EXCAVATING AND RENOVATING ANCIENT TEXTS: SEVENTEENTH- AND EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY EDITIONS OF BERNARD OF CLUNY'S *CONSUETUDINES* AND EARLY-MODERN MONASTIC SCHOLARSHIP*

MARC SAURETTE

HOW IS IT THAT, WHEN SENIOR MONKS DIED and their knowledge of traditional practices passed away, a monastery could continue to maintain an authentic and correct regimen? One eleventh-century answer was provided by Bernard of Cluny, who saw a solution in his codification of the Cluniac *consuetudines* (*Bern*).¹ The loss of community memory, Bernard worried, led novices to question the validity of customs and necessitated that he provide a “truthful” repository of Cluniac observances. Bernard’s nostalgic anxiety about customs found a direct analog five to six centuries later, as monastic reformers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries sought to restore the regular life to its “original” form of observance.² Dismayed by the perceived loss of devotion and chafing under royal and papal interventions, monks looked to a seemingly “golden age” of monasticism during the Middle Ages; the past provided both a model for inspiration and a justification for the changes they desired. Cluny, in particular, became a focus for Benedictine scholars and its eleventh-century customs were highlighted as ideals of proper devotional and institutional order. In this context the customaries of early Cluny were again brought to light and given new life under the scrutiny of Cluniac and Maurist monks.

From 1614 to 1726 seven partial and complete editions of Bernard’s customary appeared in the monastic milieu. The editors – monks themselves and heirs to medieval

* I would like to thank Isabelle Cochelin for her assistance in the preparation of this paper. It is through collaboration with her that many of the ideas presented in this paper found their genesis and elaboration. The textual collations derive mainly from a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council supported research initiative supervised by Isabelle Cochelin (with the help of myself, Tuija Ainonen and Kristen Allen) for the preparation of a new edition and translation of Bernard’s customary. I would also like to extend many thanks to Susan Boynton, Didier Méhu and the anonymous readers for their valuable comments.

(1) See the full text and translation of the dedicatory epistle in the Appendix to this volume.

(2) Joseph Bergin highlights this point in his work, *Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld: Leadership and Reform in the French Church* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), pp. 142-44, one of the few recent studies to examine this period of monastic reform with specific reference to Cluny.

Benedictine customs (in theory if not in practice) – were united in their task of defending the institution and practice of monasticism in early modern France. Monastic scholars, such as Anselme Rolle, Edmond Martène, Luc d'Achery, Marquard Herrgott, Martin Marrier, and André Duchesne, used Bernard's text for the dual purpose of promulgating positive images of monasticism and demonstrating the legitimacy of reformed observances. The practical impact of their studies was ultimately limited as the Congregation of Saint-Maur and the Order of Cluny saw their ends at the outset of the French Revolution. The work of these seventeenth- and eighteenth-century monks, however, still continues to exert an influence as the foundation of modern scholarship on Bernard and his customary.³

Though sometimes overshadowed by his contemporary, Ulrich (*Ulr*)⁴, the academic rediscovery and rehabilitation of Bernard of Cluny and his customary began as early as the sixteenth century. Monastic scholars – each for their particular reasons – saw considerable religious value (and relevance) in his text. The articles by Isabelle Cochelin, Susan Boynton and Frederick Paxton in this volume, similarly demonstrate the wealth of information *Bern* contains and the academic interest it continues to attract. My study is an attempt to bridge these two types of scholarship; it seeks to integrate the knowledge of a spiritually motivated inquiry with the concerns of present-day historians.

Of the seven editions extant from this period, there are two manuscript editions, two printed editions, and three compilations including extracts from *Bern*.⁵ These seven documents construct a chronological narrative highlighting the relationships and movements of the people, manuscripts and ideas in the rediscovery of Bernard's customary. This narrative provides an indication of how these seventeenth- and eighteenth-century editors attempted to renovate the concept of custom, and how they contributed to the historiography of Bernard's customary. For the sake of clarity, I divide my discussion into two major sections, the first detailing the various Cluniac efforts to understand Bernard, the second, the Maurist undertakings. Before I discuss the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century

(3) Daniel-Odon Hurel, for example, has recently demonstrated an explicit link between Maurist methods, outlook and ideas and those of the founders of and early contributors to the *Revue Mabillon* and the *Revue bénédictine* in his survey, "L'historiographie de la congrégation de Saint-Maur aux XIX^e-XX^e siècles: bilan et perspectives de recherche," *Revue Mabillon*, 74 (2002), pp. 7-23.

(4) We can see a continued interest in popularizing *Ulr*. The first printed edition of Ulrich's customary is Luc d'Achery's edition in the *Veterum aliquot scriptorum qui in Galliae bibliothecis, maxime Benedictinorum, latuerant, Spicilegium... opera et studio D. Lucae d'Acherii*, 13 vols. (Paris: apud C. Savreux, 1655-77), vol. 4, pp. 21-226. The work was reissued in 1723 (Ulrich's text in vol. 1, pp. 641-703), with the addition of Achery's explanation of his editorial process and minus several expurgations made by Etienne Baluze, Edmond Martène and Louis-François-Joseph de la Barre. With minor typographical errors, Jacques-Paul Migne essentially reproduced the 1723 edition in PL 149, cols. 633-778.

(5) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BNF), lat. 13877 and lat. 942; *Usus et Consuetudines sacri coenobii Cluniacensis* (without editor, place or date); the edition (*Bern*) by Marquard Herrgott as part of the *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* (Paris: Osmont, 1726); *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, ed. Martin Marrier and André Duchesne (Paris: R. Fouët, 1614, reproduced Mâcon: Protat, 1915); Edmond Martène, *De antiquis monachorum ritibus libri quinque* (Lyon: Anisson, Posuel & Rigaud, 1690); and from Luc d'Achery's edition of Ulrich in the *Spicilegium* (cited above, note 4).

editions though, I will briefly consider the existing evidence for Bernard's customary from the time of its writing until the publication of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* in 1614.

Bernard's customary is known both to specialists of Cluny and to historians of medieval monasticism as a source for the everyday life of eleventh-century monks. While Bernard may be relatively familiar to such scholars, he was not so to subsequent Cluniacs. Before the publication of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* in 1614, there is no reference to Bernard that I am aware of within any Cluniac source other than his customary.⁶ Bernard's customary did continue to be copied into the late Middle Ages within monasteries once linked to the Cluniac sphere of influence, as demonstrated by the thirteenth-century manuscript 864 of the Bibliothèque Municipale in Arras and the fifteenth-century copy, ms. 555 of the Bibliothèque Municipale at Douai.⁷ This limited dissemination hardly points to the text's popularity. The early-sixteenth-century *Chronicon Cluniacense* mentions Ulrich, but not Bernard.⁸ This general absence of information among Cluniac sources throws into doubt how familiar the monks were with the figure of Bernard, and whether they recognized his authorship of a Cluniac customary. It could be argued that this lack of knowledge about Bernard may indicate an ignorance of his authorship of customary and not of the customary itself, but even references to *consuetudo* in the Cluniac record suggest otherwise. A scrutiny of existing institutional records of Cluny, for example, indicates that Cluniac monks did not make appeals to Bernard's text *per se*, nor recognized its juridical authority. As Gert Melville argues in his article in this collection, the validity of *Bern's* customs arose not from their codification but from their repeated enactment in everyday life.

The Cluniac *Statuta* (from those of Peter the Venerable in 1146 to those of Claude de Guise in 1600) and the general chapter records never make specific reference to Bernard's customary, and most likely not to any other codified text of customs.⁹ Despite this silence, it could be argued that statutes and general chapter documents referred to Bernard's cus-

(6) I have not attempted an exhaustive search in this respect, and base this conclusion on the lack of biographical information on Bernard in Cluniac writings, the silence of historical chronicles — such as Ordericus Vitalis, Richard of Cluny, or the *Chronicon Cluniacense* — and no mention of a *Bernardus* in conjunction with *consuetudines* within the *Patrologia Latina* and CETEDOC databases. Cf. also note 9.

(7) These two manuscripts are associated, respectively, with the monasteries of Saint-Bertin and of Anchin, which have a history of using Cluniac customs. Cf. Burkhardt Tutsch, "Die Consuetudines Bernards und Ulrichs von Cluny im Spiegel ihrer handschriftlichen Überlieferung," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 30 (1996), p. 282. As Isabelle Cochelin points out in her article in this volume, monasteries no longer juridically linked to Cluny continued to copy *Bern* as a means to link themselves to its religious prestige. These two manuscripts, therefore, perhaps suggest more a spiritual and less a legal motivation on the part of the monks.

(8) *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, cols 1627-1688, here cols 1641-42. A brief discussion of the *Chronicon* and its problems, appears in Didier Méhu's *Paix et communautés autour de l'Abbaye de Cluny, x^e-xi^e*. Collection d'histoire et d'archéologie médiévales, 9 (Lyon: Presses Universitaires de Lyon, 2001), pp. 25-26.

(9) Bernard's customary is not mentioned by name within the texts edited in Gaston Charvin, ed., *Statuts, Chapitres Généraux et Visites de l'Ordre de Cluny*, 9 vols. (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1965-82). Nor does Giles Constable's edition of Peter the Venerable's statutes in *Statuta* provide direct textual analogs between Bernard and Peter. Sébastien Barret has independently arrived at a similar conclusion in his forthcoming article, "*Regula Benedicti, consuetudines, statuta: le corpus clunisien*," in *Regulae, Consuetudines, statuta*, ed. Cristina Andenna and Gert Melville, *Vita regularis*, 25 (Münster: LIT, 2005), pp. 93-103, which he kindly allowed me to consult before its publication.

tomary merely as *consuetudines* without citing his authorship. Indeed, the term *consuetudo*, *consuetudines*, and variant, *consuetum*, appear with relative frequency within these documents. I do not believe, however, that any use of *consuetudo*/*consuetudines* can be taken to refer to Bernard's text or other codified customaries. Rather, I suspect that most references indicate "custom" (e.g. *mos*) in a general sense, without any textual connotations. All the references cannot be laid out here, so I will offer only a few examples to illustrate. The statutes of Hugh V (1200) mention that in fasting the monks must adhere to the *regulam sancti Benedicti et consuetudinem Cluniacensis ordinis*.¹⁰ Since the Rule is mentioned alongside *consuetudo* it is possible to construe from the context that it is a customary (a text) not customary law (social memory) that is referred to here, perhaps even *Bern*. This contingent association, however, is so rare that this is the only example I could find. The regulations for fasting, moreover, which are to be defined "according to the rule of Saint Benedict and the custom of Cluny" are in fact those specified by abbot Peter the Venerable in statutes 13 and 14, not the customary freedoms enjoyed by the monks before his imposition of stricter fasts.¹¹ Adhering to the *consuetudo* in this context, therefore, was obeying Peter's statutes, not Bernard or Ulrich's codifications. The idea of *consuetudo* as referring to a codified body of rules seems disproved by later statutes. Certain statutes of Henry I (ca. 1314) equate *consuetudo* with exceptional privileges or abuses maintained by monasteries.¹² Suppressing such practices as an expression of overweening autonomy, these statutes categorize "custom" as something harmful to the uniformity of the Cluniac observance. They cannot, therefore, be an indication of the practices outlined in *Bern* or another normative customary adopted for universal observance. At other times *consuetudo* merely evokes the sense of "current usage or practice." A common formula appearing in a collection of the *Statuta Bertrandi I* (1301) demands that monks follow *mores et consuetudines* in liturgical and regular observances.¹³ This use equates *consuetudines* with current practice – without any textual referent. We can see a similar usage within the General Chapters, such as in 1361 where visitations were asked to be done *per consuetudinem*.¹⁴ Since *Bern* does not discuss visitations and since they, in fact, were only instituted much later in the statutes of Hugh V, this cannot be a reference to his customary.¹⁵ As the last example demonstrates clearly, the many citations of *consuetudo* are references to current practice, or observances decided by usage over a long period, not a codified official collection of custom.

(10) Charvin, *Statuts*, I, p. 46, n. 31. The manuscript BNF, n.a.l. 3012 suggests, by its compilation of *Bern* alongside the *Statuta Petri Venerabilis*, that in the early thirteenth century the Benedictine copyist(s) juxtaposed the abbatial statutes with Bernard's description of Cluniac customs. That they considered *Bern* as normative, however, is unlikely. On this manuscript, see the article by Isabelle Cochelin in this volume.

(11) *Statuta*, n. 13 (p. 52) and n. 14 (pp. 52-53). In statute 13, Peter condemns the unlawful dissonance of *nostra consuetudo* from that of the church at large.

(12) For example, Charvin, *Statuts*, I, p. 117, n. 59 and I, p. 119, n. 66.

(13) *Ibid.*, I, p. 89, n. 82.

(14) *Ibid.*, IV, p. 12.

(15) Abbots Bertrand I de Colombier and Raymond de Cadoëne, respectively in 1307 and 1412, promulgated liturgical regulations bearing the title of *consuetudines*. The existence of these texts makes it even more difficult to attribute mentions of *consuetudines* as references to *Bern* without direct textual analogues.

I am aware of only two references to Bernard and his customary outside Cluniac sources.¹⁶ One, dating from the late thirteenth century, can be found in *Liber de Viris, sive Scriptoribus illustratibus* attributed to Henry of Ghent.¹⁷ The text provides a supplement to Sigebert of Grembloux's work of the same title and, with Bernard as the second entry, the text limits itself to a very brief comment, "Bernard, a Cluniac monk, wrote for the venerable Father the Lord Hugh, Abbot of Cluny, the customs of the Monastery of Cluny, a work quite useful for zealous monks of the black Order."¹⁸ Bernard's customary had clearly achieved some degree of distinction by the thirteenth century¹⁹ not as a legislative text, but as an inspirational text for Benedictines. This, the closest thing to a contemporary description of Bernard, highlights the customary as worthwhile for all Benedictines and not, as eighteenth-century Cluniacs will later argue, as a normative text. The inspirational aspect of *Bern*, which Isabelle Cochelin highlights in her contribution to this collection, is underlined by this description.

A second reference to Bernard comes from the 1531 *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum sive Illustrorum Virorum* of Johann von Heidenberg, better known by his pseudonym Trithemius. This abbot of Spanheim describes Bernard as:

a monk of Cluny of the order of St. Benedict, a man [...] accomplished in sacred scripture, not ignorant of secular letters, and outstanding in his religious conduct and his dignity of manners. After the venerable abbot Hugh ordered it, he gathered together all the customs of the monastery of Cluny as a single volume with divided text, proposing *Consuetudines Cluniacenses* as the title of the work. He also wrote other things. He flourished under Emperor Henry III, in the year 1050.²⁰

Trithemius also mentions Bernard in his *Chronicon insigne monasterii Hirsaugiensis* (1559) where he repeats this description of Bernard, but in which he ambiguously dates the cus-

(16) The authors are cited in the entry, "Bernard de Cluny," *Histoire Littéraire de la France; Ouvrage commencé par des Religieux Bénédictins de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1835), vol. VII, pp. 595-97.

(17) The attribution of this text to Henry of Ghent is probably invalid. This work no longer appears among his authentic works (cf. Betsy B. Price, "Henry of Ghent," *Medieval Philosophers*, ed. Jeremiah Hackett et al., vol. 115 of the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* [Detroit: Brucoli Clark, 1992], pp. 236-40). I have been unable to track down any reattribution of this text. The text is printed in the collection *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica, in qua continentur.... Henricus Gandavensis*, ed. Johannes Alberto Fabricio (Hamburg: Christian Liebez and T. C. Feliginer, 1718), n. II, p. 118. The focus on monastic personages and that Bernard of Cluny and Peter the Venerable are the second and third entries suggests a monastic origin.

(18) *Bernardus Monachus Cluniacensis scripsit, ad venerabilem Patrem Dominum Hugonem Abbatem Cluniacensem, Consuetudines Cluniacensis Monasterii; opus satis utile Monachis nigri ordinis studiosis* (*Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, p. 118); alongside this entry, the eighteenth-century editor has added, *Cluniacensem Bibliothecam consule*.

(19) That is, if the dating given in the eighteenth-century edition is correct. Though I have not examined manuscripts of this text, the lifetimes of the "illustrious writers" discussed within the work are consistent with a thirteenth-century authorship.

(20) *Bernard monachus Cluniacensis, ordinis sancti Benedicti, vir in scripturis sanctis [...] exercitatus et secularis literaturæ non ignarus, religione quoque et morum honeste conspicuus. Iubente venerabili abbate Hugone, omnes consuetudines Cluniacensis monasterii in unum volumen loculamento sermone congegit, titulum praeponens operi Consuetudines Cluniacenses. li[ber]. I. Scripsit et alia. Claruit sub Henrico imperatore tertio. Anno. M.L.* Cited from Trithemius, in *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, III, chap. 347, p. 88.

tomary to roughly 20 years later.²¹ He also expands the title of Bernard's work to *Consuetudines et Ceremonialia eiusdem Monasterii*, the title given by Martin Marrier for his manuscript edition of *Bern*, discussed below. Trithemius' portrait is problematic, however. He provides no indication of his sources and he disseminates a flawed representation of Bernard's identity.²² His praise of Bernard as "not ignorant of secular letters" seems curious unless he has conflated two "Bernards of Cluny" – one the compiler of the Cluniac customary and the other, Bernard of Morlaix, a Cluniac monk responsible for *De contemptu mundi*.²³ His dating of Bernard to both 1050 and ca. 1070 likewise indicates a certain degree of uncertainty regarding chronology. Nevertheless, Trithemius provided an authoritative account for his time and, since his text was a common reference work for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, his brief description formed the basis of subsequent ideas of Bernard.

Whereas the Maurists immediately come to mind as the typical example of Benedictine scholarship during the early modern Catholic Reform, the editing of Bernard's text demonstrates that Cluniac monks also played an important role in the "rediscovery" of medieval monastic texts. First and foremost of the Cluniac endeavours was the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*. This text, a large collection in folio of *vitae*, charters, statutes and chronicles (dealing with Cluny from its origins in 909/10 to the sixteenth century) was published in 1614 through the scholarly efforts of Martin Marrier (1572-1644), a Cluniac monk at the monastery of Saint-Martin-des-Champs and André Duchesne (1584-1640), an accomplished lay historian also working in Paris. By the time of their collaboration, Marrier had resided at Saint-Martin-des-Champs for almost thirty-one years, acting as the master of the novices and the claustral prior for many of those years.²⁴ He was already the author of the *Mar-*

(21) *Claruit etiam his diebus Bernardus monachus Cluniacensis nostri ordinis, vir tam in divinis scripturis quam in secularibus litteris egregie doctus, scripsit inter caetera ingenii sui poscula, iussu Hugonis abbatis Cluniacensis consuetudines et ceremonialia eiusdem monasterii*. Trithemius, *Chronicon Insigne Monasterii Hirsaugiensis, Ordinis S. Benedicti* (Basileae: Apud Iacobum Parcum, 1559), p. 68. I can only assume that Trithemius is providing here a rough time frame; the previous date cited is 1077 in reference to the time period of Anselm and Peter Damian (†1072).

(22) It seems unusual that someone working on the history of the monastery of Hirsau, knows of Bernard, but does not mention Ulrich who wrote his customary specifically for William of Hirsau. Trithemius does not show a connection between the customs of Hirsau, and those of either Bernard or Ulrich. The transmission of relics from Cluny to Hirsau seems to be the only contact, according to Trithemius' *Chronicon* (pp. 108-111, 114), between Hirsau and Cluny during the abbacy of Hugh of Semur (1049-1109).

(23) On the life of Bernard of Morlaix, consult the article by James W. Thompson, "On the identity of Bernard of Cluny," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 8 (1906-7), pp. 394-97. For a more recent treatment of his life and writings, consult John Balnaves, "Bernard of Morlaix: the Literature of Complaint, the Latin Tradition and the Twelfth-Century 'Renaissance,'" (Ph.D. Diss., Australian National University, 1997).

(24) Germain Cheval, *La Vie du révérend et vénérable Père Dom Martin Marrier, religieux et prieur claustral du royal monastère de St-Martin-des-Champs lez Paris, recueillie de bons et fidèles mémoires, par le R. P. Dom Germain Cheval* (without place or date), pp. 6-14; two copies can be found at the BNF, one of them under the shelf number LN²⁷ 13569. According to this text, Marrier was born on 4 July, 1572 (p. 6) and upon the death of his father he entered Saint-Martin-des-Champs at the age of eleven. He made his profession on 29 April, 1596 (p. 8). He assumed the post of master of novices in 1618 (p. 11) and became claustral prior eight months later (p. 14). Under Richelieu he strove to become the prior and promised to implement the reformed observances of the Vannist/ Maurist congregation (see below), though the introduction of reformist monks was rejected by the community (p. 26). He also became an adept organist (p. 23) before he died on 26 February, 1644.

tiniana, a history of Saint-Martin-des-Champs which was the model for the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*.²⁵ Marrier was in the perfect position to undertake a documentary history of Cluny because Saint-Martin-des-Champs housed the library of the Procurator General of the Order, which held duplicate records of suits and litigations of all Cluniac abbeys, priories and dependencies.²⁶ André Duchesne was a lay historian whose publications on the history of France earned him the patronage of the king and Cardinal Richelieu (future Abbot of Cluny, 1635-42). By 1614, he had already published at least seven historical and “antiquarian” texts.²⁷

The title page of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* announces that the pieces were collected from manuscripts by Marrier and Duchesne, but that the work was completed and given notes by Duchesne alone.²⁸ Since Bernard’s customary is mentioned only in the notes to the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, it seems likely that Duchesne is responsible for its inclusion. From its placement at the end of the text, as a footnote to a description of Benedict of Aniane in John of Salerno’s *Vita Odonis*, we get a hint of Bernard’s marginal position within the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*.²⁹ In this compilation, Bernard remains peripheral to the primary sources of Cluny’s history judged as important from a seventeenth-century perspective. The note comments:

The first of the Cluniacs to collect the customs of this place and order them in one book was not St. Ulrich, who was a disciple of Hugh, the sixth abbot of Cluny and the compiler of the Cluniac Chronicle, but Bernard, a monk and a Cluniac. [Here Duchesne inserts Trithemius’ description of Bernard.] And after the writing was commanded by the venerable abbot Hugh

(25) Martin Marrier, *Martiniana, id est, Literae, tituli, cartae, privilegia et documenta... S. Martini a Campis* (Paris: du Fossé, 1606). Germain Cheval lionizes Marrier as an accomplished historian well received and critically acclaimed for these two works (*La Vie*, p. 28). After the publication of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, Marrier edited two further published texts: an edition of Odo of Cluny’s works in 1617 and a second history of Saint-Martin-des-Champs in 1637.

(26) Following the sixteenth-century wars of religion, during which many monastic libraries and archives suffered grave losses, great effort had been placed on reestablishing complete document histories. See, for instance, Charvin, *Statuts*, VI, p. 16 (1512); p. 95 (1532) and p. 124 (1542) where all Cluniac abbeys and priories are exhorted to send document inventories and the documents themselves to be duplicated. For an idea of the eighteenth-century library contents, cf. the handwritten *Inventaire des Titres de la Procure Générale de l’ordre de Cluny* (Paris, Archives Nationales de France, S 1445). Judging from the organization and difference in scripts, this text was likely compiled in 1738 and added to until 1745.

(27) Robert Barroux, “Duchesne, André,” *Dictionnaire des Lettres françaises*, vol. 3, *Le XVII^e Siècle*, ed. Patrick Dandrey (Paris: Fayard, 1996²), p. 409.

(28) The title of this work reads, *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis [...] Omnia nunc primum ex MS. Codd. collegerunt Domnus MARRIER Monast. S. Martini a Campis Paris. Monachus Professus, et ANDREAS QUERCETANUS [Duchesne] Turon. qui eadem disposuit, ac Notis illustravit*. Germain Cheval’s *Vie* (pp. 27-28) cites Marrier as the sole author of the work. Likewise, the *Vita Andrae duChesne* (BNF, fr. 17676, ff. 80^r-88^v [Latin], ff. 89^r-97^r [French final draft], ff. 98^r-100^v [French rough draft]) cites Duchesne as the major author of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* (f. 83^v). Barroux also asserts that Duchesne sought elsewhere to establish himself as the first author of this text (“Duchesne,” p. 408). Given the title, Duchesne’s publication record (over twelve works published between 1610 and 1620, cf. *ibid.*) and that the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* was Duchesne’s first collection of religious documentation, I cannot help but conclude that the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* was the product of collaboration, begun by Marrier, who completed much of the transcription himself, and then finished by Duchesne.

(29) *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, Notae, cols. 22-23 (*Notae ad vitam S. Odonis Abbatis Cluniacensi II*).

to whom [Bernard] also dedicated his work – the *Customs of the Monastery of Cluny* – with a letter which is certainly worthy not to perish: [here Duchesne inserts a transcription of Bernard’s dedicatory epistle.] And so, this book of Cluniac customs is divided into many chapters and is taken from the manuscript in the possession of Martin Marrier, a professed monk at Saint-Martin-des-Champs in Paris. But the prior of [the monastery of] Saint-Etienne-de-Nevers also showed to us another exemplar, somewhat older, from the beginning of which we copy these four lines of verse, *Monache, qui Christi fieri pugil arripuisti...*³⁰

That Duchesne only edits the dedicatory epistle of the customary and offers a very brief biography underscores the relative unimportance of Bernard and his text. The brevity of Duchesne’s description, as well as his reliance on Trithemius, hint both at his own unfamiliarity with Bernard and an ignorance shared by his readership. Without fanfare and stuck at the back of this huge tome, the brief reference nonetheless brings Bernard’s customary to public attention. Duchesne’s note would act as the single most cited source for Bernard (among manuscript and printed sources) until the publication of Marquard Herrgott’s *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* more than a hundred years later.

Germain Cheval, the author of Marrier’s *Vie*, testifies to the great interest the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* sparked among learned men curious about the monuments of antiquity.³¹ One indication of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*’ scholarly success was its adoption by the Maurists as the model for their collections on the Benedictine order.³² There is evidence of more than one Maurist writing to request a copy of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* upon realizing the difficulty of editing and composing a history of some ancient Benedictine monastery.³³ Marrier and Duchesne’s work also manifested – or perhaps kindled – a celebration of the Cluniac golden age.

The *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* brought notice to Bernard but did little to contribute new information about his customary. Its contribution was twofold. Relying on Trithemius’

(30) The text reads: *Primus autem ex Cluniacensibus, Consuetudines eiusmodi collegit, & in unum librum redegit, non sanctus Wdalricus sancti Hugonis Abb. Clun. VI discipulus et auctor et Chronici Cluniacensis Compiler, sed Bernardus, Monachus et ipse Clun. vir, sicut loquitur Trithemius, in Scripturis sanctis iugi meditatione exercitatus & secularis litteraturae non ignarus, religione quoque & morum honestate conspicuus: idque iubente venerabili Abbate Hugone, cui & Opus suum, Consuetudines Cœnobij Cluniacensis inscriptum, dedicavit hac Epistola, digna certe quae non pereat. Reverentissimo, atque totius Religionis informatori [...] praebeatis solatium, Amen. Porro, Liber hic Consuetudinum Clun. Capita multa complectitur, habiturque; MS penes D. Martinum Marrier Cœnobij S. Martini de Campis Paris. Monachorum professum. Sed & alium nobis aliquanto vetustiore exhibuit Prior S. Stephano Nivernensis, ex cuius etiam fronte quatuor hos versus scribimus. Monache, qui Christi fieri pugil arripuisti [...]. Cited from *ibid.**

(31) Cheval, *Vie*, p. 28.

(32) Luc d’Achery, the librarian of Saint-Germain-des-Prés and one of the original founders of the Maurist monastic history project, suggests in his *Advis à celui qui écrira quelque pièce pour l’histoire ou quelque vie de saint* (8 March, 1648): “Ceux qui composent l’histoire de quelque monastère peuvent imiter M. Duchesne dans les histoires qu’il a faites des maisons particulières, lequel ordonne premièrement l’histoire de suite selon l’ordre de la chronologie, et suivant les pièces qu’on luy avoit donné et les divers temoignages qu’il avoit colligé, et puis il insère lesdites pièces et tesmoignages tous entiers par année à la fin de chaque histoire.” Cited in Léopold Delisle, *Le cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1874; reprinted New York: B. Franklin, 1973), tome II, pp. 59-60.

(33) *Ibid.*, p. 60.

dating of Bernard to 1050, Duchesne asserts that Bernard, not Ulrich, was the original redactor of Cluniac customs. He also describes the two manuscripts of Bernard that were available for his consultation. One was in the possession of Marrier at Saint-Martin-des-Champs, and the other, an older manuscript (according to Duchesne), was shown to him/them³⁴ by the Prior of Saint-Etienne-de-Nevers, Dom Henri Girard. The epistle edited in the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* corresponds exactly to the manuscript BNF, lat. 13875, and thus attests to it being one of their source manuscripts. The second “older” recension is only distinguished as having four verse lines written on the frontispiece. These verses appear at the end of BNF, lat. 13875, but not at the beginning of any known text.

After the publication of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, Martin Marrier and André Duchesne continued to collaborate even though they published no further work on Cluny. According to Cheval, Marrier’s interest in the history of Cluny continued throughout his life and until his death in 1644 he hosted a group of historians with whom he loved to discuss learned topics at length (it seems that the rules of silence and enclosure were not so strongly enforced in the seventeenth century as the customaries lead us to think they were in the eleventh). During such meetings, he introduced Duchesne to a circle of scholars working on French religious and royal history. Through contact with scholars like Jean Besly and Nicolas Camuzat, Duchesne continued to receive further material for a history of Cluny.³⁵ Duchesne subsequently went on to undertake several new historical projects, earning him the title, as a recent article argues, “the father of the history of France.”³⁶

A collection of Duchesne and Marrier’s materials compiled after the preparation of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* remains at the Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris as the manuscript lat. 942. This collection was copied by various hands, including those of Duchesne³⁷ and likely Martin Marrier.³⁸ This manuscript is a compilation of Cluniac *vitae*, chronicles, and statutes, including a partial edition of Bernard’s customary by Martin Marrier. References to page and column numbers of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* within the body of text copied by Marrier indicate that these pages must be contemporary to or post-date its publication.³⁹ The specific section containing Bernard’s customary, however, does not provide any references to the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, so cannot be definitively dated to

(34) *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, Notae, col. 23: *nobis*.

(35) Duchesne continued to have Cluniac texts sent to him after the publication of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, as noted by one donor, Jean Besly, in a letter dating from 21 December, 1620; edited in *Lettres de Jean Besly, 1612-1647*, ed. Apollin Briquet, Archives historiques du Poitou, 9 (Poitiers: Éditeurs Scientifiques, 1880), p. 121.

(36) Emmanuel Bury, “Le ‘Père de l’Histoire de France’ André Duchesne (1584-1640),” *Littératures classiques*, 30 (1997), p. 121.

(37) Identified as such by Léopold Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la bibliothèque Nationale – Fonds de Cluny* (Paris: Librairie Champion, 1884), pp. 226-28. For Duchesne’s hand see ff. 70^r-87^r, 90^r-94^r, 98^r-117^v, 178^r-227^v.

(38) A comparison of ff. 9^r-67^r and ff. 118^r-177^r with f. 1^r of both BNF, lat. 17510 and BNF, Collection Mazarin, 1015 (which definitely show Marrier’s hand) seems to indicate a close, but not absolute similarity. I would like to thank Pierre Gasnault for bringing to light this connection.

(39) For example, see f. 147^r, where Marrier stops copying the *Vita Odonis* by John of Salerno, writing, “Ce qui suit est en l’imprimé des pages 51, 52, 53,” a reference to the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*.

before or after its publication in 1614. The quire separations and the difference in folio size clearly show that all the material of BNF, lat. 942 was not originally bound together, although with the exception of the first eight folios, it had been by the time of Duchesne's death.⁴⁰ Duchesne's death in 1640 provides, therefore, a *terminus ante quem* for the manuscript edition of *Bern*. Though the exact dating of this edition of *Bern* is uncertain, it proves the relative obscurity of Bernard and his customary among Cluniacs. Whether Marrier and Duchesne knowingly considered it secondary and not sufficiently significant to include in the body of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* or whether they did not know of its existence until the final stages of their collaboration, then the same conclusion can be made: *Bern* had little contemporary relevance and was poorly known.

Entitled the *Consuetudinum et cerimoniarum veterum sacri monasterii Cluniacensis liber, a domno Bernardo, Cluniacensi quondam monacho, conscriptus*,⁴¹ this edition of Bernard comprises folios 9^r-67^r of BNF, lat. 942. It begins with a table of contents, the dedicatory epistle and follows with an incomplete customary. Marginal notes citing, *e vetere MS* and *ex altero MS* prove the use of two manuscripts.⁴² From the marginal notations in BNF, lat. 942 citing lat. 13875 and from the presence of Marrier's hand within the margins of lat. 13875, we must conclude that it was one of the source manuscripts.⁴³ Lat. 13875, however, was not the base text, nor was it identified as the older version; the table of contents, which comes *e vetere MS*, has little relationship to the ordering of lat. 13875 and presents a completely different structure. We know from the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* that Duchesne and Marrier had access to at least two versions of Bernard — one being BNF, lat. 13875 and the other a lost manuscript from Saint-Etienne-de-Nevers, once in the possession of Henri Girard. Since Marrier and Duchesne considered both the Nevers manuscript and the unknown source for BNF, lat. 942 to be older than lat. 13875, it seems that the Nevers manuscript may also have been the base text for Marrier's edition. Recent research by Isabelle Cochelin suggests that the second text used in the editing of BNF, lat. 942 is probably BNF, nouv. acq. lat.

(40) After Duchesne's death in 1640 several of his manuscripts passed on to Baluze, including this one which bears Baluze's library number 258 (f. 11^r; on Duchesne's library after his death see Delisle, *Le cabinet*, tome I [1868], pp. 333-34). The initial pieces (ff. 1-8^{bis}) postdate Duchesne's possession, since Étienne Baluze described the contents of the manuscript as beginning with the piece, *Consuetudinum & cerimoniarum veterum sacri monasterii Cluniacensis liber a Domno Bernardo Cluniacensi quondam monacho conscriptus* which must refer to the version of Bernard beginning on BNF, lat. 942, f. 9^r (cf. *Bibliothecae Baluzianae. Pars Tertia: Codices Manuscriptos, Diplomata, et Collectanea* [without editor or place, 1719], p. 36). Baluze himself seems to have intended to continue the work of Marrier and Duchesne on Cluny; see BNF, Collection Baluze, 198, f. 69^{r/v} for a summary of the project he intended in collaboration with a "Père André".

(41) The title given by Trithemius is *Consuetudines et Ceremonialia eiusdem Monasterii*, in *Chronicon*, p. 68.

(42) These comments appear on BNF, lat. 942, ff. 9^r and 62^v. Similarly, we can see on f. 21^r, the comment, *Variat hæc periodus in altero M.S. estque sic...* which is followed by the text of BNF, lat. 13875. The note on f. 64^v, *Hæc parentesis in altero M.S. erasa fuit* refers to two lines erased from lat. 13875. Similar comments appear in lat. 942, ff. 62^r and 62^v.

(43) Marrier's hand can be seen in marginal notations of BNF, lat. 13875, ff. 14^v, 29^r, 32^v, 67^r, 102^v, 110^v.

3012. This manuscript, although copied in the thirteenth century (and thus more recent than lat. 13875), shares an organization and text very close to BNF, lat. 942.⁴⁴

Marrier's partial edition of Bernard was bound with other texts when it entered Duchesne's personal collection. The volume subsequently passed into the hands of his son and then to Étienne Baluze. The shelfmarks attest to the entry of this text into Baluze's collection and its subsequent transfer to the Bibliothèque du Roi upon Baluze's death in 1718. The segregation of this text into the private collections of Duchesne and Baluze removed it from the Cluniac and Maurist scholastic milieu and eliminated its further impact. The work undertaken in BNF, lat. 942 was not available to scholars who subsequently began new editions without knowledge of Marrier and Duchesne's contribution.

Sometime around 1717, Cluniac monks published the first printed edition of Bernard's customary. Only three copies of this edition are known at this point, all presently in Paris. Of these three texts, each is bound with different material. BNF, LD¹⁶ 370, for example, prints Bernard's customary after Ulrich's in a collection also containing Cluniac statutes from Peter the Venerable to Jean III de Bourbon. BNF, H-6007 comprises only the Bernard section of this previous text, while Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Assemblée Générale de France, ms. 97 binds together Bernard and Ulrich.⁴⁵ *Bern*, *Ulr* and the statutes were likely printed contemporaneously as individual fascicles (as the independent numeration demonstrates) that were subsequently combined.

This edition largely follows the structure of BNF, lat. 13875, but organizes and numbers the chapters slightly differently. The most obvious difference is the division of Bernard into two books — one laying out the responsibilities of monks and officers and the other a liturgical section — most likely for the ease of consultation. In the margins, variant readings seemingly from BNF, lat. 13875 are noted, but the edition does not indicate its sources. Perhaps, though unlikely, the Nevers manuscript was corrected against lat. 13875, as happened in lat. 942. The degree of variation between the *ca* 1717 edition and lat. 13875 show, however, that two and possibly three manuscripts were used as the basis of this edition. This conclusion would temper the judgment of those who do not see the Cluniacs as competent scholars for their time.

The dating and context of the *ca* 1717 edition of Bernard is confused by the almost complete absence of notes, critical apparatus, a consistent title or a mention of a publication date or publisher. Although the three texts of Bernard are clearly the same (in layout, typeface, content), the titles differ. H-6007 bears the title page, *Usus et Consuetudines sacri coenobii Cluniacensis per Bernardum monachum in duas partes digestae tempore S. Hugonis Abbatis Cluniacensis, saeculo undecimo*. LD¹⁶ 370 lacks this title page, beginning with what is the second folio of H-6007. Ms. 97, however, contains the title page of H-6007 followed by another

(44) I have not had the opportunity to consult the manuscripts since Isabelle Cochelin has identified this relationship and therefore have been unable to incorporate a more in-depth discussion.

(45) Ms. 98 of the Bibliothèque de l'Assemblée Générale de France contains the statutes which make up the rest of LD¹⁶ 370. A copy of Ulrich of this same edition exists at the Archives Nationales de France as L 868, n. 27.

entitled, *Chapitres Généraux de l'Ordre de Cluny, enregistrez sur lettres patentes, confirmatives des privilèges et statuts et autres actes pour l'Ordre de Cluny* and cites 1717 as the date of publication. Given that this second title page does not correspond to the content of the text⁴⁶ with which it is bound, we should be wary of considering 1717 to be the date of publication for the edition of Bernard.⁴⁷

Despite the lack of specific indications that this edition is a product of Cluniac scholarship, supplemental material attests to such a provenance. In his edition of *Bern* in the *Vetus Disciplina Monastica*, Herrgott cites his sources, one of which was an “exemplar published several years ago for the private use of the Cluniacs.”⁴⁸ Another indication comes from the manuscript *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Cluny* dating to the 1750s. It provides a description of previous Cluniac publications at Saint-Martin-des-Champs that seem to include a volume corresponding to the printed Bernard edition.⁴⁹ Valous insists, moreover, on the existence of an eighteenth-century Cluniac edition.⁵⁰ His claim may rest on the provenance of the printed collection ms. 97, from Saint-Martin-des-Champs.⁵¹ More likely, however, he is referring to Herrgott's introduction. All this evidence points to the Cluniac origin of this edition, something for which other Cluniac records offer further evidence.

The seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Cluniac juridical records do not provide direct evidence of an effort to publish *Bern*, *Ulr* or the Cluniac statutes, though they do show a concern with the publication of other texts, such as a new Cluniac breviary, ceremonial, and missal.⁵² In 1717 the monks at the general chapter demanded a new program

(46) It refers instead to the General Chapter records and decisions made in 1717. Cf. Charvin, *Statuts*, VIII, p. 18.

(47) In 1716, the General Chapter records were being printed for the first time for every abbey and priory. Charvin remarks that the printing project was discussed in 1712, 1714, and 1716 (Charvin, *Statuts*, I, p. 2). A comparison of the early eighteenth-century printed records of the General Chapters (for example, Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Assemblée Générale de France, ms. 108) with the version of Bernard, however, does show a considerable degree of uniformity. Both are printed in the same typeface, and contain similar images, and printer marks. It is quite likely that they were both printed by the same publisher, Jacques Quillau, but this similarity does not mean that they were not published at different times.

(48) *Bern*, p. 133. Cf. note 101 for the Latin text.

(49) Paris, Archives Nationales de France, L 868 n. 2, f. 2^r. The author, whom Charvin names as Claude Baudinot, was a Cluniac residing at Saint-Martin-des-Champs (Charvin, *Statuts*, I, p. 2 and idem, “L'Abbaye et l'Ordre de Cluny de la fin du xv^e au début du xvii^e siècle (1485-1630),” *Revue Mabillon*, 43 (1953), p. 86, note 6). In this work Baudinot discusses the structure of a new multi-volume *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*. He also laments the previous Cluniac publication of documentation without notes or introduction, a description which aptly fits this undated edition of *Bern*. L 868 n. 2 is the draft version of a longer text of the same name, i.e. Paris, Archives Nationales de France, LL 1350, which continues the history of Cluny up until 1757.

(50) Guy de Valous, *Le monachisme clunisien des origines au xv^e siècle* (Paris, 1935; repr. Paris: Picard, 1970), I, p. 20.

(51) The *Fonds de Cluny* of the Bibliothèque de l'Assemblée Générale de France are, according to the work of Pierre-Paul Druon (a Benedictine from Saint-Germain-des-Prés, who was the conservator of documents at the Bibliothèque du Corps Législatif from 1805 to 1833), from Saint-Martin-des-Champs and the Priory of Saint Denis-de-la-Charité in Paris (Charvin, *Statuts*, I, p. 9).

(52) The General Chapter in 1685, for example, demands that these new texts, such as the breviary, conform to the *antiquiores Ordinis usus et consuetudines* (ibid., VII, p. 229).

of inquiry into the origins and history of the Cluniac order, and mandated an educational program along Maurist lines.⁵³ This historical bent seems an outgrowth of the veneration of origins typical of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century monastic reform project.

Without direct evidence for the Cluniac origin of this edition of Bernard, I now look to the historical situation at Cluny to provide circumstantial proof. Since 1621, the Order of Cluny had been divided between two observances, the *Antiquiores* and the *Stricta Observantia*.⁵⁴ The Strict Observance espoused a return to the practices of their monastic forefathers, reimposing conventual life, expanded liturgical programs, and increased rigour in regular life, while the Old Observance desired a relaxed version of the *status quo*. As monastic reformers are wont to do, the Strict Observance tended to introduce modifications under the guise of returning to a past state of purity; the early Cluniac customs and statutes were key instruments in justifying their desired modifications which, perhaps not surprisingly, led to a state of constant litigation with the Old Observance lasting from 1621 until almost the very end of the Cluniac order.⁵⁵

After witnessing a half-century of disharmony between these two observances, the French crown – possessing nominal jurisdiction over monasteries within France – decided to impose a solution. With the aim of reconciliation, in 1676 Louis XIV laid down new guidelines for regular life at Cluny that reproduced the statutes of Abbot Jean III de Bourbon (1458).⁵⁶ A previous royal command, however, demanded that, the monks had to give their assent before any reform could be implemented. Therefore, the introduction of reformed (Strict) practices necessitated the agreement of each community's monks, since Old Observance monks could not be made to undertake things contrary to their sworn profession. Conversely, once a reformed observance had been accepted, it could not be ejected nor could Strict Observance monks be made to submit to practices contrary to

(53) Ibid., VIII, p. 19.

(54) For a summary of seventeenth-century reform of Cluny consult Bergin, *Cardinal*, pp. 222-47; Paul Denis, *Richelieu et la réforme des monastères bénédictins* (Paris: Librairie Champion, 1913); and the numerous legislation focussed articles by Charvin, “L’Abbaye et l’Ordre de Cluny de la fin du xv^e au début du xvii^e siècle (1485-1630),” *Revue Mabillon*, 43 (1953), pp. 85-117; 44 (1954), pp. 6-29, pp. 105-132; “L’Abbaye et l’Ordre de Cluny en France de la mort de Richelieu à l’élection de Mazarin (1642-1654),” *Revue Mabillon*, 33 (1943), pp. 85-124; “L’Abbaye et l’Ordre de Cluny sous l’abbatiat de Mazarin 1654-1661,” *Revue Mabillon*, 34 (1944), pp. 20-81; “La succession de Mazarin à l’Abbaye de Cluny. Le Cardinal Renaud d’Este (1661-72),” *Revue Mabillon*, 37 (1947), pp. 17-46; “Dom Henri-Bertrand de Beuvron, Abbé de Cluny (1672-1682) et la vacance du siège abbatial,” *Revue Mabillon*, 37 (1947), pp. 68-96; “Emmanuel-Théodore de la Tour d’Auvergne, cardinal de Bouillon, abbé de Cluny et le conflit de la juridiction abbatiale,” *Revue Mabillon*, 38 (1948), pp. 7-57 and “Henri-Oswald de la Tour d’Auvergne, abbé de Cluny (1715-47),” *Revue Mabillon*, 38 (1948), pp. 61-99.

(55) The Old Observance was finally dissolved by the Commission des Réguliers in 1788; cf. Gaston Charvin, “L’abbaye et l’Ordre de Cluny à la fin du xviii^e siècle (1757-1790),” *Revue Mabillon*, 40 (1950), pp. 19-20.

(56) Cf. Hugues Leroy, “Les procédures juridiques et canoniques de réforme des monastères: l’exemple de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur,” *Revue Mabillon*, 74 (2002), p. 26 for a discussion of the role of the crown in instituting monastic reform during the early modern period.

their sworn profession.⁵⁷ At Cluny, as at many other monasteries, there was a stalemate. The numerous legal briefs recorded within the *Inventaire des Titres de la Procure Générale de l'ordre de Cluny* show that Old and Strict Observance monks living side by side within a shared monastery did not lead to a state of harmony.⁵⁸ Instead, both observances litigated within royal courts in an attempt to eject the other. The legitimacy of observance was key to winning this contest.

In the 1676 royal promulgation, it was the Strict Observance, not the Old, which came under attack.⁵⁹ Since this “reform” text reproduced the 1458 Cluniac statutes, they demanded an adherence to a monasticism predating the adoption of Strict Observance practices. The Strict Observance needed therefore to demonstrate the traditional nature of their practices. The Superior General of the Cluniac Strict Observance, Paul Rabusson, the Prior of Saint-Martin-des-Champs, Jean Colin, and the Procurator General of the Strict Observance, Etienne Hugonet, were instructed by a general diet of the Strict Observance in 1710 and again in 1716 to publish the constitutions of their observance, and to insure that they conformed entirely to papal bulls and the ancient statutes of the Order.⁶⁰ By doing so, the Strict Observance could demonstrate that they were advocating traditional practices and thereby justify the continued existence of their Observance. The Diet records of 1717 records that the “new edition” of the constitutions were formally approved by the Strict Observance.⁶¹ Only in the records of 1728, however, do we learn the official name of this text: *Statuta et Consuetudines Sacri Ordinis Cluniacensis cum Constitutionibus pro Regulari seu Stricta Observantia in duas partes distributa*.⁶² This text found only limited circulation and continued to be modified up until 1771. The several printed copies extant are without, however, a place or date of publication.⁶³

(57) Ibid., p. 27. The intention was that Old Observance monks were not to receive novices and thus slowly disappear. However, they subsequently regained the right to receive novices, which lead to a situation in which Old and Strict Observance monks could perpetually live differently within a shared monastery.

(58) Paris, Archives Nationales de France, S 1445, especially ff. 66^r-67^r. Cf. note 26 about this inventory. This area of Cluny's history has received little attention despite the considerable documentation available. For one of few accounts, cf. Jean Hermant (the curé of Maltot), *Histoire des ordres religieux et des congrégations militaires régulières et séculières de l'Église*, 3 vols, (Rouen: J.-B. Besongne, 1710). Hermant's discussion of early Cluny (vol. 1, p. 231), typical of his time, cites the purity of the Cluniac customs under Berno and Odo, and advises that eighteenth-century reformers should look to them for inspiration. He is silent on *Berno*, however.

(59) The promulgation of the *Statuta sacri Ordinis Cluniacensis* in 1676 (BNF, Res LD¹⁶ 71[a] provides one extant example) began a series of litigation which is recorded in the *Inventaire des Titres de la Procure Générale* and alluded to in Hermant's history. Cf. previous note.

(60) Charvin, *Statuts*, VII, p. 353 (1710); VIII, p. 13 (1716); VIII, p. 22 (1717).

(61) Ibid., VIII, p. 22. The citation of a decision made at the general chapter of 1714 (*Statuta et Consuetudines Sacri Ordinis Cluniacensis cum constitutionibus pro Regulari seu Stricta Observantia in duas partes distributa*, s.l.n.d., p. 87) provides a *terminus post quem* for the work, which was completed by the time of the 1717 meeting. Though additional changes were recommended in 1721 (Charvin, *Statuts*, VIII, p. 58), *Statuta et Consuetudines* shows no indications of modifications dateable to that time. Even if the “new edition” referred to in 1717 was not a printed version, it seems unlikely that significant alterations were made to the text after 1717.

(62) Ibid., VIII, p. 150.

(63) The known copies of the *Statuta et Consuetudines* are: BNF, numbered LD¹⁶71 and LD¹⁶72, and one at Paris, Archives Nationales de France, numbered L 868 n. 26. The copy (Paris, Archives Nationales de France, L 868 n. 26) is found in a single gathering with an edition of *Ulr* (L 868, n. 27) and a rough draft of a 1771

Not only does its mention of *consuetudines* marks the *Statuta et Consuetudines* as important, but also its grounding of current practice in historical precedent. The first part of this text sets out the formal rules for governance, such as the convocation of diets, the conduct of visitors and election of the abbot. The second section contains a copy of the *Rule of St. Benedict* with *declarationes* – the official Strict Observance definitions about Benedict and additional Cluniac observances. These *declarationes* are meticulously footnoted; each is supported by apostolic privileges, papal bulls, statutes of the abbots, decisions of the general chapters and, importantly, the *consuetudines* of Bernard and Ulrich.⁶⁴

The size, appearance and typeface of the *Statuta et Consuetudines* are identical to that of the Cluniac printed edition of Bernard's customary. Given this similarity, I suspect that the edition of Bernard arose from the renewed attention given to his text by the *Statuta et Consuetudines* or that *Bern* was conceived as a reference section for this text. Both hypotheses nonetheless see the edition as deriving from Strict Observance studies. It is certain that the edition of Bernard was contemporaneous to or slightly postdated the *Statuta et Consuetudines*, given that the latter cites Bernard as if it were a manuscript.⁶⁵ Since the text of the *Statuta*

reworking of the *Statuta et Consuetudines* (L 868, n. 28). This last text is found more completely in BNF, nouv. acq. lat. 1501, ff. 186^r-245^v and represents the incorporation (but not termination) of Old Observance monks into the constitutional structure first laid out by the Strict Observance in the *Statuta et Consuetudines*.

(64) Bernard is cited frequently throughout the text, rivaled only by Ulrich in the number of citations. He is cited about once a chapter (and most chapters only contain one or two notes). In certain chapters, such as *De cellario monasterii*, he is cited five times (out of seventeen), or *De Septimanariis coquinae* he is cited five (out of five) times.

(65) Bernard is cited, for example, as *Bern. Clun. de diversis sentiis* (*Statuta et Consuetudines*, p. 64, chap. 14, note b) by name and chapter title, unlike Ulrich who is cited only by chapter number, for instance, *Consuetud. Clunia. Lib[er]*. 2. c. 20 (ibid., p. 56, chap. 6, note a2). At other times, Bernard is cited with a chapter number, e.g. *Bern. Clun. c. 29* (ibid., p. 69, chap. 19, note a) and without, *Bern. Clun. c.* (ibid., p. 77, chap. 29, note a). This leads me to conclude that those compiling the *Statuta et Consuetudines* were not using a printed edition of Bernard in two books with readily consultable chapter numbers, such as those in the ca 1717 edition. Of the chapters cited within the *SC* only a limited number of references had both text or chapter numbers to allow for comparison with other versions. The limited comparison of the chapters cited in the editions to manuscripts suggests a close, but not complete, similarity to BNF, lat. 13875:

Corresponding chapters of Bernard's customary cited by edition or manuscript.

* not an exact textual analog. † possible typographical error.

Chapter Titles	Chapter Numbers		
	<i>Statuta et Consuetudines</i>	<i>Bern</i>	Lat. 13875
De circatoribus	5	4	5
De hospitario	10	9	10
De refectorio	12	11	12
De armario	15	14	15
De novitiis quomodo recipiantur	16*	15	16
De officio cellarii	17†*	6	7
De instruendo novitio	21	19	19
Quomodo benedicantur novitii	22	20	22
De obitu fratris et sepultura	24	24	26
De pueris	29*	27	29
De mensae lectore	59	57	59
De fugitivis, quomodo recipiantur	60	58	60

et Consuetudines dates to *ca* 1717 and since Herrgott (see below) mentions that a Cluniac edition of *Bern* appeared a few years before his (started in 1723, printed in 1726), we can thus likely date the Cluniac edition between *ca* 1717 and *ca* 1720. The connection between Bernard's customary and the *Statuta et Consuetudines* is important, not only for purposes of dating, but also for glimpsing the motivations behind the edition. The eighteenth-century Cluniac editors conceived of *Bern* as written legislation justifying their observances. Before this time there does not seem to be any indication of its use in an official codified form commanding action, nor any sign that the Cluniacs may have considered it a text to be followed to the letter. Only in an attempt to justify their regimen in the eighteenth century did the Cluniacs (Strict Observance) interpret these texts as normative (writing justifying practice).

As a final remark on this edition, I wish to return briefly to the one copy containing the customs of Bernard and Ulrich alongside subsequent abbatial statutes (LD¹⁶ 370). It shows evidence of a certain degree of circulation, and from an *ex-libris* on the first folio we know it ended up at Saint-Martin-des-Champs in 1728, remaining there at least until 1761.⁶⁶ Near the end of the copy, there is a hand written edition of the *Statuta Bertrandi-Abbatis Cluniacen. Anno 1301*, which is signed *Dom D. Martene Cong. S. Mauri, anno 1728*.⁶⁷ This note demonstrates that Dom Edmond Martène, a Maurist working at Saint-Germain-des-Prés, had this copy in his possession until 1728. This is the same Martène (see below) who corresponded with Marquard Herrgott as early as 1723, and later worked alongside him at Saint-Germain-des-Prés from 1723 to 1726. This copy of the *ca* 1717 Cluniac edition, then, may be the copy Herrgott used in preparing his edition of *Bern*. Although it is evidence of Herrgott's "borrowing" from the Cluniac edition, this document also evokes a sense of the willing scholarly exchange between the Cluniacs and the Maurists in this period.

Though modern scholarship has not tended to ascribe scholarly tendencies to the Cluniacs, the Congregation of Saint-Maur has benefited considerably from this perspective.⁶⁸ The Benedictine Congregation of Saint-Maur was founded in 1618 and was one of the most vigorous and scholarly groups of reformist monks in France. Throughout its history the congregation maintained close ties with the Order of Cluny, and one manifestation of this link was the attention paid to Cluniac customs.⁶⁹ The most widely known example is Luc d'Achery's edition of *Ulr* in the *Spicilegium*, but other notable Maurists, such as

(66) On the first page of LD¹⁶ 370 is the inscription, *Hac collectio conceditur ad usum D. Petri Pernot 27 Aug. 1728/ Fr. G. Poncett Superius Vicarius generalis/ Nunc Juris facta est Monasterii Sancti Martini-a-Campis hoc anno 1734./ F.P. Pernot/ ex libris Martinis-a-Campis ord. Clun. Catalogo inscriptus anno 1761*. G. Poncett and F.P. Pernot were two Cluniac monks from Saint-Martin-des-Champs; respectively, numbers 531 and 706 in the *Matricula Monachorum ... Sacri Ordinis Cluniacensis*, ed. Paul Denis and Yves Chaussy (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994).

(67) BNF, LD¹⁶370 (without pagination). Edited in Charvin, *Statuts*, I, pp. 68-69 (but Charvin was unaware of this particular text at the BNF).

(68) Cf. Hurel, "L'historiographie," pp. 7-24.

(69) Multiple seventeenth-century reform projects attempted to unify the Maurist with the Cluniacs, but resulted only in failure. The Strict Observance Cluniacs as a result were largely Maurist in observance and outlook. Cf. the works cited in notes 54 and 56 for a history of these attempts at consolidation.

Anselme Rolle and Edmond Martène, and the Maurist-assisted Herrgott, also contributed to this field.

The earliest Maurist manuscript of Bernard's customary, BNF, lat. 13877, opens with the title *Liber De Consuetudinibus Cluniacensi Monasterii Editus A Bernardo Monacho Cluniacensi Circa An. X. 1050*. Folios 1-3 contain Bernard's dedicatory epistle and a table of contents, folios 4-94 comprise a more or less complete edition, and folios 95-131 are excerpted from a second manuscript. The rest of the manuscript consists of various Cistercian documents added at a later date.⁷⁰ The section comprising ff. 4-94 retains a structure nearly identical to lat. 13875, but there are sufficient differences in ordering and content to exclude its dependence on lat. 13875.⁷¹ The second copy (folios 95-131) consists of excerpts from sections on novices taken directly from a Corbie version of Bernard's customary.⁷² The letter and table of contents were added to the text during the mid- to late-seventeenth century. Therefore, the table of contents and the two customaries must represent three different stages of redaction. This conclusion is justified by a marginal note written on the first folio by Luc d'Achery, "These were partly written out by Anselme Rolle; the others [were written] at his command".⁷³ By considering Rolle and his connection to this manuscript, we are able to glimpse the motivations underlying the initial Maurist interest in Bernard's customary.

Anselm Rolle (1583-1627) was one of the earliest Maurists, participating in the congregation's foundation (1618) and the reform of its first monasteries, including Corbie, Jumièges, and Blancs-Manteaux.⁷⁴ Before becoming a Maurist, however, he started his monastic life at a Cluniac priory and was both a student and teacher at the Collège de

(70) The Cistercian material (ff. 174-80) is cropped to match the size of the proceeding folios and is paginated differently. The manuscript as a whole bears the evidence of several rebindings.

(71) It is likely based on a text from which Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, ms. 864 (from Saint Bertin) and Liège, Université, ms. 1420 (from Saint-Trond) were copied and another text from which Rolle notes some variations. In chap. 8, *De custode vini* of BNF, lat. 13877 (f. 13^v), for example, the word appearing in BNF, lat. 13875 as *orgerafro* or in Herrgott's edition as *Borgeralfro* (and in the margins of Herrgott's text as *orgerafro*) is written ~~orgerafro~~ *orgerafro*, ~~org~~ (above the line) and *borgirastio/ borgirasteo* (in the margin), suggesting that a text resembling that in lat. 13875 was corrected against another. BNF, lat. 942 contains the marginal note, *boigero*[?]. Clearly there is considerable confusion about this word but it shows that at the least Rolle had two copies to compare. Marginal notations on BNF, lat. 13877, ff. 4^v, 5^v, 6^v, 7^r, 7^v, 8^v, 9^v, 11^r etc. demonstrate that this second manuscript was akin to BNF, lat. 942.

(72) BNF, lat. 13874.

(73) *Haec descripta sunt partim a Domno Anselme Rolle; caetera ipso jubente* (BNF, lat. 13877, f. 1^r). Delisle cites d'Achery as writing this note (*Inventaire*, n. 198, pp. 314-16).

(74) Rolle made his profession at Saint-Pierre (La Réole, Bazas) and then was sent to study at the Collège de Cluny (pre-1611). According to Dom René-Prosper Tassin's *Histoire littéraire de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Paris: Humblot, 1770), pp. 771-72, Rolle joined the reformed monastery of Saint-Vanne in 1612 after which he convinced the Collège de Cluny to accept the Vannist observances. He taught at the Collège de Cluny (ca. 1612) and subsequently aided in the reform of Saint-Pierre-de-Jumièges and Saint-Augustin-de-Limoges (as prior ca. 1614). He was the assistant superior general and then the master of novices at Blancs-Manteaux (during the first years of its existence as the original Maurist monastery, ca. 1618); prior of Saint-Pierre at Corbie (1620-23); a visitor of the Maurist congregation (1621, 1624), and ended his life as the master of novices in Toulouse (1624-26). Tassin remarks that Rolle first demanded an academic regime among the Maurists and urged research into the history of the Benedictine order. Tassin largely repeats the description

Cluny. He joined the reformed Benedictine Congregation of Saint-Vanne by 1612 (which would subsequently become the Congregation of Saint-Maur⁷⁵), but he remained in contact with several Cluniacs, such as Henri Girard – the prior of Saint-Etienne-de-Nevers and later the Procurator General of Cluny – who requested the reform of his monastery in 1622.⁷⁶ Probably during his sojourn at Corbie from 1620 to 1624, Rolle came into contact with BNF, lat. 13874. His reforming efforts across France gave him ample opportunity to come into contact with other copies of *Bern.*

According to Dom René-Prospère Tassin's *Histoire littéraire de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur*, Rolle's greatest love was for the *Rule of St Benedict* and its reception.⁷⁷ He amassed considerable material on the history of monastic practice, copying texts himself and corresponding with monks across Europe to gather further material. His notes for a commentary on the *Rule* show an attempt to establish that the Cluniac statutes were in agreement with proper Benedictine observance.⁷⁸ His desire to continue with a Maurist reform of Cluniac monasticism is evident in his account (with an inspirational intent) of the Vannist reform of the Collège de Cluny.⁷⁹ Rolle's interest in Bernard's customary, postdating Marrier and Duchesne only by a few years, probably grew out of this scholarly and pedagogical interest.

Rolle, however, was not the sole hand at work in the construction of BNF, lat. 13877. This text is complicated by a mid-seventeenth century addition of the first three folios, likely the work of Luc d'Achery or a contemporary Maurist. These folios present a version of Bernard's dedicatory epistle identical to that in the Arras manuscript,⁸⁰ as well as a table of contents. The table of contents demonstrates the continued use of BNF, lat. 13877 after Rolle, since it records a later reordering of the texts; the second part, comprising ff. 95-131, was inserted into the first part (ff. 4-94) between the folios currently numbered 11 and 12.⁸¹ The hand that copied page references to BNF, lat. 13874 in the table of contents

given by Edmond Martène in his *Histoire de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur*, ed. Gaston Charvin, Archives de la France monastique, 48 (Paris: Picard, 1954), I, pp. 8, 211-15.

(75) Leroy, "Les procédures," pp. 27-31, provides a succinct history of the introduction of the Vannist observance to Blancs-Manteaux (thereby founding the Congregation of Saint-Maur).

(76) Martène, *Histoire*, I, p. 122.

(77) Tassin, *Histoire*, pp. 771-72. Rolle copied out Hildemar's commentary on the *Rule* (BNF, lat. 13800) and wrote an extended commentary on the *Rule* which was subsequently destroyed (Martène, *Histoire*, I, p. 273) as well as a treatise on the identity of Benedict of Aniane.

(78) BNF, lat. 12643, cf. ff. 7^v, 14^r-14^v, 17^r-18^v, etc. On f. 7^v, for example, begins a chapter entitled "Statuta Monasterii Cluniacensis Conformia Regulam Patria nostri Benedicti."

(79) This account is recorded in BNF, fr. 17669. The introduction of Vannist reformed monasticism to the Collège de Cluny is one of the foundational episodes in the creation of the Congregation of Saint-Maur.

(80) Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale, ms. 864.

(81) The table of contents is divided into three sections, the first beginning with *De electione abbatis*, the second with *Qualiter novitii suscipiantur*, and the third beginning at *De ebdomadario cantore*. This structure, existing solely in the table of contents, seems to separate out the information on the novices from the rest of the text. Burkhardt Tutsch, "Die Consuetudines," p. 255, posits that the table of contents points to the imposition of a three-book structure, that is, an imposition of an *Ulr*-based structure. Since the text itself is not at all restructured other than the movement of a section on the novices taken from BNF, lat. 13874, however, it seems

and notes in lat. 13877⁸² also appears in BNF, lat. 13874, which demonstrates that the reordering of lat. 13877 was an attempt to reconcile Rolle's copies with the Corbie version of *Bern*. This gives evidence of changed opinions. Whereas Rolle viewed BNF, lat. 13874 as a mere supplement to better manuscripts, later Maurists saw it as the base text for their work on Bernard.

From his note on the first folio of BNF, lat. 13877, we know that Luc d'Achery (1609-85) was aware of Bernard's customary. His annotations are not surprising, given that he, a librarian at Saint-Germain-des-Prés from 1637 until his death, had considerable opportunity to consult manuscripts of the customary.⁸³ His knowledge of Bernard is further demonstrated in his edition of *Ulr*.⁸⁴ At the end of his introduction, d'Achery reproduces Bernard's dedicatory epistle from the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* and states:

Also, another written codex of these *Customs*, compiled by Bernard, a monk of Cluny and dedicated to the blessed abbot Hugh, adds a few chapters which were lacking in both Camuzat's⁸⁵ and the Cluniac manuscript, namely chapters 13, 14, and 15 [of book III].⁸⁶ An extract of Bernard's preface is added here lest it be completely lost. [Here d'Achery reproduces Bernard's dedicatory epistle.] Above is the preface of Bernard who stands as equal to Ulrich and wrote his customary, it seems likely, at the same time that Ulrich did. Why do we prefer to edit, you ask, the collection of Ulrich more than the collection of Bernard? The reason is such, on account of the considerable fame of Ulrich and also since we consider his written collection to have been executed with a more competent pen and with a better organization, namely in dialogues. This manner of writing instructs and encourages the soul by an easier path, since it better addresses ascetic matters and rites.⁸⁷

D'Achery's preface conceives the material of *Ulr* and *Bern* as equally valid, though it suggests *Ulr* provides a better presentation. In supplementing *Ulr* with chapters from *Bern*,

more likely that the "restructurer" was simply trying to incorporate the large section on the novices (i.e. BNF, lat. 13877, ff. 95-131) into the larger text of lat. 13877, ff. 4-94.

(82) The title *Quomodo benedicantur novitii* on f. 13^v of BNF, lat. 13874 is written in the same hand as the table of contents reorganizing BNF lat. 13877.

(83) For the life and works of Luc d'Achery, cf. Jeannine Fohlen, "Dom Luc d'Achery (1609-1685) et les débuts de l'érudition mauriste," *Revue Mabillon*, 57 (1967), p. 145; and Yves Chaussy, *Les Bénédictins de Saint-Maur. Tome 1: aperçu historique sur la congrégation* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1989), pp. 57-59, 67-72. For an earlier portrait, see Tassin, *Histoire*, pp. 103-118 or Martène, *Histoire*, VI, pp. 128-31.

(84) Cited here from PL 149, col. 633.

(85) Nicolas Camuzat (1575-1655), a historian of the diocese of Troyes and a collaborator with André Duchesne (Bury, "Le 'Père'", p. 123).

(86) That is, the chapters appearing as *Ulr*, III, chaps. 13-15 (*De hostiis quomodo fiant*, *De corporalibus ablundis*, and *De reliquiis sanctorum: quomodo prosequantur sive recipiantur*) are taken directly from Bernard's customary, and were originally not in *Ulr*. The text of these chapters differs significantly from BNF, lat. 942 and lat. 13877, and most closely resembles lat. 13875 (though still maintaining some variation).

(87) *Alius etiam codex scriptus earundem Consuetudinum, a Bernardo Cluniacensi monacho concinnatarum ac B. Hugoni abbati dictarum, subministravit quaedam capita quae in utrisque et Cluniacensi et Camuzatii codicibus desiderabantur, nimirum capita 13, 14, 15. Bernardi autem praefationis pericopen ne tota pereat, hoc loco subtexere..... Hactenus Bernardi Praefatio, qui aequalis exstitit Udalrici, eodemque conscripsit tempore Consuetudines, ut conjicere licet, quo et ipse Udalricus. Cur porro Udalrici potius quam Bernardi collectionem ediderimus, ratio in promptu est, nimirum ob nominis claritatem Udalrici; quodque compitior stilo ac meliori ordine, dialogis scilicet, digestam ejus collectionem judicaverimus: qui scribendi modus, cum de asceticis rebus ritibusve praesertim agitur, faciliiori via animum instruit suadetque* (cited from PL 149, cols. 634-35).

however, d'Achery shows that *Bern* offers additional – perhaps more – material about Cluniac customs. He is most concerned with presenting an exemplar of “golden age” Cluniac monasticism as a means to “encourage the soul” to greater devotion, not to publish a definitive version of Ulrich. By offering the fullest possible account and the most rationally ordered collection of the “Cluniac customs,” d'Achery seeks to instruct and inspire contemporary Benedictine monks, perhaps even to persuade them to follow a more strict (and thus Maurist) observance.

An interest in inspiring contemporary monastic observances also underlies the subsequent work of Dom Edmond Martène (1654-1739). Martène worked alongside Luc d'Achery and Jean Mabillon at Saint-Germain-des-Prés and also visited monasteries across France to investigate their libraries.⁸⁸ He was lauded for his devotion to the *Rule*, and one of his first works was a commentary on the *Rule of St. Benedict* which cited Cluniac customs (among others).⁸⁹ He published his major work on medieval monastic observances in a massive reference text of Benedictine customs, *De antiquis monachorum ritibus libri quinque* (1690).⁹⁰ Ordered thematically, it begins with daily rituals such as proper behaviour in the refectory, continues with liturgical practices and concludes with a section of miscellanea about the election of abbots and the reception of novices. He presents over 25 citations of BNF, lat. 13874 and over 90 extracts from a twelfth-century customary of Saint-Bénigne-de-Dijon, which he describes as “hardly different” from lat. 13874.⁹¹ They are juxtaposed with extracts from Lanfranc's *Decreta*, the customary of Hirsau, *Ulr*, the *LT* and others.⁹² His comments are largely limited to giving explanatory paraphrases and he presents pages of quotation without introduction, discussion or notes. The manuscript containing his notes for this text shows that he is aware that the *LT*, *Ulr*, *Bern*, and the customs of Hirsau and Saint-Bénigne-de-Dijon are all offshoots of Cluniac customs, but he makes no attempt to analyze their relationship either there or in *De antiquis ritibus monachorum* itself.⁹³ Martène did not wish to create an authoritative text, but rather wished to show the diversity (and similarity) of practice existing within earlier monasticism.

Preserving the knowledge of ancient rites and ceremonies, not manuscript relationships, was first and foremost in Martène's mind. His preface espouses sentiments typical of reformist monks:

(88) He stopped at Cluny, for example, for seventeen days in 1710; cf. Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand, *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Paris: F. Delaulne, 1717), vol. I, pp. 227-28.

(89) This commentary is reprinted in PL 66, cols 215-942.

(90) Cf. note 5 for a complete citation.

(91) Martène, *De antiquis ritibus monachorum*, p. v.

(92) Martène discusses his sources, *ibid.*, p. iv-vii. Cf. also Aimé-Georges Martimort, *La documentation liturgique de Dom Edmond Martène: étude codicologique* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1978), pp. 529-37 *passim*.

(93) Martène, *ibid.*, p. v. His published text differs little from his preparatory notes contained in BNF, lat. 12089, which is essentially a compendium of medieval texts listed according to theme and subject material. For example, on f. 201^r he comments on the discrepancies between the *LT* and *Ulr*.

We hope that this collection of the ancient rites of monks, however, will not be unprofitable for the pious readers; not only because such is the nature of sacred things that they inspire a certain reverence for them in religious minds, but also because the customs and ceremonies of our predecessors, waning up until now and almost wholly forgotten, are contained in [this collection]. An understanding of them is able to confer no little assistance, first, to arouse in us a desire of ancestral virtue and to excite divine fervor, by which were enflamed those whom we revere as parents or whom we have received as brothers and companions of this same project; and second, to light the way for those who afterwards will undertake to restore the discipline of regular observance. We suggest that these two outcomes of the work are able to be most influential and would that, in accordance with our hopes, this conjecture not remain in vain.⁹⁴

How closely this resembles Bernard's justification for his customary! Martène decries the loss of former rigour, the current state of ignorance within monasteries and hopes that his text will instill a reverence and rekindle a piety known to his monastic forefathers.

The eighteenth-century history of Bernard's customary comes to an end with Marquard Herrgott's edition in the *Vetus Disciplina Monastica*. Herrgott (1694-1762) provides a fitting conclusion to this study because he represents the heir to the scholarship of the Maurists and Cluniacs. He made his profession at Sankt-Blasien in the Black Forest in 1715 and soon afterwards was sent to study in Rome.⁹⁵ He investigated commentaries on the *Rule* at Monte Cassino and at Saint-Gall until being sent to Saint-Germain-des-Prés in 1723. Herrgott's sojourn in Paris was part of a project of establishing a Benedictine congregation in Austria adhering to the Maurist model.⁹⁶

The publication of the *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* represented the culmination of three years of work at Saint-Germain-des-Prés. Bernard's customary, the *LT* and the customary of Hirsau fill 521 of 594 pages, making Cluniac customs the major focus of the work, supplemented by brief excerpts from fourteen further sources. Guided by the Maurist Vincent Thuillier, Herrgott wrote a lengthy introduction, reproduced texts from printed and handwritten editions, and added his own editions.⁹⁷ Unlike Martène, however, he intended to inspire his readers not to greater austerity, but rather to greater laxity in observances. We

(94) *Hanc tamen de antiquis monachorum ritibus collectionem piis Lectoribus haud ingratam fore speramus; non solum quod ea sit sacrarium rerum natura, ut quamdam sui reverentiam religiosis mentibus inspirent; sed etiam quod delitescentes hactenus, ac pene oblatae Majorum nostrorum consuetudines ac caeremoniae in ea contineantur; quarum cognitio haud parum conferre poterit, tum ad excitandum in nobis avitae virtutis desiderium, divinumque illum fervorem excitandum, quo succensi fuerunt ij, quos vel ut parentes colimus, vel ut fratres sociosve eiusdem propositi suscipimus; tum ad praelucendum iis, qui regularis observantiae disciplinam postmodum restituere aggredientur: quos duos potissimum huiusce operis fructus esse posse conijcimus: atque utinam haec conjectura ut spes nostra non frustretur* (Martène, *De antiquis ritibus monachorum*, p. v).

(95) For a brief introduction to the life of Marquard Herrgott, see Pius Engelbert's introduction to the 1999 facsimile edition of the *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* and the monograph by Josef Peter Ortner, *Marquard Herrgott (1694-1762); sein Leben und Wirken als Historiker und Diplomat*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Geschichte Österreichs, 5 (Vienna: H. Böhlau, 1972), neither of which shed much light on the publication of *Bern*.

(96) Ortner, *Marquard*, p. 72.

(97) Tassin, *Histoire*, p. 528, reports that Thuillier denied playing a role in the work (other than correcting Herrgott's Latinity). This distancing may have resulted from the very critical reception enjoyed by the *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* (see below). Herrgott's sources are listed by Engelbert (Facsimile of the *Vetus Disciplina monastica*, pp. i-ii) who does not note Herrgott's dependence on the Cluniac edition of Bernard.

see one part of his introduction, entitled *Disciplina antiquior non semper melior*, arguing that differences between present and past practice reflect the continual change and modification of the *Rule*; this would justify, among other things, the eating of meat and the abridgement of the liturgy. Whether inspired by the relaxation of observances at Saint-Germain-des-Prés⁹⁸ or of his own accord, Herrgott opposed the trend of considering medieval monastic customs as directions for present monks. His introduction to *Bern*, for example, cites a medieval Cassinese reaction to Cluniac customs:

The response concerning the Cluniac tonsure and habit is, “Since they do not please us, nor anyone who wishes to live regularly, they ought to be made to agree with the law. For they seem completely contrary to the *Rule*.”⁹⁹

For Herrgott, historical records are not the answer to the present state of monasticism and Cluniac customs do not, presently or in the past, offer a model to follow. Upon the publication of the *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* these sentiments were harshly criticized, and Herrgott was recalled from Saint-Germain-des-Prés by the abbot of Sankt Blasien.¹⁰⁰

While Herrgott was novel in his utilization of Bernard’s customary, he followed past work on the customary slavishly. In his introduction he cited Trithemius and followed the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* in seeing Bernard as the original redactor of the Cluniac customs under Hugh. With regards to the source manuscripts, we see that two texts were used:

Bernard’s writings have not been officially published, but an exemplar of them was completed several years ago only for the private use of Cluniacs, which we give here rid of nearly infinite faults and cleansed according to the [hand]written codex of Saint-Germain-des-Prés.¹⁰¹

These two texts must be the Cluniac printed edition (*ca* 1717) and a manuscript from Saint-Germain-des-Prés (BNF, lat. 13875).¹⁰² Although Herrgott says that he corrected and amended the Cluniac version, he adheres to it almost without fail. He occasionally provides variant text in marginal notes, but only rarely corrects the body of the text. Its structure, organization, italicization, notes and mistakes are reproduced. On average Herrgott made a single correction every few pages. Given that the *ca* 1717 Cluniac edition allows considerable opportunity for correction and it often differs greatly from BNF, lat. 13875, Herrgott’s acceptance of the Cluniac readings is evidence of acquiescence, not of critical diligence.

(98) Jean de Viguerie, “Y a-t-il une crise de l’observance régulière entre 1660 et 1715?,” in *Sous la règle de saint Benoît. Structures monastiques et sociétés en France du Moyen Âge à l’époque moderne (Abbaye bénédictine Sainte-Marie de Paris, 23-25 Octobre 1980)*, Hautes études médiévales et modernes, 47 (Genève: Droz, 1982), pp. 137-39.

(99) *Responsum est de habitu & tonsura Cluniacensium: Quia nec nobis placent, nec cuiquam, qui regulariter vivere voluerit, iure placenda sunt. Videntur enim omnino contra Regulam (Bern, pp. 133-34).*

(100) Engelbert, Facsimile of the *Vetus Disciplina monastica*, p. iii.

(101) *Bernardi vero locutiones juris publici à nemine hactenus factae fuerunt: sed ad usus privatos tantum à Cluniacensibus exactum est ante aliquot annos earum exemplar, quod ab infinitis propemodum mendis purgatum, ad fidem Ms. codicis sancti Germani à Pratis his castigatum damus (Bern, p. 133).*

(102) This conclusion is based on the presence of BNF, lat. 13875 at Saint-Germain-des-Prés and the exact correspondence between variants described by Herrgott as coming from the Saint-Germain-des-Prés text and the text of lat. 13875.

In conclusion, the example of Herrgott warns us that as historians, our work can only be as good as that of those on whom we depend. Herrgott's edition does not provide a proper foundation for further study and underlines the urgent need for a new critical edition of *Bern*. As a whole, though, the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century editions of the customary of Bernard emphasize the considerable scholarly effort (if not attainment) of their authors. Their work helps us trace the movements of medieval manuscripts while also demonstrating changing currents in the perception of customaries. Far more important, I believe, is how the history of Bernard's editions hints at the scholarship pursued, not only by the Maurists, but also by the Cluniacs. When I originally presented this paper at Auxerre, it was entitled "Collusion and Competition" because I originally felt opposition and conflict best characterized the reception of Bernard's customary. It seemed to me that the changes in the understanding of Bernard could be taken as the evidence of scholarly competition between the Maurists and Cluniacs, and also between the Strict and Old Observance Cluniacs. To a certain extent, we can see that the greatest conflict arises between Herrgott's and the Cluniacs' conception of Bernard's customary, one viewing it as evidence of monasticism's mutability, the other of its unchanging nature. I feel overall, however, that this period presents a picture of cooperation rather than rivalry. Texts and manuscripts circulated freely. Associations of scholars, such as Herrgott with the Maurists, or Duchesne with Marrier, enabled extraordinary collections of documents to be published. The Cluniac scholars consistently led the effort to unearth Bernard's customary, providing to others models of scholarship, basic research and texts from which to pursue further research. This conclusion should temper the notion that there were no learned Cluniacs in the modern period. Ideas, however, show little sign of active interaction. Conceptions of Bernard and his customary changed not through debate, but by a text being forgotten (such as BNF, lat. 942 and lat. 13877) or ignored (like the *ca* 1717 Cluniac edition). The conception of Bernard's customary that emerges with Herrgott, therefore, does not represent linear progress, but rather is a particular version overlooking much previous work.

DISCIPLINA MONASTICA

Studies on Medieval Monastic Life
Études sur la vie monastique au Moyen Âge

Editors of the Series
Collection dirigée par

Susan BOYNTON & Isabelle COCHELIN

Editorial Board

Sheila BONDE
Florent CYGLER

2005
BREPOLS

FROM DEAD OF NIGHT TO
END OF DAY:

THE MEDIEVAL CUSTOMS OF CLUNY

DU CŒUR DE LA NUIT À LA
FIN DU JOUR:

LES COUTUMES CLUNISIENNES AU MOYEN ÂGE

Ed. Susan BOYNTON & Isabelle COCHELIN

2005
BREPOLS

Illustration de la couverture: Abbaye de Cluny, clocher de l'Eau bénite et clocher de l'horloge
Front Cover Illustration: Abbey of Cluny, Tower of the Clock and Tower of the Holy Water
(© Éditions Gaud, Moisenay-le-Petit, France)

Illustration sur la quatrième de couverture: Bible de Moissac, Lévitique (Paris, BNF, lat. 52, fol. 49r)
Back Cover Illustration: Bible from Moissac, Leviticus (Paris, BNF, lat. 52, fol. 49r)
(cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France)

© 2005 **BREPOLS PUBLISHERS**, Turnhout, Belgium

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2005/0095/93
ISBN 2-503-51889-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS/TABLE DES MATIÈRES

Abbreviations/Liste des abréviations	7
Susan BOYNTON & Isabelle COCHELIN	
Introduction (in English)	11
Introduction (en français)	17
Anselme DAVRIL, Coutumiers directifs et coutumiers descriptifs d’Ulrich à Bernard de Cluny	23
Isabelle COCHELIN, Évolution des coutumiers monastiques dessinée à partir de l’étude de Bernard	29
Gert MELVILLE, Action, Text, and Validity: On Re-examining Cluny’s <i>Consuetudines</i> and Statutes	67
Marc SAURETTE, Excavating and Renovating Ancient Texts: seventeenth- and eighteenth-century editions of Bernard of Cluny’s <i>Consuetudines</i> and early-modern monastic scholarship	85
Susan BOYNTON, The Customaries of Bernard and Ulrich as Liturgical Sources	109
Jennifer HARRIS, Building Heaven on Earth: Cluny as <i>locus sanctissimus</i> in the Eleventh Century	131
Michel HUGLO, L’office du Dimanche de Pâques à Cluny au Moyen Âge	153
Diane REILLY, The Cluniac Giant Bible and the <i>Ordo librorum ad legendum</i> : a reassessment of monastic Bible reading and Cluniac customary instructions	163
Kristina KRÜGER, Monastic Customs and Liturgy in the Light of the Architectural Evidence: A Case Study on Processions (Eleventh-Twelfth Centuries)	191
Carolyn Marino MALONE, Interprétation des pratiques liturgiques à Saint-Bénigne de Dijon d’après ses coutumiers d’inspiration clunisienne	221
Franz NEISKE, <i>Ratio et ritus</i> dans les coutumiers monastiques.	251
Scott G. BRUCE, Monastic Sign Language in the Cluniac Customaries	273
Riccardo CRISTIANI, Integration and Marginalization: Dealing with the Sick in Eleventh-Century Cluny	287
Frederick S. PAXTON, Death by Customary at Eleventh-Century Cluny.	297
Susan Boynton & Isabelle Cochelin, Appendix/Annexe	
<i>LT</i> : Prologue (<i>Latin</i> , English, français)	319
<i>Ulr</i> : Prologue (<i>Latin</i> , English, français)	329
<i>Bern</i> : Prologue (<i>Latin</i> , English, français)	349
Bibliography/Bibliographie	355
Biobibliography of the authors / Bio-bibliographie des auteurs	387
List of Illustrations/Liste des images	389
Index of Manuscripts/Index des manuscrits	391
Index of Persons, Places, and Subjects/Index thématique, des noms de personnes et des noms de lieux	393