does not pretend that every sphere of Cluniac influence will be dealt with. Such an undertaking is completely beyond the scope and possibility of the present work. However, it is the intention of the writer to present as many facts as possible so that a general conception is gained of the scope and purpose of Cluniac work.

As a background against which to consider the facts of the history of the Cluniacs, we feel that from the beginning one impression must be born in mind concerning the program of Cluny: that the Cluniacs were not highly ascetic and uncompromising members of the Benedictine system. The Cluniacs were not a strict and highly austere order. Interested in the uplifting of the regular church, the order adopted and adapted to itself and its institution those ingredients that seemed best to suit its purpose and best fitted to meet conditions prevailing at the time. For that reason changes crept in, so that Peter's conception of the monastic ideal differed quite noticeably from that of Berno. Yet, regardless of what each held to constitute monasticism and its ideal, each followed a path of procedure that was directed to one end, the attainment of the monastic ideal and through that the uplifting of

the regular church. The establishment of the monastic ideal and the attainment thereof - that was the spirit of the Cluniac movement. What transpired did so against such a background.

CHAPTER II

THE MONASTIC IDEAL FROM BENEDICT OF NURSIA TO BERNO OF CLUNY

The Benedictine Rule

To all right thinkers it is clear that the providence of God has so provided for certain men that, by means of their transitory possessions, if they use them well, they may be able to merit everlasting rewards. I, William, Count and Duke by the grace of God, diligently pondering this, and desiring to provide for my own safety while I am still able, have considered it advisable - nay, most necessary, that from the temporal gifts which have been conferred upon me, I should give some little portion for the gain of my soul. I do this, indeed, in order that I who thus increased in wealth may not perchance, at the last be accused of having spent all in caring for my body, but rather may rejoice, when fate hath snatched all things away, in having reserved something for myself. Which end, indeed seems attainable by no more suitable means than that, following the precept of Christ: "I will make the poor my friends" (Luke 16, 9) and making the act not a temporary one but a lasting one, I should support at my own expense a congregation of monks. ...Therefore be it known to all who live in the unity of a faith and who wait the mercy of Christ, and to those who shall succeed them and who shall continue to exist until the end of the world, that, for the love of God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, I hand over from my own rule to the holy apostles, Peter, namely, and Paul, the possessions over which I hold sway, in the town of Cluny, namely, with the court, demesne manor, and the church...together with all things pertaining to it.[1]

With this charter, granted by William the Pious, Duke of Aquitaine, to Abbot Berno in 910, the monastery of Cluny officially came into existence. At the time of the founding the event seemed so insignificant that Duke William hesitated

---

[1] E. F. Henderson, Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages (London: George Bell and Sons, 1896), p. 329.

to turn out his hunting hounds to make room for the monks.[2] Yet in less than two hundred years the name of that monastery had become famous throughout Europe, and Cluny itself the head of an international system. Where once monks had built their wooden houses 'according to their own skill and knowledge', arose a new and famous school of architecture. Where once the modest building had been retarded through the lack of funds, rose the church of St. Peter's, the admiration of the world. Where once the former hunting lodge stood, rose a monastery so extensive in size that St. Louis of France and his coutiers could stay there without one monk having to leave his cell.

According to the charter of William the Pious, the grant of Cluny was made with the understanding that in Cluny a regular monastery was to be constructed, and that there the monks should congregate and live according to the Rule of St. Benedict.[3] At the time the Rule was four hundred years old, having first been set down and applied at Monte Cassino in 525. In drawing up his Rule the Nursian had sponsored a twofold break with past, i.e. elimination of extreme austerity and the subjecting of the individual monk in the community

---

[2] L. M. Smith, The Early History of the Monastery of Cluny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920), p. 12.

[3] Henderson, op. cit., p. 332.

of his profession.[4] These innovations were not so much a development from previous rules and formulations but a revolution in the field of monasticism. The general character of monastic life from St. Anthony to St. Basil was identical, in that it demanded the utmost austerity of living, and that in structure it was hermitical.[5] Only with Pachomius is there any evidence of community life, and even then the life of the individual monk was still essentially hermitical, although in a community of ascetic zealots. With Benedict, however, there was a break, altering the complexion of monastic living.

The idea that Benedict had in mind, so far as can be determined from his Rule, can be traced along six general lines.[6]

1.) The purpose of the Rule was to establish "a school for the Lord's service in the organization of which we trust that we shall ordain nothing severe and burdensome".[7] When St. Benedict first decided to be a monk, he acted in accordance with the monastic ideal of Europe of that day, that of

---

[4] Dom Cuthbert Butler, Benedictine Monasticism (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1924), p. 45.

[5] For a fuller description of the development of monasticism, see Ibid., p. 1-22.

[6] Ibid., pp. 23-24. Cf. also, R.N. Flew, The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), pp. 158-178. Flew places the idea of monasticism under three headings: 1. Communion with God; 2. The Cross; 3. Comprehensiveness.

[7] Henderson. op. cit., p. 274.

the Egyptians. He retired to a desert spot and lived in a cave, enduring hunger and thirst, heat and cold, and all the other inconveniences of place and weather. But when he came to write his Rule and legislate for his own monastery and its life, as well as that for others, his ideas had undergone a great change. Instead of hardness and austerity, the Rule breathed moderation. Benedict had no intention of establishing a system that would enforce the strict asceticism of the Egyptians. In this the wisdom of Benedict is seen. Europe was being settled by people of Teutonic strains. They were warriors, men who lived active lives. They were not basically of a mystical or contemplative bent as were the Orientals of the Near East. Benedict was a practical man. From his own experience he realized that it would be fruitless to impose a strict rule on men who were not culturally, physically or climatically accustomed to a program of severe asceticism. What Benedict desired was that monastic life should be embraced by the greatest possible number. Therefore, lest the practice of the monastic life be limited to a few who possessed the necessary make-up to follow the strict rule that the East offered, he from the very outset established the tone and tenor of his Rule - "We trust that we shall ordain nothing severe and nothing burdensome."[8]

---

[8] Compare the chapters of the Rule dealing with food, clothing, sleep, work, and reading required for the monks. In many respects the existence of the monks was more ideal than that of the peasants and farmers outside of the monastery.

2.) Another one of Benedict's fundamental ideas appears in the first chapter of the Rule. After speaking of other kinds of monks, both good and bad, he says in conclusion, "Let us proceed to treat of the best kind, the cenobites."[9]

3.) But Benedict introduced a modification into the idea of a cenobitical life. While previously monks were bound together by vows to the practice of monastic life, still they were not tied to a particular monastery or community but were allowed to pass from cloister to cloister with little difficulty. Benedict's special and most tangible contribution to the development of monasticism was the introduction of the vow of stability.[10] By it he put a stop to passage from monastery to monastery and incorporated the monk by his profession to the community of his monastery. St. Benedict thus bound the monks of a monaster together into a permanent family of community, united by bonds that lasted for life.

4.) A negative aspect of Benedict's idea lies in this that he had no thought of instituting an 'order'. St. Benedict had no intention that the monasteries that followed his Rule should form a part of a larger group. Each Benedictine

---

[9] Henderson, op. cit., p. 275. The worst possible type of monk was the gyratory who was approved of no rule, who wandered from monastery to monaster, who shut themselves up in groups of two's and three's, experience being their only teacher, their law the satisfaction of their desires.

[10] Compare chapters 29 and 46 of the Rule. Also, Butler, Benedictine Monachism, p. 132 and G.G. Coulton, Five Centuries of Religious Thought (Cambridge: Cambridge Press, 1929), p.110.

house was a separate unit, a specific entity, autonomous and self contained, having no organic bond with other monasteries, so that in reality there were as many units as there were fully organized Benedictine monasteries.[11] The basic element, then, of Benedictine polity, such as there was, was decentralization, in that there was no organization over and above the individual house itself. The idea of a federated system, one that embraced all the units so that they formed one organic unity, is essentially foreign to the idea of Benedict.

Moreover, with the Benedictines there was no special form of work to be completed. A man became a monk precisely because he felt called to be a monk and for no other purpose or object whatsoever, nor as a preparation for anything else- except heaven. The monks object was to sanctify his soul and serve God by leading a life in a community in accordance with the Gospel counsels. That work, however, of various kinds was given to the monks to be done is evident, but they are secondary, and no one of them was part of his essential vocation, that of a monk.[12]

5.) The service of God which Benedict established is contained in the three services: self discipline, prayer, and work. Of these three, self discipline was the basis and condition of the others, that which gave meaning the whole life.

---

[11] Butler, op. cit., p. 200.

[12] Ibid., pp. 28-29.

St. Benedict placed prayer, in particular common prayer as observed in the canonical offices, first in the list of external services.[13]

6.) Work fell into the catagories of manual labor and reading, the hours not spent in church being apportioned between the two. The labor was predominantly work in the fields and gardens or kitchen. Reading was confined to the Scriptures and the Fathers, and was devotional rather than intellectual in scope and character. Benedict had no intention of training scholars and learned men, but men devoted to one purpose, i.e. the attaining of heaven.[14]

Under this heading should also be included Benedict's position regarding the property of the monk. Poverty was to be absolute in a personal though not in a corporate sense. The monk personally was not permitted to own anything, neither book, nor tablet, nor pen, nor was it allowed him to own his will or his own power. But rather, all things were to be held in common, in subjection to the abbot.[15]

In summary, the idea of Benedict was in complete harmony with the purpose and aims of monasticism of the early church.

---

[13] Cf. Butler, op. cit., chapters 4-9 for the canonical offices. Cf. also Cardinal Gasquet, Introduction to the Rule of St. Benedict (London: Chatto and Windus, 1936), p. XXV.

[14] H. Bettenson, Documents of the Christian Church (London: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 173-174. Cf. also Coulton, Five Centuries of Religious Thought, pp. 212-214.

[15] Henderson, op. cit., p. 289.

In this age the conception of utility or purpose, other than the perfecting of the individual soul, does not seem to have entered into the idea of regular life. Monasticism was regarded solely as a systemmatized form of life based on the gospels of perfection, to be lived for its own sake as the full expression of the church's true life and spirit. This was to be obtained by the removal of every hinderance to the elevation of the mind, arising from self or external things, and by the practice of the Christian virtues according to the counsels of perfection. Whatever might prove conducive to the realization of the higher life was adopted and eagerly sponsored. So Benedict selected from the rules of his day and from his own personal experience those practices and principles he felt most suitable for the attainment of the monastic ideal. Regular living was the goal he desired to achieve, and to attain that highest end the Rule was formulated and executed. Benedict perceived the idea of the regular life. What is embodied in the Rule constitutes merely the means, the channels which Benedict considered most likely for the realization of the ideal. And while the details cover many phases of life and deal with divers and sundry practical problems, at the base lies the principle - the complete absolute subjugation of the individual, the suppression of the self-will. Therefore, the statement of discipline and obedience are not in themselves an end but merely the means to the end.

B. Benedict of Nursia to Benedict of Aniane

Ideal as the Rule of Benedict may have been for the inducement of regular monastic development, there were inherent within the framework of the Rule itself definite drawbacks that would not stand the test of time and tension, resulting in the inevitable, that changes and deliriations should set in. It cannot be said that these weaknesses on every occasion were directly responsible for the course that Benedictinism was to follow during the next centuries. Yet behind the scenes one cannot but sense that had the principles of the Rule been differently defined, the path of monastic life would not have led so directly into abuse and disintegration.

From the vantage point of today it can be said that such was to be expected. It was inevitable that there should arise strong personalities within the Benedictines who should see fit to define in detail the nature of the autonomy of the community, i.e. that each house was a law unto itself.[16] Admittedly, the Rule supplied the main principles for each unit, but as is the consequence of general principles, the details that fall within the principles are governed by customs, conveniences, and conditions; moreover, a body of customs

---

16 Watkins W. Williams, Monastic Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), p. 78.

conveniences, and conditions usually have a tendency to follow strong family and local likenesses.[17] Thus gradually and imperceptibly there crystallized something like a constitution for this group and that congregation, a process which after the course of years would receive the sanction of both secular and ecclesiastical rulers,[18] all of which tended to stimulate irregularity of practice and thereby weaken the force and authority of the original Rule of St. Benedict.

Moreover, the autonomy of the Benedictine community revealed its weakness in that at this time bodies of monks, unprotected by central authority or a mutual bond of union with neighboring communities, were unable to stand up under the pressure of external attack. When these attacks came, the monks, being isolated and cut-off, had no other recourse but to submit to these external forces and disperse. The history of Monte Cassino and Farfa clearly shows this. Both were left desolate for long periods of time following the invasions of the Lombards in the Sixth Century and that of the Saracens in the Ninth Century. Had there been some central authority outside and above the individual monasteries themselves, the periods of decline would have been reduced or eliminated.[19]

---

17 "Monasticism," Cambridge Medieval History (New York: Macmillan Company, 1929), V, 658.

18 Williams, op. cit., p. 78.

19 "Monasticism," Cambridge Medieval History, V, 658.

At this point it is significant to note a change that was brought about in Benedictine life and as a consequence, Benedictine ideas. As a result of the invasion of the Lombards in the Sixth Century, the monks immigrated to Rome.[20] The change from country to town life affected the routine of the community by rendering impossible long hours of agricultural labor. With that step the next followed quite easily. Monks became ordained priests. Nor was that change without results. Manual labor was abandoned as the principal occupation of the monks; and with more spare time on their hands, in order to provide activity for the monks, the Mass was celebrated more frequently and the canonical hours increased, thereby keeping the monks in the church for more hours of the day; and finally the presence of servants in the fields and kitchens.[21] This was the first great change that was to alter the principles of Benedict of Nursia.[22]

On the other hand, the autonomy of the community subjected the group to the continual risk of internal decay. The rule of a weak or careless abbot, under no effective supervision, was a constant source of danger.[23] At the same time

---

20 Butler, op. cit., pp. 292-293.

21 Ibid., p. 296. By the gradual displacement of manual labor by the monks, servants were necessary to do the work ordinarily assigned to the monks.

22 Ibid., p. 293.

23 "Monasticism," Cambridge Medieval History, V, 658.

the growth of temporal possessions fostered the temptation to relax religious observances and to admit secular customs to creep in that were quite out of harmony with the terms of the Rule. Both of these conditions combined to frustrate the attempts to maintain the principles of the Rule in conformity with the ideals and ideas of the founder.[24]

Thus the essential weakness, autonomy of the Benedictine community, the lack of central authority - evidently not apparent to Benedict when he drew up and formulated his Rule - either directly or indirectly gave birth to a combination of abuses and deliniations from the initial principle of the Rule. As the decades passed these malignant growths, in themselves not destructive to the health of monastic life, developed strange fruits that both in nature and character were detrimental to the Rule of Benedict as such. What was being produced and propagated was not Benedictine in practice, although it was still such in principle, but was an irregularity among the regulars. To maintain itself in the spirit of true Benedictinism, there was urgent need of reform and reformulation. From the workings of years of irregularity, what was called for was the spirit of conscientiousness and consecration, to rebuild and reestablish the framework of the early Sixth Century. The materialization of such a spirit appeared on the scene in the first part of the eigth century

---

[24] Ibid., V, 658.

in the form of Benedict of Aniane. Through the instrumentality of his station and stature the Rule was restored, but it was not the word of the Rule that was reestablished; rather it was the spirit. With him the second great change that was to alter further Benedictinism is noted.[25]

C. Benedict to BERNO

Although Benedict of Aniane was the first purely monastic reformer within the Benedictine system,[26] he began his carreer as an opponent of the Benedictine Rule, despising it as "fit for beginners and feeble folks."[27] The Rule of the Eastern monks, with their extreme austerity, alone seemed to reach a fitting height of asceticism. The principal objection of Benedict to the Rule was that it held up a standard of life attainable by the many. When he founded his own monastery, however, he soon learned that the rules of the Orientals were not calculated for his districts and his men. His first attempts to hold men with him in the pursuit of the monastic ideal met with dismal failure. Benedict then realized that the old Rule of St. Benedict was not to be underrated,

---

[25] Butler, op. cit., p. 296.

[26] Smith, op. cit., p. 5.

[27] Williams, op. cit., p. 85. For a fuller narrative on the life and early monastic development of Benedict of Aniane, see Williams, Monastic Studies, chapter VIII. Also, Herbert B. Workman, The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal (London: Charles Kelly, 1913), pp. 225-226.

for it was better suited to guide the many in attaining the spiritual life and set up a standard which certainly could be reached under the given circumstances. Ironically then, Benedict learned to value the Rule for the very same reason that he once despised it. So the Rule was adopted by Benedict as the standard, not only for his own monastery, but also for the houses that in later years he would reform.[28]

However, the rule that Benedict applied to the various monasteries as the standard for reform was not the original form of the Benedictine Rule. Parts and certain points of the original he rejected or permitted to stand according to his own considerations, and where the Rule was silent or somewhat obscure, Benedict supplemented it 'fitly and rationaly.'[29] The Concordia Regularum, the monumental work of Benedict of Aniane, clearly shows such a process, for it is a collection of all the monastic rules and institutions of the eastern and western fathers prior to his time. These rules, gathered and formulated in accordance with the desire of Louis the Pious to promote uniformity of monastic discipline, were compared with the Rule of St. Benedict, so that from them all "a teaching one in its essential form with that of the Rule"[30] might

---

[28] Cf. Augustus Neander, General History of the Christian Religion and Church (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1871), III, 415. Also, Williams, op. cit., pp.85-87, for more details on the change of attitude of Benedict toward the Rule.

[29] Smith, op. cit., p. 7.

[30] Williams, op. cit., p. 93.

finally be composed.[31] Thus, while Benedictine in spirit, having the Rule as the primary basis, Benedict of Aniane drew up and codified what to him seemed most conducive for the attainment of the highest ideal, the monastic life.

Somewhere around 782 Benedict attracted the attention of Charlemagne,[32] who by this time had begun to take steps to improve the cultural conditions within the Frankish Empire. Also, around 782 Benedict completed his new enlarged monastery on the Aniane River.[33] That these two events fell within the same period is significant. Charlemagne recognized that the restoration of monastic discipline was a necessary part of the establishment of law and order in the Carolingian Empire. Moreover, he recognized the value of monasteries as centers of learning for civilization, culture, and study, and that a well organized monastery was an asset to his kingdom and a positive element in the improvement of conditions in his empire.[34]

---

[31] Hugo Hendarus, who edited the Concordia in 1658, gives a list of twenty-six rules from which it was composed.

[32] Williams, op. cit., p. 88.

[33] Ibid., p. 88.

[34] "Monasticism", Cambridge Medieval History, III, 658-659. Also, Wells, Charles, The Age of Charlemagne (New York: Charles Scribner, 1913), p.281. Under Charlemagne ecclesiastical reform was an important subject of legislation. Through two channels he sought to carry out such reform work. First was the "canonical life" introduced by Chrodegang of Metz among his cathedral clergy. This rule was the application of the Benedictine Rule to the Clergy associated with the bishop in his cathedral, with the mission of the vow of poverty. The second was the revival of the Rule through Benedict of Aniane.

For that reason Charlemagne espoused the cause of monastic life, and by placing Benedict in charge of monastic reform, contributed that stimulating force that aided greatly in the spreading and reestablishing of the Rule in Gaul.[35] In fact, much of the success of Benedict's entire reform activity was due to the imperial sponsorship of Charlemagne and, later, of his son Louis the Pious.[36]

Benedict had to contend with three main abuses that had crept into monastic life. The fact that such abuses had to be attacked is evidence that they must have been present for a period of time before. These abuses were: 1.) the custom of granting monasteries as fiefs to lay propriators; 2.) the abandonment of regular observances; 3.) the diversity of observances. This latter evil was the main cause of irregularity.[37]

The action that Benedict took to combat these practices we find epitomized in the capitularies of the Council of Aachen, 817. The council had as its purpose, as far as the monasteries were concerned, "that as all monasteries had one

---

35 Ibid., p. 659. Benedict was first given authority to reform the monasteries of Aquitaine, but by the time Louis had ascended the throne this authority was extended to all of Gaul.

36 Cf. Williams, Monastic Studies, pp. 88-89, 94-96. Both Charlemagne and Louis granted Benedict charters of privilege.

37 "Monasticism", Cambridge Medieval History, III, 659.

profession, so also they should have one serviceable constitution."[38] What was to constitute Benedict's notion of serviceable was something quite different from what it had been. The aim of Benedict was to establish over a wide area some measure of uniformity and regularity, "good custom which, according to the mind of St. Benedict himself and according to the true inner meaning of the Rule, are not out of accord with the Rule."[39] The 'good customs...in accord with the Rule' stipulated that all luxury was to be forbidden, that monks must look after the offices of the house themselves and do all their own work, that visits of strangers to the monasteries were to be prohibited, that visiting monks had to be entertained in separate dormitories, that the spiritual authority of the abbot was to be upheld as absolute,[40] that monks were to speak no superfluous words, that monks were to bear themselves with extreme humility before the abbot, that at the name of the abbot the monks were to bow the knee,[41] that the Opus Dei, whose observance was the chief duty of the monk, was to be strictly executed.[42] These stipulations, taken as whole, represent an attempt to bind all monasteries to a

---

[38] Williams, op. cit., p. 94.

[39] Ibid., p. 97.

[40] Cambridge Medieval History, V, 661.

[41] Smith, op. cit., p. 6.

[42] Ibid., p. 28.

scale of simple living and to lay down the principle that uniformity of custom was to be observed in all the reformed houses. In its more practical application such a principle meant the linking together into one congregation all the scattered Benedictine monasteries. The final result was that, contrary to the desires of Benedict of Nursia, the reform work of Benedict of Aniane left in its wake the first example of a larger society, bound under one head, above and beyond the communal unit.[43]

But the single experiment was to prove insufficient to head off completely the further deterioration of monasticism, for while Benedict was praised as the man who had given back the Rule to Gaul,[44] he was perhaps too narrow in his outlook to carry through a universal reform.[45] Laying too much stress on single points, he did not see deep enough into essentials. That he succeeded as far as he did was largely due to imperial support, without which the movement would have collapsed after

---

[43] Neander, op. cit., III, 416.

[44] Smith, op. cit., p. 8. The monks of St. Cornelius had so acclaimed Benedict of Aniane.

[45] Workman, op.cit., p. 226. Workman says, "In his efforts to secure reformation Benedict (227) of Aniane made one fatal mistake: he sought a renunciation which should express itself in rigid uniformity. Meat, drink, the cut of dress, the order of service were to be exactly alike, the production of an almost mechanical mill. ...The mechanical can never be anything else than short lived; the swaddling-clothes of a rigid uniformity never fail in time to crush the new-born enthusiasm and power."

his death in 821. Yet the fault does not lie with Benedict completely. Already in 829 Louis had to call the bishops' attention to the reform and exhort them to further it.[46] Even Louis' zeal waxed faint after a time. Later it was the bishops who had to remind Louis that the monks had been confirmed in their right of free election of their abbots. Gradually more and more monasteries fell prey to worldly bishops and greedy laymen, and in the absence of strong spiritual guidance discipline among the monks became lax. Thus a synod at Trosly in 909 laments over the universal decay of monasticism, now fallen into contempt even among the laity, and it traced the cause of such conditions to the fact that nearly all the Frankish monasteries were then in the hands of lay abbots.[47]

Finally, into Gaul came fresh incursions by the Northmen and the Huns, which further prevented the development of peaceful monastic life. By the beginning of the Tenth Century the Rule survived only in isolated and rare communities.

So again, as at the end of the Eigth Century, what was needed was the spirit of conscientiousness and consecration to rebuild and reestablish the framework of Sixth Century monasticism.

---

[46] Neander, op. cit., III, 416.

[47] Smith, op. cit., p. 8.

CHAPTER III

THE FOUNDING OF CLUNY AND HER FIRST ABBOT

In the desolate years that opened the Tenth Century it was Cluny that set the example of religious duty and discipline and dignity of service. Founded in an age of materialism, she set out to recall to men's minds that interest in things spiritual which seemed to have been lost, and to do so by setting up an ideal in direct contradiction to the spirit prevalent around her. What the age called for was a reviving spirit the ideal that monasticism sought to achieve and that had not been evoked in the Ninth Century. Such a spirit was finally to be created with Cluny.

As stated above[1] the monastery of Cluny itself came into being through the instrumentality of William the Pious, Duke of Aquitaine, Count of Auvergne, 910. Originally the site had belonged to Hildebrand, bishop of Macon, but through some unknown exchange had passed to Ava, a sister of the Duke of Aquitaine, who in turn deeded it to her brother William in 892.[2] Through such a process the property, the villa of Cluny came into the possession of Duke William, who used it for a hunting lodge and kennels for his hounds. Considering

---

[1] See chapter I, page 5.

[2] Watkins W. Williams, Monastic Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), p. 23.

the geography of the area, the site was quite suited for such purposes.

After the course of a few years Duke William, diligently pondering that "rich men by means of their transitory possessions, if they used them well, may be able to merit everlasting rewards and desiring to provide for his own safety while still able, thereby gaining something for his own soul"[3] determined that no more suitable way was open to him to achieve such an end than to build and establish a monastery. Accordingly, he handed over from his own rule to the apostles Peter and Paul the possessions over which he held sway, the town of Cluny, with the court, demene manor, and the church, together with all the things pertaining to it.[4] So the entire community of Cluny, from the town itself down to the uncultivated ground around it, was deeded over lock, stock, and barrel for the purpose that in Cluny a regular monastery should be constructed in honor of Peter and Paul.

William continues in his charter that the monks "shall possess and hold and have and order these same things into all time."[5] Berno was to be the first abbot, having complete power and domination over all the monks and possessions as

---

3 E. F. Henderson, "The Foundation Document of Cluny", Select Histoical Documents of the Middle Ages (London: George Bell and Sons, 1896), p. 329.

4 Ibid., p. 330.

5 Ibid., pp. 331-333.

long as he should live. Upon his death the monks were freely to elect their own new abbot, neither William nor any other person daring to interfere with the election. The monks were to pay Rome a tribute of ten soldi, a very small sum, every five years and to have papal protection.[6]

The most important clause of the charter is that which deals with the freedom of the monastery. The monks were subject neither to William, his relation, royal officials, nor any other earthly yoke. No secular prince, count, bishop, nor even the pope himself was to seize the property, divide it, diminish it, nor give it to benefit another. Nor were they to set an abbot over the monks against their will. William called on the holy apostles Peter and Paul and on the pope to be guardians and protectors of Cluny, by canonical and apostolic authority to drive from the community of the church and eternal life those who attacked or seized the property which had been given to them. A tremendous curse was called down on any who violated this charter. Thus the original charter from the hand of the founder himself willed that from the beginning Cluny was to be absolutely autonomous. Thus from the outset Cluny was to stand for and was the symbol of monastic autonomy.[7]

Beyond this the will gives little additional information.

---

[6] L. M. Smith, The Early History of the Monastery of Cluny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920), p. 14.

[7] Ibid., p. 14.

It deals only with the deed of gift and with William's intentions regarding the monastery. No program was set down beyond that the Benedictine Rule should be followed. No formal constitution was drawn up except the stipulation of the will of William. What course was to be followed was left pretty much up to the discretion and good judgement of the abbot. Duke William in his charter stated that the abbot should preside over the monks regularly according to his knowledge and ability.[8] With the exception of the wide principles laid down by Benedict of Nursia the rule of the monastery was subject to the abbot alone. Where he saw work to be done, it could be done with comparatively little interference and infringement from rules and rulers other than himself.

That is not to say that the Rule was dead letter among the monks. Berno, while composing no special rule, did obligate his monks to follow as strictly as possible the Rule of St. Benedict.[9] What Berno hoped to achieve was concord and regularity. Therefore in the monasteries under his supervision he exhorted the monks to observe uniformity in the manner of their life, as regards ritual, the observance of silence, food and drink, and above all the giving up of pri-

---

[8] Henderson, op. cit., p. 331.

[9] P. Pourrat, Christian Spirituality in the Middle Ages (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne Ltd., 1924), I, 5.

vate property and possessions, if not better at least as well as they had done in the days preceding their entrance to Cluny.[10] That, however, changes were present and in force cannot be denied. It will be remembered that Benedict established his Rule in Italy. When Abbot Berno adopted the Rule, it was for a community in France. Therefore, what modifications were instituted were made on account of the climate and weather conditions.[11] The meanwhile, regardless of how strictly the letter of the Rule was adhered to, what the abbot had in mind and what motivated his actions was loyalty to the spirit of the founder, Benedict of Nursia.[12] The sense of distress at the relaxation of the ancient Rule and the ever present zeal to establish again the monastic ideal, created that frame of mind that compelled the great abbot to work even more diligently for the establishment of that ideal that so thoroughly possessed the first great abbot of Monte Cassino, that in the regular life of the monastic community lies the highest type of satisfaction.

The foundation principles fairly well defined, the work of constructing the monastery was carried on by the monks.[13]

---

10 Smith, op. cit., p. 15.

11 Marvin R. Vincent, The Age of Hildebrand (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), p. 16.

12 Williams, op. cit., p. 24.

13 Odd as it may seem Duke William stipulated that the monks had to build their own monastery according to their own abilities and powers.

Berno was called as the first abbot. It was by no mere accident that William chose such a man, for even before going to Cluny, Berno had established himself as zealous for monastic reform. One account of his life says that Berno became quite disgusted with the luxuries of Burgundian life, of which he was a full sharer in view of his status, that of a Burgundian noble.[14] Moreover, he became dissatisfied with effeminancy of the majority of the monks of his time.[15] In accordance with the precepts of the Gospel and for the purpose of laying up for himself treasures in heaven, he built a monastery at Gigny on his own property and endowed it with his own wealth. Monks were then invited to settle there. Berno became so satisfied with the work done that he fianlly took the vows and entered his own monastery. Later he became abbot. His rule was so thorough and so prudently conducted that his fame soon spread, to the extent that he was asked to take over the monastery of Baume, which he soon restored to its original religious and temporal prosperity.[16] When William then decided to establish his monastery, he called to his counsel Berno, of whom his followers who frequently visited Baume and who were well received there, spoke in highest terms. Berno accepted the

---

[14] Augustus Neander, A General History of the Christian Religion and Church (New York: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1871), III, 416.

[15] Ibid., p. 416.

[16] Smith, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

invitation of William and journeyed to Cluny in the company of the abbot of St. Martin-le-Autun. After discussing the project thoroughly, a site was sought. Finally the site of Cluny was chosen. Duke William was of the opinion that a better site could be chosen but finally aquiesced to the opinion of both Berno and the abbot.[17]

There is an interesting story connected with the tradition of Cluny in the Life of St. Hugh of Autun. According to the narrative the origin of Cluny is linked to that of Monte Cassino, the mother of western monasticism. In the Sixth Century men from Gaul asked Benedict to send men from Monte Cassino to Gaul to instruct them in the discipline of the Rule. Benedict sent twelve men. This group went to Anjou where the monastery of Glaufouil was founded. Because of incursions by the Northmen, the monks fled south where they settled at St. Savin, Poitiers. There monastic life flourished, so that St. Savin's became a model monastery. One of the monks, Badillo, determined to restore the abbey of St. Martin's Autun, and he sent to St. Savin's for monks for reforming purposes. The work was successful so that St. Martin's flourished. At the same time the monastery of Baume was totally lacking in monastic regularity. Monks of St. Martin's were asked to reform it, so Berno was sent. This Berno later was to become the first abbot

---

17 Williams, op. cit., pp. 22-23. Cf. also, Neander, op. cit., III, 416-417.

of Cluny. Thus the chain was formed that linked Monte Cassino with Cluny.[18]

There is also a sense in which the parentage of Cluny may be traced to St. Benedict of Aniane. Ardo, a writer of this period, reports that Benedict of Aniane sent twelve monks to St. Savin's. In about 870 the monks of St. Savin's undertook the restoration of the abbey St. Martin's-le-Autun. With the first abbot of St. Martin's, Arnulph, would then have come the spirit of the Concordia Regularum and the observances prescribed at the Council of Aachen in 817. While it is not probable that Berno was even living at St. Martin's, yet it is probable that it was with the aid of monks of St. Martin's that he began his work at Jura where he founded the monastery of Gigny before taking over Baume.[19] Also, it should be remembered that it was in the company of the abbot of St. Martin's that Berno undertook the founding of Cluny. Moreover, the author of the Life of Odo mentions one important fact, that at Baume the precepts of a certain Euticius were followed. The evidence available as to who this Euticius was points to Benedict of Aniane.[20] Thus Berno while faithfully

---

[18] Smith, op. cit., pp. 9-11.

[19] Williams, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

[20] Smith, op. cit., p. 12. Cf. also, "Monastic Order," Cambridge Medieval History (New York: Mc Millan Company, 1929), V, 661. Herbert B. Workman, The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal (London: Charles H. Kelly, 1913), p. 225, says, "The name of Benedict was assumed on his conversion in place of his first name Witiza or Euticius.

laboring at the establishment of a new monastery, began his work with the force of tradition and custom behind him. And while following faithfully the command of Duke William to establish at Cluny the Rule of St. Benedict, if what the accounts of the writers of the period can be relied upon, what he actually put into practice at Cluny was not the original Rule of Benedict which he had enforced upon the monks at Monte Cassino, but a version of the Rule that had undergone a series of changes and alterations during the course of the preceding centuries, noteably the changes wrought by the action of Benedict of Aniane and the Aachen capitularies.

The work of the first abbot was not without its results. Originally Berno had two monasteries under his control, Baume and Cluny. Before he died in 927 two or three had been added to that number, so that his successor fell heir to at least five monastic units,[21] each one while a separate unit in itself yet under the direct control of the abbot of Cluny. The influence of Berno spread quickly beyond the confines of Cluny partly by the founding of new monasteries and partly by the incorporation of those already existing, all under the direct control and supervision of Cluny and her abbot.[22] Duke

---

21 "Cluny," Encyclopedia Brittanica (Encyclopedia Brittanica Inc.; New York, 1937), V, 861.

22 "Cluny," Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1908), IV, 73.

William already at the time when the charter was granted had stipulated that the monastery and its possessions should be held under the direct control of the abbot.[23] The result of such planning and such stipulations was that by 929 Cluny was the head of a small congregation, the nucleus of the Cluniac Order. The complete fruition of this tendency, however, did not occur during the abbacacy of Berno but under the later abbots. Yet the seed was being sown; the sketches for the foundation were being drawn.

That Berno was so successful was due to a number of factors. The primary one was the personal character of the abbot himself. Devoted to the cause of monasticism, he was extremely pious and virtuous, his reputation resting for the greater part only on his works and deeds of piety and charity. But there were other factors that worked for Cluny's greatness. Geographical position was not the least of these. Cluny lay in a series of gently rolling hills, in a part of Burgundy into which neither Northman, Hun, nor Sarazen seems to have penetrated. Also, Cluny lay on one of the pilgrim routes to Rome and near the highways of the Soane and Rhone. Still more favorable for the development of her principle monastic autonomy was the political position she held, situated

---

[23] Henderson, op.cit., p. 331.

as she was in a part of Burgundy where independence was possible. There the authority of the Frankish king and the German emperor were negligible, what semblence of power the one possessed being neutralized by the other. Cluny lay conveniently distant from both so as to be practically independent of both. Nor had she any fear of the dukes of Burgundy who during the early period of Cluniac history were occupied in the holding back of the Barbarians. Besides, there was no reason why any of the powers should have troubled themselves about a small poverty stricken monastery. Therefore, Cluny was left to develop.[24] And that is precisely what she did.

---

[24] Smith, _op. cit._, pp. 35-36.

CHAPTER IV

FROM ODO TO MAJOLUS

Abbot Odo

The real history of Cluny begins with Odo the second abbot who laid the foundation for Cluny's greatness and shaped the course of later Cluniac history.[1] He came from a deeply religious family and a family of rank in the community. Since in his early childhood he was a rather delicate child, his father destined him for the priesthood. But as the boy grew and developed physically, his father decided to train him for a military career in the services of the Duke of Aquitaine. While in the services of the Duke, Odo found court life quite distasteful and longed for a life more suitable to his sensitive temperment. During this period he was plagued with terrible dreams in which he heard himself accused for his frivolous pursuits at the court of the Duke. Moreover, he was afflicted with violent, incurable headaches, the cause of which he attributed to the type of living in the royal household. All these factors combined to induce him to leave the court and go to a monastery for relief. Accordingly, at the

---

[1] Mabillon, Annales Benedictus, III xci, ann. 927 as quoted by Watkins W. Williams, Monastic Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), p. 25 states that we would probably be correct in regarding the first two abbots, Berno and Odo, as the co-founders of the Cluniacs.

age of nineteen Odo entered St. Martin's to gain relief from his physical and spiritual discomforts.[2]

Up to this point Odo, it seems, had not taken the vows of monasticism, for while yet at Tours he kept company with Count Fulke, who was a lusty pursuer of the good thing in life.[3] Odo soon soured on such a life[4] and turned his attention to reading and praying, at which he spent most of his time. His reading was confined to the classics, not spiritual works. One night he had a dream about a vase, beautiful in form, yet filled with snakes. He interpreted the snakes as referring to the classics. This greatly impressed him, so that he then turned his attention to the study of the gospel and the prophets. Such a practice however was not well received by his associates who sneered at Bible reading. Suffering the taunts and jeers until no longer possible, Odo retired to a cell and followed a very strict ascetic life, seeking satisfaction in the hardest disciplines.[5]

---

[2] L.M. Smith, The Early History of the Monastery of Cluny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920), pp. 17-20. Also, Williams, op. cit., pp. 25-26, and Augustus Neander, A General History of the Christian Religion and Church (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1871), IV, 417.

[3] At Tours at this time religious conditions were scandalous. The principles of the Rule were completely ignored. Smith, op. cit., p. 22.

[4] Williams, op. cit., p. 27, relates that at this time Odo fled from Tours and went to Paris to study. He returned to Tours after he had completed his education.

[5] Smith, op. cit., p. 19. Also, Williams, op. cit., p. 25, and Neander, op. cit., III, 417.

Odo remained at Tours for six years, until he heard of the reputation of Berno at Baume. He then left Tours and went to Baume, where he found all that he desired, and there by profession became a Benedictine monk. This occurred in 909. Since he was an educated man, Berno immediately found in Odo a valuable asset, and placed him in charge of the novices in the monastery school. In this capacity Odo remained until he went to Cluny with Berno. There he continued to offer invaluable services to the cause of monasticism. Little time elapsed before the monks recognized in Odo a man of great piety and knowledge, and through the example he presented to those around him many were roused from worldliness and irregularity to penitence and strict observance. Thus through the name that he had established for himself as a specimen of virtue and piety and holiness, Odo became the spiritual guide of many monks at Cluny and at the monasteries associated with her.[6]

In the last years of his life Berno resigned his office, dividing the monasteries under his supervision between Odo and Guy, both relatives.[7] Odo was appointed to succeed Berno as abbot at the monasteries of Boisy, Duix, Massy, and Cluny. The other monasteries, Baime and Gigny, placed under the rule of Guy, soon became centers of reaction, Guy being poorly

---

[6] Smith, op. cit., pp. 20-22. Also, Williams, op. cit., pp. 27-28, and Neander, op. cit., III, 417.

[7] "Monastic Orders" Cambridge Medieval History (New York: Macmillan Company, 1929), V, 665.

equipped and qualified to act as supervisor for those devoted to monastic pursuits. Cluny and the houses under Odo, however, continued in and furthered the work of Berno, i.e. the establishment of regularity and uniformity of monastic practice. Without Odo the Cluniac movement might well have come to an end. But on the contrary, it flourished, so that by the year 941, the death of Odo, Cluny and her abbot became recognized as reformers of Benedictine observance, not only in France but in the West generally.[8]

Great as Odo was, he could not have accomplished the work that he did, had it not been for the fact that he entered upon his work as no young and unbalanced monk, but a man tried and trained in the disciplined life. Probably to that may be attributed his following the principle of moderation which so largely contributed to the monastery's success.[9] Well on to middle age when he became sole abbot of Cluny and having passed through a period of severe asceticism at Tours, he

---

[8] Ibid., V, 665-666. By 930 three more houses had been reformed and in 930 the great house of Fleury was added to the sphere of Cluniac influence.

[9] Williams, op. cit., p. 25, states that great stress should be laid on Odo's reputation for pious living as explaning why it was that under his rule Cluny as an institution became so effective a reforming force. Neander, op. cit., III, 417, says, "Odo was a man filled with zeal for the renovation of the Christian life, while at the same time he was far from placing the essence of Christian perfection in a rigid practice of asceticism, though he did endeavor to oppose the severity of monasticism to the secularized life of the clergy and monks of his time and to awaken an enthusiasm in its favor."

was able to judge the evils as well as the merits of severe asceticism and excessive devotion, "in this truly resembling the first Benedict."[10]

Because of the experience that he had undergone during his youth and manhood, the history of Cluny's reform work for this period is the history of Odo's life. This is reflected in relations with monasteries reformed by him. The first, Rommainmantier, exemplified that. Odo exhorted the monks to follow the discipline and customs of Cluny, so that they would not differ from Cluny in regard to food and clothing, abstinence, canonical hours, silence, hospitality, subjection, and obedience.[11] Both monasteries, Cluny and Rommainmantier, were to be held and ruled by one abbot. The election of a new abbot could take place only with the consent of the other monastery, nor could another abbot be substituted for the one appointed. Odo considered that it would be highly unjust if they who had been led to the new life by the monks of Cluny should divide the fellowship of that monastery by following a course divergent from that of Cluny. Finally, to secure the protection of the new monastery, she was placed under the guardianship of Rome, thus assuring her liberty and freedom from outside control. In the event that anyone acted contrary-wise to the opinion of the abbot concerning the monastery, a great curse should come down upon him.[12]

---

10 Smith, op. cit., p. 35.

11 Ibid., p. 58.

12 Ibid., pp. 57-58.

During the years of his abbacacy Odo received charters from both secular and ecclesiastical powers that were of monumental significance for the life of Cluny. The first of these came from Rudolph of Burgundy in 927. Rudolph was concerned about the autonomy of the monastery, for almost the whole of the charter is devoted to that principle. The preamble recounts how William the Pious had founded Cluny, had freed it from secular domination, under a great and terrible curse and subjected it to Rome alone 'for protection, not domination.' Therefore, Rudolph reaffirmed that Cluny should be free from interference and absolved from the authority of kings, princes, relatives of William, and all men. The property of the monastery was to be held without interference, nor was anyone to take away its serfs or freemen. Monks were even freed from paying toll in the markets. After Odo's death they were to elect freely a new abbot and the monastery was to continue in that order and administration that William had laid down.[13] About the same time Pope John X wrote to Rudolph to restore to Cluny property that had been taken by force from the monastery, and that bishop and count were to

---

[13] Ibid., pp. 37-38. Rudolph also granted Cluny the right of coining its own money. John XI also confirmed this right. Cluny exercised this privilege for 300 years. Joan Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 13.

protect Cluny, a home of virtue and learning.[14] Again in 929 Bernon, bishop of Macon, confirmed to Cluny four churches and chapels. These Cluny was to hold as her own with no interference.[15]

In 931 John XI granted a charter that was epoch-making in the history of Cluny. John says

> Because it is only too clear that almost all monasteries have erred from the regular life, we grant, that if any monk from any monastery should wish to pass over to your (Odo's) manner of living with the sole purpose of amending his life, that is, if his former abbot has neglected to provide a regular means of subsistence..., thou (Odo) mayest receive him until such times as the conduct of his monastery be corrected.[16]

In the past this privilege of receiving monks from other monasteries had been granted but very rarely. The Council of Agde in the Sixth Century had forbidden any abbot to receive strange monks into his monastery unless with the abbot's good will and consent.[17] Also, Benedict himself in his Rule had specifically stated that once a monk had made his profession at a monastery, there he must remain so long as he follows a

---

14 H.K. Mann, The History of the Popes in the Middle Ages (St. Louis: Herder Book Co., 1925), IV, 179. Guy, abbot of Gigny had violently seized some of the possessions of Cluny soon after Berno died. The reference is to this incident.

15 Smith, op. cit., p. 52.

16 Ibid., p. 47.

17 Edward H. Landon, A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church (Edinburgh: John Grant, 1909), I, 12.

monastic life.[18] Now, however, with the express sanction of papal authority the way was clear for Cluny's propaganda work and the reception of any monastery or monastic group under his authority for reform purposes.[19] This same charter, moreover, again secured Cluny against outside domination, and the freedom of choice by the monks in the election of an abbot was assured. Finally, no one was to take away the serfs of Cluny or attack its property, and anathema was pronounced on those who broke and blessing upon those who kept the clauses of the charter.[20]

The next year, in 932, the pope reconfirmed the same privileges of Cluny with a charter. Six years later Leo VII reaffirmed the privileges granted by John and added that Cluny was free from all outside domination as William the Pious had decreed.[21] In 939 King Louis of France confirmed the monastery's privileges. Cluny was to remain as Duke William the Pious had decreed, '_liber et absolutus_', subject to Rome alone. The monks, moreover, were to choose their own abbot.[22]

---

[18] See chapter I, pp. 5-6.

[19] Smith, _op. cit._, pp. 47-49. Also, Williams, _op. cit._, pp. 29-30.

[20] Smith, _op. cit._, p. 49.

[21] _Ibid._, p. 49.

[22] _Ibid._, p. 50.

This action of Louis probably grew out of a petition by Hugh the Black who had asked Louis to confirm all of Cluny's charter.[23]

Besides the charters confirming the privileges of Cluny, yet other charters were received in 929, 931, 934, and 939 confirming the possessions that had come to Cluny as part of the original gift from William the Pious and as gifts from bishops, counts, and laymen.[24]

As stated before, these charters were epoch-making in the history of the monastery, and as far as that goes, in the history of Benedictine monasticism. Through the provisions of these charters, privileges were established that set Cluny aside as a monastery of special significance and allotted to her a position of exceptional distinction. Although in form and nature Benedictine and espousing those principles that had come down to her through Benedictine tradition, she under Odo fell heir to a form of monachism and principles of organization that were foreign to the letter of the original Rule. The right to receive monks from other monasteries was an innovation without precedent, and while the tendency toward centralization was in its embryo state through the work of Benedict of Aniane, yet the actual practice of incorporating new and reformed monasteries under the sole supervision of the abbot of Cluny was not only new to monastic organization, but in

---

23 Ibid., pp. 50-51.

24 Ibid., p. 58.

direct contradiction to the principles of Benedict of Nursia. It will be recalled that Benedict in the Sixth Century strove to create a monastic community that was a unit within itself, owing allegiance to none other head or group within the sphere of Benedictinism. However, what by charters was granted to Cluny, cut directly at the basis of the communal unit, for the monasteries that came to be associated with Cluny were no longer absolutely free and completely unfettered, but were subject to the abbot of Cluny alone. In a word, the trend was no longer toward decentralization but toward centralization, and accordingly, away from the temper and tone of Benedictism.[25] This must be born in mind however, regardless of how close the connection may have been with Cluny, there was no formal affiliation, i.e. no formal system of organization.[26]

Those charters awarded to Cluny one other privilege that before the Tenth Century was foreign to monastic practice. Duke William the Pious had willed that Cluny should be subject to the Roman bishop alone. At the time when the stipulation was made, the Duke may have been on somewhat doubtful ground in himself dealing with the purely ecclesiastical status of Cluny. The reference to the Roman See in the will should be regarded perhaps as of the nature of a "solemn recommendation of its interests and possessions to the charge of the Supreme Pontiff."[27] Yet regardless of what William

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 50-53.
[26] Evans, op. cit., pp. 10-11.
[27] Williams, op. cit., p. 30.

actually had in mind, the fact remains that in the papal and royal charters granted to Odo the status of Cluny was established, and that position was one of complete autonomy. No secular, ecclesiastical power of any significance could seize, diminish, destroy, or infringe upon either the possessions or the privileges of Cluny, none save the Roman Pontiff, and even he could not exercise complete freedom in his relations with the monastery. Thus the position of Cluny was established, and armed with numerous charters from both secular and ecclesiastical sources, the abbot and his monks were at liberty to carry on the work of their reform.

While the beginning was made by Berno by the addition of at least three new houses to the sphere of Cluny's influence, Odo, in the spirit of his predecessor and with equal vigor, carried on the work. By 930 three more houses were reformed, among them the great house of Fleury. From the work done at Fleury the fame of Odo spread so quickly and so widely that not only laymen but also several bishops joined the community at Cluny. And, it is reported, whoever built a monastery in those days delivered it to the authority of Odo that he might order and direct it.[28]

In the later years of his life Odo spent much time in reform work in Italy where the state of religion was worse

---

[28] Smith, op. cit., pp. 38-40. Williams, op. cit., p. 25, states that in 941 seventeen lived under the disciplne of Cluny.

than in France. The entire church from the papacy downward had become secularized. In the upper ranks of the clergy luxury ruled, while the lower ranks of priest indulged in the pleasures of the common people. Sections of the clergy openly paraded their wives and concubines. In the regular church conditions were equally as bad. Monasteries lay deserted and monastery lands lay waste as the result of invasions and only in isolated communities was any rule followed. What was needed was strong internal reform with competent support. Italy received both in the form of Odo as the internal power and Alberic, Duke of Rome, as the external support. Odo was appointed by Alberic director of the monasteries in Rome, and no doubt the work carried on was on the same lines as that of Cluny. The number of monasteries that felt the influence of Odo and where reform was effected totalled eight at least, including Monte Cassino and Subiaco. Before Odo returned to Cluny his influence extended as far south as Naples and Salerno.[29]

Thus in the very capable hands of a pious, virtuous abbot the work of Cluny progressed. And Cluny itself stood alone, the semblence of monastic autonomy.

Abbot Aymardus

When Odo died in 941 Aymardus became the third abbot of

---

[29] Smith, op. cit., pp. 60-64.

Cluny. Very little is known of him and his personal life.[30] He evidently was appointed coadjuster and successor at Cluny by Odo as early as 938.[31] The early appointment was probably necessitated by the frequent absences of Odo. Legend says that Aymardus was selected because of his deep humility. In the charters in which he is mentioned the adjective humilis is nearly always prefixed before his name.

According to the Life of Majolus, the history of Aymardus' successor, "Aymardus, son of happy memory and blessed simplicity, was zealous in increasing the property of the monastery and in acquiring material goods. Besides this he was devoted on the observances of the Rule."[32] Rudolph Glaber, a Cluniac monk and historian of the Eleventh Century, describes him as "a simple man though not as well known and famous as other abbots of Cluny, yet like them carefully he upheld regular discipline."[33]

In the later years of his life Aymardus became blind. It was probably on that account that after fifteen years as abbot

---

30 The writer was able to find very little on the man. What materials are incorporated into this section on Aymardus are essentially a reproduction of the pertinent facts in one chapter and various other references in L.M. Smith, The Early History of the Monastery of Cluny (Oxford University Press: New York, 1920), pp. 88-99.

31 A charter of 938 speaks of Cluny where Lord Aymardus was abbot. Smith, op. cit., p. 88.

32 Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, p. 269, as quoted in Smith, op. cit., p. 90.

33 Smith, op. cit., p. 90.

he retired from active participation in the administration of the monastery. Knowing that one of the monks in particular, Majolus by name, was outstanding for good deeds and virtuous living, Aymardus called his monks together and urged them to choose a new abbot who could better look after the needs of the monastery. He suggested Majolus, whom the monks then elected. After Majolus had been appointed as his successor, the weary, blind abbot retired to the infirmary to spend his remaining days in peace.[34]

Beginning with the Rule of Odo and continuing on during the abbacacy of Aymardus, Cluny was presented with many gifts of land and property by both laymen and clergymen, so that the physical wealth of the monastery grew. Under Odo's rule, while the spiritual reknown of the abbey was established, little attention was paid to these material interests, to their organization and administration. Here Aymardus' more practical gifts came to the fore. Lacking in the all-around stature of his predecessors, he seem to have been a thorough organizer and administrator, a talent either lacking in the other abbots or hidden beneath the more urgent needs of securing the foundation of the abbey. How and to what extent his work of administration was carried out, is not known. However, beyond being a careful adherent of the Rule as it functioned at Cluny, Aymardus' chief claim to fame lay in his practical

---

[34] Ibid., p. 89.

talents as the organizer and administrator of the property and wealth of the monastery.[35]

Since he was blind and of ill health, Aymardus could not travel as extensively as did Odo. For that reason his reform work was quite limited. Only two monasteries are known to have come under Cluny's jurisdiction while he was abbot. The first was Celsiniacus, which Louis IV made a possession of Cluny. The second was St. Anands, given to Cluny by Conrad, king of Burgundy, in 958. These two houses were reformed in accordance with Cluniac practice and tradition.[36]

The gifts from Louis IV and Conrad of Burgundy were both confirmed by charter. In 959 Louis the king of Burgundy confirmed the possessions of Cluny and also those of St. Amand's. No count or magnate could interfere with the monasteries or their property, which was for the monk's use alone.[37] Besides these, Aymardus received three royal charters from Louis, king of the Franks.[38] According to these documents Cluny's property was again confirmed and secured: it was to be held freely

---

35 The development of the Cluny estates brought the abbey for the first time into the feudal courts. The earlier Benedictine idea had been that a monk or his community should not bring an action to court and that he should appear in court under exceptional circumstances, as a witness to the truth. Evans, op. cit., p. 15.

36 Smith, op. cit., p. 92.

37 Ibid., p. 92.

38 Ibid., p. 92. These charters were granted in 946, 952, and 955.

with no interference from outside authority as former charters had declared.[39] Also, in 949 Aymardus received a charter from Pope Agapitus II. The monasteries liberties and privileges were confirmed and freedom from the domination of kings, counts, or relatives of Duke William the Pious was assured. Monks were freely to elect their abbot without consulting any prince, nor was bishop, count, or any other person to enter the monastery or give orders without the abbot's expressed consent and permission. No person was to seize or attack the monastery's property. Other possessions, churches, villages, and lands were confirmed as part of the monastery's estate. And to show that it behoved the Holy See to guard and cherish Cluny, the monastery was to pay ten solidi to Rome every five years. Those who did not observe the clauses of the charter were to be bound with the chains of anathema, alienated from the kingdom of the church of God, and tortured eternally by the devil.[40]

Thus the third abbot carried on the work that had been started by the first abbot. While the extent of Aymardus' reform work was not nearly as great as that of preceding heads Cluny, yet the character and quality was in complete harmony with the practices and principles and traditions that had become so integral a part of the Cluniac heritage.

---

[39] Ibid., p. 93.

[40] Ibid., p. 93.

By charter and decree her position had again been reaffirmed, that of monastery free and autonomous. Although Aymardus did little to add to the progress of the development of the Cluniac Order, this much can be said - he did not permit any of the monastery's privileges to be removed or her autonomous position to be encroached upon.

Abbot Majolus

In his later years Aymardus became blind and chose as his successor Majolus, who became the fourth abbot Cluny.[41] Born of an old provincial family that was quite wealthy, Majolus was provided with a thorough education in the schools of Lyon, where he was later ordained as priest.[42] At an early age he retired to live a life of solitude. So great was the fame of such action however that instead of the life of solitude that he sought, he was brought more conspicuously into the forefront of affairs of that area and community, to the extent that he was urged to accept the bishopric of Besancon. This position he refused to accept because of his humble nature. He feared that he would become too involved in secular affairs, for his desire was rather to seek the highest degree

---

[41] According to a charter of 954 Majolus is named as abbot, but Aymardus' name with the title of abbot still appears in charters up to 956, from 956 to 960 less frequently, and finally for the last time in 964. Smith, op. cit., p. 105.

[42] Evans, op. cit., p. 15. Cf. Smith, op. cit., p. 100.

of perfection available to man, that offered in monastic life. Accordingly, he left Lyon and entered Cluny.[43] He soon gained fame at the monastery because of his obedient, virtuous, humble life and was later elevated to the abbot's chair by Aymardus himself.[44]

One incident is significant to show the qualities, aims, and goals of the abbot. During the later part of the Tenth Century when the stock of Rome had reached such a low ebb, Otto II, in 975, upon the death of Benedict VI, was asked to obtain the election of a suitable pope. Otto called Majolus to Germany to consult him on the subject. Through the urgings of influential men of the court, Majolus himself was asked to assume the papal throne. The abbot of Cluny, however, did not feel himself competent to manage the multitude of secular affairs in Rome and preferred his position as abbot of Cluny. He pleaded that he had nothing in common with the Romans, neither nationality nor manners. The Emperor must look elsewhere, for he could not accept the position. Not only did the abbot plead that he was not competent, but he had been warned by Scripture to refuse the tiara of the Roman Bishop. When

---

43 Smith, op. cit., p. 102.

44 Evans, op. cit., pp. 15-16. The name that Majolus established for himself may have been determined by other features of the man. Unlike puny Odo and humble Aymardus, Majolus was a specimen of a man. According to Odilo, his disciple, he was solemn of gait, exalted in voice, eloquent of speech, angelic in countenance, serene in appearance, in every motion, gesture, or action displaying an aire of honorableness.

the proposal was made to Majolus, he consulted his New Testament for advice. The text opened at Col. 2: 8[45] which he looked upon as a warning that he ought to reject the proposal as a temptation to be avoided. Thus Majolus was devoted to the work of monasticism and the work of reform at Cluny.[46]

Majolus as abbot continued Aymardus' work in consolidating the wealth and possessions of Cluny and carried on the reform tasks of Odo.[47] Five more houses in France were reformed by Majolus during his lifetime and gifts of land, property, churches, chapels were added to the list of possessions already at the disposal of the abbey.[48] The reform energies of Majolus were also expended outside of France. As a close friend and advisor of Emperor Otto II and his wife,[49] he spent much time in Italy and at the royal court. In recognition for his services the Emperor gave him several monasteries at Pavia and Ravenna, which immediately fell under the reforming

---

[45] Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

[46] Mann, op. cit., IV, 316. Cf. also, Neander, op. cit., III, 418.

[47] Evans, op. cit., p. 16.

[48] Of the 1372 charters which cover the period while Aymardus was abbot, the majority record deeds of gifts from laymen. Many gifts were also received from bishops.

[49] The monk Syro of this period reports that "he was the ear and depository of the imperial secrets, those who had any dealing with Otto seeking him out as intermediary." Smith, op. cit., p. 105.

hand of the abbot.[50]

As Odo and Aymardus had done very little to increase the number of monasteries dependent on Cluny, so Majolus was content merely to restore and reform Benedictine houses without bringing them into any formal relation with Cluny. The work of reform did not yet include the principle of submission to Cluny.[51] When Majolus became abbot, only five monasteries were subject to him, in the sense that they looked to Cluny as their superior and source of authority.[52] While several monasteries had been revitalized by Majolus and had patterned their customs and practices upon those of houses reformed by Cluny, they were not members of a distinct order. Closely allied to Cluny by ties of friendship and by common goals and objectives, they yet recognized no superior house to which obedience was absolute, but preserved as part of their heritage the Benedictine principle of local autonomy.[53]

---

50 Evans, op. cit. p. 16.

51 "Monastic Orders", Cambridge Medieval History, V, 663.

52 Smith, op. cit., p. 115.

53 Cambridge Medieval History, V. 663. This is shown in his relation with the monastery of Fleury, once reformed by Odo. Oilbald, the abbot, had been appointed by Lothar, king of the Franks, a direct infringement upon the rights of the monks. When Gerbert of Bobbio asked Majolus to interfere, he denounced the audacity of the king and the abbot. Yet Majolus, while realizing that prestige could be gained, declined to interfere. The abbot ought to be condemned, Majolus said, but it was not for him to pass the condemnation, since Fleury was under a different ruler and in a different land. Cf. Smith, op. cit., pp. 108-111, and Mann, op. cit., V, 38.

While there was no organized movement toward the establishment of Cluny as the head of an order, yet it is evident that under Majolus a tentative beginning in that direction was made. Several monasteries were placed directly under him. Thus, St. Saviour's at Pavia was given directly to Majolus and confirmed by charter.[54] In 967 another monastery in Pavia was given to the abbot of Cluny. These as well as St. Marcel de Saucet, St. Andre de Rosaris, Arluc, Montmajour, and St. Amand's were either given to Cluny or placed directly under the authority of Majolus.[55] And in his relations with the monks of Maior Monasterium the thought of the primacy of the Cluniac abbot, while definitely not stated, is expressed in no uncertain terms.[56]

Thus Majolus carried on the work of reform, bringing more and many monasteries under the vitalizing influence of Cluny. No longer restricted to Aquitaine and the surrounding

---

[54] Smith, op. cit., p. 116.

[55] Evans, op. cit., p. 16.

[56] The monastery had been reformed by Majolus and thirteen Cluniac monks at the request of Odo of Champagne. When the king heard of the work done, he suggested, after having gotten papal consent, to Count Odo that one of the thirteen monks be appointed abbot and that the monastery be declared independent of Cluny. Royal and papal privileges were granted and the monastery was declared a special subject of Rome, subject to none else. When Majolus heard of this, he went to the monastery to protest. In his speech before the monks he calls them alien sons and asks why they have alienated themselves from Cluny, their mother. Moreover, he vehemently censured the abbot for leading the other brothers into error and for usurping the ius of Cluny by setting himself up as abbot in opposition to Cluny. The abbot of the monastery escaped only by explaining that he acted in accordance with the kings commands. Smith, op. cit., p. 121.

communities, the work spread to all parts of Italy, France, and even Germany. How many houses actually were functioning as a result of action of the Cluniac monks is uncertain. Yet the spirit of Cluny was spreading and in degenerate and irregular monasteries the monastic ideal was again reestablished. Full in the steps of the preceding abbots the task was being completed. Yet with Majolus an undercurrent of thought and activity is evident, that Cluny was no longer content to reform monasteries as parts merely of a greater Benedictine organization, but rather with Majolus a system of centralization, as a method of reform, was gradually making its appearance.

CHAPTER V

FROM ODILO TO HUGH

Abbot Odilo

Three years before his death in 994 Majolus appointed a monk of Cluny, Odilo, as his coadjustor, and upon his death Majolus was succeeded by Odilo as abbot.[1] A descendent of an old and wealthy family of Auvergne, his parents were noted for their piety and virtue. As a child, like Odo before him, Odilo was physically a weakling, partially paralized, small, thin, pale, but filled with energy. From childhood he was dedicated to the church and at an early age entered St. Julian's Brioude, where he soon distinguished himself for his humility, good works, and purity.[2] But feeling that St. Julian's was not sufficient since salvation could be attained only by means

---

[1] Joan Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 17. Cf. also, L.M. Smith, The Early History of the Monastery of Cluny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920), p. 144. The first charter that mentions Odilo as abbot is dated 994.

[2] An incident from his later life depicts his character. Odilo gained great fame on account of his charitable works, especially among the poor, during severe famines in France. On one occasion after all the graneries of the monastery had been emptied, he ordered the precious church vessels melted down and sold the metal plus the ornaments of the church to buy food to alleviate the extreme distress among the people. Augustus Neander, A General History of the Christian Religion and Church (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1871), III, 418.

of regular monastic living, he entered Cluny.[3] There as a novice he soon gained distinction for good works, humility, and moderation,[4] so that Majolus came to regard him with special love. When the old abbot felt death approaching, he called together all the monks of Cluny and proclaimed Odilo his successor. The choice was ratified unanimously by all the monks present.[5]

Little is known of the first years of his rule except that at Cluny the number of monks was increased, so that the building of the monastery were enlarged.[6] However, these early years were probably spent in extending the reform and in supervising the houses that were under the guardianship of the abbot of Cluny. Charters of gifts and protection give evidence of that fact. The Empress Adelaide gave to Odilo the monastery of St. Victor's at Geneva and also Payence

---

[3] Odilo had already met Majolus and it was through his friendship with the old abbot that he was drawn to Cluny. Smith, ,op. cit., p. 145.

[4] The Life of Odilo devotes an entire chapter to one of the chief virtues of Odilo, that of moderation. L.M. Smith, op. cit., introduction, p. xiv. Some of his qualities brought him into the censure of the severe. But Odilo told them that if he had to be damned, he would rather be damned for over-indulgence than for over-hardness. H.K. Mann, The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages (St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1925), V, 277.

[5] For the life of Odilo see Smith, op. cit., pp. 143-146. Also, Evans, op. cit., p. 16.

[6] Odilo liked to boast over his new buildings, comparing himself to Julius Caesar, in that he had found Cluny wood and left it marble. Evans, op. cit., p. 20.

In 955 the bishop of Autun gave Cluny the monastery of Mesveres; in 993 one Rudolph gave Cluny a monastery at Bevais. Also, the Count of Chalon an important monastery at Pacy. In 1010 St. Andre-de-Gap was given to Cluny, and in 1026 Vezelay came under Cluniac rule. In 1030 Amadeus I of Savore-Belly made a gift of Malaucene, and in 1038 Anbrierle was added. Others were Mantua, St. Florin, and St. Colombe.[7] In addition to these various houses and monasteries were given and confirmed to Cluny by Emperors Otto III in 998, 999, and 1001; by Henry II in 1003; by Conrad in 1024. These presents to Cluny were confirmed as dependents of Cluny and as such were granted all the rights and privileges that the mother monastery enjoyed.[8] Gifts of land, monasteries, and churches were also made by dukes and counts, their possession by Cluny being confirmed by charters.[9] All these combined to make Cluny a center of material wealth and a center of reform activity, the foremost of that age.[10]

---

[7] This list of sites is found in Evans, op. cit., p. 19. The author says that these are far from being the only acquisitions.

[8] Smith, op. cit., pp. 150-152.

[9] Ibid., pp. 152-154.

[10] Just how many monasteries were connected with Cluny at this time is uncertain. However, the number must have been quite large, for when Hugh, the next abbot reached the height of his work there were 10, 000 monks in the Cluniac system. Such a number would require a large number of monasteries.

While with the majority of these gifts charters were granted as a matter of formality, several charters were granted that are significant. Thus, for example, the charter granted by Gregory V in 998. In it the pope expressed his desire to strengthen Cluny with apostolic authority. The freedom and authority of the monastery was also proclaimed. Moreover, no one, however great or powerful, was to attack its monasteries, cells, churches, or any other property. No duke, bishop, prince, nor any other person, great or small, was to molest the monks and their possessions or dispute their rights to tithes. Under pain of anathema - and this is perhaps the most important provision of the charter - no bishop or priest was to enter the monastery for ordination of monks, consecration of her churches, or celebration of Mass unless asked to do so by the abbot. Monks were to be ordained by whatever bishop and in whatever place the abbot so desired. The abbot, who was to be chosen by the common counsel and consent of the monks, could ask any bishop to consecrate him. Anathema was called down on any who dared go against the charter. Finally, a long list of lands, churches and monasteries was included and these were to be subject to Cluny absolutely and alone.[11] In 1016 these same privileges were confirmed by Benedict VIII for Cluny itself and extended to all the dependent houses of

---

11 Watkins W. Williams, Monastic Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), p. 31. Cf. also, Smith, op. cit., p. 149, and Evans, op. cit., p. 18.

Burgundy, Aquitaine, and Provence.[12]

Again in 1027 John XIX granted Odilo a very full charter confirming all of Cluny's privileges and liberties. In the year in the presence of Conrad II the pope reaffirmed Cluny's privileges. Of specific note was the provision that no bishop was to excommunicate the monks of the abbey.[13] Also, in 1045-1046 Gregory the Sixth at Odilo's request confirmed Cluny's privileges and possession of monasteries that had been granted by Conrad's royal charters. Clement II in 1047 recommended Cluny and its possessions to all the bishops, princes, and magnates of Gaul and Aquitaine.[14] Thus the privileges and liberties of Cluny were assured. The autonomy granted to her already by William the Pious was again established for Odilo as it had been for the great abbots preceding him. Most significant factor about the provisions of the charter itself, except for the fact that the general autonomy of the monastery was reasserted, was its freedom from the power of the diocesan bishop. Although this condition had been clearly stipulated in previous charters, it seem that only now under Odilo was the plan actually carried into practice, so as to gain results. Such action was, as we shall see, not without its repercussions.

---

12 Evans, op. cit., p. 18. Cf. also, Mann, op. cit., V, 195.

13 Smith, op. cit., p. 150. Cf. also, Mann, op. cit., V, 195.

14 Ibid., p. 150.

Odilo like his predecessors reformed many monasteries. But unlike them he tended to make these monasteries subject to Cluny. It is with him that the idea of a Cluniac Order may be said actually to have begun, although, as seen above, traces of such tendencies were already present under Majolus.[15] Evidence for such a program may be found in the charter of Gregory V in 999. In the words of the charter for the first time language is used that clearly suggests that the abbot of Cluny was the "ordinary" of the entire Cluniac congregation, "an extension," as Williams says, "beyond all territorial limits of the privileges of William's Testamentum."[16] This same thought is evident in a bull of Benedict VIII, granted in 1016, that "alike civilly and ecclesiastically the Caput Ordinis and all his pertinentia owed no allegiance whatsoever save only to the Apostolic See."[17] In a negative manner Adalbero of Rheims confirmed this new trend of organization among the Cluniacs. Writing a satire against the system of monasticism at Cluny, Adalbero first attacked the leaders who, in order to carry through their reform, falsely asserted that they were reviving the principles and custom of old. "They formulate new theories which they call old, writing above them 'lex antiquissima'."[18] One of the most vicious of their in-

---

15 Evans, op. cit., p. 18.

16 Williams, op. cit., p. 31.

17 Ibid., p. 31.

18 As quoted by Smith, op. cit., p. 166.

novations, Adelbero held, was their teaching the unconditional obedience of the monk to his abbot, "so that what a monk would refuse to do of his own will, he was compelled to do by force."[19] While this assertion Adelbero does not specifically state the character of the new trend of monastic government, yet in his denunciation of absolute monastic discipline to the abbot, the tendency is apparent. While it is true that in Benedictine monasticism as a whole the monks owed obedience to the abbot, that feature is given particular significance when one stops to consider that by the time Odilo became abbot a number of monasteries had already become subject to and dependent upon Cluny and her abbot. Actually then, though they yet occupied cells at the monasteries beyond the territorial limits of Cluny itself, they for all practical purposes by being subject to Cluny, owned no superior other than the abbot of Cluny. And what else was that than the realization of the new trend toward definite centralization of power, that of making Cluny the head of the Cluniac Order. Thus there is agreement with what Hamilton says, that

> "Odilo's work at Cluny was distinguished by the intensive application of Cluniac customs to a congregation dependent houses... It may be said that Odilo left Cluny, hitherto merely a spiritual power among Benedictine houses, the head of an order, as distinct from a mere congregation of monasteries within the Benedictine system."[20]

---

19 As quoted by Smith, op. cit. p. 166.

20 "Monastic Orders," Cambridge Medieval History, V, p. 664.

What this innovation meant in actual practice was a far cry from the original Rule of St. Benedict. According to its first exposition the Rule stated that the monk was subject to his abbot. But the abbot exercised jurisdiction over his own monastery only, there being no connection between his abbey and that of another abbot. With the innovation of Odilo this entire set-up was changed. No longer did Cluny denote a particular form of monastic discipline, a new monastic sect within a larger organization, but rather, it denoted a society or association of many monasteries that acknowledged one head and followed the same rule of life. As Mosheim says

> "It denoted first that mode of living which Odo prescribed to the Benedictine monks of Cluny and then the whole number of monasteries in different parts of Europe which embraced the regulations of Cluny and united in a kind of association of which the abbot of Cluny in France was the head."[21]

Thus the cycle was completed, and Cluny was no longer purely Benedictine but an Order, a congregation, a spurious offshoot from Benedictinism.[22]

In spite of the fact that through papal and royal charters the autonomous position of Cluny and her dependents was unquestionably established, Cluny was an object of attack. As she grew in temporal riches and spiritual renown, her promin-

---

[21] John L. Mosheim, Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern (New York: Robert Carter and Bros., 1971), III, 126.

[22] Cf. Dom Cuthbert Butler, Benedictine Monachism (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1924), p. 237.

once became the object of envy and jealousy, her riches stirring up the greed of the lay lords and her independence the jealousy of the diocesan bishop. In 1016 Cluny was attacked by lay lords and in 1025 by the episcopate.[23]

According to a letter from Benedict VIII to the bishops of Burgundy, Aquitaine, and Provence, the news had reached Rome that greedy men had attacked the lands of Cluny, ravaging not only the possessions of the monastery, but also preying on the possessions of the poor that had been committed to Cluny. Such action seriously interrupted the functioning of the monks, in that they could no longer give due service to God nor extend their customary care and hospitality to the guests and poor of the monastery. The whole church was made to suffer thereby, as the prayers and Masses, which Cluny had heretofore offered for all the faithful, had to be curtailed. Accordingly, it behoved the faithful to have compassion on Cluny's plight and to rally to her side. As for the thieves and persecutors, if they did not return what had been taken by a certain date, they were to be excommunicated by the bishops and as putrifying and lifeless members, cut off from the body of the church. A tremendous curse was then laid on them.[24] Since there is no further report on the action of the pope, the outcome of the affair is not known.

---

[23] Smith, op. cit., p. 155.

[24] Ibid., pp. 157-158.

The next attack that came from the outside was more serious since it was directed at Cluny's privileges. At the Council of Ansa in 1025 the bishop of Macon had appealed to the bishops there assembled against Burchard, archbishop of Vienna, who had gone against canonical decree and slighted his rights as diocesan by ordaining monks at Cluny without his (the bishop of Macon) consent. Burchard cited Odilo to his defense. Odilo then proceeded to show the charters and privileges granted by the popes, which he reckoned to be sufficient proof for the action of Burchard. The bishops, however, were not content but went further by condemning the validity of the charters as going against the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon in 451.[25] The privileges which Odilo cited were therefore not binding since they were not in accord with canonical decrees. Convinced by this reasoning, the bishop of Vienna begged the pardon of the bishops and asked forgiveness of the bishop of Macon.[26]

But Odilo did not take such action quietly. Immediately he appealed to the Emperor and pope who took up the plight of Cluny. The pope expressed his views in four letters: one to the bishop of Macon for his audacity; one to the arch-

---

[25] The Council had decreed that abbots and monks were to submit to their diocesan and that no bishop was to ordain monks without the diocesan's consent. Edward H. Landon, A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church (Edinburgh: John Grant, 1909), I, 27.

[26] Smith, op. cit., pp. 158-159.

bishop of Lyon condemning the bishop of Macon; a third to Odilo confirming Cluny's privileges and liberties; and a fourth to Robert, king of the Franks. Robert, no doubt upon the admonition of the pope, followed the pope's procedure and confirmed the charters granted to Cluny. With both papal and royal authority substantiating the claims of Cluny, the matter was settled. But peace did not last for long, for soon thereafter another dispute arose between the Cluniacs and the episcopate over the monastery of Vezelay. There a Cluniac monk had been appointed abbot for the purpose of reforming the monastery, without the consent of the bishop of Autun. When the bishop excommunicated the mon, Odilo appealed to Rome. What resulted is not known, but eventually the king intervened, took over the monastery, and the affair ended.[27]

To this could be added the satire of Adelbero of Rheims, in which he burlesques the Cluniacs, their reform program, and sets forth his own theory of ecclesiastical hierarchy and program for reform. The central thought that runs the entire work is Adelbero's hatred of the changes transforming society which he attributed to monastic influences and which he held were contrary to the traditions and laws of the Fathers and popes.[28]

All these attacks were signs of a larger movement, of

---

[27] Ibid., pp. 159-163.

[28] Ibid., pp. 165-169.

the growing jealousy and mistrust by certain sections of the secular church for the regulars. From the lay lords sprang greed for the monastery's wealth; from the bishops jealousy, for their authority was being threatened by the autonomy which Cluny claimed not only for herself, but also for her subject monasteries.

With the death of Odilo in 994 the first phase of Cluniac activity came to an end.[29] The principles of reform had been firmly grounded and carried through, and Cluny stood foremost as the reforming house of the age. What Odilo practiced, what he enjoyed, what he exercised was a far cry from the days when Odo 'a learned man with a hundred books' stood at the gates of Cluny to submit himself to Berno, an abbot of an insignificant monastery in the woods and rolling hills of Aquitaine. Great changes had transpired in practice and administration, but the underlying character and traditions were still ever present with Odilo as with Berno. Monasticism was still the ideal, the life to be preferred, even above the honors of the secular church. And the work of reform, in the spirit of Cluniac Benedictinism, was still the end and purpose of the monks.

But with the pinacle of fame and glory a realization and the work of reform at its peak, there was heard the ominous rumblings of opposition and dissatisfaction. Not

---

[29] Ibid., p. 217.

content to see their position usurped, section of both the clergy and laity were building in their hearts a sincere animosity for all that the Cluniacs stood for. In ecclesiastical circles the opposition came not from the upper clergy, but from the diocese, the local bishop and his superiors, the archbishop. Such was to be expected, for their control of the monasteries with their wealth and authority were surely slipping away. With that event the wings of the diocesan would be clipped. The lay lords, not concerned so much about the power of the monasteries, were concerned about the mass of wealth and property in the hands of the monks. Every increase in physical riches meant that just that much more wealth was passing out of their control. In both cases it seemed almost a life and death proposition. So it was for their own position and their own standing as both secular and ecclesiastical powers that they had to register concern. And so it was that open and direct opposition cropped up against the Order of Cluny.

Abbot Hugh

Odilo refused to nominate his successor, saying that he trusted in the will of God and the wisdom of the monks to elect a new abbot. Their choice fell upon Hugh of Semur, a descendent of one of the noblest houses of Burgundy.[30]

---

30 Smith, The History of Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries (London: Philip Allan and Co. Ltd., 1930), p. 31. Cf. also, Evans, op. cit., p. 24.

His father was a noted soldier, while his mother, also of noble birth, was known for her piety and great virtue. Before Hugh was born a priest had predicted that the child would become a great and noble pillar of the church, and as the boy grew he with his whole heart and soul longed to be a monk. But it appeared unlikely that the young Hugh would attain such a goal since his father "thought little of heavenly things," and decided that the boy should follow a military career. Previous to such training, however, Hugh was sent to a Cluniac house, St. Marcel-los-Chalon, to gain an education, at which task he devoted himself most diligently. While at the house, unknown to his father, he fled to Cluny to follow a monastic life. He was then fourteen years old.[31] Hugh's decision to enter the monastery came as a great shock to his father, who traveled to Cluny at once in hopes of winning back his son. But his efforts were futile. Eventually, it seems, he became reconciled to the fact and accepted the decision[32] though it was done so with saddness and dissappointment.[33]

---

31 When Hugh entered the chapter and presented his petition to become a monk, one of the brothers said, "O happy Cluny that today receives a treasure more precious than any other." Smith, op. cit., p. 32.

32 When Hugh's father first saw him at the monastery "clad in the habit, such grace of God was his (Hugh's) that even his father who still bare hardly his vocation, admitted that he was very beautiful." Smith op. cit., p. 33.

33 Smith, op. cit., pp. 31-33. Cf. also, Evans, op. cit. p. 24.

At Cluny Hugh soon distinguished himself above his fellows for his humility, zeal, and charity. When only eighteen years old he was appointed prior, and was sent out frequently by Odilo to tend to the business of the monastery. At the age of twenty-four he became a priest, and finally at the age of twenty-five was elected sole abbot of the great monastery at Cluny.[34]

With Hugh a new era in the history of Cluny began. Preeminently a statesman for sixty years, Hugh governed the Order as a wise monarch governs his kingdom. As abbot he was the first in a line of lordly abbots who controlled the destiny of an international system, in which official supplanted personal relationships. Moreover, Hugh was known of kings, emperors, and popes. He gave advice to Emperors Henry IV and V. On one occassion he headed an embassy to the king of the Hungarians. He influenced the policies of the royal house of Castile. He addressed William the Conqueror as an inferior. He invited the king of France, Phillip, to take his vows at Cluny, and as papal legate sat in judgement over both

---

[34] Smith, op. cit., p. 33. Cf. also, Evans, op. cit., pp. 24-25. In one account of Hugh's election there is evidence that the old Benedictine policy by which the abbot was to be freely nominated by all the monks had already fallen into misuse. This account reports that Odilo refused to nominate a successor but approved the suggestion made by some of the more prominent persons of the monastery that whoever they nominated should be approved by the monks. Accordingly, when Hugh was nominated, the nomination was acclaimed by all present. Smith, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

ecclesiastical dignitaries and secular princes.[35]

Such activity, while it lay outside the formal duties of the abbot, did much to increase the prestige of the monastery, both as a spiritual center and as a depository for temporal wealth. Most of all, it increased the prestige and power of the abbot himself.[36] During the course of the sixty years that he ruled, Cluny was given many new monasteries and many ancient ones were placed under the supervision of Hugh. The exact number is not known.[37] One source says that by the Twelfth Century 314 houses[38] comprised the Order, and another says that under Hugh the congregation numbered about 10, 000 monks.[39] To what extent the figures are absolutely correct

---

[35] Smith, op. cit., p. 30. Cf. also, Evans, op. cit., p. 25.

[36] The early abbots had had to lead the common life of the monks. They had to follow the daily devotions, sleep in the common dormitory, eat in the common dining hall, keep silence at certain hours and in certain places. But with the increasingly prominent part that the abbot came to play in public life, these obligations were gradually loosened and finally completely removed, thereby releasing the abbot from their demands. Hugh was considered above the discipline of the monastic constitution. Evans, op. cit., p. 25.

[37] A partial listing is found in Evans, op. cit., pp. 27-32. Cf. also the chapters in Smith, Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries.

[38] "Cluny" Encyclopedia of Bibical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Knowledge (New York: Harp Brothers, 1894), II, 392.

[39] "Cluny" Catholic Encyclopedia (New York: Roland Appleton Company, 1908), IV, 73-74.

is beside the point. What is significant, however, is that by the time Hugh had reached the peak of his fame at Cluny, he sat at the head of a powerful organization, composed of many houses and many subjects. Nor were these marshalled forces restricted to France alone, for Cluny was now international, claiming houses in Scotland, England, France, Italy, Spain, and even one in far off Jerusalem.[40]

While his possessions were increasing, Hugh's power over the monasteries was increased and more clearly defined. His legislative, judicial, and administrative powers were extended over subject houses as over Cluny itself.[41] Such power was, moreover, sanctioned and confirmed by papal charters and bulls. In 1049 Leo IX granted a charter in which Cluny's charters, liberties, and privileges were confirmed and also reasserted the papal guardianship over the abbey, "in this doing nothing new but confirming the old."[42] The same was reaffirmed by Leo's successor, Victor II.[43] Three years later Hugh received a charter from Stephan VII in which the pope confirmed Cluny's tenure of subject houses, churches, and property. Again, no bishop could excommunicate Cluniac monks or ordain and consecrate her monks or abbots unless invited

---

[40] Evans, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

[41] Ibid., p. 25.

[42] Smith, op. cit., p. 39.

[43] Ibid., p. 43.

to do so by the abbot himself.[44] Again in 1063 Alexander II in the first year of his pontificate confirmed Cluny's right to all its charters and possessions.[45] Urban II in 1087 reaffirmed and amplified Cluny's privileges with the added provision that only a legate from Rome was to dare open his mouth against Cluniac monks and monasteries.[46] A second charter by Urban in 1088 granted Cluny again her old privilege, that Cluniac liberties and immunities were confirmed, that the monasteries of Cluny were never to be removed from Cluniac supervision.[47] Again in 1095 when two charters were granted, the privileges of Cluny were confirmed in words identical to the charter of 1088.[48] Between 1095 and 1097 Urban confirmed the rights and privileges of numerous houses under Cluny, establishing them as the property of Cluny and therefore dependent upon her.[49] Finally in 1097 Urban granted the abbey another charter, the fullest statement and exposition ever given on the position and privileges of Cluny.[50] Urban's

---

[44] Ibid., p. 44.

[45] Ibid., p. 51.

[46] Ibid., pp. 84-85.

[47] Smith, op. cit., p. 88 states that to this was added the special privilege that on five great festivals, and on Epiphany, Ascension, and the anniversary of the dedication of the abbey's church the abbot was to wear at Mass the episcopal mitre, dalmatic, glove, and sandals.

[48] Ibid., p. 88.

[49] Ibid., pp. 93-94.

[50] Ibid., pp. 95-97.

successor, Paschal II, continued the papal policy toward Cluny, though no new privileges were granted. In one chapter, however, he specifically refers to "all priories and cells subject to the regimen of Cluny." These were to be held free by the monastery and preserved for the abbot and his successors always in peace and quiet. This, as well as Cluny's former privileges, especially those granted by Gregory VII and Urban II was most solemnly confirmed.[51] Five days later from the Lateran Paschal issued another charter almost identical in wording.[52] There is yet one charter unnamed and unidentified that expresses the same views and opinions.[53]

Thus once more by the specific statement of papal charters Cluny's privileges, liberties, and possessions were unquestionably established. But a step forward toward the centralization of monastic authority had been taken. What had been started under Majolus and laid out as principle under Odilo was put into practice as a basic principle of monastic policy under Hugh. The Cluniac abbot was now the Superior, not only of Cluny, but also of every Cluniac house. The abbot of every other dependent house, regardless of how powerful, was nominated by the abbot of Cluny. All abbeys restored or reformed by Cluny had to enter the Order and thereby officially register

---

[51] Ibid., pp. 101-102.

[52] Ibid., p. 103.

[53] Evans, op. cit., p. 25. Evans gives the text of the charter.

its subjection to the mother abbey and declare its acceptance of a subordinate rank to that of Cluny.[54] The rank to which they were reduced was that of a priory, while the ruler of the monastery was demoted to that of a prior, in all things subject to the Abbot, the great abbot at Cluny.[55] Thus in actual practice Hugh sat at the head of the Order as a grand monarch and beneath him functioned a vast system of subordinates who looked up from their geographical positions, whether in France, Germany, Spain, or England, to move and to act at the beck and call of their lord, the Abbot. Thus also a new principle of monasticism was evolved, and in place of an autonomous single monastery under one abbot, an independent Order, not merely a chapter, under the supreme hand of a monarchical head, was created and firmly established.

How Benedict of Nursia would have reacted to this new institution is a matter of supposition. However, in view of his insistence upon the preversation of the complete autonomy of the individual monastic group, the monastic community, it seems safe to surmise that he would have been quite adverse to such new ideas and principles of monastic polity. After all,

---

54 The records of St. Sauxillange record "Hugo de Mercorio, abbot and prior, 1060, because at that time the abbey was reduced to a priory through St. Hugh the Great (of Cluny)." Evans, op. cit., p. 26.

55 Evans, op. cit., pp. 25-26. Cf. also, Mosheim, op. cit., III, p. 126, and Cambridge Medieval History, V, 664.

the creation of an Order cut directly at the roots of St. Benedict's most constructive contribution to monastic life, the vow of stability. Yet, on the other hand, were St. Benedict to know the spirit that moved behind the scenes during the course of the years in which the principle of the Order developed, it is equally safe to surmise that he would have nodded assent. Although they lived in different centuries, in different localities, and under different historical conditions, the abbot of Monte Cassino and the abbot of Cluny strove for one and the same end, the attainment of the monastic ideal, that form and manner of life which offered most abundantly the possibilities for the salvation of one's own soul. That they differed as to the channels and systems of organization that must be followed for the attainment of that end is secondary. What is significant is the fact that both had the same goal in mind.

Hugh lived through a period of great historical events. He saw ten popes crowned,[56] lived through the reform of Gregory VII, witnessed the struggle between Emperor and Papacy, and watched the pilgrims leave for the first Crusade. As the abbot of the greatest monastic system of the age, the head of an international institution, it is of note to examine the

---

[56] Leo IX, Victor II, Stephan IX, Benedict X, Nicholas II, Alexander II, Gregory VII, Vitor III, Urban II, Paschal II. James Bryce, "Chronological Table of Emperors and Popes," The Holy Roman Empire (New York: A.L. Burton and Company, 1886), xxi-xxii.

connection that existed between these events and the course of Cluniac history.

In spite of the important historical occurences that transpired during the abbacacy, there is practically no mention made of any historical events in the six lives of Hugh that are in existence. Not a word is said of Canossa, and of the struggle that was convulsing the papacy and the empire, the writers of Hugh's life know nothing or at least say nothing. Only once is Hildebrand's name mentioned and that is in connection with monastic affairs.[57] To Peter of Damianne, the friend of both men, Hugh was one "not unknown to Gregory."[58] Beyond that there seems to be no evidence to support the contention that from Cluny came the principles of the Hildebrandine movement of the Eleventh Century.

Tout[59], as well as Moeller, La Garde, Huillac, Jordet, Burgette[60], and Ranke among others, accepted the theory that the Cluniac and Gregorian reforms are one and the same thing, springing from the same principles and espousing the doctrines. They came to that conclusion by supposing that Gregory VII was a Cluniac monk and therefore strove to enact those tenets that

---

57 Smith, op. cit., introduction, xxvi. When Hugh's fame reached Rome, it was as a monastic reformer.

58 Ibid., p. 53.

59 T.F. Tout, The Empire and the Papacy (London: Rivingtons, 1906), p. 28.

60 Burgette says, "The Gregorian reform meant putting into action the idea of Cluny." Quoted in Smith, op. cit., p. 55.

he had learned at Cluny. Thus when Hildebrand as Gregory VII set out on his ambitious program to establish the bishop of Rome as the primary power in both the secular and spiritual realms, he was merely putting into practice the ideas and principles that he developed under the influences of the Cluniac ideology. Such a conclusion, however, is not correct. Hildebrand was not a Cluniac monk.[61] The impression that he was grew out of an error, a case of mistaken identity. Bonizo of Sutri[62], who has been classified as "thoroughly unhistorical", stated that Hildebrand had taken the cowl and had been at one time an inmate of Cluny. Paul of Bernreid, who wrote a history of Gregory VII, was formerly cited to substantiate this statement, but Paul only states that Gregory VII stayed in Francia which might apply to any part of the Rhine area. In the middle of the next century Otto of Freising not only followed Bonizo but added further- what he admitted he had heard as a rumor -

---

[61] Herbert B. Workman, The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal (Charles H. Kelly: London, 1913) p. 229, says, "Though himself no monk, Hildebrand so deliberately adopted as his own the monastic ideal, especially in the form and practice of Cluny, that until recently historians were misled into supposing that he had taken the cowl and had been atone time an inmate of Cluny. This supposition was not only false in fact; it tended to throw out of prospective the whole Cluniac reform." Smith, op. cit., p. 53, says, "The theory that Gregory VII was a monk at Cluny and that Hugh and his monks were the ardent partisans and right hand men of the pope still lingers on, notwithstanding the lack of original evidence. The argument that Cluny was the pioneer of the Gregorian reform rested on the now discredited hypothesis of Hildebrand's having been a monk at Cluny."

[62] Bonizo was a scholar, contemporary with Hildebrand.

that Hildebrand had been prior of Cluny. But all this was a confusion of fact. The Hildebrand of which Bonizo spoke was a prior in the Tenth Century under Odo, a hundred years before Hildebrand ever made his appearance.

Unfortunately the editor of the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis took Otto's assertions not as the rumor he confessed them to be, but as original evidence. The Bollandists of the Seventeenth Century repeated the error. They reasoned that it was Odilo who had formed the thinking of Gregory VII and therefore attributed Hildebrand's ideas to Cluny, that Hildebrand had been a monk at Cluny therefore his ideals were those of the monastery. This method of reasoning was then followed by many of the modern writers, especially by the French. Thus the error was brought down to modern times, and all the while the repetition of the error had tended, as Workman stated, "to throw out of prospective the whole Cluniac reform."[63]

It would be supposed that since the pope and Hugh were devoted to reform there would have been a close relationship between the two. Such does not seem to have been the case however. Letters passed between Hugh and Gregory show that conflict existed rather than close harmony. In one letter dated March, 1074, Gregory exhorted the Cluniacs not to hold

---

63 For a fuller discussion of this topic see Workman, op. cit., pp. 29-30, and Smith, op. cit., pp. 53-55. Other works which were not available to the writer are Sackur, Die Cluniacenser in Ihrer Kirchlichen und Allgemeingeschlichtlichen Wirksamkeit, also Martens, Gregory VII, 2vols.

secular princes more dear than himself. He wished Hugh's love burnt more fervently for the church, and he asked Hugh to restrain the insolence of his monks.[64] Also, he jibes Hugh for the frequent absence of Cluniac monks from their monasteries, a jibe at the relaxation of discipline at the monasteries.[65] In another letter to Hugh dated January, 1075, Gregory said that he would ward off the enemies of Cluny, for Cluny was a favorite son of the bishop of Rome. But if the monks were to be Peter's sons and soldiers, they must not hold secular princes dearer than him. And as if pleading to the Cluniacs to change their views, Gregory declared that he could give them external gifts and rule in heaven, whereas secular princes could give only poor temporal things. He wished also more clearly to know who in true faith loved St. Peter, the prince of heaven, not less than the prince of the world.[66]

From 1075 to 1077 there is no mention of Cluny in the papal Regesta, the record of papal correspondence, nor is there any record of communication between the pope and Hugh.[67] Soon after Canossa, however, an attack was made against Cluny by the bishop of Macon. The bishop again attacked the liberties

---

[64] Smith, op. cit., p. 56. Cf. also, J.P. Whitney, Hildebrandine Essays (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932), p. 11.

[65] Smith, op. cit., p. 56

[66] Ibid., p. 63.

[67] Ibid., p. 67.

and privileges of the monastery. Hugh appealed to Rome as the abbots had done in the days past, but there is not the same warm personal response to the appeal that had greeted the other abbots. There was no spontaneous outburst of sympathy from the Roman bishop, for greater and graver events overshadowed the importance of the affairs of Cluny. Although the pope sent a legate who started action against the bishop of Macon, the action was never carried out.[68]

In January, 1079, Gregory again wrote to Hugh, for there was trouble between the abbot and the pope. Gregory was indignant that Hugh had received the Duke of Burgundy as a monk at Cluny. Gregory reprimands Hugh for not taking into consideration the danger that such action involved. The pope said that since it was impossible to find a virtuous prince, Hugh had shown inconsideration to the church which needed his care. Also, by such action he was going against the advice of the pope and withholding obedience due to the commands of the pope. In the future Hugh must act with greater foresight and put the love of God and his neighbor above all virtues.[69]

In June of 1079 there was trouble again. This time in Spain a series of events caused the pope to write Hugh another letter in which he expressed grave concern concerning Cluny. Robert, a Cluniac monk, had set himself up against

---

[68] Ibid., pp. 72-73.

[69] Ibid., p. 75.

papal authority, thus undoing much of the work of the church and leading astray thousands of men, Gregory does not condemn Hugh but holds him responsible to restrain such insolent actions and to correct them so as to prevent cause of complaint. Gregory says that had he not restrained them, the love of the Curia would have turned to hate.[70] This letter is the last record in the Regesta of any communication with Hugh.[71]

Thus while there may have been an association between Hugh and the pope, this relationship was not as warm and as cordial as might have been expected.

In his relations with the other popes of the period Hugh seems to have been on good terms. Hugh was elected abbot in the same year in which Leo IX became pope (1049). Besides the charters received from Leo, one item is of note. At the Council of Rheims held in the year that Leo became the bishop of Rome to deal with the evils of simony and clerical marriage, Hugh along with several bishops was called before the council and accused of simony. It was only through his eloquent speech in which he soundly denounced all simoniacs that Hugh was able to prove himself innocent.[72]

Hugh was a personal friend of Leo's successor, Stephan IX. The pope expressed his feeling toward the abbot in a letter to the brothers at Cluny. Stephan says,

---

[70] Ibid., p. 75.
[71] Ibid., p. 78.
[72] Ibid., p. 39.

> We are debtors to all, yet we have special affection for you, who placed under the shadows of the Holy See in return for protection, pay with the comfort of your prayers. These you ought always to offer since under the See you have grown and born fruit.[73]

It will be noted that Stephan considers Cluny's chief duty and the monasteries virtue is that of offering prayers.

Under Stephan's successor Nicholas II Cluny is seldom mentioned in the papal Regesta.[74] No charters to Cluny from the hand of Nicholas are in existence. At the lateran council of 1059 when the college of cardinals was organized, there is no sign of Cluniac agreement or disagreement with the decrees handed down.[75]

Nicholas was followed by Alexander II. Although this pope granted Cluny charters confirming her property and privileges, it seems that he was prepared to go no further. In fact, at one time he censored the monastery for laxity and relaxing the discipline among the monks. After 1063, ten years before his death, Cluny is never again mentioned in the writings of Alexander.[76]

Again, while the evidence is scanty, yet what facts can be assembled give the impression that, in spite of the cherished position that Cluny maintained under the papacy, the relation-

---

[73] Ibid., p. 44.

[74] Ibid., p. 44.

[75] Ibid., p. 46.

[76] Ibid., pp. 50-51.

ship that did exist between the abbot and the Roman bishop was not exceptionally warm or intimate.

Meanwhile in the controversy between the empire and papacy Hugh and Cluny seem to have taken a neutral position favoring neither side. There is no evidence that the Cluniacs rallied as a body to the papal standards. It will be remembered that Cluny sponsored a monastic reform movement. In the controversy that raged between the pope and emperor the issues involved effected the secular church. While it is not correct to say that Cluny was entirely disinterested in the affairs of the secular church, it is also incorrect to say that Cluny thought of these affairs as the object of her most concentrated consideration. Cluny concerned herself about the secular church only in so far as the actions of the secular church affected the progress of Cluny's reform work. Thus when the secular church took action against simony and clerical marriage, Hugh was ready to join with the seculars in attacking these evils. However, these attacks grew not out of grave concern for the conditions in the church as imminent dangers to the well-being of the secular church itself, but rather out of Cluny's concern for the furthering and establishing more firmly her own reform.[77]

A review of Hugh's connections with the empire seems to substantiate this contention. Already under Henry III Hugh

---

[77] Ibid., p. 79.

stood in the good graces of the Emperor. In 1049 Henry III granted Cluny a charter confirming her privileges, rights, and liberties. In 1051 Henry asked Hugh to be the godfather of his infant son. Although Hugh at first refused because of the hardships that a journey to the Emperor would entail, he finally consented and became the godfather of the child who would soon ascend the throne of the Empire as Henry IV, the arch enemy of Gregory VII.[78] Four years later when Henry III died in 1055 the Empress Agnes begged to use his influence to quell any dissatisfaction that might arise in the Empire because of the demise of the old emperor and to pray for the soul of Henry III and the welfare of her little son.[79]

When Henry IV became the emperor the relations between Hugh and the crown seem to have continued warm and cordial. Such a condition existed in spite of the tumult that was raging between pope and emperor. Henry IV had been accused of simony and dealing with excommunicated clergymen. For such conduct the pope threatened to excommunicate him and for that matter actually did in 1076.[80] Yet in spite of the precarious position in which such action placed the Emperor, there is no indication that Hugh broke off relations with Henry. But rather, it seems that they were brought closer together. When

---

[78] Ibid., p. 66.

[79] Ibid., p. 41.

[80] Ephraim Emerton, Medieval Europe (New York: Ginn and Company, 1894), pp. 201-202.

Gregory VII met Henry at Canossa in 1077 and humiliated him by making the grand monarch wait for an audience, it was Hugh who negotiated with the pope to accept again the penitent emperor.[81] Again in 1080 Gregory took the empire away from Henry and gave it to Rudolph of Swabia. Henry then proceeded to march to Rome. When the pope refused to admit him to the city, the emperor threatened to elect an anti-pope. At that point Gregory summoned Hugh to Rome to negotiate a settlement. When Hugh went directly to Rome without first consulting him, Henry reproached the abbot, when Hugh replied that he had acted with the best of intentions. If he had seemed to place an interview with the emperor before that with the pope, it would have worked against the interests of peace and also would have lessened his power to advance the royal cause in the future. Although Hugh was unable to bring about a reconciliation, his reply so far appeased the emperor that he came to Sutri to see Hugh "not wishing to be seen second at Rome."[82]

Again in 1106 Henry professed to Hugh that he was prepared to follow his decision with regard to his relations with the Apostolic See. He wrote the abbot,

> Hasten to come to me, for I promise...I will do whatsoever you decide ought to be done to effect a reconciliation with the pope and to further the peace and unity

---

[81] Henry Hart Milman, History of Latin Christianity (New York: Sheldon and Company, 1860), III, 454-465. Cf. also Smith, op. cit., p. 41.

[82] Smith, op. cit., p. 58.

of the Roman Church.[83]

In another letter to Hugh, Henry promised that if he would only come to him, he would do his best to repair the harm he has caused and that "if we can bring about the unity of the empire and papacy, we will go to Jerusalem and there more earnestly adore Him who died for us."[84] The next year Henry IV again declared his willingness to make amends to anyone whom he had harmed by the advice of Rome and that of Hugh of Cluny.[85] Even after Gregory VII had died the archbishop of Lyon wrote to Matilda of Tuscuny, the daughter of Beatrice of Tuscuny and Godfrey of Lorraine and a staunch supporter of Gregory VII, that in spite of Henry's excommunication and deposition, Hugh still publically continued the customary prayers for him.[86]

Thus, in spite of Henry's position in the affairs of the Eleventh Century, that of an excommunicated and deposed monarch, Hugh as the head of the Cluniac Order maintained a continual and seemingly warm and cordial relationship with the grand monarch of the Holy Roman Empire. This fact, coupled with the relationship between Hugh and Gregory VII, is significant for the history of Cluny. The monastery under Hugh, as well

---

[83] H.K. Mann, The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages (St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1925). VIII, 28.

[84] Ibid., VIII, 28.

[85] Ibid., VIII, 29.

[86] Smith. op. cit., p. 82.

as under the other abbots, does not seem to have been interested in the secular church. She looked to the monk following the traditions of monasticism as alone fulfilling the explicit commands of God and thus following an ideal higher than that of the secular church. Cluny was concerned with the monastery, monasticism, the monk, not with the hierarchy, the pope, the Curia. For that reason we find the abbot dealing with the emperor as equitably as with the pope. Interested in reform the abbot looked to that source from which help was likely to come. That he looked to the pope as his head, is of course, true and quite natural, for Duke William the Pious, the founder of Cluny, had in his will placed the monastery directly under the authority of Rome, thus assuring the monastery's existence and freedom from lay and ecclesiastical interference. Thereby Cluny was removed from the control of the diocesan bishop, a condition that was necessary for the development of her work since the diocesan bishop in many cases was but the plaything of lay lords and dukes and the bishop's chair the object of Simoniacal transactions. If Cluny was to develop and establish the ideal of religious life that she espoused, she had to remain free of such power and beyond the authority of such secularized control.

Rome in turn was willing to grant Cluny these privileges and liberties and ambitious to see that they were preserved, because in the titanic struggle that was mounting over the primacy of the Roman See and its bishop, the pope could well

use a force that would bolster his position. That is not to say, however, that Cluny then worked toward the establishment of the Roman See as the prime power of the West. On the contrary, that Cluny supported Rome and concerned herself with Rome in the struggle was due to the fact that by such a policy the monastery was offered great possibilities to further her own work of reform. Rome wanted to break the power of the diocesan bishops who had become practically independent of Rome and thereby leave herself the undisputed ruler in the church. To achieve this end Rome attacked simony and clerical marriage, for if the clergy could be made to conform to the principles of Rome in such matters, then the position of the pope would be that much more enhanced. Cluny likewise opposed simony and clerical marriage. But for what purpose? Because the Cluniacs reasoned that if these evils could be eliminated, the cause of monasticism would be more firmly established. Thus, while Rome and Cluny worked within the same spheres, yet the end in view was not the same. Both pope and abbot used each other for their own purposes. And while the purpose was the same, that of reform in the church, the pope's scheme was the establishment of the papal power in the secular church, while the abbot's was the establishment of monasticism in the regular church. The purpose of each ran parallel, but the streams of activity themselves ran in different directions.

That Cluny contributed to the breakdown of simony and

clerical marriage is true. But it was not as Cluniacs that such work was done. Internationally known for their great piety and precise training, the Cluniacs soon built for themselves a reputation that was unequalled. And as men noted for having a foundation of thorough training, many of Cluny's monks became influential men in the secular church. It was not unnatural that they should have achieved such positions. With the practice of the Rule the basis of their training, it is not unnatural that they should oppose the evils that plagued the church. But it was not as representatives of Cluny that such action was carried out, but rather as responsible leaders in the secular church.

Thus it was that Cluny, her purpose and her goals well defined, worked untiringly for monastic reform. The ideal presented in the ascetic life was her objective. To that end she turned all her energies.

CHAPTER V

PONTIUS AND PETER THE VENERABLE

While Hugh lay dying the monks of Cluny elected Pontius as his successor. Hugh confirmed the election and for the first time in the history of the monastery, Cluny had to endure the government of an unworthy abbot.

Pontius was of noble birth. The son of Count Melguiel, he was related to many of the princely and royal houses of Europe. In such circumstances he was readily exposed to the splendor and wealth of the greatest courts of the continent. But in spite of these circumstances he entered Cluny upon the advice of Paschal II, his godfather.[1] Before too long, he was made prior of St. Martial's at Limourges. When Hugh neared death, so eminent had Pontius become for virtue that he was elected without a dissenting voice and consecrated by the bishop of Vienne.[2]

During the first years of his office, all seems to have gone well with Pontius at Cluny. As abbot he exercised his authority with moderation and sobriety. The acts he performed added greatly to the splendor and glory of the Order over

---

[1] Joan Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 37. Pontius had been brought up as an oblate at St. Pons-de-Thoieres, and when very young had been offered a bishopric. Paschal II disapproved and entered him at Cluny under Hugh.

[2] L.M. Smith, Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries (London: Philip Allan and Co., 1930), p. 238.

which he ruled.[3] One of his early enactments gave every evidence that his energies would be turned to the consolidation and binding together of the Cluniac houses, thus following in the footsteps of his predecessors.[4] Moreover, he made the already magnificent abbey at Cluny even more splendid by rebuilding the cloister and adorning it with sculptured capitols. Added to that is the fact that twice in the first year of his abbacacy he received charters from Paschal II, confirming all of Cluny's privileges and adding eighty-eight more abbeys and priories to the possessions of the monastery, all of which were to remain continually under the "dispostio" of Cluny.[5] One charter even granted to the abbot the unparalleled privilege of wearing the mitre of a cardinal.[6]

---

[3] He acquired three relics that gained renown: in 1112 a fragment of the cross, in 1120 a finger of St. Stephan, and a tooth of John the Baptist. Evans, op. cit., p. 37.

[4] Odilo had been prominent in the innaugaration of All Saints Day for the whole church. Pontius further set aside a special day to the memory of all the Cluniac dead, and the observance of the day was demanded in all Cluniac houses. In that way Pontius acted to bind the various monasteries a little closer together. Smith, op. cit., p. 239.

[5] Other charters were granted in 1112, 1114, and 1118, all confirming the liberties, rights, and privileges of Cluny.

[6] The charter granting this privilege was given by Calixtus II in 1119. The charter said that the abbot of Cluny "his own and special monastery" was always and everywhere to hold the office of a Roman cardinal. As a sign that Cluny was never to be subjugated to any jurisdiction but the possession of the abbot and the pope alone, Calixtus invested Pontius with his own ring. Smith, op. cit., p. 253. Cf. also, Watkins W. Williams, Monastic Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938), p. 79.

Considering these achievements, the way seemed clear for Pontius to enjoy a successful and prosperous abbacacy at the foremost house on the continent.

But the outward signs were not a true picture of actual conditions. As Peter the Venerable later said,

> Though Pontius rule earlier showed much promise, later his character changed. The levity of his mind exasperated and aroused his monks. In cases of disputes he would not listen to their advice, with the result that the monastery's property was diminished. First one, then more, then all his monks murmured against him. For about ten years this state of affairs was kept secret from the world. Then the hidden strife broke forth, the evil dissentions became known far and wide and finally reached the ear of the Roman Curia and the pope.[7]

Thus there was dissention among the ranks of the monks themselves within the Order, to the extent that they, the monks, protested to the pope himself against the extravagance of their abbot.[8] Pontius was summoned to Rome to answer the

---

[7] As quoted in Smith, op. cit., p. 266.

[8] Discontent among his own monks was not the only source of trouble. Early in his rule Pontius had come to blows with the bishop of Macon over Pontius' liberal interpretation of the chrism privilege, the blessing and consecrating of the oil used in the installation of monks and abbots. The rule was that the bishop by right should perform this duty, but Pontius had demanded that it belonged to the abbot of Cluny. Soon after this rub he came into conflict with the bishop of Teraouanne over the monastery of St. Betin's. Pontius' claim to the monastery was quashed by the bishop with papal backing. Cf. Smith, op. cit., pp. 99, 121, 159-162, 243-245. In 1114 there was trouble at St. Marial's over the election of the abbot. From 1115-1116 there were many disputes between Cluny and subject houses, and in 1116 Pontius called down the censure of the papal chancery by referring to himself as the "abbot of abbots." At the Council of Strasbourg the archbishop of Lyon attacked Pontius and accused him of causing the

charges. But for some reason or other, before such action could be taken, he resigned his post. Calixtus accepted the resignation by receiving from Pontius his pastoral staff. In 1122 Pontius departed on a pilgrimmage to Jerusalem.[9]

Pontius was succeeded by the prior of Marcigny, who ruled Cluny for three months and died. His successor was Pierre Maurice de Montboissier or, as he is commonly called, Peter the Venerable. From his youth as an oblate at Sauxtillage and monk at Vezelay and Domene, Peter had lived as member of Cluny's great organization.[10]

From the beginning of his abbacacy Peter had to contend with opposition and dissention, and in 1125 this condition errupted into open warfare. While Peter was being elected abbot and establishing himself at the monastery, Pontius the meanwhile was in Jerusalem where he won high praise, even attaining a position next to the patriarch. But tiring of his journeying in foreign lands, the ex-abbot returned to Italy. Eventually he went to Gaul. Finding that Peter the

---

diocese and the bishop great injury and loss by violently seizing property and possessions. And there was constant attack from the bishop of Macon. In the last years of Pontius' office three more disputes involved the abbot, one in 1120 and two in 1122. All concerned themselves with subject houses of Cluny and houses not under Cluniac influence. Smith, op. cit., pp. 246-264.

[9] Cf. Evans, op. cit., pp. 37-38, and Smith, op. cit., pp. 266-267.

[10] Evans, op. cit., p. 38.

Venerable at the time was absent from Cluny[11] making a visitation of Cluniac houses in Aquitaine, Pontius approached Cluny. His next move, after feeling out the attitude of the monks regarding the possibility of regaining his office, was to reinstate himself at Cluny. This he did by armed force, gathering together a little band of fugitive monks, unoccupied mercenaries, vagabonds, and criminals. He captured Cluny, drove out those who remained faithful to Peter, and attacked the neighboring villages with the intention of subjecting the monasteries in them to himself. Pontius looted all the treasuries of the monasteries and melted down the gold and silver to pay his hired soldiers and to bribe the authorities of the towns he had captured. In places where the leaders could not be bribed, he put in his own men. With such a setup Pontius and his men ran wild, squandering the gold they had stolen, burning, plundering, and killing at will.[12] This condition lasted from Lent until October of 1125 when action against Pontius was finally taken. In the early part of 1126 the pope through his legate called a council at Lyon and ordered Pontius to appear before it. Pontius, however, refused three times to answer the summons. Finally, he, the monks

---

[11] Pontius had no intentions of going to Cluny at first. Only upon learning that Peter was absent did he decide to make his way back to the abbey. Smith, op. cit. p. 269.

[12] One writer says that Pontius abstained from no kind of warfare, nor felt horror at the theft of property, nor death of men. Smith, op. cit., p. 270.

who supported him at Cluny, and anyone else that had in any way given him aid were formally excommunicated.[13] Then both parties from Cluny, Pontius and Peter the Venerable, were cited to appear in Rome.[14]

Still excommunicated Pontius went to Rome with his monks,[15] but because he was still excommunicated, he could not be admitted to the presence of the pope. Cardinals were sent by the pope to convince him to repent. Pontius replied with a curt refusal to plead guilty, insisting that no power on earth could excommunicate him but St. Peter in heaven. For such an outburst insult was added to injury, and Pontius was declared not only excommunicated but also schismatic.[16]

Such defiance was the straw that broke the camel's back. Pontius' followers refused to follow him in such a claim. Some of his adherents then agreed to fulfill the penance demanded by the pope, and having completed the task went in to state Pontius' case. Their defense rested on the argument that the deposed abbot had never lost the rule of Cluny

---

13 Even before the council the archbishop of Lyon had anathematized Pontius and his followers, and act which the pope approved. Smith, op. cit., p. 271.

14 Evans, op. cit., pp. 38-39. Cf. also, Smith, op. cit., pp. 266-271.

15 They agreed to appear on the eve of Michaelmas, Sept. 29, and exchanged hostages in the presence of the legate as guarantees thereof. Evans, op. cit., p. 39.

16 Smith, op. cit., pp. 272-273. Cf. also, Evans, op. cit., p. 39.

but had only asked for and been given a leave of absence. In reply to the defense the papal Regesta was consulted. There proof of Pontius' resignation was found and also ample evidence that Peter had been rightfully elected. After some deliberation Bishop Poits read the verdict of the Curia. Pontius was forever deprived of any ecclesiastical honor or office in the Roman Church, and Cluny with all her monks and property were restored to Peter. Pontius, still unrepentent, was thrown into prison where he died from a fever at the end of 1126. Peter was reinstated to his abbot's chair and once again peace was restored within the walls of Cluny.[17]

Yet the damage had been done, and the task that confronted Peter was doubly hard. First he had to remove from himself any suspicion and distrust of, and among, the brethern and to reform them again into a solid community; then rebuild the disasterous work that Pontius had done. In this "he put up a gallant fight but fought a losing battle."[18]

Within the Order itself disciplins had become lax. There was a tendency among the subject houses to rebel and attempt to free themselves from Cluny.[19] Priors had begun to mort-

---

17 Smith, op. cit., pp. 273-278. Cf. also, Evans, op. cit., p. 40.

18 Evans, op. cit., p. 40.

19 Already in 1125 Peter had to obtain from Honorius II a bull forbidding eighteen Cluniac houses to elect their abbots without his consent. Evans, op. cit., p. 41.

gage and pawn the property and land of the priories. Private property among the monks became a practice almost taken for granted.[20] The simple diet of the monks had changed, so that rich foods, meats and spices, honey and special wines were the rule, not the exception. The habit of the monks came to include rich soft furs and fancy materials. As for manual labor, it had become a thing of the past. In general, the austerity of the Benedictine Rule, which had already been eased during the previous decades, after Pontius became a rule of laxity and indifference.

In 1132 Peter decided that the time had come to draw up new statutes for the Order for reform purposes. The abbots and priors of all Cluniac houses in England, France, and Italy were summoned to Cluny on the third Sunday in Lent. Two hundred priors and twelve hundred monks answered the summons. To this solemn assembly Peter proposed that many of the rules governing fasts, the periods of silence, and some of the other stricter provisions of the Rule be restored. The reaction to such a proposal was anything but satisfactory. Many of the monks objected to such a reform, and in the end Peter had to give in on certain points. In general, however, the essentials of his proposals were carried through. These were

---

20 Conflicts over private property had reached such an extreme that the abbot was obligated to appoint "two staid and zealous brothers" to stand guard day and night, either together or by two's, presumably, however, not always the same two. Williams, op. cit., p. 139.

then embodied in the Status Congregationis Cluniacensis, which as Pourrat says, "gave an exact expression to the way the life of a Benedictine monk was understood at Cluny."[21]

Yet strive for reform and reestablishment of the Rule as Peter did, what he held to constitute the Rule was not in harmony with strict Benedictinism. His entire approach to the subject of monastic life, while Benedictine in hue, was not of Benedictine fabric. According to the preface of the Statua, Peter says "that which is ordained by the Lord to be unchangeably observed" is an immovable commandment, but "that which is ordered by man to be observed not for always but for a time because it serves some useful purpose" is a moveable commandment. Moveable commandments are at one time useful, at another time harmful. Fasts, vigils, manual, bodily exercise and the like, in short, monastic rules, fell into this category. Thus Peter would justify changes on the grounds of utility. Thus Peter would institute changes that were in accordance with the spirit of the Rule although in themselves they might appear to violate the letter of the Rule itself.[22]

Quite in agreement with such an approach was his attitude

---

[21] P. Pourrat, Christian Spirituality in the Middle Ages (London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne Ltd., 1924), I, 6. Cf. also, Williams, op. cit., pp. 138-143, and Evans, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

[22] Pourrat, op. cit., p. 5.

toward austerity. While he did earnestly strive to curb the laxity that pervaded the Order, his view on asceticism portrays an attitude that tended toward moderation. To a prior who was not disposed to relax in the least from over rigid asceticism, he wrote

> God accepts no sacrifices which are offered to him contrary to his own appointed order... The devil invited Christ to cast himself down from the temple; but he who came to give himself for the salvation of the world refused to end it by a suicidal act, thereby setting an example which admonished us that we are not to push the mortification of the body to self-destruction. ..Paul ...exhorts his disciples that he should provide for his body with moderation, not that he should destroy it. ... But of what avail is all the fasting in the world and all the mortification of the flesh to him who has no love? Abstain from flesh and fish; punish the eyes; spend the night in vigils, the days in toils, still whether willing or not thou must hear the words, 'Even if thou givest thy body to be burned, it profits thee nothing.' "[23]

Regarding natural emotions Peter contended that their suppression stood at odds with the essence of Christianity. "The feelings of nature, sanctified by Christianity, should be allowed their right in the shedding of tears."[24] On the subject of family ties he wrote

> If a man must abhor his country, Job would not have remained in his nor would the Lord have rendered his own illustrious by his miracles. Neither ought any good man to flee from his friends and relatives... He should not

---

[23] August Neander, A General History of the Christian Religion and Church (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1871), IV, pp. 249-250.

[24] Ibid., IV, 250.

be afraid of their earthly affections but rather seek to communicate to them his own heavenly affections.[25]

Perhaps the most outspoken indictment of Peter's views and therefore of his practices is found in the Apologia of Benedict of Clairveaux, who himself had once been directly under Cluniac influence. In this work he attacks the laxity and luxury in the Order, charging the monks with self-indulgence, small talk, and jocularity. He says that dish was added to dish and eggs were served cooked in many forms, and more than one kind of wine was drunk at a setting. Monks preferred to look at marble rather than Scriptures. Church furnishings were too elaborate. Outward ornaments were proof of avarice and love of show, not of contrite and penitent hearts. He accused them of taking gifts of villages, castles, peasants, and slaves and holding them against just complaint. He said they observed no authority, no bishop. Thus in all things, Bernard said, the Cluniacs erred, destroying the Rule of Benedict thereby. But in reply Peter claimed that such modifications, when prompted by love, were proper. As different paths lead to the same land, so different customs and costumes, with one inspiring love, lead to Jerusalem, the mother of us all.[26]

---

[25] Ibid., IV, 250.

[26] Phillip Schaff, The History of the Christian Church (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), V, 335. Cf. also G.G. Coulton, Five Centuries of Religion (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929), 526-530.

> When the Cluniac Order had thus set out in a new direction, departing from its ancient austerity and when milder principles prevailed in the Benedictine system generally, then sprang up, out of a tendency to reform, an enterprise by which the strictness of the older models was again to be invoked to life.[27]

With such words Neander concludes the work of Peter the Venerable. And rightly so. But by the middle of the Twelfth Century the Cluniac conception of discipline and the work of the Rule had departed from the ancient and traditional view of monastic life. The cry was now raised that the Rule of the Sixth Century with all its severity, austerity, and strict asceticism be reinstated. The power to do this lay not with rich, famous Cluny but with the younger and certainly more strict chapters of the Benedictine fold, the Cistercians and Carthusians.

---

[27] Neander, op. cit., IV, 251.

CONCLUSION

The period that followed Peter the Venerable was one of decline. It must not be said, however, that after Peter the Cluniacs degenerated into insignificance, for such surely would be an overstatement of fact. The Cluniacs did survive as the great reforming house of Europe. The abbot in the years that followed ruled as authoratively and as majestically as did Hugh and Peter the Venerable before him. The count of Cluniac houses increased and the number of monks embraced by the Order grew steadily so that by the end of the Fifteenth Century there were 825 Cluniac houses.[1] Moreover, the physical property and wealth of the Order increased in like proportions. So then, that Cluny diminished and passed into obscurity is far from correct. It was not until 1792 that Cluny and her system were formally dissolved.

But while in her period of greatness there were signs that Cluny was falling from her high estate. And oddly enough, the elements that contributed to the breakdown lay within the structure of the system itself.

---

[1] Herbert B. Workman, The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal (London: Charles H. Kelly, 1913), p. 256. It seems there is still some question as to how many of these houses actually were formally connected with Cluny. It is most probably correct that number of the houses merely followed Cluny's system of living on their own intiative and thus were not bone fide members of the Cluniac Order. Just how many existed under such conditions is a matter of conjecture.

Under the system in vogue at Cluny, that of absolute subjection to the abbot of Cluny, the whole burden of discipline of the united order rested with the abbot of Cluny. He was the "general", the absolute monarch of the system. The priors of dependent monasteries, however great, were but his deputies and nominees. If the abbot fell into evil ways or became the victim of personal ambition and greed, the subordinated houses under this over-centralized system soon reaped the fruits of bad government and incompetant supervision. Under such conditions it was inconceivable that the high standards of discipline and organization could long be maintained as stringently as in previous days.

Another element that eventually added to the breakdown was the internationalism of the Order. That is not to say that internationalism in itself was fatal or destructive, but the conditions that were associated with such an system fostered an attitude and reaction that was essentially unhealthy. As a system that embraced many lands and many peoples and operated on a gigantic scale, Cluny needed vast resources to function efficiently. Such resources were available to the system in the form of outright gifts and donations. Yet the unfavorable element was that the wealth accumulated became centralized. The monastery at Cluny as the head became the recipient of vast amounts of both property and actual money.[2] Accordingly,

---

[2] Workman, op. cit., p. 238, says that from the forty Cluniac houses in England alone over $100,000 was sent to Cluny each year, "a drain of gold intolerable at all time.

Cluny itself became a center of prosperity and abundance. Yet while Cluny itslef became richer, the subject houses did well to maintain themselves on such tithes as could be gathered in their community. The wealth which they accumulated no longer was the possession of the members but of the head. That as well as the necessity of looking to a foreign land and to a foreign personality as the guide and director of all community activities in time stirred up much protest and dissatisfaction among the houses that were fixed within the orbit of Cluniac supervision. Nor, in so far as money matters were concerned was it conceivable that the governments in countries in which Cluniac houses were to be found cherished the idea of great sums of money and other wealth passing beyond the territorial limits of their own domains to a foreign depository for use by a foreign organization.

Finally opposition from other monastic groups certainly did not make any positive contributions toward the aggrandizement of Cluny's position. Because of the decay that had crept into Cluniac life so far as the observance of the Rule was concerned there was a demand for new reform, for new monastic organization, for the establishment of the Rule with all its strictness. The cry was raised, "Back to St. Benedict." And in response the houses of the Cistercians under Robert of Molesme sprang up, which in principle stood opposed to the traditions at Cluny.

---

more intolerable when England and France were at war."

Thus Cluny stood opposed from within and without. The genius of her organization - that of centralization - while contributing to the creation of a system that up to that time stood unparalleled for influence and importance of work, at the same time created those conditions that eventually would contribute to her fall. The meanwhile, the irony of it all is that what Cluny espoused, autonomy and centralization of power, while her own destroyer, formed the basis of every successful order thereafter.

Did Cluny succeed in her program? As a reform movement among monastic houses Cluny met with considerable success. That is only too evident in that she had houses in practically every country of Europe. Moreover, from the position that she maintained with both secular and ecclesiastical rulers, one cannot but conclude that in her work Cluny realized goals that were beyond the dreams and expectations of the earliest abbots. So it may be said that as far as Cluny went she was successful. However, that she effected a complete program of reform is not correct. From that point of view it will have to be admitted that Cluny fell far short. Cluny did not remove the evils that had ingrained themselves into monastic life. To do such would have been nothing short of miraculous. Yet, Cluny did restore the Rule again to monasticism. Cluny did reestablish again the ideal of the monastic life. Cluny did bring back regularity and uniformity of practice. For

that reason and in that respect the movement that emanated from the monastery at Cluny may be said to have met with great success.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bettenson, Henry. Documents of the Christian Church. Selected and edited by Henry Bettenson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947. Pp. 161-184.

Bryce, James. The Holy Roman Empire. Reprinted from the latest revised London edition. New York: A.L. Burt Company, 1886.

Butler, Dom Cuthbert. Benedictine Monachism: Studies in Benedictine Life and Rule. Second edition. New York: Longsmans Green and Company, 1924.

Coulton, G.G. Five Centuries of Religion. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929.

"Cluny," Catholic Encyclopedia. IV. Edited by Charles G. Herbman et al. New York: Robert Appelton Company, 1908. Pp. 73-74.

"Cluny," Encyclopedia of Bibical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. II. Edited by John Mc Clintock and James Strong. New York: Harper Brothers, 1894. P. 392.

"Cluny," Encyclopedia Brittanica. V. New York: Encyclopedia Brittanica, Incorporated, 1937. Pp. 861-862.

Emerton, Ephraim. Medieval Europe. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1894.

Evans, Joan. Monastic Life at Cluny. London: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Flew, R.N. The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Gasquet, Cardinal. The Rule of St. Benedict. Translated with an introduction by Cardinal Gasquet. London: Chatto and Windus, 1936.

Henderson, E.F. Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages. London: George Bell and Sons, 1896. Pp. 329-333.

Kirsch, J.P. "Benedict of Aniano," Catholic Encyclopedia. II. Edited by Charles G. Herbman et al. New York: Robert Appelton Company, 1908. P. 467.

Krueger, G. The Papacy: Its Idea and Exponents. Translated by F.M.S. Batchelor and C.A. Miles. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1909.

Landon, Edward H. A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church. New and revised edition. 2 vols. Edinburgh: John Grant, 1909.

Mann, H.K. The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages. IV. Second edition. St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1925. Pp. 179-180.

------. The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages. V. Second edition. St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1925. Pp. 38-39, 95-96, 195, 214, 258-259, 262-263, 276-277.

------. The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages. VI. Second edition. St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1925. Pp. 115, 152-153, 318-320.

------. The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages. VII. Second edition. St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1925. P. 156.

------. The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages. VIII. Second edition. St. Louis: Herder Book Company, 1925. Pp. 28-29, 75, 154, 259.

Meyer, V. "Cluguy," Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. III. Edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson. New York: Funk and Wagnalls and Company, 1909. Pp. 147-148.

Milman, Henry Hart. History of Latin Christianity. III. New York: Sheldon and Company, 1860. Pp. 390-462.

"Monasticism," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. VIII. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928. Pp. 793-799, 850.

Mosheim, John L. von. Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern. III. Translated by James Murdock. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1871. Pp. 126-128.

Neander, Augustus. A General History of the Christian Religion and Church. III. Translated by Joseph Torrey. 12th edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1871. Pp. 416-418.

------. Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern. IV. Translated by Joseph Torrey. 12th edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1871. Pp. 242-245, 248-252.

Pourrat, P. Christian Spirituality in the Middle Ages. Translated by S.P. Jacques. 2 vols. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Limited, 1924.

Schaff, Phillip. History of the Christian Church. V. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923. Pp. 330-336.

Smith, Lucy M. Cluny in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. London: Philip Allan and Company, Limited, 1930.

-----. The Early History of the Monastery of Cluny. New York: Oxford University Press, 1920.

Thompson, Alexander Hamilton. "Monastic Orders," Cambridge Medieval History. V. Planned by J.B. Bury. Edited by J.R. Tanner et al. New York: Mc Millan Company, 1929. Pp. 656-661.

Tout, T.F. The Empire and the Papacy. Fourth edition. Fifth impression. London: Rivingtons, 1906.

Vincent, Marvin. "The Age of Hildebrand," in Ten Epochs of Church History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

Wells, Charles. "The Age of Charlemagne," in Ten Epochs of Church History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Whitney, J.P. Hildebrand Essays. London: Cambridge University Press, 1932.

Williams, Watkins W. Monastic Studies. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1938.

Workman, Herbert B. The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1913.