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Abstract

This dissertation considers how Peter the Venerable, the abbot of Cluny from 1122 to 1156, implemented reform through a textual program. Peter’s abbacy witnessed a period of fundamental reconstruction, in which not only the practices of Cluniac monasticism, but also its mentality and institutional ethos underwent dramatic change. This period embraces the transformations of Cluniac monasticism from a loose network of monasteries under a charismatic abbot (the *ecclesia cluniacensis*) to a structured Order containing a clear hierarchy and institutional mechanisms of authority. It also demonstrates the shift from an orthopraxic model of spirituality to one based in orthodoxy.

Centered around his three major reform works—a letter collection, the *De miraculis*, and the *Statuta*—this thesis examines the textual strategies used by Peter the Venerable to implement his monastic program. Peter’s authorial activity was unparalleled in the history of Cluny and was a disjuncture from previous and future abbatial tradition. Peter’s writings indicate a conception of the written word as a unique medium for communicating and codifying the specific practices and the general ideology of his re-envisioning of Cluny. These texts allow a bridging of an oral culture and a literate mentality by combining traditional and innovative discourses. Affective reasoning coexists with logical argumentation and appeals to abbatial authority buttress legal innovations.
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NOTE ON LANGUAGE

In a thesis written in English dealing with the Latin records of a medieval monastery in Burgundy, it seems politic to add a brief note detailing the use of language. A great deal of Latin has been read in the production of this dissertation but only brief extracts have been retained in the text itself. Latin quotations are translated into English within the body while the original text remains in a footnote (unless the expression is so commonplace it would be redundant to translate). All quotations have been translated by the author unless otherwise stated.

Due to a lack of suitable English terminology, the titles of persons or officials often appear italicized in Latin, unless an exact English analog exists. The titles of texts, likewise, appear in the original Latin. When Peter the Venerable’s Statuta is cited as a work, though a plural noun, it is treated as if singular, given Peter’s intention to create a unified codified body of legislation. Such is also the case for other plural nouns acting as titles (e.g. Ecclesiastica Officia, Consuetudines antiquiores). When referring to statutes or customs they are treated as plural nouns. Most personal names have been anglicized, or put into what approximates current usage among Anglophone historians. Place names are cited as they appear in their country of origin; French monasteries are cited as they are in French, German monasteries as they appear in German.
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ABBOT PETER THE VENERABLE AND THE
REFORMATION OF TWELFTH-CENTURY CLUNY

It is well-known that almost from the first instant of assuming office,
[Peter] had improved the *ordo* [maintained at Cluny] in many ways, for
instance in the observance of fasting, silence, and costly and curious
clothing.\(^1\)

Hence it was that he removed many superfluous things from the cloister
and what was suitable for religion he added; he prohibited less useful
things, always seeking after the suitability and utility of the Church in and
for all things.\(^2\)

The first text is taken from a letter of introduction written by Bernard of Clairvaux to
Pope Eugenius III in 1151/52; the second was written ten to twenty years later by Ralph
of Sully, Peter’s hagiographer, in describing the abbot Peter's relations with his monks.\(^3\)

Both authors provide two very similar depictions of Peter the Venerable as a reformer.
Though different motivations underlay their writings, a contentious Cistercian and an
obsequious Cluniac came to the same conclusion: Cluny had changed under the abbacy
of Peter the Venerable. Bernard and Ralph also both conceived of Peter’s changes as
orthopraxic: the addition of observances in food and clothing with newfound use for the
religious life.

---

\(^1\) Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sancti Bernardi Opera*, (hereafter, *SBO*), ed. Jean Leclercq and Henri
Rochais, 8 vols. (Rome, 1957-1977), here vol. 8, pp. 189; English translation adapted from Bruno Scott
427-28; *Quamquam paene ab introitu suo in multis Ordinem illum meliorasse cognoscitur, verbi gratia, in
observantia ieuniorum, silenii, indumentorum pretiosorum et curiosorum.*

(hereafter, *VPV*); *Hinc est quod multa superflua de claustro abstulit, et ea quae religioni congruebant
inseruit; prohibitius minus utilia, honestatem et utilitatem Ecclesiae in omnibus et per omnia semper
inquirens.*

\(^3\) On the dating of Bernard’s letter, cf. *SBO*, vol. 8, p. 189, note 1. The *vita* dates to the abbacy of Stephen I
of Boulougné (1163-1173) to whom it is dedicated; cf. *VPV*, col. 15; Denise Bouthillier and Jean-Pierre
Torrell, “De la légende à l’histoire. Le traitement du miraculum chez Pierre le Vénérable et chez son
Current scholarship, however, views Peter’s abbacy as witnessing deeper transformations. Peter the Venerable appears to have overseen a period of fundamental reconstruction, in which not only the practices of Cluniac monasticism, but also its institutional ethos underwent a dramatic rewriting. The nature of this reformation at Cluny and the mechanisms of its implementation are the topics for my dissertation. My intention is not, however, to write or rewrite the whole history of Cluniac reform during his abbacy. This field has attracted sustained attention and the subject has been well treated in numerous studies. My dissertation, instead, seeks to explain an under-explored aspect of Peter’s reform implementation, namely his use of textual vehicles for initiating change. By examining Peter’s written program of reform – his letter collection, the *De miraculis* and the *Statuta* – I will demonstrate how they incorporate rhetorical features designed to establish their reception. His texts do not only transparently communicate the material of his reform, but also contain developed strategies for ensuring their acceptance. These textual strategies initiate a process of reform as much as do the material contained therein. My dissertation is thus entitled, “Rhetorics of Reform” since I

---


5 All texts and editions are discussed more fully at the outset of each of the three parts of the thesis devoted to a specific text; cf. chapters two, six and eight.
seek to identify how Peter appeals to discourses of reform and what he constructs as the essence of Cluniac monasticism.⁶

The chapters that follow will elucidate the vagaries of Peter’s ideological campaign, but before plunging into the details of his writings, it is first necessary to discuss the position of the abbot of Cluny and the context by which his action was circumscribed. Though Peter the Venerable has often been depicted as a monarchial abbot with considerable power, recent scholarship on the abbots of Cluny suggests instead the limitations on their ability to govern autonomously. This weakness, as I discuss below, provides one possible reason why Peter, the abbot of one of the most powerful monasteries in Christendom, would resort to textual strategies to persuade and urge his will. In the following section, I will provide a brief outline of the eleventh- and twelfth-century history of Cluny and the concomitant changes in the abbatial office in order to suggest some of the reasons behind Peter’s commitment to authorship.

ABBATIAL POWER AND COMMUNITY AT CLUNY, ELEVENTH AND TWELFTH CENTURY.

Though Adalbero of Laon may have described the abbot Odilo (r. 994-1049) as a monarchial ruler governing an army of compliant monks, this is a picture likely not corresponding to the historical record.⁷ A more nuanced depiction of the relations between abbot and community has been argued in recent years, in part due to changing

---

⁶ After enshrining this as my dissertation title, I realized that “The Rhetoric of Reform” is a chapter in Giles Constable’s The Reformation of the Twelfth Century, (Cambridge, 1996), chp. 4, pp. 125-66. I decided to retain this title despite its previous use, since it now functions in this new context as a hommage to a scholar upon whose work I often depend and build.

notions of what exactly was the power of the Cluniac abbots. Since we can take the *Rule of Saint Benedict* to be a foundation of Cluniac monasticism, as Barbara Rosenwein has shown, then we must assume that the elevated power and status of the abbot as outlined by Benedict must to some extent apply to the abbot of Cluny.\(^8\) In Benedict’s conception, the abbot presided over (*praesesse*), instructed (*docere*), commanded (*iubere*) and instituted (*constitutere*) the life of his monks.\(^9\) As the local representative of Christ, the abbot received the obedience of his monks and he heard their counsel, though as Adalbert de Vogüé suggests this latter requirement did not impede the abbot’s “absolute sovereignty”.\(^10\) In de Vogüé’s reading of the *Rule*, the abbot was a legal and constitutional head whose leadership was acknowledged tacitly by the community and who embodied the communal will. Since his 1968 study was published, however, de Vogüé’s conclusions have been contested and the idea of what constitutes abbatial power has come into question. The notion of real power deriving from an abbot’s legal position, in particular, does not seem to be supported within the text of the *Rule*.\(^11\)

Recent scholarship on power dynamics within monasteries emphasizes the multidimensionality of the ideological force wielded by, through and upon the abbot. If we conceive of power, as Max Weber articulates it, as the “the probability that one actor

---


\(^11\) Cf. Michael Paulin Blecker, “Roman Law and ‘Consilium’ in the *Regula Magistri* and the *Rule of St. Benedict,*” *Speculum* 47 (1972), pp. 1-28. This article convincingly argues that de Vogüé wrongly deemphasizes the restriction of abbatial will wrought by the necessity of communal counsel. Blecker suggests that it was not the abbot but the community which corporately “owned” the property of the monastery and which were thus not materially at the whim of the abbot. For a discussion of the authoritative status of the *Rule* at Cluny, cf. Rosenwein, “Rules and the ‘Rule’” as well as the discussion in chapter ten.
within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance” then we can understand the abbot must do much more than merely fulfill a legally-defined position.\textsuperscript{12} Throughout the Middles Ages, an abbot was able to carry out his will (or God’s, for whom the abbot was a surrogate) within his monastery through appeals to various forces, including (but not limited to) coercive (e.g. whippings, incarceration), disciplinary (e.g. private penance) and ideological power (e.g. the authority of the Rule).\textsuperscript{13} At his most controlling, an abbot (or a prior like Matthew of Albano) could overcome resistance through physical force (or its threat).\textsuperscript{14} A willful abbot along with a loyal coterie of assistants such as deans and circatores could—in theory—idiosyncratically interpret the Rule (and those aspects not mentioned within it), keep his monks under constant surveillance, and force correction (or imprisonment) when lapses from the ideal were observed. In this model, an abbot would dictatorially force his will on a monastery of cowed and obedient monks. Ultimately, however, an abbot could not threaten physical coercion if he could not convince his community (or at least a significant portion of it) that his leadership upheld the ideals and spirit of the monastic project.

Whether or not the monks would accept and accede to the governance of their abbot was largely determined by the manner in which he marshaled his ideological power (which I consider as synonymous with authority). Abbatial authority was the result of the monks’ will to obey—a willed and conscious desire to accept a state of humility and obey

\textsuperscript{14} The coercive functions of the abbot/prior are discussed in chapter seven through the example of Matthew of Albano (as discussed in Peter the Venerable’s De miraculis).
another. In his study of discipline in Benedictine monasteries, Talal Asad highlights how monks voluntarily ceded power to their abbot because of the authority he could marshal. Contemporary mentalities (e.g. a habituated deference for hierarchy, the desire for an eternal reward in heaven), the abbot’s legitimacy in selection (e.g. if elected canonically or nominated by a beloved predecessor), his action (e.g. his comportment in accordance with contemporary ideals) and the particularities of the discourses to which his monks were exposed (e.g. a liturgy symbolically creating abbatial power by preaching humility and deference, or the humiliation of sinners) all played a role in establishing the conditions of abbatial power.\textsuperscript{15}

As de Vogüé admits, abbatial power was often inextricable from the regard won by the abbot’s role as the spiritual teacher and model expressed in his lived example (and to a lesser extent in his learning). This condition made his ideological power in part an interpersonal phenomenon deriving from his particular ability to represent himself as exemplary of God’s and the community’s will. Like many medieval rulers\textsuperscript{16}, power was embodied in the person of the abbot and his presence had a particularly strong ideological force.\textsuperscript{17} The power of the early abbots of Cluny, from Berno (r. 909/10-926) to Majolus (r. 954-994) were conceived as linked to the specific person of the abbot.\textsuperscript{18} In John of Salerno’s \textit{Vita Odonis} for instance, Odo’s body and its comportment are depicted as if a

\textsuperscript{15} Cf. ibid., pp. 159-67.
\textsuperscript{16} Such as the collection of articles by Gerd Althoff, \textit{Spielregen der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde}, (Darmstadt, 1997). The articles in the section on \textit{Kommunikation} well demonstrate the multiple techniques used by rulers (in this case, Ottonian kings and emperors) to negotiate power through, for example, calculated displays of emotion.
\textsuperscript{17} Cf. the discussions around this question in Maria Hillebrandt, “Abt und Gemeinschaft in Cluny (10.-11. Jahrhundert),” \textit{Vom Kloster zum Klosterverband. Das Werkzeug der Schriftlichkeit}, ed. Hagen Keller and Franz Neiske, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften, 74, (Munich, 1997), pp. 147-172.
spiritual reservoir, the sight of which was sufficient to convert unruly and resisting monks (and even highwaymen).\textsuperscript{19} Though Odo advocated a far more nuanced conception of the role of the body in his own writings, his contemporaries often perceived his presence as synonymous with his power.\textsuperscript{20} That such discourses are repeated in subsequent Cluniac abbatial \textit{vitae} from Maiolus to Hugh suggests that Cluniac monks continued to perceive their abbots as repositories of charismatic power.\textsuperscript{21} Institutional records, moreover, indicate that the oversight of monasteries by the early Cluniac abbots (Odo to Maiolus) were of a personal nature and did not establish long-lasting jurisdictional ties.\textsuperscript{22}

If presence and the development of interpersonal relationships was a key condition for the exercise of power, how could an abbot maintain influence when his flock developed into an ever-increasing number of far off monasteries? It is one thing for an abbot to assert power over monks directly present and another to control those at a

\textsuperscript{19} "In the small space of his body the good Jesus constructed among the various groves of monks a paradise from whose fountain he might refresh the hearts of the faithful." John of Salerno, \textit{Vita Odonis} I, 14, cited from \textit{PL}, vol. 133, col. 49D; English translation by Gerard Sitwell, \textit{St Odo of Cluny: Being the Life of St. Odo of Cluny by John of Salerno and the Life of St. Gerald of Aurillac by St. Odo}, The Makers of Christendom, (London, 1958), p. 16; \textit{Conserebat in parvo locello tunc bonus Jesus ex diversis nemoris monachorum paradisum, ex cujus irrigaret corda fidelium}. The image of Odo’s body flowing in virtue is continued in a subsequent paragraph. \textit{At ille, velit fons redundans, desiderantissima cunctis praebebat pocula, et quasi ex aperta biblioteca, omnibus congrua ministrabat exempla...} (\textit{VO}, I, 17, col. 51B [p. 19]). Through the linking imagery, John identifies Odo’s body, originally “irrigating” the hearts of the faithful, as an open book which offers an example to all. Two robbers “seeing the affability of his appearance” converted from their old ways and amended their ways; likewise, rebellious monks at Fleury ended their resistance when they recognized the appearance of Odo (\textit{VO}, II 19, 20, III 8; col. 71, 81 [pp. 62, 81]).

\textsuperscript{20} His \textit{Collationes}, for example, contains a well developed argument for the rejection of exterior appearance and its emptiness as an indicator of virtue (cf. \textit{Collationes}, in \textit{PL}, vol. 133, I, 9 and II, 2, cols 550C, 556BC), though he also underlines the spiritual value of developing proper comportment (ibid., II, 19, col. 565B) and the importance of physically imitating the example of Saint Benedict (id, \textit{De sancto benedicto abbate in PL}, vol. 133, col. 729C),

\textsuperscript{21} Though it is impossible to reproduce here the outlines of the evidence, this is the conclusion of research done as part of my major field preparations. “Angelici in form, composed in manners: Exterior conduct and regular life in the monasteries of the Latin West, 9th-12th centuries”.

distance. One solution was the movement towards a bureaucratized system.\textsuperscript{23} Though it has generally been recognized that few features of institutionalization underlie the structure and organization of Cluniac monasteries before the thirteenth century,\textsuperscript{24} Odilo's abbacy witnessed a change, as Dominique Iognra-Prat notes, towards a juridical construction of Cluny and its attendant houses as the \textit{ecclesia cluniacensis}.\textsuperscript{25} The Cluniac network of monasteries in the time of Odilo paralleled the institutional reconstruction advocated by the papacy. As Poeck argues, this network, which was once constituted by shared observances or liturgical confraternities, increasingly was defined by the reception of juridical privileges and controlled by bureaucratic structures.

The abbacy of Hugh of Semur marked another stage in the development of this trend, made evident by Urban II's bulls declaring Cluny the head of a Cluniac body of monasteries.\textsuperscript{26} Just as the eleventh-century papacy saw the potential for promoting ideological and programmatic change through the medium of written law, the Cluniac abbots adopted similar strategies.\textsuperscript{27} The structures of organization underlying the \textit{ecclesia cluniacensis} became premised on an acceptance of legal prerogatives of the abbots and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
pope, a form of authority little used previously by charismatic abbots to relate to their monks. Though abbots like Hugh and later Peter the Venerable likely continued to exert power and authority in part through their charismatic power or their links to powerful aristocratic kin groups, the medium of written law became an important means to promote uniformity in practices. As monastic recruitment moved away from oblates and towards older monks, the discourse of law offered a potentially powerful mechanism.\textsuperscript{28} Unlike oblates who were trained from an early age to adopt the practices and aesthetic of Cluniac life, mature adults becoming monks necessitated distinct disciplinary forces.

The period of Cluny under Hugh also experienced the expansion of Cluniac priories in which a greater number of smaller establishments were being founded as directly subordinate to the abbot of Cluny.\textsuperscript{29} This situation meant that the abbot Hugh continued to have less personal control over his monks (who were broadly dispersed and divided into an increasing number of smaller locales), and depended on legal mechanisms of governance. Codified texts of custom (such as the Consuetudines of Cluny written by Bernard or Ulrich) began to be disseminated alongside the living models of monks, priors and abbot.\textsuperscript{30} This adoption of legal mechanisms can also be located within a shifting institutional ethos of Cluny (like the papal court in Rome) which increasingly was universalizing in its attitudes. As Dominique Iogna-Prat has well demonstrated, Cluniac abbots thought of themselves as more than an abbot of a single Burgundian monastery and its dependencies.\textsuperscript{31} When Peter the Venerable came to articulate his model of

\textsuperscript{28} On this topic, cf. the work of Isabelle Cochelin, in particular, “Étude sur les hiérarchies monastiques: le prestige de l'ancienneté et son éclipse à Cluny au XI\textsuperscript{e} siècle,” \textit{RM} 72 (2000), pp. 5-37.
\textsuperscript{29} Marcel Pacaut, “La formation du second réseau monastique clunisien (v. 1030-v. 1080),” pp. 43-51.
\textsuperscript{30} Cf. Isabelle Cochelin, “La singularité de l'oeuvre de Bernard au regard de l'histoire des coutumiers,” in \textit{From the Dead of Night to End of Day}, eds. Isabelle Cochelin and Susan Boynton, Disciplina Monastica, vol. 1. (Turnhout, forthcoming), which she kindly allowed me to consult before its publication
\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Order and Exclusion}, pp. 75-95.
monasticism, Cluny had become the model of Christendom, and his monks the models
for all Christians. A single pure ideal was to exist for all.

LITERACY AND REFORM

Contemporaneous with the shift towards an organizational structure based in
literate practices, a changing conception of language is evidenced by the monastic models
described in Cluniac abbatial vitæ. Patrick Henriet’s study of sacred speech outlines how
the vitæ of the early Cluniac abbots emphasize charismatic presentations of language
(such as prayers and sermons) which have an immediate performative efficacy.\(^{32}\) By the
twelfth-century, Henriet notes, prayers were made powerful through their ability to
channel sincere internal devotion —independent of their outward enaction. Meaning not
performance was the end of language and thus language itself is shown to be of changing
import.

Brian Stock’s The Implications of Literacy provides a context helpful for locating
the significance of Henriet’s conclusions about the abbatial vitæ.\(^{33}\) Stock’s analysis
shows that the eleventh and twelfth centuries evidence a general revolution in systems of
communication, which led to fundamental changes in culture and cognition.\(^{34}\) The period,
Stock concludes, evidences the movement to a social and intellectual discourse (i.e. how
people behaved and thought) governed by texts, though actual texts were often not

\(^{32}\) Patrick Henriet, *La Parole et la prière au Moyen Âge: le verbe efficace dans l’hagiographie monastique
des XI\textsuperscript{e} et XII\textsuperscript{e} siècles*, Bibliothèque du Moyen Âge, 16, (Brussels, 2000) (on the Cluniac vitæ), pp. 55-96,
207-23, 315-352.

\(^{33}\) Cf. Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, pp. 3-11. For general works on this topic, cf. *Literacy and
Social Development in the West*, ed. Harvey J. Graff, (Cambridge, 1981); Brian V. Street, *Literacy in
*Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, (Cambridge, 1992); Matthew Innes, “Memory, Orality and
Literacy in an Early Medieval Society,” *Past and Present* 158 (2002), pp. 3-36; Michael Clanchy, *From

\(^{34}\) Such is also the conclusion of a slightly different account of this eleventh-twelth-century shift by
present. This debate over medium, moreover, allowed new questions to be asked about human experience, especially in the religious sphere where the practice of literacy was concentrated. The ascendance of literate culture, Stock demonstrates, gave rise to urges and then texts of reform since literacy reworked the means by which identity arose on a personal level (through reading) and, by generating written sets of rules, it developed and restructured behavioral patterns on an institutional level.

Stephen Jaeger broadens Stock’s dichotomy by arguing that the shift can more profitably be viewed in terms of a relative dominance of a “charismatic” versus an “intellectual” culture. As “intellectual” culture (literacy) came increasingly to define people’s experiences, a valuation was placed on interiority, certain forms of logical rationality and the textual expression of these two. He notes a corresponding (and in his interpretation necessary) devaluation of charismatic culture, which based itself in the mediation of values (spiritual, social, intellectual) through the body. According to Jaeger, the eleventh and twelfth century demonstrate a “shift from real presence to symbolic, from performance to representation”.

35 Stock, The Implications of Literacy, p. 3-5.
We can see this shift at Cluny through the evidence of changes in monastic pedagogy demonstrated by Isabelle Cochelin and Susan Boynton. Cochelin argues that the training of the body dominated educational practices of oblates until the late-eleventh century, at which time training in bodily virtue was supplanted by intellectual focused inquiry. Boynton argues a similar point by illustrating the importance of apprenticeship in liturgical practice as central to monastic education in the earlier medieval period.

The shift in priority away from bodily culture to an intellectual or literate mentality is clearly evidenced from the extant texts of Peter the Venerable. Peter himself provides the example *par excellence* of this change, whose argumentation and reasoning were left behind as texts and give evidence of his distinction. Peter does not advocate a break or disjuncture from Cluniac traditions, however, but rather works to adapt them to a new religious context. As I argue in this dissertation, Peter’s works demonstrate the textualization of both charismatic and literate discourses, not in contest but coexisting in the service of reform.

---


PETER THE VENERABLE, THE ABBOT OF THE CLUNIACS

As Gert Melville and Eva-Maria Pinkl’s studies of thirteenth-century Cluny demonstrate, the abbacy of Peter the Venerable was a critical phase in the history of Cluny. Viewed from the perspective of the thirteenth century, we can understand why. By this time, the *ecclesia cluniacensis* had been transformed from a loose network of monasteries into an Order based in institutional processes. This was the culmination of a trend, as scholars generally acknowledge, first evidenced under Peter the Venerable. The thirteenth century witnessed the death of the charismatic abbots, who gave way to “constitutional monarchs” bound by the juridical mechanisms of the Order of Cluny.

There is nothing in Peter’s biography, however, which would initially suggest an innovative spirit. Born in 1092 or 1094, Peter entered the Cluniac monastery of Sauxillanges as an oblate. He made his profession at Cluny before being transferred to Vézelay as a schoolmaster and prior, which was the first in a series of administrative appointments. His early history, as Iogna-Prat remarks, identifies him as “typically Cluniac”.

---


45 Denise Bouthillier and Jean-Pierre Torrell provide the most complete account of Peter’s life and works in their work, *Pierre le Vénéréable et sa vision du monde. Sa vie, son œuvre. L’homme et le démon*, (Louvain, 1986), after Vision.

46 *Order and Exclusion*, p. 100.
In Ralph of Sully’s account, Peter was unanimously elected to the abbatial office by all the Cluniac abbots and priors upon the death of abbot Hugh II in 1122.\textsuperscript{47} The resistance subsequently encountered by Peter from his monks, however, questions this unanimity. The early history of Peter’s abbacy was marked by conflicts, in reaction to which Peter sought to buttress his position with papal pronouncements and the support of sympathetic disciplinarians.\textsuperscript{48} His abbacy was later undermined by the return of Hugh II’s predecessor, the ex-abbot, Pontius of Melgueil, who arrived at Cluny in 1125 in an attempt to regain his position there.\textsuperscript{49} This abbatial schism was resolved through papal intervention, which, though excommunicating and removing Pontius from Cluny, did not resolve the dissent and factionalism of the Cluniac monks. Peter spent the first decade of his abbacy in ceaseless itinerancy, beseeching support from the papal court in Rome, subduing rebellious monks and spurring on the faraway houses of the ecclesia cluniacensis to adopt reformed observances.\textsuperscript{50} The challenge (and alternatives) posed by Cistercian monasticism (or new movements like the Carthusians) did little to help Peter maintain control over Cluniac priories and dependencies, though they may have contributed to Peter’s own monastic models. His early concern with reform first culminated in 1132 with a general meeting of all Cluniac abbots and priors at which Peter promulgated a series of statutes designed to redefine and reorganize the practice of

\textsuperscript{47} Cf. VPV, 1, col. 17-18.
\textsuperscript{49} The most recent discussion of this schism can be found in Joachim Wollasch, \textit{Cluny ‘Licht der Welt’}, pp. 198-224 and Méhu, \textit{Paix et communautés}, pp. 315-26; an additional source, which I have been unable to consult, is the dissertation of Nadine Fresco, \textit{L’affaire Pons de Melgueil: 1122-1126. De l’ordre à l’inquiétude dans le monachisme clunisien}, 2 vols, (Paris 1973). The question of Pontius’ relationship to Peter is further discussed in chapter eight and appendix C.
\textsuperscript{50} Cf. Vision, pp. 48-68 for a discussion of the evidence for and scholarship on Peter’s journeys.
Cluniac monasticism.\textsuperscript{51} After this time, Peter’s authority seems to have been established at Cluny and in much of the \textit{ecclesia cluniacensis}.

Most of Peter’s reform writings date from after the period of initial instability during two major times: the first from the late 1120s until 1135 (letter 28, the first redaction of the \textit{De miraculis}, the initial promulgation of Peter’s statutes) and the second in the 1140s (letters 111, 149, 150, 161, the second redaction of the \textit{De miraculis}, the codification of his statutes and his economic reorganization).\textsuperscript{52} Peter’s texts, as we discuss throughout this dissertation, often directly seek to establish a lasting power base for the abbot of the Cluniacs and likely represent a form of persuasion complementary to his charismatic efforts.

As Peter’s travels suggest, much of his abbatial power was manifested charismatically in his presence. This influence is something to which contemporary witnesses attest. The \textit{Vita Petri Venerabilis} identifies, for example, that his charisma encouraged his selection as abbot. Repeating the words of his electors, the text notes that all Cluniac monks perceived him as:

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
noble in birth, decorous in manners, devout in faith, pure in religion, humble and at peace, shining with wisdom, submitted to discipline and from a young age instructed according to the Rule in all things.\textsuperscript{53}
\end{center}
\end{quote}

Ralph of Sully’s description of Peter’s abbacy continues with like expressions of charismatic virtue, characterizing his governance as the embodiment of personal relationships between abbot and monk, established through the individual concern he

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{51} Cf. chapter eight.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Cf. appendix E.
\item \textsuperscript{53} \textit{VPV}, 1, col. 18CD; \textit{nobilis genere, adornatus moribus, fide devotus, religione purus, humilis et quietus, sapientia splendidus, disciplinae subditus, et per omnia ab ineunte aetate regulariter instructus}.\end{itemize}
demonstrated for his monks and the love he engendered in them.\textsuperscript{54} He fulfilled the role of a father to them, acting out of concern, not command:

He was not puffed up, nor did he present himself as powerful, but as if a little boy, with every wish he assiduously preferred to learn by scrutinizing divine things. The benign father taught his [monks] humility, patience, goodness, gentleness and to keep pure their conscience with fear and with trembling.\textsuperscript{55}

As Ralph subsequently describes, Peter’s charisma, was more linguistic than visual. He preached, Ralph attests, “with affect and effect, [and] when preaching he taught even more by act”.\textsuperscript{56} Though remarking how Peter fulfilled the injunction in the \textit{Rule of St. Benedict} which urged the abbot to teach by deeds more than words (\textit{factis amplius quam verbis}), Ralph immediately underscores Peter’s intellectual instruction.\textsuperscript{57} Peter teaches through his love for his monks, which manifests itself in an inward concern and outward injunctions. Ralph remarks that Peter despised the world, but he does not describe Peter’s conduct as proof of this. Instead, he refers to what Peter said, asserted and taught.\textsuperscript{58}

This privileged conception of the link between exemplarity and preaching, as Patrick Henriet also notes about Peter, differs greatly from the abbatial models of Peter’s predecessors.\textsuperscript{59}

Peter the Venerable’s charismatic eloquence is also heavily emphasized in Peter of Poitiers’ laudatory poem, the \textit{Panegyricus}, written \textit{ca} 1130/34.\textsuperscript{60} Peter of Poitiers

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 3, col. 19.
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 3, col. 19D; \textit{Non elevabatur, nec se magnum faciebat: sed quasi puer parvulus divina scrutando, votis omnibus assidue discere praepotbat. Docebat suos Pater benignus humilitatem, patientiam, bonitatem, mansuetudinem, et ut cum timore et cum tremore suam conscientiam in puritate custodirent[...].}
\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 3, col. 19B; The text reads, \textit{affectu et effectu praedicabat, et praedicando magis actu docebat.}
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Regula Sancti Benedicti}, II, 11, p. 444.
\textsuperscript{58} VPV, 3, col. 19C.
\textsuperscript{59} Henriet, \textit{La parole et la prière}, p. 217.
\textsuperscript{60} A limited discussion of the poem was undertaken by Constable (LPV, II, pp. 331-43, appendix Q), who briefly summarizes the content and provides its only modern analysis. Peter of Poitiers is also discussed, though with little reference to the \textit{Panegyricus}, in J. Henri Pignot’s \textit{Histoire de l’ordre de Cluny depuis la
breathlessly exalts the abbot Peter’s parentage, eloquence, manners and virtue; eloquence and charismatic presence are identified as coterminous in Peter the Venerable.\textsuperscript{61} The proof of this, Peter of Poitiers continues, was the abbot’s effect on people. Provoked by the reputation of the visiting abbot, Peter of Poitiers describes how the people of Aquitaine gathered to see him and—while illuminated by his presence—they were even more enriched by his eloquence.\textsuperscript{62} The abbot Peter’s appearance provides a text to be read, where his eyes, his mouth, his clothes all speak out his virtue.\textsuperscript{63} His eloquence, the poem continues, is the preeminent mark of Peter’s grace and cannot be properly narrated by anyone but Peter himself.\textsuperscript{64} Peter of Poitiers, for one, was enslaved by a love arising from this eloquence, causing him to abandon all thoughts of a life without his abbot.\textsuperscript{65}

While we can see in these flowery declarations a means for Peter of Poitiers to seek promotion from his abbot\textsuperscript{66}, we also glimpse a conception of Peter the Venerable as

\begin{flushright}
fondation de l’abbaye jusqu’à la mort de Pierre le Vénérable, (Autun-Paris, 1868), III, pp. 461-72. I refer here to the edition of the Panegyricus appearing in the PL, vol. 189, cols 47-58 reprinted from the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, Martin Marrier and André Duchesne, eds., (Paris, 1614; rpt. Mâcon, 1915), cols 607-614; hereafter cited BC. It is also edited in the 1522 edition of Peter’s works by Pierre de Montmartre (cf. LPV, II, pp. 45-47). This latter text edits the text, like the BC/PL version, from the manuscript n. 381 located in Douai, Bibliothèque municipale (cf. LPV, II, pp. 48-49). As discussed in the following chapter, this manuscript also contains Peter the Venerable’s letter collection, which is prefaced by Peter of Poitiers brief works.\textsuperscript{61} Panegyricus, col. 48A, 49D. A letter by Peter of Poitiers (edited by Giles Constable, LPV, I, p. 1-3) also repeats the flowery praise developed in the Panegyricus.\textsuperscript{62} Panegyricus, col. 50AD.\textsuperscript{63} The poem (ibid, col. 50C) reads, “Your beautiful eyes proclaimed your royal origin./ And a bashful modesty painted your expressions./ Your clothing, the gait of your humble body—these witnesses/ declared that you considered the world nothing.; Clamabant oculi germen regale venusti./ Quique verecundus pinxerat ora rubor;/ Vestis, et incessus humili de pectore, testes,/ Dicebant mundum te reputare nihil.\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., col. 50D; Longa mihi fuit illa dies, audire volenti: Esset in eloquio gratia quanta pio!/ Nam laudata nimirum fuerat facundia nobis;/ Sed quis eam digna laude referre potest?/ Audivi, fateor, sed inenarrabile quietam;/ Audivi linguam principis egregiam;/ Sermo potens, de te non audeo scribere quidquam;/ Ne tenuem calamum tam grave frangat opus;/ Te coram linguae Cicero rex ille Latiniae;/ Si quid forte velit dicere, mutus erit;/ Tu Socratem vincis, reddis sine voce Platonem;/ Rhetoricos omnes tu trepidare facts;/ Obstupui, fateor, tanta dulcedine verbi;/ Incipiens mecum taliter ipse loqui;/ Fama nihil dignum tanto pastore ferebas;/ Plus aliquad video vox tua quam cecinit.\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., col. 51A; Tunc magis atque magis tua me dilectio traxit;/ Et totus rapit max in amore tuo.\textsuperscript{66} Cf. ibid., col. 52A, where the author seeks to remind Peter the Venerable not to forget to return for him, so that he might continue to advance on his “journey” by becoming an assistant to the abbot Peter.
primarily defined by his eloquence. This depiction, moreover, seems to be one that Peter the Venerable himself valued, approved and protected. He wrote a long poem ostensibly defending Peter of Poitiers against certain detractors who derided his poetry. Since Peter identified that an attack on the poem of Peter of Poitiers represented an attack on its subject (i.e. himself), the abbot was obligated to defend the writings of his monk from critical rumours. The poem modulates from a defence of Peter of Poitiers into a panegyric of Classical and Christian authorship and that Peter the Venerable chooses the written word as the medium for his discussion emphasizes the considerable value placed by him on the written text, as I explore further below.

PE T E R TH E V E R N A B L E A N D T H E W R I T T E N W O R D

The hand should be turned from the plough to the pen: pages can be ploughed with holy letters in place of ploughing fields; on the sheet of the word, the seedbed of God can be sown, which can fill hungry readers with the ripe crops of perfect books and multiplied fruits; and the celestial bread can thus drive out the deadly hunger of the soul. So, clearly so, you can become a silent preacher of the holy word, and with a silent tongue your hand will resound with shouting voices in the ears of many people. You will remain cloistered in your cave, you will travel across lands and seas through your books, you— an observer from a lofty position— will cry out the word of God among the public assemblies through the mouth of a reader, [and] you will whisper the very same to the silent servants of God in the withdrawn corners of cloisters and houses. [...] You are urged to do this by a not insignificant recompense of this labour, which you will acquire on behalf of all whom you have been able to assist by this laudable effort. For many will have overthrown pride, subjugated luxury, despised avarice, or dominated anger on account of reading your books [and] they will have been freed or have repented from many evils, with the result that the group gathered by your efforts will add to the storehouse of your eternal fruits. And while the works of a man ordinarily are limited by his life, and with the passing of his life so too do his works pass away, you will not die a [true] death, nor passing from life will you cease from good work, since you are recalled from death to life by your works.

67 Adversus calumniatores carminum sui Petri Pictaviensis defensio, cited from PL, vol. 189 (reprinted from BC, cols 1337-44), here, col. 1005D; Nec mihi commenis nocet haec injuria tantum,/ Sed magis egregios respicit illa viros. Peter asserts that an attack against Peter of Poitiers not only defames himself but also all writers of worth (from Classical poets to St. Paul, Augustine and Ambrose, among others). We see from Peter’s concern a need to protect his own literary reputation, and his acceptance of his authorial reputation as a defining condition of his own public identity.
And just as much as the life of your books, as so I said, will have been able to endure, by an equal amount will the profit of your works continue after your death in the view of God.\textsuperscript{68}

Persuading Gilbert of Senlis to retain the eremitic life and to not engage in itinerant preaching is the goal of Peter the Venerable’s letter 20. The solution which Peter offers for Gilbert’s desire to abandon his isolation is the medium of the written word. He presents writing as a form of silent preaching which will allow Gilbert to save souls while bound by silence and enclosed by the walls of a hermitage. He conceives of authorship, therefore, as a means to combine the active and contemplative lives. Peter does not expect Gilbert to abandon his desire to preach, but instead urges him to rechannel it into textual form. Though written with this specific purpose in mind, Peter’s words perhaps give evidence of his own struggles to balance the desire to withdraw from the world while, as abbot of Cluny, being caught up within it.\textsuperscript{69}

\textsuperscript{68} The Letters of Peter the Venerable, ed. Giles Constable, Harvard Historical Studies, 78, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1967), ep. 20, vol. 1, pp. 38-9 (hereafter, LPV); adapted in part from the translation by Giles Constable in The Reformation of the Twelfth Century, p. 213; Pro aratro convertatur manus ad pennam, pro exarandis agris, diuinis litteris paginax exarentur, seratur in cartula uerbi dei seminarium, quod maturatis segetibus hoc est libris perfectis, multiplicitis frugibus esurientes lectores repleat, et sic panis caelestis laetalem animae famem depellant. Sic plane sic uerbi diuinii poteris fieri taciturnus praedicator, et lingua silent, in multorum populorum auribus manus tua clamosis uocibus personabit. Clausus teneberis speleo tuo, et in codicibus suis terras ac maria peragrasis, in publicis ecclesiæs conventibus lectoris ore uerbum dei de sublimi loco spectaculum inclamabis, in remotis claustrorum et domorum angulis illud idem serui sui silentibus insussurabilis. [...] Animet te ad hoc agendum non parum laboris praemium, quod pro omnibus consequeris, quibus hoc laudibili studio subuenire potueris. nam quotquot tuorum volunim voluminum lactione superbiam prostrauerint, luxuriam subegerint, auariciam contemptuerint iram domuerint, a quibuslibet malis vel caruerint vel paenituerint ut manipuli sudoribus tuus collecti, aesternarum frugum tuarum horrea cumulabunt. Et dum cum vita hominis opera eius finiri soleant, et cum deficientie deficere, tu nec mortuas morieris, nec a uita deficiens a bono opere cessabis, quando operibus tuus ad utiam mortuos revocabis. Tantoque tempore etiam post mortem tuam apud deum extendetur lucrum operum tuorum, quanto ita dicam durare, potuerint uita librorum tuorum.

Regardless of its specific goal, Peter enunciates a concise theory of authorship in this passage. It is a means to serve God since the text effects a transformation of sinners to the proper path and by this effort secures salvation for the writer himself. Through the written word, a monk is able to reach an audience in faraway places and in future times. Not bound by the physical presence of the author, books allow a monk’s ideas and intentions to address unseen crowds of laity and of cloistered monks. In Peter’s conception, therefore, texts are an extension of oral preaching, but also differ from and improve upon this. Since books are able to address a larger audience and can instantiate the ideas in a medium prolonging their existence, writing multiplies the benefits of preaching. This depiction of authorship, I believe, is representative of Peter’s attitudes about his own texts.

Peter the Venerable’s personal commitment to authorship is evident not only from such comments, but also from his extant texts. Peter the Venerable has left behind a body of writings to a degree vastly unlike the other Cluniac abbots. He composed several...
works of many different genres, including letters, miracle stories, legislative material, and liturgical texts. Some of these works addressed an audience of seculars, others were written with monks specifically in mind. Peter’s letter collection includes, for example, many practical and administrative letters about maintaining the network of Cluniac monasteries (collecting tithes, managing the movements of monks, fighting jurisdictional conflicts). Others of his letters, like letters 28 and 111, closely resemble treatises, like those written by Peter against heretics, Jews and Muslims which illustrate the theorizing of this twelfth-century abbot. His De miraculis combines heterogeneous narratives (visions of the dead, demonic manifestations, hagiography and panegyric) into a defence of the Church and the promotion of Cluniac monasticism. His Statuta and Dispositio rei familiaris reunited the legislative enactments of an abbacy devoted to reorganizing Cluny and the ecclesia cluniacensis. His extant liturgical work consists of a number of sermons, prayers, hymns, and a complete office of the Transfiguration that were inserted into the Cluniac liturgy. We see then, that the corpus of Peter’s writings contains a wide variety of material addressing a diversity of practical and theoretical aspects.


72 On the editions used of these works, cf. the primary sources noted in the bibliography and the beginning of each genre-section.
74 Cf. chapters two through five.
75 Cf. chapters six and seven.
76 Cf. chapters eight through ten.
77 For the liturgical material cf. the editions noted in the bibliography, and cited in Robert Folz, “Pierre le Vénérable et la Liturgie,” in Pierre Abélard- Pierre le Vénérable, pp. 143-163.
The subsequent historical record of Peter's abbacy demonstrates his continuing reputation as a noted author. Within fifteen years of his death (†1156), Peter's *vita* had been written by Ralph of Sully (himself to become the abbot of Cluny in 1173). Ralph's account is the first Cluniac *vita* to devote considerable space to a discussion of the subject's writings.\(^7\) A portrait of Peter as scholarly and bookish, coexists with a glowing account of a charismatic abbot dedicated to God.\(^7\) This initial *vita* was incorporated along with information taken from Peter's own writings and from the poems of Peter of Poitiers into another description of the abbot's life in the fifteenth-century *Chronicon Cluniacense* (which also depended on material from the thirteenth-century *Venerabilium abbatum chronologia*).\(^8\) The longer anonymous *vita altera* from the *Chronicon Cluniacense* provides an even greater emphasis on Peter as a writer.\(^8\)

**OBJECTS OF STUDY**

Dominique Iogna-Prat's work on Peter the Venerable has well elucidated the role played by this powerful Cluniac abbot as (taking the term from the passage cited above) a "silent preacher" to the laity.\(^8\) I wish to evaluate the complement to this, by looking inward, not outward. I explore, therefore, how Peter embedded a certain political rhetoric within those texts which he intended to be received and read by his monks.\(^8\) As we saw

---

\(^7\) *VPV*, 5, col. 21.

\(^7\) Cf. *VPV*, 3, col. 19.

\(^8\) The *Chronicon Cluniacense* is found in the *BC*, cols 1627-88; The extracts about Peter in the *Chronicon Cluniacense* have been reprinted as the *Vita Altera* in *PL*, vol. 189, cols 27-42. For a discussion of the various redactions of this document and its relationship to the *Venerabilium abbatum chronologia*, cf. Didier Méhu, *Paix et communautés*, pp. 24-26.


\(^8\) By political rhetoric, I mean a conscious desire to reduce his monks' perceptions of available choices for the construction of obedience to him as abbot and to (his interpretation of) the *Rule* as a sort of authoritative
above, Peter viewed writing as the means to fulfill pastoral obligations and to return his audience to the true path of religion. This allows us to conclude that Peter the Venerable identified a transformative role for his texts. As I argue in the following chapters, his letter collection, *De Miraculis* and *Statuta* provided the major textual avenues to introduce his particular ideologies of reform to his monks.

I begin with a discussion of Peter the Venerable’s letter collection(s) because the letters provide the most explicit indications of how Peter personally related to and expressed himself with monastic correspondents. As outlined in chapter two, the form of the letter collection and the extant evidence for the dissemination of his letters suggest a largely Cluniac audience. As we see both from the prefaces to the letter collection(s) and from his own epistolary conventions, written correspondence is highlighted as a suitable and effective medium for executing his spiritual duties as abbot. Letters allow, as Peter emphasizes, both the embodiment of charismatic presence and the textualization of argumentation. This discussion forms an introduction to chapter three, in which I examine the coexistence of seemingly impersonal, rational argumentation with intensely personal, affective persuasion (love, humiliation) in Peter the Venerable’s debates with Cistercians generally and with Bernard of Clairvaux in particular. These letters (which were open letters with a secondary Cluniac audience) are of particular importance since they explicitly discuss questions of reform and proper monastic observance. These letter-treatises provide an overt justification for changes such as we see advocated in subsequent letters, his *De miraculis* and the *Statuta*. Chapter five opens this discussion, showing how Peter employed letters filled with rationalism and affectivity to establish his

---

power over the monks of the *ecclesia cluniacensis*. We see in these letters Peter’s use of affective and logical reasoning as a memnotechnical device, encouraging proper action (through love) while appropriating his monks illicit desires and rechanneling them into suitable reformed thoughts and action (through humiliation). This reformation of his monks’ intellects and wills parallels his recreation of monastic memory in the *De miraculis*.

Though the *De miraculis libri duo* was Peter’s most widely disseminated work and it addressed topics relevant to both secular and religious spheres, I argue that this text is the narrative equivalent of the *Statuta*. It privileges a literate mentality and transmits the substance of Peter’s reform effort. Chapter six argues that the *De miraculis*, chiefly in its second redaction, was intended to address a Cluniac audience. The narrator’s voice bridges the numerous and heterogeneous stories of the *De miraculis* and implants a hermeneutic process urging the transformation of the audience. Through exemplary Cluniac figures Peter conveys his model of monastic life to his monks and argues for a rejuvenated relationship between abbot and community, as I contend in chapter seven. In this new monastic model, Peter projects an ideal of monasticism privileging the interiority and self-reflection necessary for the supra-individual reformation advocated in the *Statuta*.

In 1146/47 Peter the Venerable compiled the *Statuta*, a collection of abbatial decrees intended to renovate the observance of Cluniac monasticism. In contrast to the personal nature of the letters and the omnipresence of Peter’s narrative voice in the *De miraculis*, the *Statuta* appeals to the letter of the law, and presents itself as the most removed from charismatic power. The *Statuta*, as we will see, innovates both in its form
and its substance. In chapter nine, I introduce and outline the context and content of the Statuta. Chapter ten outlines the forms of validation Peter incorporates within the text in order to justify his reforms. The final chapter of this section locates these discourses within the history of Cluniac legislation, showing that Peter’s innovation lay not only in his specific reforms but also in how he formulates them within a Cluniac juridical tradition.

Peter’s discursive strategies of the three textual forms—epistolary, narrative and legislative—are the objects of my research. What do they purport to address? How do they present themselves? What images do they project? Can we see common objectives, rhetorical strategies and representations? As I argue in this dissertation, considerable unity exists throughout these texts. Peter promotes and argues for substantive change; he urges a reformation of Cluniac monasticism based in a shift from orthopraxy to orthodoxy, from affectivity to rationality and from orality to literacy. Peter the Venerable, or rather his texts, are valuable for how they demonstrate the negotiations of these transitions.
By the time of Peter the Venerable’s death in 1156, a sampling of his correspondence had already been gathered together in an official letter collection. Compiled during his life under the direction of himself and his secretary Peter of Poitiers, this compilation of heterogeneous texts records the diversity of relationships the abbot of Cluny maintained with secular and ecclesiastical figures throughout his abbacy. The letters provide an arena for rational debate and an affective means to coerce a fulfillment of Peter’s will from his correspondents. Both forms of persuasion are significant in understanding the means by which Peter uses the written word to promote reform. In chapter two, I examine how Peter consciously conceives of his epistolary writings as textual embodiments of his charismatic presence. As I discuss in chapter three and four through Peter the Venerable’s epistolary debates with the Cistercian Bernard of Clairvaux, this discourse of personal relationships coexists with logical argumentation. Their correspondence demonstrates Peter’s use of the monastic schism of Cluny and Citeaux as a pretext to promote an innovative representation of Cluniac monasticism. The following chapter develops on this theme of reform, demonstrating how Peter’s letters to Cluniac monks drew on similar affective strategies and promoted a positive rhetorical portrait of Cluny. I first look to the extant evidence for Peter’s letter collections.
The early abbots of Cluny left behind few letters; altogether abbots Odo, Aymard, Maiolus, Hugh and Pontius are the authors of less than twenty extant letters.\textsuperscript{1} The letter collection of Peter the Venerable, in contrast, contains just under two hundred epistles.\textsuperscript{2} This quantitative difference provides a preliminary indication of Peter’s disjuncture from the authorial models of his predecessors.\textsuperscript{3} A key difference between Peter and previous Cluniac abbots was the desire for his letters (and some of those of which he was the recipient) to be compiled in an official form and to be retained for posterity.\textsuperscript{4}

Peter’s letters were not private documents meant for the ears or eyes of a few recipients, but rather they were intended, like most medieval letters, to circulate publicly.\textsuperscript{5} This open character of Peter the Venerable’s letters identifies them as material useful for understanding Peter’s construction of a reform ideology. Not only do they contain explicit discussions of Cluniac custom and reform, but they also betray developed rhetorical strategies for influencing both their recipients and wider audiences. Often the letters demanded a recognition of both audiences, as in Peter’s attempts to humiliate

\textsuperscript{1} On this topic, consult the article by Dominique Iogna-Prat “Cluny” in the \textit{Dictionnaire des Lettres françaises. Le Moyen Age}, pp. 311-16 and the works already cited in note 70 of chapter one.
\textsuperscript{3} Cf. the previous chapter.
\textsuperscript{4} This conclusion is based on an argument ex silentio. We have no evidence of previous abbots compiling letter collections, and their \textit{vitae} are similarly silent. John of Salerno, for example, briefly describes Odo’s written works, but does not mention letters among them (\textit{Vita Odonis}, I, 20, col. 50 [p. 20]). John prefers to depict Odo’s body “as an open book”, \textit{quasi ex aperta bibliotheca}, (\textit{VO}, I, 17, col. 51, [p. 19]) and how he was perpetually traveling to reform monasteries and achieve peace between kings and princes (\textit{VO}, II, 19, col. 71, [p. 62]). These descriptions mirror Patrick Henriet’s conclusion about the preaching of the Cluniac abbots before Peter the Venerable as indicating a preference for charismatic, not textual expressions of language; cf. \textit{La Parole et la priere au Moyen Age}, pp. 209-215.
Bernard of Clairvaux. These epistolary tactics positioned Peter, his reforms and Cluny itself as legitimate, necessary and beneficial within Christendom, as Gillian Knight’s studies have demonstrated. As I argue below, Peter also intended that his letter collection circulate within Cluniac monasteries in order to influence the self-definition of his own monks. By identifying himself as an exemplary representative of Cluniac monasticism, which I discuss in the following chapters, Peter offers an explicit theoretical underpinning for his monastic reforms through his letters. Before addressing this topic, however, I turn first to a description of Peter’s letter collection and to the evidence of its circulation during and after the life of Peter the Venerable.

THE LETTER COLLECTION(S) OF PETER THE VENERABLE.

Based on manuscripts, internal evidence, and the conclusions of previous editors, Constable posits three stages in the compilation of Peter’s letter collection. The first redaction was Peter’s original epistolary record book (roughly the first fifty-seven letters of Constable’s edition), later added to in 1142 with further letters drawn together by Peter of Poitiers. A third redaction was produced in 1152 again by Peter of Poitiers which incorporated letters written between 1143 and 1152. Constable suggests that the “general order of the collection was not the result of any theoretical regard for chronology, but of the way in which the letters were kept and copied by Peter of Poitiers”. Constable notes that the first fifty-seven letters seem randomly organized, while those coming after follow

---

7 LPV, II, pp. 17, 74-80.
8 Ibid., II, pp. 79-80.
a roughly chronological order. Though Peter of Poitiers was responsible for compiling and structuring the two later letter collections, Constable argues that Peter the Venerable continued to play a considerable role in selecting the content. In letter 158 to Hugh of Amiens (ca 1149/51), for example, Peter expresses his regret at not having, “filled some of my letter books with the letters sent to you and adorned them with your replies as if with sparkling gems”. We see a similar sentiment expressed in letter 124 to his secretary Peter of Poitiers, “take [this text] and add it, if it seems worthy, to the others which you are accustomed to transcribe”. We see from this remark not only Peter’s concern with constructing a literary monument in his letter collection, but also that he was in part responsible for determining its contents.

Giles Constable’s 1967 edition of Peter the Venerable’s letters (a reconstruction of the third stage of redaction) contains one hundred and ninety-five letters, of which one hundred and sixty-six were written by Peter himself, twenty-five were addressed to him, and four letters (where Peter is neither the writer nor recipient) were included to provide context for Peter’s letters. As Constable notes, the letters date from throughout Peter’s abbacy, with the earliest letter (letter 28) dating likely from ca 1127 and the final letters included in the collection were written in 1152. No letters antedate Peter’s ascent to the abbacy of Cluny, likely indicating that this collection was meant to present Peter in his time in power. Recipients of his letters included popes, bishops, abbots, hermits,

---

9 Ibid., II, p. 79.
10 Ibid., ep. 178, I, p. 419 (cited and translated in LPV, II, p. 13, though Constable mistakenly refers to it as letter 158); The sentence reads as a whole: Deuissem plane quod me negligisse non parum paenitet, qualescumque libros meos epistolis uobis missis implesse, et rescriptis a uobis uelut gemmeis floribus adornasse.
11 LPV, ep. 128, I, pp. 325-26 and ep. 124, I, p. 318; Acctpe igitur, et si dignum uidetur, ceteris quae transscribere soles adivunge.
13 Ibid., p. 80.
emperors, kings, and counts and the topics of his letters are no less diverse: he sought to recruit members of the clergy to Cluny, he chastised heretics, schismsatics and disobedient monks, he offered spiritual and doctrinal advice, he debated legal issues, he mediated jurisdictional disputes, he intervened in abbatial and ecclesiastical elections, he sought legal, financial and physical assistance and he worked to protect Cluniac territory and ideals. This description is only a very limited summary of the multiplicity of issues Peter treats within his letter collection, which itself is also only a selection of all the letters he wrote during his lifetime.

Constable identifies Peter’s collection as belonging to a “literary” type and discounts that it was archival (or exhaustive) in nature. The letter collection (at any stage) was not a complete register of all of his correspondence. As Constable demonstrates, there are references to lost letters mentioned by Peter (in letters 147, 149, 158, 186) and indicated in letters to him (letters 110, 153). There are also epistles to Peter in letter collections of other twelfth-century authors. The Cluniac cartularies, furthermore, contain additional letters written to and by Peter of a more administrative nature which record the financial, economic and estate matters of the monastery. Further letters have also been unearthed by Constable since his edition was printed in 1967. All these

14 Ibid., p. 13.
15 Cf. for example the letter collection of Peter of Celle which contains a letter to Peter the Venerable chastising Cluniac intemperance in food and clothing; The Letter Collection of Peter of Celle, ed. and trans. Julian Haseldine, (Oxford, 2001), ep. 24, pp. 66-79. A search of the PL database alone shows more than twenty additional letters to Peter the Venerable written by abbots and popes.
16 These letters, Constable remarks, sometimes have a “literary character”, but are for the most part official documents not epistolary works (LPV, II, p. 15, esp. note 62).
factors point to a single conclusion: the letter collections must be the result of a limited, not comprehensive, inclusion.

While each letter had an individual purpose of communicating needs, thoughts or judgements to its particular recipient, the complete collection was likely conceived as promoting one as well. Such is also the conclusion and presentation of Peter of Poitiers who notes that each letter provides a chapter in the book of the letter collection.\textsuperscript{18} Constable concludes that the collection as a whole was intended to enshrine Peter the Venerable’s literary reputation and thus led to the inclusion of the “more elegant” letters, while also “occasionally taking into account the importance of the recipient”.\textsuperscript{19} In addition to this role, his letter collection can also be read as an important \textit{apologia} for Cluny.

Gillian Knight’s recent studies on the epistolary discourse of Peter the Venerable emphasize Peter’s conscious presentation of Cluny and himself within the letters.\textsuperscript{20} The inclusion and elimination of letters, as well as the language, imagery and manipulation of epistolary conventions serve to project and define relationships not merely between Peter and his correspondents, but also between Peter/Cluny and a wider audience of readers. In Knight’s analysis, the abbot Peter in the letters was meant to embody the Cluniac monastic project as a whole; the presentation of Peter as a vital, informed, confident abbot had the same effect as depicting Cluny itself in this manner.

Knight does not consider, however, what effect this rhetoric may have had within Cluniac circles. As we note below, the manuscript tradition for the letter collection and

\textsuperscript{18} Peter of Poitiers, “Epistola Petri Pictavensis ad dominum Petrum abbatem Cluniacensem,” \textit{LPV}, (unnumbered), I, p. 1. This passage is cited and discussed below.
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{LPV}, II, pp. 14.
\textsuperscript{20} Cf. above, note 6.
also individual letters demonstrate its popularity among Cluniac and Benedictine
monasteries, not the Cistercian milieu. This diffusion, therefore, argues for an impact on
Cluniac audiences with the object of self-definition, a claim which I will further support
in subsequent chapters.

Like the letter collection of Bernard of Clairvaux, no two extant manuscripts of
Peter’s letter collection comprise the same contents, making it difficult to understand the
objective of his (and Peter of Poitiers’) editorial process. In total, Constable cites six
source manuscripts (though the text of one remains only in a 1522 printed edition). Some
manuscripts contain a selection of letters of a very limited scope, such as the manuscripts
Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale (BM), 2261 (s. XV) and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale
de France (BNF), Latin 13876 (s. XIII) which contain only the correspondence of Peter
the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux. The two most complete versions of the
collection, manuscripts Douai, BM, 381 (s. XII) and Le Puy, Cathédrale, unnumbered (s.
XV) are exemplars, respectively, of the short (110 letters) and the long (162 letters)
redactions; the first compiled, ca 1142 and the other at least ten years later. Only the very
late manuscripts from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries derive from non-Cluniac
monasteries.

In letter 161 (discussed in chapters four and five) Peter the Venerable explicitly
remarks that he expects that Cluniac monks should have read or heard his letters 28 and
111 to Bernard of Clairvaux. He thereby indicates that specific letters circulated

---

22 Troyes, BM, ms. 2261 (s. XV) comes from Clairvaux; Rome, Biblioteca Alessandrina, mss. 97 and 98 (s. XVI/ XVII) are copied from the 1522 printed edition of the letters, and Paris, BNF, Latin 2582 (s. XV) is too corrupt a text, according to Constable, to permit any identification; cf. LPV, II, pp. 59-62.
independently of his collection to an audience wider than the named recipient. While the manuscripts of the most complete versions of Peter’s letter collection derive from French monasteries within the Cluniac sphere, there is evidence of other more widely circulated individual letters. Peter’s first epistle to Bernard of Clairvaux (letter 28), for example, was repeatedly copied and received considerable circulation as an individual treatise. This letter currently exists in nineteen manuscripts and three additional manuscripts are known to have contained it (which is the largest number of copies of any letter). These manuscripts derive from the region of Cluny and from Cluniac and Benedictine monasteries in the lowlands. Peter’s letter to the hermit Gilbert (letter 20) was also widely distributed both in number and in place. It is known to have existed in a total of eighteen extant and missing manuscripts whose provenance can be traced to Cluniac, Cistercian, Benedictine, and Franciscan houses in England, France, Germany, Belgium and Poland. This letter, then, hints at a wide dissemination Peter’s letters may have achieved. Though concentrated in Cluniac circles, letter 20, and perhaps many others, made their way to diverse monastic or mendicant houses across Europe during and after Peter’s lifetime. Of all the manuscripts known to contain Peter’s letters, fifteen derive from the lowlands, twelve from France, five from Germany, two each from England and Italy and one each from Spain and Poland. This dissemination hints at a mainly French/Belgian interest, but indicates as well that the letters reached to the corners of Europe. Of these manuscripts, seven date to the twelfth century, four to the twelfth/thirteenth century, five to the thirteenth century with the remaining twenty manuscripts coming in

23 *LPV*, II, p. 69.
24 Ibid. A single manuscript comes from the Cistercian abbey of Dunes.
25 Ibid., II, p. 70.
26 Ibid., II, p. 74.
and after the fourteenth century. This distribution indicates the continuing interest in Peter's letters over the late-medieval and early-modern period.

The extent of Peter's reach becomes all the more evident when the letter collections of his contemporaries are considered. Peter of Celle's collection, for example, is extant only in two manuscripts and there is no evidence of individual letters circulating in the manner of Peter the Venerable's letter 20 and 28. The collection of John of Salisbury remains in three manuscripts, one of which is incomplete, another which is a copy of an earlier one of these three. That Peter's letters circulated widely is thus indicated in relation to the dissemination received by his contemporaries of equal fame. I now turn to the topic of Peter's epistolary reputation.

**THE RECEPTION OF PETER'S LETTER COLLECTION**

Like the prologues to the *Statuta* or the *De miraculis*, Peter the Venerable's letter collection(s) is introduced by a prefatory (and in this case complimentary) epistle. It merits attention for two reasons. Peter of Poitiers, as Constable has concluded, was an important force in the compilation process and thus it is important to understand his conception of the letters and to acknowledge the influence he may have had. By its presentation of Peter the Venerable (the author) and the nature of his writings, this letter sets out the hermeneutic context for the medieval audience. Since this letter prefaces both the early version of the letter collection (Douai, BM, n. 381) and the subsequent redaction

---

27 Ibid.  
28 *The Letters of Peter of Celle*, pp. xxxiv- liii.  
30 Cf. chapter nine.  
31 Cf. chapters six and seven.
(Le Puy, Cathédrale, unnumbered), we know that it must have circulated with the abbot Peter’s permission and wish, something Peter of Poitiers explicitly highlights in his text.\textsuperscript{32} In his prefatory letter, Peter of Poitiers adopts the conceit that he must convince Peter the Venerable to disseminate his learning in a written medium. He exhorts “Awake, therefore, you the most eloquent of men, and endeavour to share with your faithful companions, not only by speaking, but also by writing, the nourishment of your learning in which you certainly abound more than all your predecessors.”\textsuperscript{33} Since Peter of Poitiers opens his letter with a laudation of his abbot’s already written works\textsuperscript{34}, it seems safe to conclude that this letter merely provides an excuse to wax eloquent about the value of Peter the Venerable’s texts.\textsuperscript{35} The first stage of the letter underscores Peter the Venerable’s unparalleled authorial qualities, the second emphasizes the manifold benefits derived from reading his works, and the third outlines his especial authorial responsibility as abbot of Cluny. Examining this argument in greater detail, provides an excellent introduction to Peter the Venerable’s epistolary rhetoric.

\textsuperscript{32} Peter of Poitiers, “Epistola Petri Pictavensis,” LPV, (unnumbered), I, p. 1, in which Peter of Poitiers announces his intention to introduce his abbot’s works. As it is found in the lost exemplar C, as well as in the Douai and Le Puy manuscripts, Peter of Poitiers’ works (this letter and the Panegyricus) prefaced the collection of Peter the Venerable’s works (beginning with his Apologia for Peter of Poitiers, and following with the letters). Cf. LPV, II, pp. 49, 56-57, and 95. Constable dates this letter to ca 1142. A letter written by Peter of Poitiers also prefaces Peter the Venerable’s Contra sectam Sarracenorum; cf. the edition of Peter of Poitiers’ Epistola and Capitula, in Petrus Venerabilis Schriften zum Islam, ed. Reinhold Glei, Corpus Islamico-Christianum, Series latine, 1, (Altenberger, 1985), pp. 226-30 and 230-34.

\textsuperscript{33} Epistola Petri Pictavensis,” p. 2; Expergiscimini ergo uir eloquentissime, et fidelibus conservis doctrinae cibaria quibus certe cunctis decessoribus uestris plenius abundatis, non solum loquendo, sed etiam scribendo, erogare studeat.

\textsuperscript{34} “I have seen, most beloved father, and examined with much care [your] little book. Scarcely leaving my hands for a single moment, the more it is read, the more completely it attracts the soul of the reader; the more subtly it is considered, the more sweetly it tastes.” Ibid., pp. 1-2; Vidi pater karissime, inspexique libellum studiosius, qui uix aliquo temporis interualllo de manu mea recendens quanto frequentius legitur, tanto amplius legentis animum trahit, quanto subtilius discititur, tanto dulcius sapit.

\textsuperscript{35} Peter the Venerable had already completed the initial drafts of his major works and many were circulating (e.g. letter 28) by the time of this letter (ca 1142). Peter of Poitiers may have also intended his letter to encourage the dissemination of Peter the Venerable’s works, which is consistent with Peter the Venerable’s letter 129 (1141/44, cf. LPV, ep. 129, I, p. 139) suggesting that the period after 1141 was a time of textual revision.
The first section reproduces much of the description highlighted in Peter of Poitiers’ *Panegyricus* (itself designed to curry favour with the abbot Peter and to promote his eloquence). Peter the Venerable is termed the fount of wisdom, eloquence and erudition as well as depicted as the source of the wisest, clearest and most learned discourse among all the philosophers of Gaul.  

His argumentation, rhetoric and learning exceed the ancients (Plato, Aristotle, Cicero) and his language, eloquence and disputation make him the equal of the Church fathers (the Evangelists, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose and Gregory).

Peter’s authorial preeminence, like that of his precursors, provides a precondition for the second part of the argument—that Peter’s prose should be eagerly read with no little benefit:

You will thus be able to offer much benefit not only to us, but also to those far away, not only to the living but also to all future Christians, if you—like your fathers—leave for posterity, exactly as the Holy Spirit inspired you, such monuments of your shining genius in your sermons, letters and various treatises.

This excerpt introduces an argument from utility. Peter of Poitiers (and any reader or listener, i.e. an audience not limited either by place or time) receives no little help in the journey to salvation from Peter the Venerable’s texts, an excursion made enjoyable by the sweetness of the abbot Peter’s prose. After he outlines the preeminent authorial qualities of his abbot, he suggests that Peter the Venerable replicates not only the ability but also fruits of the fathers of the Church (the Evangelists, Jerome, *et al.*) who, “by writing merited to please God through the double fruit of holy preaching and offered an example

---

37 Ibid., p. 2; *Ita quippe non nobis solummodo, urerum quibusque remotissimis, nec praesentibus tantum, sed et futuri temporis Christianis multum prodesse ualebitis, si more patrum uestrorum prout uobis spiritus divinus sugeterit, in sermonibus, in epistolis, diuersisque tractatibus tam praeclari monimenta ingenii posterorum memoriae relinquatis.*
of pious imitation to all coming after them”. 38 Authorship and text are what are to be imitated, not only the man or his virtue. The patrician examples, Peter of Poitiers contends, provide a model for conceiving the written word as an enduring medium for spiritual guidance. His letters, in imitating the production of such men, are the means to multiply his presence and influence across Christendom.

This evocation of patrician tradition introduces the third and final thrust of Peter of Poitiers’ preface. 39 He argues that authorship is the embodiment of the traditional viva vox of Cluniac abbots. 40 He expresses gratitude for his abbot’s writings and urges that Peter the Venerable write further works for his monks:

Truly, what am I doing when I urge such things to your majesty and when I extol it with excessive verbiage as if it were a difficult or strange thing for the office of your person, since Cluniac abbots have maintained a zeal for writing under special prerogative from ancient times? They certainly are not compelled by authority alone to write, but even if they did not do so, they would necessarily be ashamed, as degenerate offspring and one much different from the parental image are. 41

By rhetorically asking himself why he bothers to write such an argument, Peter of Poitiers seeks to normalize the idea of his abbot’s authorship. It seems part of a strategy meant to appeal to common sense and designed to hide the hints of novelty or his own uneasiness about the enterprise under debate. It also serves to relocate the desire to write into an impersonal realm of official duty. The difficulty of Peter of Poitiers’ insistence,

---

38 Peter of Poitiers, “Epistola Petri Pictavensis,” LPV, (unnumbered), I, p. 2; Scribendo autem et deo placere meruerunt per duplicem fructum sanctae praelectionis, et cunctis post se uenientibus exemplum prebuerunt piae imitationis.
39 Peter of Poitiers’ text demonstrates a stylistic shift between the effusive laudation of his abbot’s rhetoric (using the language of affect) and the use of rational argumentation.
41 Peter of Poitiers, “Epistola Petri Pictavensis,” p. 3; Verum quid facio ego, maiestati vestrae talia persuadendo, et quasi rem difficilem uel alienam a personae vestrae officio uerborum superfluitatibus extollendo, cum scribendi studium speciali praerogativa Cluniacenses abbates a temporibus antiquis obtineant? Nec certe sola auctoritatem compelluntur ut scribant, sed et si non fecerint, sicut degeneres multumque patriae formae dissimiles necesse est erubescant.
however, is made clear from his problematic appeal to abbatial tradition. He remarks that a single example—Odo of Cluny—suffices to demonstrate his abbot’s prerogative and glosses over the lack of texts left behind by intervening abbots.\(^{42}\) Passing over this inconsistency, Peter of Poitiers concludes that as the abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable retains a special auctoritas to commit his thoughts and advice to text, or as we see here, to disseminate a letter collection. The arguments seem superficial, and, if nothing else, appear to illustrate the somewhat innovative nature of Peter’s text. Odo and Odilo had written vitae, sermons, liturgical material and theological treatises, but never something so redolent of its author as a letter collection.

We can glimpse in Peter of Poitiers’ preface an explicit attempt to enunciate validity not from the text itself, but rather from its author and context. As we see later repeated in the De miraculis and the Statuta, the prefaces of Peter’s works underscore authorial identity, purpose and justification in order to construct the avenues of their reception. In the letter collection, we have the additional buttress of Peter of Poitiers’ personal appeal to prevent accusations of pride. The exceptional nature of Peter the Venerable’s position (which his monk claims for him) justifies the novelty of his enterprise, something which may have otherwise been received with polite distaste.

Concern about public reception of the letter collection is likely why Peter of Poitiers constructs a developed argument as an introduction to the letter collection. A similar anxiety is found in Peter of Poitiers’ preface to his Panegyricus where he seeks to

\(^{42}\) Ibid. Peter of Poitiers notes that only Odo, not Aymard, Maiolus or Hugh took advantage of this prerogative; Quod si quosdam eorum nihil penitus scripsisse obicitis, excusatur Heimardus, cum utroque Hugone, quia uidelicit illa eruditionis perfectio defuit; excusatur Maiolus, quia fortassis ad hoc vacuum tempus non habuit.
defend himself against his refusal to disseminate his poetry anonymously. To name himself as author and to append his works to those of his abbot:

... is not my presumption, but is done at your [i.e. the abbot Peter's] command, which to contradict, I regard a sin. Indeed I, not only in all things, but especially in this matter, do not hesitate to obey you, not in pursuit of arrogance—may God always keep it far from me— but from the spirit of obedience, especially since I know many men of proven religion and humility to have zealously done the same in the past from some of their writings. I certainly desired to imitate them in this little work of ours more than certain writers in our own times, who—I do not know whether by caution or by inexperience— always suppress their names.43

This comment is valuable in demonstrating how Peter of Poitiers puts forward higher authorities to justify the novel desire of identifying himself. His careful phrasing and anxiety suggest that the intention to publicize oneself or, in Peter the Venerable's case, to disseminate personal correspondence seems to oppose or at least does not conform fully to a monastic tradition focused on communal identity and orthopraxic pursuits.44 This is consistent with contemporary evidence suggesting that writing was not an unproblematic enterprise to be carried out by monks during the twelfth century.45 Peter of Poitiers anticipates a charge of hubris by seeking to define his intention as obedient and humble

43 Panegyricus, col. 47BC; ... hoc non mea praesumptione, sed vestra, cui nefas duco contradicere, jussione factum esse. Ego vero cum in omnibus, tunc etiam in hoc vobis obtemperare non dubito, non arrogantiae studio (quam semper a me longe faciat Dominus!), sed obedientiae devotione, praeeritum cum sciam multos probatae religionis et humilitatis viros, hoc idem de quibus scripsit scriptis suis olim studiose fecisse. Quos certe magis in hoc quantulacunque opusculum nostro imitari affecto, quam quosdam nostri temporis scriptores, quia nescio qua vel cautela, vel imperitia ubique nomina sua supriment.
44 On charismatic and non-textual education at Cluny, see Isabelle Cochelin, art. "Besides the book", pp. 21-34.
(he merely imitates literary exemplars and does not invent anything). Peter of Poitiers founds his repudiation of this model partly on an appeal to an “ancient” idea of authorship, but primarily on his obedience to his abbot.  

Both Peters chose, in fact, to avoid a tradition of anonymity and established their works in self-identification, using their identity to ground the status of their texts. That Peter the Venerable selects the laudatory (and purple) prose of Peter of Poitiers to preface his work hints at a similar play between humility and self-promoting authorship. As we will note in subsequent chapters, Peter the Venerable does not promote a panegyric account of himself in his other works. He does work, however, to defend the reputation offered him by Peter of Poitiers. In his apologetic poem, the *Adversus calumniatores carminum sui Petri Pictaviensis defensio* Peter the Venerable argues that any detraction faced by his monks was felt by him. More than just a personal attack on the abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable continues, criticizing the *Panegyricus* condemns the writings of Classical authors and the fathers of the Church. Both Peters, the *Defensio* argues, are justified by their antecedents. Employing invective against the critics, the *Defensio* demonstrates the contempt felt for his critics and the value Peter the Venerable himself placed on promoting his *auctoritas* (and literary reputation). It also suggests that both Peters shared similar ideas about the value of texts.

---

46 Peter identifies obedience as the primary justification—it is the first condition mentioned and the most lengthily discussed.

47 Michel Foucault notes that the Middle Ages witnessed two distinctive modes of authorship, one in which justification was intrinsic to the text (based on the authority of its ancientness) and others which demanded the recognition of the text’s validity by the status of its author (cf. “What is an Author?” in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow, [New York, 1984], pp. 101-20). He simplistically differentiates these different modes as literary and scientific, though, as we see from Peter the Venerable the validity of epistolary correspondence can be grounded in the prestige of the author. Foucault’s conception is useful, however, since it notes the force of justification predicated on the identity of the author.

48 *Adversus calumniatores carminum sui Petri Pictaviensis defensio*, in PL, 189, col. 1005D (henceforth abbreviated, *Defensio*).
I have dealt at length with Peter of Poitiers’ prefatory material since it identifies a fundamental condition for reading Peter’s letters, namely that they are more than just personal correspondence. The letters are a manifestation of the abbatial office and of spiritual exemplarity. If Peter’s right to write is inseparable from being the abbot of Cluny, then so too must his correspondence reflect the concerns of Cluny. They need not, in fact, do so, but such is the interpretation given by Peter of Poitiers in the preface to the letter collection and the single evidence of the letter collection’s contemporary reception. We see here an evocation of the rhetorical portrait that Peter the Venerable promotes in his own epistles, that of a spiritually adept abbot devoted to his duties and to his monks.

**TEXTUAL EMBODIMENT: PETER’S EPISTOLARY CHARISMA**

You undertook a long letter, but you do not well preserve the rhetoric in it, though you call yourself skilled at law. If done ignorantly, it is to be forgiven. But if knowingly, it is to be considered obstinacy. The rules of the art demand that in oration you must be pleasing not exasperating to a judge. In contradistinction, the letter which you sent sounded improper, smelled of insults, [and] breathed of threats. Nothing ever is accomplished through such [a form of] persuasion unless by the unwilling. What is sought is usually obtained by entreaties not threats, by requests not attacks. You cannot hope, therefore, to gain anything from us through such a means. For you argued [your case] unwisely and unlearnedly when you aggravated one (formerly benevolent and obliging) whom now disturbed you ought to have pleased. Come, therefore […] and you shall not lose the promised profit […] and justice will have dictated a response.49

This succinct definition of epistolary etiquette in letter 8 to the priest Stephen provides a model for understanding Peter the Venerable’s particular conception of epistolary

---

rhetoric.\textsuperscript{50} Regardless of its justness, a matter will not be positively adjudged without proper framing. Words must be pleasing and requests must be elicited or encouraged, not expected or demanded. Nothing will ever be granted willingly, Peter continues, if threats and such forms of persuasion are uttered. This text provides a concise definition of a concept central to Peter’s works: all things need to be communicated in such a way as to ensure their positive reception. In response to Stephen’s evocation of his legal skill, Peter places their epistolary relationship within a juridical context. The relationship between the two follows rules (\textit{regulae}) and justice derives from how the case is argued, though Stephen is the lawyer and Peter the judge. Peter explains letter writing, therefore, in the terms Stephen will understand. We see in this letter another guiding tenet of all of Peter’s literary works: the need to adapt the style to the context of the audience. It is also important to comprehend that exchanging letters in this conceptual space is not only about issues or ideas, but about people relating. Stephen cannot forget that he is merely a priest while Peter is a powerful abbot. Stephen cannot threaten, but Peter can, since he is the judge with the power over the case. From this presentation of rhetoric to Stephen, it emerges that Peter conceives of their epistolary debate as if it is a charismatic enterprise, in which issues are resolved along the lines of a personal relationships.

In this notion of epistolary rhetoric as dependent upon social status of the correspondents (and their relative positions), Peter is consistent with twelfth-century

\textsuperscript{50} Constable comments on Peter’s rhetorical education (\textit{LPV}, II, pp. 35-36), “Peter the Venerable himself attended none of the schools where the new epistolary style was taught. He was the product of a purely Cluniac monastic environment, and the style of his letter owes more to his wide reading in patristic and classical literature than to any formulated rules of letter writing. […] Peter’s own letters were written with considerably greater freedom of organization and style than the \textit{dictatores} would have permitted. He showed no regard for the division into salutation, exordium, narration, petition and conclusion prescribed in the \textit{artes dictandi}.”
trends.\textsuperscript{51} This notion of charisma entrapped in the written text, moreover, was a natural result of a medieval culture transposing Classical rhetorical conventions (intended for oral communication) into epistolarity.\textsuperscript{52} From the 1120s onwards, the evidence provided by letter writing manuals indicates that the earlier rhetoric of persuasion was replaced by a rhetoric of personal relationship. As Brian McGuire and Stephen Jaeger have shown, written correspondence was a typical medium among twelfth-century Churchmen, in particular, for the transmission and encouragement of bonds of affectivity.\textsuperscript{53} As the following chapters demonstrate, Peter the Venerable operates well within this discourse, envisaging texts as substitutes for presence and seeing, as we note below, affectivity as key to this function.

Peter the Venerable's letter to Odo, the abbot of Saint-Symphorien at Beauvais,\textsuperscript{54} is a rare discussion of the import of epistolarity, a letter which highlights the personal bonds and affectivity engaged through the exchange of letters:

I have desired for a long time and I have desired greatly, my beloved, to write to your Charity when an opportunity presented itself, so that my affection (which was not able to be manifest to you in the living voice since distance prevents this) might at the least make its way through the dead devices of letters.\textsuperscript{55}

Peter writes this expression of concern and affection to Odo, apparently since Odo's silence and the multitude of concerns occupying his own time had encouraged Peter to


\textsuperscript{52} James J. Murphy, \textit{Rhetoric in the Middle Ages}, (Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1974), pp. 197-200.


\textsuperscript{54} \textit{LPV}, II, p. 103. Constable notes three different historical figures are suggested by historians for this Odo, but concludes that the recipient is best identified as the abbot Odo of St. Symphorien (ca. 1126-32).

\textsuperscript{55} \textit{LPV}, ep. 13, I, p. 19; \textit{Optaueram diu et multum optaueram qualibet occasione sumpta caritati tuae mi dilectissime scribere, ut affectus meus qui se tibi locorum remotione prohibente manifestare uiua voce non poterat, litterarum saltem mortuis figuris insinuaret.}
neglect their correspondence.\textsuperscript{56} The epistolary lull caused, Peter remarks regretfully, a silence which incurred an inner coldness between the two, but his feelings were immediately revived to their full ardour upon receiving a new letter from Odo.\textsuperscript{57} Their love, we see, demands constant performance and expression:

> With every word and attention I upheld a more dear affection for you, [...] the force of your spirit blew upon the dying embers of my breast, and rekindled for some time the dormant fires by its breath, when it transmitted the desired letter of a dear one desiring, not mistrusting.\textsuperscript{58}

The words of the letter (and its affective content) evoked a powerful response from the recipient. Odo’s words inflamed Peter’s spirit to leave aside all his other affairs, just as, no doubt, Peter’s words were intended to do for Odo. Peter reiterates his joyful reaction (\textit{ut dixi}) and remarks joyfully that by being driven to write, he is paradoxically brought to a state of inner silence and repose, “for when I read your letter, beloved brother, I perceive the image of your blessed soul as if in the brightest mirror”.\textsuperscript{59} Not only does the text communicate an affective undertone, but the text also transmits the very spiritual essence of its writer. It is this image or imprint on the text, Peter asserts, that gives power to the written word and allows the transmission of love.\textsuperscript{60}

The letter seems to continue without any ulterior motive than to laud the pleasures and the benefits of letter writing. Peter uses the terminology and images of orality in urging Odo to write again, begging him to “open his lips” and to speak what he wishes to

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{57} Though Gillian Knight (“Uses and Abuses of amicitia,” note 18, p. 60) has identified such statements of “you have not written, has our love grown cold?” as topoi, in this letter its use does not appear as a justification for writing in the \textit{captatio benevolentiae}, but as a lengthy consideration of the reality of this emotional process.
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{LPV}, ep. 13, I, p. 19; \textit{Omnibus verbis et scedulis cariorem tibi servaueris affectum [...] Sed sufflavit wisi spiritus tui emortuos cineres pectoris mei, et ignes diu consopiros affligut suae recaescre fecit, dum desideratam dilecti epistolam desideranti, sed non suspicanti transmisit.\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., pp. 19-20; \textit{Nam quotiens frater karissime eas lego, totiens beatae animae tuae faciem uelut in clarissime speculo intueor [...].}
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., p. 20.
say. The letter from Odo provides Peter, as he exclaims, with an opportunity to leave aside the business occupying him and reengage with his amor quietis. This act of communication makes it that “we be pleased by the singular beauty of Rachel in you since out of [our] love for retreat and spiritual silence we abandon at present the fruit of Leah for you”. Since Jacob’s marriages to Leah and Rachel (Gen. 29) are commonly allegorized as the need for Christians to engage in (respectively) the active and contemplative life, Peter here welcomes the spur of Odo’s letter, which draws him back into the contemplative life. Reading provides a meditative retreat. The value of writing, however, is not limited to the recipient:

This labour [letter writing] must truly be pleasing to you and the body should never cease from such fruitful activity, with the result that you offer to God an interior holocaustum, since the mind labours by meditating on divine things, the eyes by reading, the hands by writing, the tongue by speaking, [and] altogether, the interior and exterior man by operating in harmony.

Reading, writing, speaking, thinking: these four different uses of language offer privileged means for spiritual development. Physical and mental harmony are established by them, and God himself is granted a worthy offering. We see, therefore, that in Peter’s conception, letters are not merely a medium for the expression of good wishes or

---

61 Ibid.; Aperi ergo labia... dic quae michi dicenda proponebas.
62 Ibid., pp. 20-21: ut quia amore quietis et silentii spiritualis, Liae fructum ex te ad praesens perdimus, Rachelis in te singulari pulchritudine oblectemur.
64 LPV, ep. 13, 1, p. 21; Debet is labor valde tibi esse iocundus, nec a tam fructuoso opere aliquatenus corpus cessare, ut dum mens divina meditando, manus scribendo, oculi legendo, lingua loquendo, totus homo interior atque exterior cooperando laborat, holocaustum medullatum deo offeras [...].
information, but they provide a vessel for the transmission of personal and spiritual energy. Since Peter moves in this letter from an expression of thanks for receiving a letter, to the spiritual benefit derived from it, and finally to a discussion of the spiritual implications of letter writing, the progression shows that the written word is in fact not dead text. Rather, as with the living voice, text can be life-bringing, allowing the reader to become a new man. As Peter of Poitiers noted about Peter’s letter collection(s), “the more it is read, the sweeter the reward”, 65 likewise Peter the Venerable conceived of letters: they translate spiritual benefits since the soul of the writer is imprinted upon the text. In presenting the written word in this manner, we glimpse a direct answer to any who might contest the value of literary production. As we noted in the previous chapter, Cluniac abbots had traditionally taught by word and gesture in a charismatic manner, physically present and imitable. Peter here makes the argument that a text can fulfill this function as well. The medium of text, in fact, due to its ability to bring unity to the inner and outer man, is beneficial as a pedagogical and spiritual instrument. In addition, written correspondence provides for Peter an ideal medium for discussions about religious life, since ideas can be transmitted and argued directly.

Up to this point I have argued that both Peter of Poitiers and Peter the Venerable urged the acceptance of the written text as a valid medium for monastic expression. They did so by constructing it as the equivalent of the spiritual presence of the abbot and by asserting its justification in precedent and utility. The arguments piece together a validation of Peter’s authorial action in light of the Cluniac tradition of charismatic bodies and voices. Notwithstanding the novel usage of the written medium, a key

---

65 Peter of Poitiers, “Epistola Petri Pictavensis,” p. 1; cited above, note 34.
divergence from previous abbatial discourse is Peter’s incorporation of reason into his arguments.

**Peter the Venerable’s Rational Epistles**

A suggestive source for understanding Peter’s use of logical argumentation is the letter 43 to Theodard, the Prior of La Charité. Peter’s letter collection evidences that Peter shared a warm and affective correspondence with Theodard similar to that with Odo discussed above. Their letters are filled with expressions of their mutual love (*dilectio*) and of the affectivity arising from their textual exchanges. Whereas Peter’s letter to Odo concentrates on the spiritual benefits of letter writing, letter 43 shows his desire to transmit concern, counsel and commands. He begins his letter with evocations of his affection for Theodard (*sincerae caritatisuis seribus confuendo; karissime*), which had been encouraged by the letters exchanged between them. One of these letters, Peter reveals, was a request from Theodard asking to be allowed to leave his position as the prior of La Charité, something to which Peter will not accede. In order to make the necessity of his judgement manifest to Theodard, Peter appeals to logic, “For the mind (*animus*) is unable to be capable of true perception (*consilium*), unless through reason it

---

66 In Constable’s edition of the letter collection, letters 14, 30, 42, and 43 were written by Peter to Theodard; letter 41 is a letter from Theodard to Peter.

67 Theodard makes explicit his (and his monks’) debt of love to Peter in letter 41 (*LPV*, I, p. 136): *Ut tamen uestra cognoscat benignitas, beneficior omn res memores, et teneri debitos, ipsa ex parte memoramus, quamuis reprendere non possumus*. Their inability to repay the full debt makes them mindful of their obligations to Peter. Later in this letter, Theodard refers to the affect engendered by a recent message from Peter conveyed by a courier also named Peter: *Mexitis nos dominum Petrum exemplar cordis vestri ad nos, qui cor uestrum cordibus nostris inferret, et sua presentia quantum uobis placet nos laetificaret*.

68 Peter opens his letter 42 (*LPV*, I, pp. 137) with an expression of affective effect of Theodard’s letter, *Legimus et religimus intent litteras uestras, quaetanto cor nostrum gaudio exhilarabant, quanto uos laetificatos sonabant*. Peter continues later in the letter to transmit his especially affection. Though he minimizes his return gift (*multa non conferimus*), which is his love (*multum diligimus*), Peter knows that charity inflames Theodard’s love (*accendit non mediocriter ignem huius amoris vestra caritas*). The true charity of God binding them, he remarks, increases the experience and inner feeling of charity (*hunc caritatis affectus*) between them.
has subjected its will to [its] own advantage." This statement introduces a discussion of why he does not remove Theodard from office and why Theodard must change his conduct. Peter sketches a series of premises, refutes Theodard's assertions, puts forward his own arguments and buttresses them with textual authorities. The outlines of these arguments are unimportant at the moment, but his use of reason is noteworthy for two reasons. First, we see that the rhetoric of love underlies the debate providing a justification for Peter's words (i.e. Peter expresses his sincere affection as a means to demonstrate the truth behind his arguments). Second, we understand that Peter conceives of reason or logic (ratio) as central in the subjection of improper desires. Reason, it seems, is central in the reconstruction of a monk's economy of desire. The will must seek after its true goal (i.e. salvation) after it is brought to true knowledge by reason. The will, therefore, is not suppressed, but rather is channeled towards the objective of salvation. Peter implies, moreover, that reason and the will are interdependent: both affect the other.

Peter expects that his letter will overcome Theodard's misguided confusion in thought and thus will correct improper behaviour. This is not done merely by logical argumentation, but in conjunction with affectivity and intention. Such a notion is

---

69 LPV, ep. 43, I, p. 138; Non enim capax veri consilii animus esse poterit, nisi uelle suum utilitati propriae ratione subdiderit. From its context, utilitas must be understood as an objective of or a desire for salvation.  
70 Peter remarks that Theodard suffers from "the appetite of an obstinate will" (obstinatae voluntatis appetitum), causing him to threaten his salvation by acting against the virtues of obedience and salvation. Theodard claims that he is unable (due to the infirmities of his nature and age), to oversee his monks, but Peter remarks that it is his excessive spiritual practices which weaken him. Evidently Peter had already commanded (mando, praecipeo) that Theodard should rest and eat more, and by not doing so, he disobeys his abbot. Theodard threatens charity, moreover, by failing to take care of himself while regarded as the example for the monks of his priory. By failing in charity, Peter remarks, Theodard loses all benefit from his spiritual exertions.  
71 I take this term from Talal Asad (Genealogies of Religion, p. 130) who uses it to describe the will and affectivity addressed (and in part created) within the disciplinary space of the monastery. Asad posits that the entire assemblage of desires, habits, actions and beliefs together resulted in the 'moral disposition' of the monks.
suggested at the end of the letter in Peter’s admonishment, “Recall your mind (*animus*), my beloved, from this intention”.

The intention to which Peter refers is the pursuit of disobedience and his excessive concern with his self; Theodard’s proper intention is charity. This evocation of *intentio* is helpful for understanding the relation between affectivity and logic in Peter’s thought. As Mary Carruthers has made clear, *intentio* meant much more to a twelfth-century monk than “intention” does to a modern reader, i.e. possessing a specific desire or objective. A monk such as Peter and Theodard would have understood *intentio* as a person’s attitudes, aims and inclinations, but also as a state of physical and/or mental concentration *willingly* adopted. A person’s *intentio* acts as conscious moral disposition, links intimately to affectivity and informs thought and action.

Peter’s admonishment to Theodard, therefore, is not an injunction that he “change his mind”, but an insistence that he restructure his mind/soul within the context of a proper *intentio* – provoked by Peter’s reason/reasoning (i.e. *ratio*). The evocations of love and charity in the letter seek to draw out Theodard’s charity and to reorient his desire towards God. Perhaps Peter’s letter also acts as a written exemplar from which Theodard can glimpse the functioning of such a disposition.

David Appleby has argued for a similar conception of Peter’s cognitive model. He views the mind as largely conceived in Augustinian terms, where the soul was made up of a trinity of memory, reason and will.

He too notes the importance of affectivity in Peter’s theory of knowledge, seeing memory as a storehouse not only of experiences, but

---

72 *LPV*, ep. 43, I, p. 140; The phrase reads more fully: *Sed iam quia finire festino, revoca quaeo dilectissime ab hac intentione animum tuum, in brevissimo certamine, pro sempiterna requie desudando contente [...].*


74 Ibid., p. 16.

of their emotional context. Memory work was a necessary precursor for a successful monastic life. Experiences and the affects with which they were bound were expected to be restructured in order to make the monk open to concepts of spiritual love and charity. We can see, perhaps, that intentio and memoria are closely related ideas. Reason and will struggle with one another until the proper intentio or memoria is attained.\textsuperscript{76}

The importance of the link between affectivity and rational argumentation has heretofore received little attention. This is in part likely due to the texts under investigation. Dominique Iogna-Prat's excellent study of Peter's polemic texts notes Peter's preference for rational argumentation.\textsuperscript{77} This kind of text, he argues, represented a novel instrument in the fight on heresy—the disputatio mode—which refuted the heretics' teachings by a point by point discussion using reason and not only textual authorities.\textsuperscript{78} This form of discussion allowed Peter to relate to and address those outside the proper Christian order (i.e. heretics, Jews, Muslims) without having to assume a foundation in orthodox Christian faith. Due to this lack of foundation Peter likely could not depend upon a common affective discourse, and thus moved towards a more intellectual approach.

Iogna-Prat notes in passing that Peter's earliest use of the disputatio form was the letter 28 written in response to the criticisms of Cluny in Bernard of Clairvaux's Apologia. From this we can surmise, therefore, that Peter's appeals to reason are not limited to anti-heretical discourse. We cannot assume, however, that they are identical to those used against the Petrobrusians, Saracens and Jews (i.e. those outside Christian

\textsuperscript{76} Peter argues that reason should rule and the will be subjected (praeponenda contristans utilitas, subponenda noxia voluntas), but this does not mean that the will/desire is overcome and without power; cf. LPV, ep. 43, 1, p. 138.
\textsuperscript{77} Order and Exclusion, pp. 136-38.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., p. 125. I follow here the discussion in chapter four, "Polemic Method," pp. 120-147 passim.
society). As Gillian Knight has demonstrated, a key rhetorical strategy also underlying letter 28 is the appeal to personal relationships.\textsuperscript{79} Through this and other letters to Bernard, I will demonstrate how the language of \textit{amicitia} incorporates the discourses of rationality and affect into the negotiation of status and a theory of reform between these two abbots.

\textsuperscript{79} \textit{Correspondence}, pp. 199-203.
In Peter the Venerable’s letter collection(s), we find many letters exchanged with contemporary religious figures. Among them, Pope Innocent II and Pope Eugenius III, Hato of Troyes, Henry of Winchester, Guido the Carthusian, abbot Suger of Saint-Denis, and abbot Bernard of Clairvaux stand out as the most celebrated. Of these preeminent figures, however, Peter’s epistolary exchanges with Bernard of Clairvaux have attracted the most attention from historians. As we noted in the previous chapter, his letter 28 to Bernard also was the most widely distributed letter of Peter’s corpus. The historiographical focus and its medieval popularity identify Peter’s correspondence with Bernard as a natural beginning for understanding Peter’s epistolary rhetoric.

For the purpose of this thesis, the letters written between Bernard and Peter are important for two major reasons. In certain letters, Peter theorizes an explicit justification for reform. Not just a defence of Cluny against outsiders, the letters provide (and are intended thusly) a new foundation for Cluniac monasticism based in juridical thought and rational authority. Peter’s letters, though addressed to Bernard, circulated widely within Cluniac circles and were conceived, as later evidence demonstrates, as a definition of the religious project under Peter to those outside and inside Cluniac monasteries. The outlines of this theoretical redefinition are the major focus of the following chapter.

But the letters do not just disseminate ideas. Rather, and this is their secondary import, they also textualize affective strategies designed to manipulate the reader. An appeal to “emotional communities”, just as much as an appeal to textual communities,
underlies the text as a form of argumentation and persuasion.\(^1\) Love and humiliation coexist in the letters of Peter the Venerable to Bernard of Clairvaux as avenues to allow ideas to become practice—not only to the named recipient, but also to a wider public. Through these tactics of persuasion and dissuasion, Peter seeks to rebuke Bernard directly for creating dissension (as Peter presents it) between the Cistercians and the Cluniacs, and to revive *caritas* among their monastic brotherhood. In addition, the letters act to construct a rhetorical portrait of Peter the Venerable and his monastic project. This emotional rhetoric offers us valuable insight into how, as we will develop further in chapter five, Peter draws on the discourse of personal affect to reposition Cluny and Cluniac monasticism among his own monks. I now turn to a discussion of the considerable historiography about the relationship between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux.

**BOSOM BUDDIES OR MERELY PEN PALS?**

Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux both left behind sizable letter collections which show their correspondence on consequential and inconsequential matters with popes, anonymous monks and secular rulers. They gave spiritual advice, they offered practical assistance, they protected and advanced their jurisdictions, they intervened in legal battles, they launched Crusades. Over the course of twenty years, they continued a sporadic correspondence with each other, in which they proclaimed themselves dear friends, spiritual companions and mutual supporters. The most complete of Peter’s letter collections contains twelve letters from Peter to Bernard—the largest

---

\(^1\) I will address the question of emotional and textual communities below, ideas taken, respectively, from the work of Barbara Rosenwein and Brian Stock. Among other works, cf. Barbara Rosenwein, “Worrying
number to any recipient save Innocent II and Eugenius III – and six from Bernard to Peter. Additional letters to Peter are found in Bernard’s collection: a total of six letters to Peter are included in this work but only one received from him. In Peter’s own letter collection, letter 28 is the first instance of their exchange (ca 1127) followed by a number of letters concerning the dispute over tithes between the Cluniac monastery of Gigny and the Cistercian Le Miroir (1137-38). An additional group of letters date from 1144. Between 1149 and 1152 (the time of Bernard’s death) a steady correspondence existed between the two men.

Peter’s letters to Bernard have benefited from continued scholarly discussion since Dom Clémencet published his Histoire littéraire de saint Bernard abbé de Clairvaux et de Pierre le Vénétable, abbé de Cluni in 1773. This Maurist scholar was the first to examine Peter’s letters with a modern critical attitude and did so with an eye

---

3 Peter’s letters 65 (late 1137), 73 (spring, 1138), 29 (fall, 1138); and Bernard’s letters 147 (spring, 1138), 148 (1138), 149 (1138). On dating of Peter’s letters, cf. LPV, II, pp. 140, 147, 121. For dating of Bernard’s letters, cf. “Table of Letters, Recipients and Dates,” compiled by Beverly Mayne Kienzle in LBC, pp. 538-52. The question of tithes was of singular importance for Peter the Venerable, which had symbolically differentiated Cluny from other monasteries. The grant of the exception from tithes to the Cistercians (1132) seemed to mark the eclipse of Cluny in the eyes of the papacy. This was a fear which Peter expressed to Pope Innocent II in ep. 33 and to a Cluniac audience in ep. 34. The criticism of the Cistercian attitudes to tithes is evident is evident from two public letters to the Cistercian abbots (on ep. 35 and 36, cf. below, this chapter). On this topic, cf. Giles Constable, ‘Cluniac Tithes and the Controversy between Gigny and Le Miroir,’ Revue bénédictine 70 (1960), pp. 591-624, esp. 609-17, reprinted in Cluniac Studies, art. viii; or his more extensive work, Monastic Tithes from Their Origins to the Twelfth-Century, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 10, (Cambridge, 1964) for Cistercian attitudes.
4 Peter’s letter 111 (spring, 1144); and Bernard’s epistles 228 (early 1144) and 267 (1145). For the dating of Peter’s letters, cf. LPV, II, p. 172; for Bernard’s, cf. previous note.
5 Peter’s letters 149 (September, 1149), 150 (October, 1149), 145 (autumn, 1149), 164 (April, 1150), 175 (autumn, 1150), 181, (March, 1151) and 192 (May, 1152); Bernard’s 387 (summer, 1149), 389 (October, 1149), 364 (March/April, 1150), 521 (summer, 1150), and 265 (autumn, 1150). For dating of Peter’s letters, cf. LPV, II, pp. 198, 199, 208, 216, 219, and 226; for Bernard’s, cf. note 3 above. Knight remarks that only a single (and complimentary) letter written by Peter (ep. 175) was copied in Bernard’s official letter collection, suggesting that its compiler may have been choosing to de-emphasize Bernard’s correspondence with Peter and the links between them (Correspondence, pp. 281-82).
to shared attitudes, intentions and projects. Writing himself during a period of monastic unification, Clémencet argued that the abbots of the two most powerful monastic networks of the Middle Ages were joined by friendship and the same monastic outlook (i.e. reformers). The two abbots, he suggests, shared similar qualities of heart and their common ideology led to a renewal of Christian amicitia between them and their two institutions. This judgment dovetailed well with the situation in Clémencet’s own time, when the Cistercians and Cluniacs existed in cooperation, unified (along with the Maurists) under the reformed customs of Monte Cassino. This conclusion, therefore, must have seemed very reassuring to an eighteenth-century monk belonging to an order struggling to reform and unify monastic institutions in France. This thesis, the product of considerable erudition but perhaps also of nostalgic thinking, came to focus attention on the affective nature of Peter and Bernard’s correspondence.

David Knowles adopted Clémencet’s ideas and viewed the friendship of Peter and Bernard as the means for the introduction of reform ideology into Cluniac circles. He characterized Peter and Bernard as initially hostile due to Bernard’s critique of Cluny, but the development of friendship led to Peter’s acceptance of Cistercian ideals. The Cluny at

---

the end of Peter’s abbacy, according to Knowles, is essentially a Cistercian Cluny.

Subsequent scholarship denies that Peter uncritically accepted Cistercian practices, but an acceptance of the authenticity of their friendship has continued.

Jean-Baptiste Auniod provides another example of this persisting attitude. The letters, he suggests, depict a Peter enraptured and overcome by Bernard’s spirit, the two filled with mutual admiration, love and rising above any dispute. This portrait demands a rather idiosyncratic reading of the letters subsuming any of their disagreements and explicit antagonisms as a brief difference of opinion. However, around the same time (1955/56) as Auniod wrote his article arguing the ‘real’ friendship between Peter and Bernard, Joseph Lortz disputed such a possibility. He saw the letters instead as exercises in monastic rhetoric which combined effuse politeness and an emphasis on the topos of Christian brotherly love. Ambrogio Piazzoni’s work also showed a hesitation to accept uncritically the existence of real friendship between the two men, and suggested instead a mutual recognition of “esteem” which derived from their position as the heads of powerful monastic institutions. Nonetheless, the advocacy of the “real friendship” thesis continued, expressed most recently by Brian McGuire’s work on monastic

---

11 Cf. Adriaan Bredero, art. “Saint Bernard in his relations” and ibid., Cluny et Cîteaux au douzième siècle. L’Histoire d’une controverse monastique, (Amsterdam - Maarssen, 1985); Giles Constable’s, art. “Monastic Legislation at Cluny,” pp. 151-161; id., “From Cluny to Cîteaux”, in Georges Duby. L’écriture de l’Histoire, ed. Claudie Duhamel-Amado and Guy Lobrichon, Bibliothèque du Moyen Age, 6, (Brussels, 1996), pp. 317-322; rpt. in Cluny from the 10th to the 12th Centuries, ed. vi. Unlike Knowles, these works deny the Cistercian nature of the reforms and posit Peter’s links to broad trends in twelfth-century monasticism. See also chapters five and eight for further discussion.
practices of *amicitia*. About Peter and Bernard he says, "this elusive relationship, I am convinced, developed into a real friendship, with moments of hope, anger, trust, fear and mutual need. […] The proof of [Peter’s] sincerity lies more in his attitude than in his words."\(^{15}\) This remark underlines the foundation of both McGuire’s account and the explication of this question generally: he attempts to prove that the affective bond evidenced in the letters must be "sincere" in the modern sense and does not allow that the text itself may be the medium for negotiating the relationship between the two authors. McGuire relegates the question of Peter and Bernard’s friendship to a discussion over whether words referenced a real or unreal emotional bond.\(^{16}\)

One possible solution to this debate is offered by Gillian Knight’s recent work, *The Correspondence of Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux*. This study attempts “not to reconstruct the actual historical relationship between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux […] but rather to deconstruct their epistolary relationship”.\(^{17}\) Focusing almost entirely on the language of their correspondence, Gillian Knight notes that the evocations of friendship between the two tend to be formulaic and toposic.\(^{18}\) In order for meaningful debate to occur between different monastic institutions, Knight argues, the rhetoric of friendship was a strategy to bridge difference. Divergences in attitude, observances and habit between Cluny and Cîteaux, though often leading to


\(^{16}\) Hence McGuire concludes his analysis of Peter the Venerable with the statement, "Of all the monastic writers of the twelfth century, Peter the Venerable manages to provide descriptions of friendship that are most convincing to the modern reader." (ibid., p. 258). This conclusion seems to overlook the possibility that a convincing rhetoric of affectivity is Peter’s objective, i.e. that he wished his readers to believe the sincerity of his words in order to attain his own objectives.

\(^{17}\) *Correspondence*, p. 279.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 279-81.
hostility, could be addressed through the epistolary exchanges of their figureheads meeting in a neutral textual space.\textsuperscript{19} 

At the basis of Knight’s argument is the idea that an appeal to amicitia signals debate and contestation; the topos serves to disguise the conflict and distract the recipients from causes of hostility. By demonstrating the topoic basis of Peter and Bernard’s epistolary friendship, Knight’s presentation seems to provide the proof of a lack of affectivity, though I think that it might in fact suggest the opposite.\textsuperscript{20} A tendency of medieval studies to differentiate between rational and emotional uses of amicitia discourses has lead to a dichotomous, not complimentary, conception of the two.\textsuperscript{21} I suspect that medieval authors rationally employed emotional arguments to encourage the acceptance of a proposal, as present-day politicians are only too willing to exploit.\textsuperscript{22} I believe that a discourse of friendship only works as a rhetorical argument if an affective element is present as a motivator. An expanding body of literature supports this point,

\textsuperscript{19} A similar presentation of the political import of emotions within antagonistic negotiations is to be found in Gerd Althoff’s “Empörung, Tränen, Zerknirschung: ‘Emotionen’ in der öffentlichen Kommunikation des Mittelalters,” Frühmittelalterliche Studien 30 (1996), pp. 60-79.

\textsuperscript{20} In a recent review, Brian McGuire attacks Knight’s book as an overly formalistic linguistically focused study. This review, distributed as “03.02.15” of the online TMR distribution list can be found at, “http://www.hti.umich.edu/tmr/”. Given Knight’s implicit criticism of McGuire’s approach and methodology, it should perhaps be not surprising that this review tends to be negative. He uses the opportunity afforded him by the review to attack, as he calls it, “a general trend” in medieval studies towards more focused, formalistic studies, which avoid doing works of grand synthesis (Richard Southern’s Making of the Middle Ages evoked as a positive example). As well he seems dismayed that she could attribute negative emotions and attitudes to these monastic figures. He opens his review with a discussion of “her nastiness”, which as it turns out, is not directed at any scholar, but towards her subjects. His review provides therefore as much information on his own ideas about amicitia as Knight’s.

\textsuperscript{21} The propensity for dichotomous presentation likely derives from positions inherited from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries arguing for the inherent irrationality of the medieval person or for the medieval flowering of romantic beliefs. In reaction to these suggestions, much of twentieth-century scholarship, has combated these notions, demonstrating the unique rationalism of the time, but in doing so, denigrates the emotional and affective aspects of medieval culture. For a good illustration of this dichotomous presentation, cf. J.S.P. Tatlock, “The Middle Ages—Romantic or Rationalistic,” Speculum 8 (1933), pp. 295-304.

\textsuperscript{22} On the increasing use of affective argumentation in current political discourse, cf. the suggestive article by Benjamin DeMott. “Junk Politics. A voter’s guide to the post-literate election,” Harpers Magazine 307 (November, 2003), pp. 35-43.
denying that the use of topoi in medieval texts is somehow “antithetical to the expression and communication of genuine feelings”.

A vocabulary of emotions must be somewhat stereotypical so that they can be communicable (as Knight demonstrates), but these expressions remain valid communicators of “sincere” or “authentic” emotional feeling.

In fact, linguistic evocations of emotion (“emotives”) can have a transformative impact on an audience which shares with the author a common affective rationality (called “emotional communities” by Barbara Rosenwein).

In applying this model to the epistolary relationship of Peter and Bernard, we can glimpse how Knight’s conclusions could be taken further. The constituents of the friendship topos may not merely signal debate or distraction but may also provide a means to negotiate further.

Appealing to the norms of amicitia allows Peter to coerce emotional reactions from Bernard (or a larger audience), not just signal minor victories in an intellectual debate. When supplemented by this concept of “emotional communities,” Knight’s conclusions provide an excellent framework for reading the letters and understanding their discourses. My discussion benefits greatly from her focused analysis, as well as her conclusion that considerable caution should be taken when addressing the language and content of Peter and Bernard’s epistolary exchanges. By exploring the intersections of Peter’s logical and emotional argumentation (both of which are ‘rational’

23 Mary Garrison, “The study of emotions in early medieval history; some starting points,” Early Medieval Europe 10 (2001), pp. 243-50, here, p. 245. This volume also contains several other useful methodological studies for the study of emotion, including Barbara Rosenwein’s “Writings without fear of early medieval emotions,” pp. 229-234.

24 Cf. Barbara Rosenwein, “Worrying about Emotions in History,” pp. 821-46. I am much indebted to Barbara Rosenwein who first introduced me to the idea of “emotional communities” at a journée d’études on the Cluniac customaries organized through the Centre d’études médiévales in Auxerre in the summer of 2001.

in their own way) we can see how his texts strive to implement the concepts contained
within, in part to influence the Cistercian divisiveness and also to construct a self-portrait
of himself and Cluny.

**SELF-PRESENTATION OF BERNARD AND PETER’S FRIENDSHIP**

A valuable starting point in this discussion is understanding how Peter and
Bernard themselves viewed their friendship, not from how they expressed it to each
other, but instead to others. Unfortunately Peter the Venerable has left behind few
indications of this sort, and so we must look to a letter written by Bernard to Pope
Eugenius III in 1151/52 for evidence. This letter comes at the end of Bernard and Peter’s
abbacies in the period identified by historians as a time of **rapprochement**. In this letter,
we can see espoused a notion of friendship veined with political undertones:

It may seem foolish to write to you on behalf of the lord of Cluny and to
wish to defend [one] whom everyone desires to have as a defender
(*patronus*) for themselves. But I write, though this is not necessary for
him, in order to satisfy my emotion (I say my emotion, not [that] of
another). Since I cannot accompany him in body, I shall be with my friend
[in spirit] on his pilgrimage. What can separate us? Not the height of the
Alps, nor the cold of the snows, nor the length of the journey. And I am
now present to him, attending to him by this letter. He is never without
me. I am indebted for his esteem, through which I am considered worthy
to be received into the rank of his favour (**gratia**). But the favour (**gratia**)
itself acquits me of the debt, since necessity has been translated into free
will.

---

26 For some brief comments on the presence of “affective rationality” in Cluniac monasticism, cf. Thierry
Lesieur, “Modèle clunisien de la justice divine et mode de la rationalité,” *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*
26 (2003), pp. 3-21 which interprets the writings of Odo of Cluny.
28 Bernard of Clairvaux, ep. 277, in *SBO*, vol. 8, pp. 189, adapted from the translation of Bruno Scott
James, *LBC*, n. 349, pp. 427-28; *Stultum videtur scribere ad vos pro domino Cluniacensi et quasi velle
patrocinium ferre, quem omnes sibi patronum habere desiderant. Sed scribo, etsi non necessarie illi,
satisfaciens tamen affectui: affectui dico meo, non alterius. Ipso enim, quia corpore non possum, prosequor
amicum peregrinantem. Quis nos separabit? Nec altitudo Alpium, nec nivium frigora, nec longitudo
itineris. Et nunc praepens sum, in litteris his assistens illi. Sine me poterit esse nusquam. Debitor sum
dignationi eius, per quum dignus habitus sum assumi in id gratiae. Sed debito ipsa absolvit gratia, quia
necessitas in voluntatem transiit.*
Here near the end of his life, we see Bernard praising Peter, the abbot of Cluny, which was a monastery so reviled and attacked by Bernard in his earlier years. The letter has three stages: Bernard first lauds Peter as needing no introduction since he is a powerful patronus, he then outlines his motivation for writing to Eugenius III (formerly a Cistercian abbot and one of Bernard’s disciples) on Peter’s behalf and finally concludes (though this is not reproduced in the above excerpt) with the praise of Peter’s role in reforming Cluniac observances.

We must assume that Peter had requested a letter of introduction from Bernard. This request gave rise initially to an obligation surprisingly owed not by Peter, but by Bernard. To understand why, we must look to the final sentences of the above cited passage which incorporate a telling play on words. By thinking well of him (i.e. Bernard), Bernard comments, Peter introduces Bernard into his (Peter’s) favour (gratia). The favour (gratia) repays itself, however. In the second use of gratia, we must read it either as “esteem or regard” (recalling the dignatio used in the previous phrase), as “thanks” or as a “favour done”. On one level Bernard states that by writing the letter of introduction (i.e. doing a service), he is repaying Peter’s esteem for himself. In another interpretation, we could read that the esteem or thanks implicit in Peter’s request acquires Bernard’s debt as well. Key to both readings is understanding that Peter’s gift can only be reciprocated if Bernard acts voluntarily. As we will see below in the letters to the Cistercian Philip and Galcher of Clairvaux, free will is a constituent aspect of Peter’s use of the friendship.

---

29 Cf. below.
topos. Friendship allows equals to exchange favours, not out of obligation, but out of mutual esteem.\textsuperscript{31}

What are we to make of this letter? Of the expression of friendship? We can see that the letter of recommendation presents friendship as a forum for negotiating and confirming social status. Though Peter is ascribed titles showing him to be worthy of high regard (\textit{dominus, patronus}\textsuperscript{32}), Bernard spends most of the letter establishing Peter’s credentials through the expression of their friendship. Bernard is careful to emphasize that he writes his own feelings, not those of another, thereby underlining its sincerity.\textsuperscript{33} When read by Eugenius, the double emphasis on Bernard’s affection would clearly declare a closeness with Peter, something which is again underlined when the letter modulates into a presentation of Peter as a reformer (and which implies that he is an admirer of the Cistercians). Peter and Bernard, (or read as the Cluniacs and Cistercians) are shown to be in harmony. Eugenius is in essence being told to respect Peter and the exchange of \textit{gratia} between Peter and Bernard provides the evidence for this recommendation. The authenticated friendship in this letter, therefore, serves as clear proof of Peter’s good character. The expression of affectivity, we can see, is used as a means to persuade Eugenius. This use of the friendship trope is suggestive more of its instrumentality, than its “purity”, especially when we consider that this is the period (\textit{ca} 1151/52) identified by historians as the most amicable time of Peter and Bernard’s relationship and thus the most likely to evidence emotional bonds.

\textsuperscript{31} Cf. below.
\textsuperscript{32} This latter term implies more than “patron” or “protector”, suggesting also “defender” (as if in a legal dispute), something emphasized by Bernard’s description of his own intent “to undertake a defence” (\textit{patrocinium ferre}) of Peter. This usage is perhaps an allusion to Peter’s polemics against the Jews, Saracens and Petrobrusians (and even against the Cistercians). and of his considerable skill in debate.
As a final note on this letter, I find it interesting that Bernard identifies his actions as a friend to be coterminal with the letter itself. Bernard’s assistance and his friendship are circumscribed by the textual space of the letter. Perhaps we are to understand from this that correspondence is the best medium for the expression of amicitia between Peter and Bernard. As the following section notes, Peter certainly believed that the expression of amicitia is the proper mode in which to correspond with Cistercian monks.

**PETER’S CISTERCIAN CORRESPONDENCE**

The letters of Peter the Venerable to Cistercian monks suggest a complex relationship with the order of the White monks, exhibiting features of strong affection as well as antagonism. Through the amicitia trope Peter transmits his overt admiration, respect and love for the Cistercian congregation, though the discourse also serves to critique and undermine Cistercian pretense. Peter appeals to friendship in all of his six letters written to Cistercian recipients (not including the twelve letters to Bernard of Clairvaux and the six to Nicholas of Clairvaux, his secretary34 which also contain similar declarations). Two letters are addressed to all Cistercian abbots, one to Rainard, the abbot of Cîteaux, one to Geoffrey, the abbot of Les Roches, and one each to Philip and Galcher,

---

33 The description of Peter’s “pilgrimage” (across the Alps during the winter) is perhaps an additional layer of authentication, which provides a dating mechanism and sends a message akin to, “Peter and I are in accord at the time described.”
34 On Bernard’s letters with Peter, cf. above, note. 1. In Peter’s letter collection, letters 151, 176, 180, 182, and 193 were sent by Peter to Nicholas; letters 153 and 179 were received from him. The relationship of Peter the Venerable with Nicholas of Montiéramey (or of Clairvaux) and its modern historiography has been discussed by John Benton, “The Court of Champagne as a Literary Centre,” *Speculum* 36 (1961), pp. 555-557 and id., “Nicholas of Clairvaux and the Twelfth-Century Sequence,” *Traditio* 18 (1962), pp. 149-79; Constable *LPV*, II, pp. 316-330, appendix P and *Correspondence*, pp. 227-277. The relationship has been hotly debated, with suggestions ranging from Nicholas was a Cluniac spy to he deliberately tried to sabotage Bernard’s reputation, or was used as a means of Bernard to excuse his past impolitic words. The relationship of Nicholas with Peter remains confusingly unresolved. This ambiguity has led me to avoid the letters exchanged between Peter and Nicholas altogether, especially given that other suitable letters are available.
respectively the prior and the cellarer of Clairvaux. These letters address diverse subjects and all overtly claim the close affection of Peter for the recipients and their monks.

I begin my discussion in a reverse chronological order with the letters to Philip and Galcher (letters 183 and 184) which evidence Peter’s instrumental use of the friendship trope in 1150 (roughly the same time as Bernard’s letter to Eugenius III). In these letters Peter writes to elicit help in allowing the monk Nicholas of Clairvaux to visit Cluny. As we continue to examine Peter’s letters, we see that the instrumentality of the amicitia trope is not a late development in Peter’s rhetoric, but rather is a usage which is consistent throughout his Cistercian correspondence. In fact, the earlier the letter, the less Peter’s critique is disguised, as is evident from letter 120 to Rainard (describing the hospitality shown at Cluny to certain Cistercian monks returning to Cîteaux) and (to a lesser extent) in letter 136 to Geoffrey (a letter of consolation after the death of a young monk, John of Toucy, who had transferred from a Cistercian abbey to a Cluniac priory). While asserting on the surface his love for the Cistercians, the expression of friendship in these letters also hints at the welcome (and asylum) he (and Cluny) offers to any Cistercian. A direct attack premised on the failure of amor and caritas is evident in the earliest letters 35 and 36 (ca 1132/40) to all Cistercian abbots, which address the dispute over tithes between Gigny and La Miroir. I treat these letters lastly since the open disagreement between the Cluniacs and Cistercians introduce well the following chapter, in which I begin with Peter’s letter 28 (ca 1127) to Bernard of Clairvaux.

Instrumental Friendship

The letter to Philip of Clairvaux, in particular, makes explicit Peter’s intentional use of friendship as a strategy of influence. Letter 183 (ca 1150) is the only letter
exchanged between Peter and Philip, though in letter 151 to Nicholas of Clairvaux (October, 1149) Peter singles out the monks Philip, Galcher and Garnerius for good wishes.\(^{35}\) Philip was therefore known to Peter before he wrote letter 183, likely from Peter’s stay at Clairvaux in mid-1149. No evidence of future correspondence or of further obligations exchanged between them is extant. Despite this, the letter to Philip certainly demonstrates the employment of a written affective strategy:

Solomon said, *A new friend is like new wine, let it grow old and you will drink it with sweetness.* Thusly, brother, you seem to be to me. I give thanks to God that you are a new friend. I hope to God that you will grow old in friendship and you, who please me though a new friend, will please me so much the more upon aging. For the longer sincere love [continues] the sweeter it is accustomed to be.\(^{36}\) I was always pleased since […] your peaceful and benign manners recommended that I love you greatly. Henceforth command therefore what you might wish from one ready to obey. But you must also obey according to the law (*ius*) commanding friendship. I asked the lord abbot that he send to me before the feast, his and your Nicholas. Make a case before him so that he does what I petition.\(^{37}\)

This passage begins with a scriptural citation used previously in an epistle to Hato of Troyes whereby Peter equates friendship and wine as growing sweeter with age.\(^{38}\) The citation is employed as part of an affective rewriting of Peter’s relationship with Philip. Philip is not an old friend like Hato, but is depicted as one untasted and untested to whom Peter extends the love of his friendship. Peter stresses that “sincere love” (*sincerus amor*)

\(^{35}\) *LPV*, ep. 151, I, p. 372 and ibid., II, pp. 200-1. Peter had traveled to Clairvaux in mid 1149, suggesting these monks became known to him then. Garnerius is referred to as *nostrum* leading Constable to conclude he was a Cluniac who had moved to Clairvaux.

\(^{36}\) Cf. ibid., ep. 86, I, pp. 223-24 to Hato of Troyes for Peter’s use of a similar metaphor.


exists between them. He avows a love which is true and unfeigned. Such declarations, appearing also in letters 28 and 111 to Bernard of Clairvaux, are hallmarks of Peter’s evocations of friendship. While it is difficult to evaluate the affective response to this textual strategy, Peter shows that he does not conceive of their friendship as empty rhetoric. He supposes that it is an effective manipulative tactic based on a reciprocal exchange of love. Peter debates about the obligations of love and by doing so provokes Philip to action—using their mutual love as a force to define their relationship. He denotes Philip as worthy of his love and as able to fulfill his request. By basing his request in the language of love and friendship, Peter sets up an unspoken implication. If Philip were to reject Peter’s offer to deepen their love, he would disregard the ideal of love basic to the monastic life.\textsuperscript{39} Also, to rebuff Peter’s love is to deny Peter’s perception of him as worthy of affection. To reject Peter’s love, therefore, is to deny one’s own worth. The offer, though clearly a rhetorical strategy, seems also to be one which evokes and demands emotive and affective responses. Despite being separated by monastic observances and by distance as well as being bound by divergent ties of affection, Peter expects that he and Philip are nonetheless bound by similar rules of behaviour. We can perceive that the love by which Peter presides over his own Cluniac monks is here used with Cistercians—a not insignificant testimony to an ideal of the universality of love which unifies all monastic communities and arguably all Christians.

As a persuasive rhetorical argument and as affective manipulation, the discourse of friendship and love seems an effective means to request favours. We see that in his letter to Philip, Peter uses words like \textit{amor} and \textit{diligo} to express the relationship between

them (these are terms Bernard does not employ for Peter in the letter to Eugenius III, but does elsewhere). Love of this sort must have conferred something like honour or esteem for it to be reckoned worthy of acceptance.\textsuperscript{40} We see from the letter to Philip that Peter maps the terminology of responsibility onto the discourse of love. Like other forms of gift exchange in medieval culture, the offering of love demands reciprocation according to understood norms.\textsuperscript{41} Peter the Venerable describes friendship as enshrined in law (\textit{ius}) which establish rules to be obeyed. The offer of friendship brings obligation, Peter asserts, and this love between friends constructs a situation of mutual subjugation. Philip can command (\textit{iubeo}), but only if he also accepts the discourse of friendship. Peter asks here for his wish to be carried out, though this request brings with it the voluntary obligation to fulfill the command of Philip.

The possibility of commanding favours through the discourse of friendship is made all the more evident by the contrast provided in the letter to Galcher. This note was written and sent together with letter 183 and addresses the same topic. In the short missive, Peter makes clear his will:

Since, you are no longer a new friend, but one of many years, I do not labour in speaking to you, nor do I employ a long insinuation to get at that which I intend. For he who is a friend, does not expect entreaties, but the wish of a friend. This, once acknowledged, he should labour to implement immediately. My wish is that the brother Nicholas spend Easter with us. Now you know what I want. It is henceforth your [desire as well] that I do

\textsuperscript{40} Jaeger, 	extit{Ennobling Love}, p. 18-19.
not wish nor write in vain. I asked your lord abbot for this. If it is necessary, may you also ask [him]. 42

A justification for brevity provides the opportunity for Peter to honour Galcher and perhaps even to publicize their love before an audience of Cistercians. Making his bluntness into a praise of their deep friendship, Peter openly expresses the intent of his letter. A wish made known ought to be fulfilled without question by one bound in an “aged” love. Peter here clarifies the ideal of obligation between friends. One need not ask, merely reveal a wish; a will-to-obey is inborn when a friendship has already grown mature. Read simultaneously with the letter to Philip, the blunt brevity of this epistle is softened by the understanding that Galcher’s friendship is the “sweeter wine” and the more beloved of Peter. Philip (and perhaps an audience of Cistercians), upon hearing the letter to Galcher would presumably be driven to deepen his (their) intimacy with Peter.

The relationship between Peter and Galcher is given further complexity when considering their previous history. Epistle 378 from Bernard to Peter (ca 1145) indicates that a Galcher known to Peter has entered Clairvaux. Bernard’s letter informs Peter that Galcher has been received:

Your son Galcher has now become ours, according to the rule, All things are thine and thine are mine. Let him be no less of your family by being shared; and if another favour is possible, let him be all the more familiar and dear to you because he is ours, as he is to me because he is yours. 43

42 LPV, ep. 184, I, p. 427; Quia iam non nouus, sed multorum annorum amicus es, non laboro apud te in loquendo, nec ad id quod intendo, longa instinuutione utor. Nam qui amicus est, non exspectat preces, sed uelle amicit. Quod ut agnoscit, statim implere laborat. Velle meum est, ut frater Nicholaus nobiscum pascha faciat. Iam quod uolo agnoscit. Tuum est amodo, ut non frustra uelim, neque frustra scripserim. Rogavi inde dominum abbatem. Si necesse fuerit, roga et tu.
43 Bernard of Clairvaux, ep. 267, SBO, vol 8, translation adapted from LBC, n. 307, p. 308; Filius vester frater Galcherus, factus est et noster, secundum regulam illam: Omnia mea tua sunt, et tua mea [Joan. XVII, 10]. Non sit minus familiaris, quia communis: sed si est quod possit alia gratia, sit familiarior atque acceptior, ut mihi, quia vester est; sic vobis, quia noster est.
If this Galcher is indeed the same Galcher who became the cellarer of Clairvaux, we can understand how their acquaintance was first made (and the slightly more imperious tone).

If Galcher was once a Cluniac monk, moreover, we can perceive from letter 184 the continuing existence of bonds between former abbot and monk. In this letter, as in Bernard’s letter 378, Galcher’s entry to Clairvaux does not mean the end of the bonds of love and obligation between them and the former abbot can continue to negotiate them.\(^4^4\)

Love persists in Peter and Galcher’s relationship and love for a son becomes love for a friend, which continues to be a source for obligation and responsibility.\(^4^5\)

The twinned letters to Galcher and Philip underscore an affective form of persuasion employed by Peter the Venerable which did not rely on direct authority or relationships of obedience. It does seem to depend in this case on voluntary mutual submission (i.e. being able to be commanded by the other) and a reciprocation of favours. Through this emotive discourse, Peter attempts to further his reach and expand the area of his influence. Whether Bernard ultimately denied the request and whether Nicholas ever traveled to Cluny is not clear, leaving the efficacy of the method an open question.\(^4^6\)

Peter, however, seems to think the strategy as valid and useful, unless he was intentionally using methods to doom the success of his request, something which seems at odds with the effort of sending four letters.\(^4^7\)

\(^4^4\) Knight (Correspondence, p. 187) interprets ep. 267 as ironically informing Peter that his idea of shared communities will only lead to monks leaving Cluny for Cheaux. Regardless of Bernard’s intent, like Peter’s letter 136, it evidences the fluidity of movement between monasteries and the common use of familiar language to describe the entirety of the monastic order.

\(^4^5\) On Peter’s expression of paternal love, cf. chapter four.

\(^4^6\) Nicholas had visited Cluny once in 1149 and Constable suggests that Bernard likely would have acceded to a second visit in 1151, though he admits there is no evidence for this conclusion (LPV, II, p. 325). Peter had invited him (via Bernard) to come to Cluny for Christmas in 1150 (ep. 175), but Nicholas had been unable, as Bernard states it, to leave the business occupying him at Vézelay.

\(^4^7\) Besides the letters to Philip and Galcher, Peter also sends one letter each to Bernard (ep. 181) and Nicholas (ep. 182); cf. LPV, eps. 181-84, I, pp. 423-27.
By sending four letters to different Cistercians—all at Clairvaux—Peter the Venerable was not attempting to make a private request. Instead, he publicized his desire to receive Nicholas at Cluny and in all four letters he remarks on his bonds of friendship with the Cistercian recipients. To Nicholas he emphasizes the depth and sweetness of their friendship. To Bernard, he puts forth his request by asking, “Surely it pleases you that I love (diligo) him with so much emotion (affectuosius) whom you and many of yours, I think, love so tenderly? And what greater proof of true friendship is there than to love (amare) what a friend loves? I love (diligo) him on account of you, I love him also on account of himself.” Peter presents Nicholas as an extension of his friendship shared with Bernard and identifies Nicholas’s visit as a symbol of the flowering relationship between the two as friends and as figureheads of Cluniac and Cistercian monasticism. When considered alongside Peter’s other letters making the request for Nicholas’ visit, the language of amicitia creates an undertone concerned with the failure of love. If friendship means the union of wills, as Peter remarks to Galcher, then the effort of writing four different letters to convince Bernard suggests a certain lack of proper affection. If Bernard, moreover, is unwilling to grant so important a request to a friend—a request which Peter has made very public to Bernard’s monks—would he not deny this

50 LPV, ep. 181, I, p. 423; An non placet tibi, ut eum quem tu ut arbitror, multis tuorum tenerius diligis, ipse affectuosius dilligam? Et quae maior probation uerae amicitiae, quam amore quod amicus amat? Diligo eum causa tui, diligo et causa sui.
51 Ibid., p. 424 where he parallels Bernard’s amor and the caritas to be maintained between the two congregations. In addition, Peter underlines himself as an example to be followed, remarking that he has allowed such movements in the past. He specifically notes that he permitted Robert and Garneau to transfer to Clairvaux, perhaps implying the necessity of Bernard’s reciprocity. This Robert was the kinsman of Bernard who had transferred to Cluny and provoked Bernard’s ep. 1. This letter, in which he criticizes Robert for moving to a less austere observance, often is taken as the forerunner of Bernard’s Apologia and an initial provocation for Peter’s letter 28 (both the Apologia and letter 28 are discussed in detail below). By bringing up Robert in the context of letter 181, it seems that Peter wishes to remind and to warn Bernard about the dangers of stirring up discord (and harming caritas) between the black and white monks.
status to Peter as well as to his own monks. Peter thus places Bernard in the same
conundrum in which he positioned Philip, encouraging him to consider what would be
lost by failing to grant a minor favour, and how love (amor and caritas) could be served
by consenting to it.

In addition to illustrating Peter’s instrumental use of the amicitia topos, Peter’s
letters about the visit of Nicholas demonstrate the use of friendship as a means for self-
promotion. He is unfailing in love (both in the interpersonal and the charitable forms) and
understands well its rules, thus symbolizing his fitness as a Christian leader. This
discourse may also have sought to indicate how he loved and was loved by many
Cistercians (i.e. showing a close kinship to them and a lack of opposition to their
ideology) and a general image of Cluny united with Cîteaux. Difference did not divide
the two families of the monastic order, the letters hint, nor did it limit the bonds of
amicitia. This latter notion is a perhaps a rhetoric less convincing for a Cistercian
audience. A Cluniac or Benedictine reader, however, would recognize it as a recruitment
call.

UNIFYING FRIENDSHIP

In the letters discussed above, and in most of his letters to the Cistercians, Peter
attempts to represent himself as the one who seeks out the friendship of specific
Cistercians and lavishes love on them. In letter 120 to Rainard (ca 1134/50), Peter
describes the recent visit of some Cistercian brothers on their way to Cîteaux who
remained at Cluny for several days.52 He emphasizes that their every need was attended

---
52 This letter can only be dated, according to Constable (LPV, II, p. 180) between 1134 and 1150 (the
duration of Rainard’s abbacy) due to the lack of any dating features. The letter is brief and contains few
to and that they were made very welcome within the monastery. They were, Peter
continues, made beloved to him by their stay. In a very tangible way, Peter expresses the
ability of Cistercians and Cluniacs to cohabitate without dispute and with love. The
mention of hospitality, however, likely should be interpreted as unusual since in letter
150 Peter mentions that he decreed that Cistercians were welcome in any Cluniac
cloister, save Cluny itself.\textsuperscript{53} If such is the case, then Peter’s letter evidences all the more
that he was wishing to project an image of a compliant and charitable institution. I
suspect that the reason for this pleasant projection lay in the specific audience being
addressed. The monks who had been sheltered and who carried the letter were part of a
delegation to Cîteaux to discuss the deposition of their abbot by Rainard,\textsuperscript{54} Giles
Constable has identified this monastery as likely Montpeyroux, long associated with the
Montboissier family (i.e. Peter the Venerable’s kin) and founded by Amadeus of
Hauterives, originally a Cluniac monk. These were monks, Constable suggests, who were
suffering from the excessive oversight of Cîteaux. Given this context, it would not be
impossible to read this letter, with its emphasis on hospitality, as an invitation to enter the
Cluniac fold.

Even though this interpretation may be circumstantial, it is quite certain that a
degree of circulation of personnel occurred between Cluniac and Cistercian monasteries.
We see this emphasized in letter 136 to Geoffrey (\textit{ca} 1137/56), the Cistercian abbot of
Les Roches, where Peter emphasizes the fluidity of the Cistercian/ Cluniac designations.
The letter proffers consolations for the death of John of Toucy (a Cistercian monk who

---

\textsuperscript{53} On letter 150, cf. the discussion at the end of this chapter and in chapter eight.
\textsuperscript{54} \textit{LPV}, II, p. 180.
became a Cluniac prior), Peter emphasizes the devotion, the reputation and exemplary life lived by John who was, “our brother, our son, whom Your Benign Love committed to me”. Peter concludes with the regret that John would never return to Les Roches as had been intended. We see in this letter that Peter again emphasizes his affection for the Cistercian Geoffrey, as well as for the deceased John, while indicating that Cluniacs and Cistercians were part of a single and unified order of monks.

**HUMILIATING FRIENDSHIP**

In the two final letters we will discuss here (letters 35 and 36), Peter employs friendship as the means for Peter to humiliate the Cistercians. These letters were written a year apart (sometime between 1131 and 1140) which identifies them as Peter’s earliest correspondence with the Cistercians apart from the *epistola disputans* (letter 28) sent to Bernard of Clairvaux. Even though the letters are ultimately vehicles to criticize the Cistercian brotherhood, Peter reiterates a closeness felt for the Cistercian cause. Letter 35 admonishes the Cistercian claim of exemption from paying tithes to Cluniac monasteries, and letter 36 is ostensibly Peter’s apology after hearing about the resentment provoked there by his comments.

Letter 35 begins with a salutation addressed “to our most beloved and venerable brothers, the lord abbots of Cîteaux, Clairvaux, Pontigny and others”, thereby signaling an affectionate and warm letter. If openness is the sign of true friendship—as Peter commented to Galcher—then the turns, insinuations and protestations of letter 35 signal

---

55 *LPV*, ep. 136, I, p. 341; *frater noster, filius noster Iohannes, quem michi benigna dilectio vestra commiserat [...].*

an inimical, apologetic or defensive posture. Peter opens with an evocation of the great
affection he holds for the Cistercians and he describes why he loves them so:

I revere in you the fervour of a new institution: the resolve in labour, the
meagerness of foodstuffs, the poverty of your clothes, and innumerable
other things sounding out the humility of [your] monastic project. I
embraced with the arms of my whole heart the practices of your holy
activities and smelling it, I cleaved to the good odour of your name, and I,
peaceful, was unable to hear anyone interpreting perverse things about
you. For I was not content that I alone felt this about you, but made into
your preacher, I preached the praises of your way of life to ours and
others, and both privately and publicly with many laudations extolling
what [practices] are yours. I also converted the souls of many to your love,
even those [who were] adverse. And since through the grace of God [...] He
had given efficacy to my words and He—who makes two into one—had
united the hearts of our brothers with you through the unity of his spirit,
such that in faith and charity not two, but one congregation is already able
to be believed.58

For a letter ostensibly about monastic unification and about the distinction of Cistercian
monasticism, Peter and his actions seem to be disproportionately highlighted. He is
emphasized as the herald of Cluniac charity (using seven first person verbs in a row),
who brought his monks to admire Cistercian ideals even though rebuffed by the white
monks, as he continues:

He [the odious enemy, i.e. the devil] cast among us the apple of discord so
that after the one and single charity had departed, he may be able to put to
flight all the forms of virtue with little effort, and after the head of all good
things has been cut off, all the members may be made to die together.

57 *LPV*, ep. 35, I, p. 113; *Karissimis et ueneralibus fratribus nostris, domino abbati Cisterciensi,
Clareuallensi, Pontiensi, et alii [...]. The depiction of the Cistercians as beloved friends extends into the
first several lines of the letter.
58 Ibid., p. 114; *Venerabar in uobis nouae institutionis fervorem, laboris instantiam, uictus parsimoniam,
uestitus uilitatem, et alia innumera, monastici propositi sonantia humilitatem. Amblectebar totius animi
brachis sanctorum exercitia operum et bonum nominis uestri odorem inhians hauriebam, nec aliquem
sinistra de uobis interpretantem pacatus audire ualebam. Non eram contentus ista solus de uobis sentire,
sed uester praedicator effectus, nostri et alienis conversationis uestrae praeconia praedicabam et
priuatum ac publice multis laudibus quae uestra sunt efferens, etiam auersos ad uestrum amorem multorum
animos conuertembam. Et quia per gratiam dei [...] dederat ipse efficiaciam sermonibus meis et fratrum
nostrorum corda ille qui facit utraque unum, ita unitate spiritus sui uobis unierat, ut sicut fide sic et
caritate iam non duae sed una congregatio credi posset.*
Thus he did plainly when the tithe was not rendered by you to the Cluniac brothers or others and when this was affirmed by apostolic privilege.\(^{59}\)

When arriving at this section of the letter, the reader is made to understand that the surface of the letter preaches monastic unity through love and charity even though the underlying tone is of admonishment and reproach. The initial image of monastic harmony is overturned and the appeal to earlier halcyon days acts to heighten the contrast between the past (linked with what the Cluniacs and especially Peter undertook) and the present state of affairs (the product of the Cistercian choice). The depiction of Peter’s great love and of his success at converting Cluniacs and others (\textit{nostris et alienis}) to love them, serves to emphasize by contrast how the Cistercians rejected his love and abandoned his affection. The Cistercian refusal to pay tithes becomes, in Peter’s letter, a choice of discord on their part and the contingent loss of charity destroys the charitable attitudes extolled by Peter at the outset. He makes an effort to forewarn of the possible isolation of the Cistercian congregation within the monastic brotherhood, when he admonishes their refusal to render the tithe “to Cluniac brothers or others” (\textit{Cluniacensibus fratribus uel aliis}). This warning recalls the earlier reference to the audience of Peter’s preaching (\textit{nostris et alienis}), making a link between the previous and potential future hostility of public opinion towards the Cistercians.

The deficiency of the Cistercians is made all the more evident, Peter claims near the end of the letter, by the abundant authority supporting the Cluniac position, though he

\(^{59}\) \textit{Ibid.}; \textit{lecit inter nos pomum discordiae, ut recedente una et sola caritate, uniuaera uirtutum genera minore labore valeat effugare, et praeecesso honorum omnium capite, membra simul omnia cogantur interire. Sic plane, sic fecit, quando ne a uestris decimae Cluniacensibus fratribus uel aliis redderentur, et hoc apostolico privilegio firmaretur [...].}
defers from reproducing it in his letter due to expectations of epistolary brevity. He prefers instead to highlight the inversion of the proper order where the ancients (Cluniacs) are subjected to the modern (Cistercians), fathers to the sons; where the poor are not meek but seek to seize wealth violently like aristocrats. We will note that this hierarchy was already established at the outset of the letter, when Peter praises the Cistercians as the new monastic sons, which in light of this reversal, is shown to be a form of depreciatory esteem. In Peter’s account, justice is perverted and scandal arises to take its place. The Cistercian practices of poverty which he claimed to admire so greatly at the outset of the letter, are implicitly contrasted with the Cistercians’ avaricious greed at the end, when charity is lacking. Peter’s conclusion makes clear the emptiness of Cistercian observances in light of this deficiency:

For what will be the benefit of manual labour, fastings, vigils, chastity, almsgiving and of the other practices of sacred works — aside from hope for you and ours— when, as I said before, charity is absent? Peter’s solution is to show that the “new institution” is humiliated before the wisdom of the ancients (i.e. the Cluniacs and Benedictines). By making clear the empty nature of their claims, his words seek to reverse the inversion of status held to by the Cistercians. The letter thus functions as a cautionary meditation upon the disjuncture of reputation and reality. This focus is evident in the letter, where we see little description of the

60 Ibid. p. 116. Peter reaffirms his own model behaviour by evoking his pursuance of proper rules even in epistolary matters. This tactic to avoid more discussion thus provides a further means to chide his recipients.
61 Ibid, p. 115; Hoc tantum infero, antiquis modernos, patribus filios, haec tenuisse, periculorum si mutetur existere. [...] Quis magis uidetur inustus, diues parces an pauper violentus? Quis majore dignus est supplicio, retentor proriorum an raptor alienorum?
62 Ibid., pp. 115-16; quae enim uobis nel nostris ultra spes in laboribus, quae in eiuniis, quae in vigillis, quae in castitate, quae in elemosinis, quae in aliis sacrorum operum exercitiis, remota ut supra dixi caritate esse poterit?
Cistercian practices and Peter focuses largely on perceptions of them: he admired them, many others had not, and public opinion about them changed. The “novel” Cistercian observances (a charge which he reiterates in letter 111 and which must be understood as negative) are “redolent” of humility, but lack a foundation in charity. “I pray and I advise in equal measure,” Peter concludes, “I pray as a suppliant and I advise as a friend [...] lest you bring infamy upon yourself, lest you bring aggression to us and lest you take away charity from us and at the same time from yourself —charity, which is the single remedy for Christian souls.”64 The infamy referred to here must be the public recognition of the Cistercians’ empty spiritual practices.

The humility to which the Cistercians aspire is therefore incomplete. And Peter’s letter is the agent for the restoration of their humility. What else could Peter be doing than encouraging the Cistercians to remember (memoro) their proper state as laid out in the Rule of Saint Benedict?:

The seventh step of humility is that a man not only admits with his tongue but is also convinced in his heart that he is inferior to all and of less value, humiliating himself and saying with the prophet: *I am but a worm, not a man, the lowest of men and despised by the people.* (Ps. 21) *I was exalted and then humiliated and overwhelmed with confusion.* (Ps. 87) *It is a blessing that you have humiliated me so that I can learn your commandments* (Ps. 118).65

---

64 Ibid., p. 116; [..] or pariter et consulo, oro ut supplex, consulo et amicus [...] ubis ne inflamiam, nobis ne violentiam inferatis, et ne nobis simul ac ubis caritate Christianarum animarum unicum remedium auferatis.
By publicly reprimanding the Cistercian failure in monastic practice, Peter undertakes a critical mode common among twelfth-century monks and a mode in which Bernard and the Cistercians were well versed. Peter intends to call the Cistercians, in essence, "bad monks" and intends for them and others to know that he does so. By making his criticisms, Peter marshals the power of public censure (thus the repeated references to general perceptions) by outlining an argument—convincing to a larger non-Cistercian readership— which deflates the Cistercians' elevated (or as Benedict states, exalted) self-conception.

The motivation behind Peter's letter becomes evident. True humility, as Bernard of Clairvaux also admitted, allows a more complete experience of gratitude, leads to the recognition of each individual's radical dependence on others and encourages submission to the laws of God (i.e. charity). Peter wishes to effect this recognition (making the Cistercian acknowledge their debt to Cluniac and Benedictine monks and return to the path of charity) not only through logical argumentation, but also by forcing an affective reevaluation of self-conception. Like Benedict, Peter realizes that humility is not only a state of being, but also a process of becoming, contingent upon the enaction of a movement from high to low. Peter creates the conditions for this movement/deflation by presenting the Cistercians as they wish to be perceived and then demonstrating how they are perceived, how they should act and then how they do act. This demonstration of ideal and (failed) reality provides the opportunity for a cognitive (hence the arguments, the

---

66 Talal Asad, Genealogies of Religion, p. 78. The most obvious example of this literature is, of course, Bernard of Clairvaux's Apologia. This literature, and the Apologia in particular are discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

appeal to textual authority) as well as an affective recognition of failure. That Peter makes his pitch, as he is careful to assert, as a friend and out of love for them, hinders (but does not prevent) a defensive reaction.

In Peter’s following letter 36 written a year later, he expresses his surprise at how his letter was received. Letter 36 is presented as abject apology in which Peter, mea humilitas, denies seeking to cause any disharmony. He hopes that the new letter, “heals the injury which the first [letter] brought on and [that] the schism of our minds –no matter how great– is unified with the glue of the holy ghost conjoining the divided parties”.

Unity of the monastic order is again underlined when Peter presents himself as an agent of peace, harmony and order. Having discussed at length this previous letter, we are well aware that the previous epistle was not one trying to appease the Cistercian sensibilities and was intended to provoke a strong reaction. Peter’s surprise, I believe, cannot be taken as a mark of false duplicity, but rather should be read as an open indication of his true intent. He candidly affirms what his project is and he does not deny what he did. He is harsh, but loving. He does what a true friend must do, which is to offer the Cistercians suitable advice and to minister to them as befits monks pursuing humility. For them to react angrily or hurt is an indication of their failure to respond as proper monks. By accusing Peter of sowing disharmony, they reinforce their own unsuitable disposition and show their lack of proper love.

Just as the Cistercians are public in their practices of humility, so too is he justified, Peter intimates, in publicly promoting their humility. He evokes the existence of friendship as a means of underscoring his earnestness in this regard and justifying his

---

intervention, stating that he does not want “the heart [to be] veiled with a covering of duplicity” because friends should be open with each other.\textsuperscript{69} By this assertion, Peter explicitly denies that his intent was uncharitable, since he sought to create the conditions for the growth of charity. Since the rebirth of unity necessitated Cistercian humility, Peter’s humiliating words acted in the interest of friendship and monastic charity. It is telling of Peter’s mentality that he can present himself as the essence of humility (\textit{mea humilitas}) while he lectures others of their manifold faults.

Unity is Peter’s ideal state for monasticism according to his letters to Cistercian recipients. He emphasizes unification of the divided, he reproduces his personal amicable interactions with Cistercian individuals, and he underscores the fluidity of moving from one group to the other. Cluny and Citeaux differ in practices, he allows, but many of the Cistercian observances are praiseworthy and could be suitably adopted by the Cluniacs. Underneath his approval, however, there are repeated implications of Cistercian self-exaltation. Peter presents himself as the opposite, as working towards unity, as a humble monk, and a rebuffed friend acting with unstinting love and charity, though disturbed by the potential duplicity of his Cistercian counterparts. Peter emphasizes how he fears the loss of fraternal charity, which, as we note in more detail in the following chapter, provides the theoretical foundation for Peter’s idea of the monastic life. The epistolary humiliation of the Cistercians is a sort of textual \textit{purificatio}, i.e. implementing minor pain and suffering which allows for improvement. As we see in the following chapter, this presentation is paralleled in the letters between Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux.

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., p. 117; \textit{nolui [...] nec coram amicis inter quos omnia nuda esse debent, duplicitatis velamine cor velare}. This is an image also use in ep. 181 to Bernard of Clairvaux (cf. LPV, 1, p. 425).
Though much of the analysis in the following chapter focuses on Peter and Bernard’s theoretical debates over reform, an understanding of the affective structures to which Peter appeals are a necessary beginning for understanding why and how he makes his arguments. The above discussion, moreover, is central for introducing Peter’s affective manipulations with his own monks, as we examine in chapter five. As we saw, friendship serves several instrumental purposes for Peter: projecting positive self-portraits and providing the means for spiritual improvement (through positive encouragement or negative humiliating models). A recognition of this usage, however, should not suggest that his friendship and love is without feeling. Rather, love and friendship manifests itself through the unique modalities pertinent to monastic relationships. Love, for Peter, means a concern for salvation and taking spiritual care of those who are beloved.
Of the manuscripts containing Peter the Venerable’s letters, one is especially notable for our purposes. The manuscript Paris, BNF, Latin 13876 reunites only four of Peter’s letters (ep. 28, 111, 149 and 150), but in those letters he explicitly theorizes about the legal and spiritual foundation of the Cluniac observances as well as presents arguments justifying the renovation of *consuetudo*.¹ These letters, I suggest, form a preface of sorts to the earliest and most complete extant version of Peter the Venerable’s *Statuta* which follows later in the manuscript. Little more is known of this manuscript than that the theme of reform lies at the core of this thirteenth-century compilation originating from the onetime Cluniac monastery of Saint-Germain-des-Prés.²

In the letter 161 (*ca* 1144/56) addressed to all the monks of the *ecclesia cluniacensis*, Peter identifies two letters (ep. 28 and 111 to Bernard of Clairvaux) which were circulating publicly and which were to be read by his monks if they had questions about reforms of the Cluniac observance:

---
¹ The manuscript unfolds as follows: letter 28, (fols 1r-34r), letter 111 (fols 34r-47v), letter 149 (48r-50r) and letter 150 (50r-53r). Bernard of Clairvaux’s letters (54v-74v), Peter’s *Statuta* (fols 75r-87v), concluding with *Regula Statutarum minorum* (fols 88r-101v). For a description of the manuscript, cf. Constance’s introductions to the *Statuta* (pp. 25-26) and his letter collection (*LPV*, II, p. 61) or the more limited entry in Léopold Delisle, *Inventaire des manuscrits de la bibliothèque Nationale- Fondes de Cluny* (Paris, 1884), p. 316.
² Not having personally examined this manuscript, I am unable to make conclusions beyond the basic information provided by Constance and Delisle. Constance concludes that this manuscript represents a copy of the final redaction of the letter collection, since letter 28 is a corrected version, and the manuscript includes letters 149 and 150 which were not written by the time of the earlier versions. Saint Germain-des-Prés was attached to Cluny at various times in its history; cf. Wollasch, *Cluny ‘Licht der Welt’*, pp. 90, 94. The subject matter and dating suggest a possible link of this manuscript to the institution building of thirteenth-century Cluny, when the question of how to promulgate statutes and how to interpret the *Rule* was reopened; cf. the conclusion to this thesis, chapter eleven.
For if something about receiving novices, manual labour, clothing and such things was changed by the good fathers after Saint Benedict, it was not done for a dubious, but rather a clear and rational reason. And since the sake or reason was carefully described twice in two letters sent by me some time ago to the lord abbot of Clairvaux, I adjudge it superfluous to repeat this here.³

It seems telling that alongside the codification of Peter’s reforms (the Statuta, ca 1146/47) the thirteenth-century compiler copied out those letters (ep. 28 and 111) explicitly cited by Peter as basic to his justification for reform. To these epistolary treatises, two further of Peter’s letters were appended (ep. 149 and 150) which discuss how to maintain separate observances within affiliated Cluniac and Cistercian monasteries (one letter refers to a statute on the topic not presently extant [ep. 150]).⁴ All of Peter’s texts pertain to the reform of observances and the governance of a religious institution as does the non-Petrine material — a Franciscan Rule and certain letters from Bernard of Clairvaux to Peter.⁵ From their position within the manuscript, it seems clear that the medieval compiler identified Peter’s four letters (ep. 28, 111, 149, 150) as the most pertinent to the discussion of reform. Taking my cue from this manuscript, I will centre my discussion of Peter and Bernard’s epistolary debate in these four letters.

The debate of Peter the Venerable and Bernard of Clairvaux emerges from these letters as a discrete segment of a much broader concern with law and custom permeating the twelfth-century Church. Through the four letters to Bernard, I scrutinize Peter’s theorizing: on his role as abbot, on the proper relationship with his own monks and on the

³ LPV, ep. 161, I, p. 390; Si enim de nouiciis susciipiendis, si de opere manuum, si de uestibus et quibusdam similibus, a bonis patribus post sanctum Benedictum, mutatum est, non dubia sed certa et rationabili causa factum est. Et causa vel ratio, quia bis a me in duabus epistolis, olim domino abbati Clareuallensi directis, studiose descripta est, hic iterare superflium iudico. This letter is discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.
⁴ These letters date to September or October of 1149 (LPV, II, pp. 198-99), thus were potentially written after letter 161 (ca 1144/56).
⁵ LPV, II, p. 61
foundation of his monastic program. It is key to note that Peter makes arguments against Bernard which not only serve to convince Cistercians but would also persuade Cluniacs to follow his reforms. He glorifies the observances of his institution, but also undercuts them. He advocates certain things, but then does not in subsequent letters. He identifies himself as against Cistercians (thus ensuring that he is not taken as one of them) even though the nature of his reforms suggest a relatively close ideology.6

While foundational for understanding his theory of reform, Peter the Venerable’s letters to Bernard also provide valuable evidence of his rhetorical machinations and his textual strategies of authority. Central to this effort is the combined use of affective and logical argumentation. Looking at each letter individually in a chronological progression, I chart out the continuity and disjunctures of his ideas and his forms of textual power.

THEORY OF REFORM I: DEBATE OVER CHARITY (LETTER 28)

A few years after his ascension to the abbacy of Cluny, likely in 1127, Peter the Venerable wrote a long letter to Bernard of Clairvaux.7 In this letter—the first text written between the two monastic figures—Peter outlines a defence of Cluniac customs and a rejection of Cistercian criticisms. But why? Was he preemptively attacking Cistercians, whose growing influence he feared? Was he simply responding to Cistercian invective? Both possibilities have been argued, but scholarship now generally accepts that Peter’s letter is a response to Cistercian polemic. It replies to Bernard of Clairvaux’s Apologia,

6 Cf. chapter seven.
which was written some time before letter 28. Bernard’s apologetic treatise is framed as if an open letter chastising Cistercian monks for their pride. It outlines a critique of Cluniac monasticism and a concurrent legitimization of Cistercian ideology/practices.

This work judged Cluny according to Cistercian criteria, something at which Peter bristled and to which his letter 28 responded. I argue that Peter’s letter did not merely seek to defend Cluny against its detractors, but it was also intended to define his vision of Cluniac monasticism to its adherents and supporters. Since Peter was still in the early years of his abbacy (ca 1127) and was unsure in his power over the ecclesia cluniacensis, we can see in this letter the first instance of his theorizing about the widespread reformulation of Cluniac monasticism.

The nature of Peter’s discussion has been well summarized. The structure of the letter, as Knight outlines, comprises three major sections: a) a detailed summary of Cistercian accusations against the Cluniacs, b) a point by point reiteration of Cistercian criticisms, followed by a detailed rebuttal using textual authorities, logical argumentation,

---


10 LPV, ep. 28, I, p. 52-56.
ridicule and invective\textsuperscript{11}, and closing with c) an extended conclusion focusing on the ideal of salvation and the necessity of discretion.\textsuperscript{12} This structure foreshadows the form of argumentation later applied by Peter in his anti-heretical rhetoric.\textsuperscript{13}

Though written to Bernard, Peter frames his letter as if a reply to criticisms which he had heard, not from Bernard but from Cistercian monks generally. From the salutation, we see that Peter projects an image of Bernard as a Cluniac sympathizer, "To Bernard, the lord abbot of Clairvaux, venerable on account of your qualities, beloved (\textit{dilectissimo}) on account of your affection\textsuperscript{14} (\textit{affectu}) towards us, the brother Peter, the humble abbot of the Cluniacs, wishes present health and eternal salvation".\textsuperscript{15} Bernard’s esteem for Cluny is presented in the salutation as the reason why Peter writes to him about the divide between the Cluniacs and Cistercians. In a perfunctory \textit{captatio benevolentiae}, Peter expresses his mutual love for Bernard, whose good reputation (\textit{bonae conuersionis tuae aromata}) has long won Peter’s love and esteem. His letter, Peter remarks, provides the opportunity to deepen this love:

I certainly would have preferred to reveal to you the secrets of my heart by the living word rather than to gather together these writings with a scurrying pen. But large distances of lands, much business and many hardships, [as well as] the bitterness of those attacking us have hitherto prevented this, lest it came to pass. […] I recognized in you the erudition of the secular world and, what is far more useful, [I saw you to be] equally instructed by and decorated with the wisdom of divine letters […] such that you –remaining a man rich [in wisdom]– are able to supplement the

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., pp. 57-88.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., pp. 88-101.
\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Order and Exclusion}, p. 125.
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Affectus} could also be read more neutrally as, ‘state of mind’ or ‘emotional position’; cf. Mary Carruthers, \textit{The Craft of Thought}, pp. 14-16. Perhaps \textit{affectus} can be interpreted as a reference to the care or oversight which Bernard has shown for the salvation of the Cluniacs i.e. in his \textit{Apologia}.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{LPV}, ep. 28, I, p. 52; \textit{Pro meritis uenerabili, pro affectu erga nos dilectissimo, domino Bernardo Clareuallis abbatii, frater Petrus humiliis Cluniacensiium abbas, salutem praesement, et salutem aeternam}. In the first lines of the letter, Peter continues with an expansion of Bernard’s belovedness, citing his good reputation (described as a ‘smell’ and “fragrance”, much the description of the Cistercians in letter 35) as enticing Peter’s heart and filling him with desire for Bernard.
indigence of others and to bring forth a clear judgement regarding doubtful things.\textsuperscript{16}

In the final part of this passage, Peter refers to the “indigence of others” and “doubtful things”, which I interpret as a reference to his own writing, i.e. the letter 28. He offers a typically humble valuation of his own letter while simultaneously praising Bernard’s ability to make his meager text speak out. The implication of Peter’s humbleness/ praise is that if his argument fails to be disseminated, it is owing to Bernard’s inadequacy – either as an educated rhetor or as a friend. Friendship and the reputation which stimulated it provides the opportunity for Peter’s thoughts to be introduced to the Cistercians and to encourage Bernard, their spokesman, to be responsible for communicating Peter’s message.

The meaning of Peter’s letter is made immediately evident, as the letter quickly modulates into a disputation of a catalogue of Cistercian accusations. Peter recounts what “certain of your [monks] object to ours [my monks and myself]” and follows this list with what “ours” reply.\textsuperscript{17} The use of “yours” and “ours” is used consistently throughout the text. Though letter 28 is a response to Bernard’s Apologia, Peter avoids addressing Bernard’s criticisms directly. Instead he locates his debate with Bernard within the context of an institutional schism, in which Bernard’s ideas (as expressed in the Apologia) are ostensibly those of the Cistercians and Peter’s ideology is presented as the typical Cluniac thought. This depiction has the effect of highlighting the abbots as responsible for their monks, while depersonalizing the conflict between them. Bernard is

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 53; Malui quippe uivo sermone secreta cordis mei tibi aperire, quam haec seedulac calamo percurrente committere. Sed multa terrarum intercapedo, multa negotiorum et tribulationum, nobis ingruitium amaritudo, hoc ne continget hucusque prohibuerunt. [...] Nomi enim te eruditione saecularium, et quod est longe utilius scientia diuinarum litterarum instructum pariter et ornatum, [...] ut et aliorum indigentiam ipse diues permanens supplere, et de dubis certam ferre sententiam ualeas.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 53, 57; Obiiciunt itaque nostris quidam vestrorum [...]; Ad haec nostri [...]
highlighted, moreover, as apart from and above his monks until the very end of the letter. This presentation of their abbot (already presented as learned and admired by all) encourages the imitation among the Cistercians of his supposed acceptance of Peter’s thought and good will. The pre-existing love for their abbot thus seems to be co-opted for a Cluniac end.

The text develops as if a legal debate in which Peter is the spokesman for the Cluniacs. Textual “witneses” are appealed to, and the language of jurisprudence grounds the discussion.\(^{18}\) As Peter presents the case, the Cistercian perspective is refuted, criticisms of Cluny are proved unfounded and Cluny remains unharmed. Unlike Cistercian polemic, Peter is careful to point out, his argument is not based in the language of invective, but embodied in reasoning.\(^{19}\) His argument is made substantively, not, as he imputes to his opponents, with “mere words” (*nudis verbis*).\(^{20}\) Peter does not deny the criticisms about Cluniac monks. Yes, they fail to live in complete accordance with the “letter” of the *Rule*, he admits. One example he provides acknowledges a potential criticism but shows its ridiculousness: guests cannot be received in full accordance with the precept of Saint Benedict, since it would be impractical and impossible to have hundreds of monks welcoming each arrival.\(^{21}\) To do so would contradict Benedict’s injunction of enclosure and would impede the practice of more useful spiritual exercises. Here, as he does quite often in this letter and in his writings in general, he makes an argument from necessity and utility before appealing to textual authorities, in this case

\(^{18}\) *Correspondence*, p. 30.

\(^{19}\) Peter’s conclusion is bolstered by Iogna-Prat’s assessment of Bernard’s anti-heretical discourse (*Order and Exclusion*, pp 126-28), which bases itself in traditional polemic and invective, omitting any arguments from logic.

\(^{20}\) *LPV*, ep. 28, I, p. 83; *Order and Exclusion*, p. 121.

\(^{21}\) *LPV*, ep. 28, I, pp. 71-72.
the words of Benedict himself. Peter suggests that strictly following Benedict’s precepts for the reception of guests at Cluny revolts against logic and the cherished concept of monastic claustration. This contradiction arises from the specific context of Cluny (e.g. the huge number of its guests and monks) and justifies the Cluniac adaptation:

It is necessary that we return to what we outlined above and from this show that we fully keep the Rule. Saint Benedict said, Let the abbot so temper and dispose all things so that souls may be saved (RB, 41:5). He said, all things, he excepted nothing. If therefore, the abbot is allowed to temper and dispose all things for the good of souls, it is lawful for him to temper these things which have been mentioned.\(^\text{22}\)

The discretion of the abbot allows him to resolve the contradiction between the different expectations of the Rule. But only the abbot, Peter argues, is justified in making changes. There is a discrepancy, however, between this presentation and the Cistercian one. It was not abbatial discretion that the Cistercians declaimed but rather that the Cluniacs “renounce the precepts of the fathers for your traditions”\(^\text{23}\). On account of this discrepancy, the argument about the Rule may target more a Cluniac audience, than a Cistercian one, as I will further address below.

In the peroration of his letter, Peter returns to a personal form of address and to the issue of the love Bernard is said to hold for Cluny. Peter asserts that the arguments and authorities of the Cluniacs (i.e. of letter 28) have destroyed the Cistercian position. “Your charity,” Peter continues, “ought to keep in mind (mentem) that divine mandates are sometimes mobile, at other times immobile”\(^\text{24}\). Now for the first time Peter directs his words directly at Bernard whose mind (singular) should be changed, since his charity

\(^{22}\) Ibid., p. 73; oportet ut ad illa quae superius posuimus recurramus, et inde a nobis regulam integre conservari probemus. Sic inquit beatus Benedictus, abbas omnia temperet atque disponat, ut animae saluentur. Omnia dixit, nichil excaepit. Si igitur pro salute animarum licet abbati omnia temperare atque disponere, licuit haec quae dicta sunt sic temperare [...].

\(^{23}\) Ibid., p. 53; patrum praecepta pro vestris traditionibus abicitis.

\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 88; Hoc tamen reducere ad mentem caritas uestra debet, quod diuina mandata partim mobilia partim sunt immobilia.
forces him to reconsider. We see here a typical use by Peter of his rhetoric of love in which logic and emotion are tied together. Peter asserts that he has rationally and conclusively demonstrated his position to Bernard’s mind. Only charity (which here is most suitably understood as charity in intention) remains to flower, which, if Bernard will not change his mind, is notably absent in him and among the Cistercians. To not alter his position towards the Cluniacs, Peter argues, speaks of Bernard’s failure as a monk, which is underscored since Peter no longer speaks of human love (*amor, diligo*) but of divine love (*caritas*). For his audience, Peter quickly outlines a definition of charity as an affective force, “infusing itself in the hearts of the first fathers” (*priorum patrum cordibus se infundens*), providing the precepts allowing human salvation and creating in turn unanimity within the hearts of Christians ever since the time of the apostolic Jerusalem community.  

The implication of this definition—that his Cistercian audience and Bernard especially needed to be told what is charity—likely was intended to humiliate, but perhaps also to convert them, by this humbling, to a proper intention in charity.

By this point of the letter Peter has shifted his discussion to a meditation upon charity and dispensation. This section shows Peter’s transference of charity from a discussion on personal ethics (cognition) to an institutional ethos. Instead of refuting specific Cistercian criticisms, Peter targets the mentality underlying them to demonstrate why the Cluniac interpretation of the *Rule* must be accepted.  

This section forms a complement to Peter’s suggestion that Bernard/ the Cistercians lack a proper sense and understanding of charity. Peter explicitly outlines the proof that charity does not mean an

---

25 Ibid., pp. 88-89.
26 *Correspondence*, pp. 35-36.
unchanging adherence to the *Rule*, as he portrays the Cistercians doing.\(^{27}\) Why is a literal adherence to the *Rule* necessary, Peter contends, when it is the spiritual foundation not the physical acts which bring about the salvation of the soul? *Caritas* (depicted as an interpretive imperative) provides the solution to this confrontation:

> What has changed many old precepts in this manner, what has instituted new ones, what has imposed first this and then that precept, if not charity, being mindful of customs, times, places, sometimes for the general, at other times for the particular good, but always in a solicitous manner, mindful of human salvation?\(^{28}\)

All laws of the Church, Peter contends, must follow the rule of charity. The *Rule of Saint Benedict* too, must be founded on this basis, and thus the *Rule* can be changed because of it (as Benedict himself says). Since all salvation occurs through charity and the *Rule of Saint Benedict* itself is subject to charity, then the *Rule* cannot be the final word. To argue for a literal observance, as the Cistercians do, is to do injury to charity Peter concludes.

As long as context is taken into account (i.e. customs, times and places), old precepts can be dispensed with and new observances can be instituted.

---

\(^{27}\) *LPV*, ep. 28, I, pp. 97-98; “You [the Cistercians] have said, “St. Benedict framed his Rule either with or without charity. But none of you [i.e. the Cluniacs] dare affirm that he framed it without charity. Therefore, you do not deny that he framed it with charity. Since the Rule was framed with charity, it was not to be changed. If it was not to be altered, then it was to be adhered to. Therefore, either you injure the saint by changing it or you obey it by maintaining it in all things.” And to this we [the Cluniacs reply], “It is evident that the *Rule* was framed by charity, [but] it is not evident that for this reason it is not to be changed. Rather, since it was framed by charity, it follows that it was [intended] to be altered.” *Dissisit*: *Sed sine caritate beatus Benedictus regulam aut cum caritate condidit. Sed sine caritate eum illam condidisse, nemo uerum audet affirmare. Cum caritate igitur eam non negatis conditam, iam quia per caritatem condita constat, mutanda non fuit. Si mutanda non fuit, tenenda fuit. Aut ergo mutando intueriam sancto infertis, aut tenendo ei in omnibus obaeditis. Et nos ad haec: Quia per caritatem regulam condita est, constat, quia ideo mutanda non fuit non constat. Immo quia per caritatem condita est, sequitur quia mutanda fuit.*

\(^{28}\) Ibid., p. 90; *Quid multa in hunc modum uetusta praecipua mutavit, quid noua instituit quid nunc ista nunc illa mandavit, nisi pro moribus, temporibus, locis, nunc generaliter, nunc specialiter, semper tamen humanae saluti sollicitae inseruientiis caritas?* Translation adapted from Eugene Goodrich, “The Limits of Friendship: A disagreement between Saint Bernard and Peter the Venerable on the role of charity in dispensation from the Rule,” *Cistercian Studies* 16 (1981), pp. 81-97, here pp. 85-86.
Peter’s discussion of charity owes a great deal to the formulation of this principle in the legal writings of Ivo of Chartres (1040-1115). Ivo, like Bernard and Peter, was writing before the golden age of canon law, when the exact nature of law and reform continued to be worked out. Ivo of Chartres’ major contribution to the history of canon law (and in particular to Peter and Bernard’s writings) was the formulation in his Prologus of a general theory of law and dispensation. Ivo posits two distinct kinds of law, one eternal and the other contingent. Contingent laws (praecptae) can be changed through dispensation, which is synonymous with changes instituted by licit authority. Peter cites Ivo’s collection in his letter 28, noting that when there is necessity, one in power has the right to make changes for the utility of the Church. Peter compares himself to the pope, though as abbot of Cluny, he is only responsible for the ecclesia cluniacensis. The abbot of Cluny, he asserts, is responsible for ensuring that the means to salvation are not set in stone because he must update the laws of his church according to new conditions. To deny the dispensing power of charity, as Peter argues the Cistercians do, is to reproduce the attitudes of the Pharisees who adhere to the old law and reject the divine revelations of Christ. Though Peter refers to his monks as “the more ancient” and the Cistercians as “new”, he reverses this in his presentation of the Cistercian mentality, which he presents as the same as that of Jews unwilling to receive the revelation of the

29 Cf. the introduction to Le précepte, pp. 44-47. Callerot, Miethke and Jaquinod note that Bernard’s De praecptae vel dispensatione also takes its formulation of law from Ivo via Peter’s letter 28, though he may have had access to other texts.
31 LPV, ep. 28, I, pp. 61-62, 80.
32 Ibid., pp. 57, 97; Correspondence, p. 44.
New Testament. This inversion recalls Peter’s humiliation of the Cistercian abbots in letter 35, where their exalted self-conception is deflated. In the context of letter 28 such an intent is far from central, though the promotion of Cistercian humility seems well suited to Peter’s other affective strategies against Cluniac detractors. Having already accused Bernard and the Cistercians of lacking proper charity, Peter’s arguments certainly point to a desire for the Cistercians to reevaluate their monastic foundation.

The effect of this inversion of the Cistercian position is quite different when a Cluniac audience is considered. By it, Peter also shows the Cluniacs to be the more suitable monks, since they accept the possibility of innovation, are not bound by the restrictions of literalism and have accepted God’s offering of charity. Cluny is presented as both new and old, able to accommodate new situations and not irrationally bound to a finite Rule. Implicit in this discussion, it seems, is an argument against pure orthopraxy and for orthodoxy. Bernard sees value in acts (in Peter’s presentation), while Peter perceives validity in intentions, an argument for which, given the prevailing ideology of the twelfth-century, Peter would increasingly find considerable support. The solution to the Cistercian criticisms, moreover, likely serves Peter’s promotion of change within Cluny. If Cluniac observances are defined by their grounding in the dispensation of charity, what is to stop them from changing again? Must any custom be adhered to blindly? And who is responsible for making such changes? Peter argues for the preeminence of the abbot in making these decisions and being responsible for all

33 Cf. the discussion of letters 35 and 36 at the end of chapter three.
legislative action. As we see in letter 111, Peter continues to argue that monastic practice needs to be constantly updated, though he moves away from advocating the necessity of the abbot to be solely responsible for ensuring its continued modernitas. In this later letter, we also see a confidant Peter, on the offensive and seeking to humiliate his Cistercian opponents.

THEORY OF REFORM II: REWORKING CUSTOM (LETTER 111)

Letter 111 is a second epistolary treatise focused on the subject of reform belonging to the Peter/Bernard correspondence. Like letter 28, it is one of the longest texts in Peter the Venerable’s collection and it again presents itself as a reply to Cistercian criticisms of Cluny. The letter dates from early 1144 and follows after a period of apparent silence between Bernard and Peter. It is not a coincidence, I believe, that this letter dates from the same time as the second redaction of his other works concerned with reforming Cluniac monastic practices: the De miraculis (ca 1142) and the codification of the Statuta (1146). Just as these two texts are rewritten from an earlier redaction, so too does letter 111 rework the ideas of letter 28.

One of the major goals of this letter is a continued theorizing about the foundation of monastic practice. In this letter, we see Peter at a time when no longer faced by the outright resistance of his monks: he softens his position on abbatial discretion and, having refined his discourse on inferiority, presents reform as both an individual and institutional spiritual process demanding love and reason. As we will see in subsequent chapters,

35 This point is discussed at length in Eugene Goodrich, “The Limits of Friendship,” pp. 81-97.
36 LPV, ep. 111, I, pp. 274-99 with dating and notes, II, pp. 172-74. This letter has received far less attention than letter 28. A brief summary is provided by Knowles, art. “The Reforming Decrees,” pp. 4-5, as part of his introduction to the Statuta. Knight offers an excellent thematic and stylistic commentary (Correspondence, pp. 101-53), but she does not note that this letter functions as a rebuttal of Bernard’s De praecipio vel dispensatione.
37 Correspondence, p. 101.
many of the ideas Peter expresses in letter 111 are also developed for a Cluniac audience in the *De miraculis* and in the preface to the *Statuta*.

The second objective of this letter is to address the continuing disharmony between the Cistercians and Cluniacs. In this letter Peter subtly identifies Bernard as promoting this “monastic schism” and seeks to rebuke him alongside other fractious monks. Under the veil of fraternal unity and charity, Peter takes another opportunity to argue the licitness of altering custom at Cluny and, paralleling his letter 35, to humiliate Cistercian pretensions. We can also see in this letter, as I argue below, a response to Bernard’s treatise, *De praeccepto uel dispensatione* (*ca* 1142/44) which provided additional motivation for Peter to write.

Letter 111 can be divided roughly into three major sections directed at past, present and future action. The first part is a short reply to Bernard’s previous letter, the second a lengthy criticism of the current state of monastic disharmony and the final, a brief exhortation for Bernard to direct his pen against Islam. As a whole, the letter attempts to set up the proper conditions for a resolution; first, of the epistolary silence between the two abbots, second, of what Peter calls the ‘monastic schism’ and last, of the dangers posed against Christendom. The middle section is the most relevant for understanding his conception of reform. It is necessary, however, to first understand the context of this section within the letter.

Peter’s letter opens with an extended quotation from the last letter sent to him by Bernard of Clairvaux. Peter reorders, reworks and refutes this text.\(^{38}\) Bernard’s letter itself is a response to an earlier letter of Peter, no longer extant, in which Peter appears to

---

have tried to initiate a new epistolary dialogue.\textsuperscript{39} This section of Peter’s letter is filled with the language of \textit{amicitia}, and the friendship between them forms the justification for why Peter writes to him again. His discussion of their epistolary relationship, however, contains a defensive reaction to Bernard’s previous letter. Without the text of Peter’s initial letter, the gist of Bernard’s reply is difficult to reconstruct. A hint of suspicion clearly underlies Bernard’s letter, which opens asking:

\begin{quote}
Does it please you to joke like this? Graciously indeed and in a friendly manner provided that you play in such a way as not to mock. Do not wonder at this, for your so sudden and unexpected favour makes it suspect to me.\textsuperscript{40}
\end{quote}

Bernard presents a tone of suspicion and a calculated rebuke of Peter’s previous letter writing. He then continues with an inquiry into Peter’s joking tone, language and intent, which modulates into an affirmation of his own silence. Bernard says,

\begin{quote}
I will sit and I will be silent. […] And lest you alone seemed to have joked (\textit{lusisse}) with me, I think that you will not now dare to rebuke me for this silence of mine.\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

Bernard seems to equate his own silence with joking/ play, but how is silence playful? Up until this point, Bernard associates play with ambiguity and suspicion in meaning as well as a means of mockery. Is he joking, then, that he wishes to remain silent? Or that he says he’s silent, but is not really? Or perhaps that his silence is a means to mock and ridicule Peter?

It is difficult to understand Bernard’s message, but from Peter’s reply we perceive his dissatisfaction with this “game”. Peter repeats Bernard’s question back to him, “Does

\textsuperscript{39} Such is also the conclusion of Gillian Knight, \textit{Correspondence}, pp. 109-10.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{LPV}, ep. 110, I, p. 272; translated in \textit{Correspondence}, p. 107; \textit{Itane iocari libet? Dignanter sane atque amicabiliter, sed si ita luditis, ut non illudatis. Nolite mirari hoc, nam suspexit id michi facit ustra ipsas tam inopinata dignatio.}

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{LPV}, ep. 110, I, p. 273, adapted from the translation in \textit{Correspondence}, p. 108; \textit{Sedebo et silebo […] Et ne solus uideamini michi lusisse, puto iam non audebitis hoc nostrum silentium reprehendere.}
it please you to joke like this?" returning Bernard’s suspicions and characterizing Bernard as the offending prankster. He comments about himself, “I do not play, but strive in earnest to bar acknowledged rivalries from the hearts of many and desire that you incite yours to prevent [them also].” We glimpse here a repetition of Peter’s initial suggestion in letter 28 (emphasized here as having been made sincerely), that Bernard himself should take the lead in dampening his monks’ antagonism towards Cluny. Gillian Knight also sees in the flowery praise of Bernard’s letter allusions to Peter’s admiration of Bernard’s education which prefaced letter 28. These preliminary features indicate that Peter intends to reprise the material of this previous letter to Bernard. As Knight has well demonstrated, this introduction serves to highlight both Peter’s intention to reopen public debate on the monastic schism and his rejection of Bernard’s suggested public silence. I believe that these initial allusions to silence anticipate a discussion appearing later in the letter which criticizes the Cistercians’ “false” and injurious silence. As I will discuss further in this chapter, silence, or rather the lack of silence, is an important focus of criticism directed at Bernard whose treatise on dispensation, De praecypo uel dispensatione, had already signaled an antagonistic reopening of the Cluniacl/ Cistercian debate.

The second section of the letter is a simulated dialogue between a Cistercian and a Cluniac, designed to resolve monastic divisions. Just as in letter 28, Peter constructs an imaginary exchange between stereotypical figures who support the Cistercian and Cluniac perspectives. These two combatants are again identified as “ours” and “yours”:

---

42 LPV, ep. 111, I, p. 276; Itane iocari libet?
43 Ibid.; qui nos simulataes de multorum cordibus non ludo sed serio excludere satago, et ad excludendum uos incitare intendo [...].
44 Correspondence, p. 118.
I see that some of both our and your sheepfolds have held themselves mutually opposed to one another in sworn combat and they who ought to live in the house of the Lord under one spirit have fallen away from mutual charity.\textsuperscript{46}

Unlike letter 28 where Peter only talked of Cistercian hostility, here Peter admits the loss of caritas on the part of some Cluniacs as well. Peter presents himself as blameless in this regard and despite his clear affiliation with Cluny, he identifies himself as an impartial mediator working on the behalf of all monks. His discourse is that of an inquisitor and chief prosecutor litigating the case of the schism before the courts of charity.\textsuperscript{47} Using the language and forms of juridical discourse, Peter seems to chastise equally the Cluniacs and the Cistercians for their accusations and explores the causes of their mutual animosity. Unlike letter 28 where Peter’s authorial voice was clearly associated with the defence of Cluny, in letter 111 Peter prefers to project an impartial role, where he adjudges both sides. The presentation of himself as the only capable judge indirectly impugns Bernard and his role in the schism.

The letter seeks out the reasons for discord in order to develop a solution. Peter’s argument proceeds from an analysis of three potential origins: two false and one true. The first cause is a difference of customs. Peter’s discussion first proceeds from the abundant citation of patristic and monastic textual authority, by which he asserts that the Church has always allowed and encouraged diversity of customs. The second stage of this argument is the move to logical reasoning. Logic affirms that “the simple eye of charity,” as he terms it, allows different Cluniac and Cistercian customs to be equally justified (he provides parallel lists of observances). The second false cause is the difference, not of

\textsuperscript{46} LPV, ep. 28, I, p. 277; Cerno aliquos tam de nostris ouilibus quam de uestris aduersum se invicem iurata bella suscapiisse et eos qui in domo domini habitare unanimes debuerant, a caritate mutua descuisses.
\textsuperscript{47} Correspondence, pp. 129-30.
customs generally, but of the colour of the habit specifically. Peter burlesques the Cluniacs’ and Cistercians’ ridicule of each other’s habits, showing that this division is antithetical to the spirit and words of the Rule of Saint Benedict. He asserts that while tradition and all authorities support the black clothing, white is allowed only according to the dispensation of charity. We will return to a discussion of this argument later in this chapter, as part of a discussion of Peter’s continuing attempt to humble the Cistercian audience. By his mockery of antagonistic monks, Peter segues to the final and, as Peter asserts, true cause behind the schism: the pride of the Cistercians and the envy of the Cluniacs.

Peter’s letter suggests that the resolution of this schism lies not in the monks themselves, or in the modification of their institutions, but in a change of priority. This topic is addressed in the third and final section of the letter. As Peter portrays, Satan promotes competition between the Cluniacs and Cistercians as a means to allow his troops to grow in strength (this is a return to an image taken from letter 35). The monks now need to direct their competitive spirit towards defending Christendom against the perfidy of Islam. The only legitimate spiritual warfare, he concludes, is that targeting the detractors of the Christian church.

On the surface Peter’s letter argues for the reconciliation of monks through solidarity against Islam. Peter’s words, however, hide a private criticism and admonishment directed at Bernard of Clairvaux. We glimpse this subtext from a comment at the very end of the letter. In urging Bernard to write on the evils of Islam,

---

49 Ibid., pp. 294-95.
Peter offers a newly translated copy of the Koran as encouragement. In recompense, Peter requests that Bernard also send him one of his treatises:

Send me, if you would [...] that letter of yours [...] which you sent, I believe, to some monks in Chartres [...] I once read it at Cluny but have never since been able to get hold of it to read it again.50

This letter is Bernard’s work *De praeceto vel dispensatione* written soon before Peter’s own letter 111.51 Composed at the request of monks at Saint-Père-en-Vallée outside Chartres, this treatise considers to what extent abbots and monks have the right to dispense with a literal observance of the *Rule of St. Benedict*.52 Bernard took the opportunity to consider the problems of abbatial power and of monks transferring between monasteries (of which he disapproved). Underlying his explanations, however, was the ranking of monastic observances, with the Cistercians above all. The Benedictine brothers at Chartres, and perhaps Cluniacs generally, were encouraged to adopt the better Cistercian customs. In many ways, this treatise resembles a second *Apologia* in that it covertly attacks Cluny under the guise of providing guidance to Benedictine monks.

The majority of letter 111 (i.e. the second section with its discussion of the three possible origins of the monastic conflict) attacks the arguments made in Bernard’s *De praeceto vel dispensatione*. As I shall outline further below, the correlations of ideas between the letter 111 and *De praeceto* suggest Peter employed Bernard’s treatise as the basis for his construction of a Cistercian-Cluniac dialogue.53 The “you” Peter admonishes

---

50 Ibid., p. 299; *Mittite si placet* [...] *epistolam illam uestram quibusdam Carnotensibus monachi ut michi uidetur missam* [...] *quam Cluniaci semel legi, sed nunquam postea ad relegendum habere potui*.
53 The lack of exact textual analogs can also be explained by Peter’s assertion (cited above) that he had been able to read it once, but no longer possessed a copy of it.
is both a stereotypical monk and Bernard himself. Peter’s request for a copy serves to emphasize to the reader (whether Bernard or a wider audience) an explicit link between his reason for writing and Bernard’s work. Though this relation between Bernard’s treatise and Peter’s letter 111 has attracted little attention from scholars, it is key for understanding Peter’s letter. This text is the instantiation of Bernard’s false silence and Peter’s reference to it exposes Bernard’s most recent attempt at stirring up dissent between the Cistercians and the Cluniacs. The dating of the treatise to ca 1142/4 explains why Peter may have reinitiated a correspondence with Bernard. Just as Peter’s letter 28 was an indirect response to the Apologia, letter 111 sought to refute and rework Bernard’s De praecippo.

In essence, Peter’s debate in letter 111 about the two false causes of the monastic schism (the difference of customs and habits) continues and reprises the material (and especially the peroration) of letter 28. Peter again questions Bernard’s criteria for evaluating proper monastic observance and what should underlie the critical judgement of the legislator. Unlike letter 28 where the discussion focuses only on Cluniac observances, in letter 111 Peter compares Cistercian practices with Cluniac customs, ultimately presenting them as different but not conflicting instantiations of religious observances.

---

54 Knight (Correspondence, p. 150) follows Eugene Goodrich’s interpretation of the debate over charity in the letters of Peter and Bernard. Goodrich cites the De praecippo as an important embodiment of Bernard’s thought on charity, but he does not note its usage within letter 111 (art. “The Limits of Friendship,” pp. 91-92). His brief discussion on the De praecippo focuses on the ideas of law shared by this treatise and Peter’s letter 111 without noting that one is a response to the other.

55 The first medieval use of this diversi sed non adversi argument is found in a letter of Anselm of Laon (ca 1117), subsequently also employed by Peter Abelard and Hugh of Saint-Victor among others; cf. Hubert Silvestre, “Diversi sed non adversi,” Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale 31 (1964), pp. 124-132. This formula may be inspired, as Silvestre argues, by a passage from Augustine of Hippo’s Enarratio in Psalmos.
Peter finishes his letter 28 with a critique of the Cistercian interpretation of adherence to the *Rule*. He concludes that Cistercians have improperly understood and maintained charity, which thus has distorted their judgements. Likewise, Peter's letter 111 takes up the question of the proper way to perceive the *Rule*. The idea of the *oculus simplex* is used by Peter (and Bernard in the *De praecpto*) to designate the evaluative capacity (involving both spiritual and intellectual perception) necessary to attain true knowledge. Though every monk should seek out this form of perception as part of his individual spiritual exercises, Peter and Bernard shift this interpretive framework (analogous to *intentio*, I believe) to the unique position of one legislating monastic precepts.

Peter and Bernard agree that the abbot holds a preeminent position as legislator, but they differ over how abbatial discretion (i.e. the ability to institute new precepts) is justified. Both admit that the abbot must scrutinize precepts and customs with the *oculus simplex* in order to perceive the proper course of action. This discretionary gaze is defined as a fundamentally different mechanism by Bernard and Peter.

In the *De praecpto uel dispensatione*, Bernard employs the concept of the *oculus simplex* in the middle of a treatise asking whether a monk was justified in disobeying his abbot or his profession in order to seek better observances. Bernard begins the work by cautioning against any form of disobedience and emphasizing the binding validity of the monastic profession. His argument proceeds to argue that what is professed is only the minimum in observance and thus any monk may also deepen his commitment through more strict (i.e. Cistercian) observances even if not required. As Bernard asserts, monks can live a better life even if not in a monastery of a better

---

observance. Bernard’s solution for the monks at Saint-Père-en-vallée is a practical one: obedience to the abbot (even if he seems to contravene good observance) is preferable to self-will which can lead to error.

Bernard advocates the necessity of obedience because of the difficulty for the average monk to attain true knowledge. Only a few are able to perceive truly the proper order of things, i.e. to see with an oculus simplex. The criteria are twofold: “I believe two things are necessary for the interior eye to be truly simple; that is charity in the intention and truth in the choice”. By citing “charity in intention” we can note a return to the topic of Peter’s letter 28 where a charitable intentio is identified as the ultimate interpretive framework for all monastic customs. Proper intention is the first step in evaluating monastic custom, but adhering to the true is a necessary complement for Bernard. What Bernard denotes by “truth in the choice” is less evident.

Bernard admits that it is difficult for anyone to know truth in an absolute sense, and thus certainty should be found more in the cultivation of literalism than innovation. This becomes an argument for the literal adherence to the Rule. The way of truth, Bernard suggests, is to “live the Rule”, not just “according to the Rule”. Who lives the Rule? The Cistercians. Who lives according to the Rule? For Bernard, all other monks. He asks rhetorically whether on this account monks should transfer to places with better and truer observances. He answers negatively, concluding that there would be too many problems inherent to that solution. Bernard urges his readers, instead, to follow harsher customs within the monastery of their profession and increase the austerity of their

---

57 Ibid., 21, pp. 269-70 (121-22).
58 Ibid., 36, pp. 279 (133); Ego vero, ut interior oculus vere simplex sit, duo illi esse arbitror necessaria: caritatem in intentione et in electione veritatem.
practices. To cap this discussion he asks rhetorically, "Should the monks of Marmoutier, for example, profess the customs of the Cluniacs or should perhaps the latter profess the rites of the former? Should both profess the literal strictness of the Cistercians?" This option, left unanswered, has only one logical outcome—all monks should follow Cistercian uses if they are concerned about their salvation. Other observances are possible, but Cistercian monasticism is the only "true" and thus best observance. For this reason, Bernard notes, the Rule was devised by Benedict:

not because it is unlawful to live in a different manner, but because this manner of life was found to be expedient for the gaining and preservation of charity. As long as they serve this end, they stand fixed and immutable and cannot licitly be changed, even by superiors.

Due to the transcendental authority of Benedict’s text, subsequent legislators can only modify precepts when they are opposed to charity, not only for the purpose of promoting it. By advocating the necessity of literal readings of the Rule, Bernard’s treatise argues not only for Cistercian preeminence, but also against the juridical voluntarism at the basis of Peter’s defence of Cluny. If the legislator is bound only to serve the Rule, then the modifications to the monastic regimen at Cluny are invalid despite the dispensatory right of the abbot.

Given his defence of Cluny in letter 28 in part rested on the practice of abbatial discretion, it is perhaps not surprising that Peter takes issue in letter 111 with Bernard’s argument. He cautions Bernard:

---

60 Ibid., 49, p. 287 (142).
61 Ibid., 48, pp. 286 (adapted from the English translation, p. 141); Numquid, verbi gratia, aut in Maiori Monasterio usus Cluniacensium, aut isti forte illorum ritus, aut vero utrique Cisterciensium distinctionem litteratoriam profitetur?
62 Ibid., 4, p. 257 (108); The passage reads in full, Porro inventa atque instituta fuerunt, non quia alter vivere non liceret, sed quod ita magis expediret, nec plane ad alium quam ad lucrum vel custodiam caritatis. Quamdiu ergo caritati militant, immobiliiter fixa sunt mutarisque omnino, ne ab ipsis quidem praepositis, sine offensa possunt.
Be careful, therefore, so that love of your own thinking does not cloud the light of your senses, since anyone who observes not unity but only that which he himself wishes, does not merit to obtain unity.\textsuperscript{63}

Peter admonishes that the Cistercians adhere to the true no better than the Cluniacs. Peter affirms that Cistercian and Cluniac customs both utilize the oculus simplex in their validation, but not in the form Bernard advocates. The oculus simplex is defined by Peter as “sincere charity and the intention of saving souls”.\textsuperscript{64} This definition is a valuable illustration that the salvation of as many souls as possible is the highest good of monasticism for Peter. The ultimate truth, according to Peter, is not as Bernard asserts, the literal observance of the Rule, but the rule of charity:

\begin{quote}
I say it is true, as you say, that the commandments of the same Rule are observed differently by those professed of the same Rule between communities. But lest you consider the monks at fault for these [differences], lest you dare argue based on this reason of transgression, listen to the authority of the King of Heaven, \textit{If your eye shall be simple, your whole body shall be light}. And hear the Apostle, \textit{Let everything you do be done in love}. Listen also to our father Augustine, \textit{Have love and do what you will}.\textsuperscript{65}
\end{quote}

Peter admits very readily that Cluniac practice is far less literal in observance since it seeks to follow a different intention than Citeaux.\textsuperscript{66} Peter does not believe, however, that monks have to live a life of austere simplicity in order to merit salvation equal to the Cistercians. Cluny does not focus on austerity but on refuge. Cluniac practice allows considerable leeway in clothing, prayer and manual labour since its mission is to save as

\textsuperscript{63} LPV, ep. 111, I, p. 280; \textit{Attendite ergo ne lucem sensuum uestrorum propriae sententiae amor obmubilet, quia unitatem assequi non meretur quisquis non ipsum sed quod uult ipse tuetur.}
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., p. 282; \textit{sincera caritate saluandarum animarum intentione.}
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., p. 281 (translation adapted from Goodrich, art. “The Limits of Friendship,” p. 93); \textit{Verum est inquam quod dicis, eiusdem regulae mandata in quibusdam capitulis ab eiusdem regulae professis dissimiliter observari. Sed ne huiusmodi monachos propter ista reos existimes, ne hac de causa praearciptiones arguere audaces, audi caelestem, immo regis caelorum auctoritatem: Si oculus tuus fuerit simplex, totum corpus tuum lucidum erit. Audi et apostolum: Omnia uestra in caritate fiant. Audi et patrem Augustinum: Habe caritatem, et fac quicquid uis.}
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., pp. 282-83.
many souls as possible by allowing them into the monastic life. The universal and egalitarian embrace of love is at the core of Peter’s monastic ideology, both in letter 111 and in his other works. As we saw in his letters to Cistercian brothers, for example, Peter conceives of love as uniting all Christians and promotes this as a force motivating positive action. In his argument in letter 111 Peter again uses charity to provide a theoretical justification for Cluniac monasticism and also to motivate Bernard to embrace a position of less animosity. The instrumental appeals in letter 111 to the love underlying Peter and Bernard’s friendship introduces the advocation of charity as a force for uniting their two observances. In letter 28, as in letter 111, Peter balances personal (Bernard’s love for Peter/Cluny) and spiritual love (the dispensing power of charity) as a means to persuade his position. If Bernard fails to accept the value of the Cluniac way of life, then he lacks proper love. Peter’s argument later continues, therefore, to demonstrate that a distinction between observances such as Bernard posits is impossible to maintain. Only love and charity defines the monastic quest for God.

The means of disproving Bernard’s argument that Cistercians adhered to a better religious life arises in Peter’s discussion of the monastic habit. In discussing the second false cause of the monastic schism (showing that wearing white and black are both valid), Peter returns to the theme of silence he originally addressed in the introduction of his letter. In order to ridicule the Cistercian and Cluniac hostility for one another, Peter portrays the two groups as absurd and ridiculous. Cluniac monks loudly mock the image of a white monk as if a monstrous chimera. Hypocritical Cistercian monks, however, are very talkative when alone, but present the image of silence when they see a black monk

---

67 Peter asserts here a very conventional picture of Cluny, mirrored also in his De miraculis, (see chapter six). The idea of Cluny as refuge or asylum is discussed in Order and Exclusion, pp. 37-54.  
68 LPV, ep. 111, I, p. 286.
approaching. Peter intends these images as a rebuke and through this mockery urges the need for a transformation of attitudes both among Cluniacs and Cistercians. The image of the Cistercian modulates, however, into an image of Satan silently stirring up heresies and schisms among men. The silent yet secretly talkative Cistercian reminds Peter of the kind of man in whom “evil plots with a corrupt heart” and, in a more forceful image, of Lucifer who always seeks to sow dissension between Christians. Peter highlights an image of false silence as the hallmark of division.

Why does Peter initiate an obvious digression away from the subject of the monastic habits to concern himself with an abstract issue of silence (or its lack)? In the introduction of the letter, we have already seen Peter’s criticism of Bernard for playing at being silent. Though there is no explicit identification, the image of the publicly silent but privately garrulous monk may be a depiction of Bernard himself. Like Satan who uses lies and half truths for stirring up divisions, Peter indirectly accuses Bernard too, of promoting discord with half truths. What is the lie? The first lie made by Bernard was in his previous letter to Peter where he asserted that he did not wish to talk further about the Cistercian/Cluniac schism. The De praecepto uel dispensatione evidences this untruth. Bernard’s second lie was made in the De praecepto uel dispensatione when he asserted that the Cistercians follow a “true” observance. The Cistercian habit shows the falsity of Bernard’s claim. This digression, therefore, has the effect of highlighting a flaw of Bernard’s argument in De praecepto vel dispensatione since Bernard has no justification for the Cistercians’ white habit. Peter reproduces this silence in his letter, by no longer excerpting any text or ideas from Bernard’s treatise for the duration of his argument.

69 Ibid., pp. 286-7.
70 Ibid., pp. 287-88 and again 292.
71 Ibid., p. 286; praeo corde machinatur malum (cited from Prov. 6.13-14)
against the habit. Bernard is made to appear mute and silent in light of Peter’s arguments. This rhetorical effect, therefore, seems to suggest that Bernard cannot account for the white habit as being in any way a literal observance of Benedict.

After evoking this theme, Peter demonstrates through abundant textual authority that there is no justification for a white habit. Peter concludes, therefore, that the white habit can only be justified by the oculus simplex, i.e. the dispensation of charity. Peter provides a positive interpretation of this failure to adhere to the Rule. The Cistercian monk, he politely comments, “is praised since he excites the fervour of his own soul more and more in its holy project through the unaccustomed brightness of his clothing”. The whiteness of clothing is useful, since it has a self-reflexive power, but it has no intrinsic value except that it spurs on its monks. Peter here also denotes a limitation of the Cistercian program, that they are too concerned with their own salvation, not that of all Christians. In contrast, therefore, the Cluniacs devote themselves to their particular interpretation of the Rule based in an ideal of charity. The Cluniacs do not need a white habit or a mostly literal observance, since their program is much more grounded in their particular traditions and customs. As Peter notes, “under this rule or under the profession of this rule, a monk is able to advance safely along different paths”. Peter reaffirms this relativism when he remarks, “take care to hold inwardly to the way which seems right to men,” reiterating the need for monks to adhere to their own particular spirituality, before criticizing that of others. This comment, moreover, suggests that Peter argues for an

---

72 Ibid., pp. 287-88.
73 Ibid., p. 290; laudatur et ille, quia vestium insolito candore, sui magis ac magis animi in sancto proposito excitat [...] fervorem (italics in the translation are mine).
74 Peter recalls here Bernard’s distinction between living the rule and living according to the profession of the rule. Compare De praecepto, 47-49, pp. 285-87 (140-42) with LPV, ep. 111, I, p. 281; sub eadem regula vel eiusdem regulae professione, per diversos tramites tuto monachus incedere possit.
75 LPV, ep. 111, I, p. 280;
adherence to a common interiorized orthodoxy which would overcome orthopraxic differences. We see an advocacy of interiority coming at the expense of exterior practices, an idea we note is also heavily emphasized in Peter’s *De miraculis.*

Peter’s promotion of monastic diversity based in relativism moderates the argument of letter 28. Whereas in letter 28 he justified Cluniac variation from the *Rule* as based in the abbatial right to dispensation, he seems to allow in letter 111 a broadening of what validates differences in monastic regimen. Speaking to the entirety of the Cistercian and Cluniac monks, Peter advises:

If you now wish, Cluniac brother, Cistercian brother, to keep this Charity intact which the apostle called the very *law of Christ,* if you wish to accumulate for yourself the greatest treasures in Heaven through it, [and] if you wish to keep them once accumulated, make every effort you can, and [...] shut the entrance of your steady heart to those relapsing and preserve the eternal cohabitant with every embrace of your holy heart. Charity retained firmly will lift you to the kingdom of Heaven.

Peter focuses on the interior: the monk is addressed as an individual (within a group), the condition must be willed (*uolo*), and maintained in the breast (*pectus, cor*). This reinforces Peter’s implication that *intentio* in charity be retained inwardly within each brother in order for each monk to attain heaven. This argument serves to contest Bernard’s conclusion that the individual monks need not concern themselves with considering “truth” but need only rely on the leadership of the abbot. This difference in argumentation suggests that Peter argues (in contrast to Bernard and letter 28) for a democratization of charitable perception which therefore should infuse the consciousness

---

76 Cf. chapter six.
77 *LPV,* ep. 28, I, p. 69; cf. above.
78 *LPV,* ep. 111, I, p. 293; *iam si hanc caritatem quam legem Christi idem apostolus uocat, uis frater Cluniacensis, frater Cisterciensis, integrum conservare, si per ipsam maximos tibi thesauros in caelo recondere, si reconditos conservare, da totam quam potueris operam [...] firi firmi pectoris redeuntibus ostium clade, et cohabitatricem sempiternam totis sanctae tuae amplexibns retine. Subieuabit te caritas ipsa firmiter retenta ad regna caelorum.*
of every religious person. Perhaps we can see in this argument a Peter in circumstances far different from those of the time of letter 28. Since letter 111 was written twenty-two years after the beginning of his abbacy, Peter's authority seems far more established. He no longer focuses on reform as the product of an authoritarian abbot with legislative power, but instead advocates reform as a personal spiritual renewal. This change urges that his Cluniac monks internalize reform as an interior process, accepting it not as a period of disjuncture but as the very basis of the path to salvation.

Peter the Venerable ends his discussion with a condemnation of Cistercian vainglory and Cluniac envy— the final and true causes of division. No austerity or simplicity will be able to save the Cistercians, he comments, if they remain proud:

The apostle was censured so that he would not prefer himself to another apostle and should not a monk also be censured lest he prefer himself to another monk? The better disciple was subjected to the lesser, the superior to the inferior, by Christ the teacher, and [yet] do I, a Cluniac, strive to be elevated above the Cistercian? Christ subjected himself to his disciples, and will a Christian and monk raise his neck swelling with pride above his brother perhaps far better?  

Peter concludes with a rejection of all differentiation or ranking of observance, rebuking the Cistercian pride for wanting to be exalted above the Cluniacs. The Cluniacs are similarly rebuked by Peter for their envy. The Cistercians should not be resented for their reputation, but rather their fervor should be imitated.  The Black monks, Peter suggests, are worthy and strong religious, but have grown and been shown as sluggish by their new

---

79 LPV, ep. 111, I, p. 292; Corripitur apostolus ne se praeferat apostolo, et non corripietur monachus, ne se praeferat monacho? Subponitur a Christo magistro, minori discipulo maior, inferiori superior, et super Cisterciensem ego Cluniensis eleuari conabor? Submitterit se suis discipulis ipse Christus, et super fratrem longe forsitans meliorem tumentem superbia leuabit cervicem Christianus et monachus?

80 Ibid., p. 291.
brothers. Cistercian pride and Cluniac envy share in common a lack of charity.\textsuperscript{81} The means to return to an intention in charity, Peter concludes, is humility:

\begin{quote}
From where humility departs, there by necessity pride enters. Where envy is born, immediately charity dies. For neither is it possible to love him whom the envious envy, nor is charity able in any way to remain in one not loving. On this account, where charity is lacking, so is humility and where humility is lacking, so is charity.\textsuperscript{82}
\end{quote}

Peter’s shift to promoting humility signals his true purpose in writing: to humiliate the Cistercians and Cluniacs. Humiliation does not work towards for political gain or for strategic advantage in the debate between Peter and Bernard in this context. Instead, it is the means to restructure the proper moral disposition of these monks, allowing charity to be grasped again. Humility here is conceived as the practice of virtue needing to be held to within one’s soul. Mere practices of humility (as he criticizes in letter 35) are insufficient without interior adherence.

Charity is also an intention to which Bernard himself should return, Peter comments:

\begin{quote}
Now at length, the pen hastens back to you, my beloved, to whom the present letter is sent so that, on that [topic] from which it took its beginning, it may finish its perhaps unfortunate proxility. With my conscience as witness, my reason for writing, as I professed above, was truly charity alone. In order that this [charity] completely bind us to one another, I strove to revive it by a breath of mutual discussion and to fan the accustomed flames of mutual affection even greater. It remains that you [also do so...] by word and example, not only to the monks but also to the whole of the Latin Church.\textsuperscript{83}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., pp. 292.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., p. 292; Unde enim humilitas recedit, ibi necessario superbia succedit. Ubi inuidia oritur, confestim caritas moritur. Nam neque eum cui inuidet inuidus, potest diligere, nec in non diligente caritas aliquamodo permanere. Propter ista, unde abest caritas, abest humilitas, et unde abest humilitas, abest et caritas.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., p. 293; iam tandem ad vos mi carissime, cui praesens epistola mittitur, stilitus recurrit, ut a quo sumpsit initium, in ipso suam fortassim importunam prolxiatatem finiat. Causa michi scribendi ut superius professus sum, teste conscientia, sola uere caritas fuit, ut quantum ad utrumque nostrum attinet, flatu collocationis eam recalescere, et in mutui affectus solitas uel maiores flammas erumpere cogerem. Restat ut vos […] exemplo uestoque non solum monachis, sed et toti Latinae aeccliae [...]
Peter returns here to the material of his introduction in which he expresses his love and respect for Bernard. Affection in letter 111, like in letter 28, becomes the avenue for introducing Peter’s ideas to the Cistercians. Love (affectus) and charity are linked in Peter’s discourse and the one is intended to promote the other.

In some manuscripts this letter continues, turning to invective aimed against the Saracens. In BNF, latin 13876, however, the letter breaks off as if the relevant material had come to an end, as does the letter for our purposes. In the letter, then, Peter subtly admonishes Bernard’s claim to truth and posits literalism to be a false condition for ranking spiritual practice. If Bernard’s “false silence” and Cistercian pride were responsible for the monastic schism, the letter provided a means of redress and humiliation. This dialogue between the Cluniac and the Cistercian, Peter seems to intend, acts as a means to re-channel hostility towards a positive end of unification. Peter wished to effect change not only in the Cistercian, but also in the Cluniac monks. Perhaps the construction of Cluniac “envy” was not just merely a reflection of a pre-existing situation, but an exploitation of a stereotype to encourage Cluniac change. If Cluny envied Cistercian success, perhaps that emotion could be exploited to compel its reform. Peter’s argument was also an elegant way to deflect concerns about the validity of Cluniac customs. That he had an entire institutional ethos to defend demanded that Peter deny the Cistercian ideas. Since he resolved Bernard’s privileging of literalism by positing charity (based in relativism) as justifying monastic observance, Peter shows that he conceived that custom was worthwhile only so long as it had power to arouse devotional fervour among its practitioners. From this perspective, Peter seems to differ greatly from Bernard. But only from the Bernard that appears in letter 111, since in De
*praecetto vel dispensatione* Bernard argues that very thing as well. One of his first topics of discussion, in fact, is the differences between stable, fixed and firm laws. Customs are such things that can be modified by the superiors of a house or order, so long as they are not, mere backsliding.84 Bernard in essence was using the *De praecetto vel dispensatione* to accuse Cluny of this degeneration. Peter’s letter sought to show that it was not degenerate. More important, perhaps, is the effect the presentation of this debate had on Cluniac monks. Peter asserts the possibility of changing customs to keep pace with the times. He advocated innovation and looked to the future.

**THEORY OF REFORM III: OFFERING REFUGE (LETTERS 149, 150)**

Some five years after the composition of letter 111, Peter responds to a letter of Bernard with the two connected letters, 149 and 150 (*ca* autumn, 1149) thereby initiating a further period of correspondence.85 In the time elapsed, it appears that much has changed. On the surface, Peter presents the monastic schism as healed and Cluny and Cîteaux are no longer bitterly divided. Nonetheless, the charity which exists between them is incompletely expressed by the Cistercians. We can see letters 149 and 150 as together promulgating a single epistolary dialogue in which the two abbots continue to debate the relative positions of the Cistercians and Cluniacs. Gillian Knight characterizes letter 149 as a private letter delivered directly to Bernard by his secretary Nicholas and marks it as different from the publicly circulated letter 150.86 However, both letters were included in Peter’s letter collection, suggesting he viewed them both as a continuation of the public discourse begun in letters 28 and 111.

---

84 *De praecetto*, 2-10, pp. 255-61 (106-13).
85 *LPV*, II, pp. 198-99.
86 *Correspondence*, pp. 156-57.
Letter 149 forms an introduction to letter 150, as both deal with the possibility of a union of institutions. The covert hostility and defensiveness underlying letter 111 is abandoned for the spirit of camaraderie. If the end of letter 111 advocates the unified purpose of Cluny and Citeaux as against Islam, Peter suggests here the outlines for a growing union of the two institutions through cohabitation. It is not a unity of customs or liturgy or ideology, but of common association and joined society. Beginning with letter 149 and its introduction to the themes of letter 150, I outline below a final stage of Peter’s institutional definition—one based not in attacking the Cistercians or defending the Cluniacs, but rather in the elucidation of a common harmonious monastic space.

Like letter 111, much of letter 149 is written as a response to Bernard. It opens with a description of the letter Peter just received from Bernard, “Brief is the letter, but considerable is the material for replying”. A perusal of Bernard’s letter does not suggest what exactly is being answered. Bernard provides an avowal of the bonds of amicitia shared by him and Peter before recounting his apology for any division between them. The letter begins with cordial greetings and continues with the expression of the love between them:

To the most reverend father and dearest friend, Peter, by the grace of God, abbot of Cluny, brother Bernard, called abbot of Clairvaux, greetings in the true Saviour.

If only I could send my mind to you, as [I sent] this letter. Without doubt, you would then read most clearly what the finger of God has written in my heart concerning your love [amor], what it has impressed on my innermost marrow. [...] My soul [anima] has long adhered to yours and an equality of charity has made equal minds [animos] from unequal persons. For what [might] my humility [share] with your sublimity, if [your] dignity [dignatio] had not changed [my] position [dignitatem]? And then it happened that both your sublimity and my humility were merged into the other, such that I am unable to be humble without you and nor you sublime

87 LPV, n. 149, I, p. 364; Brevis est epistola, sed multa respondendi materia.
without me. [...] Believe one who loves, that neither has there sprung up in my heart, nor has there been extorted from my mouth, anything that would provoke the ears of your Beatitude. [...] Greet for us your holy multitude and request that they pray for their son.\(^8\)

Since this message is Bernard’s first letter after Peter’s letter 111, perhaps we understand this emphasis on the veracity and sincerity of his love [amor] for Peter, as a reply to Peter’s own avowal of the same.\(^9\) This love has previously bound their souls together, Bernard states, but only now through an equal charity were their minds also able to be so. I believe that this charity which Bernard cites must be read as an *intentio* in charity. A common charity has finally allowed the two to perceive issues (left unstated) in the same manner.\(^0\) Bernard thereby seems to acknowledge the utility of their debate. The two are linked now, Bernard comments, by mind and soul, such that their very virtue is held in common. His humility, Bernard thanks, has been aided by Peter, apparently by altering Bernard’s *dignitas*. Bernard here uses the word *inclino* which suggests that he underwent a downward movement. We can interpret an agreement of sorts here, where Bernard agrees with Peter that they can act as foils for each other, helping each other maintain their proper reputation and position (i.e. *dignitas*). These seems to be an acknowledgement of the value Bernard received from Peter’s humiliating words of letter

\(^8\) Bernard of Clairvaux in *LPV*, ep. 148, I, pp. 362-63 (translation adapted from Knight’s in *Correspondence*, p. 158); *Reuerentissimo patri et amico carissimo Petro dei gratia Cluniacensi abbati, frater Bernardus Claraeullis vocatus abbas, in uero salutari salutem. *Vitam sicut praesentem epistolam ita uobis mentem meam mittere possem. Sine dubio tunc clarissime legeretis, quid in corde meo de amore uestro digitus dei scripserit, quid meis impresserit medullis. [...] Iam pridem conglutinata est anima mea animae uestræ, et de personis imparibus pares animos fecit parilibat caritatis. Quid enim meae humilitati cum uestra sublimitate, si non inclinasset dignatio dignitatem? Ex tunc factum est, ut utrinque permiscerentur, et mea humilitas, et sublimitates uestra, ut nec ego sine uobis humiliis, nec uos sine me sublimis esse possetis. [...] Credite amanti, quia nec in corde meo ortum est, nec ab ore meo extortum est, quod aures beatitudinis exasperaret. [...] Salutate nobis sanctam illam multitudinem uestræm et orate ut orent pro pueru suo.*

\(^9\) Bernard’s epistle (numbered 148 in the *LPV*) is the next letter extant and by its inclusion, Peter’s letter collection signals Bernard’s letter to follow letter 111.

\(^0\) That Bernard subsequently in the letter comments about disagreements and harsh words suggests this to be a reference to the Cistercian/ Cluniac disharmony.
111. While he seems to appreciate his humbling, Bernard also defends himself as having never wanted to stir up discord, and the veracity of their mutually acclaimed love, Bernard suggests, is proof that he could never have undertaken or even harboured a desire to cause offence to Peter.

The depth of Bernard’s letter is not lost on Peter. In letter 149, Peter remarks on its complexity and undertakes a quasi-exegetical reading of and reply to its underpinnings, beginning with the salutation. He disagrees with Bernard’s use of “most reverend father” and emphasizing instead that their relationship is one of friends (amicus carissimus) not a father/son bond. He quotes from an earlier letter to him written by Guido the Carthusian, in which Peter himself is rebuked for using such terminology.\(^91\) Peter reverses Bernard’s titular positioning in the salutation where he is “the brother Peter, the humble abbot” and Bernard is called “the venerable and brilliant man of Christ, the lord Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux”.\(^92\) Peter (through the words of Guido) cautions Bernard that using such terms inflates “Our Meagerness” (i.e. Peter) with “dangerous elation”.\(^93\) We see in Peter’s emphasis on his humility a rewriting of Bernard’s acknowledgement of their codependency, where Peter rejects sublimity for humility on account of Bernard’s words. It underlines moreover how being dearest friends creates a space in which they are united in a common coequal love, echoing Bernard’s sentiments. This initial section, then, parallels, reiterates and agrees with Bernard’s evocation of a love shared between them.

\(^{91}\) Cf. LPV, ep. 25, I, pp. 47-48.
\(^{92}\) LPV, ep. 149, I, p. 363; The salutation reads: Venerabili et praetctoro in membris Christi uiro, domino Bernardo Clareuallensi abbati, frater Petrus humilis Cluniacensium abbas.
\(^{93}\) Ibid., p. 364; infirmitatem nostram; periculosa elatione. Peter quotes here from Guido’s letter (numbered 25 in Constable’s edition of the LPV, I, pp. 47-48).
The concern with truth and the problems of relating their true feelings in both Bernard and Peter’s letters hints at continuing tensions between them. Bernard says, “Believe one who loves,” and Peter responds, “neither shall I have ever doubted your words in any way, provided that they were expressed sincerely.” Peter admits that he has never been completely sure about their tone. This questioning of the truth of their relationship is then solved, for Peter at least, in Bernard’s apology. Despite the proof of Bernard’s criticisms, Peter accepts the claim as truth, agreeing that Bernard was neither serious in nor intent on being antagonistic. As further evidence of how minor he considers Bernard’s infractions, Peter replies:

I pardon, therefore, and grant forgiveness easily. It is not a difficult task for me, which I say humbly, even in serious faults, to pardon anyone seeking [or] to grant forgiveness to anyone asking. Hence, if it is easy to forgive even in serious matters, how much easier is it in [offences] which are slight or non-existent?

Peter shows himself to be magnanimous and forgiving. By doing so, however, Peter also emphasizes Bernard’s criticisms as unimportant, suggesting perhaps that no injuries were received on its account. With this apology, Cluny seems redeemed in the eyes of the Cistercians and the Cistercians in the eyes of the Cluniacs. The offence and the hostility are overcome; unity in friendship can be re-established. It allows, therefore, Peter to move on to other topics.

Peter’s admission of absolution is immediately followed by a discussion of more administrative topics –the grant of lands claimed by Clairvaux which had been entrusted

---

94 LPV, ep. 149, I, p. 365; The passage reads in full: Credite amanti ut uerbis uestris utar, quia nec in corde meo ortum est, nec ab ore meo extortum est, ut de uerbis uestris quolibet modo si tamen serio exprompis aliquando dubitauerim.

95 LPV, ep. 149, I, p. 366; Parco igitur, et de facili ueniam tribuo. Non est apud me, quod humiliter dico, etiam in offensis grauibus, labor grauis, ut ignoscam oranti, dem ueniam postulanti. Quod si in grauibus ignoscere labor non est, quanto minor in leibus aut nullis est?
to Cluny by a Roman subdeacon Baro. In the letter, Peter repeatedly remarks on the
tenuousness of the Cistercian claim to such properties, stating that his offer to restore the
grant to Clairvaux rests more on his (Peter’s) desire than on Baro’s testament.\textsuperscript{96} Only
suspicious witnesses can give evidence of a deathbed grant to Clairvaux, after it had
already been promised to Cluny. Nonetheless, Peter concedes it to Bernard who is then
left in his debt. At the end of the letter, Peter seeks a favour, perhaps in repayment:

In conclusion, I ask as much as I can (as already I have commanded
through some persons of your order) that you really make mention
\textit{[memoriam]} of me and you to the large community of holy men which
have gathered at Citeaux and attentively commend myself and the entire
body of the Cluniac congregation to their prayers.\textsuperscript{97}

Mirroring Bernard’s request for prayers in letter 148, Peter closes his letter seeking that
his memory be evoked at the Cistercian general chapter. A minor request perhaps, but
also a potentially powerful symbol of association. An exchange in this context could
function only as an indication of confraternity and union.\textsuperscript{98}

The letter 150 suggests that Peter wished a formal institutionalized relationship
between Cluny and Citeaux. Like the commingled humility/sublimity of letter 149, Peter
hoped that Cluniac and Cistercians monks would circulate between monasteries of both
observances in order to bring about a parallel spiritual strengthening. The personal letter
149 seems to be an introduction to the more public letter 150. Unlike the largely
convivial tone of letter 149, however, letter 150 begins with an admonition to the

Cistercians:

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid.; \textit{In fine rogo quantum possum et supplico, quod iam per quasdam uestri ordinis personas mandaui, ut in hoc tanto sanctorum uiorum qui Cisterci conuenerunt, conuentu, mei utique uestri memoriam faciatis, meque totumque Cluniacensis congregationis corpus eorum intente orationibus commendatis.}
\textsuperscript{98} Cf. Giles Constable, “Commemoration and Confraternity at Cluny during the Abbacy of Peter the Venerable,” in \textit{Die Cluniaencenser in ihrem politisch-sozialen Umfeld}, pp. 253-78; rpt. in \textit{Cluny From the Tenth to the Twelfth Century}, (Ashgate, 2000), art. x.
The days of man are brief. They flee and do not come back. No traces of them return. Wretched man flows like rushing water, since, like [days] themselves and at a rapid pace, he hastens forward to an end he does not know. On this account, we must not dissemble but hasten forward, we must not tolerate dangerous procrastination, we are not free to dally [...].

Peter fears for the salvation of his Cistercians brothers and admonishes them to take care for their souls. Before it is too late, Peter demands, the schism must be healed. This warning prefaces Peter’s promotion of mutual hospitality and his reprimand of Cistercians wishing to bar Cluniacs from entering, as if they were not true monks. The change of tone from declarations of friendship in letter 149 to admonishing prose in letter 150 signals a differing audience for this letter. Peter exhorts, lectures and uses invective.

Though addressed to Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter explicitly requests the letter to be read to the community of brothers gathering for a general chapter. As Knight notes, Bernard is addressed as a pastor and spiritual mentor of the Cistercians throughout the letter, moving away from Peter’s previous use of the friendship topos. Bernard is presented as already convinced of Peter’s project and the letter is intended to convince recalcitrant Cistercian brothers. Like letters 28 and 111, Bernard is again presented as if already overcome by the validity of the Cluniac position. This position is highlighted all the more when the audience read this also in letter 149.

Knight demonstrates that Peter assumes that he is addressing an audience of “Cistercian zealots” fearing any interaction with Cluniac monasticism. Peter urges them to stop promoting disunity:

99 LPV, ep. 150, I, p. 367; Breues dies hominis sunt. Fugiunt, nec redeunt. Vestigia eorum nulla retrorsum. Labitur miser homo more fluentis aquae, cum ipsis, et praecepti cursu, ad finem quam nescit, excurrit. Eapropter non est dissimulandum, sed festinandum, non est periculos a procrastinatio sustinenda, non est mora libera nobis [...].
100 Ibid., p. 371.
101 Correspondence, p. 179.
102 Ibid., pp. 179-180.
You, my beloved, will be able to fight this great peril of the brothers [and] to cure so noxious a disease of souls, if with laudable skill [arte] you shall unite to the body of our society the flock of your congregation, or rather the sheep of the fields of Christ, who admire you above all mortals except Him [and] who chiefly count on you. Perhaps you are amazed since I said, arte. But do not marvel. I present what is customary. [...] Ars, I say, is necessary for you if you should wish to fulfill this work so laudable, so salvific, [and] so pleasing to God.\textsuperscript{103}

Bernard must work towards the unity of the two congregations even though, Peter remarks, it will demand considerable effort to negotiate the union of their hearts. Peter’s solution is a sharing of common places in order that both groups become accustomed to one another and do not accept scandalous rumours about each other. Peter makes this connection explicit in a later passage:

Variation in colour, diversity of dwellings, dissimilarity of practices hinder affection, they are opposed to unity. White beholds black, and wonders as if at a monstrosity. Black looks upon white, and marvels as if at a misshapen prodigy. New practices [instituta] exasperate a mind accustomed to other uses and what this mind was not accustomed to see cannot easily please it. This, however, is the case among those who look at the face and does not attend to what is deliberated in the mind. The rational eyes do not look upon [novel practices] in this way, the spiritual eyes do not contemplate those things thusly. They see, they understand, they recognize that a different colour, diverse usage, [and] separate residences change nothing among the servants of God...\textsuperscript{104}

Peter argues that differences in custom can be ignored and that intention in charity will allow the unity of the Cistercian and Cluniacs. Peter recognizes that difference breeds hostility, so both observances should look to the deeper unities and commonalities

\textsuperscript{103} \textit{LPV}, n. 150, I. p. 368; \textit{Huic tanto fratrum periculo tu subuenire, huic tam noxio animarum morbo, tu carissime mederi poteris, si gregem congregationis tuae, immo oues pascuae Christi, quae te post ipsum prae cunctis mortalibus suspiciunt, quae tibi maxime inquitur, corpori societatis nostrae laudabili arte unieris. Mirabere fortassis, quia dixi arte. Sed noli mirari. Profero quod usitatum est. [...]}. Ars inquam tibi necessaria est, si hoc opus tam laudabile, tam salutiferum, tam deo gratum impletur volueris.

between the two congregations. Peter returns, therefore, to the argument of letter 111, where he argues that inner virtue is the focus of spirituality, not outward practices. He continues with this argument, saying that some difference should be maintained. Black should not become white, nor white, black. The solution is merely cohabitation:

Let each one use the colour he chooses, let him hold to the uses by which he devotes himself to salvific faith and charity. But at least let their homes be unified, let there be an undifferentiated cohabitation of diverse colours and uses, let charity be nourished and promoted in the service of God by such a practice [arte], let the iniquity contrary to charity be routed and expelled. This can be done either completely or for the most part, I think, when the monks of the old order come to the monasteries or residences of the new monks, as long as they have not been excluded from the Church, the cloister, the dormitory, the refectory or from the remaining offices.

Peter outlines a practical solution to the monastic schism: if separation and distance breed contempt, then the monks should allow for spaces where interaction will accustom one type to the other. By such familiarity, Peter suggests, the question of inequality of observance and the ranking of types will be overcome. This is a solution that makes an equal demand of one observance for the other. It is important to note, as addressed below, that this is not merely a solution argued to the Cistercians, but one ostensibly instituted among the Cluniacs. Peter has already enacted this proposition:

Fifteen years ago I admitted all the brothers of your order and decreed that they be received into all our cloisters except the cloister at Cluny; and I did not worry about the white or black mixed together in our places, nor did I hear people worrying though many warned me that this might happen.

---

105 Cf. above.
106 Ibid, p. 369; Vitatur unusquisque colore quem elegit, teneat usus quibus se salua fide et caritate deuouit. Vniuntur saltem habitacula, sit indifferentes diuersorum colorum et usum cohabitatio, nutriatur et prouehatur in seruis dei tali arte caritas, perturbetur et expellatur contraria caritati iniquitas. Fiet hoc uel ex toto uel ex plurima parte ut arbitror, si quando antiqui ordinis monachi ad nosorum fratrum monasteria uel habitacula uenerint, ab aecclesia, a claustro, a dormitorio, a refectorio seu ab officinis relicitis exclusi non fuerint.
107 Ibid, pp. 370-71; Admisit ante quindecim annos uniueros uestri ordinis fratres, et recaepi praecaepe, preter Cluniacense claustum, in omnia clastra nostra, nec de albo uel nigro colore simul in locis nostris admixto curaui, nec curantes cum muti mici ne id fieret instarent, audiui.
Difference, he assures the Cistercians, does not lead to further hostility but to a fruitful union. He urges, “let the hearts cut asunder gradually be reunitied by this remedy and when none sees difference between themselves [...] let them learn to be one”. 108

Underlying the idea of shared space is Peter’s advocacy of an internalized regulation of monastic life. The inward adherence to a common charity, not the uniformity of practice, defines the monastic life. He expects each monk to maintain his own spiritual exercises and outward forms of spirituality in the midst of a diversity of practices. The individual, therefore, not the monastery, is the locus of regulation. Holding to an interior rule of charity, therefore, seems to be the goal advocated by Peter. No difference of custom is sufficient to harm charity, moreover, but continuing to treat Cluniacs as insufficiently pure to enter Cistercian cloisters is a rejection of charity. Resistance to cohabitation, Peter warns, is to adhere too strongly to an exterior regimen and not to the spirit of the Rule. He equates Cistercians again with the Jews and the Rule with Mosaic Law, insisting that any continued polarization of Cluny and Cîteaux evidences the latter adhering to the letter of the law, but ignoring the spirit. We can see perhaps in this warning another admonishment about the state of their reputation.

Peter argues that his monks and Bernard’s can develop into a cohesive and unified whole. Difference in custom means little, though it offers an opportunity for learning and for reconceptualizing. New developments can inspire old orders and allow continued relevance and preeminence of long established communities. The situation that Peter proposes and attempts to institute, provides not only a solution to antagonism, but also a model for Cluniac reform. The rules for the monastic life can change. Nothing need be

108 Ibid., p. 371; *Vnientur paulatim hoc remedio corda discissa, et dum nil inter se discretum viderint [...] unum esse addiscant.*
adhered to, unless in the service of charity, brotherly good will and proper intention. In contrast, the Cistercian focus on literal observance is presented as retrograde, shortsighted, discriminatory and harmful to salvation. The Cistercian resistance to change, which Peter identifies as their hallmark, cautions against opposition to reform and a mindless adherence to the past. This is a sentiment and precedent useful for Peter’s own reform of Cluniac monasticism.

CONCLUSIONS

By 1149, Peter’s discourse of reform and friendship has changed considerably from its first elucidations in 1127. In the more than twenty intervening years, Peter’s position seems to have changed both with the Cistercians and with his own monks. As the letter collection (Paris, BNF, ms. lat. 13876) presents their correspondence, Peter convinces Bernard to see the Cluniac perspective, uniting their soul’s love and the charity of their minds’ eye. The progression towards greater unity that we see, however, is consistently based in instrumental and analogical expressions of love and friendship. As we see culminating in letters 149 and 150, Bernard and Peter’s friendship is constructed within the letters as a model for the union not only of their affectivity, but of their monastic institutions.

The four letters written by Peter the Venerable to Bernard of Clairvaux argue the issue of reform on several levels. Peter elucidates a strong defence of Cluny against Bernard of Clairvaux which placed in check this Cistercian abbot’s anti-Cluniac rhetoric. Peter shows to his readership that he sought to create bonds of societas and amicitia with the Cistercian order, while simultaneously employing these bonds to influence his Cistercian opponents. Peter’s role as abbot is underlined in the letters to Bernard (and
other readers) and he presents himself as a model and example for others to follow (both the Cistercians and the Cluniacs).

Peter's role as representative of Cluny is emphasized throughout. He speaks for all his monks, though in letter 111, he is even above them, judging them as he judges the Cistercians. Since Peter intended these letters (at least letters 28 and 111) to be read and considered by all Cluniac monks, we can construe an argument addressing them as well. He explicitly notes that he intended these letter as a justification for the introduction of greater austerity (as we see in letter 161). All the letters emphasize how the rule of law justifies Cluniac particularities; this discourse necessitates an acceptance of the relativistic charity among his own monks. We see in these letters, therefore, the initial theorizing necessary both for a shift towards the written juridical institution embodied in the Statuta and for the acceptance of a new mode of spirituality (i.e. one based in orthodoxy and not strictly bound by orthopraxy) which he more fully outlines in the De miraculis.

A Cluniac who advocated the eternality of custom and the illicitness of reform would reproduce Bernard's condemned assertions. If a Cluniac would not admit the role of charity, then he must acknowledge the importance of Cistercian literalism, which in turn would invalidate his own observances. An acceptance of the role of charity, moreover, signals the reception of an orthodoxic enterprise, in which the spirit and inward religion is the locus of religious endeavour. By urging his monks to self-identify with his rhetorical portraits of Cluny (governed by law, regulated by charity), Peter uses their envy of the Cistercians to encourage the introduction of an ideology of reform. The rational argumentation at the core of the letters, however, shows the reasons why they
need to accept it. In the following chapter, I will focus on how Peter’s uses similar strategies when he attempts directly to put his theory of reform into practice with his monks. This process of implementation is very telling about how he conceives of his abbatial power.
Peter the Venerable’s Epistolary Relationships with His Monks

In the previous two chapters, I argued that Peter the Venerable based his epistolary rhetoric in the use of an affective and rational argumentation in order to persuade both Bernard of Clairvaux and a broader audience to accept the validity of his presentation of Cluniac monasticism. In the present chapter, I wish to demonstrate how these two rhetorical streams also coexist, if not to a greater extent, within his letters to Cluniac monks. Peter’s affective strategies, based in the motivating power of love (and also fear), encouraged his will to be carried out, but also demonstrate to the modern historian how he conceived of his relationship to his monks. In addition, his rational argumentation explains the overt reforms encouraged among his monks. Understanding Peter’s epistolary rhetoric, therefore, allows us to perceive the historical context and discursive environment in which Peter promulgated the renovation of Cluniac monasticism.

Societas amoris: Governance through Love

For his outstanding commitment to Cluny, Peter of Barri, the abbot of Saint-Augustine at Limoges merited to be lauded by abbot Peter the Venerable. The congratulating letter (ca 1140/56), subsequently inserted into Peter’s letter collection, demonstrates to posterity how the Cluniac societas was conceived by Peter the Venerable. We see from the uncommon salutation, where Peter wishes an “abundance of sincere love” (sinceri amoris plenitudinem) for this abbot of Saint Augustine-lez-Limoges, that Peter of Barri was the recipient of an especial affection. This affection arose, Peter remarks, from the continued love and service shown by Peter of Barri despite
having left the Cluniac milieu for the Benedictine Saint Augustine. Peter the Venerable was impressed how, “you are unlike certain men of our times who, coming from our congregation [and] having taken up abbacies or having been adorned with archbishoprics, flee us in spirit, as they did in body; they immediately recoil from the love of their [brothers] and rejoice as if the yoke of the monastic order had just been cast off”. On the contrary, after his departure to Saint Augustine, Peter of Barri continued to cherish the affective bonds born at Cluny and continued to labour on behalf of its interests. His example demonstrates the fluidity of movement in the twelfth-century *ecclesia cluniacensis*: monks professed at Cluny circulated to other monasteries where they were freed *in stricto sensu* from obedience to Cluny or its abbot. Ideally, an affection for their brothers, for Cluny, or for the monastic life (which Peter presents as synonymous) should never die, even if such ex-Cluniacs were not further obligated to obey their abbot. The greatest evil, Peter the Venerable subsequently laments, was that monks leaving Cluny, “disregard their [brothers] and meet with none but strangers. Already they do not remember where originally they had come so long ago, where they had remained and from where they had departed”. We notice that Peter the Venerable conceives of Peter of

---

1 The circulation of Cluniac officers outside the *ecclesia cluniacensis* is well discussed by Giles Constable, art. “Cluniac Administration and Administrators in the Twelfth Century,” pp. 17-30 (with notes on pp. 417-424). Saint Augustine-lez-Limoges was a Benedictine abbey (originally an Augustinian house, as the name suggests). Peter of Barri later returned to the Cluniac fold several years after Peter the Venerable’s death, when he also became the head of the Cluniac abbey of Saint-Martial-de-Limoges in 1161. *LPV*, II, p. 190. Saint-Martial-de-Limoges was the epicentre for Cluniac reform activity in Limoges ever since its reception of Cluniac observances and abbots in 1062. For the late eleventh- and twelfth-century history of Saint Martial, cf. Andreas Sohn, *Der Abbatiat Ademars von Saint-Martial de Limoges (1063-1114). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des cluniacensischen Klosterverbandes*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchturns und des Benediktinertums, 37, (Münster, 1989).

2 *LPV*, ep. 138, 1, p. 345; *Non estis quosdam nostris temporis homines, qui de congregatio nostra, aut in abbatisias assumpti, aut episcopatibus decorati, ut corpore sic et mente a nobis diffugium, ab amorem suorum statim resiliunt, ut uelut abiecto graui quantum ad ipsos monastici ordinis iugo, exulant.*


4 *LPV*, ep. 138, 1, pp. 345-46; *Suos postponunt, alienos sectantur, nec iam uel quo primum uenerint, uel ubi manserint, uel unde exierint, recordantur.*
Barri as still belonging to the Cluniac family and remaining bound by the ties of love. We see from this implicit vilification of those unlike Peter of Barri how Peter the Venerable conceived the proper order of things at Cluny. It was based, according to him, in mutual support, fraternal cooperation and submission to the community’s corporate interests. This internal bond is conceived as so strong that monks like Peter of Barri should continue to be emotionally and spiritually bound to Cluny’s interests no matter what their status or locale. Peter of Barri, is praised since, “you hasten here and there for dealing with Cluniac affairs, and at the will of us or of one of ours, you proudly oppose everywhere anyone inimical to our republic,” emphasizing his submission to the fraternal societas, not just to Cluny’s abbot.\(^5\) This portrait repeats Peter’s rhetoric also evident in his letters to the Cistercians that love and charity bind all members, Cluniac or not, of the monastic order in the pursuit of common spiritual objectives. What is important for our purposes here, is to note that this idea seems to emerge naturally from his own conception of the ecclesia cluniacensis as a family established in love, unanimity and internal solidarity.

The letter to Peter of Barri provides a suggestive beginning for understanding Peter the Venerable’s relationship with his monks. It shows how he conceived of Cluniac monasticism as a community of love at whose helm he stood, not governing by command, but presiding by the elicitation of obedience. As we see below, this presentation is one common in Peter’s letters to his monks, where he acts as a father to his monks. He disports himself in his letters as one with privileged knowledge, but with little personal power, always acting in the interests of his Cluniac familia. He does not

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 346; pro causis Cluniacensibus terminandum huc illucque discurrens, et ad nutum nostrum uel nostrorum, rei publicae nostrae impugnatoribus te ubique audacter opponis.
command obedience, but rather he educes adherence to his will. In his letters the compliance of his monks is rarely presumed. Instead he seems to expect that his authority is dependent on his ability to coax his monks into willed submission. Yet Peter’s letter collection contains certain exceptions to this mode (thereby proving the rule). I turn now to a discussion of Peter’s voice at its most commanding and insistent. These rare examples show how Peter makes little reference to his personal abbatial authority and grounds his influence within his authorial strategies.

THE VOICE OF AUTHORITY

Imperiousness is the exception in Peter’s letters (at least those presented in his letter collection), which appeal to more subtle affective and rational argumentation. From Peter’s correspondence with the priest Stephen (letter 8) cited in chapter two, we grasp that Peter did not suffer fools gladly. His authoritative voice with Stephen, as well as his demand for Stephen’s deference and obsequiousness, show that Peter was confidant of the respect owed to him. In his role as abbot, father and master, Peter modulates this strategy.

Peter’s clearest use of the rhetoric of authority is evident from four letters. In all of them, this rhetoric is initially illustrated by his rejection of the commonly accepted practice of naming the recipient before the sender in the salutation. This reversal of the natural order occurs only when he addresses the priest Stephen, an unnamed Apollinarian monk and twice Gilo, (a supporter of Pope Anacletus II during the papal schism, the cardinal-bishop of Tusculum and ex-Cluniac monk). In the first, Stephen had so offended the abbot that Peter feels he must remind the priest of his lowly status. In the
other letters (to the heretical monk and Gilo), the recipients were excommunicated and Peter presents them as unworthy of this form of respect. The salutations of these letters provide an initial demonstration of Peter’s superiority and authority. To Stephen and the heretic he offers invective and rational correction. To Gilo Peter offers advice, friendship and love. Common to these four letters, however, is the use of reproach—Peter is right, they are wrong, Peter perceives truly, they are in error.

As we saw with the priest Stephen, Peter does not initially try to convince or attempt to persuade the recipient of their errors, but merely expresses what must be followed. With the heretical monk, Peter rebukes, admonishes and derides the heretic with explicit invective. He opens his letter 37 (ca 1130/32) with a complete rejection of the heretic’s claim to truth and asserts the necessity of Peter’s intervention:

Even though your bestial foolishness, profound stupidity and complete lack of learning convince me to despise your wandering senses and that they are not worthy of even a vile response, nonetheless there are two reasons which compel a soul made nauseous by you to respond to you. One, because I am commanded to care for the infirm of my flock, to firm up the broken, to look for the lost, to strengthen the weak; the other reason is because I fear that the simple lambs in fellowship with you might be infected with your pestilence by dwelling together every day... [and] by your absurd and ridiculous speech [...].

As we also saw in the letters to Cistercian recipients, Peter applies a harsh voice when necessary. At the core of Peter’s admonishment, however, is the elucidation of the conditions necessitating his letter. The invective forms an explanation of why he writes and situates the immoral status of the recipient—two goals likely intended for a larger

---

6 LPV, eps. 8 (to Stephen), 37 (to the anonymous heretic), 40 (to Gilo), 66 (again to Gilo), I, pp. 14, 117, 134, 195.
7 LPV, ep. 37, I, p. 117; Licet bestialis insipientia profunda stultitia et omnimoda ineruditio tua, erraticos sensus tuos contemnere, nec saltem uli responsione dignos esse persuadeant, sunt tamen duo, quae ad tibi respondendum, animum erga te nausiantem instigant. Unum, quo gregis mei infirma curare, confecta solidare, perdita requirere, debilita confortare praecipior; alterum, quo consociatas tibi simplices ooriculas, diutina cohabitatione tabe tua infectas esse formido [... et] illo insulso et ridiculoso aeloquio [...].
audience to which Peter then transmits orthodox doctrine. Since Peter explicitly intends to protect the community of monks ("the simple lambs in fellowship with you") from the contamination of heresy, even the initial invective has a logical purpose. By dramatically illustrating his hostile opinion of the heretic, perhaps Peter intends invective as the first step in forcing the heretic to see himself as others see him. The heretic’s humiliation (like that of the Cistercians in letter 111) and his concomitant social censure might be conceived by Peter as the initial means to bring about a re-entry to Christian society.\(^8\)

Peter, as he lays out, is obligated to contain the pollution of heresy and also to correct the “broken” heretic, who might convince others not through the truth of assertions but through rhetorical deceptions. As Dominique Iogna-Prat demonstrates, the heretic is addressed and refuted on his own terms: first Peter outlines the body of axioms supported by the heretic and circumscribes the topics under debate, second he elucidates the contradictions and specious reasoning underlying the heretic’s conclusion.\(^9\) Peter’s argument underlines that he does not rely on either personal or textual authority in refuting the heretic, but on ratio—the faculty for reasoning whether he has faith or not. In Iogna-Prat’s interpretation, Peter intends this reasoning to lead the heretic back to orthodoxy.\(^10\) We see, therefore, that Peter recognizes his rational argumentation as the best strategy for eliciting agreement from those who do not adhere to proper Christian order, while also useful to convince a wider audience not to be swayed by the heretic’s words.

---

\(^8\) While Peter does not speak in term of humility in this letter, Peter’s invective aims to bring the heretical monk low and to deflate his exalted self-conception: calling him stupid and unlearned in response to the monk’s pretensions of clever rhetoric, or doctrinal machinations.

\(^9\) *Order and Exclusion*, p. 125; also cf. pp. 142-43.

\(^10\) Ibid., p. 125.
Unlike Stephen and the unnamed heretic, Gilo of Tusculum was a member of the Cluniac *societas* and, as a cardinal bishop, a prominent churchman. Gilo, therefore, belonged to an emotional community shared by Peter and to which Peter could appeal. Like the heretic, Gilo was an excommunicate; unlike him, Gilo was only a schismatic (supporting Anacletus II over Innocent II in the papal schism). He had not left, therefore, the society of Christian believers. Likely on account of this difference, Peter employs a modified strategy against Gilo of Tusculum employing appeals to affect. Gillian Knight notes in her analysis of letters 40 and 66 that Peter shies away from vilification and invective.\(^{11}\) He prefers instead to appeal to reason and familial loyalty. Though Peter excoriates Gilo’s lack of wisdom (*non sapientia sed insania*), he argues not through invective but by an appeal to logic. Peter rationally lays out the reasons why Gilo should abandon his errant position and return to the unanimity of the one Church. He supplements this line of reasoning with an appeal to the relationship of love long established between them. In letter 40 (1130/34), as Knight demonstrates, Gilo is depicted as the prodigal son, given a second birth at Cluny under the parentage of its abbot.\(^{12}\) On this basis, Gilo is exhorted to return to the embraces of his former *familia*. In letter 66 (1138), Peter emphasizes his personal love (*amor*) for Gilo and outlines the many attempts he has undertaken to maintain charity on account of their former *societas*. The logic of this charity, as Knight makes note, demands that Gilo reciprocate Peter’s love and adopt a charitable intention. Gilo must make a choice: come to see his situation through Peter’s vision and reject his schismatic position or scorn it altogether and thus choose damnation. Voluntarism underlies this discussion, though only one palatable path

---

\(^{11}\) Knight, art. “Politics and Pastoral Care,” pp. 364-71. I follow here Knight’s analysis.

\(^{12}\) Ibid., p. 369.
is left to be taken after Peter outlines the conditions and repercussions of Gilo’s choices. As in the letters to Peter of Barri, Peter again demonstrates here, even with a member long departed, that affective bonds are expected continue to determine relationships among monks of the Cluniac societas.

As with the letters of Bernard of Clairvaux, the letters to Gilo demonstrate the link of affective and logical argumentation. Peter conjures up images of a welcoming monastic family to attract him and creates fearful images of Hell to dissuade him. These poles of love and fear appeal to the very basis of Benedictine monasticism—a movement to true humility. If we recall the twelve stages of humility laid out in the Rule of Saint Benedict, we will note that the monk must progress from a cringing fear of God to a delight in faultless obedience:

After ascending all these steps of humility, the monk will quickly arrive at that perfect love of God which casts out fear (1 John 4:18). Through this love, all that he once performed with dread, he will now begin to observe without effort, as though naturally, from habit [ex consuetudine], no longer out of fear of hell, but out of love for Christ, good habit and delight in virtue.¹³

The affective motivators Peter employs with Gilo are foundational in the cultivation of humility and obedience as laid out in Benedictine monasticism. This use of affectivity, especially of love, is a strategy which we will see repeated throughout Peter’s letters, providing a means for Peter to elicit authority—not command—over his monks.

¹³ Regula Sancti Benedicti 7, 67-69, pp. 488-91 (p. 201); Ergo, his omnibus humilitatis gradibus acensis, monachus max ad caritatem Dei perveniet illam quae perfecta foris mittit timorem, per quam universa quae prius sine formidine observabat absque ullo labore ululut naturaliter ex consuetudine incipiet custodire, non iam timore Gehenne, sed amore Christi et consuetudine ipsa, bona et dilectatione virtutum.
ORDER IN THE MONASTERY

As the abbot of Cluny, Peter was owed obedience by the monks at Cluny and the brethren of the monasteries pertaining (pertinentes) to it.\textsuperscript{14} Peter’s letters well illustrate how he conceived the obedience owed to him. It was not an absolute subservience, but the effect of a dynamic process between abbot and monk. In letter 43 (1130/39) to Theodard, the prior of La Charité-sur-Loire (discussed briefly in chapter two), we can note how Peter underlines his unwillingness to command obedience from monks. Peter responds to a letter from Theodard which claims that he (Theodard) is unable to continue overseeing his monks due to the infirmities of his nature and age. Peter writes back to deny this request but is careful to frame his response as having understood Theodard’s complaints as having been made in the interest of peace, not disobedience.\textsuperscript{15} For this reason, Peter comments, he is not “aroused to respond injuriously” (in the manner, presumably, used with the heretic) but with words of encouragement.\textsuperscript{16} Peter’s response appeals to both a rational and affective argument, not his ability to command.

The discourse of love in this letter has already discussed in chapter two, so here I will concentrate on Peter’s logic for rejecting Theodard’s entreaty. Peter remarks that Theodard suffers from “the appetite of an obstinate will” (obstinatae voluntatis appetitum), causing him to threaten his salvation by acting against the virtues of obedience and charity. Theodard’s problematic self-will manifests itself in an excessive dedication to spiritual practices (fasting, vigils, labour) which hinders his ability to act as a prior. We can see from this criticism that it is not the behaviour (i.e. excessive asceticism), but the result (i.e. Theodard grows infirm and cannot sufficiently care for the

\textsuperscript{15} LPV, ep. 43, I, p. 138; Agnosco ego querelas, non coruiino sed columbino de corde prolatas [...].
monks under his supervision) which Peter criticizes. What is worse, Peter chides, is that he continued to undertake an exhaustive regime even after he was already commanded to diminish in austerity and to rest in the infirmary.\textsuperscript{17} Peter does not express explicit anger at this lack of disobedience, but instead encourages Theodard to contemplate about his own thinking:

If you reflect well, you will recognize that you greatly err in this rejection [\textit{contemptu}] of fraternal charity. For even with the authority of the paternal command removed, charity ordains to prelates what should never be disregarded [\textit{contemnendum}] from the hearts of the faithful and of those living subject to piety.\textsuperscript{18}

Even with the prior of La Charité-sur-Loire (one of the oldest and most vibrant of Cluny's priories), Peter conceives that his abbatial authority alone is unable to achieve what charity itself can mandate. Peter commands action, but suggests that true obedience will arise only if Theodard makes his choices in line with the impulsions of charity. Likely Peter presents his will so forthrightly since they have established the love between them as unquestionably sincere, since Theodard has asked to know Peter's will and since Peter does not doubt that his prior will obey (at minimum outwardly).\textsuperscript{19} It is perhaps for these reasons that Peter resorts to strategies more subtle than in this letter, to work his will on recalcitrant monks. Persuasion, as we see in Peter's other letters, is the key to his abbatial influence.

From letter 58 to Peter of Poitiers (\textit{ca} 1134) we catch a further glimpse how Peter the Venerable conceived of his authority during the same time period as letter 43. In this

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.; \textit{ad iniuriose respondendum accendor}.

\textsuperscript{17} In several successive sentences, Peter repeats that he demanded (\textit{mandaui}), ordered (\textit{iussi}), and commanded (\textit{praecipi}) lighter duties to Theodard, who did not follow them (Ibid., pp. 139-40)

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 140; \textit{In quo fraternae caritatis contemptu, non parum te deliquisse, si bene perpendis recognoscis. Remota enim paternae insionis auctoritate, quod de cordibus fidelium ac pie uiuentium subditorum etiam praelatis caritas praecepit, non est aliquo modo contemnendum}. 
letter, Peter seeks to convince Peter of Poitiers to leave a hermitage recently entered and to attend to the affairs of Christendom alongside his abbot. We see again that Peter appeals to affect and reason, in addition to an evocation of monastic common sense. It is this latter tactic which concerns us here.

After opening his letter with an evocation of his beloved son—a theme much emphasized throughout the letter—Peter the Venerable introduces his reason for writing. He complains that he is caught up in the business of the world, lacking the assistance of his monk. This complaint modulates into a reproach of Peter of Poitiers’ desertion (in Peter the Venerable’s presentation) and spirit of disobedience. In the midst of an extended logical argument (premised on the love and charity binding the two men), Peter the Venerable appeals to his monk’s conception of propriety:

I obeyed your will, when I saw that you were unwilling to go on, and gave you permission to stay. You therefore changed the proper order, you made the head into a tail; you placed me, upside-down, last and yourself, first; as a son, a disciple, and a monk you refused to follow your father, master and abbot. Here I am laboring, while you rest; I am awake, while you sleep; I am weeping, while you are silent; I am fighting, while you relax; I am wandering over the world, while you are sitting on your mountain.²⁰

If we remember that Peter the Venerable is seeking to draw out his monk from his hermitage, then the accusations of disobedience and insurrection appear to be more a form of argumentation than a fault to be redressed.²¹ Peter chooses not to command his monk to leave and depends instead on persuasive instruction. But how does an evocation

---

¹⁹ The letter indicates that this is not Peter’s first reply to Theodard’s request, who has continued to act as prior.
²⁰ LPV, ep. 58, I, pp. 184-85 (translated by Constable, LPV, II, p. 340); ego tuae voluntati obaediens, quem nolle pergere uesti, ut remaneres concessi. Tu ergo ordinem peruertisti, tu caput in caudam mutasti, tu praepostero gradu me ultimum te primum constituisst, dum patrem filius, dum magistrum discipulus, dum abbatem monachus sequi contemptissi. Ecce me laborante, tu quiescis; me vigilante, tu dormis; me clamante, tu taces; me purgante, tu uacas; me orbem lustrante, tu in tuo monte resides.
of inverted hierarchy become the means to coerce its correction? Humiliation, again, seems to be the key to Peter’s rhetorical strategy.

Drawing upon notions of order common to himself and his monk, Peter the Venerable simultaneously exhibits his current state (subservience) and his regular dignity (father and master). By this twofold projection of order (along with sufficient interpretive markers to demonstrate which is good/ bad) the abbot shows that he loved his monk so much that he himself was debased through it. This self-humiliation was intended, it seems, to provoke Peter of Poitiers to recognize the problem of adhering to his own self-will. If Peter of Poitiers truly loved his abbot (as is emphasized so carefully throughout the letter), then he would not permit Peter the Venerable to continue being in such a humiliating a state. Though restricted to textual space, not a physical ascetic display, the abbot Peter’s calculated self-debasement was intended to shame his monk into a matching but perhaps involuntary state of humiliation.

---

21 Peter’s letter largely seems to lessen the fault of Peter of Poitiers’ “disobedience”. Peter the Venerable himself, attending to the exigency of spiritual discretion, seems to have originally permitted Peter of Poitiers to enter the hermitage.


23 Cluniac precedents for such a use of humiliation have been suggested by Lester K. Little in his study of liturgical cursing, Benedictine Maledictions. Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France, (Ithaca, 1993), pp. 26-30. A direct parallel to Peter’s intent seems to be found in the non-Cluniac) example of Bishop Godefrof of Amiens cited by Little (pp. 142-43). This bishop donned a simple monk’s habit and walked on foot in order to secure the release of his provost Adam from hands of neighbouring castellans (after several previous attempts had failed). Little’s work develops upon the study of Patrick Geary (“L’ humiliation des saint,” Annales: ESC 34 [1979], pp. 27-42; revised in Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages, [Ithaca, 1994], pp. 95-115.) who saw humiliation as a ritual inversion of order, twisting and confirming the cultural categories of superbia and humilitas in order to accrue forms of social/ideological influence. Kim Esmark has concluded the same in his recent thesis, The Holy Dead and the Social Order. Relics, Ritualization and Symbolic Power (Anjou, 10th to 12th Centuries), (Roskilde University, 2002). Esmark notes specifically of the value of humiliation in the maintenance of monastic discipline. Calculated displays of self-abasement have also been the subject of discussion in Gerd Althoff’s study of Ottonian and Salian Germany, Demonstration und Inszenierung. Spielregeln der Kommunikation in mittelalterlicher Öffentlichkeit,” in Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde, (Darmstadt, 1997), pp. 229-57. In addition, there are useful comments about humiliation in Mary Mansfield, The Humiliation of
Peter the Venerable does not suggest that he has lost authority through this episode in a general sense (among other Cluniacs, for example). Between himself and this particular monk, however, there is a lack of unanimity. Their wills conflict and only once they perceive the situation alike, will the specific order of their relationship be reestablished. The letter to Peter of Poitiers is therefore evocative of two ideas. First, Peter presents abbatial power as an affective bond which should not be resisted.

Obedience is a relationship maintained partly through voluntary submission to a beloved abbot and partly though submission to the established hierarchy. In such a presentation, obedience does not derive only ex officio but also from a monk’s conscious will-to-obey. Secondly, proper order itself is the function of each monk fulfilling his roles. Peter the Venerable must preside, Peter of Poitiers must follow. This conclusion is further evoked later in the letter when Peter the Venerable laments his duties (always fulfilled) which prevent him from entering into a monastic retreat. Again an appeal to Peter of Poitiers’ sense of pity functions to underline the necessary obligations of the monastic office. To deny his responsibilities, his abbot suggests, would be to subvert the order of monastic society (and of salvation). Peter of Poitiers is therefore made to realize that he must imitate his abbot who fulfills his responsibilities to others.

Love and the expectations of its reciprocation, as we have seen, are a means of motivating unwilling obedience. An evocation of proper relationships of love can also provide a means for rebuking his monks. In letter 147 (1147) Peter uses a similar proper exchange of love as a means to rebuke and influence the recalcitrant abbot of Figeac (showing this strategy to be used consistently throughout Peter’s abbacy):

_Sinners in Thirteenth-Century France_, (Ithaca, 1995), especially pp. 262-77, a work far more focused on practices of penance than humiliation _per se_.

To the venerable, beloved and loving lord Ademar, abbot of Figeac, the brother Peter, the humble abbot of the Cluniacs, sends greetings and (although injured) nonetheless sends sincere love.

I wrote once, I wrote a second time to one who has written once, but not a second time. I marvel that nothing has been written by you after my first letter, and nothing after the second. No reason but one, the reason of thinking, was able to present itself. If you wish to know [to what cause I attribute your silence], I respond that you have not found a response to the objections. If this is it, then only one response remains, that is, to confess [your] guilt. Thence at least there should be material for writing back, thence your letter is able to say to me: “I confess a fault, I request forgiveness.” [...] Do not let my complaint delay your journey, since, as Solomon said, “it is a return to a friend.” I will expect your arrival at Cluny or its environs either at Christmas or at Epiphany. 24

Love, despite injury, continues to define their relationship. Peter presents a syllogism to Ademar; since you are silent, then you agree with my criticisms, if you reply now, you will be treated with love. Peter emphasizes the importance of reciprocation –first in letters, second in love. Peter is owed a reply, not only of letters, but of feeling. Peter has shown his love to Ademar who has not reciprocated. Yet, even though he is injured, Peter remains a friend. The relationship of love is not broken, merely temporarily tested, and awaiting the reestablishment of proper order. Unlike with his letter to Peter of Poitiers, however, the abbot Peter attempts to use this evocation of the order of love more in the manner of a command to Ademar. Peter’s judgement has been passed, the resolution has been laid out, and compliance can re-establish the proper order. Obedience

---

24 LV, ep. 147, I, p. 362; Venerabilis dilecto and diligendo, domino Ademaro abbati Figiacensi, frater Petrus humilis Cluniacensis abbas, salutem, et licet lesum, tamen sincerum amorem. Scripsi semel, scripsi secundo, semel scribenti, secundo non scribenti. Miratus sum nihil a nobis rescriptum meae primae epistolae, nihil secundae. Causam cogitandi, nulla preter unam occurrere potuit. [...] Si quaeritis quam aestimem, reponeo, non inuenisse uos ad obiecta responsum. Quae si est, restabat unum, hoc est, confiteri reatum. Inde saltem rescribendi materia esset, inde michi ustra loqui epistola posser, confiteor culpam, postulo ueniam. [...] Nec obstet itineri uestro querela mea, quia ut ait Salomon, est regressio ad amicum. Expectabo ego, aut Cluniaci, aut circa, uel in natale domini aut in eius epiphania, aduentum uestrum [...].
thus, is elicited, not by debate, but through adherence to the system of love for one another.

All three letters suggest that the office of the abbot does not necessarily command authority, but that the person of the abbot must evoke a recognition of it from his monks. Roles of abbot/monk, father/son, master/servant appear to be dynamic and depend on their performance between individuals. Peter the Venerable continues to define his authority charismatically—as if arising from personal relationships—even though their negotiation takes place in a textual space. The difference of the abbatial voice presented in letter 43, 58 and 147 suggests, however, that Peter weaves together multiple textual personae tailored to context. Thus, in letter 43, when Peter is assured of Theodard's continuing obedience and when his authority is unquestioned, he projects a more explicit voice of authority, though one still tempered by rational and affective appeals. With Adhemar, since guilt has already been proven, Peter only lays out the conditions for satisfaction. As we see below, the commanding use of affect we see with Adhemar is employed variously by Peter with his monks.

**COMPETITIVE SPIRITUALITY**

Order, obligation and responsibility are all concerns underlying the letters discussed above. They are themes, moreover, which are echoed in the letters remaining to be discussed in this chapter. He has his duty as abbot to fulfill, driving him ceaselessly to consider the position, behaviour and fate of his monks. As we see in the following discussion, Peter constructs a symmetrical structure of submission where he yields to the
demands of his office and he expects his monks to succumb to his abbatial judgment.  

Part of his burden, Peter presents, is to urge his monks to acknowledge their service under him, and to fulfill a state of self-willed obedience. We glimpse this strategy further in epistles 159 and 161 which form a pair of letters advocating the observance of greater austerity. The comparison of them well elucidate further epistolary mechanisms employed by Peter to implement his will.

At the same time he was reworking the *De miraculis* (ca 1142), Peter wrote to the monks of Saint Martial-de-Limoges to encourage the more austere practice of religion there. Though there is not any external indications that this Cluniac abbey was particularly deficient, Peter singles it out for encouragement in letter 159:

> May you and all of your order be ashamed to appear inferior in the observance of monastic religion to any of the new [orders], lest, God forbid, the disciple be above the master, contrary to the words of the lord, lest you remain thirsty at your well while others drink, and lest you starve while others eat their fill at your table. For you know that every feature of the religious project [which] the new men of our age appear to have, it took its beginning from you, it received its matter and form from you. Hasten, therefore, in the path of the commandments of the Lord with the same haste as others, so that none arrive before you. [...] Be especially attentive to concord and obedience so that, as you labour in these and other exercises of sacred virtues, the laymen admire your works and exalt the Father who is in Heaven.

---


26 As noted in chapter two, Theodard of Saint Augustine became the abbot of Saint Martial-de-Limoges in 1162. This monestary was the centre of Cluniac activity in Limoges from 1062 until 1246 (when it secured a papal recognition of their autonomy).

27 *LPV*, ep. 159, 1, pp. 384-85; *Pudeat uos uestrique ordinis omnes in religionis monasticae observantia quibuslibet nouis inferiores uideri, ne contra dominii verba sit quod absit discipulus super magistrum, ne de fonte uestro alii haurientibus, uos sitiatis, ne de mensa uestra alii saturis, uos seiuini permaneatis. Nostis enim quod fere quicquid religiosi propositi nostri seculi noui homines habere uidentur, a uobis principium sumpsit, a uobis materiam formamque suscaepit. Currite igitur non seignius quibuslibet viam mandatorum dei, nemo uos in currndo praue nitat. [...] Paci praeципue et obaedientiae operam date, ut tam in his quam
This letter, which begins with an evocation of the love held for the brothers at Saint Martial, encourages greater austerity, not through criticism or invective, but through an appeal to competition and the proper relationship of old and new monks. This letter seems to anticipates the discourse of competition/mutual humiliation Peter develops in letter 111 two years later. In letter 159 Peter asks that his monks improve their life and their spiritual reputation lest they allow the students (i.e. the Cistercians) to be made their masters and the Cluniacs are robbed of their ancient good repute.\textsuperscript{28} Competition between the Cluniacs and the Cistercians is used as the lever to promote an improvement in monastic regimen. Peter does not command adherence based on his authority, but presents the matter as if the choice is left to the monks. Peter’s words spell out, however, the implications of their failure to do so: loss of status, well being and spiritual power, as well as their humiliation before the Cistercian onlookers.

In contrast to the encouragement offered by an appeal to competition in letter 159, Peter resorts to invective, scriptural citation and rational argumentation to compel his will in letter 161. The letter 161 represents a unique letter within Peter’s letter collection. It directly and explicitly exhorts all Cluniac monks to adopt a greater strictness in diet. This letter, dated by Constable to between 1148 and 1152, comes after a lifetime of encouraging austerity generally as well as promulgating specific norms for diet and fasting through general chapters and statutes.\textsuperscript{29} This letter provides the evidence of

\textit{in aliis sacrarum uirtutum exercititis, uobis desudantibus, uideant saeculares opera uestra et glorificent patrem qui in caelis est.}

\textsuperscript{28} The appeal to competition between Benedictines and the Cistercians is also a discourse employed by medieval popes to encourage reform, cf. Usmer Berlière, “Innocent III et la réorganisation des monastères bénédictins,” \textit{RB} 32 (1920) and id. “Honorious III et les monastères bénédictins,” \textit{Revue belge de philosophie et d’histoire}, 2 (1923), pp. 227-65.

\textsuperscript{29} On this topic, cf. chapter 8. Constable (“Monastic Policy,” p. 120, note 3) refutes Knowles’ suggestion that this letter provides evidence of a final acceptance of Cistercian doctrine. Constable suggests that the
Peter’s final attempt (at least according to the existing historical record) to accomplish an acceptance of his model. Addressed “to the venerable and beloved brothers, as much the priors as the guardians of order, no matter where they are located,” the letter opens with a rhetorical justification of his right to write. \(^{30}\) “Do I speak or remain silent?” Since he must say something, Peter’s letter then asks whether he, the abbot of the Cluniacs, should address his monks with or without a voice of authority. \(^{31}\) He could “speak pleasantries and foresee dreams” and allow his willingly ignorant monks be damned \(^{32}\) or he could fulfill his mandate as abbot and (with an image taken from Isaiah) raise his voice “like a trumpet”. \(^{33}\) Peter alludes to two different passages in Isaiah to underline his intent on doing the latter. His first citation of Isaiah (“like a trumpet,” 30.10) is followed in scripture by Isaiah’s own justification for writing, thereby also suggesting the purpose of Peter’s letter:

Write it before them on a tablet, and carefully inscribe it in a book, and it will be until the final day as a witness forever. For they are a rebellious people, faithless sons, sons who do not hear the law of God. (Is. 30.8-9)

\(^{30}\) Ibid.; \textit{Loquar an sileam?} This beginning recalls the opening of Peter’s letter to Gilo (\textit{LPV}, ep. 66, I. p. 195) and Bernard of Clairvaux’s treatise, \textit{De praecepto vel dispensatione}, (cf. chapter three) both of which meditate on the propriety of intervention. Bernard uses this opening to discuss the abbot’s ability to dispense with the rule and use his discretion to modify the practice of monasticism laid out in the \textit{Rule of St. Benedict}. Peter asks himself in his opening whether his epistolary intervention—intended to bring the schismatic Gilo back into the Christian fold—is permissible. The “impossibility of silence” already discussed in chapter one, is addressed by Dominique Iogna-Prat (art. “L’impossible silence,” pp. 111- 152).

\(^{31}\) Ibid.; \textit{loquimini nobis placencia, uidete nobis uisiones.}

\(^{32}\) Ibid.; \textit{LPV}, ep. 161, I. p. 388; \textit{Quasi tuba.}
Peter identifies a parallel between his letter and Isaiah’s text, both of which were intended to act as evidence of proper/improper behaviour. We see, therefore, that Peter’s letter acts as a catalogue of what will not be tolerated, but has been observed among his monks. His purpose in part is to record for posterity an unimpeachable record of what is “legally” expected from his monks. Since this letter also comes after the promulgation of the Statuta (1146/47), we can perhaps see here a reminder of its legal status.

The second allusion to Isaiah (58.1) shows that the letter is not merely a record, but a call to action. The biblical citation links Peter’s voice with that of God admonishing the Jews to return to proper religious practice. The passage in Isaiah continues, “Announce to my people their crime […] since day after day they seek after me and they wish to know my ways as if they were a people that practiced justice”.  

This section of Isaiah contrasts religious ritual with the mindful service God desires and the quotation introduces a similar theme in Peter’s text. Peter criticizes those monks who maintain a semblance of the religious life but abandon its essence. On account of this failure, he must shout out like the prophets. To admonish and exhort is one of his fundamental obligations as abbot and should be for all Cluniac priors:

I speak and I shout and I admonish so that those of you who preside over others speak and shout these things. For you ought to be fearful no less than I if you remain silent, since you know that you are called upon if not with the fullness of power, at least then with concern.

Just as Peter seeks out Bernard to repeat a message to the Cistercians, Peter wishes his priors to act as his mouthpiece. The letter thus allows the multiplication of Peter’s voice

---

34 Isaiah 58.1-2: *Et amnuntia populo meo scelera eorum [...] Me etenim de die in diem quaerunt, et scire vias meas volunt.*

35 *LPV*, ep. 161, I, p. 388; *Loquor ergo et clamo, et ut ipsi qui praeestis aliis haec loquamini, et inclametis admonese. Nam nec in modico minus ubis quam michi si tacueritis formidandum est, cum sciatis uos vocatos, etsi non in plenitudinem potestatis, tamen in partem sollicitudinis.*
to all ends of the *ecclesia cluniacensis*, and for it to be taken up in the mouths of his officials. Even those not coerced with a "command of paternal authority" (as Peter says to Theodard), are encouraged to admonish and correct their monks, and thereby to fulfill their own duty of paternal oversight. His phrasing of last sentence indicates that an anxiety or concern (*sollicitudo*) for souls (presumably their own as well as their monks’) should motivate every Cluniac to follow Peter’s words. But some monks, it seems, can be called upon “with the fullness of power” (*plenitudinem potestatis*). Who these monks are, however, is never clarified in Peter’s letters.

The parallels between this opening and the beginning of letter 37 (to the heretical monk) are suggestive. Unlike Peter’s usual evocation of bonds of love in the opening, Peter resorts here and in letter 37 to an argument for why he must intervene, based in his pastoral obligations to his monks. Peter states the conditions why his will should be followed (i.e. he is the abbot), but the letter does not depend upon this assertion. Instead, the foundation is in invective, dissuasion and logic, again just as we in letter 37 to the heretical monk. There is a strong affective foundation to this letter, but like letter 37 and unlike the letter to Theodard, Peter of Poitiers or even the monks at Saint Martial, this letter does not ground itself in their personal relationship of love, nor does it encourage through attraction. It founds itself instead on fear. We can see in these parallels that Peter seeks to introduce his letter and to induce a *purificatio* among its recipients.

Since Peter is reiterating in letter 161 an idea already expressed several times in other arenas (the *De miraculis*, the various recensions of the *Statuta*), we see that an ideal of austerity in diet was perhaps not being adopted by the Cluniacs. A refusal to accept simpler food and a greater observance of fasts mark them, in Peter’s presentations, as
dissidents, denying the proper order of monasticism much like a heretical monk. To counter their resistance Peter strives to demonstrate their error. Peter perceives in their failure in abstinence, the image of an “overturned order” where buffoons (scurra) and monks appear identical.\textsuperscript{36} This argument sets up Peter’s attack on his monks’ pretensions and the reality and elucidates the basis of his humiliating discourse.

The rational argumentation that Peter develops in letter 161 closely follows the structure of his epistolary treatises to Bernard of Clairvaux, and as Iogna-Prat demonstrates, to Peter’s anti-heretical treatise \textit{Contra Petrobrusianos}.\textsuperscript{37} Following the introductory justification, letter 161 moves through four stages of discussion, beginning with an \textit{investigatio} and subsequently progressing through \textit{discussio}, \textit{inventio} and \textit{defensio}. These rhetorical forms mark the movement from an inquiry into the evidence for Cluniac laxity, to a debate showing its illicit nature, to a reiteration of this conclusion and finally an excoriation of those resisting. Both argument and invective are basic to Peter’s letter. This polemic style, Iogna-Prat asserts, provides the argumentative model intended to be used for the \textit{purificatio} of Christian detractors. \textit{Purificatio} in this context is viewed as a positive and necessary action, in which strife becomes the opportunity for the purification of Christian society. The ideal of \textit{purificatio} that Iogna-Prat views only within Peter’s anti-heretical writings, however, seems very present in the letters that Peter addresses to Christian and even Cluniac dissidents.

Peter presents letter 161 as a projection of his fear for his monks’ salvation and the love he holds for them. Beyond naming his monks as beloved in the salutation, however, Peter does not exploit this love as a force motivating his message. He worries

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.; \textit{peruerso ordine}.

\textsuperscript{37} Cf. chapter three; \textit{Order and Exclusion}, p. 138.
that unless he speaks, the sinful state of those in authority and thus all monks will be unafraid to continue along their shameful path; Peter, as abbot, would remain responsible for their damnation. Part of Peter’s enterprise is to reestablish this fear into his monks.

Offering secondary evidence and his own first-hand testimony for his monks’ failures, Peter’s *investigatio* of gastronomic excess equals the hyperbolic depiction of Cluniac excess found in Bernard of Clairvaux’s *Apologia*. The monks are described in very bestial terms, as birds of prey and vultures, who reject the very name of men or monks by their feasting. They do not follow the minimum of the precepts laid out in the *Rule of St. Benedict* when they maintain their fasts only on a single day, but not the rest of the week, nor when, without a thought for the prohibitions of Benedict, they feast on pork, venison and poultry. Peter highlights Benedict’s prohibitions that the meat of four-legged animals cannot be eaten, but he identifies all meat as the same. He intends his own more inclusive standard (i.e. statute 12) which forbids all eating of meat to be adhered to. The spirit of the *Rule* is thereby contravened and, what is more problematic, “the sacred order is blasphemed by this depraved example for on-lookers. [...] If anyone, driven by the fear of God, wished to abstain from such food, he is immediately mocked by such people and is called a hypocrite, a pretender and a profane”. Peter argument against excess is the harmful effect of scandal on Christians outside the monastery. The monastic life loses its power to encourage or its ability to provoke virtue as pious monks become branded as hypocrites and pretenders by others. Peter’s argument is again an urge to competition. Peter lays out a condition: improve yourself or face humiliation. Peter’s

---

38 *Apologia*, VI, 12, p. 91 (p. 253) and IX, 20-21, p. 97-99 (265-69); cf. chapter three.
40 Ibid., p. 389; *uidentibus pravo eorum exemplo sacer ordo blashematur [...]. Deridetur iam a talibus, si quis timore dei ductus a tali esu abstinere voluerit, et ypochrita, simulator, ac prophanus vocatur.*
letter can be seen, in fact, as the initial phase of a public loss of reputation, in which the monks are made to see their pretensions and their true self.

Peter’s letter modulates into discussion of how a rejection of simple food transforms monks from ascetics into unregulatable gluttons. We can see here how Peter struggles to make connections between outward practices and interiority. The richer the food a monk tastes, the more he desires new and exotic tastes. Food has the effect of destroying temperance and moderation and introducing insatiable desire. Peter asks whether such desire can acknowledge any boundaries and concludes that a properly ruled soul cannot survive elaborate foods. This line of reasoning is buttressed by textual authority and an argument from necessity: the Rule is broken and Cluniac lands cannot supply the monks with such excessive dishes. The material foundation of the monastery is therefore threatened directly by this immoderation. To eat meat and not follow the fasts, moreover, contravenes the very oath they made at their profession. To eat meat is, as Peter puts it, to lie to God and deceive their very selves. This last point Peter develops further:

Why do you say, “I am a monk?” O would that be true! [...] Your own words condemn you from your own mouth such that they adjudge you a worthless servant; men preserve and angels uphold the chirograph which you wrote, [which is] to be put before you on the day of the great judgement of God before the tribunal of the highest and true judge, Jesus Christ; “to be put before you”, I say, and to be read, either for life or for death. And so that you do not have recourse, as you normally do, saying that this chapter was changed like some others by some holy fathers for a clear reason, I answer, such is not the case. Indeed if something concerning the reception of novices, manual labour, clothing and similar things was changed by the good fathers after Saint Benedict, it was not done for a dubious reason, but for a clear and logical reason. And since the reason and logic were [already] scrupulously described twice by me in two letters [28, 111] sent some time ago to the lord abbot of Clairvaux, I
adjudge it superfluous to repeat this. If you were more studious, you would find it there [explained] fully.\textsuperscript{41}

The monks who do not follow Peter’s injunctions repudiate their position and sworn role by not obeying the Rule. Peter reminds them that they will be judged according to a fixed criteria: what, on paper, they swore to God at the time of their profession. Two texts, in addition to Peter’s letters are evoked here: the Rule of Saint Benedict and the chirograph of each monk’s profession. We can glimpse here an evocation of the oath as the basis of the legislative regulation to the monastery.\textsuperscript{42}

After evoking the authority of the profession/chirograph, Peter does not argue further, pointing out that this has all been rationally explained to them in letter 28 and 111 to Bernard of Clairvaux.\textsuperscript{43} Peter buttresses this discussio and inventio with a forceful concluding image taken from John of Salerno’s Vita Odonis.\textsuperscript{44} Peter recounts a story

\textsuperscript{41} LPV, ep. 161, I, p. 390; Quid dicis? Monachus sum. Et o utinam. [...] Verba tua te condempnant, de ore tuo ut seruam nequam te iudicant, cyrographum quod scripsisti, homines servant, angeli retinent, proponendum tibi in die magni iudicii dei, ante tribunal summi et ueri iudicis Ihesu Christi, proponendum iugam et legendum, siue ad utiam siue ad mortem. Et ne tibi recurrere liceat ad id quod soles, ut dicas et hoc capitulum, sicut et alia quaedam a sanctis quibusdam patribus certa ratione mutatum, respondes: Altiter est. Si enim de nouicis suscipiendis, si de opere manuum, si de uestibus et quibusdam similibus, a bonis patribus post sanctum Benedictum, mutatum est, non dubia sed certa et rationabilis causa factum est. Et causa uel ratio, quia bis a me in duabus epistolis, olim domino abbati Clareuallensi directis, studiose descripta est, hic iterare superfluum iudico. Si adeo studiosus fueris, ibi plene reperies.

\textsuperscript{42} The importance of the petitio as the basic experience with literacy for every monk is considered by Sébastien Barret, “Éléments d’institutionnalité dans les actes originaux du ‘fond du Cluny’ de la Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Xe- XIe siècles)” in Die Bettelorden im Aufbau: Beiträge zu Institutionalisierungsvorgängen im mittelalterlichen Religiosentum, ed. Gert Melville and Jörg Oberste Vita Regularis, 11, (Münster, 1999), pp. 557-602, here 590-91. Useful for the subject of oaths and law is the discussion in Magnus Ryan, “The oath of fealty and the lawyers,” Political Thought and the Realities of Power in the Middle Ages / Politisches Denken und die Wirklichkeit der Macht im Mittelalter, ed. Joseph Canning and Otto Gerhard Oexle, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 147, (Göttingen, 1998), pp. 211-228. Cf. also the summary of the implications of “speech acts” in Little, Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France, especially pp. 113-118.

\textsuperscript{43} Cited in chapter three.

\textsuperscript{44} Jigna-Prat (“Costumes et statuts,” p. 25) underlines the evocations of John of Salerno’s Vita Odonis and the Rule as important manifestations of Peter’s use of textual authority. LPV, ep. 161, I, p. 391; quoting from John of Salerno’s Vita Odonis, III, 3, 4, and 9 (PL, 133, cols 43-86, here cols 78, 81-82) in turn taken from Odo of Cluny’s Collationes, III, 20 (PL, 133, cols 512-638, here cols 605-6). The stories of the gluttonous monks are preserved in the Vita Odonis written by Naldog in the 1120s (cf. PL 133, cols 102-103, chp. 48), though Peter follows John’s version which ostensibly directly cites Odo’s telling of the stories. The chapter in Naldog retains a sense similar to Peter’s and begins with the warning, Quisquis
where a monk demanding to eat chicken, chokes on and dies from the objects of his desire, miraculously punished by divine intervention. Peter presents the example and the words of Odo of Cluny, "the reformer of the Rule" and "the restorer of the monastic order in Gaul,"\(^{45}\) to demonstrate the justice underlying a reconfirmation of strictures on eating meat:

In almost all the ends of our Europe, there was nothing about being a monk beyond a tonsure and a habit. [Odo] pursued the work of God single-handedly during that time; he first laid down the foundations of Cluny [and] afterwards he did not cease to plant the seeds of religion here and there as long as he lived. What did he—your first father—think, therefore, brother, about the chapter on meat? What did he say? What did he write? Consult his book, reread his words! You will find among other topics that he wrote [to inspire] terror of such things.\(^{46}\)

By this point in the letter Peter has emphasized his own paternal position as abbot, his own attempts to revive a lagging religion and has noted that any monks who eat meat are only monks in name and appearance.\(^{47}\) The correlation between Peter and Odo and the fallen monks in their respective times is thus made evident to the audience. Just as Odo tells stories of divine retribution to caution his monks, so too does Peter. By demonstrating his similitude to Odo, Peter buttresses his precept with the teaching of this "first father" and suggests the universality of restrictions of diet for all Cluniac monks by citing Odo as the spiritual founder of all Gallic monasticism. The story, moreover, is told immediately after Peter has argued that any reform of custom must be done for some legitimate "sake or reason" (\textit{causa uel ratio}) and he references his letters 28 and 111 to

---

\(^{45}\) \textit{LPV}, ep. 161, I, p. 391; \textit{ordinis monastici in Galliis reparator [...] regulae reformator Odo.}

\(^{46}\) \textit{Ibid.; In cunctis pene Europae nostrae finibus, de monacho preter tonsuram et habitum, nichil. Institit ille divino operi pene tunc solus, et Cluniaci prima iaciens fundamenta, post huc illucque religionis semina, quamdiu adultis, serere non cessavit. Ille ergo o frater primus tuus pater quid de carnium capitulo sensit? Quid dicit? Quid scripsit? Consule librum eius, relege verba eius. Invenies inter alia ad terrorem talium illum scripsisse [...]}. 
Bernard of Clairvaux for further explanation of this point. His previous argumentation in the letter declares that it is illicit to allow at any time the eating of meat and Odo’s story is then presented as an answer to any who cite the relaxation of strictures as customary to Cluniac monasticism. Peter’s narration of the gluttonous monks allows an authoritative statement about proper practice to be made. The discourse of the letter changes here from logical argumentation to storytelling (or from paradigmatic to narrative modes of explanation, as a cognitive scientist would put it\(^{48}\)). Since it is clear from Peter’s direct citations of John of Salerno’s *Vita Odonis* that this was the source for Peter’s telling, alterations from it clearly display goals Peter wished this story to re-present.

The story Peter recounts is a conflation of two stories in the *Vita Odonis*.\(^ {49}\) As Peter tells it, a monk returns to the house of his parents and asks for a meal. When they offer him fish, he angrily refuses and, killing a chicken himself, demands that it be cooked for him. Blushing at the impudence of this monk, the parents hurriedly prepare the chicken. At this point, Peter’s story slightly changes from Odo’s (or rather, John’s) version. In the original, the monk is questioned by his parents whether he is allowed to eat fowl, to which he answers with a pseudo-scientific assertion of the shared origin of fish and fowl. Peter omits this section (perhaps unwilling to provide a further reason for dissent) and emphasizes instead the shamefulness of the action, something clearly recognized by the blushing laity in the story. The effect is slightly altered by Peter to emphasize the loss of public repute engendered by the monk’s action. Peter then continues with a depiction of the intemperate nature of the monk, injecting the

\(^{47}\) Ibid., p. 390; cf. the discussion of letter 161 in chapter four.


\(^{49}\) VO, III, 3 and 4 (col. 78).
description of another monk from an earlier story of the *Vita Odonis* (VO, III, 3). The monk is unable to wait for his food to be cooked, and so, driven by the insistence of his gullet, seized the carcass with a "fury of action" (*actus furia*) and eviscerates it. The impatience of the monk is rewarded with death, as the first chunk of meat he swallows lodges in his throat and kills him. The death scene is depicted with significant differences in the *Vita Odonis* and letter 161

[As Odo recounts] “He took a piece of it and put it in his mouth, but he could neither spit it out nor swallow it, and it deprived him of life. Before he died, he received blows and buffets in scorn as a reward of his wickedness.”

[And John adds] If your spirit is shocked [*commove*] at the death of these two brothers, as at that of the one mentioned before, I will show you now, by an example, that they deserved the deaths which came upon them.50

[As Peter recounts] And the piece immediately became lodged; first he tried to swallow it, but he was unable; then he attempted to cough it up, but that did not work [either]. Everybody ran over, shouted all around; they redoubled their frequent blows to the throat of the patient, they laboured with every zeal and effort in order to dislodge the fatal meat. But to no end. Thus, with the passage of the throat plugged, with spiritual vigor obstructed, this monk, was unable to confess his sin, nor to take the salutary nourishment, which is the body of Christ, since the death-bringing meal was in the way, was dead in a moment. Thus, [this monk] overcome by so fearful a death taught that present and future [monks] should fear to fall into the hands of the living God [He 10:31] and clearly demonstrated that the eating of meats is unsuitable for strong and healthy monks.51


51 *LPV*, ep. 161, 1, p. 391; *Quam statim attritam, dum traiicere conatus esset, not potuit, cum reicere, nec illud praevaluit. Accurrunt omnes, conclamant undique frequentes ictus collo patientis ingeminant, ut mortis esca reici posset, toto studio et conatus laborant. Sed nequiequam. Ita via gullets opturata, spiritu vitali praeculso, monachus ille nec conficiere peccata, nec escam salutarem, hoc est corpus Christi, obstante mortifero cibo sumere praevalens, in momento extinctus es. Sic tam terrribili morte praeventus horrendum esse incidere in manus dei viventis, praeentes et posteros docuit, et esum cranium ad fortes et incolumnes monachos non pertinere, lucide demonstravit.
The greater length and detail of Peter’s account are the most immediately striking differences. In Odo/John’s version, the monk dies almost immediately and the beating to save his life is depicted as a symbolic punishment for his impudence. In Peter’s account, the monk also dies “in a moment” but the description concentrates on drawing out the death of the monk. The reader experiences the last moments of the monk struggling first by himself, and then with the help of onlookers. The monk is helpless to save himself after he makes the choice to eat meat. The visitation of divine retribution is made all the more evident in Peter’s version by showing that not only the monk himself but even a gathered crowd was not able to save the choking monk.

By allowing himself to eat meat, Peter allegorizes, the monk chose damnation, rejected confession and the reception of the Eucharist. The physical death of the monk, Peter implies, was also a spiritual death, in which the everlasting life of the soul was abandoned for the fleetingness of corporeal appetite. The threat underlying this story is thus twofold: firstly, not to eat meat or face divine retribution; and secondly, not even the assistance of companions can offer deliverance from such a fate. Peter also uses this story to reemphasize the importance of confession and the Eucharist, though this aspect is completely absent from the original story.

In Odo/John’s version, the death of the monk is followed by further scriptural proof for abstinence from meat. The proof of the story’s validity is its correlation to further scriptural proof. Peter, however, locates the authenticity in its author (identified by him as Odo). He begins the story with Odo’s status and concludes it with, “This certainly is the teaching of Cluny, brother, the judgement of your first and holy father

---

52 This second threat was perhaps directed to those monks thinking that prayers for the dead would be sufficient to rescue their souls if damned.
Odo". This difference allows him to provide an authoritative literal and moral reading of the story without needing to argue the validity of the contents or his interpretation of them. Peter focuses instead on making an impression on the audience. Fear and terror dominate this story. Peter remarks that Odo wrote to inspire fear (ad terrorem) lest his monks eat meat, the monk's death was fearful (tam terribile morte) teaching that corporeal desire should be fearfully avoided (horrendum esse). The death scene is drawn out such that the reader is made to witness and identify with the physical responses and spiritual movements of the dying monk. Peter wishes his audience to reflect upon the fate of the intemperate monk and fear befalling a similar fate themselves. The evocation of emotions, therefore, momentarily replaces logical argumentation to demonstrate proper action.

The letter as a whole, however, is constructed by Peter as a dialogue between a recalcitrant monk and himself in which Peter confidently and magisterially provides the material necessary to counter any rebuttals offered by his theoretical opponent. An obligation to intervene arises from his abbatial role, but Peter relies on his superiority in logic and his authoritative knowledge to persuade what he advocates a necessary position. "I say", "I respond", "I adjudge," he writes, using verbs of argumentation and cognition, but not command. In the concluding defensio, Peter presents his conclusion as an undeniable truth not due to his innate righteousness, but because he can rationally demonstrate his position. In Peter's text, ratio is the way to truth and dissidents should recognize their erring state. From this text, we see that truth is identified with Peter, though its acceptance derives from his thought, not from some preexisting state of

---

53 Ibid.: Haec est certe Cluniacensis frater, primi et sancti patris tui Odonis de carnibus monachorum sentential, haec doctrina.
authoritative command. Peter expects his position as abbot to grant him the opportunity to address his monks, but abbatial authority is not the reason he expects their adherence.

Peter warns of the damage to reputation and possible accusations of hypocrisy, he burlesques the monks’ excessive desire for food, he inserts a reminder of what are proper habits of fasting, he provides a rational argument for adherence to fasts, he threatens the monks with damnation, he provides a miracle story warning against non-adherence, and he extensively cites scripture warning against eating meat. Though Peter consistently reemphasizes his role in urging correction, he remarks in conclusion:

But lest I seem excessive in my speech, I will now finish my words. For, why should I say more? If these [words] do not deter you neither, I think, will more. If these do not correct you, neither, I imagine, will further. Therefore, God shall grant whether what was said should benefit you. But if they should not have profited you, at least they will benefit me. For I will say to God what the father Benedict maintained about the aforementioned masters despised by their subjects: I do not hide your judgement in my heart, I assert your truth and your salvation. But those holding to their contempt rejected me.54

His job is done, he reminds the monks. Closing off his letter with a citation from the chapter on the abbot in the Rule of Saint Benedict, Peter indicates that he fulfills his responsibility; what remains is whether the monks will fulfill theirs. Through this open question, he elaborates a final vivid evocation of fear, exhorting his audience to consider the day of their death and the judgement to come. When faced with this assurance of a future in hell, what monk would not follow Peter’s strictures?

The absence of a discourse of love and the presence of fear is best understood as a function of the general Cluniac audience being addressed in this letter. Unlike with other

54 LPV, ep. 161, I, p. 394; Sed ne nimius in loquendo uidear, iam uerba finio. Ad quid enim ea ultra producerem? Si te ista non terrent, nec plura ut puto terrerent. Si te ista non corrigunt, nec ut aestimo maiora corrigerent. Det ergo deus ut tibi quae dicta sunt pro sint. Quod si tibi non profuerint, michi saltem proderunt. Dicam enim deo, quod pater Benedictus contempts a subditis magistros dicturos perhibet:
letters we have discussed in this chapter, this disciplinary letter is meant to target all
Cluniacs monks, especially those who are failing. Since fear, as the Rule argues (7.10-
13), is the initial disposition in the monastic progression, it provides a motivator common
to all monks. Peter cannot highlight and draw upon the affects of personal responsibility
in such a widely addressed audience, and so a generalist argument is used.

The use of invective and a humiliating intent seem to point in a similar direction.
We have seen that Peter employs the power of humiliation in several letters, but his use
in letter 161 parallels most closely the strategy of letter 111. By contrasting the conduct
of his monks and their inflated self-conception with their perception by others and their
enmity to accepted standards, Peter seeks to bring about a reevaluation of self and a new
respect for the law (i.e. his statutes). Invective functions in this context not as a passive
expression of their lack of moral worth, but as an injunction triggering to reconsideration
and restructuring of their monastic dispositions. This abasement, though intended to give
authority to Peter’s strictures on fasting (statute 12), likely also seeks to underline Peter’s
own abbatial authority. If Peter’s argument was successful, he would accrue ideological
power from the monks’ recognition of the validity in Peter’s arguments and his
legislation. Such a recognition could not help but to enforce Peter’s state above their
newly humiliated selves. It seems telling, however, that the sole use of this voice with
Cluniacs comes near the end of his abbacy, after more than twenty-five years in which to
consolidate his power through other means.

iustitiam tuam non abscondi in corde meo, veritatem tuam et Salvatore tuum dixi. Ipsi autem
contempnentes, spreuerunt me. Peter cites from the Regula Sancti Benedict, II, 9.
A RETURN TO LOVE

The use in letter 161 of a rhetoric of chastisement is the exception not the rule when Peter addresses his monks. The majority of his letters to Cluniac monks portray monastic brethren as beloved and cherished. Though this is hardly a unique rhetoric, Peter repeatedly demonstrates an affection towards these monks which is paternal and demands a recognition not only of his love, but of the order engendered by it. A letter to the brothers of St. Andrew of Northampton (ca 1130s) provides an indication of this type:

While we love everyone belonging to the body of the Cluniac congregation in accordance with the debt of communal charity, we embrace you among the rest with a certain special affection. And although we have never seen your locale in its physical aspect, nonetheless we have watched over you, not only daily, but continuously, with a regard of true love. This is the result of the fame of your excellent way of life, but especially of your brother Thomas, or rather, our brother Thomas, because even if you are missing [him] personally, nonetheless through him you possess us and all our goods. For he is an intimate of ours, and so much beloved in Christ that while your England has often sent innumerable gifts to Cluny, it never offered anything more gracious and dear [to us] than [Thomas] himself.  

Peter identifies a reciprocal bond between himself and his monks. He watches over them, he loves them, since they follow a well ruled life and since they produce (and give up) such fine monks. The monks at St. Andrew offer the gift of their excellent spiritual service (both in their proper observance and preeminently in their alumnus Thomas), which wins them the protection and “special affection” of Peter, their abbot. This exchange presents all the brothers —including Peter— to be mutually bound by the “debt of

---

55 LPV, ep. 45, I, p. 141; Cum omnes ad Cluniacensis congregationis corpus pertinentes communi caritatis debito diligamus, uos inter reliquis speciali quodam affectu complectimur. Et licet locum uestrum corporali aspectu nunquam uiderimus, intuitu tamen uerae dilectionis uos non tantum cotidie, sed et continue intuemur. Facit hoc bonae conversationis uestrae fama, sed specialiter Thomas ille uester, immo noster, quo etsi personaliter caretis, pro eo tamen nos et nostra omnia possidetis. Est enim nobis intimus, et tantum in Christo carissimus, ut cum innumera Cluniaco sepe uestra Anglia munera miseris, nichil uquam isto gratius aut carius optulerit.
charity”. The language of love which we have see up to now only expressed to individuals, also is employed with communities.

The expression of a dynamic love existing between monasteries and between Peter and his monks –seemingly a sign of religious allegiance and confraternity– unites and unifies monasteries under Cluny and its abbot. This state of love is the basis of the monastic “emotional community”, where it acts as a motivation and explanation for action. We see such a use in Peter’s imploring request for all Cluniac monks to say prayers for his deceased mother Raingard, sister of Marcigny (1135). He makes the request:

If the affection of your charity, if the heart of your piety, if the breasts of your mercy abound towards me, your helper and servant of some kind, then let me put it to the test, I beg. Whence, absent in body, present in spirit, I debase myself with the complete affection of my heart before the feet of your sanctity, and that I might merit to be heard by you, I implore with all the prayers I am able.\footnote{LPV, cp. 52. I, pp. 152-53; Si uesperae caritatis affectus, si uiscera pietatis, si ubera misericordiae erga me qualemcumque seruam uesrum et ministrum uigent, nunc precor esperiar. Unde absens corpore,}

This passage reemphasizes an important strategy in Peter’s textual arsenal. He and his monks are united by bonds of love and affection. He abases himself and evokes his subservience to request something from them. Calling himself their servant, he expresses that his spirit, as if a physical being, prostrates itself before their feet in submission with love, to beg their favour. Like letter 58 to Peter of Poitiers, Peter again presents a striking image of his self-humiliation in order to provoke a reciprocation from his monks. The inversion of hierarchy/status allows for Peter, who has power and responsibility, to seek something from the monks ostensibly under his command. Proper monastic hierarchy, then, is inverted through love so that love and charity might be further served. We see

\footnote{LPV, cp. 52. I, pp. 152-53; Si uesperae caritatis affectus, si uiscera pietatis, si ubera misericordiae erga me qualemcumque seruam uesrum et ministrum uigent, nunc precor esperiar. Unde absens corpore,
emphasized again, therefore, that love allows relationships to be manipulated and
maintained. Love allows gifts to be given and received. Love allows for reciprocation and
redistribution.

The *societas* of love is further emphasized in a letter to the brothers of Mont
Thabor. In this letter, Peter recounts the arrival at Cluny of a brother from this monastery
(in the Holy Land) who revealed the existence of a theretofore unknown monastery
following Clunian customs. This monastery was not institutionally linked to Cluny, but
became a part of its brotherhood in Peter’s heart:

The affection of our hearts increased much more, or rather, completely
united [itself] to your sanctity, as he reported that you are united to our
body in the present day not only by a common faith, by a common
monastic profession, but also by a careful observance of the Clunian
*ordo*.\(^{57}\)

Proper observance of the Clunian *ordo* (i.e. customs/observances) merits their entry into
a privileged community of love. The unity of their endeavours aids them both:

May you pray for us who are praying for you, so that faith and charity
which connects us here to you, though distant and unseen, unites [us as]
companions and co-worshippers for eternity through the grace of the lord
Christ and the gift of his spirit.\(^{58}\)

The community of love is reinforced and made eternal by the exchange of prayers
sanctified by Christ. More than just exchanging aids for salvation, the letter promotes an
association based on love, reciprocity, mutuality and communalism. A desire to develop
further communities of love and to gather more souls into their shared brotherhood,

---

\(^{57}\) *LPV*, ep. 80, I, p. 215; *Adaxit multo magis immo prorsus uniuit sanctitati uestrae affectus cordium
nostrorum quod retullit non solum communi fide, non solum monastica professione, sed insuper
Cluniacensis ordinis sollicita observatione vos corpori nostro unitos esse moderno tempore.

\(^{58}\) *Ibid.*, p. 217; *Oretis uidelicet pro nobis orantibus pro uobis, ut fides et caritas quae nos hic uobis etiam
non uisit et remotisssimis iungunt, gratia Christi domini et dono spiritus eius in aeternum conuituros et
collaetaturos coniunga[n]t.*
underlies Peter's encouraging missive. There is not indication in this letter that Peter
seeks any authority over this far off monastery. By this presentation, Peter promotes an
image of Cluny as naturally spreading across Europe (as far as the Holy Land), but also
gives an important notice of the ideological foundation of Cluniac monasticism: love is
its most important good.

**CONSTRUCTING OBEDIENCE THROUGH PAPAL INFLUENCE**

The letters discussed above show that love forms an important basis of abbatial
influence exploited by Peter over his monks. They demonstrate the importance of
affective tactics in a way that institutional records, like the cartularies, cannot. The
brevity of the language of the charters does not permit such a conclusion and present in
contrast clear juridical relationships of power. The Cluniac cartularies, for instance,
record an agreement dating to February, 1132 between Peter, the abbot of Saint-Gilles
at Limas and Peter, the abbot of Cluny:

It is instituted as follows, that if the religious *ordo* in the monastery of
Saint-Gilles should lessen in anyway, I, Peter, the abbot of Saint-Gilles, or
my successors will reform it at the command and counsel of Peter, the
abbot of Cluny or his successors. I, Peter, the abbot of Saint-Gilles, also
concede with the counsel of our community, that when Peter, the abbot of
Cluny, or his successors should come into the monastery of Saint-Gilles,
he should be received with reverence [...] and sitting in our seat, ruling
also the chapter [...] they shall have the faculty of correcting what ought
to be corrected.\(^\text{61}\)

---


From this document, Peter the Venerable is presented as having authority over the reform of Saint-Gilles and as holding the status of the abbot himself with all due authority and power when present. This document limits the abbot of Cluny’s power to times when reform is necessary and he is present. This monastery, though reformed by Cluny, is not necessarily subject to the abbot of Cluny at other occasions. When compared to the amorphous communities of love outlined in the letters, the appearance of Peter’s form of command seems strikingly different. The legal language of the charter may disguise, however, Peter the Venerable’s tenuous command. The charter admits that the dispute between Cluny and Saint-Gilles was longstanding. Since this document was signed in the presence of Innocent II and Matthew, the bishop of Albano (both of whom were strong supporters of Cluny), their role in settling this dispute seems likely. In such a case, this charter constitutes, but does not describe a pre-existing commanding power. If Peter the Venerable was only able to achieve this control over an abbey after the pope had intervened on his behalf and enshrined the abbot of Cluny’s authority in the legal agreement of this charter, then perhaps this juridical authority was irregular.

To attain such legal declarations of authority, the abbot of Cluny Peter sought assistance from the papacy. As we can see from the epistles remaining in Peter’s letter collection which deal with this topic, Peter’s persistently humbles himself and the ability

---

*Cluniacensis, vel successorum ejus, reformabimus. Concedo quoque ego Petrus, abbas Sancti Egidii, consilio conventus nostri, ut cum Petrus abbas Cluniacensis, vel successores ejus in monasterium Sancti Egidii venerint, cum reverentia suscipiantur […] et resideri in sede nostra, capitudem etiam regendi […] ac per se ipsos que corrigenda fuerint corrigendi habeant facultatem. This charter records the entry of this monastery as an obaedencia into the ecclesia cluniacensis.*

62 The mention of Saint-Gilles in visitation records dating from 1260 provides continuing evidence that the monastery continued to be part of the *ecclesia cluniacensis*, definitely incorporated juridically by the thirteenth century; cf. Poecck, *'Cluniacensis Ecclesia*', p. 374.

63 The document n. 4029 (p. 384) opens with the explanation: *Inter Cluniacensem ecclesiæ et monasterium Sancti Egidii ingens multo tempore controversia extiterat.*
of his monks in order to secure the paternal assistance of the papal court. He identifies the annexation of monasteries in such a manner as the only basis for establishing reform. In letter 23 to Pope Innocent II (1132/36), Peter and Cluny are depicted as monastic reformers at the will of the pope. Letter 23 is presented as a reply to a letter Innocent had sent to the monks of Luxeuil delegating Cluniac monks to reform the practice of religion there.65 Peter’s obedience to the pope is complete:

We received your command with due reverence, but we not immoderately fear its difficulty. For just as your wisdom knows, in the affairs of religion, new institutions can be founded more easily than old ones can be restored, since, as the blessed Gregory affirms, it seems very difficult for men instituted in one way to ponder new things in an old mind. Indeed, he who only builds new edifices does not need to labour to annihilate old ones, but he who strives to repair old ones, is restricted by a twofold care, since he is responsible for the destruction of the old and the construction of the new. About these issues [i.e. the burden of reforming Luxeuil], we of your Cluniac Church, who know the situation, gravely fear lest what is a solace to other churches repeatedly causes us injury, as happens when our brothers are so often transferred to other churches.66

Peter affirms that Cluny will fulfill its duty, but cautions Innocent to avoid commanding further like requests. These exclamations of hardship, however, preface Peter’s subsequent machinations. The monks had come to Cluny, Peter describes, and he was prepared to send them an abbot and all necessary monastic officials to govern Luxeuil properly under Cluniac custom (i.e. annex the monastery to the ecclesia cluniacensis).

Upon learning this, however, the brothers of Luxeuil left, unwilling to countenance such

---

64 Cf. chapter seven and chapter eight.
65 Constable remarks that any papal documentation of this enterprise is no longer extant (LPV, II, p. 111).
66 LPV, ep. 23, I, pp. 43-44; Quod praecaeptum debita quidem reuerentia suscapiamus, sed pro sui difficultate non mediocrum formidamus. Nam sicut notit sapientia uestra, in negotia religionis facilius possunt noua fundari quam uetera reparari,quia secundum beatum Gregorium, hominibus aliter instituitis durum valde uidetur, in mente ueteri noua meditari. Qui enim noua tantum aedificat, eum in ueterum destructione non oportet laborare. Qui autem uetera reparare nititur, duplici cura constringitur, quoniam illi et ueterum destructio et nouorum incumbit aedificatio. Super haec et uestrae Cluniacensis aeclesiae nos qui rem nouimus valde timemus, ne frequentaret sicut sepe fit ad alias aeclesias translatis fratribus nostris, quod aliiis refrigerium, nobis infererat detrimentum.
a position. Peter writes here to Innocent, then, to argue for the installation of a Cluniac head to Luxeuil. This was never done and the difficulties he anticipates here are later asserted to have been proven true in letter 97 (ca 1141/2). Peter explains that he cannot further pursue this matter himself due to excessive constraints on his energy, “What more might I say? *The whole head is tired and the whole heart is faint. From the sole of the foot to the top of the head, there is not health in it. Let the father provide for his sons*. ” Both the head (Peter) and the heart (Cluny) is drained from the efforts of reform. The argument presented here, it seems, seeks less a respite from reform activity and more papal intervention to secure further monasteries subject to the abbot of Cluny. Unless the pope provides them with the proper resources for reform (i.e. the submission of reformed monks to the abbot of Cluny), Peter suggests, he will eschew further demands to reform monasteries. Peter demands that legally grounded abbatial authority is a precursor to Cluniac reform of non-aligned monasteries.

Peter’s humble reckoning of Cluniac resources functions not only to demand further charters of legal power from the papacy, but also has the effect of promoting Cluny as a model for reform in the monastic world. Such is the sentiment in a reply to Pope Lucius, who had sought Cluniac twelve monks and an abbot to found a new Cluniac house in Rome. In letter 118 (1144) Peter insists that Cluny receive a written confirmation in writing of Lucius’ grant. Lucius, however, decided to split the Cluniacs between two monasteries (San Suba and another one), and makes known his worry that his monks, if “divided between different places, will be useless and lose the good which

---

67 *LPV*, ep. 97, I, p. 258.
68 *LPV*, ep. 97, I, p. 258; *Quid plura dicerem? Omne caput languidum, et omne cor merens. A planta pedis usque ad uesticem, non est in eo sanitas. Prouideat pater filiis.* Peter is citing Isaiah 1.5-6.
69 *LPV*, II, p. 176, note to p. 302, l. 23; there is further information on this affair in letter 113.
they could maintain had they all stayed together".\textsuperscript{70} He reaffirms the difficulty of instituting reform without legal controls for which he still hopes. Peter thus seeks to establish a single reformed monastery within the Cluniac \textit{societas} founded upon contractual agreements. His reticence to appeal to duty again is the means to directly and juridically oversee its future state. As with Luxeuil, Peter uses the trope of humility/weakness as a means to demand greater authority over an old and independent monastery. Unfortunately, Pope Lucius’ death soon after (and the succession of the Cistercian Eugenius III) meant that the privilege was never granted and the Cluniac monks were subsequently expelled from the monasteries in Rome.\textsuperscript{71} Nonetheless, Peter the Venerable’s correspondence with Pope Lucius demonstrates how Peter’s promotion of personalized relationships was a means to an end. This end was the reception of permanent written privileges. Without the permanence of a written record, Cluny could not claim authority over monasteries reformed by its monks and meant merely an exhaustion of Cluniac resources. We can see, therefore, that Peter continued his use of humility in order to secure a legal buttress for his abbatial authority from the pope –the paternal authority to which Peter himself was subject. His letters worked to secure for himself the authority of legal sanctions, a form of power on which Peter grounds his reforms most evidently in his \textit{Statuta}. This is a topic to which I will return in later chapters.

\textsuperscript{70} \textit{LPV}, ep. 118, I, p. 312; \textit{per partes diuissi, et nichil proficerent, et fructum quem simul positi ferre possunt perderent.}

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{LPV}, ep. 119, I, p. 312. This letter, likely coming early in the papacy of Eugenius III (1145), also shows an concerted effort to establish good relations between Peter and the pope, thus hinting at the unending cycle of rhetorical submission.
CONCLUSIONS

The hierarchical structures of abbatial power which emerge from institutional records, such as charter 4029, suggest the commanding position desired by Peter the Venerable. It is key to note, however, that such expressions of domination/submission were mediated by the efforts of other parties, such as the pope. The authority Peter receives over monks through the authority of the pope was enshrined in the voice of law, but we have little evidence whether this relationship was adhered to.

This image of a clear vertical hierarchy of obedience is tempered by the letters Peter exchanged with his own monks. In them he uses a voice of authority and ensures that his will is carried out, but he does not expect simple, unquestioning obedience, however. Rather Peter cajoles, urges and inspires. His authority is not innate, but authored: it is a function of his ability to convince his monks (or dissidents) of the correctness of his path through reasoning and evocations of fear and love. This system of love—Peter’s most consistent affective argument—emphasizes the foundation of Cluniac monasticism in emotional and spiritual love. By reinforcing its existence in the relation of abbot and monk, it promotes the existence of that very order within the lives and souls of the monks. Love draws the souls of his monks towards him, towards obedience and towards an order of charity. In the end, Peter’s discourse of love is a means to power, but it is not a superficial or manipulative ploy. Instead abbatial power functions only to ensure that love and charity are followed, the proper order for salvation is maintained, and abbatial obligations are fulfilled.
Between 1134 and his death in 1156, Peter the Venerable wrote and rewrote a collection of miracle stories gathered over the course of his lifetime. This text, the *De miraculis libri duo*, was Peter’s most widely disseminated work and addressed a cluster of topics appealing to the universal Church and to his Cluniac monks in particular. As I argue in the following chapters, this text is a narrative equivalent of the *Statuta*, privileging a literate mentality and transmitting the substance of Peter’s reform effort. Chapter six argues that the *De miraculis*, chiefly in its second redaction, was intended to address a Cluniac audience. Using affective and rational structures similar to those used by Peter in his letters, the narrative voice constructs an argument urging the monks’ personal renovation (of will, desire and thought). This reconstruction forms a precursor for supra-individual reform, which is the topic of chapter seven. Through exemplary Cluniac figures, Peter conveys an imitable model of monastic life promoting the interiority and self-regulation, a doctrine preparing for the foundational ideology of the *Statuta*. 
WRITING THE *DE MIRACULIS* AND MEMORIALIZING THE MIRACULOUS

The *De miraculis* is, in essence, a collection of stories. The chapters are filled with original and, as Peter strives to underline, the most up-to-date tales about monks, priests, peasants, demons and ghostly specters. Above all, Peter’s work is about God, whose power and plans are manifested in every supernatural event, miraculous vision or fearful encounter with demons. In these stories Peter highlights God’s care for humanity in order to remind Christians of their religious responsibilities as well as to urge specific means to fulfill them. In this sense, Peter’s endeavour is edificatory in that he wishes to build up certain forms of spirituality at the expense of others. As I argue in this chapter, a dominant theme of the *De miraculis* is the construction of and adherence to proper modes of Cluniac monasticism. I argue this first by presenting the evidence for a Cluniac readership of the *De miraculis* and further through an analysis of Peter’s narrative modalities.

MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS, CONTENT AND CONTEXT

Scholarship on the *De miraculis* owes its current state to the foundational work undertaken by Denise Bouthillier and Jean-Pierre Torrell, comprising numerous studies, an edition and a translation.¹ Though a printed edition of the work was first completed in 1522 it has been only lately, largely through the efforts of these two scholars, that Peter

¹ *De Miraculis libri duo*, ed. Denise Bouthillier, *CCCM*, 83, (Turnhout, 1988), translated into French by Jean-Pierre Torrell and Denise Bouthillier in *Le Livre des Merveilles de Dieu*, (Paris-Fribourg, 1992), hereafter abbreviated *DM*. References to the *De miraculis* are to the edition and translation by Bouthillier and Torrell; the line numbers and the first page reference correspond to the edition and the references in parentheses are to the page numbers of the French translation. Cf. the bibliography for a complete list of works by Bouthillier and Torrell.
the Venerable’s miracles stories have been accepted as a work of considerable erudition. Their study *Pierre le Vénérable et sa vision du monde* offers a valuable introduction to the complexities of this document and has defined the field of scholarship to date. Their findings have been supplemented by subsequent work undertaken by Huguette Taviani-Carozzi, Dominique Iogna-Prat and to a lesser extent Jean-Claude Schmitt who have shown that the wealth of material within the *De miraculis* has hardly been exhausted.

One of the most significant contributions offered by Bouthillier’s edition of the *De miraculis* is its elucidation of the multiple stages of writing that underlie the text. Bouthillier identifies two major versions of the text: the “brief” collection (Ω) written ca 1134/35 and the “long” collection (A) ca 1142/44. The evidence for these redactions derive from internal and external elements to the *De miraculis*. The earliest evidence for the *De miraculis*, for instance, comes in Peter’s letter 53 to his brothers containing an epitaphium for their mother Raingard (dated Summer, 1135). In this letter, Peter recalls the “devout and sincere religious living” of the monk Gerard (†1133) which “I

---


3 On their work as being one of rejuvenation, cf. *Vision*, pp. 136 and 162. They also conceive their work as introductory and note, “Beaucoup reste encore à dire sur le *De miraculis* et sur son auteur.” (*Vision*, p. 161) as a conclusion to their treatment of Peter’s authorship of the *De miraculis*.


5 Cf. the conclusions reached by Bouthillier, *DM*, 85*-86*; for her evidence, cf. chp. III, pp. 57*-84* passim. With the exception of a few manuscripts, the majority of Ω manuscripts (brief collection) fall into of the β subgroup.

6 *LPV*, II, p. 133.
memorialized fully in the first book on miracles”. From this remark, we see that a redaction of Peter’s collection of miracle stories had already been completed by mid-1135. Peter’s letter 129 to Peter of Poitiers (dated 1141/44) asks that he return the letters and a vita of Matthew of Albano entrusted to him in order that he (Peter the Venerable) might rework them. The presence of miracle stories from Peter the Venerable’s trip to Spain (1142) and from his later life (up until 1156), as well as the insertion of a vita of Matthew of Albano, demonstrates that Peter continued to augment his text until his death. From the manuscript evidence, Bouthillier posits the existence of an original two book structure (comprising 23 chapters in total), which, when later reorganized, formed the majority of the first book of the long collection. The latter was an amended and augmented version of Peter’s original compilation, comprising (in Bouthillier’s edition) sixty-three chapters (including two prologues) divided into two books.

In Peter’s first redaction—as reconstructed by Bouthillier—the work has as its objective the affirmation of the Church in light of the Petrobrusian heresy. The prologue underlines the utility of miracles for promoting faith and the text itself begins with several miracles of the Eucharist. These give evidence of Christ’s real presence in the

---

7 LPV, ep. 53, I, p.162; de cuius devota et sincere conversacione in libro miraculorum primo plenius memorauit.
8 Constable and Bouthillier disagree about the dating of this letter. Constable notes the problems of dating this letter (LPV, II, pp. 182-184) but views a date between 1139 and 1141 as the most likely. Bouthillier (DM, 85*-86*) on the other hand, interprets the reference to the labourious journey (see the following note) as something past, not future, thus dating to after Peter’s trip to Spain (1142).
9 LPV, ep. 129, p. 327. Peter remarks, “For this reason, therefore, we interrupt your leisure (we do not wish ever to be at leisure) in order that you send to us something of Augustine as solace for our labourious journey; and also send our letters, and the vita of the lord bishop Matthew, since the book against the heretics lacks the edition as [it was] conceived and given birth in my very own heart.” Inde ergo ocium tuum interpolamus, nec omnino feriatum esse volumus, ut aliquem nobis de Augustinianis laboriosi itineris nostri consolatorem dirigas, et epistolam nostras, ac uitam domini Mathel episcopi, quia liber contra hereticos editus deest, utel proprie cordis concaepit et partus. Cf. DM, 57* and Vision, p. 121.
11 Cf. appendix B for a description of the chapters, and their reorganization between the brief and the long collection.
host and urge proper respect for the Eucharist (DM, I, 1-5). In the third, fourth and fifth chapters, the miracles of the Eucharist are also used to underline the necessity of proper confession, a theme which Peter further develops in chapter six, where confession provides the means to exorcize a demon. Seemingly anxious lest his readers view this interior-focused solution as a denial of the physical incarnation of demons, Peter explicitly affirms in chapter seven the material reality of angels and demons, as well as the utility of sacraments in effecting salvation. The importance of spiritual exercises (prayer, meditation and physical asceticism) is expressed through the lived examples of sanctity underlined in the four following chapters (DM, I, 8-12) which form an abbreviated vita of the monk Gerald. The second book of the brief collection comprises a series of vision stories, in which the efficacy of intercessory prayer is defended through the veracity of the visions. The exception is the final story—a vision of a demonic procession disguised as monks—which cautions the readers not to assume blithely the nature of people from their appearance.

A concern with demonstrating the efficacy of spiritual exercises is also developed within the long collection. Given that the first book of the long collection is largely a reproduction of the two books of the brief collection, this theme is inescapably present. There are, however, significant augmentations and a certain degree of reordering. Several chapters of the brief collection are provided with new introductions or conclusions to link the old stories to the revised narrative arc of the long collection. Peter adds many new chapters, as well. One chapter (DM, I, 9), for instance, reframes the discussion of

---

13 Cf. appendix B for exact details about the reorganization of the chapters.
14 DM, I, 5, 11, 16, 19, 23 and 25.
intercessory prayer (originally, the second book of the brief collection) into an *apologia* for Cluny. On account of this additional chapter, a defence of sacramental efficacy is transformed into a vision of Cluny as an extraordinary celestial citadel devoted to the ministering to the dead. The second book of the long collection takes up and expands the theme introduced by the *vita* of Gerard, namely that meritorious acts of holy men need to be made known to the world for its edification. Peter includes a *vita* of Matthew of Albano into which he incorporates themes addressed in the short collection (veracity of visions, the efficacy of spiritual exercises) and in the first book of the long collection (defence of Cluny). Peter adds the model of the Carthusians (through both communal and individual examples) and a smattering of further monks’ visions which seem to be appended by Peter at an even later point. These additions, I suggest, rework the text into an advocacy of Peter’s particular model of monasticism. Before I turn to a demonstration of this point, however, I wish to outline how the *De miraculis* has been understood to date.

**WHY MIRACLES: TITLE, CONTENT OR EVIDENCE?**

“Un ouvrage multiple” is how Denise Bouthillier and Jean-Pierre Torrell entitle one of their chapters analyzing the *De miraculis*; they begin with an admonition to the reader, “le *De miraculis* est une oeuvre difficile d’accès”. From a modern perspective, the expanded collection of the *De miraculis* is undeniably a work which defies easy interpretation. The material seems to be heterogeneous, the organization is that of a

---

16 The *vita Mathei* comprises *DM*, II, 4-23. This *vita* may have circulated independently before its inclusion in the *DM*.
17 Cf. *DM*, II, 33 which dates to 1155/56 (*Vision*, pp. 57, 133). This story demonstrates that though the long version was redacted *ca* 1144, this time did not spell an end to Peter’s additions. It underscores, moreover, Peter’s ceaseless desire to ensure the “up-to-date” state of his text.
18 *Vision*, p. 136.
compiler and—with the exception of the *vita* of Matthew of Albano—each chapter is a
discrete story with distinct participants and locale. Peter is concerned what the effect of
this structure might be on his audience:

> I hope that it is established and always constant within the memory of the 
readers what I have often said above, that I do not respect the order of 
time, nor do I avoid any kind of miracle. Therefore they will not have been 
disturbed by the confusion and mixing of chronology, which can perhaps 
be glimpsed, but they will have comprehended that I do not follow the 
passage of time but only the truth of things done at any time.¹⁹

His order, Peter remarks, is not chronological but atemporal and is organized around the
“truth of things done”. Peter justifies not having a chronological narrative (i.e. an
ordering by the times of events) or a chronological testimony (i.e. an ordering by the time
Peter’s hearing or witnessing the stories), claiming that mere mortal order is unnecessary 
when one talks about supreme truth. This order behind this truth is thus left to be read by 
the audience.

The text resembles an unstructured dossier: the stories are united in their tenuous 
link to the categories of the “marvelous” or “miraculous”, but are grouped together with
some explicit linkage and little thematic unity. Visions of the dead mix together with
miracles engendered by the Eucharist, the machinations of demons and hagiographic
description.²⁰ The lack of structure seems partly a result of the multiple stages of
redaction. The *De miraculis*, then, very much resembles Peter’s letter collection given
that it is more the result of a compiling process than a strict thematic or argumentative

¹⁹ *DM II*, 3, ll. 1-7, pp. 102 (195-96); *Quod sepe supra fassus sum me in relatione horum miraculorum, 
nullum temporis ordinem seruare, nullius generis miracula uitare, fixum ac stabile apud lectorum 
memoriam esse desidero. Tunc enim nulla temporum que forte uideri posset confusione vel permixtione 
turbari poterunt, quando me non temporum seriem, set rerum quolibet tempore gestarum veritatem 
obsuare cognoverint.*

²⁰ For more a complete description of the types, numbers and groupings of the miracles, cf. *Vision*, pp. 136-
145 or id., “Miraculum. Une catégorie fondamentale chez Pierre le Vénérable,” *Revue Thomiste* 80 (1980),
*passim.*
strategy. As we deal with in the second half of this chapter, however, we come to see that
Peter’s narrative voice plays an important role in determining how the stories relate to one
another and what can be considered their proper meaning. Though the stories seem
episodic—each story as a separate entity within God’s larger plan—Peter incorporates his
presence as an organizing meta-narrative.

Bouthillier and Torrell attempt to account for Peter’s ordering of the text, but they
are hesitant to identify an organizing principle, whether from a modern or medieval
perspective.21 Despite the title De miraculis, Bouthillier and Torrell conclude that a
rational investigation into the category of “the miraculous” was not Peter’s intention and
that this text served vastly different ends.22 Not the title, but the first words of Peter’s
prologue explicitly indicate his objective:

The grace of miracles occupies an eminent position among the spiritual
gifts of the Holy Spirit due to its inherently great utility, with the result that
chiefly through it the world is freed from the shadows of unfaithfulness, it
is given the eternal light of truth, and also in the hearts of many of the
faithful to whom at some time the vision [of a miracle] was granted, faith is
increased, hope grows and charity is strengthened through it.23

Peter’s intent is to use miracles, therefore, to provide material for enhancing the faith of
believers. Peter’s text is both about miracles and about how through miracles the
audience can be strengthened in belief (faith, hope and charity). What transformation has
been made possible by the experience or viewing of a miracle, Peter is convinced he can
transmit by having others read about one. This quasi-polemic nature relates—Bouthillier

22 Vision, p. 145. The title libro de miraculis is found in the earliest manuscripts, DM, p. 3.
23 DM, I, prol. II. 1-7, p. 3 (69); Cum inter Spiritus Sancti karismata, gratia miraculorum non parum
obtineat dignitatem, utpote que tantam in se continet utilitatem, ut maxime per illam et mundus ab
infidelitatis tenebris liberatus, et eterno lumine veritatis donatus sit, et adhuc in multorum fidelium
cordibus, quibus aliquando hoc uidere datur, per eam fides augeatur, spes crescat, caritas confirmetur.
and Torrell, Dominique Iogna-Prat, and Giles Constable are all in agreement— to Peter’s intention to respond to the accusations raised against traditional Church doctrine.  

Iogna-Prat focuses on the consciously close relationship between Peter’s *Contra Petrobrusianos* and the *De miraculis*. Peter of Bruius attacked the foundations of certain Church institutions (sacred space, the efficacy of the sacraments, the reality of supernatural interventions) and, as Iogna-Prat has shown, targeted churches within the Cluniac sphere of influence.  

The *De miraculis*, as Peter himself admits in letter 129, acted as a reservoir of contemporary “overt miracles” designed to complement the rational argumentation already presented in the *Contra Petrobrusianos*. The “irrefutable” testimony offered by miracles and visions provides a corroborative form of persuasion to Peter’s polemical treatise. As Iogna-Prat argues, therefore, the *De miraculis* fits into Peter’s larger project of ordering and systematizing Christendom.

In this respect, Iogna-Prat agrees with Bouthillier and Torrell’s suggestion that Peter conceived the first version *De miraculis* as an attempt to instill a new orthodoxy within its readers. The *De miraculis* shows an unrelenting concern for purifying the

---


26 *Order and Exclusion*, p. 234.

27 Ibid. The nature of Peter’s argument suggests that the *De miraculis* was not have been intended to target the Petrobrusians directly, but to buttress wavering believers. Since, for instance, the truth of miracles (resisted by the Petrobrusians) is affirmed by demonstrating how some visions are proved “true” by their fulfillment, a belief in God’s providential plan is a precondition to reaching this conclusion. Since coincidence could be an equally likely explanation offered by a skeptic (or a Petrobrusian), a belief in providential order is a *sine qua non* of the reader’s mentality to believe such an argument. This point suggests that the work must target Christians, not heretics.

28 Ibid.

29 Citing the prologue of the second book, Bouthillier and Torrell state, “Pierre précise son but dans les termes les plus forts: il veut ‘construire’ l’édifice de l’Église et ainsi rendre gloire à Dieu.” (*Vision*, p. 147). Strictly speaking, Peter does not explicitly state that “building up” the Church is his intention, but rather
Church, which sometimes manifests itself as attacks on secular clergy, and sometimes on the aristocratic laity, at both times promoting typically Gregorian themes. Huguette Taviani-Carozzi also notes this point, showing that the relationships between living and dead in the *De miraculis* reproduce a societal order and hierarchy based on an acceptance of a Christian “three orders” model, in which the laity are civilized by and subordinated to ecclesiastical virtues.\(^{30}\) Iogna-Prat also concentrates on the *De miraculis* as part of Peter’s project of “silent preaching” – using texts as a surrogate for oral preaching to a non-monastic audience, the secular clergy directly or the laity indirectly.\(^{31}\)

Peter’s work indeed grounds itself in the justification for the role and the practices of the Church generally, but Iogna-Prat’s thesis perhaps applies more to the first redaction of the *De miraculis* than the second. Though a concern with orthodoxy is a concern of both the first and second redaction of the *De miraculis*, the modifications of Peter’s second redaction point to a narrowing of audience and to a change in purpose. I turn to this topic in the section below.

**PREACHING TO THE CONVERTED: CLUNIAC MONKS IN THE DE MIRACULIS**

One of the main problems in understanding the audience of the *De miraculis* is the potential disjuncture between authorial intention and actual dissemination. The surviving manuscript tradition of the *De miraculis* demonstrates that this work was the most broadly disseminated text of Peter’s corpus by its numerical and geographical distribution.\(^{32}\) Of the manuscripts containing a more or less complete text of the *De miraculis*, five date from the twelfth century, two from the twelfth or thirteenth century,

---

\(^{30}\) Taviani-Carozzi, “Ordre et hiérarchie,” p. 239.


\(^{32}\) Cf. *DM*, pp. 35*-56* *passim.*
six from the thirteenth, two from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, one from the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, and one from the fifteenth century. Those medieval manuscripts of an ascertained provenience were copied in France (10), England (1), Germany (2), Poland (1). The seventeen more or less complete versions of the *De miraculis* are supplemented by three abridged versions and extracts of the *De miraculis* are found in over seventy additional compilation manuscripts. Not only are the areas of distribution considerable, but so are the locations in which the manuscripts were read. Of the most complete manuscript collections, the *De miraculis* seems to have been copied in Augustinian (2), Benedictine (2), Carthusian (3), Cluniac (5), Cistercian (4), and Premonstratensian (1) houses.33 The earliest manuscripts (from the twelfth century) derive from French Benedictine (2), Cluniac (2), and Cistercian (1) monasteries. The manuscripts of the second collection (the longer version), however, point to more focused audience. Only seven manuscripts of this redaction are extant (out of a total of sixteen), which derive from Augustinian (1), Benedictine (1), Cluniac (2) and Carthusian (3) houses. It seems telling that every Cistercian manuscript (4 mss.) is of the short version which does not contain the modifications promoting Cluniac monasticism.

The popular reception of Peter’s work is hardly surprising given the general appeal and longevity of miracle collections. Bouthillier and Torrell demonstrate, for instance, that the *De miraculis* ties into a tradition of the “marvelous” which, though largely monastic in origin, appealed to a secular and religious audience.34 The specificities

---

33 Cf. *DM*, pp. 34*-47*.
of each text, however, limit any general conclusions about the genre and its audience. A recent article by Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu has demonstrated the important influence Peter’s work had on the content and structure of subsequent miracle collections of Cistercian, Dominican and Franciscan authorship. The monastic milieu, therefore, welcomed and was predisposed to receive warmly a text like the *De miraculis*.

The positive reception of the *De miraculis* among a monastic audience seems certain given that its content relates models and examples instructive to the lives and experiences of monks. Unlike previous Cluniac hagiographic literature, the focus of Peter’s descriptions of miracles and virtues are on monks and priors, not abbots, highlighting fallible monks, the fears of ordinary monks and the dangers which surrounded them. Though this focus is present to some extent in both redactions, we will see that the longer collection evidences a reworking meant to target the monastic audience. As the following analysis underscores, Cluniac monks provide the major characters and lessons within the second *De miraculis*. Beginning from the slightly tenuous assumption that representation within the stories might provide an indication of the intended audience (i.e. people like to read about themselves, or, Peter wrote stories about those he wished to influence), I demonstrate that the relative proportions of different groups—the laity, the secular clergy and monks (divided into Cluniac and non-Cluniac)—suggest a Cluniac audience.

35 They note, for example, that the *Miracula sancti Benedicti* written at Fleury had a very concrete goal of attracting pilgrims and thus sought the widest possible audience (*Vision*, pp. 202-3), while Cluniac hagiographic antecedents were written with a monastic readership in mind.


When considering the individuals involved in the stories (either as sources or as participants) we see the second redaction of the *De miraculis* focusing increasingly on monastic persons. The first book of the long version contains lay individuals in only four chapters (14%) and the secular clergy in two more (7%). In the second book of the long version, only three of thirty-three chapters (9%) involve individuals outside the monastery.\(^{38}\) Non-monastic persons, therefore, appear in less than 15% of the overall chapters (and are the centre of the narrative in far less). In the brief version, this percentage is higher, as the laity and secular clergy appears in five of nineteen chapters (26%).

Of the stories in the first book of the long version focusing on monks, Cluny or Cluniac monks are at the centre of nineteen of twenty-two chapters (86%). Of the nine new stories added to the first book of the long version, all but one deal with monastic individuals and only one of the monastic stories introduce a monk who is not explicitly denoted as Cluniac. The second book of the long version contains similar proportions.\(^{39}\) Overall then, of the forty-four chapters added in the second redaction of the *De miraculis*, only four chapters contain non-monastic individuals, and four chapters deal with non-Cluniac monks. To put it otherwise, Cluny is the focus of thirty-six out of forty-four new chapters (82%). We see from these proportions (and the change from the brief version)

\(^{38}\) *DM*, II, chps. 1, 2, and 30.

\(^{39}\) It is slightly more problematic to offer percentages for the second book. Since the *vita* of Matthew of Albano fills nineteen of thirty three chapters (57%), this one person skews the results of overall surveys. In his *vita* only three chapters (16%) deal with his life outside the monastic environment and every chapter makes reference to his being a "true monk" even when outside the monastery. Only three of the nine monastic stories (33%) in the second book of the long version (not including the vita) contain non-Cluniac individuals (e.g the Carthusians). This percentage changes to 11% if the *vita* is taken into account. In the second book of the long version only three stories are centred around lay people. One is Saint Maiolus' miraculous resurrection of a dead child, another the divine punishment of oppressive counts of Mâcon, and the third is a defence of prayer for the dead. Even the miracles involving the laity, therefore, deal with issues of concern for Cluniac monks.
that the second redaction of the *De miraculis* concentrates increasingly—despite an already obvious bias in the first redaction—on monastic individuals and derives a greater number of stories (in both absolute and relative terms) from Cluniac sources.

Lexicographically, this focus is also apparent. In Peter’s text *Cluniacus* (and variants) appears thirty-eight times and *cluniacense* fifty-seven.\footnote{In Instrumenta Lexicologica Latina: *De miraculis libri duo*, Corpus Christianorum, fasc. 44, (Turnhout, 1988), s.v. *Cluniacus, cluniacense*, pp. 15-16.} This number puts these words within the twenty-five most frequently used words (not including common conjunctives, pronouns and prepositions), sharing a frequency with such basic spiritual terms as *spiritus* (57), *confessio* (40) or *animus* (40). Cluny and Cluniacs, therefore, are clearly at the centre of Peter’s work and provide most of the material for his discussions, especially in the second redaction. Not only are they first and foremost in the text itself, they provide (with the exception of three chapters on the Carthusians\footnote{Even the idealized portrait of the Carthusians simply reproduces ideas, practices and descriptions previously identified by Peter as Cluniac. In the description of the Carthusians, (*DM*, II, 27) Peter emphasizes that they are armed against pride, envy, ambition, and vain glory through their vile clothes, this perhaps an implicit critique of the pride and ambition aroused in the Cistercians by their distinctive white habits, something Peter treats at length in letters 111. On this letter, cf. chapter four.} the sole monastic model to be followed. Regardless of the audience that later read it, the text shows Cluny to be synonymous with the monastic ideal.

The reason for this high percentage of Cluniac material may simply be a function of the stories or informants known to Peter the Venerable. From his own words, we know that Cluniac monks he met on his travels were the witnesses for some of the miracles.\footnote{For example, cf. *DM*, I, 28, when he learns of a vision while in Spain. On Peter’s travels, cf. *LPV*, II, pp. 257-269, appendix D.} Since he only wished to recount miracles he had heard from reliable witnesses, perhaps this also led to a bias towards men proven in the religious life.\footnote{On Peter’s discussion of true miracles and reliable witnesses, cf. note 1 above and the discussion below.} From his other works, such as the *Contra Judaeos*, however, we perceive that Peter had a storehouse of other
miracle stories he choose not to include in the *De miraculis*. Though Iogna-Prat argues for a wider reception of the *De miraculis* among the secular clergy, the overwhelming focus on monks leads me to believe that it must be directed towards a monastic audience.

Whereas Peter’s miracle stories provide ammunition for strengthening faith, hope and charity and for convincing any Christian of the efficacy of the sacraments, the models of spirituality and devotion presented are entirely monastic. The ascetic ideals and the promotion of the *opus dei*, for instance, provide an imitable guide only suitable for a monastic readership. Even Matthew of Albano, who begins and ends his life as a member of the secular clergy, is described only in monastic terms even when having departed from the monastery. Potentially, the apologetic undertone of the *De miraculis* might offer a narrative response to Cistercian polemic (already attempted by Peter in his letters). There is no manuscript evidence, however, that the second redaction of the *De miraculis* (containing the major Cluniac apologetic material) circulated within Cistercian monasteries. Bouthillier and Torrell note that many of the criticisms leveled by the Cistercians against the Cluniacs are implicitly rebutted in the Cluniac observances promoted by Peter in the *De miraculis*, but I can find no explicit evidence of this. We see that ultimately the *De miraculis* became identified by the Cistercians as pro-Cluniac polemic since similar texts are written and consciously modeled on the *De miraculis*, but containing pro-Cistercian ideology. I find this, therefore, to be the most likely possibility that the *De miraculis* strives to shore up support for Cluny’s preeminence among monasteries in general and to instill adherence to a common monastic model

---

45 Cf. chapter seven.
46 Cf. above.
48 Polo de Beaulieu, “L’émergence de l’auteur,” pp. 177-78.
within Cluniac affiliated monasteries. Certain obvious proofs suggest this possibility. The twelfth-century dissemination of the \textit{De miraculis} occurs mostly within French Benedictine and Cluniac monasteries. One story (\textit{DM}, I, 13) cautions monks lest an abbot encouraging them to transfer monasteries turns out to be a demon in disguise. By encouraging limitations of monastic transfers while also maintaining that Cluny remains a refuge for all (\textit{DM}, I, 9), Peter targets not the Cistercians, but Benedictine monks or Cluniacs thinking of abandoning their past observances. This defence of the \textit{status quo} is found also in Peter’s advocacy of Cluniac autonomy, such as the story about the convent of Marcigny, where the prior’s command overrides even that of a papal legate (\textit{DM}, I, 22). Likewise, the vision of the Spanish King-Emperor Alfonso in which the promise of a perpetual tribute to Cluny is memorialized, serves to remind Cluniac monks of what they are owed. Peter’s text often seems to assume a Cluniac readership. More examples will be discussed in the following chapter, when miracles directly dealing with Cluniac monasticism are examined in more depth.

As we noted about Peter’s letter 111 and Bernard of Clairvaux’s \textit{De praeccepto uel dispensatione}, a concern with bringing further monasteries into the fold was present in both Cluniac and the Cistercian texts.\textsuperscript{49} Just as Bernard addressed Benedictine brothers to convince them of Cistercian superiority, the \textit{De miraculis} can be viewed as doing the same. Given the ambiguity of what exactly a “Cluniac” monastery was (a place that followed Cluniac customs? Or that was subordinate to or dependent upon Cluny? Or that had been reformed by Cluniac monks?\textsuperscript{50}), perhaps Peter felt it necessary to address his treatise to a wider audience of monks, hoping to encourage others to join through an

\textsuperscript{49} Cf. chapter four.
\textsuperscript{50} Cf. chapter one.
evocation of his Cluniac model. Regardless of the specific intended audience, Peter emphasized a monastic program (identified as Cluniac) as a central concern of his work.

Bouthillier and Torrell agree that the *De miraculis* contains a strong political undertone by which he promoted Cluniac monasticism.\(^{51}\) Having been attacked by the Cistercians and disrupted by the succession issue of Pontius of Melgueil, they suggest, Cluny was in a disharmonious state during the early abbacy of Peter the Venerable. This state was something Peter sought to address through the *De miraculis*. Bouthillier and Torrell vaguely comment that Peter wrote "pour redonner confiance et fierté aux clunisiens" and note:

\[
\text{tous les arguments que Pierre pouvait faire valoir à l'égard de ses propres moines pour les affirmer dans leur vocation clunisienne, étaient du même coup des affirmations de la légitimité de ce genre de vie contre les coups de boutoir du trop évangélique voisin.}^{52}\]

If it is true that this work sought to restore confidence to Cluniac monks, how did it do so? If the *De miraculis* cleverly served as a defence of Cluny, both to its own monks and to its detractors, what depiction of Cluniac monasticism did it present? Is Peter's depiction of Cluniac monasticism one that would be accepted by his Cluniac contemporaries? We have seen from Peter's letters to his own monks and those to Bernard of Clairvaux that what he promoted internally was roughly the same as what he defended against the Cistercians. Just as the polemic *Contra Petrobrusianos* finds itself complemented by the *De miraculis*, perhaps so too do his apologetic letters and the *Statuta* find further support in the miracle stories. This text links to a theme common to many of Peter's other works, namely his concern for the proper program of Cluniac monasticism and its reform.

\(^{51}\) *DM*, pp. 25*-29*; *Vision*, pp. 151-61.

\(^{52}\) *Vision*, p. 152.
This last possibility, addressed only in passing by Bouthillier and Torrell, merits further attention. If the second redaction of the *De miraculis*, like Peter’s letters 28, 111, 149 and 150, provides a defence of Cluny against its detractors or dissenters, might it not also, like these letters, have provided a new conceptualization of monasticism not directed outwardly, but inwardly at his own monks? We have seen that there is evidence that the *De miraculis* was written with Cluniac monks as the intended audience, at least in part. How then was the text expected to affect them? I turn now to Peter the Venerable’s narrative authorial presence in the *De miraculis* to explore this topic.

**Peter the Venerable’s Authorship of the *De miraculis***

Up to this point, I have striven to demonstrate a certain unity to the stories through a focus on the Cluniac audience addressed by Peter the Venerable’s *De miraculis*. The single explicitly identified centre of the stories, however, is their authorship by Peter. Throughout the *De miraculis*, Peter underscores and reemphasizes that he is responsible for selecting, organizing and interpreting the stories. From the declaration of authorship in the first prologue, Peter strives to make it clear that he is the one framing the narrative:

I often find myself growing indignant how, when hidden by unfruitful silence, miraculous things vanish (which occur in many places and in our times, though less commonly now than previously) because none puts his mind to writing down what, if made manifest, would benefit the readers. Since I have not been able to induce anyone but myself to this end, I prefer to attempt it with such a pen [that I can], not fearing to be judged presumptuous for such a significant matter. As was said by somebody previously, *I prefer that I, rather than no one*, relate such a useful topic.53

53 *DM*, prol. I, p. 3 (69-70); [...] indignari sepe soleo, cur ea que nostris temporibus plerisque in locis miracula, licet rarius quam priscis temporibus proveniunt, cum non sit qui ad illa scribenda animum applicet, que prodesse legentibus manifesta poterant, infructuoso silento tecta dispareant. Vnde quoniam nullum ad hec nisi me cogere poteram, malui quolibet stilo ea aggredi, non pauens de persumptione tante
Containing an element of unwillingness, a hint of humility yet also an indication of his driving need to record God’s presence on Earth, Peter’s prologue disguises the craft and artifice underlying his writing. As the *ego* organizing the text, Peter is the one who regrets, who writes, who organizes, who narrates, who perceives, who pours out his soul into the text. Though his authorial voice resounds through the prologue, Peter presents himself here as subject to greater influences. He cannot be silent.\(^4\) He must mind the reader. He is driven to write the text out of an unspoken obligation to memorialize God’s works. We perceive thus how Peter’s authorship is highlighted and validated from the very outset of the text. We can see that his authorial status and intention remain unchanged decades later, as is highlighted in the prologue to the second book:

Because I proposed to write down the miracles done in our time or near to our times (of which irreproachable knowledge is offered) for strengthening faith and instructing morals, some others must be adjoined to those that precede, no less useful, I believe, for those who read or hear them. […] I regret and I grow angry […] at the apathy of many who, though they are richly endowed with wisdom, literacy and eloquence, are reluctant to commend through [the medium of] writing for the memory of future generations the miraculous works of omnipotent God, which ceaselessly happen in many lands for the instruction of the Church.\(^5\)

Writing, reading and experiencing miracles are all inextricably intertwined in Peter the Venerable’s text. With literacy comes responsibility; the ability to read and write brings with it an obligation to serve divine purposes and to edify the Church.

\(^4\) *DM.* II, prol. II. 1-12, p. 93 (185); *Quoniam ad roborandam fideum, et mores instruendos, miracula nostro tempore, vel circa nostra tempora gesta quorum indubia cognitio datur scribere proposui, post ea que premissa sunt alia quoque legentibus seu audientibus non minus ut credo utilia, adiugenda sunt. […] Doleo enim et […] torpori multorum irascor, qui cum scientia litteris atque eloquio abundant, miranda omnipotentis Dei opera, que sepe in diversis terrarum partibus ad instructionem ecclesie fiunt, memorie posterorum mandare scribendo, pigritantur.* The introductory *quoniam* may also imply a temporal sense, emphasizing that the second book is entirely new material added to the text in its second redaction.
In her analysis of the prologues to twelfth and thirteenth-century miracle collections, Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu has noted that a self conscious didacticism lies at the heart of this genre.\textsuperscript{56} Her analysis also gives an indication of the success of Peter's text, which was the first instantiation of what became a much imitated textual genre.\textsuperscript{57} Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu also evidences aspects of the distinctiveness of the *De miraculis* in relation to subsequent miracle compilations, which manifested many of the same modalities as Peter's, but lacked his emphasis on a prominent first-person narrative voice. Like his contemporaries and successors, Peter conceived of writing as an individual effort with a justification, plan and author. What distinguishes Peter in her account is not his explicit objective, but how he grounds his *auctoritas*. Later collections were works of author-compilers who logically organized stories—often taken from other authoritative texts such as Peter's *De miraculis*—and who are rarely present within the stories. In these works, the author appears fleetingly and largely disappears from the text. Peter, however, is repeatedly affirmed as an author through fragments of autobiography, his direct witness of miracles and visions, and the explicit first-person narrative he provides to the audience. That the presence of an author is so distinctive indicates it as a topic calling for further investigation.

\textsuperscript{56} Marie-Anne Polo de Beaulieu, "L'émersion de l'auteur," pp. 176-78.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid. We can see that Peter earned renown as an author of this text in the subsequent imitation of the *De miraculis* (leading to a distinct genre). While his epistolary rhetoric depended upon emphasizing and re-emphasizing the relationship between the correspondents and appealed to the power of his textualized charismatic presence, the *De miraculis* becomes a text of which has an existence of its own, independent of the status of its author. This difference suggests a change of *auctoritas* based in the author to one based in the text. A melding of these two strategies seems to take place in the *Statuta*.
Unlike most hagiographic literature in which the author "vanishes" in order to allow the audience to experience unmediated the subject's sanctity, Peter binds together the heterogeneous stories through his personal commentary. The import of Peter's narrative voice is initially suggested by the late twelfth-century \( P^2 \) manuscript (Paris, B.N.F. ms. lat. 17716) from Saint-Martin-des-Champs in which the scribe effaced Peter's narrative comments while adding further criticisms of laxity. To undertake such extensive modification hints at a concern about the reception of Peter's authorial speech within the text. A second indication arises from the sheer magnitude of Peter's presence. Peter the Venerable's voice sounds out clearly within every story of the De miraculis. He outlines his personal relationships with those from whom he hears secondhand of miraculous events or visions. He also offers his direct testimony of others' and his own interactions with the supernatural. Whether a bit player in one of his monks' narratives or as the central character in a personal encounter with demons or visions of the dead, Peter himself is both a narrator and an actor within the De miraculis. The audience is thereby encouraged to blur the distinctions between the instantiations of Peter as the author of the text, the narrator of the stories, and the participant within the stories.

**Peter's Activity within the Narrative**

Unlike Peter's letter collection in which the voice and opinions are directly identified as those of the abbot Peter—the head and mouth of the Cluniacs—the De miraculis projects an image of Peter as an author and compiler independent of abbatial

---

59 Cf. *DM*, pp. 84*-85*.
60 Peter directly participates in the narrative in *DM*, I, 6, 8(2), 8(5), 18, 28 and II, 11-13, 23, 25, 33.
authority. The paucity of references to his status as abbot evidence a certain lack of effort to present this role. It is alluded to most obviously in DM, II, 12 where the text refers to the election of the “author”. As we discuss in appendix C, however, this chapter is likely a later interpolation not written by Peter. He does present himself as a monastic superior in three chapters: he tests the obedience of the monk Gerard, he imposed the oversight of Marcigny to Turquillus and summons Matthew of Albano to restore proper observance after he (Peter) was called to oversee the Cluniac congregation.\(^{61}\) In none of these chapters, however, does he refer to himself as abbot. A monk is urged by a vision of Gerard to confess to the “abbot” as he subsequently does to Peter, though Peter is not explicitly named as abbot. The final chapter of the De miraculis (DM, II, 33) describes how Peter felt the responsibility “according to his office” (pro officio) to urge a monk to make a confession, though no mention is made to what office this is.\(^{62}\) Through these references Peter obliquely presents himself as an abbot, perhaps assuming that his extratextual identity was already well established in this regard. Nonetheless, we can still conclude that within the text itself Peter does not explicitly premise the stories’ acceptance on the basis of his abbatial authority.

When Peter is presented as an actor within the story, he is depicted as traveling to religious sites\(^{63}\) or as a spiritual doctor.\(^{64}\) In both cases, his participation in the narrative introduces how he had the opportunity to hear of a miracle\(^ {65}\) or to view one.\(^ {66}\) In his first appearance in the De miraculis, for instance, Peter confesses a brother in the infirmary at

---

\(^{61}\) Respectively, DM, I, 8(2), 21 and II, 11.


\(^{64}\) DM, I, 6, 8, 18, 28, II, 33.

\(^{65}\) E.g. DM, I, 28.

\(^{66}\) E.g. DM, II, 33.
Sauxillanges and thereby views the miraculous transformation effected. This monk, once a knight, was tormented by the attacks of a demon taking the form of a black horse.

Peter's first impulse was to sprinkle holy water in order to exorcise the demon, but this action had no effect. Upon comprehending the cause of the torment to be interior, Peter took another approach:

I exhorted him to scrutinize carefully his past life and to confess if he recognized any sin in it (especially of the more serious type). After he had consented to this, the other monks retired with the exception of two brothers I kept with me. Until the end of the whole process, I sat before him and I held in my hand a small wooden cross bearing the image of the Saviour in order that he might be inspired [animaretur] to confess. He began his confession and proceeded to confess for some time. Since his great weakness at times disturbed the flow of his words, I occasionally helped him by repeating to him what was able to emerge from his soul to his mind. And resuming quickly his narrative thanks to my meager assistance, he accomplished what he had begun.67

In this description Peter acts as a spiritual confessor. He maintains a narrative focus for the monk and helps the monk (but does not direct him) to interrogate himself. This role, I believe, can be considered paradigmatic of how Peter conceives his narrative voice in the De miraculis. Despite that the confession was interrupted by the monk's physical weakness and by repeated demonic attacks, with Peter's guidance and after several hours of spiritual combat, the monk had fully confessed all his faults and come to peace. The key to this battle, Peter remarks later in the chapter, was the monk's exceptional memory which allowed a complete scrutiny of all aspects of his past life.68 It was not Peter who

---

67 DM, I, 6, II. 70-81, p. 19 (87); eum ut studiose preteritam uitam suam perscrutaretur, et siquid noxium maxime de gravioribus in ea recognosceret confiteretur, hortatus sum. Hoc postquam concessit, remotis aliis, et duobus tantum michi adhibitis, ante illum consedi, et cruciculum ligneam cum imagine Domini, ut magis ad confitendum animaretur, donec omnia consummata sunt, manu tenui. Confiteri ergo cepit, et confitendo aliquando processit. Etquia multa infirmitas ordinem uerborum eius aliquando perturbabat, iuvaebam eum interdum, reducendo ei ad mentem queque animo occurrere poterant. At ille modico meo adivactorio, confestim resumpto ordine, quod ceparat exequebatur.

68 Perhaps not surprisingly, Peter's role in this episode has been likened to that of a psychoanalyst or therapist; cf. Vision, pp. 145 (note 26), 267-70 and Bouthillier and Torrell, "De la légende à l'histoire. Le
provided a solution, but rather the monk who brought about his own salvation. As Peter exhorted in the story, “Brother you must persist also; the evil spirit is working to prevent your salvation, which, if you hold the course, you will attain”. The key to victory for this monk, as Peter presents it, was to relate fully all his life and to scrutinize his entire memory as part of a purification of his soul. As I argue below, this confessional assistance is analogous to the role assumed by Peter’s narrative voice throughout the De miraculis. The stories of his monks are given voice by Peter, who, in recounting them, strives to recall his audience to a proper remembrance of the religious life. Reading and hearing these stories, Peter seems to hope, will provoke a meditation of them, thereby leading his monks to a self-willed and interiorized process of reformation.

WITNESSES OF AUTHORITY

Each chapter of the De miraculis typically contains a story related to Peter by a different witness. The sources of the edifying narrative, like the individuals within them, are manifold and democratized. Peter takes pains to identify clearly a source for each story, noting whether he himself witnessed it or had heard it from a reliable person. General renown and public knowledge are also cited, but only after specific witnesses are named. At times he references “not only two, but even three witnesses” (non a duabus tantum, aut tribus testibus), consciously evoking the standard of evidence named in


69 DM, I, 6, II. 88-89, p. 19 (87); At ego: “Insta ergo et tu frater; malignus spiritus est, impedire festinans salutem tuam, quem si perstiteres, uinces.”

70 Peter himself is a direct witness in chapters DM, I, 6, 9, 18, 20, 22, 23, 28; II, 9, 10, 27.

71 Cf. appendix B for the witnesses of each chapter and the few chapters that lack any. Peter typically names his witness but also (as in DM, I, 10) asserts their virtuous state as evidence for being a trustworthy witness.
Deuteronomy (19:15) for adjudging reliability.\textsuperscript{72} As Bouthillier and Torrell note, only five stories lack a provenance and Peter’s declamations of veracity.

The varied sources give rise to multiple narrators who recount their lives, experiences, visions and thoughts.\textsuperscript{73} Though Peter provides the majority of commentary, the audience also reads/hears several distinct voices recounting and repeating the same message. Not only does this first-person testimony provide validation of Peter’s own voice, but, as I argue below, it encourages the individual members of the audience to recognize their own individual voice as an essential part of the Christian community. Key also in Peter’s reproduction of witnesses’ voices is an attempt to overcome the limitations of writing. Just as his letters attempt to transmit his charisma, his \textit{De miraculis} attempts to make the miracles real to the readers, as if they themselves were experiencing them.

Most chapters only contain a brief testimony of a few lines, but some stories are recounted largely in this voice\textsuperscript{74} which narrates miraculous experience\textsuperscript{75} and visions of the afterlife\textsuperscript{76} or of demons\textsuperscript{77}. Narration is assumed most often by the witnesses of the miracles, but at times demons or specters also speak out.\textsuperscript{78} Specters speak in order to bear direct witness of the afterlife, while witnesses verbalize their direct contact with heavenly figures or demonic terrors. These direct voices bring a certain immediacy to the narrative.

A priest tormented by visions of his future in hell, for instance, articulates clearly each

\textsuperscript{72} \textit{DM}, I, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8(5), 10, 11, 13-15, 18, 20-28, II, 2, 15, 17-21, 25, 26, 33. The \textit{vita Mathei} contains very little first person testimony and also is less concerned with demonstrating the sources for the stories (cf. appendix B for more detailed notes in this regard). With the \textit{vita Mathei} section excluded the witnesses’ own words are said to be recounted in twenty-eight chapters, i.e. 61% (47% including all chapters of the \textit{De miraculis}).

\textsuperscript{73} \textit{DM}, I, 4, 11, 15, 18, 23, 27, 28, II, 2, 21. The story in \textit{DM}, I, 26 is mainly narrated not by the witness, but in the first-person singular of the specter viewed by the witness who then retold it to Peter the Venerable.

\textsuperscript{74} \textit{DM}, II, 2

\textsuperscript{75} \textit{DM}, I, 4, 20, 21, 23, 24, II, 21.

\textsuperscript{76} \textit{DM}, I, 6, 7, 8(5), 18, 25.

\textsuperscript{77} (Specters) \textit{DM}, I, 4, 8(5), 10, 11, 23-28; (demons) \textit{DM}, I, 13 and 14.
aspect of his future torture. Between Peter's interjections, the priest recounts his simultaneous experience of lions ripping him apart, a cauldron of fire broiling him and then his admission that he believes himself to be too damned for any help.\(^9\) In the story of the monk tormented by a demonic horse for not fully confessing his sins (discussed above) the infirm individual speaks likewise at four points.\(^0\) He begs the demon to leave him in peace, he describes the demonic attacks to Peter, he demands that the demon let him tell his story and then relates the peace he felt after the demon left. His four interjections, then, mark different stages in the battle with the demon: his initial terror, a request for assistance, a commitment to confession and finally being at peace. His comments are incidental and not substantial in telling the story, however. and though Peter is concerned with allowing this monk to speak his own memories (as we noted above) this story is told in the *De miraculis* through Peter's voice, with the exception of these four comments.\(^1\) Since much of the chapter is Peter's defence of the efficacy of sacraments (in light of the unsuccessful application of holy water to put the demon to flight) and the promotion of interiority as true religious observance, we can see that the first-person testimony serves to authenticate the larger import of the chapter. By allowing the words of others to speak in his text, Peter presents the *De miraculis* not only as his interpretation but also as the authentic transmitted experience of miraculous events.

In addition to using first-person testimony to overcome the limits of his own narration, Peter seeks to use the status of the witness to buttress his own messages. Such is the case when the voice of Saint Hugh, the abbot of Cluny, relates one of the longest first-person testimonies in the *De miraculis*, even though he recounts only a story told to

\(^{9}\) *DM*, I, 25.

\(^{0}\) *DM*, I, 6.

\(^{1}\) In the critical edition, the monk speaks fifteen lines of text (out of a possible 159 lines, or 9.5%).
him. Though Peter elsewhere refuses to repeat stories he could not verify with direct first-hand testimony, Hugh’s status is sufficient to authenticate a story about the special renown of Cluny. A concern with validity is also evidenced by the vision of the hermit Peter of Engelbert (DM, I, 28). Peter begins the chapter by recounting how he sought out the hermit after hearing about his vision, which argues for the efficacy of prayers for the dead (especially those of Cluniac monks). Peter the Venerable remarks how the “maturity of his age, the gravity of his manners, the corroboration of all and also the whiteness of his hair convinced to accord firmly a complete faith [in him]”. Peter also emphasizes that in order to eliminate any doubt from his mind whether the vision was true; he questioned Peter of Engelbert at length, asking him to bear witness to his testimony before a crowd of Peter’s companions (who included the Spanish bishops Stephen of Osma and Martin of Orsene among other religious and learned men).

Peter’s concern with truthful testimony continues when the hermit presents his story with a confirmation of its authenticity, beginning his tale with the words, “I recount what you ask of me not as I learned it from another but as I saw everything with my own eyes”. After this comment Peter interrupts the hermit’s story to remark on the positive reception of his testimony from all the gathered individuals. Peter regrets that in his retelling he eliminates others’ reactions and repeats verbatim only the words of the

---

82 DM, I, 15.
84 DM, I, 28, II. 20-22, p. 88 (178); etatis maturitas, et morum gravitas, et cunctorum attestatio, ipsaque nivea canicies, fidei integram constanter reprehendere suadebant.
85 Ibid., II. 24-25, p. 88 (178). Peter often expresses that he initially feels doubt which is overcome by the force of the witnesses’ words. This targets those questioning the authenticity of the story who would find their state of mind represented and then undercut within the narrative. Similar evocations of doubt, subsequently overcome, appear also in I, 8(5) and 24. In this last chapter, Peter mentions that he could have included several additional and noteworthy stories about the protagonist (Guy, the bishop of Genève), but the lack of suitable witnesses prevented him from presenting them completely without doubt.
86 Ibid., II. 32-33; Ego ait istud quod a me queritis ab alio non accepi, set ipse propriis omnia oculis uidi.
hermit, stating, "I wish to pass to the speaker so that anyone of you (who reads or hears this) believes not only that you grasp the sense of the words, but also that you hear the exact words from his mouth".\textsuperscript{87} The voice of the hermit then recounts a dream-vision in which a dead mercenary warns of the damnation awaiting parsimonious kings. The hermit was visited by a Sancho who had died in his service and now sought aid for his soul. Sancho speaks about the fate of two fellow citizens, Peter of Jaca and Bernier of Stella, the first in heaven, the second in hell, because of (respectively) their trust and disbelief in prayers for the dead. When questioned about Alphonso VI, the specter notes that the king had been tortured alongside criminals but was quickly succored by the monks of Cluny. Peter of Engelbert concludes his story with a declaration of the authenticity of the dream-vision; he confirms its truth when his wife remembers that he still owed Sancho some money, as Sancho had claimed. At the conclusion of the hermit's discourse Peter the Venerable comments, "I faithfully wrote down this vision so manifest and so memorable, reproducing it word for word for the edification of the faith and morals both future and present and I showed clearly, through the testimony of the dead themselves, what prudence is necessary for mortals."\textsuperscript{88} Peter then concludes with a glorification of the Leonese royalty who had supported Cluny.

The outcome of this vision would likely have been well known among monks and laity alike. Soon after this vision was witnessed, King Alphonso VII donated substantial

\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., ll. 39-41, p. 89 (179); Volo autem eum loquentem introducere, ut quicumque hoc legetis sive auditis, non solum sensum verborum, set et ipsa verba ab eius ore usus putetis audire. Peter also cites his word for word reproduction of the witnesses' testimony in DM, I, 6, 21, 23.

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., ll. 134-37, p. 91 (183); Hanc tam claram et commendabilem visionem, uelut uerbum e verbo exprimens ad edificationem fidei et morum tam modernis quam posteris fidelis transmisi, et quanta cautela mortalibus necessaria sit, mortuorum ipsorum testimonio declarauit.
holdings to Cluny and instituted a tithe on its behalf.90 The two named witnesses to the
testimony—Stephen of Osma and Martin of Orsene—also appear as witnesses to the
official charter of this grant.91 The story implies (for those who knew subsequent events)
that the king was convinced by this vision to offer further gifts to Cluny. Peter also gives
evidence of the affectivity of visions, encouraging people to act in certain ways out of
recognition of its truth. The implicit causation adds a final layer of validation, moreover,
in which the content (proof of efficacy of prayers) is acknowledged by a sovereign
authority.

Evident from this story, therefore, are the several layers of authentication. The
witness is vetted and vouched for91, the testimony is observed by many, the vision proves
its reality, and Peter the Venerable repeats twice that his account exactly reproduces that
of the hermit. Though this measure of justification exceeds what is typical for the De
miraculis, the forms of validation are common. A miraculum, as Peter presents it, seems
akin to an exemplum. Exempla stories were destined to be inserted into sermons for the
instruction of the faithful. A key component of the exempla was that they were self-
sufficient and self-validating—containing all the elements and explanation necessary to
convince the reader of their veridical status.92

---

90 DM, note to II. 24-25, p. 88, (item, p. 179); Charles J. Bishko, “Liturgical Intercession at Cluny for the
King-Emperors of Leon,” in Studia Monastica 3 (1961), pp. 53-76.
91 At other points in the De miraculis, Peter’s defence of witnesses becomes very lengthy and involved,
such as in DM, I, 7. In this chapter, Peter argues the validity of the spiritual conversion undergone by a
monk who had entered Cluny ad succurendum on the basis that he had undergone a change of heart, even if
he had not undertaken the physical practices of monasticism. Vouching for the witness becomes, in this
chapter, a justification for deathbed conversions as well as promoting the importance of intention over
orthopraxy.
92 Claude Bremond, Jacques LeGoff, Jean-Claude Schmitt, L’exemplum, Typologie des Sources, 40,
Peter displays a similar concern with identifying the authenticity and veracity of his own personal testimony. His dream vision of William of Roanne provides an excellent example of this intent. Peter begins his narrative with an affirmation that dreams can at times be authentic visions, citing the textual authorities of Scripture (Genesis and Matthew) and Odo of Cluny's *Vita Gerardi* to solidify his claim. He then recounts his dream of William. Despite being in a dream state, Peter comments, he was as if awake with his memory functioning perfectly. Upon seeing the vision of William before him, Peter asked a series of questions. How are you? Are you with God? Is our belief true? How did you die? William replies that he was happy and with God, that the Christian beliefs in God was certain and that he had been poisoned. After this initial vision, Peter awoke, and inscribed the dream onto his memory. He then fell asleep and had the same dream again, which convinced him of its veracity. The subsequent confession of William's murderer is advanced as proof of the dream's authenticity. Much like facts are used by historians, Peter employs miracle stories as revealed truths to demonstrate the divine order for the world. We can see in this particular story the affirmation of the Christian faith as well as the implication that all wrong-doings will be punished by God. By outlining the truth-value of the vision, Peter argues for the veracity of the vision, while avoiding debate about the content. By emphasizing the authoritative and trustworthy nature of the witnesses (himself included) and the miracles, Peter the Venerable frames the content of the *De miraculis* as unimpeachable. As such, the miracles and visions act as building blocks within Peter's arguments which cannot be questioned, thereby making his interpretations of them all the more authoritative.

---

93 *DM*, II, 25.
94 Ibid., II. 63-65, p. 144 (255).
95 Ibid., II. 89-94, p. 145 (256).
PETER THE VENERABLE’S NARRATIVE PROCESS

In addition to the first-person testimony, the De miraculis is narrated through four major forms: description, organizational asides, logical argumentation and affective persuasion. This narrative process closely reproduces the textual strategies underlying Peter’s letters with the same goal of provoking a reconstruction of his monk’s desire, thinking and (thereby) comportment. The key to effecting this transformation of the reader in Peter’s presentation, seems to be the reconstruction of memoria, which demands a reorientation of affect and intellect. We can see the initial hints of this underlying structure in Peter’s description and his organization, which I will discuss first.

Through descriptive passages, Peter outlines the historical context for the story and describes the events which took place. Peter notes the location of the story, the events leading up to it, a brief discussion of the protagonist –essentially all the information necessary for understanding how and what was the miraculum experienced. These are essentially the foundation of Peter’s account. The description, however, is often sprinkled with justificatory asides which attempt to note support for various customs or practices which Peter wishes to underline but which do not arise naturally from the narrative. In one chapter, for instance, Peter opens the story;

During the night hours another time, a brother [who was] a woodworker, lay in bed removed a little from the others. A blazing lantern illuminated this place, as is the custom in the dormitories of monks.\footnote{I have been unfortunately unable to consult the study by Marinus Pranger on Peter’s narrative style in DM, I, 1; cf. “Narratieve superioriteit: Petrus Venerabilis en het bijenwonder [Narrative superiority: Peter the Venerable and the miracle of the bees],” Millennium: Tijdschrift voor Middeleeuwse 12 (1998), pp. 126-137.}

\footnote{DM, I, 14, ll. 1-4, pp. 45-46 (122); Alio quoque tempore, alter guidam frater lignorum artifex, nocturnis horis in loco aliquantulum ab alis sequestrato iacebat. Quem locum ut in monachorum dormitoriis moris est, lampas accensa illustrabat.}
Though this information is unnecessary for understanding the story subsequently told (where the monk overhears monks boasting of their conquests), its significance is glimpsed when we note that this is a custom that Peter also strove to institute as a standard among his monks.\(^8\) Its casual inclusion allows Peter to imply (without any justification) that the use of lanterns is and should be standard practice among the Cluniacs. Similar details are found elsewhere in the *De miraculis*, urging the devotional use of wooden crucifixes, the sounding of offices in the infirmary, and the necessity of novices to declare their profession directly to the abbot of Cluny.\(^9\) These asides seem to be a simple means to inscribe Peter’s norms on the minds of his monks without resorting to active argumentation.

As already noted earlier in this chapter, the stories of the *De miraculis* are bound together with limited linking text hinting at the larger plan. This commonly consists of brief comments, such as *supradictus* or *ut dictum est* by which Peter marks text containing themes related to earlier material.\(^10\) Peter also embeds certain indications of an ordered plan when he invokes conventions of brevity or the necessity of changing topic:

> It seems fitting to devote further attention [to this matter], but since this labour does not pertain to the plan and such a matter cannot be explained by brief words hastening toward others, it is necessary that—with these words interrupted— we move onto those things, as we promised, which need to be discussed about the revelations of the dead.\(^11\)

We can see an increased interest in making this overarching plan evident in the second redaction (long version), since such statements abound in the new chapters and several

---

\(^8\) Cf. the discussion of statute 49 “Concerning lights in the dormitory” in chapter nine.
\(^10\) Bouthillier offers numerous examples, cf. *DM*, p. 33*.
\(^11\) *DM*, I, 9, II, 66-70, pp. 36-37 (111); Liberet his diutius inmorari, set quoniam ad propositum opus hoc non pertinet, et tanta materies breui atque ad alia festinanti non potest explicari sermon, necesse est ut istic ad presens intermissis, ad ea que de mortuorum reuelationibus sunt exequenda, ut promisimus accedamus.
old chapters are given new material of this sort.\textsuperscript{102} Passages similar to that cited above are sprinkled throughout the \textit{De miraculis}. By them Peter is able to hint at thematic and doctrinal linkages between distinct stories and returns the mind of the reader/listener to the key messages underlying the text as a whole. The audience is provided with indications of an order underlying the narrative, but are not provided with an explicit structure for deciphering it. This idea replicates David Howlett’s conclusion about Peter’s writing style in a letter to Heloise, that Peter “invites the reader to participate by drawing inferences, without which the authorial implications remain incomplete”.\textsuperscript{103} To more fully explore this suggestion, I wish to return to a passage taken from the second redaction (long version) cited at the outset of this chapter:

I hope that it is established \textit{[fixum]} and always constant \textit{[stabile]} within the memory of the readers what I have often said above, that I do not respect the order of time, nor do I avoid any kind of miracle. Therefore they will not have been disturbed \textit{[turbari]} by the confusion and mixing of chronology, which can perhaps be glimpsed, but they will have comprehended \textit{[cognouerint]} that I do not follow the passage of time but only the truth of things done at any time.\textsuperscript{104}

This discussion of narrative order also seems to be an expression of the order of the soul/mind. Employing the language of cognition, Peter emphasizes that things should be \textit{fixum} and \textit{stabile} in the memory, thus allowing them not to be confused \textit{(turbari)} from the lack of superficial order.\textsuperscript{105} Peter wishes, instead, to assist the reader in the search for truth which should not be sought from chronology or categories, but from their own recognition \textit{(cognouerint)} of the “truth of things”. To more fully understand Peter’s intent, I turn now to Peter’s theory of memory.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{102} Of the chapters of the brief collection, eight (just less than half) contain significant additions (\textit{DM}, I, 4, 5, 11, 16, 19, 20, 23, 25).
\textsuperscript{103} Such is also the conclusion of David R. Howlett, in his brief analysis of a letter of Peter in his article, “Arithmetic rhythms in Latin letters,” \textit{Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi} 56 (1998), pp. 193-225, here p. 217.
\textsuperscript{104} \textit{DM} II, 3, ll. 1-7, pp. 102 (195-96); the complete Latin text can be found in note 19 above.
\end{footnotesize}
REMEMBERING AND THE *DE MIRACULIS*

The miracle stories which Peter recounts are intended to create an effect on their audiences. Intended to free the world from the “shadows of unfaithfulness,” to offer the “eternal light of truth” and to strengthen faith, hope and charity (i.e. the basis of Christian life), Peter conceives of his text as allowing the transformation of his audience. The key to effecting this change is memory.

In the prologue to the first book, Peter the Venerable seems to equate the impact of miracles as coterminous with their memorialization. If he did not write down the miracles, he would be responsible for “their disappearance”, since miracles themselves, not merely the knowledge of miracles, “vanish when they are not recorded”. The act of establishing miracles within the text gives them continued life and utility. In other words, a miracle remains merely a sign; it has an existence (and meaning) only insofar as it has a continued life in written word or living memory. Miracles, Peter seems to suggest, are fundamentally communicative strategies.

If I say that memorialization is the end of Peter’s writing, I do not mean it in some historiographical manner, i.e. leaving behind a factual account of events in his time. Memory serves another function in Peter’s writings. It is the means to enable the renewal and transformation of an individual. From his analysis of Peter’s *Contra Petrobrusianos*, David Appleby has shown that memory does not act as an archive for Peter, but rather, echoing Mary Carruthers’ arguments about monastic theories of memory, as a cognitive

---

106 *DM*, I, prologue, ll. 1-7, p. 3 (69); cf. note above.
process.\textsuperscript{107} According to Appleby, Peter’s theory of knowledge is fundamentally based in recollection, where the soul moves to regain the memory of God already imprinted upon it (adhering to an Augustinian notion of the soul where memory exists within a psychological trinity of memory, intellect and will). Memory is the part of the soul, in this model, which can experience simultaneously the vestigial imprint of God, a consciousness of the outside world and the individual self. Only memory, therefore, can be provoked to a proper and simultaneous consciousness of God, the world and the soul. As Appleby concludes, “memory is not simply the recollection of events, it is the realization of the importance of those events, then manifesting itself in moral action”.\textsuperscript{108} He remarks that certain visual symbols, like the Eucharist or the sight of the Holy Sepulcher, are designated by Peter as having a privileged power to awaken the memory of the soul to the magnitude of Christ’s love for humanity, thereby instituting a flowering of love in a person’s subsequent behaviour. We can see that miracles (and stories about them) hold a position similar to the Eucharist in this regard. Visions of the afterlife or of demons, Peter comments, are used by God as an instrument more potent than common words or images to warn of things to come. At the end of a story about a priest’s visions of his future torments in hell, Peter comments:

In no way (as the blessed Gregory said) did the wretched priest see all these things for his own sake, whom the vision would not benefit at all. Through him, however, the heavenly order demonstrated how carefully the sacerdotal office must be administered and how reverently the divine mysteries must be handled. [...] But since the terror of future punishment cannot be shown to men still living in the flesh except through ordinary words or images of well-known things, it pleases God to show through such simulations of bodies what souls departed from their bodies are


\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., p. 130.
forced to endure in punishment for their depraved acts. Although these things were demonstrated in past miracles during the time of the Fathers, divine compassion wished nonetheless to reconfirm the former revelations with new and to rouse with fresh impulse those who, as if languishing in a dream of heedlessness, disregarded the former [revelations].

Peter argues a twofold conclusion. First, the vision was experienced by a sinner (a priest who did not properly respect the purity demanded of his office), but it was intended by God to inform the monks gathered at his death bed. The vision—related to the audience—was intended to teach a lesson. The parallel to Peter’s role in this regard really needs no further explication. That the priest’s vision of hell and torments (being mauled by lions, being roasted in a cauldron of fire) used images which his mind could make use of (i.e. had memory of), and that he could translate them thereby to his audience, evidences that the power of the vision was not limited to one experiencing it. In fact, Peter remarks, the vision came too late to help reform the priest and the only benefit was to the onlookers. It is not the transcendental power of the vision which affects the audience, but the essence of the vision, which in this case was to engender terror of damnation (the use of affective guidance, especially fear, will be examined further in the following section). It seems logical that Peter conceives of himself in a similar manner, recounting stories to provoke his readers through their secondhand experience of visions and miracles, transformed by commonplace words and images.

109 DM. I, chp. 25, ll. 113-116, 135-143, pp. 78-9 (166-67); Que omnia secundum quod beatus Gregorius dicit, nullo modo propter se infelix presbiter uidit, cui nihil ulius ipsa profect, set quanta cautela sacerdotale officium administrandum, quam reuerenter diuina mysteria tractanda, superna per eum disposito demonstravit. [...] Set quia terror supplicii futuri, non nisi per verba usitata, uel per expertarum rerum imagines, hominibus adhuc in carne usiuentibus potest ostendi, placuit Deo per tales corporum similitudines ostendere, quid exuto anime corporibus pravis exiuntibus meritis cogantur tolerare. Que licet antiquioribus miraculis patrum temporibus demonstrata sint, uoluit tamen etiam diuina miseratio nouis revelationibus priora confirmare, et eos qui uetera despiciunt, ueluit negligentie somno torpentes, recentibus impulsionibus exciari.
As we return to the two last forms of Peter’s narrative process (logic and affectivity), we can see that these two complementary strategies are intended to transform the soul/mind of his reader. Like in his letters, therefore, Peter premises the implementation of reform in personal transformation. Though ratio is a far less important strategy in the De miraculis than in his letters, it remains an important means of re-orienting his monk’s souls.

**Logical Argumentation**

The De miraculis contains a number of ideas justified internally through logical argumentation.\(^{10}\) For instance as we have already seen, Peter prefices his dream-vision of William of Roanne with a brief but multi-layered proof for the authenticity of dreams.\(^{11}\) In another chapter (treated in more depth in my next chapter), Peter argues the efficacy of the sacraments in light of an exterior practice (splashing holy water) which was insufficient to exorcize a demon.\(^{12}\) One of the most developed uses of reasoning, however, comes in Peter’s argument for the role held by demons in the providential plan.\(^{13}\) In this story added in the second redaction, a terrified brother overhears three demons boasting about their successes in imperiling souls. One demon at Cluny was unable to accomplish anything, but another had encouraged a knight to commit adultery and a third had manipulated a school master of a monastery to commit fornication with one of his pupils. The next morning the monk rushes to inform the abbot Hugh of what he overheard, which when investigated was revealed to be true. Wondering why the demons

---

\(^{10}\) The most developed examples can be found in *DM*, I, prol., 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 25, 27, II, prol., 19, 25, 33.

\(^{11}\) *DM*, II, 25.

\(^{12}\) *DM*, I, 6.

\(^{13}\) *DM*, I, 14.
would reveal their successes, Peter does not question the witness but the intent of the
demons, concluding that they served divine providence. These “truthful assistants of
mendacity” (ueridicos mandatii ministros), Peter continues, were used by divine
providence to warn of the dangers of damnation, to underline the security of Cluny as a
sacred citadel and to allow for the redemption for sinners they imperiled, perhaps with
and perhaps without the demon’s knowledge and will. 114 In almost the exact terms as in
his letter 94, Peter outlines his proof for his assertion (extending almost eighty lines in the
critical edition), citing extensive scriptural evidence to show that demons aided the good
either knowingly or ignorantly. 115 He declares his certainty about either possibility and
ends in conclusion:

I added this to what was said or perhaps is to be said about demon-
sightings, so that none may be surprised that [demons] undertake their
words or deeds as if by free will, because this is not their work, but the
plan of Divine Providence, which benignly uses evil for exalting the glory
of His name and, through their evil actions, produces much goodness for
His own. […] How can the stupidity of the human mind, sunk deeply as it
is, be able to guard against such artifices of [Satan’s] cunning if He, who
is called the Wisdom of God, does not reveal them to us? 116

What is noteworthy about this passage is that it begins with an assertion which will brook
no disagreement and concludes about the fallible senses of humanity, perhaps as warning
to those who disagree with Peter’s interpretation.

Peter’s logical commentary works towards an explication of a story’s
significance. These authoritative judgments appear at the beginning or end (and

114 DM, I, 14, l. 30, p. 47 (123).
115 Cf. LPV, I, ep. 94, p. 250; Vision, pp. 409-10. This justification, ll. 31-110, are omitted from P2.
116 DM, I, 14, Il. 96-107, p. 49 (126-27); Hoc ad ea que de visionibus demonum dicta vel forte dicenda sunt
interserui, ut nemo consilia seu opera sua eos quasi sponte prodere miretur, quoniam non ipsorum hoc
opus, set diuine dispensationis est consilium, que ad ampliorem nominis sui gloriam etiam bene utitur
malis, et de ipsorum malicia, multam erga suas benignitatem operatur. […] Quomodo depressa in imis
humane mentis stoliditas, tot dolositiatis eius uersutias cauere valeret, nisi ille qui Dei Sapientia vocatur,
eas nobis detegeret?
sometimes both) of each chapter. We can note an increased concern with establishing narrative certainty in the long collection since several chapters contain noteworthy additions in which Peter offers explicit interpretive conclusions.\textsuperscript{117} These statements provide an explicit summary of the proper meaning of the individual narratives, usually calling for reverence of the sacraments or concluding on the efficacy of the sacraments, prayer and certain spiritual exercises in attaining salvation. We can see that Peter strives (even more in the second redaction) to address the rational component of his monks by addressing them with logic.

A minor aspect of Peter's argumentation is the use of textual citation. Unlike much of twelfth-century monastic historiography, Peter does not excerpt from codified collections of miracles, historical works or legal documents to provide his stories with legitimacy.\textsuperscript{118} He does supplement some of his stories with direct quotations from some texts, including Classical authors, Scripture, Patristics, \textit{vita}, the \textit{Rule} and contemporary theologians.\textsuperscript{119} Overall, it is used sparingly, as if appeals to textual traditions are not as convincing as up-to-date reasoning. Explicit citation multiplies, however, when Peter presents monastic models (such as through the personage of the monk Benedict\textsuperscript{120}) or

\textsuperscript{117} \textit{DM}, I, 5, 11, 16, 19, 23, 25.


\textsuperscript{119} Cf. \textit{DM}, "Index Locorum S. Scripturae" and "Index Scriptorum", pp. 169-179; since these indices cite texts mentioned in the footnotes and apparent textual analogs, the number of direct citations explicitly noted by Peter are far fewer than those numbered by the editors. Peter's explicit citations of Scripture, for example, can be found in \textit{DM}, I, 6, (ll. 58-65); 8 (ll. 25, 40, 85-90, 148, 190, 247), 9 (ll. 42-45, 53-55, 60-1), 13 (ll. 32), 14 (ll. 45-6, 53-55, 60, 65, 76, 89, 103), 17 (l. 2), 18 (l. 45), 20 (ll. 1-2, 17, 22, 82-84, 103, 123, 127), 25 (l. 131), 27 (ll. 67, 135), 28, (ll. 157-9). II, prol. (ll. 18-19), 1 (ll. 31-32, 56), 5 (ll. 11-12), 6 (ll. 26-28, 29, 46-48, 61), 9 (ll. 11-12), 10 (ll. 15, 25, 29-31, 32, 33, 35, 63), 12 (l. 94), 14 (ll. 3-4, 11, 17, 22), 15 (ll. 11-13), 20 (ll. 32), 22 (ll. 17-18, 48), 24 (ll. 21), 25 (ll. 7-8, 49-50), 27 (ll. 19-20, 30-31, 33, 34), 28 (ll. 15-16, 20, 46), 29 (ll. 7-8, 22-3, 31-33, 60), 30 (ll. 53-55).

\textsuperscript{120} \textit{DM} I, 20 or II, 10; cf. chapter seven for an in depth discussion of both chapters.
explains doctrinal issues (such as the use of evil by divine providence\textsuperscript{121}). When texts are cited by Peter within logical argumentation, the citations seem intended to provide authoritative proof for contentious points he makes.\textsuperscript{122} As he presents his monastic models however, the lived examples of charisma authenticate the texts, such as Gerard of Cluny who “proved in his very self the truth of what the Apostle said”\textsuperscript{123}. In this instance, the validity of scripture (a person reaps what he sows) is shown to be manifest and truthful by the conduct of the person. Likewise, the use of excerpts from the \textit{Rule} to describe the Cluniac monk Benedict explicitly demonstrate that he lived the life instituted by Saint Benedict. The textual references link the Cluniac monks Benedict and Gerard with valid codified models of conduct, but it is the virtuous action of the monks which prove the value of the written words. We see a similar process at work in the \textit{De miraculis} as a whole. Modern examples and logical proof target the rational faculty of his monks, urging them to reform their behaviour. As such, we can see close similarities to the letters, where Peter saw logic as a key strategy in urging, persuading and reconstructing his monks’ will-to-obey. The same use here, despite an explicit objective, points to Peter’s similar intent. Argumentation, moreover, never operated independent of affectivity in the letters, and in the \textit{De miraculis} we see the same focus on the rhetoric of emotions.

\textbf{AFFECTIVITY IN THE \textit{DE MIRACULIS}}

Within the \textit{De miraculis}—as in Peter’s letters— the twin poles of fear and love form guiding principles behind the characters’ behaviour as well as the interpretation

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{DM}, I, 14.
\textsuperscript{122} As Logna-Prat has shown (\textit{Order and Exclusion}, chp. 4 \textit{passim}).
\textsuperscript{123} \textit{DM}, I, 8(2), II. 247-48, p. 32 (103); \textit{veram esse Apostoli sententiam […] in se ipso comprobuit}. 
given by Peter. As introduction to Peter the Venerable’s affective narrative, I wish to recall Peter’s use of storytelling in letter 161 (ca 1144/56). In this open letter to all his Cluniac monks, Peter the Venerable excoriates his monks’ gastronomic excess, beginning with legal and logical proofs but climaxing in a cautionary story of a glutinous monk taken from John of Salerno’s *Vita Odonis.*

We see a similar narrative method employed throughout the *De Miraculis.* Fear forms an especially prominent motivator in Peter’s stories. In twenty-two out of twenty-eight chapters of the first book in the long collection (79%) Peter describes the terror of the participants, calls explicit attention to its lack, or debates the use of fear in the divine plan. Fear is not a negative but admirable emotion, and we see that Peter encourages his monks to experience it through the examples of those maintaining a properly fearful disposition. Peter praises, for instance, the nuns of Marcigny who, when their convent caught fire, were too filled with the dread of the world and the love of God to leave their cloister. Needless to say, the fires were put out by a miraculous wind before the nuns were harmed. This story demonstrates that there are certain fears to ignore but others miracles demonstrate that fear and terror also act as instructive guides. As we noted above, Peter explicitly argues that terror is intended by God to remind monks to take care in the present life. Peter also remarks that fear is a means by which God coerces individuals to adhere to His will. When explaining the purpose of demons in the providential plan, Peter concludes, “[God] uses [demons] in the manner of a prudent

---

124 Cf. chapter
125 Such as *DM*, I, 28.
126 Such as *DM*, I, 14 and 25.
127 Helpful for understanding the philosophical and cognitive aspects of Peter’s conception of fear is Sarah C. Byers’s “Augustine and the Cognitive Cause of Stoic Preliminary Passions (Propatheia),” *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 41 (2003), pp. 433-448.
128 *DM*, I, 23.
paterfamilias so that the bad slaves, who are in no way persuaded by love to serve, only follow the commands of the lord in slavish terror". Peter conceives of fear as evoking obedience, as is natural for a Benedictine abbot. Here Peter appeals to the first stage of humility that every monk must learn: the need to follow commands out of fear of God and damnation. Peter uses fear so often in the De miraculis it suggests, as in letter 161, that there is a disciplinary intent underlying his text.

A complementary strategy is an appeal to love and Peter balances his portrait of terror with descriptions of sincerus amor. The theme of love, however, is present in only 23 stories of the long collection (38%). Whereas fear presents those things from which the soul should be repelled, love identifies what the will must desire and pursue. Unlike fear, love never merits an explicit discussion of its utility in the De miraculis. Instead, the lived examples of model Cluniac monks are infused with subtle indications of their ability to love and be loved. The chapters on Gerard, Benedict, Matthew of Albano, and the anonymous Carthusians all contain numerous evocations of their love of spiritual exercises, of God, and of the Virgin Mary. Gerard is motivated by his love of Saint Hugh and Matthew of Albano is transformed by his friendship with Ralph, the archbishop of Rheims. The friendship of these latter two are described as “religious” (religiosa familiaritate) which made the two equals through love. Through his friendship, Matthew improved in religion:

The good canon, brought together with the good bishop by the harmony of their good manners and upright life, advanced little by little in daily

129 DM, I, 14, ll. 48-50, p. 47 (124); utitur eis sane more prudentis patrisfamilias ut malis seruis, qui cum nullo ad serviendum amore moveantur, servili tantum torrore, dominici imperii obsceuntur.
130 Cf. appendix B for specific details.
131 DM, I, 8 and II, 5-6.
increments towards a greater love of religion as well as a greater love of sacred conversion and conduct.\textsuperscript{132}

This passage prefaces Matthew’s entry into the monastic life in the following chapter. The love born of this friendship sparked the “divine fire” in Matthew’s heart (\textit{diuinus ignis}) and made him long for the monastic order. Love, it seems, is both transformative and transformed in him. The love of Ralph becomes a love of religion through the attractive influence of love itself. The monk, Gerard, likewise comes to develop his love for chastity, the liturgy and divine things through his contact with Cluniac monks during his youth.\textsuperscript{133} The image of such perfect men motivated love to take complete possession of his soul.\textsuperscript{134} Perhaps this transformative notion is also the idea behind Peter’s descriptions of his model monks. They exhibit love and thereby encourage the reader to do the same.

At their most basic, fear and love act as narrative shorthand showing what is to be avoided or undertaken. More importantly however, these affective markers indicate to the reader how their own emotions are to be experienced and provide an orientation for the proper moral disposition of a monk.\textsuperscript{135} He expresses the need to love confession and interior scrutiny by casting it as the love of God, and its omission as falling into the hands of demons.\textsuperscript{136} Peter therefore uses the larger categories as a means to construct a detailed picture of proper and improper conduct and dispositions. As Mary Carruthers argues

\textsuperscript{132} \textit{DM}, I, 5, II. 19-22, pp. 104-5 (199); \textit{Sic bono episcopo bonus canonicus, bonorum morum uiteque honeste congruentia coniunctus, paulatim per cotidiana incrementa, ad maiorem religionis ac sancte conversionis et conversationis amorem promouebatur.}

\textsuperscript{133} \textit{DM}, I, 8(1).

\textsuperscript{134} \textit{DM}, I, 8(1), II. 18-19, p. 24 (94); […] hic [amor] artius eius animum semper possideret.

\textsuperscript{135} Cf. Thierry Lesieur, “Modèle clunisien de la justice divine et mode de la rationalité.” pp. 10-11. Lesieur argues that St. Odo of Cluny developed a conception of reason in which the feelings of fear and love allowed an individual to perceive the order of justice informing the whole universe and to guide him on the path towards reform.

\textsuperscript{136} For example, cf. \textit{DM}, I, 3, 4, 6 and II, 33.
about monastic theories of memory, affectivity is an important strategy for contextualizing specific ideas wishing to be remembered. By placing rules and precepts within a story with clear indications of good and evil, abstract rules are made concrete and assigned to distinct memory-categories. I suspect this is what Peter attempts to undertake with the *De miraculis*. He wishes to make a story which is memorable and convincing, but he also wishes to reconstruct the soul of the reader. Through his argumentation and his affectivity, Peter strives to draw the soul/mind of his audience towards a contemplation of the higher truths nestled within the miraculous.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have argued that Peter’s second redaction of the *De miraculis* served to address his own monks and that the diverse *miracula* were integrated by Peter’s consistent and ever-present narrative voice. It is significant, I believe, that Peter does not place abbatial action at the centre of his didactic tales, though he carefully places himself, as the single extended participant in all the narratives. Unlike previous Cluniac hagiography which focused on the textual and imitable model of the Cluniac abbots, it is not Peter’s own conduct or his enactions of spirituality which instructs his monks, but rather his words. He authors formulations of ideal monks and present actions or thoughts to be avoided and to be pursued, which demands the active interior development of his monks. His textual strategies transmit not only the content of his monastic ideology, but also serve to induce the reader to internalize and memorialize it. The conversion of memory seemingly supported by Peter’s text allows the reform of the individual, not in his actions, but in within his soul and consciousness. In the following chapters, we see his

---

reasons for dissemination such a text. As I outline in the following chapter, the *De miraculis* offers an extended argument for a monastic spirituality largely based in interiority and pure intention. Through the authorial techniques outlined above, Peter strives to implement such a program. When viewed from this perspective, the *De miraculis*, seems a necessary complement to the *Statuta*, where he changes the external practices and rituals of Cluniac monasticism.
Due to the balm of spiritual virtues flowing [from the Cluniacs], the entire edifice of the world was filled with the perfume of their ointment, when the fervour of monastic religion, which had almost grown cold in that time, revived under the example and zeal of those men. Gaul, Germany and the overseas Britain testify to the above; Spain, Italy and all of Europe confess it, filled [as they are] with monasteries —some founded newly by them and others restored from past decline. There, colleges of monks persevere day and night in divine praise and in other exercises of the spiritual virtues, just as celestial troops surround God in accordance with their stations [ordinibus] such that through them also, it is possible to understand the saying of the prophet: Blessed are those who live in your house, O Lord, who praise you everlasting. But how can I specify what parts of the world, when our renown has traveled from our Western edge to the ends of the East and penetrates every corner of the Christian world? Indeed, [Cluny] is the vine and [her monks] are the branches, who bear much fruit (according to evangelical judgement) by cleaving truly to the Christ-vine and having been purified by the Father-gardener.¹

Such is one of the most explicit and concise defences of Cluny in any of Peter’s writings.

This passage, introduced in the second redaction of the De miraculis, typifies Peter’s attempt to promote Cluny and to address himself to his monks, as well as Peter’s public attitude about Cluny: the monastery was a paradise on earth, the monks served and bettered the entire world, they were second to none in reknown and spiritual influence.

Peter locates the prestige and power of Cluny in the spiritual warfare conducted by the

¹ DM, I, 9, ll. 44-60, p. 36 (110-11); Hinc effusa spiritualium uirtutum nardo, impleta est tota mundi domus, ex odore ungenti, dum religiosis monasticis ferox, qui illo tempore pene refrigererat, illorum uirorum exemplo studioque recaluit. Gallia, Germania transmarina quoque Britannia hoc testatur, Hispania, Italia, totaque Europa fatetur, plena monasteriis, ab eis aut notuer fundatis, aut ab antiquo senio reparatis. Ibi monachorum collegia, in morem celestium agminum per ordines suos Deo assistentia, cum alius sanctarum uirtutum exercitiis, diuinis laudibus die noctuque ita insistunt, ut de eis quoque a prophetis dictum possit intelligi: Beati qui habitant in domo tua, Domine, in secula seculorum laudabunt te. Set quid aliquas mundi partes enumer, cum de nostro ultimo Occidente usque ad ipsum Orientem fana hec perueniret, nec aliquem christianorum orbis angulum lauerit? Hec namque est uinea, hii sunt palmites, qui ueri Christo inherentes, et a patre agricola purgati, secundum euangelicam sententiam multum fructum afferunt.
monks through prayer and spiritual exercises that united them with Christ and were overseen by God-the-Father. This passage contains nothing particularly novel, nothing especially revolutionary. These are all sentiments already expressed by Peter, among other places, in his letters to Bernard of Clairvaux. As I argue in this chapter, the *De miraculis* advocates sentiments and ideas—in narrative form—already expounded in his letters. Cluny’s traditional role as refuge and the function of its monks as caretakers of the dead continue to be emphasized in Peter’s text as the basis of its preeminence. However, interpreting these stories not as the historical situation, but as monastic ideology, I examine in this chapter what Peter promotes in the growth and change of Cluny. Cluniac monasticism, like a vine constantly rising toward the sun and spreading its branches, needs sometimes to be pruned so that it may bear only the finest fruit. And who better situated and more justified than Cluny’s abbot to fulfill this role? As we see below, Peter promotes a monastic ideal that conceives of the abbot and his priors as a centre of reforming activity. The authority of the abbot, however, is not absolute and, as we see in this chapter, his role is limited both by his relationship with his monks and the very nature of Cluniac monastic spirituality.

**RENEWAL AND REFORMATION IN THE *DE MIRACULIS***

From the passage cited above, we perceive that Peter places Cluny at the centre of reform and revival in monastic life. Cluny populated the world with monks through its foundations and its restorations. Cluniac monks revived an ardour in a world grown cold in religious passion since the time of their monastic forefathers. Not only the multiplication of monasteries, Peter suggests, is admirable, but also the new-found virtue

---

2 Cf. chapter four for further discussion.
and spiritual zeal which are the hallmarks of this Cluniac restoration. Because of this emphasis on modernitas throughout the De miraculis, we know that this picture does not only serve to recall Cluny's foundation or early history, but also addresses the twelfth-century Cluny under Peter himself, including the one brought about by Peter's reforming efforts.

Just as Peter remarks that the monks of Cluny were purified by God-the-Gardener, so too does Peter describe himself and others, as cleaning and pruning the monastic crop. The metaphor of Cluny as a vine requiring tending, for instance, is recalled in a later story of the De miraculis. The panegyric description cited above is somewhat at odds with the account of Cluny that follows in the Life of Matthew of Albano:

In the great and noble field of the monastic order [ordinis] there had recently sprouted [plants] deadly to the useful ones, needing to be cut down or even more to be uprooted; due to the failure and indolence of some, whom I do not wish to name since for the most part they have all left this life, many [shoots] needing to be weeded had sprouted. To help with this matter, I summoned (as I already said) a great and energetic labourer of the vine of Christ [...] 3

The monastic ordo to which Peter refers is Cluny, the deadly plants are monks advocating a less than perfect asceticism and the energetic gardener is Matthew of Albano, who was summoned by Peter from Saint-Martin-des-Champs for the purpose of restoring discipline. 4 Whereas in his letters, Peter uses the term monasticus ordo to designate all adhering to the monastic life (without distinction between Cluniac, Cistercian or unaffiliated Benedictines), here it means only Cluny or the ecclesia

3 DM, II, 11, ll. 13-18, p. 116 (216); Succreuerant paulo ante in magno illo et nobili monastici ordinis agro resecanda vel potius euellanda utilibus satis contraria, et quorum dem quos nominare nolo culpa vel desidia, nam ex maiori parte iam uita exessentur, plurima exsitripanda, exoria fuerant. Ad huius rei adiutorium, magnum hunc et uinee Christi non segnem operarium ut iam dixi accersiens [...].

4 Ibid., ll. 7-8, p. 116 (214); ad ordinis adiutorium et ad imposite curae supportandum sarcinam.
cluniacensis, but perhaps this is an intentional transposition of the monastery of Cluny for any monasteries. The weeds, Peter continues after the passage cited above, were pruned by removing impairments and superfluities (noxia et superflua) in food, drinking, and customs (moribus). Peter avoids naming the specific lapses and offers anonymity to the instigators, leaving the matter “to be passed over in silence” (reticenda). Presumably, the vine always continues growing so there must always be someone to prune or else it will become unruly. This picture of Cluny is not one of a monastery beset by troubles, but one in which temporary problems with discipline are overcome and corrected. This is a portrait sure to please Cluniacs (since all order was restored) and Cistercians (since laxity is admitted and addressed). We glimpse a picture, therefore, of Cluny itself undergoing reform—not of Cluny reforming the world—as a necessary and perpetual process.

COERCIVE LEADERSHIP: THE PRIORATE OF MATTHEW OF ALBANO

From Peter’s letter 28 to Bernard of Clairvaux we have seen the idea of abbatial discretion underscored as a key principal in determining proper monastic practice at Cluny and Benedictine monasteries generally. The leadership of the abbot (and his use of discretion) is also key to proper monastic observance in other examples provided in the De miraculis. In the chapter entitled “Matthew’s conduct towards his subordinates” (DM, II, 9) Peter outlines a model for monastic leadership through Matthew’s action as prior of

---

5 The addition of reticenda may hint at something deeper. Its use does not seem to be merely a topic statement (e.g. an aside to the reader apologizing for a need for brevity), since he is already very vague on what was changed. His purpose here is likely to avoid further scandal about this subject by suppressing its memory. Since a more specific elucidation of the customs changed would only aggravate Benedictine (like Odericus Vitalis) or Cluniac monks resistant to a stricter observance (something advocated by the Cistercians), Peter likely conceives the former as his readership.

6 On the ideal abbatial position emerging in the Rule, see the study by Adalbert de Vogüé, La Communauté et l’Abbé dans la Règle de saint Benoît.
Saint-Martin-des-Champs. It is perhaps telling that Peter selects Matthew as his model of
leadership –Matthew who is depicted as a strict reformer operating at Peter’s command.
From the beginning of the chapter, Matthew’s quality of mercy is emphasized, “He was
merciful with [his monks], by preparing necessities for them according to their abilities
and by granting requests with great labour to each one just as was their need, following
the apostle and the Rule of Saint Benedict”. The passage continues on to describe how he
looked after the ill, the poor and guests as much as he was able, and whencesoever he was
absent he exhorted his monks to keep his example in mind. He was, as Peter summarizes,
“a father for all, without exception and with the requisite discretion”. His mercy, though,
did not translate into permissiveness or laxity. Instead, Peter describes Matthew’s justice,
which manifested itself both in his lived example and his judgements. The beginning of
the chapter which emphasizes Matthew’s love for his monks, segues into an account of
the fear he engendered, thus identifying in Matthew the two poles of affective motivation
which Peter himself employs throughout the De miraculis. He punished those neglecting
the Rule and showed himself, “inflamed with the inner fire of divine zeal in his heart,
words and countenance” when dealing with those sinning knowingly. By acting as
father and corrector, Matthew parallels the traits associated with God-the-gardener, since

---

7 DM, II, 9, pp. 111-13 (208-211); Qualis erga subditos fuit. The best treatment of Matthew of Albano
remains Ursmer Berlière’s “Le cardinal Matthieu d’Albano (c. 1085-1135),” Revue bénédictine 18 (1901),
pp. 113-140 and 280-303; a few additional comments, and an edition of his letter to the Benedictine abbots
at the 1131 chapter of Benedictine abbots at Reims is in Stanislaus Ceglar, “Guillaume de Saint-Thierry et
son rôle directeur aux premiers chapitres des abbés bénédictines: Reims 1131 et Soissons 1132,” Saint-
Thierry, une abbaye du VIe au XXe siècle. Actes du Colloque international d’histoire monastique, Reims-
8 Ibid., II. 10-12, p. 111 (208); Misericors in eos erat, necessaria eis pro uribus preparando, et unicuique
secundum Apostolicam et patris Benedicti regulam prou opus erat, multa labore questia largiendo.
9 Ibid., II. 31-32, p. 112 (209); Omnibus et absque exceptione, et cum congruenti discretione, pater erat.
10 For more on this topic, cf. the previous chapter.
11 Ibid., II. 36-37, p. 113 (209); corde, uerbis, et uultu, interiore zeli Dei flamma […] inflammatus.
he too attempts to weed the Cluniac garden. With approbation Peter recounts Matthew’s attempts to implement corrective punishments:

Following Cluniac custom, he reprimanded those erring as seemed just, [some] with bloody whippings, [others] he restrained with irons, with fetters and various types of bonds and he sent many to a shadowy prison; by imposing a strong hunger and thirst, he broke the pride of the body and spirit.\textsuperscript{12}

We could hardly find a better description of coercive tactics of mental reconfiguration from a Stalinist-era dissident. Spiritual reeducation is the end, and Matthew effects changes in disposition through a training and targeting of bodies. In Peter’s depiction, physical restraints provide a symbolic recreation of an inner battle to overcome desire (e.g. hunger and thirst) and allow the soul to be perfected by corporeal means.

Peter expands on Matthew’s disciplinary practices in the story of a “spiritually dead brother”.\textsuperscript{13} When an obstinate sinner refused to mend his ways and ignored the frequent admonitions of his father and brothers, Matthew had a subterranean cavern—a “perpetual sepulcher”—prepared for him.\textsuperscript{14} Faced with the prospect of being walled in alive and after having seen the very image of his corporal tomb, the monk undergoes a spontaneous reconversion and rejects his past failings with all his heart. He is renewed (becoming humble and contrite) and like Lazarus, took on a new mortal life in order to merit eternal life. We see here again where the inner and outer man are conflated and a physical solution is proffered to correct the spiritual.

Matthew’s ability to reform a monk’s personal disposition is mirrored in his supra-individual reform successes. Peter approvingly comments how not only his

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., ll. 41-45, p. 113 (210); deliquentes Cluniacensi more prout iustum uidebatur sanguinolentis uerberibus castigabant, ferro, compeditibus, et diversi generis uinculis coherebant, tenebroso plerisque carceri mancepabat, fame valida et siti, carnis ac spiritus superbiam conterebat [...].

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., ll. 47, p. 112 (210); spiritualiter mortuo.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., ll. 46, p. 112 (210); sepultura perpetua.
subjects (*subditus*) but also those in far away monasteries were deterred/ frightened away (*deterreo*) from sinning "by Matthew’s name alone".\(^{15}\) He excelled so greatly in exterminating sin that:

he induced the house committed to him to a far better state of religion than [it was] used to and aided by the help of a few good men, he restored [*reformaret*] to the best observance of religious life several surrounding monasteries and abbeys which had languished in the fervour of the complete monastic *ordo*.\(^{16}\)

This example underscores strongly how Peter conceives correction, whether personal or communal, as the product of coercion brought to bear by a prior or abbot. Whether the correction of the individual, of a house, or many houses, the goal of the abbot/ prior is to achieve reform. Reform/ correction need not be limited to only the house directly governed since Saint-Martin-des-Champs as well as its neighbours were improved under the guidance of Matthew.

Fear is Matthew’s mechanism for inducing changes in observance. Matthew presides over his monks, who are subjected to his power, his spiritual guidance and whose very spiritual identities are constructed by him. Though Peter’s portrait seeks to defend Matthew, as we see below, he is representative of an idea of governance which is a counterpoint to one based in love. Peter implicitly contrasts Matthew with other figures—himself included— who preside through love, not fear. Indeed, Peter inserts the image of Matthew as a tyrant ruling through fear between two descriptions of the love Matthew

---

\(^{15}\) Ibid., ll. 67-68, p. 113 (211); *solo Mathei nomine deterrebat*.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., ll. 71-76, p. 113 (211); The passage reads in full: *In hac virtute ita preceluit, ut et domum sibi commissam ab longe maiorem solite religionis statum peruceret, et multa circumposita monasteria uel abbatias, que a totius monastici ordinis feroare languerant, adiutus quorundam bonorum uirorum auxilio, in optimum religiose conuersationis propositum reformaret*. 
had for all and how he was beloved by all.\textsuperscript{17} By this example Peter warns of the dangers awaiting (in this life) those monks who do not will their obedience and reform their souls. Intentional blindness leads to terrible punishments, the evocation of which are intended to repel the readers’ soul/mind from the possibility of sin or failure in obedience. Just as Peter was filled with harsh words and invective with heretics and undisciplined monks, so to does his description of physical punishments urge improvement and correction, though in this case, indirectly. The fearful Matthew is thus presented as one alternative—one intentionally feared by his monks— to Peter’s own form of leadership which is based in more subtle and benign techniques.

SECRET OF THE SOUL: SCRUTINIZING INTERIORITY

Love, as we have seen in the previous chapter, is a motivator equal to fear. To emphasize this point, Peter describes the charismatic leadership of William of Roanne. On all his monks, Peter says, William “left an imprint of his virtues”.\textsuperscript{18} He was chosen by Peter to be prior and abbot of several different monasteries chiefly on account of his angelic purity, his especial mercy and his ceaseless practice of virtue.\textsuperscript{19} Unlike Matthew, Peter describes William as encouraging monks by his own loving example, not through corporal punishments.\textsuperscript{20} Peter offers also an image of himself as one who promotes conversions (of the sort Matthew instills through the fear of a “perpetual sepulcher”) by a careful scrutiny of his monks’ consciences and the elicitation of proper confessions.

\textsuperscript{17} The beginnings of \textit{DM}, II, 9 and II, 10 evoke the love held by and for Matthew, which contrasts with the harsh tone of the middle section of II, 9.

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{DM}, II, 25, l. 38, p. 144 (254); \textit{virtutum signa impressa reliquit}.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., ll. 22, 29-30, p. 143 (254); \textit{angelice monachus mundicie [...]. Nam quantum facultatis et scientie in eo fuit, iuxta morem et modum Cluniacensis ordinis ac propositi, sacris semper etiam aliarum uiritum exerciciis inuigaluit}. We can note here another passing reference to actions as if normalized custom, cf. the previous chapter for a discussion of other of these justificatory asides.

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., ll. 32-54, pp. 143-44 (254-55).
As we noted in the previous chapter, Peter is presented as a spiritual doctor caring for the inner lives of his monks within the *De miraculis*. In addition to the example cited there of the monk helped to make a complete confession by Peter, the *De miraculis* contains further stories of Peter’s spiritual guidance. Peter recounts, for example, an episode of a brother informed by a vision of the deceased Gerard (a monk to whom Peter had just devoted several hundred lines of praise) to speak with the abbot (i.e. Peter) if he should wish to be freed from the torments of a demon.\(^{21}\) The story implies, with the proof of a vision of the afterlife, that Peter should be informed of inner troubles in order to assist the monk. The final chapter of the *De miraculis* similarly contains an account of a sick monk who only makes a partial confession when exhorted by Peter to make a full and complete accounting of his life:

> I admonished, according to my office [*pro offitio*], that as long as he was lucid, he should scrutinize his conscience, confess his sins and not neglect anything relevant to his salvation, but rather prepare himself with as much effort as possible for completing safely the pilgrimage by means of confession, devotion and prayer.\(^{22}\)

Peter’s responsibility to oversee confession, we see here, derives *pro offitio*, i.e. from the abbot’s duty to act as pastor to his flock. He does not command confession, however, but solicits it. The monk acquiesces gladly (*libens*) and Peter provides absolution. During the night, however, a dream informs the monk that he had not offered a complete confession, and he worriedly re-confesses the following day, again to Peter. It is not only Peter’s duty, but also the brothers’ will, drawing monks to take advantage of the spiritual guidance and assistance offered by the abbot.

---

\(^{21}\) *DM*, I, 8(5), ll. 275-77, p. 33 (105).

\(^{22}\) *DM*, II, 33, ll. 17-21, p. 164 (283); *Monui pro offitio ut quamdiu compos sui erat, conscientiam scrutaretur, peccata confiteretur, nec aliquid ad salutem anime pertinens intermitteret, set confessione, devotione, oratione, ad iter peregrinum secure explendum se toto quo posset conatu pararet.*
From this last story we see how Peter describes the benefits monks receive for wanting using their spiritual father to their advantage. There are, of course, other monks who do not. Peter tells the story of a brother at the monastery of Lihons-en-Santerre, who was a monk in name and habit, but not in life or comportment. This monk, admonished often by his prior and his brothers, remained spiritually blind even when faced with remonstrations, punishments and whippings. He rejected “the treatment of spiritual medicine” and while he changed for a time outwardly, he did not receive its balm inwardly. The end suffered by this monk offers a cautionary example to any of a similar disposition. After being forced to maintain a perpetual claustration, the monk grew angry and decided to set fire to the monastic storehouse. The monk saw the destruction of foodstuffs as a suitable compensation for the restrictions the community had placed on him. Instead his excessive self-will and his lack of self-regulation is divinely punished by an avenging angel before he could do much damage. His death, providing an example for the monks witnessing it (as well as those reading about it) promotes the importance of subjection and obedience as the proper monastic disposition. Should interior submission to God and community lack, correction cannot be accomplished and damnation results. The emphasis here is placed on monks being personally responsible for regulating their attitudes and disposition.

Salvation cannot be forced on anyone, Peter argues. The abbot has a special role as a spiritual father and —as we see from the example of Matthew— as a prison warden. We perceive two strategies of leadership: coercion and attraction. Both effect a response and a result, but ultimately (as the last example demonstrates) coercion can only be as

\[23\] *DM*, II, 24, pp. 140- 42 (249-50).

\[24\] Ibid. I., 15, p. 140 (250); *spiritualium cura medicorum*. 
effective as the response it engenders inwardly. Monks must undertake a "true" confession; they must incorporate a new "life" into their hearts and minds. The abbot cannot force conversions, but can only set up the conditions for their self-integration. Though partly aided by abbatial or communal supervision, it is largely through individual practice and belief, as we see below, that Peter suggests salvation is attainable.

**Limits on Fear: The Balance of Exteriority and Interiority**

Peter presents the governance of the abbot as determined in part by the will of his community to obey (as noted also in the letters). It is noteworthy that the role Peter takes for himself in the *De miraculis* is that of a loving father-confessor, not (as with Matthew) as a fearful monastic lord. He presents an image of himself as one urging conversion to a better life, not commanding it. This may be the result of his conception of spiritual exercises which, as we see below, provides theoretical limits to the role an abbot or prior might play in the individual religious life of a monk. How can an abbot command reform when, as Peter suggests in the *De miraculis*, interior disposition—not external practice—is the means for salvation? An abbot can control the body with rules and regulations, but not the hearts and minds of his monks. What he can do, it seems, is to set up the conditions for such a spirituality to be internalized. Part of this enterprise is accomplished through the text of *De miraculis* by which Peter transmits an ideological model for Cluniac monasticism. Peter proposes a conception of monastic practice that relates exterior observances to interior dispositions and that encourages self-regulation in addition to communal surveillance. I turn now to this discussion of Peter’s overt monastic program by focusing on its correlations of interior and exterior spirituality.
Within the *De miraculis*, several characteristics are repeated over and over again as key features of the Cluniac monks. These descriptions rely on stock characteristics—many of which are based in corporeality—which provide an indication of Peter's ideal of proper monastic practice. Since these physical descriptions, moreover, are part of an attempt to describe sanctity and religion holistically they explicitly interact with the discourse of virtue. Through these ideas about the body, its fashioning and its relationship to the soul, Peter's descriptions can be seen to access his ideals of monastic spirituality.

Among the numerous stories of the *De miraculis*, Peter's portrait of Benedict, a Cluniac monk, stands out as noteworthy for our purposes. Peter signals the exemplary status of Benedict initially through several indirect and direct citations of Gregory the Great's *Life of Benedict* and the *Rule of Saint Benedict*. After a long description of Benedict's manner of living according to the strictest interpretation of the *Rule of St. Benedict*, he states:

> Now, if our pen is directed to the condition/comportment [*habitus*] of his body, its very self will be judged to speak sufficiently. Certainly his weakened body, his lean face, his hair—unkempt and venerable in its very whiteness—his bowed head, his eyes scarcely ever revealed, [and] his mouth ruminating the sacred words without pause indicated a man fixed not on earth but on heaven.²⁶

For Peter, Benedict's body is rather loquacious. By using the term *habitus*, Peter highlights that it is not just the state of body itself which shows Benedict's spiritual

²⁵ The indirect citations are found in *DM*, I, 20, II. 37-38, 38, 39-43, and 44-47, pp. 59-60; direct quotations appear in II. 1-2, 27, and 34, p. 59. In the second redaction of the *De miraculis* the first line is modified to contain a clear evocation of the Cluniac Benedict as a new Saint Benedict. The β version begins, *Frater qui dant religiosus vaide clunicensis monachus nomine benedictus*, while the later redaction reads, “*Fuit et alius ut de magnô legitur *gratia benedictus et nomine*.” (quotation is from Gregory the Great's *Dialogue*, prologue II; cf. *DM*, p. 58, note to II. 1-2). The effect of the change is to emphasize the Cluniac monk as the equal to Saint Benedict, and an example for all monks (not just Cluniacs).

²⁶ *DM*, I, 20, II. 76-80, p. 61 (143-44); *Iam si ad habitum corporis eius stitus conviertatur, solus ipse sufficiens laqui indicabitur. Corpus quippe attenuatum, facies macilenta, capilli incompi ipsaque canicie uenerandi, uultus demissus, oculi uix unquam patentes, os sine requie sacra uestra ruminans, non in terra set in celo positum hominem indicabant.*
success, but rather how his body is held, controlled and tempered by his manner of living. This use recalls Peter’s description of Benedict when he entered Cluny, “after his habit was changed at Cluny, he became a true monk”. The putting on of a new habit (the clothing) provides a symbolic representation for a transformation of Benedict’s corporeal and spiritual life. The polyvalency of habitus allows Peter to elide the physical body, its behaviour, the symbolic vestment of the monk and Benedict’s spiritual identity. To return to Peter’s description of Benedict’s appearance, his body is defined as providing a sign of his physical asceticism. His body and face are thin from his fasting, his hair shows both his old age (and thus maturity/ seniority) while its being uncombed indicates a lack of concern with cultivating physical beauty. His bowed head indicates humility, as do his hidden and downward-looking eyes. His mouth, as if operating independently from his spirit, ceaselessly dwells on the scriptures. In Peter’s portrait, the physical features evidence the result of Benedict’s ascetic practice. All these physical features act as indications of the holy monk’s religious intention and show how he has submitted his body to his soul’s desires. Benedict’s outside, therefore, serves to reveal his powerful interior fervour. Peter’s description hints that external appearance is important only in so far as it is the outward result of spiritually motivated acts and feelings.

Through Benedict and other stories of the De miraculis, Peter shows a continuous concern to identify the visible body and its acts as symbols of proper spiritual life.

Turquillus, a prior at Marcigny was described as, “offering out something heavenly by

---


28 *DM*, I, 20, ll. 6-7, p. 59 (140); *mutato apud Cluniacsum habitu, verus factus est monachus*. 
the appearance of his gentle and humble body and countenance".\textsuperscript{29} In a dream of a monk at Cluny, Christ "showed the happiness of his heart by the bearing of his glorious body and the clapping of his hands".\textsuperscript{30} These two quotations further suggest a conception of the controlled exterior as a marker of interiority. Peter makes a direct link between genuine inner feeling and its outward manifestation through the body and gestures of virtuous men. He especially highlights this theme in the description of the monk Gerard. Peter presents him as, "educated at the feet of the memorable holy father Hugh, [becoming] the image of his virtues," and later adds, "dressed with the habit of the regular life, he showed in his good and nearly perfect acts to have removed the secular world from himself".\textsuperscript{31} Like the examples cited above, Gerard’s acts, gestures and appearance provide a medium for expressing interior dispositions outwardly. Depicting him as a monk of pure and simple life, "dressed outwardly in sacred vestments, filled inwardly with the spirit and faith," Peter further hints at the relationship between exterior and interior.\textsuperscript{32} Peter subsequently makes explicit the nature of this relationship between spiritual life and its outward manifestation:

He did not know to feign anything, but as he was inwardly, he showed himself outwardly. If you came near his mouth, you would immediately confirm what I say to be true. He so strongly maintained the essence of divine things, which he had drunk from boyhood, that to attentive observers almost every one of his words and deeds smelled only of the heavenly fragrance.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{DM}, I, 21, ll. 4-5, p. 64 (147); \textit{ipsa miti et humili corporis et uultus spetie, quiddam celeste pretendens.}
\textsuperscript{30} \textit{DM}, I, 15, ll. 26-27, pp. 50-51 (128); \textit{cordis leticiam gestu gloriosi corporis et ipsarum plausu manuum demonstrabat.}
\textsuperscript{31} \textit{DM}, I, 8(1), ll. 8-10 and 21-23, p. 24 (93); \textit{ad pedes memorandi sancti patris Hugonis educatus, uirtutum eius imaginem, multa ex parte in se ipso expressam ostendit; Qui habitu religionis indutus, seculum se exuisse, bonis et propemodum perfectis actibus demonstravit.}
\textsuperscript{32} \textit{DM}, I, 8(2), ll. 124-26, p. 28 (98); \textit{uestibus sacris exterius parasus, interius spiritu et fide reple tus.}
\textsuperscript{33} \textit{DM}, I, 8(1), ll. 27-28, p. 25 (93); \textit{Nil simulare nouerat, set qualis interius existebat, talem se exterius demonstrabat. Ad os eius si accederes, statim que dico uera esse comprobares. Diuinarum rerum saporem,}
Describing his virtue in terms of the senses of sight and smell (i.e. perceptive organs linking the material world and cognition), Peter concretely establishes inward/celestial things as perceptible in Gerard’s exterior. But the outward, again, is emphasized as only a sign of the interior. He “exists” (existō) inwardly, while his outside merely “shows” (demonstrō); this suggests that his religious essence is internal, for which his outward appearance can only be the sign.34 His appearance not only shows his interior devotion but it was such that it could convince people of its truth. With Gerard, Peter asserts the validity of the exterior as a sign. He seems to accept, though, that Gerard is not the norm and that a potentially problematic relationship between the sign and its signified can exist.

The possibility of disjuncture between interiority and exteriority translates into an abiding anxiety over the possibility of simulating the signs of religion without the proper concurrent interior emotion and devotion. While Peter asserts that the monk Gerard was incapable of ‘simulating’ or ‘feigning’ anything, by the lauding of this trait he hints at this being something uncommon.35 Peter’s praise, moreover, suggests that it should be imitated. What seems intimated in Peter’s comment about Gerard is made explicit in several of the stories of the De miraculis. Peter shows (perhaps with disciplinary intent) with concrete examples what happens when people appear other than they are within; the inward sicknesses still end up manifesting themselves in the body through specific

---

34 This depiction promotes the conception of the exterior body to be a text, needing to be deciphered and subject to exegesis. This concern with interpreting the body (in an exegetical fashion) also has currency within the writings of Bernard of Bellevaux, a Cistercian abbot writing in the late-twelfth century (cf. Apologiae duae, ed. Robert B.C. Huygens, with introduction by Giles Constable, CCCM, 62, [Turnhout, 1985], pp. 46-229). On the idea of textual bodies, cf. Jaeger, The Envy of Angels, pp. 275-78. Jaeger concludes that this idea is a distinctive feature of the twelfth century.

35 DM, I, 8(1), ll. 27-28, p. 25 (93); cf. above.
means, either physical sickness or demonic possession. The outward accoutrements of religion cannot long hide their diseased insides. For the sinners presented in the De miraculis, sickness of the body becomes the means by which interior fault is made visible and public. This very orientation importantly betrays the apparent privileging of the interior as the locus where religious life resides. A contradiction seems apparent, and Peter himself seems unable to resolve these tensions in his thought. As David Appleby also concludes, “we may describe his position as either an uneasy Christian materialism or a not altogether consistent Christian idealism”.\(^{36}\)

The story of the partial confession given by a Cluniac monk well illustrates Peter’s inconsistency on the matter of interiority/ exteriority. This monk, “distinguished in manners and diligent in labours”\(^{37}\) falls ill to an incurable fever from which he cannot be healed. Only after Peter forces a “true” and complete confession does the monk reveal hidden faults and attempt to correct them. Peter views the transformation of the monk who changed (conversus) “as much as possible in his body and wholly in his mind” to become “beautiful and benign”.\(^{38}\) The correction of the monk’s soul brings about a partial restoration of his body and an improvement in appearance. This narrative seems a natural development of Cluniac linkages of spirituality and beauty.\(^{39}\) Peter perhaps expresses a construction of interiority which would appeal to a Cluniac monk (himself included)

\(^{37}\) *DM*, II 33, II. 11-12, p. 164 (283); *elegans moribus, opere strenuus*
\(^{38}\) Ibid., II. 30 and 43, p. 165 (283); *ille, ut potuit corpore, totius autem mente; formosus et benignus.*
focused on physical perfection.\textsuperscript{40} For monks wishing to attain faultless comportment and
a beautiful exterior, Peter may impart a new strategy: to be concerned with interior
achievement lest the body express hidden faults. However, perhaps it can be interpreted
as a pedagogical intent: Peter might appeal to the discourse of the body as a means to
instruct his monks, without considering all the theological refinements of such examples.

Unlike the change of the monk cited above however, no other monks undergo a
physical transformation following their inward correction. In the story about a monk
exorcized of demons through confession (\textit{DM, I, 6}), for instance, Peter explicitly relates
the sickness to interior fault and concludes that this monk’s illness could not be healed
until his soul was cleansed.\textsuperscript{41} Another monk becomes sick and is unable to swallow any
food, including the Eucharist, because he had only given the semblance of a confession.\textsuperscript{42}
In all these stories, a causal relationship exists between the exterior and interior: ill health
is seen as the direct consequence of a impure spirit. As with more saintly appearance, the
sinner’s exterior is defined and moderated by the individual’s internal state.

As a brief footnote, Peter’s appearance itself is the subject of Ralph of Sully’s
\textit{Vita Petri Venerabilis}, though he devotes little attention to considering the relationship of
interiority and exteriority. He offers a brief portrait of Peter’s appearance, which tends to
focus on outward acts and behaviour rather than his visual presence:

\begin{quote}
He found recreation in reading and prayer and he so shone with the
splendour of wisdom that he seemed amicable to all. Sweet in eloquence,
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{40} On the physicality of the monastic regimen at Cluny until the twelfth-century, cf. Cochelin, “Besides the
Body,” pp. 28-29.
\textsuperscript{41}\textit{DM, I, 6}, ll. 49-52, p. 18 (85).
\textsuperscript{42}\textit{DM, I, 5}. A similar story with the subject being a lay person is found in \textit{DM, I, 3}. 
decorous in aspect, admirable in word, insurpassable in speech, singular in
beneignty, flowing with innards of mercy, he was loved by all.\textsuperscript{43}

While Peter is described as \textit{decorus} (i.e. ‘beautiful’, ‘suitable’) in his appearance, this
outward form is subordinated to his “shining” wisdom and his “sweet” eloquence. Ralph,
however, is more typical twelfth-century theorist, insisting on interiority and paying
relatively little attention to its link to the exterior. In Ralph’s conception, Peter’s actions
(speech, reading, prayer) and disposition (wise, merciful, benign) make him loved, and
his appearance is only a negligible part of his charismatic presence. In the \textit{vita} as a whole,
Ralph’s depiction of Peter focuses on his miracles and interior sanctity, while ignoring
the exterior.\textsuperscript{44} Even when discussing Peter’s care for ensuring the welfare and health of
the monks, Ralph’s finds a way to insist on interiority:

But he did this, making provisions for the tranquility of the brothers, lest
at some point they suffer penury. While his soul was intent on these
things, he took care no less of interior things, but sought the fervour of
order [\textit{ordinis}] with a fervent mind.\textsuperscript{45}

In this extract, which is one of two places where Ralph describes Peter’s concern for the
exterior material side of religion, the emphasis is placed on asserting that living
outwardly did not detract from his interior spirituality.\textsuperscript{46} His attention on the exterior man
is contextualized as being completely within the context of a mental and inward search.

\textsuperscript{43} VPV, 1, col. 17; \textit{Lectioni et orationi vacabat, et ita sapientiae splendore fulgebant, ut amabilis omnibus
videretur. Suavis eloquio, decorus aspectu, sermone admirabilis, facundia insuperabilis, benignitatem
singularis, misericordiae visceribus affluens, universis compatebatur.}

\textsuperscript{44} Only six of sixteen chapters focus directly on Peter, rather than his miracles (most taken from the \textit{De
miraculis}). These six initial chapters focus on his early education, his election, his actions as abbot, his
diplomatic maneuverings and his writings. Even the section on Peter’s conduct as abbot focuses on his
devotion to prayer, almsgiving and confession (VPV, 2, cols 18-19). Peter’s physical asceticism is a theme
largely absent from Ralph’s presentation.

\textsuperscript{45} VPV, 2, col. 20; \textit{Hoc autem faciebat fratrums quieti providens, ne aliquando penuriam paterentur. In his
vero cum esset animus intentus, nec minus interiora curabat, sed ferventi mente fervorem ordinis
requirebat.}

\textsuperscript{46} The other example is Peter’s anxiety about a monk outside in the cold, to whom Peter offers his pelice
(VPV, 2, col. 19AB)
for God. Ralph’s presentation of exteriority shows almost no concern for linking outward appearance with virtue and spirituality. While this lacuna may arise from the brevity of the work or its focus on the miraculous, it certainly hints at the insignificance of the exterior as a locus for spiritual practice. As the following section demonstrates, Peter advocates the fashioning of the exterior through inward directed ascetic practices.

THE SPIRITUAL BENEFITS OF PHYSICAL ASCETICISM

The monastery of Cluny is well known throughout almost the whole world for its religion, severity of discipline, number of brethren, [and] complete observance of the monastic ordo [...]. There, innumerable multitudes of men, casting off the heavy burdens of the world from their shoulders, submitted their necks to the sweet yoke of Christ.\textsuperscript{47}

Peter’s laudatory description of Cluny—a portrait that would not be utterly denied by his contemporaries, nor by present day historians—evokes the image of monks ceaselessly toiling in the service of God. For Peter this labour is both internal (\textit{theoria}) and external (\textit{studia, exercitia}), ranging from meditation on the one hand, to fasts, mortifications, vigils, the \textit{opus dei} and the psalmody on the other. Though some acts appear more physical, some less, most spiritual exercises act on both the body and soul whether performed inwardly or outwardly. Some practices, such as reading scripture or reciting the psalms, are performed outwardly with the lips, tongue and voice, but have an import on the mind, heart and soul (as we saw from the example of Benedict). Others—celebrating the Eucharist for instance—demand a state of inner purity\textsuperscript{48}, derive their

\textsuperscript{47} \textit{DM}, I, 9, II. 28-34, p. 35 (108); \textit{Est autem Cluniacense monasterium, religione, discipline severitate, fratrum numerositate, omnique monastici ordinis obseruantia, tota pene orbe notissimum [...] Ibi innumere hominum multitudines, graues mundi sarcinas ab humeris suis abierant, suavit Christi iugo colla submisserunt.}

\textsuperscript{48} Peter describes an unnamed German priest who was miraculously prevented from performing mass and touching the Host. He needed to seek forgiveness with “a contrition of body and heart” after he merely “seemed to live the religious life” and hid his sins of the flesh (\textit{DM}, I, 2.1. 50, p. 10 [75]).
salvific power from a divine intervention and are performed with words, gestures and actions. Still others, like fasting and flagellation, directly impact the body and the soul by destroying physical desire.

External ascetic practices play an important role as spiritual exercises in Peter’s De miraculis. As discussed above, Peter envisages outward appearance as a symbol of interior devotion. If exterior form is merely a symbol of inner spiritual movements, does the exterior have no spiritual value independent of its relationship to the interior? Peter does not provide a definite answer, but tends to promote this idea. Appearance, like that of Gerard and Benedict discussed above, could seem to offer a contradiction to such an notion, since can provide a model of sanctity to other monks by their visual example. This model, however, seems to depend upon affective forces of attraction which draw souls to contemplate only those offering a proper image. Peter privileges, moreover, certain kinds of observances in his monastic model which specifically allow a bridging of interior and exterior forms of religion. As we see below, intentional interior devotion seems to be a necessary basis of all monastic observances in Peter’s ideal.

In the brief apologia of the Cluniac way of life cited both at the outset of this chapter and of this section, Peter describes the meritorious divine work and the spiritual burden borne by the monks at Cluny. He depicts the monks undertaking ‘training” or “exercises” in virtue “in the manner of celestial troops,”49 by which they perfect their religion and adopt a virtuous life. About this perfected way of life, Peter further comments, “To the inhabitants of this place (subjecting their flesh to the spirit with

---

49 DM, I, 9, l. 50; cited above in note 1.
continuous exertion), living is Christ and dying is gain, as the Apostle says truly. This description raises two questions: what is this “continuous exertion” to which Peter refers and how does it subordinate the body to the soul? As will be shown below, Peter’s repeated insistence on the centrality of external ascetic practices to the regular life and their value in a program of corporal subjugation identify them as the logical solution to the first question (“continuous exertions”) and, thus, provide the key to understanding the second (the subordination of the body to the mind). As emerges in the *De miraculis*, certain ascetic practices allow internal devotion to create an external and visual religious form by bridging the interior and exterior. These acts, furthermore, operating both inwardly and outwardly reproduce the suffering and passion of Christ and thus fashion an ideal-like manner of living.

The lengthy description of the Cluniac monk Benedict’s asceticism provides a valuable summary, worth quoting at length, of what Peter valued as monastic conduct:

He remained perpetually silent unless a clear and serious reason compelled him to speak. His words were very brief, removed from trifles, jokes and all other things tending towards relaxation. If ever there was a discussion about spiritual issues, he was never without sighs, never without tears; he was unceasing in singing the psalms and in constant meditation of the holy scriptures day and night. On account of this he always carried around a glossed Psalter since he sang the psalms not superficially as is the custom for some, but with the greatest attention and devotion. [...] His eyes were rarely free of tears, his tongue never ceased from the psalmody. He was accustomed throughout almost the whole time of his life to exhaust a body [already] broken by innumerable punishments with the roughest hair shirts. [...] Completely intent day and night on the contemplation of the divine, he transcended all mortal things with his mind and by an inward envisaging of the Creator almost continually placed himself with the blessed angels. [His cell] was indeed the only witness of his unceasing

---

50 Ibid., II. 41-43, p. 36 (110); *Huius loci habitoribus continua concertatione carnum spiritui subicentibus, uere secundum Apostolum Christus uiuere est et mori lucrum*. Peter is citing Phil. 1: 21.
prayers, of continuously flooding tears, of the most harsh flagellations and of his daily sacrifices.  

An absence of outward action (silence) and the application of practices (prayer, tears, meditation, hair shirts, flagellations, reciting the psalms) comprise Benedict’s spiritual exercises. Since this quotation is followed by an explicit discussion of Benedict’s exterior aspect (already discussed above) which depicts his form as the construct of physical asceticism, Peter underscores the relationship between body and action. It is the use of his body, not his display/ appearance, which is involved in this asceticism. His eyes were filled with tears, his tongue never stopped singing the psalms, his body was broken by fasts and hair shirts. In this depiction, the value of asceticism does not seem to be the effect of Benedict’s appearance on others, but the effect on his own soul mediated through his body.

In reciting the psalmody the tongue is described as the active agent, yet at the same time Benedict sings not perfuctorium but cum intentione atque devotione, hinting at his consideration of the meaning and significance of the psalms. Despite its physicality, Peter’s description also underlines the concomitant interior actions. Benedict’s singing is praiseworthy both in his ability to sustain the outward recitation of the psalms, but also in his understanding and internalization of the text. We can note, moreover, that it is a text,

---

51 DM, I. 20, ll. 44-72 passim, pp. 60-61 (142-43); Silebat perpetuo, nisi cum eum certa et grauis causa loqui cogebat. Uerba ejus brevissima, a nugis, jocis atque omni prorsus ociositate aliena. Si quando uero de spiritualibus sermo erat, numquam is sine suspiris, nunquam sine lacrimis fiebat. Psalmodia indeficiens, scripturarum sanctarum nocte dieque meditatio. Propret quod et psalterium glosatum semper circumferebat, quoniam psalmos non perfactoriae, ut quibusdam moris est, set summa cum intentione atque devotione cantabat. […] [R]aro oculi a lacrimis, numquam uero lingua a psalmodia cessabat. Innumeris confectum supplicis corpus, toto pene uite sue tempore ciliis asperrimis exasperare consueverat. […] In hac diuinae theorie totus nocte dieque intentus, mente cuncta mortalitae transcendebat, et cum beatissimis angelis interne Conditoris uisioni pene lugiter assistebat. Hec indeciuentium orationum, hae assidue inandantium lacrimarum, hae durissimorum flagellarum, hae cotidianorum sacrificiorum, sola guidem testis tunc affuit […].

52 The injunction to sing with pauses so that it was possible to reflect on the meaning of the words was the first statute of Peter’s Statuta, n. 1, p. 40-42.
not other monks, which provides the proper interpretation of the psalms. Benedict’s
dedication to his glossed book of psalms shows his literacy and his attempt to embody the
theoretical knowledge contained in it. Benedict thus looks not only to examples around
him, or the words of scripture, but also to authoritative texts as part of his spiritual
exercises. The outward practice and the inward application of the psalms inform
Benedict’s asceticism.

In his fasts, vigils, mortifications, crying, singing (etc.) Benedict undertakes
superhuman demonstrations of his religion, pushing an already broken and exhausted
body to do more. This ceaseless exhaustion of the body leads to the contemplation of God
and allows Benedict to transcend mortal things. Peter’s discussion of contemplation, we
see, is intimately linked to the descriptions of the bodily practices which bracket it. By
placing the discussion of contemplation within a section dealing with external ascetic
practices, Peter indicates that internal spiritual states need not be exclusive of exterior
practices, and both are part of a similar process of religious development. This idea is
subsequently made concrete when Peter emphasizes the results of Matthew of Albano’s
asceticism:

He did not leave any part of contemplation [theorie] untouched, but
subduing his body with fasts, vigils, and hair shirts, through silence, the
psalmody and those exercises which were mentioned [above], he applied
himself to be changed completely from the old to the new man, and thus,
to make almost fully a passage from the oldness of the world to the
newness of Christ.\(^5\)

As with his description of Benedict, Peter depicts corporal labour and mental
contemplation to be part of a concomitant process of spiritual progress. Both the mind

\(^5\) *DM II. 8, l. 35-39, p. 110 (206-207); Non relinquebat partem aliquam theorie intactam, set ieiuniis,
ugilis, clicitisque asperis corpus edomans, silentio, psalmodia, et his que dicta sunt studiis, de uereri in
nouum hominem totus mutari, et sic a vetustate mundi nouitatem Christi plenum propemodum transitum
facere satagebat.*
and the body can be modified to create a perfect monk, who in his practices and his soul attain (almost completely) a perfect imitation of Christ. By using set (but) to distinguish contemplation from other ‘bodily subduing’ exercises, however, Peter underlines the specifically predominant value of ascetic practices and their ability to effect a religious transformation. Like Benedict, Matthew undertakes fasts, vigils, and physical mortifications to subdue the body. When supplemented by liturgical labour, these acts effect a change from the old to the new man. Peter first uses this metaphor in the preceding chapter to describe Matthew’s entry into the monastic life, but here implies something further. The ‘new man’ is someone, in this instance, who lives fully with Christ.

We see a similar conception in the case of the monk Armand who, in changing his habit, “also turned away his soul from all worldly attachament.” For Peter, the monastery allows both physical and spiritual change to occur, it allows men to internalize and externalize fully the imitatio Christi. Gerard, for one, is fashioned by his childhood contact with the Cluniac monks to love chastity and to devote himself to the inward and outward practice of the liturgy and the psalmody. Years after Matthew of Albano had given up his monastic habit for episcopal robes, he continued to maintain his previous observances:

54 DM, II, 7, II. 49-51. p. 108 (204). Peter comments, “At his own vow and petition, he cast off the old man and was clothed with the new, he was subjected to the monastic rule and then adjoined himself to the body of the monastery as much as he was able or ought.” Voto et petizione propria exuitur ueteri homo, induitur novo, regule monastice subditur, corpori monasterii quantum tunc fieri potuit, uel debuit, associatur. On the noviciate and profession of monks at Cluny, cf. Isabelle Cochelin, “Peut-on parler de noviciat à Cluny pour les Xe-XIe siècles?” Revue Mabillon 70 (1998), pp. 17-52.
55 This common topos of monastic literature is discussed in Constable, The Reformation of the Twelfth Century, p. 25, and his Three Studies in Medieval and Religious Thought, pp. 169-217.
56 DM, I, 18, II. 8-10, p. 55 (134); the passage reads, Cluniaci habitum religionis induit.Cum quo et animum ita ab omni mundano affectum mutavit. Cf. above.
57 DM, I, 8 (1), II. 14-23, p. 24 (93).
He did not abandon, under the pretext of any [pastoral] cares, anything of the offices, of the chants, [nor] of the full Cluniac psalmody. He maintained the observances of the cloister in his palace and, while exposed to the world, he held himself apart from secular vanities—as if in an inviolable enclosure—on account of a commitment to religion made inborn through long and constant practice. He confined himself within himself [...] more solitary than collegial.  

Matthew’s external observances, due to his long standing adherence, constructed a cloister around himself, helping him to remain inwardly in the monastery and therefore inwardly perfect. This quotation equates observances with the monastery itself, suggesting that these outward forms of religion are the essence of the monastic life. This passage also indicates that religious commitment is a process and the habitus is the result of a program of practices. The “new man” takes the form of an individual identity habituated inwardly and outwardly to the monastic life.

But how do these practices function? Physical restrictions allow the expiation of sins, but more importantly, strip the body of its desires. We see such a correlation emphasized in the story of Gerard. Having retired to a hermitage, this monk:

Content with limited food, [Gerard] expiated by his present abstinence any [faults]—if ever he had failed in this matter. Stripped of all the cares of this world, he became all the more close to God in his spiritual desires, the more distant he was from human activities.

We see in Gerard again the movement towards the “new man”. In the example of Gerard, Peter sets up a series of contingent conditions moving from physicality to transcendental

58 DM, II, 14, ll. 10-16, p. 124 (227); Nichil de offiiis, nichil de cantibus, nichil de prolixa Cluniacensi psalmodia, quorumilibet curarum pretextu reliquit. Seruabat in palatio institutio claustrum, et mundo expositus, firmo et longo usu, ueluti innato religionis proposito, a secularum usitatum, se quasi septo firmissimo secernebat. Cohibebat se intra se [...] magis solus quam cum alis. In this last sentence, Peter cites Sepulcius Severus’ Vita Sancti Martini, X, 2. We can also note the use here of instituta in the sense of “proper observances” or “practices”, not as a specific legislative form; cf. chapter eight and nine for further meanings of instituta.

59 DM, I, 8 (4), ll. 221-224, p. 31 (102-3); Sobrio uictu contentus, siquid forte in his aliquando deliquerat, parcitata presenti expiabat. Curis omnibus mundi huius extus, tanto spiritualibus desideris Deo fiebat propinquior, quanto ab humanis actionibus factus erat remotor.
experience. Fasting limits food-intake and allows for bodily contentment with less of food. A reduced corporeal desire represents, in turn, a rejection of earthly concerns which give freedom to spiritual desires and thus a movement towards God. Fasting has a purifying role, it seems. Since Peter questions whether Gerard had ever been guilty of excessive consumption, the description is less an explanation for Gerard’s sanctity and more one of the utility of fasting for his audience. Gerard certainly provides evidence that the rejection of bodily concerns (allowing for the ascendance of spiritual ones) is a fundamental goal of physical asceticism, yet this is not the only end. It seems fasting does not just deny the body but also allows its recreation. By eating less, Gerard needs less food; his body, therefore, is transformed, not merely rejected. Only an insatiable desire for ‘heavenly bread’ remained in Gerard who had satisfied the “happy hunger” of his soul.\(^6^0\) The will, therefore, was tamed through physical asceticism. Moreover, he “persisted so devotedly in the ecclesiastical offices, that neither daily labour nor nightly rest was ever able to render him less vigourous in these things”.\(^6^1\) Limitation and austerity thus became a means to not only remake the soul, but also improve the body. Peter’s depiction of Benedict similarly demonstrates how his body — his outward form — and his form of religion, is, strengthened and more able to bear the demands of the regular life.\(^6^2\) Benedict sustains an unceasing program of prayer, singing and mortification, despite being already broken and weakened.

We can see that Peter maintains an equilibrium between physical asceticism and inwardly focused exercises. We see the necessity of this interior cultivation in the story of

\(^6^0\) DM, I, 8 (1), ll. 92-94, p. 27 (95); The description reads, […] pani celesti noster hic Gerardus inhiiabat, et beatam anime sue esuriem, pastu quotidiaio recreabat.

\(^6^1\) Ibid., ll. 32-33, p. 25 (94); Ecclesiasticis officiis ita devotus insistebat, ut nec labor diurnus nec requies nocturna eum in his aliquando reddere segnem valerent.

\(^6^2\) Cf. above.
Peter receiving the confession of the monk tormented by a demon-horse (DM, I, 6). Upon having offered the Eucharist and having sprinkled him with holy water to no effect, Peter identified the interior of the monk as the locus of disease. Since the brother continued to be tormented by the attacks of the demon until he completed a "true" confession to Peter, Peter defends in the text his initial attempts to heal the man with holy water:

But lest someone marvel that the demon was not put to flight by the sprinkling of holy water, then let him understand that a remedy applied to the exterior is unable to do anything for a sickness lying hidden in the interior. By 'sickness' I mean mortal sin, which as long as it remains camouflaged in someone's interior, the exterior reception of any sacrament cannot do anything for them. This is shown clearly in the principal sacraments of the Church, baptism and the Eucharist. If, in fact, they were able to be salvific, despite the persistence of interior malice, not even Judas would have hanged himself on a noose after having received the sacrament of the body of Christ alongside the other disciples. 63

This passage clearly denies the possibility that the exterior reception of the sacraments can possess a salvific power independent of interior acceptance. We see from this assertion, therefore, that in Peter's conception, exterior practices demand a corresponding interior intention in order to be efficacious. While they have a certain value in reforming the body, their value is limited by the extent to which there are concurrent interior spiritual movements.

COMMUNAL HERMITS: INTERIORIZING THE CLOISTER

Given Peter's preference for the quiet of Mary over the work of Martha expressed in letters 28 and 111, it should not be surprising that the De miraculis contains an

---

63 DM, I, 6, II. 49-57, p. 18 (85-86); Set ne miretur aliquis benedictae aquae aspersione demonem non fugatum, agnoscat, tabe interius latente, unctione exteriore adhibita nihil proficere posse. Tabem autem dico letale peccatum, quod quandiu in interioribus cruoris libet latuerit, nullius exteriore sacramenti percepto ei prodesse poterit. Quod in precipuis ecclesie sacramentis, uidelicet baptismate et corpore Domini, aperte ostenditur. Si enim malicia interiore manente, salvare ista possent, nec Judas post acceptum cum aliis discipulis corporis Christi sacramentum laqueo se suspenderet.
overarching concern for subsuming exteriorities to the dominion of interior dispositions. Reproducing the depictions of Benedict and Gerard, Peter also describes how Carthusian monks lived “like the ancient monks” wearing vile clothes and hair shirts, living in abject poverty and subject to severe fasts. Peter describes the Carthusians as sequestered in individual cells and devoted to silence, reading, prayer and manual labour (e.g. copying manuscripts) except for when attending the communal worship of the opus dei. The example they offered to other monks, Peter contends, compelled him “to transmit to the memory of present and future generations” the deeds of such a holy “institution”. The ability of the Carthusians to retain their inward focus, Peter seems to suggest, derives from their “eremitical institution” —namely the increased possibilities for solitude. Is this, then, the model that Peter wishes to supply to Cluniac monks?

Neither in the De miraculis, nor in his other works does Peter show a desire for greater eremitical organization. As Knight notes in her analysis of his letters, Peter retains a certain skepticism about the benefits of complete solitude and even his glorification of the eremitical ideal focuses on the self-definition of Cluniac cenobitic monasticism.

When describing Cluniac monks, Peter’s concern with interior practice does not call for an absolute retreat within or from the monastic community, but demands active engagement with externals —whether things outside the self (soul) or outside the

---

65 DM, II, 27, ll. 14-16 and 48-91 passim, pp. 149-152 (261-64).
66 Ibid., ll. 98-103, p. 152 (265); The description reads more fully, His ne tam sanctam institutionem omnino muti preterisses uidemur, breviter premisisis, ad miracula per quosdam ex ipsis nostro tempore facta, proceindendum est[...] ad presentium uel posterorum memoriam transmittendi.
67 Perhaps we can see a very subtle jibe directed towards the Cistercians in this promotion of the Carthusian practices. Peter here shows that he (and Cluniacs) are open to new ideas, but by refusing the present any Cistercians, he indicates that they are not the best, nor more worthy of imitation.
68 Knight, “The eremitical ideal,” pp. 16-17, 42-43.
monastery. We see from the examples of Gerard and Matthew, however, that exterior practices are legitimized through their relationship to interiority. This relationship provides a justification for retaining a close concern with proper exterior practice and thus with the proper mode of life to be lived and regulated by the abbot. Neither an absolute retreat to the interior, nor an analogous retreat from public society to private isolation are promoted. Rather the necessity of and concern for a relationship with others is central to Peter's idea. In the portrait of Cluny first cited at the outset of this chapter, the monks are described as troops, implying that they must act in concert. Gerard, even when he adopts a an eremitical lifestyle at Aujous, does so as a leader of other retreat-minded monks. Benedict, despite Peter's insistence that he found refuge in the hermitage of the Cluniac bell tower dedicated to Saint Michael (which alone witnessed his spiritual exercises), he still "lived not for himself but for all". He acted as a "roundsman" keeping watch over the monks and participated in all communal activities. He did not withdraw, but supplemented communal worship with private exercises. Peter describes how when alone he was, "completely given over to divine contemplation", he transcended mortal things, and was rewarded with a vision of the heavenly host. Despite Benedict's success at internalized devotion, Peter dedicates only a few lines to this aspect, however, and focuses mainly on his practice of virtue. Matthew of Albano, Peter remarks, was notable for his "practice of sacred reading", but due to the exigencies of being a prior, he was bound to the labours of administration, despite his desire to find the

69 *DM*, I, 8 (4), ll. 212-14, p. 31 (102).
70 *DM*, I, 20, ll. 31-45, pp. 59-60 (141); on the role of monastic surveillance and the "roundsman", cf. Scott Bruce, "Lurking with Spiritual Intent: A Note on the Origin and Functions of the Monastic Roundsman (Circator)," *Revue bénédictine* 109 (1999), pp. 75-89.
71 *DM*, I, 20, ll. 64-70, 73-75, pp. 60-61 (142-43).
72 Ibid., ll. 67-68, p. 61 (143).
"repose of Mary". The communal character of Matthew’s monastic life is heavily underscored by Peter when he was a prior:

He remained perpetually in the cloister with the brothers. [...] He had chosen, as it is said, the communal cloister, the communal oratory, the communal buildings of the brothers, in which he remained sheltered from the tumults of the world, just as Moses had remained in the tent protected from the stones of the Jews. [...] There, by constant reading, assiduous meditation, and the most fervent prayer, recommending himself and cleaving to God, [...] he did not neglect any part of the contemplative life [...].

Being in a cloister does not prevent, Peter underscores, the cultivation of inward focused spiritual exercises. Though the example of Matthew we see a clear focus on communal, not solitary life. This emphasis seems a deliberate foreshadowing of Matthew’s ability to retain his spiritual focus—and his Cluniac observances—despite being a bishop in the world. Matthew only becomes a solitary, in Peter’s account, when he is surrounded by the secular clergy in his bishop’s palace. The cloister thus seems necessary for anyone wishing to perfect his mind and body in the practice of virtue.

Other monks are watched over, corrected and chastised within the monastic community. Abbots and priors expel false monks, encourage morale, elicit compliance and mete out suitable punishments. One monk, Bernard, is rewarded with correction for his occasional excess of levity. Even Benedict—someone charged with the supervision of other monks—developed his humility by accepting punishments awarded for false

---

73 DM, II, 8 (1), II. 20-22, p. 109 (206); Marie otio.
74 Ibid., II. 12, 22-26, 31-32, 35-37 passim, p. 109-10 (206-7); Morabatur in claustro assidue cum fratribus […] [C]ommune claustrum ut dictum est, commune oratorium, communes fratrum domos elegerat, in quibus velit Moyses in tabernaculo a iudeorum lapidibus, sic ipse a mundi tumultibus tutor permaneret. […] Ibi frequenti lectione, assidua meditatione, feraentissima oratione, Deo se commendans et uniens […] non relinquebat partem aliquam theorie intactam. Ralph of Sully (VPV, 2, col. 19) similarly emphasizes how Peter kept to the society of his brothers and maintained the cloister. This description hints not only at the importance of the communal life, but seems to underline the abbot/prior should not consider himself apart or above the community.
75 Cf. above.
76 DM, I, 10, II. 6-12, p. 37 (112).
accusations.\textsuperscript{77} We can recognize, therefore, the monastic cloister as an important space for communally enforced rule adherence to transform the inward man. Officers like Benedict are subject to the censure of the community and the community is subject to the censure of the abbot or prior.

Benedict is also free of surveillance in his tower cell (save for the witnessing stones) as he retreats into inward meditation. Is the cultivation of an eremitical attitude, perhaps then, something that Peter wishes to be pursued within his cenobitic community? From statute 53 of Peter’s Statuta we see that eremitical practices were encouraged within the monastery of Cluny itself. In this statute Peter commands that parts of the new church be restricted only to monks to allow them a space for personal worship free from the curious laity:

The reason of this institute was that since the brothers did not have a place, besides the old Church of St. Peter, where they could strive to undertake whatever sacred and secret things appropriate to religious men, [and since] already day and night they claim that part of the new Church for themselves, where they assiduously burned to God the sacred and secret aromas of prayers, where they worshiped the pious Creator with many prostrations and genuflections, where they repeatedly hurt their bodies with cutting whips either for the sake of penance or increased merit, and where, by these and similar holy endeavours, they commended themselves and their fellows constantly to God, as if in a hermitage far from the sight of men.\textsuperscript{78}

In this space—\textit{velut in heremo}—the monks can pursue their holy exercises. We can see here again an elision of community and solitude, of exterior and interior spiritual practices.

\textsuperscript{77} \textit{DM}, I, 20, ll. 39-44, p. 60 (142).

\textsuperscript{78} Statuta, n. 53, p. 83; \textit{Causa instituti huius fuit, ut quia fratres praeter veterem ecclesiam sancti Petri non habeabant ubi quaedam sacra et secretiora ad religiosos homines pertinentia exercere valerent, iam dictam illam novae ecclesiae partem sibi diebus et noctibus vendicaret, ubi sancta et secreta orationum aromata deo assidue accenderent, frequentibus metaneis vel genuflexionibus pio conditori supplicarent, acribus saepe flagellis vel ob paenitentiam, vel ad meritum augendum corpus attererent, et his ac similibus sacris studiis, velut in heremo, ab hominum remoti spectibus, incessanter se suosque domino commendarent.}
I suspect that Peter’s promotion of the eremitical ideal is far more revolutionary than merely an allowance for greater private devotional practices within the *coenobium.*

Rather, I think that he locates the monastic objective in an ideal of an interior hermitage such as he describes in a letter to Peter of Poitiers:

> *Lo, I have gone far off, flying away and I abode in solitude.* And as in the enclosures of mountains, so let us build for ourselves in the hidden places of our hearts, solitudes where alone a true hermitage is found by those who truly despise the world, where no outsider is admitted, where the storm and the noise of worldly tumults is calmed, where the voice of the speaking God is heard without any sound of a bodily voice in a *whistling of a gentle air.* Let us go back constantly to this solitude while we are in body and are absent from the Lord and placed in the middle of crowds and let us find in ourselves what we seek in the uttermost borders of the world, for the *kingdom of God is within you.*

Peter conflates solitude with communality and depicts inward—not physical—separation as the key to all religious life. This depiction in no way invalidates, however, the Cluniac monastic form. Using the language of both cenobitic and eremitic models and of both inward and outward practices, Peter seems to give evidence of an internalized and personalized form of devotion.

A complement to the supervision and governance undertaken by the abbots and priors, Peter seems to advocate, is the interiorization of rules. Self-control, as well as

---

79 On Peter’s eremitical thought, cf. Jean Leclercq, “Pierre le Vénérable et l’érémite clunisien,” pp. 99-120; Giles Constable, “The ideal of inner solitude in the twelfth century,” pp. 27-34 and “Eremitical forms of monastic life,” pp. 239-264; and most recently in Gillian Knight’s “The language of retreat and the eremetic ideal in some letters of Peter the Venerable,” pp. 7-43. I would like to thank Winston Black for allowing me to consult his unpublished paper, “*Velut in heremo:* The tempered eremitism of Peter the Venerable,” which provides a modern historiography of Peter the Venerable’s eremitical thought.

80 *LPV,* ep. 58, I, p. 188; translated in Giles Constable, “Ideal of Inner Solitude,” p. 29; *Ecce elongauer fugiens, et manxi in sollicitudine. Et velut intra septa montium, sic intra archana cordium nobis solitudines aedificemus, ubi a teneris mundi contemplatoribus inaniter tantum heremus inuenitur, ubi nullius externus admittitur, ubi mundanorum tumultuum turbo fragorque sopitur, ubi sine ullo corporeae uocis sono in sibilo aurore tenuis uox dei loquentis auditur. Ad hanc fili dilectissime solituidinem dum sumus in hoc corpore et perigrinamur a domino, in medio quaque turbarum positi, assidue recurramus, et quod in extremis orbis finibus quaereremus, in nobismetipsis nam et regnum dei intra nos est inuenierns.*
submission to communal or abbatial sanctions, is marked as a core feature of the monastic life promoted by Peter. This idea of self-regulation is a key feature behind Peter’s legislation, as we see in the following chapters.

CONCLUSION

The majority of my discussion has focused on the examples of Gerard, Benedict and Matthew since they provide the most tangible content for Peter’s ideas of Cluniac monastic spirituality. Through their examples, I have sought to demonstrate that Peter places considerable emphasis on the practice of an inward focused spirituality, subsuming much of outward practice under this rubric. As I explored in the letters and as I consider with the Statuta, Peter shows an abiding concern for finding a justification for practices which are based in an adherence to an inner ideal. In this regard, then, the De miraculis closely resembles these other works. As a supplement to observances, Peter promotes an ideology in which personal asceticism and physical restriction is highlighted alongside the opus dei. The community does not provide the only means to salvation, and individualism of practice is emphasized.
In 1146/47 Peter the Venerable codified a lifetime of reform activity into a single text. The product was his Statuta, a seemingly heterogeneous collection of abbatial decrees intended to renovate the observance of Cluniac monasticism. As I argue in the following chapters, this text is the most explicit instantiation and the culmination of Peter’s reform-inspired thought and activity. The Statuta functions on two levels: its form innovates just as much as its substance. In chapter eight, I introduce and outline the context and content of the Statuta. Chapter nine outlines the forms of validation Peter incorporates within the text in order to justify his reforms. As a conclusion to this investigation, I examine the close parallels between the use of these strategies in the Statuta and in the Dispositio rei familiaris (1147/48), an administrative reorganization of Cluny’s estates. Chapter ten then locates these discourses within the history of Cluniac legislation, showing that Peter’s innovation lay not only in his specific reforms nor in his structures of validation, but also in his reworking of the traditional form of abbatial decrees.
LEGISLATING REFORM: THE CONTEXT AND CONTENT OF THE STATUTA

PRECURSOR I: THE GENERAL CHAPTER OF 1132

In 1132 Peter the Venerable summoned a general chapter which reunited over 1200 monks and 200 priors from France, Italy, Germany and England. There Peter promulgated a series of statutes which met considerable resistance, according to Ordericus Vitalis (the sole account of this meeting):

Peter of Cluny then sent couriers and letters to all his cells and summoned all the priors from England, Italy and other realms, ordering that they should come to Cluny on the third Sunday of Lent in order to hear precepts of monastic life stricter than they had held previously. [...] He imposed new fasts on his subjects monks, took away times of conversation and various supports of bodily infirmity, which the moderate mercy of reverend fathers had previously allowed them.

We see in Ordericus a corollary to Bernard of Clairvaux’s praise that, “almost from the first instant of assuming office, [Peter] improved the ordo [maintained at Cluny] in many ways, for instance in the observance of fasting, silence, and costly and curious clothing”.

In Ordericus’ account, abbatial power is at the centre of the endeavour: Peter summoned

\[\text{References:}\]
1 Generally, scholars have referred to this meeting in 1132 as one of the first “Chapter Generals”, though I prefer to speak of it as a “general chapter” since this term differentiates this meeting from the annual meeting of Cluniac abbots and priors instituted in the Statutes of Hugh V and a hallmark of Cluny’s transformation into an Order. On this topic, cf. the introduction to Constable’s edition of the Statuta, CCM, VI, pp. 22-3 as well as Florent Cigler’s survey, “Le chapitre général de Cluny (XIIe-XIVe siècle). État de la question,” in Anthropologies juridiques. Mélanges Pierre Braun, ed. Jacqueline Hoareau-Dodinau and Pascal Texier, (Limoges 1998), pp. 213-235 and id. Das Generalkapital in hohen Mittelalter, Cisterzienser, Prädmonstratenser, Kartäuser und Cluniacenser, Vita regularis, 12, (Münster, 2002).
3 Bernard of Clairvaux, ep. 277, (cf. chapter 1, note 1, p. 1 for the Latin)
his monks and Peter imposed stricter precepts. We see that Peter’s advocacy of austerity represented a definite programmatic change at Cluny since these statutes encountered resistance, at least in Ordericus’ account:

The monks, however, who were always used to obey their master and unwilling to oppose him, which would be contrary to religious custom, received the harsh commands but pointed out with reason that the venerable Hugh and his predecessors Majolus and Odilo had kept a strict way of life and tried by it to lead their Cluniac disciples in Christ. [...] The austere master, however, [...] rivaling the Cistercians and other seekers after novelties, persisted in his harsh endeavors and was embarrassed to cease at that time what he had begun. Later, however, he was softened and agreed with the view of his subordinates; and mindful of discretion [...] and merciful, he came to the aid of the weak and omitted many of the stern decrees which he had proposed.⁴

Whether Peter subsequently retreated to a less austere path is open to question. Bouthillier and Torrell conclude that Ordericus was simply fabricating a story to justify lapses at his own monastery.⁵ As Ordericus died in 1142, neither the precepts nor Peter’s change of heart can refer to the extant text of the Statuta which was promulgated only in 1146/47.⁶ A question arises, therefore, as to what is the relationship between these statutes (1132) and the Statuta (1146/47). Knowles suggests they are the same.⁷ Bouthillier and Torrell deny this likelihood.⁸ Constable refrains from making a conclusion either way. Since we lack these initial precepts (it is not clear if they were written texts), it is impossible to reconstruct the similarities of the two groups of statuta

---


⁵ Vision, p. 40.

⁶ As is noted in Peter’s preface to the Statuta, p. 39; also see the following chapter, note 4.


⁸ Vision, p. 38. Given that the 1146/47 Statuta contains a codified body of statutes, I am also hesitant to conclude on their similarity to the 1132 statutes.
beyond a recognition of a shared *ethos*. The *Statuta* (1146/47) imposes greater austerity in silence, fasting and creature comforts (clothing and bedding) – as do the statutes in Ordericus’ account – but the *Statuta* (1146/47) also contains a much wider range of institutional modifications which do not fall under these categories.⁹

The reaction of the Cluniac monks which Ordericus describes likely indicates the perspective of Cluniac traditionalists.¹⁰ Ordericus underlines the cold reception experienced by Peter at this general chapter and notes the general discontent caused by an abbot who sought to govern through precepts, not by his example. Ordericus recounts that the Cluniac monks obeyed the precepts, though he seems to imply that resistance was justified. Peter is depicted as one alone urging change and as an abbot lacking proper discretion, as well as being unable to recognize the injustice of his actions. Ordericus’ account hints moreover of the authoritative and commanding position of the Cluniac abbot, though this is something Peter himself does not present to Cluniac monks in his early letters, the *De miraculis* or, as we see below, the *Statuta* itself.¹¹ Perhaps this autocratic presentation gives evidence of Ordericus’ attempt to discredit Peter as unrepresentative of his monks. By passing over any description of monks in agreement with Peter’s attempted promulgation of reforms, Ordericus seeks to deny the representative nature of Peter’s leadership and to assert the untenability of his reforms.

Ordericus’ depiction also indicates a further attempt to discredit Peter’s statutes. They are rejected as too austere, as pure novelty and as Cistercian. Ordericus’ tone is clearly dismissive; he sees nothing wrong with the current state and considers the

---

⁹ Cf. below and refer to Appendix D.
¹⁰ Such also is the conclusion of Bouillier and Torrell, *Vision*, pp. 35-6. I use the world “traditionalist” as a means to describe those resistant to change, without asserting there is a homogenous ideology universally shared by those resistant to Peter’s statutes.
¹¹ Cf. chapters four and six.
changes as frivolous invention lacking moderation. Though Peter likely did promote
innovations at this general chapter and demanded greater austerity of his Cluniac monks,
this characterization may be less a truthful evaluation of the nature of the reforms than a
tactic to urge their rejection. As we have already seen from Peter’s letters, appeals to
the schism of Cluniac and Cistercian monks can act as a rhetorical strategy intended to
effect certain types of monastic solidarity. Calling Peter’s reforms, “Cistercian” may
simply be another means to identify certain practices to be avoided by proper
Benedictines.

Perhaps, however, the attribution of the statutes as Cistercian does indeed
describe the essence of the statutes and why they were so hateful to this monk. One way
to read Ordericus’ account, as Knowles does, is to take it as proof that Peter’s reforms
were the direct implementation of Cistercian regulations. Bouthillier and Torrell base
their assessment on Constable’s judgement and reject Knowles’ interpretation, positing
instead an inspiration in general twelfth-century trends. A third possibility also presents
itself to be read from Ordericus’ text. In the Historia ecclesiastica the Cistercians are
presented as the detractors of the black monks and as the usurpers of the Benedictines
who are the true servants of God. The Cistercians, Ordericus asserts, have become
powerful by recruiting followers on the basis of their novelty, not their practices of
virtue. An aspect of their novelty which Ordericus particularly disdains is their
adherence to the letter of the law. Like the Jews, Ordericus claims, they depend overly on

---

12 Cf. Vision, p. 35.
13 Knowles, “Peter the Venerable”, p. 142.
law, insufficiently on charity and discretion.\textsuperscript{16} As we see from Peter’s debates with Bernard of Clairvaux, this literalism is something with which the Cluniac abbot also at times disagrees. Since letters 28 and 111, for example, develop a strong argument against a reliance on such literalism, Peter and Ordericus seem to be in agreement.\textsuperscript{17} Perhaps it is not just the literalism itself which Ordericus condemns but the ideology lying at the heart of the Cistercian conception of the Rule as an authoritative and definitive guide to behaviour.\textsuperscript{18} The abnegation of customary precedent and of the communal memory of the monks is inherent in such a conception of the Rule; also the charismatic role for the abbot, who led by example, is less prominent. Though this remains only a hypothesis, it seems Ordericus feared that the statutes, with their potential for acting dispositively, posed a danger to his own vision of monasticism.

\textbf{Precursor II: Papal Sanctioning (1137)}

While it is impossible to know the exact nature of the 1132 statutes, we can readily perceive from Peter’s subsequent actions that he envisages his reforms as instituting a new rule of law. After the resistance of Cluniac brothers at the 1132 General Chapter, Peter sought justification for his changes from the papal court and received a papal sanction from Innocent II \textit{ca} 1137:

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{17} Cf. chapter three for a discussion of the representation of the Cistercians as “judaizing” by their adherence to the letter.

[...] favouring your just requests, with the authority of those present, [and] in keeping with the example of our predecessor Pope Celestine of happy memory, we grant an unlimited ability to you [Peter] [...] such that you are permitted to correct and to institute in the abbeys pertaining to the monastery of Cluny whatever you see requiring correction and requiring institution there in accordance with God, the Rule of Saint Benedict, and the statutes of the order. The sentence which you wish to be promulgated canonically against the contumacious and rebellious, we also make to be inviolably observed under God the creator, considering it fixed and firm, No one, therefore, may diminish this text of our concession or to contradict it with daring temerity in any way.19

Innocent II declares that he will not brook any opposition to Peter’s reforming actions. The resistance to Peter’s statutes implicit in Peter’s letter 161 (1144/56), however, indicates that Innocent’s injunctions were not unquestionably accepted in Cluniac houses.20 This resistance questions what was the Pope’s authority over Cluny and its “pertaining abbeys”. From the very beginning of Cluny (as we see in the foundation charter of William of Aquitaine) the pope had been identified as a protector and defender of Cluny alongside the saints Peter and Paul.21 Over the course of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, a succession of popes supported the exemption of Cluny and its houses from episcopal jurisdictions, subordinating them to the papacy directly or via the abbatial

---


20 Cf. chapter five.

21 Les plus anciens documents originaux de l'abbaye de Cluny, ed. Hartmut Atsma, Sébastien Barret and Jean Vézin, 2 vols, Monumenta paleographica Medii Aevi, Series Gallica, (Turnhout, 1997-2000), I, n. 4, p. 38; Et obscuro vos, o sancti apostoli et gloriosi principes terre, Petre et Paule, et te, pontifex pontificum apostolice sedis, ut per auctoritatem canonicam et apostolicam, quam a Deo acceptis, alienatis a consortio sanctae Dei ecclesie et sempiterne vite predones et invasores atque distractatores harum rerum quas vobis hilari mente promotaque voluntate dono, sitisque tutores ac defensores jam dicti loci Clungiaci et servorum Dei ibi commanencium, harum quoque omnium facultatum propter clementiam et misericordiam piissimi redemptoris.
head.\textsuperscript{22} The result of this process of exemption, as Gert Melville has shown, was a hierarchic Cluniac body which was established by the time of Hugh of Semur and which held Cluny and its abbot as the head and abbeys and priories as its members.\textsuperscript{23} The end of this structuring was ultimately the constitution of these member monasteries as legal subjects subordinated to the abbot of Cluny, who himself was a direct dependent of the papacy.

Didier Méhu has nuanced this picture of the papal assistance given to Cluniac abbots during the twelfth century. Pontius of Melgucil obtained from popes Pascal II, Gelasius II and Calixtus II the confirmation of more privileges and honorific distinctions than ever before accorded to Cluniac abbots.\textsuperscript{24} Upon his election, Peter the Venerable also received the support of Calixtus II who without effect demanded in two separate bulls (1122, 1123) that the abbot's authority be respected and reminded of the impossibility of Pontius returning.\textsuperscript{25} Upon the succession of Honorius II, Peter traveled to Rome in 1125 to render homage and left with five bulls demanding the submission of Cluniac monks to Peter.\textsuperscript{26} The pope was of assistance not only in buttressing Peter's power over the \textit{ecclesia cluniacensis}, but also in firming up his support at Cluny itself. These bulls seem to indicate, however, both an increasing reliance on papal juridical mechanisms and a desire for greater uniformity within the \textit{ecclesia cluniacensis} (both of which were unsympathetically received). However, by their repetition and the clear lack

\textsuperscript{22} For the most recent account of this process, and accompanying historiography, cf. Méhu, \textit{Paix et communautés}, pp. 52-86, especially pp. 81-86; also, \textit{Order and exclusion}, pp. 57-62.
\textsuperscript{24} Méhu, \textit{Paix et communautés}, p. 319.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., p. 320.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., pp. 184-86.
of adherence (as Ordericus’s account and the schism under Pontius evidence), these bulls appear to provide more proof of Peter’s lack of power and of the inefficaciousness of papal authority at Cluny than of the power they imply.\(^{27}\) As a sign of his weak abbatial authority at Cluny, Peter immediately sought help from Honorius II in Rome upon hearing of Pontius’ occupation of Cluny (carefully avoiding Cluny on his way). Honorius condemned and excommunicated Pontius, which ultimately forced a peace settlement to be adjudicated at Rome. Pontius, however, refused to accept the pope’s jurisdiction and claimed, if the sources are to be trusted, to be subject only to Saint Peter himself. A papal prison resolved this argument and Peter returned to Cluny in 1126 armed with another affirmation of his authority. However, only six years later, he encountered further resistance at the general chapter in 1132.

From this brief history, we note that papal promulgations did not procure the obedience of Cluniac monks. They demonstrate, however, the aspiration of Peter to solidify his power in canon law on a theoretical level. Through the papal bulls, everyone from bishops and parish priests to monks in monasteries associated with Cluny were presented with the legal foundations of Peter’s and Cluny’s institutional position.\(^{28}\) The jurisdiction of Cluny and the directorship of the abbot had been expressed in law under the authority of the pope. All that remained was for the abbot to achieve this position. Unlike the imperious Pontius, Peter sought a less monarchial path by embarking upon campaign of association with papal authority.

As in his letters and the *De miraculis*, in the *Statuta* Peter also encourages specific ways for his monks to receive his text. As I argue below, Peter seeks to ground the

\(^{27}\) On the ambiguous reception of papal statutes at Cluny, cf. also chapter five.

\(^{28}\) Poeck, *Cluniacensis Ecclesia*, pp. 80-84.
Statuta in a revitalized conception of law. Like the Gregorian reformers who saw legal texts as a means to overcome the weight of tradition, Peter promotes his Statuta as a dispositive text against Cluniac traditionalists. Alongside the legitimizing features of abbatial precedent and collegial consent, the Statuta seeks to promote a new conception of law based in reason. As we see below, this discourse was an essential part of Peter’s attempt to reorganize fundamentally Cluniac monasticism through the Statuta.

PRECURSORS III: THE EVIDENCE OF PETER’S EARLY STATUTES

The earliest textual evidence for Peter the Venerable’s use of written abbatial statutes comes from two statutes—one extant and the other obliquely cited in Peter’s letter 150. In the former, we see that Peter presents a commanding abbatial presence and in the second, we glimpse an attempt (ca 1135) to promulgate his will across all the Cluniac houses. The introduction provided by these texts are helpful in subsequently demonstrating the appeal to law and reason in the Statuta.

The first statute mentioned is edited as A2 of Constable’s edition. It required all the brothers at the monastery of Cluny (and its outlying dependencies) to return to Cluny to receive new monastic garments at fixed times during the year. The distribution of clothing was a lure, in this statute, to draw all the monks back to Cluny for the seven

---

30 This letter is discussed more fully in chapter four.
31 This statute contains few indications helpful in dating it. In his Dispositio rei familiaris (ca 1148, discussed in the following chapter), Peter notes that in his third and most recent reordering of the estate administration he transferred the responsibility for distributing clothing from the chamberlain to the prior; cf. Peter the Venerable, Dispositio rei familiaris, in CLU, n. 4132, vol. 5, pp. 481-82. If we assume that this decree stems from the same period as the one referred to in the Dispositio, then it was likely promulgated not long before the Statuta.
major feasts and thus to participate in the chapter meetings. It does not apply to all the *ecclesia cluniacensis*, but only to the monks and officers directly under Peter’s oversight.

Statute A2 comprises a decree but lacks any explanation of why the change was necessary— unlike every statute in the *Statuta*, as we will see. In contrast to the appeal to reason dominating the *Statuta*, this precept begins, “Let those present and future know that Peter, lord and worthy of every veneration, the abbot of the Cluniac monastery, always dedicated to honesty and utility […] commanded [*praecedit*]”.

Peter’s abbatial prerogative as well as his commanding and venerable status are emphasized alongside an assertion of his commitment to honourable and useful action. Peter presents himself as authoritative both in his rank and in his disposition. As he subsequently notes, a desire for problems to be healed (medicari) motivates this decree which he commands and strengthens (*precepit, corroboravit*) in chapter.

There is no explicit mention of collegial assent; the community is not said to consent or provide counsel, but merely to act as an audience. The decree references the monastic community in order to indicate that it was informed orally, not just through the text. The validation of this precept, therefore, seems directly based in the charismatic force of the abbot. Peter commands the presence of his monks and lays out punishments for non-adherence. The subtle textual maneuvers which characterize the *Statuta* are lacking.

This statute provokes several questions. Did all statutes originally have a form similar to this? Or is Peter able to be more authoritative because it pertains only to Cluny? The lack of additional evidence limits any definite conclusions. At the very least,

---

32 Ibid., n. A2, p. 106; *Noverint presentes et superventuri quod dominus et omni veneratione dignus, Petrus Cluniacensis cenobii abbas, honestati et utilitati ubique deditus […] precepit […]*. Compare this phrase with that of Odilo or Hugh’s statutes; cf. the discussion in chapter ten.

33 Ibid.

34 Cf. the following chapter.
statute A2 suggests the power Peter held over the monks directly owing him obedience. It is perhaps an influence which Peter hoped to hold over all the monasteries of the Cluniac network, but one which necessitated alternate forms of validation to attain. It seems noteworthy that this text records that Peter commanded (praecipio) – not instituted (instituto) – suggesting that the use of this latter term in the Statuta denotes something different from an abbatial command. It is also possible that Peter may not have felt the need to develop here the public image of himself as a conciliator – as he does in his letters, the De miraculis and the Statuta – since this decree was not intended to be diffused beyond Cluny and since the dependence of these monks on the material support provided by Cluny perhaps offered an adequate motivation for them to obey Peter.

In letter 150 to Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter indicates that he had decreed at a general chapter (ca 1135) the right of entry and hospitality of all traveling Cistercian monks to any Cluniac monastery, save Cluny itself.35 This reference indicates, as does Ordericus Vitalis’ account, that Peter implemented new decrees across the ecclesia cluniacensis. The lack of a textual copy unfortunately impedes our understanding of how this decision may have been framed, especially since letter 150 is the sole reference to it. The hostility between Cluniacs and Cistercians that Peter describes in his letters 28, 111 and 150, moreover, casts doubts whether such a decree would be easily enforceable in Cluniac houses.36 Though Constable suggests that this is a reference to a statute, Peter uses the term praecaepi and makes no mention of a text. Did Peter cite this “command” as an official ‘demonstration’ of openness, something to be brought up as evidence of the Cluniac forward-looking attitude? Likely. That the only mention of it occurs fifteen years

35 LPV, ep. 150, I, pp. 370-71; Admi ante quindecim annos uniuersos uestri ordinis fraters, et recaepi praecaepi, preter Cluniacense claustrum, in omnia clastra nostra [...]. Cf. chapter four.
36 Cf. chapters three and four.
after its promulgation suggests a certain propaganda value. The importance of this reference for our purposes, therefore, is to demonstrate that Peter had sought to implement reforms across the *ecclesia cluniacensis* before the collection of the *Statuta*, but that the means of doing so differed considerably from the discourse embodied in the *Statuta*.

**CODIFICATION OF THE *STATUTA* (1146/1147)**

In the most recent critical edition completed by Giles Constable, the *Statuta* comprises 76 statutes introduced by a preface. This structure follows the order first adopted in the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* (1614) which combined the statutes of two recensions, likely manuscript Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France (BNF) Latin 13876 (fols 75-87v) and BNF, nouvelles acquisitions latines (n.a.l.) 3012 (fols 50v-56v). Constable similarly bases his edition on BNF, Latin 13876, which is the oldest extant manuscripts, but contains only the first sixty-two statutes. He corrected these against and supplemented them with the statutes in BNF, Latin 10938, a thirteenth-century version copied for Abbot Ivo of Cluny (1256-75), and in BNF, n.a.l. 3012, a copy from the late

---

37 All references to the *Statuta* will be to the Constable edition, *Statuta Petris Venerabilis abbatis Cluniacensis IX (1146/4777)*, *Consortiones Benedictinsae Variae (saec. XI-XIV)*, Giles Constable, ed. CCM VI, (Siegburg, 1975): 19-106; hereafter abbreviated *Statuta* followed by statute number and page number (in parentheses). The introduction to this edition (pp. 24-27) provides a summary of the manuscript sources and the previous editions.

38 *BC*, cols 1353-1376. Marrier and Duchesne note, “in transcribing these statutes we used two ancient manuscripts, one in the library of Saint-Germain-des-Prés at Paris which having been supplied by the humane and learned monk Jacques Dubreuil, presented only sixty-two, the other belonging to Dom Henri Girard, the prior of St. Etienne de Nevers, which supplied the remaining fourteen...”. (cited and translated by Constable in *Statuta*, introduction, p. 26). Constable (p. 26) convincingly demonstrates the use of Paris, BNF, Latin 13876 and presumes that the second manuscript has been lost. Isabelle Cochelin, however, has communicated to me that the other manuscript is very likely Paris, BNF, n.a.l. 3012.
thirteenth or early fourteenth century. The dependence on relatively late copies for the last fourteen statutes hinders a definite conclusion about the *Statuta’s* structure ca 1146.

While inconclusive for establishing the exact nature of Peter’s intended form, the three medieval manuscripts of the *Statuta* are useful in suggesting the circulation and audience of the text. Each manuscript derives from Cluny or a Cluniac monastery. Every version of the *Statuta* is copied alongside additional legislative material. These two factors indicate a reception of this text largely among Cluniac monks and with a legislative purpose. Two manuscripts (BNF, Latin 10938 and n.a.I 3012) especially indicate that this interest in the legislative basis of Peter the Venerable’s *Statuta* is predominant by the thirteenth-century.

Though the preface identifies that Peter collected all his statutes into a single work in 1146/47 (“the twenty-fourth year of my abbacy”), the statutes demonstrate that Peter had steadily promulgated reforms since 1132. Statute 19 was issued, for example, while work on the third major church at Cluny (consecrated by Innocent II in 1130) was still in progress. Statute 61 refers to a practice only instituted in statute 25. In addition, as Constable posits, Statute 62 may represent the original conclusion to the 1146/47

---

39 *Statuta*, pp. 25-26. A fourth manuscript of the *Statuta* exists (Paris, Archives Nationales, LL 1345, fols 1r-14v), but, as Constable has shown, it is a copy of the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* edition.


41 As discussed above in chapter two, BNF, Latin 13876 also contains a number of Peter’s letters to Bernard, and a Franciscan rule. BNF, Latin 10938 contains liturgical calendars and customs, alongside a copy of the *Rule of Benedict* and the annals of Cluny. BNF, n.a.I. 3012 contains Bernard of Cluny’s *Consuetudines*, the “statutes” of Odilo, Hugh (1) of Semur, Peter, and Hugh V (both the 1200 and 1205 versions).

42 *Statuta*, preface, p. 39.

43 Ibid.
recension of Peter’s statutes and the additional statutes derive from a different time. The text, though containing the practices instituted over the course of Peter’s abbacy, shows a certain unity by its form.

The text derives its name, Statuta, from the formulaic phrase, statutum est which are the first words of each decrees in this collection. The second part of each statute, providing its rationale (causa), refers to the decree as an institutum. Statutum and institutum are used interchangeably by Peter, likely reflecting the lack of distinction between these terms among his contemporaries. As we see from statute 9 (cited more for its brevity than any especial representativity), each statute is constructed as twinned act and argument:

It is instituted that on the first Sunday of the Advent of the Lord, the beginning of the Gospel according to Mark is read, which begins thus: Initium evangelii Iesu Christi filii Dei sicut scriptum est in Ysaia propheta and the rest.

The reason for this institute was that formerly the gospel Cum approinquasset Hierosolymis et venisset Bethpage ad montem Oliveti was read –it is unknown when or at whose command [this reading] was instituted– [which] either little or not at all suits the day of the Lord’s Advent, when upon his birth, he first appeared to the world. This [former

---

44 Statuta, p. 22.
45 Peter himself never refers to this text as the Statuta and the earliest manuscripts do not either.
46 Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus, (ed. Jan F. Niermeyer and Co van de Kieft, revised by J.W.J. Burgers. 2nd rev. ed., [Leiden-Boston, 2002], s.v. “statutum”) translates the statutum as “resolution, command, decree, statute” and the institutum as “1. legal provision, rule, ordinance, regulation; 2. order; 3. writ.”. The Revised Medieval Latin Word List (ed. Ronald Edward Latham, [London, 1965], s.v. “statutum”) defines statutum as “statute, decree, legislative act” while the Oxford Latin Dictionary (ed. P.G.W. Glare, 2nd ed. [Oxford, 1982], s.v. “institutum”) defines institutum as “mode of life, habits, practices, manners; a regulation, ordinance, institution”. The definition of “statutum” in Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis, (ed. Charles Du Cange, revised by Léopold Favre. 10 vols, [Noirt, 1883-87], here vol. 8, s.v. “statutum”) unites the two words, “locale institutum, consuetudo recepta in loco”. Conceptual differences between statutum, institutum and consuetudo in the twelfth century do not seem overly distinct. Gratian, writing ca 1140, places statutum between lex and consuetudo. It is a type of canon whose purpose is to act as a rule, “it leads one aright and never takes one astray”. But others say that it is called a rule because it rules, presents a norm for living rightly, or sets aright what is twisted or bent” (Gratian, The treatise on laws : (Decretum DD. 1-20), translated by Augustine Thompson and James Gordley with an introduction by Katherine Christensen, Studies in medieval and early modern canon law, 2, [Washington, 1993], D. 3.2). The transitional nature of instituta or statuta between custom and law seems evident.
reading] is more suitable for the procession of his Passion, than the procession of his incarnation or birth.\textsuperscript{47}

The statute initially outlines the specific nature of the change: the gospel reading on the first Advent Sunday should start with the beginning of Mark. The justification for the change was a concern with truthful correlation, Peter remarks, since the words of the gospel readings should correlate with the events being memorialized. When compared to the statute A2 discussed above, we can note that the form of Peter's decrees within the Statuta is oriented towards persuasion and justification. An imperious voice lacks (in comparison to statute A2), and a focus on explanation is obvious. This difference suggests a slightly different audience for and nature of the Statuta. It seems to address a readership which is not subservient and which must be coerced into obedience of its precepts. As in his letter 161 (though lacking the strong affective component), Peter uses the voice of reason to convince the minds of his monks of the Statuta's validity.

The material of statute 9—a minor modification to the liturgy—is common within the Statuta. Twenty-seven statutes (35%), for example, deal with liturgical matters. These statutes, however, are scattered throughout the text, and little overarching structure is apparent. The end of the preface to the Statuta highlights the importance of the liturgy within the text as a whole:

Because truly the Rule orders that nothing be preferred to the opus dei, neither in writing do I hold anything above it, and thus I begin with the divine service, namely, the ecclesiastical office.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{47} Statuta, n. 9, p. 49; Statutum est, ut prima dominica Adventus Domini, legatur principium evangeli secundum Marcum, quod sic incipit Ininitum evangeli Iesu Christi filii Dei sicut scriptum est in Ysaia prophetæ, et reliqua. Causa huius instituti fuit, quia ignotum ex quo tempore, vel cuius instituto, legebatur prius evangelium, vel parum, vel nihil, ad diem Adventus Domini, quo per nativitatem suam mundo primo apparuit, pertinens, et magis passionis ipsius, quam incarnationis, vel nativitatis, praecursionis congruens, hoc est, Cum appropinquasset Hierosolymis et venisset Bethphage ad montem Oliveti.

\textsuperscript{48} Statuta, preface, p. 39; Verum quoniam operi dei nichil praeponendum esse regula præcepi, nec ego ei aliquid in scribendo praeferam, sed ab ipso opere divino, hoc est ecclesiastico officio, exordium sumam.
This acknowledgement has the effect of both emphasizing the textual nature of the *Statuta* and of providing a sense of unification between its diverse parts. By saying he privileges the liturgy both in placement and importance (as demanded by the *Rule*), Peter implies that he groups like statutes together and thus has a plan for organizing them. The statutes, therefore, are presented not simply as a collection of reform decrees, but as a corpus to be read together. As with his letter collections and the *De miraculis*, the specific order Peter applied to his collection of statutes is unclear today, but his intent for them to be considered a single text is unquestionable.

In the first thirty statutes, a certain categorization of material can be glimpsed. The first nine statutes (n. 1-9) specify and reform liturgical performance. They are followed by a series of statutes promoting greater austerity in diet (n. 10-15), in clothing (n.16-17), in bedding materials (n. 18) and in social intercourse, above all silence (n.19-25). Afterwards a number eradicate customs having lost their significance (n. 26-30). The remaining forty-six statutes are not grouped into categories, mixing liturgical with disciplinary issues of differing content. Liturgical statutes comprises the largest single category and deal with various issues: removing excessive antiphons or psalms (n. 31, 32, 67, 71), adding new masses and offices (n. 5, 50, 54, 57), changing psalms, hymns and antiphons of specific masses or offices (n. 9, 58, 59, 68, 74-76), moderating the form of the chant and comportment (n. 1, 4, 55, 56, 65, 66), creating priority among offices and masses (n. 2, 3, 6, 61, 72), modifying performative directions (n. 7, 62, 73), and recognizing practices already accustomed to be followed (n. 53, 60). In addition to the liturgical alterations, a number of practical issues are addressed: the duties of monastic

---

49 Cf. Appendix D for the statute rubrics. Perhaps the end of this categorizing organization signals the boundaries of the original 1132 statues.
officers (n. 33, 45, 64, 69, 73), the regulations for entry into the monastery or priesthood (n. 35-38, 43), as well as certain practical issues ranging from the times for shaving to the times of using the major chandelier (n. 34, 49, 51, 52, 63). Two statutes on the problem of monks leaving the cloister (for manual labour and to travel [n. 39, 40]) introduce a brief series dealing with dependent monasteries (41, 42, 47), the acceptance of donations (44) and lay servants (45, 46, 48, 70), all of which address the specific problems of monks living in small dependencies and priories far from Cluny itself.

There is a dominant theme immediately evident from these statutes. A spirit of limitation and austerity underlies both the material and liturgical reforms. Customs which have lost their relevance are culled and replaced with those depicted as meaningful. All practices must be based in proper intent, such as the singing of the psalms which must be sung so that they are understood and meaningful to the monks. We can see a clear focus on promoting a concept of monastic practice based in interiority. A balance of community and individual monk is also maintained. Private masses are excised when they conflict with communal services, but distinct times and places are set aside for the practice of individual spiritual exercises *velut in eremo.* These are the themes, we will recognize, that Peter promotes to his monks within the *De miraculis.*

The desire for greater simplicity, austerity and rationalism which underlie these statutes have been attributed to the Cistercian character of Peter’s *Statuta.* David Knowles has suggested that the focus on austerity, the emphasis on fasting and the simplification of the liturgy demonstrate a transmission of Cistercian ideals. In comparing the statutes with the list of criticisms in Bernard’s *Apologia,* he declares the former based

---

50 *Statuta,* n. 53, p. 83.
on the latter.\textsuperscript{51} He does this, even though he admits that many statutes find no precursor in the \textit{Apologia} and he avoids discussing the statutes not paralleling Bernard’s criticisms. If we look at the statutes about the reception of novices, for example, the measures taken in the statutes do not offer a reply to Bernard’s criticisms. Instead, the statutes (n. 35-38) are used to affirm the power of the abbot of Cluny as regulating this aspect.\textsuperscript{52} Statute 37 set the time of the noviciate to one month (not the year, as Peter remarks in letter 28, that the Cistercians demanded\textsuperscript{53}), though the abbot retains a right to allow earlier entrance if the novices are in danger of being dissuaded from entering. The other statutes emphasize that the profession of monks must be done before the abbot of Cluny—he alone possesses the right to accept new monks (n. 35) and receive their profession of obedience (n. 38). Even if the subject finds a parallel in the criticisms of Bernard, this does not mean that a shared intention underlies them or that one led to the other. The promotion of austerity measures does suggest, however, a new trend in Cluniac monasticism.

The idea of an unambiguous reception of Bernard of Clairvaux’s ideology is hard to accept given other evidence of Peter’s attitudes towards Bernard, though some inspiration may be attributed to their example. His remarks in letter 35 (extolling the Cistercian practices of humility, \textit{ca} 1132/40) indicates that Peter saw considerable value in the directions taken by their spiritual exercises, especially their greater austerity and simplicity. We must remember, however, that this praise acted in that letter to criticize and humiliate Cistercian pride.\textsuperscript{54} Nonetheless, as we see in letters 149 and 150 (1149), near the end of his abbacy Peter saw the value in promoting the parallel observance of

\textsuperscript{51} Knowles, art. “Reforming Decrees,” pp. 3, 7-17.
\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Statuta}, n. 35-37, pp. 69-72.
\textsuperscript{53} \textit{LPV}, ep. 28, 1, pp. 58-62.
\textsuperscript{54} Cf. chapter three for a discussion of this letter.
Cistercians and Cluniacs customs within common monastic space. From such comments, Peter demonstrates that he clearly was looking to new monastic models to revive the monastic fervour at Cluny, and that Cîteaux was one example to which he looked.

Since no direct textual correspondences exist, that I am aware of, between the Statuta and Cistercian documentation, it is difficult to establish the specific linkages—if there are any—between Cluny and Cîteaux. Of the numerous monastic exemplars that Peter presents in this letters or the De miraculis none of them are Cistercian, while other new movements like the Carthusians receive considerable praise. The lack of more explicit indications of debts and borrowings could be explained as unlikely, however, given that Peter was aware of the antagonism held by his monks for the Cistercians. Peter’s rhetoric may be simply a careful attempt not to alienate his reforms from a Cluniac audience. Thus, I agree with Constable who concludes that Peter’s idealization of simplicity, humility and physical austerity was inspired generally by twelfth-century religious movements, of which the Cistercians were one important and ideologically dominating force. Such trends would explain similarities between Cistercian and Cluniac doctrine, without necessitating Peter’s dependence on Bernard of Clairvaux.

Although accepting similarities between the Statuta’s ideological foundation and that of Cîteaux, Jean Leclercq’s ascribes to the text a moderation typical of Peter and indicative of a Cluniac mentality. Though Peter and Bernard consciously defined their

---

55 Barret, “Regula Benedicti, consuetudines, statuta: le corpus clunisien” and Florent Cyglyer, Das Generalkapital in hohen Mittelalter, pp. 343-46. C glyer cautions against seeing significant influence of Cistercian ideas on Cluniac monasticism, even in the thirteenth century and later.


monasteries as representatives respectively of old and new monasticism (as we have seen in chapter three), it must be noted that this chronological order does not correlate with ideological resistance or innovation. Pietro Zerbi, for instance, acknowledges that in the *Statuta*, Peter demonstrates “une sensibilité au monde nouveau” quite unlike his contemporary Bernard. Giles Constable similarly critiqued the tendency to consider as homogeneous the dichotomies of new/old, Cluniac/Cistercian or traditional/reformed monasticism. He cautions historians not to be bound by such oppositions, nor to read too much into them. It is dangerous, Constable asserts, to judge Cluny by its the relation to Cîteaux, as it once was, and to assume this is a valid measure of Cluny’s novelty or a suitable means to evaluate how Peter reformed his monks. An analysis based on this opposition, moreover, seems to reproduce uncritically twelfth-century Cistercian polemic.

Constable became one of the first major advocates of the *Statuta* as an expression of a vigourous Cluniac spirituality. He argues that the monastic policy of Peter the Venerable not only sought to defend the ‘old’ type of Cluniac monasticism against the critics from the ‘new’ monasticism, but also to adapt it to a new spirituality. The *Statuta*, he asserts, remained a completion of pre-existing Cluniac customary legislation. Subsequent scholars have adopted a similar perspective, suggesting that Peter did not undertake a large-scale reform project with his own monks because he did not have much laxity to correct. Robert Folz’s close examination of Peter’s liturgical

---

reforms concludes that Peter conserved ancient liturgical traditions, such as the rigorous execution of the psalmody, but enriched them with increased reading and personal meditation. The statutes demonstrate his discretion, according to Folz, and also his adaptation of old practices to fit with new circumstances. Peter does not greatly reform the liturgy, Folz argues, but strives to imbue it with a new ideology. Though using the same psalms and hymns, Peter stressed that the personal, the emotional and the intellectual aspects of worship be recognized and understood by every monk. Interiorized religion grounds the Statuta, Folz notes.

Bouthillier and Torrell emphasize features of institutionalization in their discussion of the Statuta. The growing size of the Cluniac network, with more monasteries given to be reformed and an increase in new but small foundations, necessitated changes. Reforms such as the limitation of the liturgy would allow for the continued spread and expansion of Cluniac monasticism into small priories. The movement away from tradition-bound conduct, the promotion of interior worship and the encouragement of literacy provided a means to incorporate more monks in the Cluniac fold. From this suggestion, we can glimpse that perhaps the changes brought about by the Statuta were not meant to reform fallen monks, but an attempt to deal with the international character of Cluniac monasticism. The Statuta, in their interpretation, did not address a period of decadence as is implicit in the Cistercian-focused hypothesis, but rather a time of new found fervor. This is a fervour, perhaps, that is more attributable to Peter than to all of his monks, as the resistance to his reforms, which were so strongly emphasized by Ordericus Vitalis, warns.

---

This debate over origins is useful to elucidate what has been interpreted as the Statuta’s major ideological foundations. The ideas that Peter attempts to implement can be neither defined as old or new in essence. Notwithstanding the question whether the Statuta inspired was inspired by Citeaux or was born from Cluniac conventions, we can see a significant shift in how the Statuta constructs the relationship between monk and institution or between exterior custom and interior acceptance.

A recent article by Sebastian Barret suggests that regardless of its content, the textual and legislative nature of the Statuta has a significant impact on the functioning of the Cluniac communities. Like Torrell and Bouthillier, he suggests that abbatial statutes were a constitutive stage in the institutionalization of monasticism at Cluny—not by the regulations themselves, but in the structures of communication which accompanies them. Peter’s statutes sought changes to Cluniac practices, but also engendered a new sense of abstraction. The personal subjectivity of the monk was redefined not as the member of an emotional community, but as a representative of principles based in order, rationalism and systematization. Barret demonstrates that this is the case for the statutes promulgated after the time of Peter the Venerable, but can we see a similar nature in Peter’s Statuta? If this is the case, then the Statuta functions just as the De miraculis, instilling an internalized self-regulatory impulse, in which the will-to-obey is not defined by performing practices or obeying the abbot, but through inward adherence to a set of principles, beliefs and judgements. The Statuta, we will see, embodies a double function, both laying out a series of laws and arguing for the necessity of obeying the law.

---

65 Ibid., 554.
66 Ibid.
LEGAL Fictions: the rhetoric of Peter’s reform legislation

The legislator, according to Plato, must embody the duality of the “slave-doctor” and the “free-doctor”. The slave-doctor dictates his remedies through coercion while the free-doctor must learn from the patient how to persuade him or her to follow the offered advice. For Plato, the slave-doctor represents law proper, while the free-doctor is a pretext to the law. Obedience is the end of both strategies, but the latter admits the possibility of refusal. Likewise, Plato argues, before subjection to law is established, the legislator must use rhetoric to prepare the audience to experience the laws as necessary. The origin of the laws cannot be in law itself, but in the negotiations between a legislator and his subjects. Before law is possible, the legislator, whether a person or a body, must first convince the subject that his/its acts are exemplary and therefore legitimate.

Though Peter the Venerable would have never read this analogy, we see in his Statuta a manifestation of this very process. The Statuta acts as an argument for and an instantiation of written legislation. Through the discourse of law, Peter uses various “lies” of authority (as Plato calls them) to coerce acceptance so that his precepts come to be accepted as authoritative. By privileging a newly codified body of custom/law, Peter modulates the traditional Cluniac form of customary adherence and provides a dispositive means for implementing reform within monasteries. His appeals to abbatial precedent, to collegial consent and to the discourse of reason are all elements of an attempt to validate the rule of law. Key aspects of Peter’s Statuta, then, are its form, its features of legitimization and its structures of justification.

---

PROLOGUE AS PRE-TEXT: THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE *STATUTA*

As we have seen in the previous chapter, the *Statuta* is not arranged in a systematic order. This lack of systematic order should not overshadow, however, the presence of common stylistic and thematic features which unite the individual statutes into a single work. Just as the form of each statute (comprising an *institutum* and a *causa*) is constant, Peter offers further unity through several underlying discourses. The rhetoric of law—namely the pre-text of the legislator—comes to the fore in the preamble, which should be understood as the dominant legitimizing strategy.

The preamble to the *Statuta* is explicitly identified as a "justificatory preface of the lord Peter abbot of Cluny concerning certain customs changed in his time." With a rubric such as this, it is difficult to misconstrue the intent behind Peter's preface. Not merely an introduction to the statutes, the preface acts as a defensive argument validating both the changes he implements and the textual form he constructs. To this end, Peter starts by recalling the general utility of the written word:

Since it is always useful to preserve in memory things (especially religious things) undertaken, it seemed to me that I should transmit through the medium of writing to the knowledge of present and future people those things which were changed, increased or diminished in the Cluniac institutes in the past twenty four years, that is, from when I, unworthy, took up the pastoral office.

---

2 *Statuta*, preface, p. 39; [...] satisfactionis praefectio domini Petri Cluniacensis abbatis de quibusdam suo tempore mutatis consuetudinibus.


4 *Statuta*, preface, p. 39; Quoniam res gestas, et maxime religiosas, memoriae commendare semper utile est, visum est mihi ut ea quae in Cluniacensis institutis a viginti quatuor annis, hoc est ex quo officium pastorale indignus suscepit, mutata, aucta, vel dempta sunt, scriptura mediante, ad modernorum vel posterorum notitiam transmittam.
We have seen a similar justification in the *De miraculis* and, as discussed at the end of this chapter, in the *Dispositio rei familiaris*. There is an inherent value in text, he suggests, as a means to stabilize and transmit knowledge. This is a common sense universalizing argument, ("it is always useful") for why he would wish to leave a written record of his actions. Even though the desire may be self-evident, the specific kind of text that Peter wishes to codify demands further justification.

To ensure the suitable reception of this text, a dual *auctoritas* underlies the *Statuta*. Peter’s authorship is underlined (e.g. “I wrote this”) as is his authority (e.g. these changes took place “under my abbacy”). Peter returns to a presentation of his unique position and ability to outline change later in the prologue, as I will discuss below, but he first argues against those who deny that change in religious observances is licit. Peter identifies the reforms he institutes at Cluny as a manifestation of the need to update the laws of the Church:

Frequent change of ecclesiastical usages, if necessary, ought not seem new, uncommon or miraculous to any of the wise, because it is one thing that is ordered by God to be unchangingly maintained as an eternal law, and another that is ordered, not in perpetuity, but by men for the reason of whatever utility at a certain time. And that first thing, indeed, ought not be changed on account of this, since if it is not followed, eternal salvation is not attained in any way. Indeed, this second, therefore, is changed from time to time, since what at one time was useful, is proved harmful at other times. And to say it more clearly, what things are of true virtue should never be changed; what, however, are aids to virtues, can be arranged instrumentally according to the suitability of things, people and times. [...] Fasts, vigils, manual labour, the exercises of the body, however, [...] must sometimes be diminished, at other times augmented or suppressed completely for the sake of clear necessity and charity.  

---

5 We have seen from the *De miraculis*, however, that leaving behind a record is not an apolitical enterprise, but one concerned with establishing an account to support certain religious ends. For Peter’s concern with memory, cf. chapter six.
6 Statuta, preface, p. 39-40; Nulli enim sapientium nova, inusitata, et mira videri debet usum ecclesiasticorum, si necessaria fuerit, et frequens mutatio, quoniam aliud est quod a deo aeterna lege immobiliteter tenendum praecipitur, aliud quod ab hominibus utilitiatis cuiuslibet causa ad tempus, non in perpetuum, imperatur. Et illud primum quidem idcirco mutandum non est, quia si non servatur, nec salus
Taking the argument from Ivo of Chartres he first addressed in letter 28 and again in letter 111, Peter argues that under certain circumstances ecclesiastical observances can be changed in accordance with necessity, utility and charity. Peter, like Ivo, distinguishes between mutable (mobilis) and eternal (immobilis or eterna) laws, suggesting that monastic usages are a type of the former, and charity an instance of the latter. Peter here adapts Ivo's argument to the situation of his monastery. Though Ivo's Prologus is written for bishops about canon law, Peter's application to monastic usages is a transference of the underlying thought. The effect of this discussion is to present monastic observances as manifestations of law, but to do so discreetly. Peter only uses the term lex a single time, but nonetheless he presents custom as being judged according to the same criteria as written law. Monastic practices which were formerly affirmed by their use are implicitly asked by Peter to be based in the abstract principles of necessity and utility in the service of charity. But who decides what is necessary, what is useful, what is charitable? Ivo argues that the reform of law must be undertaken "under the authority of leaders" (auctoritate presidentium) citing Leo the Great's affirmation, "he who has

*aeterna ullo modo conservatur. Hoc vero secundum ideo quandoque mutatur, quia quod aliquando utile fuerat, aliquando nostrum comprobatur. Et ut clararius eloquar, quae verae virtutis sunt, nunquam mutanda sunt; quae vero adiumenta virtutum, pro congruentia rerum, personarum et temporum utiliter dispensanda sunt. Nec enim praeceptum fidei, spei, vel charitatis, et quae sub ipsa charitate continentur, castitatis, humilitatis, veritatis, et sinceritas mandata mutari, quolibet dispensante, vel quolibet dispensatione possunt. Ieiunia tamen, vigiliae, opus manuum, corporalis exercitatio, quae justa Apostolum, utilis quidem sed ad modicum est (I Tim. IV), et similis istis, quae enumerare proximitas prohibet, nunc minui, nunc augeri, nunc omnino subtrahi certae necessitatis vel charitatis causa praepositorum magisterio debent."

7 Prologue, n. 9-12, pp. 75-77; for a discussion of Peter's letters 28 and 111 and their relationship to Ivo of Chartres, cf. chapter four.
8 Ibid., p. 30.
9 Peter refers to lex at only one point other than the prologue: statute 38 (Statuta, p. 73). In this decree, Peter demands that all novices from monasteries belonging to Cluny come before the abbot at Cluny for their profession. He depicts this regulation as something which could not be denied. He wants to correct a situation where priors and abbots might only send their novices, as he says, up to fifteen years after their entry into the monastic life. It is interesting that he invokes the work lex when he is asserting the authority of the abbot of Cluny over all the monasteries of the ecclesia cluniacensis.
10 On the status of custom before Peter the Venerable, cf. the discussion in the following chapter.
power, can dispense laws” (*qui potestatem habet, ea dispense*).\(^{11}\) Peter sees himself as one of these decision makers, a natural position given that it was papal legislation which had buttressed this authority of the Cluniac abbot.\(^{12}\) He evokes, however, abbatial prerogative and precedent, the consent of the Cluniac chapter and the precepts of the *Rule of Saint Benedict* to explain and justify his legislative action:

The apostles followed this rule [i.e. to change custom in accordance with necessity and charity] as did their successors: the apostolic pontiffs, the sainted monks, the fathers of hermits and also the past founders of the great and powerful order of Cluny. If it is necessary to name each of these founders, I can show that from the beginning, Saint Odo, up to the final one ascribed the title of sanctity, the saintly father Hugh, all changed many things of the customs instituted in their times, on account of the demands of necessity, always for some useful reason [causa]. For our predecessors usefully instituted many things which later men usefully modified for a clear subsequent reason. Having followed them, I changed some of the former usages when a reason [causa] of clear utility advised, and on that account, in making them I did not raise myself above them, as some used to murmur in far removed corners in order to corrupt the fraternal flesh. Rather, in imitation of those holy fathers, I did not deviate from their path. I did this not by my will alone, but following the precept of the Rule and with the counsel of certain wise and God-fearing brothers. I did this, subsequently, with the assent of the general chapter.\(^{13}\)

---


\(^{12}\) Cf. the discussion in the previous chapter.

\(^{13}\) *Statuta*, preface, p. 40; *Hanc regulam apostoli ipsi secuti sunt, hanc eorum successores apostolici pontificis, hanc sancti monachorum seu hermitarum patres, hanc etiam praeecedentes Cluniacensis ordinis magni et egregii fundatores. Hos si nominare singillatim necessitas imperaret, ostenderem a primo sancto Odone, usque ad ultimum sanctitatis titulo insignitum, Hugonem sanctum patrem, universos de instituti consuetudinibus, plurima suis temporibus, urgenge tamen necessitate, utili semper causa mutasse. Multa enim priores utiliter instituerunt quae sequentes certa interveniente causa utiliter mutaverunt. Hos ego secutus, quaedam in pristinam usibus, certae utilitatis causa monente, mutavi, et idcirco non ut quidam olim in angulis, ad corrodendas carnes fraternas, semonis locis insussurrabant, me esta facienda eis praetuli, immo hac sanctorum patrum imitatione, ab eorum tramite non deviavi. Feci tamen hoc non solo meo arbitrio, sed iuxta regulae praecetum, quorumam deum timentium ac sapientium fratrum consilio. Feci hoc tandem capituli universalis assensu.* Knowles ("The Reforming Decrees," pp. 4-5) notes that this preface repeats arguments of letter 28, "previously arguing against the Cistercians, he defended the great abbots of Cluny for introducing mitigations of the Rule in the interests of Charity, now against his detractors at home, he is citing his predecessors as supplying precedents for his own changes, many of which are in the direction of austerity and a closer observance of the Rule. These last features, we may remark, he does not emphasize." Such a comment, however, overlooks Peter’s intention that his monks also read letters 28 and 111.
Precedent is here cited as the justification for an ability to innovate. Peter maintains the abbatial prerogative held by all previous Cluniac abbots. The act of reform, Peter remarks, was not novel, only the content of his reforms. With this argument, Peter addresses those monks, like Orderic Vitalis, who cited Peter’s abbatial forefathers as a reason to resist Peter’s reforms. Peter clearly depicts himself as an agent of change (mutavi, feci), but only in order to place himself within a larger process. In making his alterations, Peter continues, he did not operate alone, but along lines laid out by utility, the Rule and a group of wise and proper monks. The final product, he reminds the reader, was then approved and assented to by all the Cluniac monks at a general chapter.

This mandate provides an argument for Peter’s exemplarity as a legislator. By presenting himself as the heir to ecclesiastical and abbatial tradition and as the representative of the Cluniac monks, Peter combines in his person two different strategies of validation. Peter indicates (or rather argues) that his preeminence has been acknowledged both de iure and de facto as the promulgator of the Statuta. These legitimizing forces underlie the conception, framework and form of the Statuta and help us understand the means and the end of Peter’s reform project. I now turn to an explication of these themes within the text of the Statuta.

DEPICTING PRESENT AND PAST: REGULATED MONASTIC COMMUNITIES

I wish first to discuss Peter’s construction of the monastic community and to examine how this presentation establishes a specific relationship between himself and his monks, as well as between past and present practice, in the body of the Statuta. Though Peter cites collegial consent as a foundation of his promulgation of the Statuta, Peter promotes his auctoritas within the text by creating a portrait of a passive monastic
community. This depiction is partially accomplished through the verbs of command used throughout the Statuta. With the exception of Peter’s personal voice (discussed below), the passive voice dominates the text: reforms are instituted (statutum est) and ordered (praeeptum est), masses are celebrated (celebratur) and actions are begun (incipiatur). Practices are commonly outlined as in statute 22 where the statute reads, “It is instituted that silence be maintained everywhere”, where the silence is emphasized as an impersonal good –it is not the brothers actively keeping silence. With the exception of a single monk –Peter– agency is erased and delocalized; the monastery itself becomes identified as a series of practices and places inhabited by shadowy figures. The monks are presented neither as directly engaged in action nor as the focus of the monastic program outlined in the Statuta. Only in statute 31 does Peter remark that a reduction in psalms was done “at the request of many and almost the entire community” who found the former number too burdensome.\textsuperscript{14} It was not their active will which motivated the change, however. The incapacity of the brothers provides only a necessary cause to limit the liturgy. This argument has the effect of highlighting how Peter accedes to the demands of the brothers (and thereby demonstrates his moderation), but importantly it also implies the weakness of the community itself.

Before I address this last topic, I must first explain how I interpret Peter’s implication of passivity. I do not wish to argue that Peter’s monks were mindless automatons, but I do think that the Statuta argues for a situation where they re-conceive themselves as the functionaries of rules and principles. Peter does not imagine his monks as lacking agency, but rather –just as we have seen in his letters and the De miraculis– he wishes their wills to be governed by the rules of logic and reason. The monks themselves

\textsuperscript{14} Statuta, n 31, p. 66; multorum et totius paene conventus postulatione.
are expected to conduct themselves “rationally” (rationabiliter) as actors within the
monastic program. Statute 2 demands that monks to maintain reverence for the Lord’s
day “as much as it is reasonable to do”.\textsuperscript{15} Statute 37 suggests that monks should find that
“it seems reasonable” to ensure a probation of at least one month.\textsuperscript{16} Reason is regimen to
be exhibited and practiced by monks, therefore, not just an unthinking adherence to rules
and traditions. We see here the same foundation of monastic practice as advocated in the
\textit{De miraculis}.\textsuperscript{17} This characterization is fundamental for an abbot seeking to ground his
authority, as we will see, in ideas of rational law and in the foundation of a constitutional
society.

The \textit{Statuta} subtly outlines an impetus for the Cluniac monks to reconceptualize
their outlook (along rational lines) by presenting an image of Cluniac monasticism beset
by difficulties before the promulgation of Peter’s statutes. Monks are cited largely in
order to identify improper practice to which was once adhered. The rare times the
brothers appear as active participants within a \textit{statutum}, it is a negative action being
presented: “all must abstain from lard” (n. 15) or “none of the brethren should dress” in
this or that material (n. 16).\textsuperscript{18} In statute 1 the voices of the singers (not the singers) must
follow the same rhythm, pauses and tempo; the statute then directly censures “monks”
who did this improperly. Statute 7 demands that a bell be rung to summon brothers to the
major mass because the brothers previously ignored the hour of the mass when engaged
in other tasks. What is important to note about these references is that they implicitly
contrast the past with the present state of affairs and that they suggest statutes to be the

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., n. 2, p. 43; \textit{quantum rationabiliter fieri poterat}.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., n. 37, p. 71; \textit{visum est esse rationabile}.
\textsuperscript{17} Cf. chapters six and seven.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., n. 15, p. 54; \textit{ad adipe […] omnes abstineant}; n. 16, p. 54; \textit{nullus fratrum […] vestiatur […]}. Cf.
also n. 10-12, 15-18.
solution to previous problems. When the Statuta claims that many monks were "formerly consumed by shameful and filthy desire" and cites the "sinister suspicion, or rather the proof of unmentionable things which resulted, even if only in the past" from an unsuitable practice, it implicitly points to the need for reform.\textsuperscript{19}

The construction of a "bad past" subtly offers a warning to present and future monks who question why certain measures were implemented. This depiction follows the image of Cluny (DM, II, 11) in the De miraculis where a few noxious weeds (i.e. improper practices and unsuitable monks) had been allowed to grow until a reassertion of order led to a restored state of propriety. As in the De miraculis, problems are also relegated to a former state of Cluny which predate Peter's corrective statutes.

In his presentation, Peter creates an image of a community which had allowed a few bad decisions to be introduced. Relative to this, a space is established for an agent of positive change. This portrait therefore provides the opportunity for the expansion of Peter's abbatial power and his right to promulgate legislation. His presentation prepares for a monastic program which is defined less as acts of virtue, but as the fulfillment of abstract principles of law and the avoidance of error. This redefinition prepares for and is part of Peter's advancement of rationality as the basis of the monastic enterprise. As we will see from Peter's self-presentation in the Statuta, his ability to provide suitable guidance to his monks - not some innate abbatial command - legitimizes his ability to preside over the ecclesia cluniacensis.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., n. 16, p. 55; inhonesta ac turpis curiositas, qua olim multi nostrorum [...] se comebant; ibid. n. 46, p. 78; sinistra quaramdam rerum, nec non dicendarum suspicio, immo magis probatio, quae etsi olim [...] proveniunt [...].
AUTHORING ABBATIAL AUTHORITY

Though Peter cites abbatial precedent and collegial consent in his prologue as two ways to ensure the positive reception of the Statuta, these ideas are transformed in the text to promote the former and, as we have seen, delimit the latter. Though there is little explicit content within the Statuta from which to adduce Peter’s intended abbatial role, a few indications point to a self-presentation as a learned but humble abbot. A hint of this self-conception emerges from Statute 55 which slightly modifies the manner of welcoming the abbot to chapter. Under Peter’s decree, the gathered brethren only need to stand up and bow slightly, no longer all the way to the ground. It suggests the humility of the abbot (i.e. Peter) who is willing to forego to some extent a sign of respect out of an understanding, as it is presented, of the physical infirmity of some older monks. While suggesting his mercy and humility, this statute also effects a recognition of the converse: that the abbot must be offered some gesture of submission. We see that Peter works to effect a ritual (though perhaps only token) acknowledgment of abbatial authority across the ecclesia cluniacensis.

At the end statute 62, Peter provides further clues for understanding the limits of his abbatial power. He states, “Though I hesitate to command it, I wish nonetheless that this shall have been done where it is possible among our [houses], just as it was done by me at Cluny”\(^\text{20}\). Peter requests, but does not command, widespread implementation of the statute(s). This deference to the will of monks beyond Cluny itself suggests what is hinted in his letters, that he wished to govern monks outside Cluny, but not did not seek

---

\(^{20}\) Ibid., n. 62, p. 95; Quod sicut Cluniaci a me factum est, sic ubi fieri potuerit apud nostros, licet praecipere verear, opto tamen ut fiat. Peter may be referring here to the statute or to the Statuta as a whole.
to do so through demands on obedience. This statement also suggests that only at Cluny itself could he marshal the fullness of abbatial power. To address the larger audience of the *ecclesia cluniacensis*, Peter returns to a time-honoured strategy: the use of textual strategies to promote his ideological power.

As we saw outlined in the prologue, Peter underlines his personal role in writing down and instituting the reforms from the very outset of the *Statuta*. Unlike many law collections and most monastic collections of statutes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries which were anonymous, Peter the Venerable locates himself at the centre of his text, identifying himself as its promulgator both in the preface and body. The first person singular is used throughout the *Statuta* over thirty times, concentrated mainly in the preface and certain statutes. The majority of these are Peter’s textual asides (e.g. n. 73, *ut audivi*; n. 62, *ut iam dixi*). Often he uses his personal voice as evidence of problems to whose existence he can testify (e.g. n. 16 *supra quam dicere velim sicut et ipse vidi*; n. 17 *ut ipse novi*).

Though only directly evident in two statutes, we can note a use of the first-person which exhibits a tonal difference from Peter’s testimonial voice. In two statutes 61 and 66, Peter’s voice modulates into that of a discussant in a dialogue. In statute 61, he excoriates the untruthfulness of his monks, who he expects to be the “sons of truth”, singing the psalm *Lux intrat albescit polus* during the dark of night. Lack of truthful correspondence between the words and their context of performance provides the initial

---

21 Cf. chapter five.
22 Gérard Giordanengo, “*Auctoritates et auctores dans les collections canoniques (1050-1140)*,” in *Auctor et Auctoritas*, pp. 99-129, here pp. 106-7. At Cluny, for instance, all other collections of statutes (all post-dating Peter) are promulgated by the abbots, but are decided upon by the collective deliberation of the community, cf. chapter eleven.
23 *Statuta*, n. 1, 7, 9, 16, 17, 26, 36*, 37*, 46, 61*, 62*, 66*, and 73; * denotes the use of more than one first person verb in a statute.
24 Ibid., n. 61, p. 93; *filiis veritatis*. 
justification for the change, but lest someone resist (by noting that not all such inconsistencies are rooted out), Peter provides further justification:

But if anyone objects, "Why not also in other things?" [...] then I respond, "Indeed I truly desired that all things be corrected among us and everywhere if it was possible to do it peacefully." But since, as I see it, this is not possible, I shall use the words of Pope Gregory the Great, "If I am unable to carry back many sheaves from the dominical field at least I will bring a few, or two, or at least one." 25

First, we can note Peter's explicit acknowledgement of his limitations. He can only change so many observances, and so he reforms what he knows he can accomplish. By admitting his awareness of the resistance with which he is faced, he also acknowledges that he is an agent of change. Peter obliquely declares himself—in imitation of papal and patristic authority— as the one reflecting on what should be changed and why. Second, Peter's reasoning, not his authority, is what is intended to motivate the acceptance of the statute by his monks. We see a similar point emphasized in statute 66, where Peter explains that the monastic school children (pueri scholares) should not be excluded from monastic offices. After he rejects the nature of this practice as a "so-called custom" without a known origin, he appeals to a passage from scripture to support his conclusion:

For as the prince of the apostles says, anyone of any people who fears God and serves justice is received by him. If [anyone] of any people, I ask, why not anyone of any order? If anyone of any order, why not anyone of any rank? Of any condition? Of any age? And since an obvious thing does not require a long demonstration, I state briefly that every monastic and ecclesiastical dignity was altogether restored to our school children, if they are good and proper. 26

25 Ibid., n. 61 p. 93; Quod si quis obiciat, cur non et in ceteris... respondeo, velle me quidem valde ut talia cuncta, si cum pace fieri posset, apud nostros et ubique corrigentur. Sed quia, ut aestimo, hoc non potest fieri, verbis magni Gregorii papae utar: Si non possum de agro dominico multos reportare manipulos, saltem paucos, saltem duos, saltem unam feram.
26 Ibid., n. 66, p. 97; Nam cum princeps apostolorum dicat, in omni gente, qui temet deum, et operatur iustitiam, acceptus est illi. Si inquam, in omni gente, numquid non in omni ordine? Si in omni ordine, numquid non in omni gradu? In omni conditione? In omni aetate? Et quia res clara longa probatione non eget, breviter dico omnem monasticam vel ecclesiasticam dignitatem, si boni et digni fuerint, restitutam esse a nobis publice scholaribus.
Peter's disputant voice again emerges from this passage. He is arguing a point with which he expects disagreement, and as such, he appeals to argumentation. These two examples (n. 61 and 66) provide an important hint that Peter presents himself as a voice of reason (and perhaps a teacher) for his monks. As we also saw in his letters and the *De miraculis*, Peter is present throughout the *Statuta* as the embodiment of rational discourse, and to a lesser extent abbatial command. Like Peter's self depiction in the *De miraculis* as one only providing spiritual assistance, Peter here identifies himself as spiritual father having come (through reason and charity) to a knowledge of correct observances.

**RATIONAL ARGUMENTATION**

Much as Peter constructs an image of his monks as rational actors, his text provides a tangible and imitable model of logical reasoning. As he lays out in the preface, Peter evaluates the licit or illicit nature of reform to previous customs according to fixed and clear criteria: necessity\(^{27}\) and utility.

Statute 32 provides an illustration of Peter's citation of necessity. The statute limits the number of prebends given for the remembrance of dead brethren to fifty in total which was necessary, Peter remarks, due to the impossible costs of supporting the original regimen (in which an infinite number of brothers could theoretically be commemorated). Statutes 44, 45, 52 and 63 are based in a similar argument, also in reference to economic restriction, and statutes 55 and 65 are founded on a recognition of the physical limitation of his monks.

\(^{27}\) In the preface, the first mention of necessity as a dispensing factor is enunciated as the reason why Odo or Hugh changed things. Thus necessity is presented as a traditional Clunian rationale for reform.
Peter also highlights the importance of utility in justifying changes to avoid the appearance of impropriety, to increase reverence for the divine office, to enhance the spiritual profit of the monks, to restrain desire or temptation, or to rid the monastery of fruitless practices (i.e. those based in mindless adherence to tradition). This final category illustrates especially well Peter’s use of an argument based in utility. Words that do not match coinciding actions in the liturgy, he argues, should be avoided; actions that have lost their significance or practicality need to be updated. He justifies the elimination of the midday siesta on fast days according to the following:

Certainly it was an ancient tradition of the monks to balance the reduction of habitual sleep on fast days with an equal nap before the meal [… ] But because subsequent monks (followers of natural science more curious than the ancients) judged it detrimental for the body to sleep with an empty stomach, they changed the midday siesta on fast days to this brief rest, with the result that they did not retain the reality of this midday rest, but only the simulacrum of truth. They added to this aforementioned simulation (or what should more be called ridiculous superstition) […] that the brethren were aroused by a lengthy sounding of the bell—as if they were sleeping deeply—and, as if unkempt and disheveled, they wash their hands, they comb their hair and they fulfill completely every solemnity of the longest midday for the length of a long cycle of readings. For this reason, it is judged that this time, formerly spent in such useless labour, now be filled with readings, songs and divine sacrifices or any useful exercises.

Peter criticizes this practice as a useless adherence to a tradition which has lost all purpose. Since the utility of the practice had already been removed for health reasons and

28 Statuta, n. 13, 23, 24, 40, 42, 46, 47.
29 Ibid., n. 2-5, 10, 20, 50, 60, 68, 75, 76.
30 Ibid., n. 7, 8, 53, 62, 75.
31 Ibid., n. 16-18, 42, 48.
32 Ibid., n. 9, 21, 26-30, 58, 59, 61, 71.
33 Ibid., n. 26, p. 63; Et quidem antiquus monachorum mos erat ieiuniorum diebus detrimenta usitati somni congruenti dormitione ante mensam compensare. Sed quia sequentes monachi antiquissimiores phisicae secatores ventre vacuo dormire inutili corpori judicaverunt, ad eam brevitatem meridianos ieiuniorum somnos redigerunt, ut meridianae quietis nullam veritatem, sed solum veritatis simulacrum retinerent. … jam dictae simulacioni magis ridendam superstitionem, ut velut graviter dormientes prolxiore sonitu signi excitarentur, et quasi longa lectorum revolutione hispidi et incompi manus abluerent, capita comenerat, et omnem prorsus solemnitatem longissimae meridianae expellerent. Unde indicatum est ut corporis tam inutili labori inserviens, lectionibus, cantibus, et sacrificiis divinis seu quibustibet utilibus exercitiis impenderitur.
since reason had already been used to provide a justification for a change to this custom, Peter suppresses it despite an acknowledgement of its antiquity. It is interesting that Peter notes a previous change to custom which also employs an appeal to the discourse of reason (e.g. natural science). After this change, however, the practice had no purpose, and its only value derived from the monks adhering to tradition. He denigrates ritualized behaviour, therefore, as a simulation of truth and therefore valueless. If practices are to be performed, Peter suggests there should be a tangible cause for it. While utility provides the rationale for an initial justification for a change in custom, Peter’s appeals to authoritative texts and to alternate customs, as we see below, present further validation of Peter’s new Cluniac observances.

APPEALS TO TEXTS AND TRADITION

From the very first line of the Statuta we can recognize that Peter conceives of the written word as a special medium for the preservation of information and as an authentic record to be accepted by present and future monks. He likewise believes that other suitable records have been left behind by past religious writers, whose texts provide guidance for what the Cluniacs should follow. The Statuta contains appeals mainly to those texts fundamental to the monastic life: the Rule of Saint Benedict and the Bible. He invokes the Rule within the preface and directly refers to it in seven statutes. This number compares with five explicit citations of scripture, two of patristic authority and two of canon law.35

34 Ibid., n. 11, 12 (x2), 14 (x2), 22, 37(x2), 39, and 56, pp. 50-53, 60, 71-72, and 74.
35 Explicit citations of Scripture are found in Statuta, n. 11 (x2), 19, 22, 49, 70; Patristics: n. 26 (Jerome) and n. 61 (Gregory the Great). There are two further citations of patristic authority, which are not explicitly attributed, in n. 52 (Augustine) and n. 71 (Leo the Great). A citation of Ivo’s Decretum serves to justify
Though Scripture is explicitly cited to strengthen Peter’s arguments urging the adopting of further austerity in eating (n. 11), silence (n. 19, 22) and clothing (n. 70), it is also a means to appeal to authority and avoid addressing underlying reasoning of changes. An excellent illustration of this usage occurs in statute 49 which demands that none of the brothers sleep without a light because:

the sons of light also always live in physical light since, according to the apostle (speaking about spiritual light), You are all sons of light and sons of God; we are not of the night, nor of the shadows. But even though, as I said, he speaks of that spiritual light, the Lord nonetheless said this very thing about the physical and spiritual light at the same time, All who do evil hate the light and do not come into the light in order that their works are not exposed; but he who undertakes truth comes into the light so that his works are revealed since they are done in God.  

While the presence of light could be justified as a measure to prevent ill deeds or dissuade demons (such as in the De miraculis), Peter instead offers a symbolic/spiritual justification for the practice. The validation consists largely of scriptural citation (1 Thess 5.5 and John 3.20-21) and the reasoning is purely symbolic. Authority demands, Peter offers, that the monk should even physically dwell in the world of light. We likely see here a typical Cluniac preference to avoid direct reference to the danger of sexual misconduct and thus the symbolic justification is highlighted all the more to avoid mention of the underlying cause.

---

36 Statuta, n. 49, p. 80; filii lucis semper in luce etiam corporali conversentur, quia, juxta Apostolum, de spirituali loquentem: Omnes filii lucis estis, et filii diei; non sumus noctis neque tenebrarum [1 Thess. V]. Quod licet, ut dixi, de illa spirituali luce dicat, hoc ipsum de corporali tamen simul et spirituali, ait Dominus: Omnis qui male agit, odit lucem, et non venit ad lucem, ut non arguantur opera ejus; qui autem facit veritatem, venit ad lucem, ut manifestentur opera eius, quia in Deo sunt facta [Joan. III].

Like Scripture, the Rule is also invoked as authoritative, predominately for the specific subjects of silence, fasting, manual labour and the time of probation.\(^{38}\) According to the letters 28, 111 and 161, these are some of the most controversial issues for Cluniac monks.\(^{39}\) This use of authoritative text differs from the references to texts in the De miraculis, where the examples of the Cluniac monks Gerard and Benedict served to authenticate the Rule. In the Statuta the evidence of the Rule determines (in part) what is proper practice. Statute 12 provides an excellent illustration of Peter’s use of the Rule as a textual authority. In this statute he demands that all monks abstain from eating meat. He justifies this change with the following causa:

The reason for this institute was the authority of the Rule, in which this very thing is commanded and it is prohibited lest healthy monks at full strength eat flesh. Moreover, [this is done] since there is not able to be found any rational reason for changing this chapter as were found with some other chapters of the Rule altered by the fathers.\(^{40}\)

The argument seems sound. No meat for the healthy since the Rule, an authoritative text, demands it. Peter thereby demonstrates that his reforms operate along the clear lines provided by the Rule. Peter also suggests that the customs he changed cannot have been counted as true customs since they so clearly contradicted the written observances of Benedictine monasticism.

However, Peter also hints that dispensation is possible, given a proper reason. We see from statute 12 that the Rule is not an unimpeachable source of authority for either Peter or Cluniac monasticism (in his presentation). Precepts of the Rule theoretically

---

\(^{38}\) These are the issues criticized by the Cistercians which Peter defended in letters 28 and 111. The concern with fasting and austerity in food is also highlighted in his letter 161 to all Cluniac abbots and priors; see chapter five.

\(^{39}\) Cf. chapters three to five.

\(^{40}\) Statuta, n. 12, p. 51; Causa instituti huius fuit ipsa Regulae auctoritas, in qua hoc idem praecipitur, et ne sanus et integris viribus monachus carnem comedat, prohibetur. Insuper etiam quia nulla rationabilis causa mutandi huius capituli inveniri poterat, sicut in quibusdam aliis eiusdem Regulae olim mutatis capitulis a patribus inventa est.
could be rejected should some “reasonable cause” exist (as Peter puts it) without endangering its larger authority.

Just as texts justify Peter’s changes, the lack of validating texts is cited as a factor in dispensing with old customs. When altering the readings for the first Sunday in Advent, for example, Peter comments on the lack of justification for the inappropriate verse, “it is unknown when or by whose institute”.\(^{41}\) The lack of proper origins provides a way to delegitimize custom, while the existence of valid texts allows proper practice to be constructed.

It is important to acknowledge, however, that Peter clearly did not consider that all old customs were sources of opprobrium. In statute 13, for example, he justifies a change in the regulations for fasting by distinguishing between proper and improper custom:

The reason for this institute was firstly the reverence and love of saints and secondly the unsuitable and unworthy dissonance of our custom from the use of other churches, since both the Roman Church and the entirety of other churches, save only ours, undertook the fasts of vigils in the aforementioned manner.\(^{42}\)

Custom itself is not wrong or problematic, since in this statute he cites a widespread custom against a limited custom.\(^{43}\) We can see such a similar rationale repeated in statute 10 on the use of lard, where universal Christian custom acts to delegitimize (and humiliate) the Cluniac monks’ former practice:

The reason for this institute was its not little unsuitability, since not only clerics, not only the laity, but also even the children and ill of the whole

\(^{41}\) Ibid., n. 9, p. 49; *ignotum ex quo tempore vel cuius instituto*.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., n. 32, p. 52 (my emphasis); *Causa instituti huius fuit, in primis quidem reverentia et amor sanctorum, secundo tamen loco incongrua nec honesta nostrae consuetudinis ab aliarum ecclesiarum usu dissonantia, quia et Romanae ecclesiae, et aliarum ecclesiariarum universitas, nostris tantum exceptis, ieunia vigiliarum modo suprascripto servabant*.

\(^{43}\) There are six explicit citations of broad ecclesiastical usages as a rationale: *Statuta*, n. 4, 5, 10, 13, 15, and 57.
Latin church abstain from all eating of meat, whether solid or ground or liquid, on account of a long ancient practice [done] out of reverence for the Lord’s Passion on that day; only the aforementioned monks either drown their vegetable with lard or receive various dishes roasted in it.  

Unlike letters 28 and 111 where Peter argued the Cluniac customs which were different but not in opposition to Cistercian observances, in this causa Peter demonstrates that his monks’ dissonance from a certain standard (which he presents as universal) is objectionable. He expects his Cluniac monks to be more austere and abstemious than normal Christians and uses this discrepancy in practice to chastise and humiliate them. By such a use, we are reminded again of how the past serves to provoke the Cluniac monks to change their ways.

**PETER’S MONASTIC PROGRAM**

In the prologue to the *Statuta* Peter evokes the written text as the means of ensuring his project’s longevity and considers it, as he does in his *Dispositio rei familiaris*, as a manner to strengthen its implementation. The *Statuta*, in one sense, is conceived by Peter as the medium for the preservation of information and as an authentic record to be accepted by present and future monks. Seventy-six statutes record the standards which Peter felt were justified to be altered in his time and provide a point of reference for future reformers about why he felt compelled to innovate and modify the Cluniac observances. In another sense, the *Statuta* ensures the lasting influence of Peter’s monastic program by promoting a new institutional way of thinking. Just as the *De miraculis* sought to instill the proper memories (or rather the forms of memory) for a

---

44 Ibid., n. 10, p. 49-50; *Causa instituti hujus fuit inconveniens non parvum, quod non solum clerici, non solum laici, sed et ipsi pueri et infirmi totius Latinæ Ecclesiae ab omni esu carnis, et solidae vel atritae et liquefactae pro more iam antiquo, ea die, ob reverentiam passionis dominicae, abstinebant, soli monachi jam dicti adipe et leguminæ sua infundeabant, et eo frixa diversa fercula assumebant.*

45 See below, on the *Dispositio rei familiaris* for a discussion of text as “strengthening”.
reconstruction of the monks’ moral dispositions, or as the letters sought to reorient their will and ratio, the Statuta seems also to outline a rational disposition needing to be internalized and adhered to—no matter where or in what monastery a monk was.

Peter’s text introduces (or was intended to introduce) to all the monks of the ecclesia cluniacensis an approach to custom (defined now as law) based in reason. I suspect that this was ultimately Peter’s ruse. Peter appeals to the combined authority of abbatial power and tradition, collegial consent, rational argumentation and the rule of law to encourage the positive reception of the Statuta. If a monk were to accept the Statuta out of respect for and obedience to the abbot of Cluny, to some extent he would come to admit the discourse of law based on the prestige of its author. If a monk were to accede to the changes out of a respect for their rational basis, in part this acceptance would effect a recognition of Peter’s abbatial authority, since he has proven himself worthy of their assent. The overlapping forms of authority were perhaps necessary to address and coalesce the diverse constituents of the ecclesia cluniacensis: some searching to imitate the new spiritual movements of the twelfth-century, others looking to continue in their customary practices with little interest in novelty.

\textit{Dispositio rei familiaris}

As a conclusion to this chapter, I wish to discuss Peter’s \textit{Dispositio rei familiaris} (ca 1147/48) which sheds additional light on Peter’s legislative impetus.\textsuperscript{46} This text or series of ordinances set up a new system for provisioning the monks and guests of the monastery of Cluny. Like the statuta A2, the \textit{Dispositio} records Peter’s abbatial command

\textsuperscript{46} Peter the Venerable, \textit{Dispositio rei familiaris}, in \textit{CLU}, n. 4132, vol. 5, pp. 475-82, hereafter abbreviated \textit{Dispositio}. Cf. Wollasch, \textit{Cluny. ‘Licht der Welt,’} pp. 234-46 who also notes that the \textit{Dispositio} is closely linked to Peter’s other legislative enterprises.
addressed to the monks directly under his oversight.\textsuperscript{47} The document decentralized agricultural production to a group of deaneries, such as Chaveyriat, Peronne and Lourdon, which along with the \textit{granatorius} of Cluny were responsible for feeding the monks (or their horses) for a certain amount of time. This document also set out various changes to the material affairs of Cluny and its estates: what officers were to distribute to others outside Cluny, what was the proper weight of bread loaves, who specifically provisioned the stables, and who was charged with the care of the brothers’ clothing. Taken as the “second phase of Peter the Venerable’s attempt to expand revenues and reorganize the production of the domain,” this document has often been seen as mere economic restructuring, and thus interesting only as something to gauge financial problems and productive capacity.\textsuperscript{48} The \textit{Dispositio rei familiaris} embodies, however, the same legislative rhetoric as the \textit{Statuta} and explicitly links its purpose with that of the latter text.\textsuperscript{49} In Peter’s words, “what previously I did only in the spiritual realm [i.e. the \textit{Statuta}], I do now for the domain which is at one time spiritual and corporeal”.\textsuperscript{50} The \textit{Dispositio rei familiaris}, then, provides a second instance of Peter’s codification of the Cluniac institutional reform and sheds light not only on the economic situation, but also on Peter’s mechanisms of reform.

Dating from 1147/48,\textsuperscript{51} the \textit{Dispositio rei familiaris} is prefaced with a preamble similar to, though perhaps more explicit than, the \textit{Statuta}. This preface recalls two

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{47} On statute A2, cf. chapter eight.  
\textsuperscript{49} The word \textit{ordinatio} is used six times, \textit{institutio} once, and \textit{constitutiones} twice to describe the document (or a previous version of it). \textit{Dispositio}, p. 475.  
\textsuperscript{50} The text notes in the preface that this work was written twenty-six years after Peter’s assumption of the abbacy at Cluny (ibid.).}
emphases underlying the Statuta: firstly, that the written text provides a special medium for preserving arrangements and secondly, that decisions must be taken on the basis of a rational choice, not tradition. To start with this second aspect, Peter constructs a simple but effective explanation for the reorganization of Cluniac provisioning based in necessity:

[W]hen I was raised twenty-six years ago to the responsibilities of the abbot, I found a Church vast, religious, illustrious, but very poor. The expenses were considerable, the revenues, compared to the expenses, were almost nothing. There were 300 and more brothers and the house could not feed a hundred from its own resources. There was always a throng of guests, an infinite number of poor. The harvest collected by the deaneries scarcely lasted four months, and other times, not even three; the wine often did not last more than a month, definitely not more than two. [...] Seeing such narrow straits and after taking council with the wise brothers who were then living, I instituted a provisioning among the deaneries as seemed reasonable to me and them and I made ordinances so that they provide a sufficient amount of bread, of beans and such for the community at Cluny [...].

Desperation necessitated change. Taking again a page from Ivo of Chartres, Peter presents necessity as a valid reason for dispensing with the former situation. If the situation did not change, Peter remarks, Cluny would not survive and is it not better to suffer change, he asks rhetorically, than the destruction of the monastery? Peter presents the modifications as if commonplace and the provisioning system as something fluid.

Peter utilizes language for previous systems which evoke less permanence: consuetudo

---

52 Ibid., p. 475; [...] quando ad hoc officium ante viginti sex annos assumptus sum, magnam quidem Ecclesiam, religiosam et famosam inventi, sed pauperrimam, magnarum expensarum, et comparatis redditibus cum expensis, nullorum pene redditum. Trecenti erant vel eo amplius fratres, nec centum de propriis sumptibus domus illa procurare valebat. Turba hospitum semper, pauperum numerus infinitus. Congregata de omnibus decanis annona vix quattuor mensibus, aliquando nec tribus, vinum undecunque collectum, nunquam duobus aliquando mensibus, nec uno sufficiebat [...]. Has angustias ego videns, habito cum sapientibus fratribus qui tunc vivebant consilio, prout mihi et ipsis rationabile visum est, mesatica per decanias constitui, et ut conventum Cluniacensem de pane, de fabis, et eorum sagine quidam ex decanis uno mense, quidam duobus mensibus, quidam tribus hebdomadibus, quidam quindecim, quidam octo diebus, hoc est, integro anno procurarent, ordinavi.

53 Prologue, n. 31 and 44, pp. 95-97 and 115-123.
and *privilegium*, for example, are not used, with *mos* taking their place. Peter also highlights repeatedly that the 1147/48 text was not the first ordinance that he had commanded of this sort. He argues that the proper system lies in a rational organization agreed to by abbot and monks, but ordered (*ordino*) by Peter alone.\(^{54}\) The *Dispositio* is presented, therefore, as responding to necessity and as providing a more useful arrangement of Cluny’s provisioning system.

Necessity explains why Peter reorganized the provisioning system, but not why the *Dispositio rei familiaris* or the restructuring it demanded was legitimate. The text therefore presents several further internal claims to authority. Peter places the validity of the written document in being a stable receptacle for truth. The first words of the *Dispositio* specify Peter’s claim:

> Since human memory is certainly slippery, and men continuously dying are not able to leave behind a truthful report of events for those coming later, the assistance of writing was invented by the first wise persons. For what is written is known not to receive change, and unless it is corrupted by accident or intention, it passes in one and the same way the truth of deeds done without modification to those coming after.\(^{55}\)

From the outset of this text Peter identifies a special relationship between his document and truth (i.e. a true record of deeds done). The written word is privileged over orality (it is less subject to corruption) and hints at the special status his text should receive among its readers or hearers. Peter does not directly equate his text (and thus its contents) with truth, though I suggest that a partial identification of the two is an effect of the rhetoric.

He continues:

---

\(^{54}\) Alain Guerreau’s study on the economics of deaneries cited in the *Dispositio* leads him to conclude that the reorganization demonstrate a “rational exploitation” of resources; cf. “Douze doyennes clunisiens au milieu du XII\(^{\text{e}}\) siècle,” *Annales de Bourgogne* 52 (1980), pp. 83-128.

\(^{55}\) *Dispositio*, p. 475; *Quoniam res valde labilis est humana memoria, nec morientes incessanter homines veracem semper posteris suis rerum gestarum famam relinquere possunt, scripturae subsidium a primis sapientibus adinventum est. Nam quod scribitur varietatem suscipere nescit, et nisi casu vel studio corrumpatur, uno eodemque modo veritatem rerum gestarum indifferenter succedentibus tradit.*
And in order that this ordinance would always be followed every year, I commanded it with the assent and desire of all the brothers in the chapter and I strengthened it by writing.\(^{56}\)

Permanent adherence to *Dispositio* is a function of its acceptance by the community of monks at Cluny, Peter shows, but also of his command and sexualization. By identifying his decree as written and by highlighting the virtue of text as stability, Peter argues that the *Dispositio* should be considered stable and fixed.

Since Peter later remarks that the *Dispositio* is in fact a modification of an earlier text he commanded, he allows that the authority of the text is contingent and impermanent —able to be modified by some future text. This ideology argues for an acceptance of the rule of law, in which only authoritative texts can modify those coming before. Changes not deriving from such an action must be seen as corruption. A justification for subsequent change must from some “reasonable cause” such as differing circumstances or well-founded arguments:

After some time it seemed both to me and to the brethren that certain parts of the former ordinance should be changed, and that certain deaneries which were furnishing provisions should be assigned to other services for the monastery, in accordance with what *reason* compels.\(^{57}\)

In the second ordinance, popular assent is again emphasized alongside Peter’s preeminence as a justification for change and reason defines the new order. Abbatial authority and collegial assent is reenacted and subjected to the demands of a rational system. The need to consult with the brothers allowed a new and better plan to be developed, and thus we see again a new plan being adopted:

\(^{56}\) Ibid., p. 475; *et ut semper annuatim haec constitutio servaretur, universorum fratribus assensu et voluntate in capitulo praecepi et scripto firmavi.*

\(^{57}\) Ibid., p. 476; *Procedente dehinc tempore, visum est tam mihi quam fratribus, ut quedam de pristina ordinatione mutarentur, et aliquo decanie que mesatica faciebant, ad alios monasterii usus, juxta quod ratio exigebat, deputarentur.*
This second plan likewise remained in effect for a long time. But since, as it is written, where there is much counsel there is much security, and however good any plan might be, when a better one appears, it must be changed without hesitation.\textsuperscript{58}

Reform is an ever-present feature of the economics of the monastery, Peter suggests. The good advice of his monks provoke new plans and always the system can be improved.

We see here Peter promoting a system of incremental progress improving upon the past in which the monastic community at large is instrumental in helping make decisions. The text, however, only uses the first person plural twice (mutauimus, censuimus) when discussing changes to the size of bread to be eaten, which had required the wider counsel and agreement of the brothers.

This involvement of the community buttresses the evocation of abbatial authority. Peter remains a central motivator behind the text. The \textit{ego frater Petrus humilis Cluniacensis abbas} declares Peter to be the legislator at the outset of the document.

Throughout the work as a whole Peter emphasizes his personal role by frequently employing the first person singular: \textit{ego} appears five times and verbs in the first person singular appear eighteen times. The first person is used during descriptive sections detailing the state in which Peter had found Cluny (\textit{inveni, nescio enim quo casu}), but are predominantly used to denote Peter’s direct legislative action (\textit{statui, constitui, decrevi, praecipio, facio}) in the preface and in describing the organization of responsibilities between officers of Cluny or the control of lands directly under the authority of the abbot of Cluny.\textsuperscript{59} Declarations of legislative action appear fifteen times in the passive voice

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., p. 477; \textit{Hec secunda ordinatio longo rursus tempore mansit. Sed quia, ut scriptum est, ubi plurima consilia, plurima salus, et quantumlibet bonum sit, quodlibet consilia, meliore tamen superveniente, absque dubitatione mutandum est.}

\textsuperscript{59} His grant of leftovers to the almoner (ibid. p. 478), which recalls \textit{Statuta}, n. 33, p. 67-68, and his rationalization of providing provisions for the stables (\textit{Dispositio}, p. 480) seem to address jurisdictional
(mirroring the predominant usage in the Statuta): institutum est (4), constitutum est (3), statutum est (2), decretum est (3). Impersonal verbs thus tally with those in the first person plural.

Between the Statuta and this legislative work are important similarities, but also fundamental differences. The Dispositio rei familiaris resembles the Statuta very closely in form. It constructs reform along rational lines, but does not attempt to provide an explanation for each change. The changes are shown as implemented both by the abbot as well as assented to by the community. It contains a preface justifying its status, simultaneously arguing for its acceptance as authoritative while establishing the discourses by which this very authority should be defined. Two fundamental differences from the Statuta can be identified: this text addresses only material/administrative conditions and it directs itself only to the monks of Cluny itself. The first difference meant that the core nature of Cluny (i.e. its spiritual practices) was neither questioned nor changed in reworking the running of estates and the sources of its provisioning. Monks were merely asked to involve themselves in the proper administration of the monastery and to ensure that it worked smoothly. Such changes did not target the identity of the monks, or the essential experience of the monks. The second difference, perhaps more significant, results from Peter’s targeting of Cluny and its deaneries, not all the houses of

issues which, as he says, gave rise to quarrelling between the monks. In these two cases the officials are directly beneath his control at Cluny. The first case is interesting, since it reads, “I alone grant to the almoner” which implies that the decision-making power his alone and that that none should question his authority. The third use of a verb in the first person singular to denote legislative action comes in limiting the provisioning of wine from Cluniac lands alone (ibid.), which again pertains directly to the lands under the direct control of the abbot of Cluny.

60 There are three exceptions: the prior of Cluny is justified in holding responsibility for the monks’ clothing since he is already de facto in charge (ibid., p. 481-82) and Peter transfers the responsibility for provisioning the stables to a single person in order to avoid quarrels and shortages that had arisen. (ibid., p. 480) The third exception is the limitation of the number of offerings for dead brethren to fifty. Peter offers two quotations from Horace to justify this restriction from simple necessity (ibid., 479). It would be impossible, he says, to support a thousand dead, while only three/four hundred monks live at Cluny.
the *ecclesia Cluniacensis*. Thus, the relations of obedience and submission were clear and unambiguous. The *Dispositio rei familiaris*, however, does emphasize—along with the *Statuta*—a systematizing impulse which underlies Peter’s general re-envisaging of all aspects of Cluniac life.
And the statutes promulgated by the Cluniacs did not deviate from Benedictine discipline, but in this matter they utterly attained perfection such that they observed the Rule the most strictly of all.¹

In the preface to his 1759 reprint of the Statuta in the Codex Regularum, Lucas Holste claims that the Cluniac statutes were dispositive and prescriptive texts promoting proper Benedictine regular observance. This assertion did not refer to Peter the Venerable’s Statuta, but to the “communication of the Cluniac statutes” to William of Hirsau, or in other words, Ulrich’s customary.² In Holste’s conception, Peter’s statutes only offered a limited amendment of Ulrich’s already authoritative codification of Cluniac practice which was in turn largely based in the legal prescriptions already decreed by Odo of Cluny. According to this model, monastic observance of custom was concomitant with adherence to normative law codes. Holste’s conflation of custom and statute, and his acceptance of the shared authoritative status of the Rule, the customaries and the Statuta, however, conflict with how historians now understand Cluniac legislation. Significant differences have been demonstrated to exist between these successive text forms, which has necessitated a redefinition of this eighteenth-century model. By tracing these differences and thereby outlining the antecedent traditions of Peter’s Statuta, this chapter seeks to demonstrate its simultaneous grounding in Cluniac tradition and twelfth-century

¹ Lucas Holste (Holstensius) Codex Regularum monasticarum et canonicearum, (Augsburg, 1759) in part reproduced in PL, 189, col. 1025; Neque statuta a Cluniacensibus edita a Benedictina disciplina deviabant, sed in hoc omnino collimabant, ut sacra illa Regula ab omnibus arctissime observaretur.
² Ibid.; horum statutorum communicationem.
innovation. By the time of Peter’s codification of the Statuta, two major pre-existing authoritative traditions are evidenced at Cluny: an extensive body of custom and a limited set of dispositive legal texts. The second tradition is something to which Peter explicitly links himself, as we see in this chapter, in order to modulate and overturn features of the first.

THE RULE AND CUSTOMARY RULE AT CLUNY

The oft cited definition of Cluniacs as *monachi iuxta regulam beati Benedicti uiuientes* in the act of foundation (909/10) provides important evidence for the especial position given to the Rule at Cluny from its very outset.\(^3\) As Barbara Rosenwein demonstrated more than twenty-five years ago, a sense of legalism grounded in the Rule of Saint Benedict lay at the heart of the early Cluny.\(^4\) The privileging of the Rule’s authority did not prevent innovation—as is evident from the acceptance of an expanded Carolingian liturgy or of distinctly Cluniac practices—but it did encourage a spirit of uniformity.\(^5\) As Cluny’s reputation grew and its spiritual position became recognized as preeminent within Christendom, other monastic houses began to imitate its customs or request their reform by Cluniac monks so that they too could share in its prestige and spiritual power.\(^6\) The initial spread of Cluniac customs largely took this form, though

---

\(^3\) Les plus anciens documents originaux de l’abbaye de Cluny, vol. 1, n. 4, p. 34. Such is the conclusion, for example, of Sébastien Barret, “Regula Benedicti, consuetudines, statuta: le corpus clunisien.” Isabelle Cochetin recent work on Odo’s *Vita Geraldii* and John of Salerno’s *Vita Odonis* concludes that the ideas of Odo of Cluny, more so than Berno or William, underlie this charter, cf. “Quête de liberté et réécriture des origines: Odon et les portraits corrigés de Baume, Géraud et Guillaume,” in *Guerriers et moines. Conversion et sainteté aristocratiques dans l’occident Médiéval*, Collection d’études médiévales de Nice, 4, (Nice, 2002), pp. 183-215, here pp. 213-14.


\(^5\) Ibid., p. 313.

\(^6\) The best introduction to the early history of Cluny continues to be the works of Barbara Rosenwein: *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century*, (Philadelphia, 1982) and id., *To be the Neighbor of St. Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny’s Property: 909-1049*, (Ithaca, 1989).
reforming abbots inspired by the example of Cluny also forced Cluniac observances to be unwillingly accepted on independent monastic houses content with their own traditions. John of Salerno (as evidenced by his Vita Odonis) perhaps even more than Odo himself, urged a unity of practice and warned against deviation from standard observance.  

Despite such evidence, it seems that in this early period it was not the Rule, but customary observance which provided a foundation for monastic practice. For tenth- and eleventh-century monks, there was not necessarily a contradiction between “living according to the Rule” and following alternate customs, since the Rule was interpreted as a spiritual guide open to completion. Communal norms and living use—not juridical texts—legitimated the forms of monastic observance. Similarly, eleventh-century reform implementation, as recent work by Isabelle Cochelin suggests, was achieved not by spreading normative documents (as Holste seems to argue), but by transmitting discipline through voice and practice. From the requests for Cluniac monks in Peter’s letter collection, we see that Cluniac monks continued to undertake (or at least be asked to perform) similar practices of restoratio well into the twelfth-century.

Over the course of the eleventh century, however, lived observances came to be increasingly written down as customaries and Cluny, in particular, manifests this trend. Cluniac monasticism is one of the richest sources for existing customaries and its monks

---

11 This theme is addressed in Cochelin, “Besides the Book,” pp. 21-24 and id., “Étude sur les hiérarchies monastiques,” pp. 7-8 and the discussion of embodied practices of reform in her reevaluation of Cluniac customaries, “La singularité de l’œuvre de Bernard,” in From the Dead of Night to End of Day, eds. Isabelle Cochelin and Susan Boynton, Disciplina Monastica, vol. 1. (Turnhout, forthcoming), which she kindly allowed me to consult before its publication.
12 Cf. chapter five.
left behind four lengthy customaries\(^{13}\): the *Consuetudines antiquiores*\(^{14}\), the *Liber Tramitis*\(^{15}\) and the customaries of Ulrich\(^{16}\) and Bernard.\(^{17}\) The reasons behind this textualization and its implications have engendered considerable discussion among historians.\(^{18}\) Stock and Constable agree on the significance of the customaries: in an oral culture, the writing of texts likely signals the existence of ideological conflict and the debate of different factions.\(^{19}\) Constable’s initial assessment of the customaries viewed them as settling contested observance through the codification of practice.\(^{20}\) He sees customaries building upon the *Rule* as “laws to a modern constitution”.\(^{21}\) The work of

---


\(^{17}\) Edited as *Ordo Cluniacensis* by Marquard Herrgott in *Vetus Disciplina Monastica* (Paris: Osmont, 1726); reproduced under the direction of Pius Englebert. (Sieburg, 1999), pp. 133-364, hereafter *Bern*. A diplomatic edition of a single manuscript (Paris, BNF, Latin 13875) accompanied by a bilingual English/French translation is under preparation by Isabelle Coehlin and Susan Boyton. Critical editions of Bernard’s and Ulrich’s customaries are in preparation for the *CCM* under the guidance of Laurentius Schlecker and Isabelle Coehlin.


Isabelle Cochelin, however, suggests a more nuanced nature of the customaries at Cluny. In a forthcoming article, Cochelin questions the specific juridical nature of the customaries—especially that of Bernard—which reaffirms that lived experience continued to determine legitimate Cluniac observance until the twelfth century. This conclusion finds a parallel in the work of Gert Melville who posits that the monks’ repetitive enactions of norms were the legitimizing forces underlying the customaries, not a dispositive nature intrinsic to the texts. Cochelin also notes that of the Cluniac customaries, only Bernard’s customary was intended for circulation within Cluny (among the novices as a pedagogical text). Cochelin concludes that this customary likely remained a reference text, not a normative codification. By the late eleventh century (unlike the writings of customaries prior to this period), the Cluniac urge to write down customs, she concludes, was born of a process of institutionalization (such as a need to account for the increasingly complex tasks of monastic officers), was aided by the development of a literate mentality among Cluniac monks, and was due to social and spiritual developments within Christendom, leading in the increased proportion of adult novices (in relation to oblates). Bernard’s customary, in Cochelin’s understanding, was not the product or evidence of a juridical revolution. This reinterpretation has important repercussions for the study of Peter the Venerable’s Statuta.

The traditional understanding of monastic governance constructs a progressive development beginning with an authoritative Rule, which is completed by accretions.

---

22 Cochelin, “La singularité de l’oeuvre de Bernard”; Sébastien Barret (“Regula Benedicti, Consuetudines, Statuta: le corpus clunisien”) presents the work of Isabelle Cochelin as embodying a paradigm shift in the historiography of the customaries.

compiled in customaries and institutionalized through statutes. Since this assessment constructs the codification of custom as a precursor to the elaboration of statutes, the nature of statutes themselves is questioned. If statutes do not, as has been traditionally assumed, complete the pre-existing body of customary law, then they must be the first attempts at the implementation of a prescriptive legislative model based in dispositive texts. Do we see significant differences, therefore, in the legitimizing discourses of these two text forms? Is there disjuncture? Comparing the textual strategies underlying Bernard and Peter’s text suggest the lack of a direct legislative antecedent in Bernard’s customary.

Of the so-called “Cluniac” customaries, only Bernard’s seems to be both written at Cluny and intended for internal use. It is thus differentiated from others and identified as the customary most likely to have been known by Peter or referenced in subsequent legislation. This text is also the last customary to be written at Cluny in around 1080. It is important first to remember that the Cluniac customaries date from the beginning to the end of the eleventh century during the abbacies of Odilo and Hugh and thus chronologically predate Peter’s Statuta by up to a century and by no less than fifty years. The temporal distance between the texts is thus substantial.

The relationship of Peter’s Statuta to Bernard’s customary is something about which it is difficult to have certainty. In his edition of the Statuta Constable has provided a detailed citation of the correspondences in material between Peter’s work and the

---

24 Cygler, “Règles, coutumiers et statuts,” p. 48 well summarizes this evolutionary interpretation.
26 Cochin, “La singularité de l’oeuvre de Bernard.”
27 The dating of this text continues to be debated, especially as the preparation of a new edition of Bernard’s customary is suggesting new conclusions about its history and nature. In the meantime, cf. Cochin, “La singularité de l’oeuvre de Bernard” and Burkhardt Tutsch, Studien zur Rezeptionsgeschichte der Consuetudines Ulrichs von Cluny, Vita regularis, 6, (Münster, 1998), p. 31.
customaries of Ulrich and Bernard. These correspondences demonstrate that the Statuta and Bernard drew on a similar knowledge base and the customaries are often useful in explaining things that are taken for granted in the Statuta. There is not to my knowledge, however, any direct textual links between them nor any explicit reference to a written customary within Peter’s writings.28

Additional evidence for the non-juridical nature of Bernard’s customary comes from the thirteenth-century Liber de Viris, sive Scriptoribus illustratibus attributed to Henry of Ghent:

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.29

Bernard’s customary clearly achieved some degree of distinction not as a legislative text, but as an inspirational text for Benedictines. This description highlights the customary as worthwhile for all Benedictines and not, as others will later argue, as a normative or legislative text for Cluny alone.

Bernard’s customary opens with a dedicatory epistle written to the abbot Hugh of Semur, which immediately marks the text as distinct from the Statuta. Bernard’s

---


29 The text is printed in the collection Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica, in qua continentur [...] Henricus Gandavensis, Johannes Alberto Fabricio, ed., (Hamburg, 1718): no. II, p. 118. Bernardus Monachus Cluniacensis scriptis, ad venerabilem Patrem Dominum Hugoem Abbatem Cluniacensem, Consuetudines Cluniacensis Monasterii; opus satis utile Monachis nigrorum ordinis studiosis. Alongside this entry, the eighteenth-century editor has added, Cluniacensem Bibliothecam consule. The attribution of this text to Henry of Ghent is likely invalid. This work no longer appears among his authentic works (cf. Betsy B. Price, “Henry of Ghent,” Medieval Philosophers, ed. by Jeremiah Hackett et al., vol. 115 of the Dictionary of Literary Biography [Detroit, 1992], pp. 236-240.). I have been unable to discover any reattribution of this text. The general focus on monastic personages (Bernard of Cluny and Peter the Venerable, for instance are the second and third entries) suggests a monastic origin. 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.
authorship of the customary does not bring with it any weight. Instead, Bernard must appeal to the authority of his abbot Hugh to legitimize his enterprise. But even this enterprise is suspect since likely Bernard only received Hugh’s approval after his text was completed. Instead, as Isabelle Cochelin demonstrates, Bernard found his inspiration in the knowledge of the seniores or maiores (i.e. the monks higher in status and more mature in observance).  

The reason for his redaction of the Cluniac consuetudines (Bern), Bernard of Cluny asserts in his dedicatory epistle, was the conflicts arising about proper practice when senior monks and their knowledge of traditional observances passed away. The loss of the community memory, Bernard worried, led novices to question the validity of customs and necessitated that he provide a “truthful” codification of Cluniac observances. He assures the reader that he is to be believed since he gathered the customs from trustworthy testimony. The main thrust of the prologue appears to be proving that his text reproduces accurately what was the lived experience of the monks and was the oral and charistmatic teaching of the abbot Hugh of Semur, both of which ultimately provide legitimacy to his customary. With the help of God, Bernard affirms, he has created a text against which observances should be measured and should provide a reference for future generations:

I beg that our brothers, moreover, do not scorn to take the drink of truth from a wooden vessel, nor contemn, if it should happen that they grow thirsty, the cold and clear water on account of the lead pipe through which

---

30 According to Tutsch (Studien zur Rezeptionsgeschichte der Consuetudines Ulrichs von Cluny, p. 31), Bernard wrote at the command of abbot Hugh, But Cochelin has convincingly demonstrated the a posteriori role played by him (see note below).
it flows, in order that they might know on which judgments they ought to be grounded to not retreat from the path of holy customs.  

His rhetoric may be poor, he suggests, but the substance is not. His redaction of the customs nourishes the brothers and offers the source of sacred knowledge to them. He humbly (or ineffectually? or sadly?) concedes that the brothers may only sometimes wish to know the truth which he offers. There is no insistence that his text (or his representation of the customs) is expected to be taken as absolute; nor does it demand adherence to the letter. As Cochelin notes, _sciendum est_ is the most common formula introducing information (85 times). This frequency puts into perspective Constable’s comment, “Bernard used ‘constitute’ four times, ‘sanction’ three times, and ‘decree’, ‘order’, ‘establish’, ‘change’, ‘indulge’ and ‘proceed from’ once each” by which he insists on the legislative aspect of Bernard’s customary. The text therefore seems to be more concerned with informing than commanding.

While Bernard’s account defines itself as recording custom to prevent the loss of community memory, part of Bernard’s account is also to account for why and how practices change. He seems to expect what he lays out so painstakingly in his text will be altered in the future. At several points throughout the customary he admits the dispensing power of reason and in one chapter he notes, “the aforesaid custom of burial may be changed, if required by some reasonable cause in accordance with time and place.” In another, he remarks that a practice should be maintained unless necessity demands change, or further, “unless perchance the need should be so great that it would be an

---

32 Ibid., preface, p. 135; _Obsecro autem fratres nostros ne dedignetur ex ligneo uase potum uteritatis sumere, neque propter plumbeam fistulam per quam fluit aquam frigidam claramque despicient si eos sitire contingit ut sciant quibus sentencias inniti debeant ut a sanctarum consuetudinem tramite non recedant._

33 Cochelin, “La singularité de l’œuvre de Bernard.”


35 _Bern_, I, n. 24, p. 196; _immutabitur predicta consuetudo sepulturae, prout temporis aut rei necessitas dictauerit._
impiety not to break the custom." In both these cases, however, the changes referred to are hypothetical, which cautions us to not envision this principle of change as an underlying feature of his customary or of eleventh-century Cluniac conceptions of custom. Nonetheless, Bernard invokes the dispensing power of reason and necessity, which correspond well with the theoretical arguments developed by Peter the Venerable. The major distinction between their works appears not to be in the forms of justification for reform, but in the power held by the text. The explanations for change seem to be shared by Peter and Bernard, but Peter's text is intended to be dispositive, (i.e. it supplants traditions of custom or law that came before). Bernard's customary is not laid out as a series of rules to be followed but rather an overall summary of the practices, observances and responsibilities within Cluniac monasticism. It is more encyclopedic than legislative, as the following excerpt suffices to demonstrate:

The granatorius is he who receives the yearly produce. The prior makes known to him at harvest time the whole produce collected, how many measures come from this or that obedientiary [...] He has under his care the grains, the wheat and all the vegetables of the monastery.37

This description differs greatly from Peter's focused and delimited statutes. It outlines the responsibilities, but rarely adopts a commendatory style, consistently retaining a descriptive tone.

If Bernard's customary truly was a reference text meant for novices, this difference alone demonstrates its textual force to be fundamentally different from the Statuta. Peter intended all the monks of the ecclesia cluniacensis to read and to abide by

---

37 Bern, I, n. 7, p. 150; Granatorius est qui annonam recipit, haec quando messis est, tota annona collecta prior innotescit quot modii de illa et de illa obedientia sunt .... Ipse habeat in custodia sua frumentum, siliginem, totumque legumen monasteri.
his text, not merely the novices. If Bernard’s customaries, then, does not offer a
legislative precursor to the Statuta, what was its influence on Peter? As Constable notes
and has been remarked upon in the previous chapter, Peter is ambiguous about the
propriety of custom. Custom may simply be a practice, as Peter puts it, which has
“already changed into a custom in such a way that many people think it is a custom”.
Instead of adherence to custom, Peter relied on other textual precedents of
institutionalization—charters and abbatial statutes—to win the freedom to transform
Cluniac monasticism.

LITERATE LEGISLATION: CHARTERS AND ABBATIAL STATUTES

The lived experience of monastic practice embodied in the Cluniac customaries
coeexisted alongside other textual forms grounding the institutional construction of
monasticism at Cluny. More so than with the customaries, Peter’s Statuta follows upon a
developed Cluniac tradition of legitimizing practical decisions through written acts. Early
charters and abbatial statutes provided clear precedents for the Statuta in a way that the
customaries did not. We can note, for example, a distinct appreciation for the role of text
in the acts and charters of Cluny. These texts served to memorialize agreements made
between the monastery and some outsider (e.g. lay people, clergy, monastic houses),
much like Peter the Venerable’s Statuta outlined the specific conditions for the
observance of Cluniac monasticism—a sort of agreement between himself, the monastery
of Cluny and the houses of the ecclesia cluniacensis.

38 Statuta, n. 72, p. 102; Hoc iam sic in consuetudine versum fuerat, ut multi consuetudinem esse putarent.
As Sébastien Barret outlines, the early records of Cluny display a concern with their authentication and validation through textual and ritual strategies. In this early period, the writing of such texts (e.g. grants of donation) were inscribed into oral memory and partly given legitimacy through a performance of ritual actions uniting the donors and recipients. The text, in this case, served to memorialize the conditions already agreed to and to offered a means of ensuring a certain duration of knowledge. The texts, notably in the *captatio benevolentiae*, often reproduced the strategies of validation which underlay the context of its enaction. Barret suggests that the documents implied an autonomy and authority in the textual representation of the agreement through such prologues, even though they were largely formulaic. Appeals to Roman law and scripture (denoting the juridical supremacy of written law) colluded with other forms of authority (such as the influence of the author, the directing values of the agreement) to ensure the act’s acceptance and continuance. The repeated use of imagined forms of authority (such as appeals to written law) alongside markers of real power (e.g. the ritual context) over time reconstructed the appeals to law from a semblance of justification to its instantiation. This discursive shift would play a very significant role in ensuring the reception of ideals of law during the twelfth-century.

The need to balance forms of authentication in the early Cluniac charters finds a parallel in Peter’s text, though the performative structures of justification are less prominent in the *Statuta*. Perhaps taking his cue from these earlier texts, Peter grounds his statutes in multiple sources of authentication. The *Statuta* differs somewhat from the

---

40 We can safely interpret Peter’s remark in the *Statuta*’s prologue that he had secured the collegial consent of the Cluniac monks as a reference to a previous personal/charismatic promulgation of the statutes. However, his prologue does not make reference, for example, to the nature of oaths sworn or punishments awaiting oath-breakers, as so often occurs in the early charters.
specific forms of validation located within these charters, however, since it cites precedent, collegial consent, and the status of written legislation. The *Statuta* was enacted along juridical lines in which consent was sought from the monks, but its power did not derive from its symbolic enactment between abbot and community. Rather in Peter’s depiction, his ability as legislator derived *ex officio*, based on the precedents of his successors and their implementation of reform.

The question of what exactly was the status of early abbatial statutes has received some debate. Abbatial statutes, Constable argues, depended on the constitutional position of the abbot of Cluny which was such that his statutes would be enforced at Cluny and in all Cluniac houses by his will.\(^{41}\) Constable himself notes the problem of such an assessment, stating the need for further research into the “constitutional position” of the abbot of Cluny in relation to his monks.\(^{42}\) The use of the term, “constitutional position” seems problematic in this context. To define the Cluniac abbot’s relations with his monks as such assumes the existence of a Cluniac system regulated by law.\(^{43}\) More recent conceptions of the Cluniac customaries, as we discussed above, suggest the problem of this assumption. As we have seen from Peter’s other works, moreover, he does not seem willing (or able) to express an abbatial authority demanding obedience.\(^{44}\) Peter elicits and persuades submission to his will in those contexts, but does not command it. Did his predecessors act any differently?

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 159.
\(^{43}\) Constable (ibid.) bases this conclusion on a conception of legislation at Cluny in which custom functions as a written law code, not, as is increasingly being concluded, a descriptive or inspirational enterprise. Cf. above in this chapter on this question.
\(^{44}\) Cf. chapters, five and seven.
There is limited evidence for changes in custom being instituted through statutes promulgated by Cluniac abbots during the abbcacies from Odo to Pontius, which demonstrate some stark differences from Peter's Statuta. While only a few statutes remain for any abbot before Peter the Venerable, their contents and form underline both his novelty and his adherence to tradition. The surviving statutes, however, may be only a sliver of original acts made by the abbots.\textsuperscript{45} No statutes of Odo remain extant, for example, though Ulrich's customary mentions one instituting a feast for St. Martin and an entry in the 1543 General Chapter records the loss of a book of his statutes (along with other precious manuscripts) to looters.\textsuperscript{46} Drawing on the Liber Tramitis as well as Bernard and Ulrich's customaries, Constable notes that the customaries explicitly cite measures attributed to the abbots numerous times (Odo once, Maiolis twice, Odilo seven times, and Hugh nine times)\textsuperscript{47} though the extant statutes are fewer (Odilo [2]\textsuperscript{48}, Hugh [3]\textsuperscript{49}, and Pontius [2]\textsuperscript{50}). Though Constable projects a picture of the abbots before Peter as ruling by decree, the evidence (fragmentary as it may be) suggests the rarity of this action (roughly only a single statute instituted every ten years). In contrast, the Statuta suggests that Peter's enacted more than two statutes for every year of his abbacy. We can likely conclude on this basis alone Peter was far more willing or able to make use of abbatial statutes than any of his predecessors.

A connection between Peter's statutes and those of previous abbots of Cluny is made evident by Pontius' statutes which institutes new regulations for genuflecting and

\textsuperscript{46} SCG, vol. VI, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{47} Constable, "Monastic Legislation," p. 156.
\textsuperscript{48} Odilo, Statutum sancti Odilonis abbatis de defunctis, in LT, n. 139, pp. 199-200 and SCG, I, n. 1, pp. 15-16.
\textsuperscript{50} Pontius, Statutum Pontii abbatis de defunctis, SCG, 1, n. 3, pp. 18-19 and Statuta, A1, pp. 105-6.
which is a direct precursor to Peter's statute 4. The latter merely restates Pontius' precept with minor modifications, and thereby demonstrates that Peter was consciously working within an established tradition of abbatial decision-making. The repetition of Pontius' statute illustrates as well the limited diffusion or acceptance of the initial decree, which necessitated its reiteration by Peter. This statute perhaps also suggests that Peter possessed the power in his time to institute what Pontius was unable to decree in his,

Like Peter's statutes, earlier decrees do not contain a clear sense of unquestioned abbatial authority. Rather appeals to personal power coexist with a grounding in divine law and collegial assent. Odilo's statute concerning the commemoration of the dead is interesting in this regard, since both Hugh and Pontius refer to this decree as a precedent justifying their own statutes. We see from Odilo's text, however, that not even he was capable of instituting his will without additional structures of validation:

It is decreed by the blessed father lord Odilo, one with the consent and request of all the Cluniac brothers that, just as the feast of All Saints been undertaken on the kalends of November in the Church of God which has been built up far and wide throughout the orb of the world, thusly the Commemoration of all the faithful departed is done by us in the festive manner for whomever were [and will have been] from the beginning of the world until the end. Let the dean and the cellarer make an almsgiving of bread and wine to all the arriving paupers on the aforementioned day after chapter, just as is the manner done on the day of the Last Supper. And let the almoner receive entirely whatever remains from the refection of the brothers at lunch on that day, except the bread and wine which he receives after dinner. Also on that day after the evening gathering, the bells should be rung and the office for the dead begins. At the morning mass, the office should be done in the manner of a feast [and] all the bells are sounded. The tactus is sung by two brothers. All brothers should make offerings privately and celebrate mass publicly for the repose of all faithful souls and twelve paupers are fed.

And so that this decree retains eternal force, we wish and we seek and we command that it be followed both in this place and in all places belonging to this place. And if anyone takes up the example from this, our

---

51 Compare Statuta n. A1, pp. 105-6 (Pontius) with ibid., n. 4, pp. 43-45 (Peter). Cf. especially the note to statute n. 4, pp. 44-45.
faithful project, let him become a partner of all good pledges. Therefore, we command and order that the memorial of All Christians is undertaken once a year; we lead the worthy to a perfect state with the result that we adjoin something onto the divine prayers more than the accustomed manner, for the souls of our brothers serving God under the norms of the nourishing Benedict in the monasteries fighting for God. Also we institute that a commemoration of our beloved emperor Henry be done alongside them, as we deservedly should on account of many gifts given by him. [...] And since divine grace supports this, as we mentioned above the commemoration of them is done for all future time, as much in this place as in all places looking to here. The authority of divine law admonishes us that in the house of the Lord (which is the Church of the Faithful) all of the devout must strive to offer something for the men gathered by God to Him so that he is not justly punished by God for hiding the talent like the lazy servant, but so that he is rewarded with divine mercy for faithfully multiplying the profit like the good servant.  

I have quoted this statute at length to demonstrate two points about the earlier statutes.

First, we see that Odilo lays out with great detail the obligations for the feast. The statute outlines out a large number of conditions and concludes with a reference to scripture (Matt. 25.14-30; Mark 13.34; Luke 19.11-27) indicating to the monks the proper attitude  

---

52 Charvin edits this statute on the basis of a single late thirteenth/ early fourteenth-century manuscript, (BNF, n.a.l. 3012). This statute (ca 1030/31) is a modification of Odilo’s original commemoratio (ca 998). SCG, I, 15; Decretum est a beatissimo patre domino Odilone, una cum consensu et rogatu omnium fratrum Cluniacensium, ut sic ut in ecclesiis Dei, quae per orbem terrarum longe lateque constructe sunt, in die kalendarum novembrium agitur festititas Omnium Sanctorum, it agatur apud nos festivo more Commemoratio omnium fidellium defunctorum, qui ab initio mundi fuerunt usque in finem, tali modo. Ipso die supradicto post capitulum, faciant eleemosynam decanum et cellarius de pne et vino omnibus supervenientibus pauperibus, sicut nos est agi in Cena Domini. Et quicquid ipso die ex refectione fratum remanserit ad prandium, ex integro recipiat eleemosinarius, nisi tantum panem et vinum, quae post cenan recipiat. Ipso etiam die post vespertinalem synaxim, pensusent omnia signa, et agatur officium pro defunctis. Ad missam vero matutinalem, festivo more agitur officium, omnia signa pulsantur. Tractus a duobus fratibus cantetur. Cuncti fraters offerant privativim; et publice missas celebrent pro requie omnium animarum fidellium, et duodecin paupers reficiantur. et ut hoc decretum perpetuum vigore obineat, volumes et petimus et precipimus tam in loco hoc, quam in cunctis ad istum locum perinentibus, servetur. Et si altus aliquis ex ista nostra fidei inventione sumperit exemplum, particeps omnium bonorum officiatur votorum. Ergo qualsiter omnium memoria christicolarum semel in anno agatur monuimus et precepimus, dignum profection ducimus, ut pro nostrorum fratum animabus, sub almi Benedicti norma in cenobitis Deo militantibus, in divinis aliquis obsequius plus more solito adaugeamus. Neconon ut memoria chari nostri imperatoris Henrici cum eiusdem precipe agatur, constituius, ut merito debeamus, multis ab ipso ditatis opibus. [...] et ita divina favente gratia, ut premisimus, eorum agatur memoria per omnia futura tempora, tam in hoc loco quam in omnibus ad hunc respiencitibus. Auctoritas divine legis nos admonet, ut in domo Domini, quod est ecclesia fidelium, unusquisque devotorum pro viribus a Domino sibi collatis, aliquld offerre student, ne scilicet ut piger servus, pro talenti absconsione, jure a Domino damnetur, sed potius cum bono servo pro lucro fideliter multiplicato, digna mercede remuneretur.
for receiving the practices. Odilo’s statute on the commemoration of the dead lengthily enumerates the new practice and all facets are specified for his audience. If we contrast this with Peter’s statute instituting the feast of the Transfiguration (statute 5), we see that Peter seems to allow more freedom to the monks. The statute is far less lengthy than Odilo’s and specifies only an analogous celebration as a model:

It is instituted that in every monastery and church which belongs to Cluny the Transfiguration of the Lord should be celebrated according to the manner of the Purification of St. Mary, with the day’s proper readings, responsories and offices, though the procession is excepted.¹⁵³

Peter’s brevity may derive from a general familiarity of his monks with the feast, but also shows that he does not demand precise rituals in his statute. The feast must be adopted, but how exactly it is implemented remains outside the text, still allowed to exist within the realm of custom. Since Odilo’s text, like Peter’s, was intended to circulate beyond the monastery of Cluny itself and make its way into all monasteries respicientes to Cluny, perhaps Odilo’s lengthiness and thoroughness is necessary to introduce a uniform custom. Odilo grounds the statute as Cluniac (done by him cum consensu et rogatu omnium fratrum Cluniacensium), but he is not adverse to others also adopting this feast. Anyone who implements it, he suggests, will share in the profit of a prayer confraternity with Cluny, which indicates that he is consciously addressing non-Cluniac monasteries. Like the Liber tramitis, Odilo seems to provide a detailed description of customs for the use and inspiration of other monasteries.

How Odilo encourages the acceptance of his statute is a second question important for our discussion. The second half of Odilo’s statute is devoted to

¹⁵³ Statuta, n. 5, p. 45; Statutum est, ut per omnia monasteria vel ecclesias, quae ad Cluniacum pertinent, Transfiguratio Domini eo more quo Purificatio sanctae Mariae, excepta processione, cum lectionibus, responsorii, et officiis ad diem pertinentibus celebretur.
emphasizing the legitimacy of the decree. Unlike Peter who could rely on abbatial precedent, Odilo’s statute grounds itself in collegial permission and divine sanctification. As the text presents the situation, the decree was formally proclaimed by Odilo, but the community at Cluny had asked for and consented to the change Odilo disseminated. The corporate body of Cluniac brothers, not Odilo himself, is presented as the locus of validation. Furthermore, a transcendental force inspires the establishment of the feast day. “Divine grace” and “the authority of divine law” urges the changes, not any person. These seems very different from Peter’s Statuta which grounded itself so deeply in human ratio. Like Peter’s use of textual authority, Odilo’s decree highlights Saint Benedict to show that the statute fits with his norma (i.e. patterns, standards).

Interestingly, Benedict is not seen as a text or a codified of rules to follow, only as something to be interpreted and accommodated. A concluding invocation of divine support for Odilo’s decree is found in the citation of Scripture by which the monks are exhorted to be like the productive servant. To refuse the decree is comparable to acting as the lazy servant. We see a hint here, perhaps, of the affective and narrative strategies that Peter uses within his letter and the De miraculis. Odilo’s statute in general bears some similarities to Peter’s Statuta but lacks a voice of the abbot-as-legislator.

Hugh’s statute instituting liturgical modifications opens similarly to Odilo’s, “The authority of divine law admonishes us […] therefore the venerable Hugh, the abbot of this sacred monastery of Cluny decreed with the communal counsel of the brothers” and later adds, “it is decreed by that father with the consent of the brothers”. For Odilo and Hugh, the same ideas of justification are present: popular consent and divine law validate

---

54 Hugh of Semur, Miscellanea, n. 6, pp. 166-67; Auctoritas diuine legis nos admonet […] [quocirca uenerabilis Hugo, huius sancti Cluniacensis coenobii Abba […] decreuit cum communi fratrum consilio […]]; Decretum est ab eodem patre cum consensu fratrum [...].
decisions to modify current practice. Unlike Peter’s statutes, however, there is not a clear
distinction between the will of the abbot and the will of the community. In both Hugh and
Odilo’s example, the abbot “decrees” alongside his monks, suggesting a lack of
differentiation. On account of this it seems questionable whether these decisions can be
attributed to the abbots who do not, like Peter, make clear their agency. Moreover, since
the texts cited above “decree” (decreuit, decretum est), but do not “institute”, we must
ask ourselves whether the enactions done under Odilo and Hugh should truly be called
statutes.

We can note subtle changes in the statutes of Pontius. He explicitly intended his
statutes to be received beyond the monastery of Cluny itself as an authoritative decree
and the chapter is presented in a more passive capacity not having an active role in
making decisions. Such is indicated in his statute on the commemoration of the dead:

In the name of the holy and indivisible Trinity, let all present and future
brothers and sons of the holy monastery of Cluny know that in the first
year of my abbacy I, brother Pontius, a sinner and unworthy to be called
abbot, decreed with communal counsel and I confirmed with this
document [paginam] in the Cluniac chapter in the presence of all that a
universal memorial be celebrated upon the vigil of All Saints for all the
dead brothers and the sisters of our congregation since the foundation of
this place. [I did this] considering how the blessed Odilo instituted the
general memorial of the deal of All Faithful upon the message of the Holy
Spirit and how our pious ancestor the Lord Abbot Hugh celebrated the
anniversary of the brothers in his time for many years.55

55 Pontius, Statutum Pontii abbatis de defunctis, SCG, I, n. 3, p. 18; In nomine sancte et individue Trinitatis.
Noverint omnes fraters et filii sancti Cluniacensis cenobii presentes et futuri quia ego frater Pontius
peccator, abbas idigne vocatus, perpendens qualiter beatus Odilo, sancto dicantame Spiritu, omnium
fidelium defunctorum generalem statuerit memoriam, qualiterque pious antecessor noster dominus Hugo
abbas, fratrum suo tempore defunctorum per aliquot annos celebraverit anniversarium, primo anno nostre
ordinationis, communi decrevi consilio et in capitulo Cluniacensis coram omnibus, per presentem
paginam, confirmavi ut cunctorum fratrum atque sororum congregationis nostre ab ipsis fundatione
defunctorum, deinceps in vigilia Sanctorum Omnium universalis memoria sollemniter recolatur.
The correspondences between this statute and Peter’s are striking. The opening formula of Peter’s statute A2 closely parallels Pontius’. The decree is intended to be permanent and the legislative action is undertaken by the abbot. Pontius’ humility recalls Peter’s letter 52 in which he declares himself beneath his monks in order to ask them to begin special prayers for his mother. This correspondence suggests a certain spirit of negotiation in the act. We see clearly from the act that Pontius cannot command his will. In the statute he initially employs the first person singular (decrevi, confirmavi), which subsequently changes to the plural (praecepimus, adjunximus, statuimus) to reinforce an image of communal assent to the changes subsequently detailed. With Pontius (like Peter) we see a dual appeal to common consent and abbatial precedent. It is interesting how Pontius constructs the filiation of the decree as based in Odilo’s precedent. By their different accretions to the liturgy, Hugh and Pontius each reinforce the solemnity of this feast and of their predecessors capacity to implement further offices like it.

An interesting novelty in Pontius’ text is the reference to the statute as a pagina. The reference contains a hint of Peter’s subsequent and explicit evocation of the value of written text. The pagina, i.e. the written word, becomes Pontius’ means to ensure, confirm and stabilize the practice, though only after the practice has already been accepted by collegial assent. The similarities between the discourse of Pontius’ and Peter’s statutes, as well as the repetition of at least one of Pontius’ statutes, make interesting hints about Peter’s predecessor in light of the portrait of Pontius constructed in the De miraculis.

---

56 Statute A2 opens, Noverint presentes et superventuri quod… (Statuta, A2, p. 106).
57 LPV, ep. 52, 1, pp. 152-53; cf. chapter five.
58 The portrait of Pontius is likely a later addition to the De miraculis; cf. chapter seven and appendix C.
It is not insignificant, I believe, that these early statutes repeatedly deal with similar topics, such as the addition of specific liturgical services. Of the three statutes noted above, one each of Odilo, Hugh and Pontius deal with commemoration of the dead. One of Hugh’s statutes, moreover, which established a liturgical celebration in honour of Alphonso VI of Léon-Castille, was consciously modeled on a decree of abbot Odilo calling for the commemoration of the emperor Henry II. Hugh’s statute, like Odilo’s before him, provided the means to complete an exchange between the monks and aristocratic benefactors. These two statutes seem very similar to the charters enshrining gifts to Cluny made in the tenth and eleventh centuries. We can see this especially in the last of Hugh’s texts identified as a statute, which is a grant of confraternity to Lambert, the abbot of Saint-Bertin (1090-1125). What distinguished this text in order to be identified by its editor as a statute is not clear from the text. Such a lack of difference has lead me to conclude that calling these acts of the Peter’s predecessors as “statutes” ignores the specific status intended by Peter for his decrees.

Only Pontius’ modification of the times of genuflection (A1) truly addresses novel territory. This change, according to the statute, is done “out of reverence for the ancient and most sacred Nicene council” and to ensure that Cluny not deviate from a near universal observance of the Church. Couched solely in terms of a return to traditional and proven custom, Pontius slightly modifies some liturgical stage directions. Again we see Pontius providing an antecedent for Peter, not only in the specific material of the statute but also in its appeal to law.

59 Hugh of Semur, Statuta sancti Hugonis abbatis Cluniacensis pro Alphonso rege Hispaniarum, in Miscellanea, n. 1, pp. 159-60.
60 LT, 139, pp. 199-200.
61 Pontius, in Statuta, n. A1, p. 104; pro reverentia antiqui et sanctissimi Niceni concilii, nec non et pro communi usu tocius pene aeclesia dei [...].
CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we have traced the relationship between Peter the Venerable’s *Statuta* and possible legislative antecedents. This examination has elucidated many similarities but emphasized the lack of direct models for Peter’s codification. In comparison to his antecedents generally, Peter’s text evidences a grounding in both novel and traditional modes of justification. The abbatial statutes provide the most obvious precursors as they are textualized decrees and demonstrate shared features of justification such as collegial consent, abbatial precedent or authoritative texts. One major justification lacks, namely the explicit appeals to logic and reason. In addition, his statutes were so much vaster in number and dealing with a much wider range of material than those of Odilo, Hugh and Pontius. Peter establishes his work as an authoritative text, and, by arguing for the his statutes to be based in law, not charismatic leadership, Peter seeks to construct reforms that would have a life beyond his abbacy. The appeal to law inherent to Peter’s text shifts his reforms out of the region of practiced observances into the realm of abstract principles. Customs are no longer justified by the duration of their practice or the acceptance among the community but by their adherence to spiritual ideology which is rationalized and systematized. Peter’s *Statuta* is fundamental in reforming Cluniac monasticism, therefore, since it offers an argument for the adoption of a legislative mentality in the monastery. The *Statuta* implicitly argues that the present concerns of the monastic community are to be considered more than the weight of tradition or the examples of earlier monks and abbots. Personal relevance, not the standards of tradition, were the measure for practice. By establishing his own exemplarity as a legislator, Peter asserts his authority and simultaneously provides the means for its
very effacement, Given Peter's justificatory discourses, it should perhaps not be surprising that the next statutes promulgated at Cluny evidence a systematized and ordered Cluny. By 1200 Cluny had made a shift from the *ecclesia cluniacensis* to the *ordo cluniacensis*, in which a formal institutionalized structure had been adopted and a counsel of monks –the *definitores*– were charged with adjudging the norms to be followed. I turn now to this document in the guise of a conclusion to show that the free-doctor of law had managed to prepare for the way of the slave-doctor.
CONCLUSION

[D]esiring to provide for the salvation of those committed to us for the honour of God and wanting to preserve ourselves from danger, lest perchance we, the posted watchmen, have not maintained our vineyard, we strive to reform—in such a way that we do not harm feeble souls as much as possible, if we impose new or difficult things on the mediocre—those things which were sanctioned long ago by the fathers, but in part were deformed by a lack of attention. In order to do this, we are urged by the examples of our holiest father, the most high pontiff Innocent III who, following the wisdom and grace given to and implanted in him from heaven, labours with provident concern to restore in temporal and spiritual matters the partly fallen state of the monasteries directly pertaining to him. Therefore [...] we constitute, or rather we propose the constitutions to be maintained which pertain to his name and his glory.¹

This text is taken from the preface to the statutes promulgated at Cluny on the 29th October, 1200 under the abbot Hugh V. Differences with Peter’s text are manifest.² The abbatial role has been muted and the pope, not the abbot, provides the exemplary model of the legislator.³ Unlike Peter the Venerable who underlined his own role, his abbacy and his ideas, Hugh V is not named within the prologue. Instead a series of first person plural verbs exhort the Cluniac abbots, priors, monks and conversi to follow the example

¹“Domini Hugonis V, abbatis Cluniacensis xvii, super institutionibus que sequuntur prefatio,” in SCG, vol. I, p. 41. The statutes of Hugh V (1200) are found on pp. 40-52 and a second groups of statutes from his abbacy (1205/6) are reproduced on pp. 53-60; [...] nos cupientes ad honorem Dei nobis commissorum providere saluti, et nobis cavere a periculo, ne forte positi custodes, vineam nostram non custodierimus, ea que a patribus dudum sancta sunt, sed in parte per incuriam deformata, sicut possibile est, intendimus reformare, ne si nova vel gravius proferremus in medium, infirmos animos lederemus. Ad quod efficiendum, sanctissimi patris nostri Innocentii tertii, summi pontificis, provocamur exemplis; qui juxta datam sibi cellitum sapientiam et gratiam inspiratam, statum monasteriorum ad se, nullo medio, pertinentium, circa spiritualia et temporalia partim dilapsum curat provida sollicitudine restaurare. [...] Igitur [...] ipsum, que ad ipsius nomen et gloriam pertinent tenenda constituius, imo constituta proponimus [...].


provided by pope Innocent III and the fathers of the Church.\textsuperscript{4} Does this silence about abbatial authority, then, signal a loss of power by the abbot of Cluny? Denise Riche and Sébastien Barret argue that it does not, noting the imperative tone underlying both the prologue and the statutes generally, as well as the lack of concomitant forms of validation.\textsuperscript{5} Gert Melville agrees, seeing Hugh V’s statutes as embodying the new model of the abbot as presiding but circumscribed by law.\textsuperscript{6} As Eva-Maria Pinkl demonstrates, Hugh V’s statutes demonstrate the acceptance of the rule of law among Cluniac monks. This prologue, she concludes, evidences the movement towards a system of monastic organization in which, the rigor of the law, not the vigor of charity began to command adherence.\textsuperscript{7} In her estimation, law not charismatic figures governed Cluniac monastic life in the late-twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

This prologue, therefore, provides a useful endpoint to an inquiry into Peter the Venerable’s reform writings. By Hugh V’s statutes, Cluny had become an “order”, with structured legislative mechanisms (the general chapter, the definitores), a system of visitations and defined roles for priors.\textsuperscript{8} The second set of statutes promulgated during the abbacy of Hugh V (1205/6) outlined the proper position of the abbot of Cluny.\textsuperscript{9} In these later statutes, the abbot was defined as a representative of the monks bound by law but

\textsuperscript{4} Domini Hugonis V, abbatis Cluniacensis […] prefatio,” in SCG, vol. 1, p. 41; The salutation reads, \textit{Venerabilibus et charissimis nostris abbatibus, prioribus, monachis et conversis ad Cluniacum pertinentibus, frater Hugo, humilis Cluniacensis Abbas, salutem, gratiam et bendictionem.} Not cited in note 1 above is the appeal to John the Baptist and the sons of the prophets as legislative antecedents. No mention is made of Cluniac precedents.


\textsuperscript{6} Melville, “Cluny après Cluny”, p. 118.


\textsuperscript{8} Gert Melville, “Cluny après Cluny,” pp. 97 and 109-100; cf. also Florent Cygler’s survey, “Le chapitre général de Cluny (XIIe-XIve siècle),” pp. 213-235 and id., \textit{Das Generalkapital in hohen Mittelalter}.

without charismatic power, or, as Gert Melville calls him, a “constitutional monarch”\textsuperscript{10}. The rule of law in turn influenced other forms of organization, such as administrative structures, which had once been based in personal and affective relations.

As the course of the thirteenth century progressed, abbatial itinerancies and exhortations decreased in importance as provincial visitors and their mechanisms of oversight administered the abbeys and priories of the Cluniac Order.\textsuperscript{11} Work on this period of Cluniac history has demonstrated the expansion of written communication in administration,\textsuperscript{12} though Peter the Venerable’s abbatial successors do not indicate his concern with authoring authority outside of written law.\textsuperscript{13} Peter represents, therefore, an anomaly in the history of Cluniac abbots. It seems that as authority was more defined along constitutional lines, there was less impetus for abbots to negotiate with the monks about their power and the obedience they could command.

Textual negotiations of power, however, are considered by Peter to be an important means of enacting his influence. In his letters, he utilized affective and logical argumentation, appealing to spiritual charisma and his superior knowledge as foundations of authority. The \textit{De miraculis} demonstrates Peter’s use of the narrative form (grounded again in affective and logical reasoning) to urge his audience to identify with and internalize the portrait of Cluniac monasticism he constructed. The \textit{Statuta} sought to tie

\textsuperscript{10} Gert Melville, “Cluny après Cluny,” p. 118.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., pp. 118-19.
\textsuperscript{12} The study of Cluniac administrative and juridical writings (and their impact on reform) for the period after Peter the Venerable has benefited from considerable German scholarship. For the major studies, cf. Jörg Oberste, \textit{Ut domorum status certior habeatur...} Cluniazensischer Reformalltag und administratives Schriftgut im 13. und frühen 14. Jahrhundert,” \textit{Archiv für Kulturgeschichte} 76 (1994), pp. 51-76; Gert Melville, “Zur Funktion der Schriftlichkeit im institutionellen Gefüge mittelalterlichen Ordens,” pp. 391-417; Sébastien Barret \textit{Regula Benedicti, consuetudines, statuta: le corpus cluniens.”}
\textsuperscript{13} Cf. Riche, \textit{L’ordre de Cluny}, pp. 211-12. She notes that the abbots coming after Peter the Venerable are identified as learned and lettered, but her evidence for this conclusion is an eighteenth-century Cluniac memoir. With the exception of letters exchanged by abbot Hugh III with Peter of Celle, there is no evidence for the authorial activity of Cluniac abbots in the hundred years after Peter the Venerable.
together the theorizing of the letters with the model of monasticism of the *De miraculis*,
by subsuming them under the discourse of law. It is this last text that evidences Peter's
lasting impact.

Peter the Venerable sought to take advantage of the potential offered by the
written word and through his attempts we can perceive the coexistence of multiple forms
of power. He channeled features of oral and literature cultures as a means to develop his
authority at a time when experimentation was allowed. Ultimately, we can see his success
in promoting literate practices and mentalities by the subjection of his monks to a rule of
law, with little arena for charismatic displays of spirituality that had characterized Cluny
up to and including the abbacy of Peter the Venerable.
APPENDIX A: PETER THE VENERABLE’S CORRESPONDENTS

Ademar II, abbot of Figeac: 147
Alberic, cardinal of Ostia: 84
Albero II, bishop of Liège: 89
Anonymous, (heretic), 37
Anonymous, (bishop of Bethlehem), 31
Anonymous, (king of Jerusalem), 82
Anonymous, (patriarch of Jerusalem), 83
Amadeus III, count of Savoy, 68
Arnulf, (to Peter of Poitiers), 125
Aymard, archbishop of Narbonne, 105
Bartholomew, doctor, 158a, (to PV†), 158b
Bernard of Clairvaux, 28, 29, 65, 73, 111, 145, 149, 150, 164, 175, 181, 192; (to PV), 74, 110, 148, 152, 163, 177
Carthusians: 24, 48, 132, 170, 186; (to PV), 25, 169, 187
Celestine, 112
Citeaux, abbots and priors of, 35, 36
Cluny, 52, 133, 161
Dulcianus of Montpellier, 19
Eugenius III, pope, 119, 122, 141, 142, 156, 157, 158, 171, 173, 174, 188, 189, 190, 191; (to Hugh, archbishop of Vienna), 154
Eustache, knight and brother of PV, 160
Everard of Barre, Master of the Templars, 172
Galcher, cellarer of Clairvaux, 184
Geoffrey, abbot of Les Roches, 136
Geoffrey, archbishop of Bordeaux, 106
Geoffrey, bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne(?), 79 (to PV), 78.
Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres: 137
Gilbert, recluse, 20
Gilbert, noble youth, (to Peter of Poitiers), 127
Gilo, the schismatic cardinal of Tusculum, 40, 66

Gregory, monk, 94
Guarinus, bishop of Amiens, 108
Haimericus, papal chancellor, 3, 34,
Hato, bishop of Troyes, 5-7, 18, 22, 69, 70, 81, 86, 95, 121; (to PV), 71, 85, 96
Heloise, abbess of the Paraclete, 115, 168; (to PV), 167
Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester,
49, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 88, 107
Henry of France, bishop of Beauvais,
146
Hugh, archbishop of Vienna, (from Eugenius, 154), (to PV), 155
Hugh Catula, knight, 51
Innocent II, pope, 1, 11, 17, 21, 23, 27, 32, 33, 39, 46 63, 64, 72, 92, 97-99, 101, 103, 104; (to PV), 62
John IX, patriarch of Constantinople, 76.
John Comnenus, Byzantine emperor, 75
Laon, clerics at, 100
Louis VII, king of France, 130
Lucius, pope, 113, 116, 118; (to PV), 114
Marcigny, convent at, 185
Matthew of Albano, 2, 47
Milo I, bishop of Thérouanne: 102
Mont Thabor, community at, 80
Nicholas, bishop’s chaplain: 87
Nicholas, Bernard’s secretary, 151, 176, 180, 182, 193; (to PV), 153, 179
Odo, abbot of Beauvais: 13*
Odo, abbot of Saint-Martin-des-Champs, 135
Peter, abbot of St. Augustine at Limoges, 138
Peter, archbishop of Lyon, 38, 54
Peter of Poitiers, Peter’s secretary, 26, 58, 124, 129; (to PV), preface, 123, 128

† Peter the Venerable
Peter the Venerable, 25, 41, 62, 71, 74, 78, 85, 96, 110, 114, 148, 152, 153, 155, 158b, 163, 165, 167, 169, 177, 179, 187 (22)

Peter the Venerable’s brothers, 53
Philip, Prior of Clairvaux: 183
Pontius, abbot of Vézelay and brother of PV, 16, 91
Rainard, Cistercian abbot, 120
Robert, former chancellor of the King of England, 77
Robert the Scholastic, (to Peter of Poitiers), 126
Roger, King of Sicily: 90, 131, 162
St. Andrew of Northampton, community at, 45
St. Martial at Limoges, community at, 159

Sigard, King of Norway, 44
Stephen, cleric of Lyon, 50
Stephen, priest, 8
Stephen de Castello, 140
Stephen of Charolais, formerly archbishop of Vienna: 139
Suger, abbot of Saint-Denis: 109, 166; (to PV), 165
Theobald, abbot of St. Columba: 144*
Theobald, prior of Saint-Martin-des-Champs, later bishop of Paris, 134.
Theodard, prior of La Charité, 14, 30, 42, 43; (to PV), 41
William, bishop of Embrun, 12
William II, bishop of Orange, 67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Chapter (long)</th>
<th>Book Chapter (short)</th>
<th>Miracle Type</th>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Links</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Subject(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prol.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(SEGUE CHAPTER)</td>
<td></td>
<td>utility of miracles, purpose of writing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 1</td>
<td>I, 1</td>
<td>Host, made flesh</td>
<td>fear, contrition, surprise</td>
<td>Defending efficacy of Host (sacrament)</td>
<td>Auvergne</td>
<td>Aimeric, Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>peasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 2</td>
<td>I, 2</td>
<td>Host, disappearing</td>
<td>fear, contrition, tears, joy</td>
<td>Defence of Host and the necessity of pure celebrants</td>
<td>Teutonic lands</td>
<td>Aimeric, Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand</td>
<td>priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 3</td>
<td>I, 3</td>
<td>Host, cannot swallow</td>
<td>contrition</td>
<td>Sacraments (Host) ensures truth, defends confession</td>
<td>Charlieu</td>
<td>2 or 3 monks &amp; Prior of Charlieu</td>
<td>pious, youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 4+</td>
<td>I, 4</td>
<td>Vision, of white figure (sacramental symbol)</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>Sacraments (confession) ensures salvation</td>
<td>Monastery of St-Jean d'Angély, Saintonge</td>
<td>Pierre, monk</td>
<td>Gilbert, priest, converted to monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 5+</td>
<td>I, 5</td>
<td>Host, cannot swallow</td>
<td>compunction, contrition, humility</td>
<td>Host ensures true confession</td>
<td>Monastery of Tours-sur-Marne (Cluniac)</td>
<td>Abbot Raoul</td>
<td>monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 6</td>
<td>I, 6</td>
<td>Demon, interiorized and exorcized by true confession</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>True confession necessary for salvation</td>
<td>Sauxillanges</td>
<td>PV himself</td>
<td>monk, ex-knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 7</td>
<td>I, 7</td>
<td>Demon, exorcized by holy water</td>
<td>fear, joy</td>
<td>Demons, angels are real, and sacraments have</td>
<td>Sauxillanges</td>
<td>Etienne &amp; Olivier</td>
<td>monk, ad sucurrendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 8</td>
<td>I, 8-12</td>
<td>Vitae</td>
<td>love, desire</td>
<td>Efficacy of acts</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>PV himself</td>
<td>Gerard, oblate monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 8 (2)</td>
<td>Vision, of angel, Mary, Christ</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>Efficacy of acts</td>
<td>Priory of Beaumont, Chalon-sur-Saône</td>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td>Gerard, monk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 8 (3)</td>
<td>10 Ordeal judgement</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Efficacy of Acts (divine intervention)</td>
<td>St. Savour @ Nevers</td>
<td>Gerard (not explicit)</td>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 8 (4)</td>
<td>11 Vision, God</td>
<td>fear, love</td>
<td>Efficacy of Acts</td>
<td>Aujoux</td>
<td>Gerard and others</td>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 8 (5)</td>
<td>Vision, of demon, of baby Jesus</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Conclusion (life, acts = truth of God)</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>anon. Brother, Gerard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cluny, spiritual citadel (SEGUE CHAPTER)</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>Cluny = Good, Spiritual Fame, celestial troops</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>PV himself</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 10</td>
<td>II, 1</td>
<td>Vision, of deceased abbot</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Defence of intercessory prayer</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>monks @ Cluny, related to PV</td>
<td>Bernard Savinelle, monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 11+ [β omits II, 61-65]</td>
<td>II, 2</td>
<td>Vision, of deceased monk</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Defence of intercessory prayer</td>
<td>near Uxelles</td>
<td>same as above</td>
<td>Prévôt of a Cluniac dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Devil, enemy of Cluny (SEGUE CHAPTER)</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Devil especially hates Cluny, the celestial citadel</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Line(s)</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Explicit Source</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Demon, attempts to deceive monk into leaving cloister</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Devil seeks to tempt monks to leave Cluny because it is too strict.</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>John, monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vision, of gossiping demons</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Demons serve God's purpose: surveillance of monks</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>monk (woodworker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vision, of Mary, Christ, devil</td>
<td>love,</td>
<td>Christ and Mary among monks, devil hindered by acts of monks</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>monk @ Cluny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Demons, in church</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Visions of demon at night, demons living at Cluny at night</td>
<td>Cluny (not explicit)</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Alger, monk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Demons, as bear</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>Proper conversion, wanting to devour Cluny</td>
<td>Cluny (not explicit)</td>
<td>PV himself, Armand</td>
<td>Armand, novice, ex-knight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 19+ [β omits II. 1-10]</td>
<td>II, 10</td>
<td>Vision, of angel</td>
<td>joy vs. fear</td>
<td>Vision of Heaven at Death</td>
<td>Cluny (not explicit)</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Eppo, monk received by Hugh (teutonic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision of Heaven at Death: practices, intent lead there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Truth of visions (proof of divine intervention)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marcigny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benedict, monk at Cluny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfred, &quot;man of good manners&quot; with Turq. to PV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 25+</td>
<td>II, 8</td>
<td>Vision, of lions bringing death, of torments of hell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision of Hell at Death. veracity of visions through fear; if reject prayer will go to hell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[β lacks II. 129-50]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lusignan (Poitiers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 26</td>
<td>II, 5</td>
<td>Vision, of deceased prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 27</td>
<td>Vision of deceased knight</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>defence of intercessory prayers, good acts of the church</td>
<td>Mâcon</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Gerard, monk and ex-lord of castle Beaujeu (Mâcon), appears to his son Humbert, then to Milo, a knight of Anse, then Humbert again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 28</td>
<td>Vision, of deceased knight</td>
<td>lack of fear</td>
<td>defence of intercessory prayers (esp. aimed at aristocracy. Kings and Cluny)</td>
<td>monastary of Najera, Spain</td>
<td>related by brothers of Najera to PV</td>
<td>Peter Englebert, monk converted in old age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prol.</td>
<td>(SEGUE CHAPTER)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>utility, memory, writing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 1</td>
<td>Demons, punish evildoers</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>God punishes oppressors of churches</td>
<td>Mâcon</td>
<td>known by all people, proved true by a second similar event</td>
<td>laity (two counts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 2</td>
<td>Host, feeds trapped miner(souls)</td>
<td>love, (man, woman)</td>
<td>defence of intercessory prayer</td>
<td>La Ferrière, Grenoble</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>laity, trapped miner and wife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 3</td>
<td>Prologue to Matt. vitae (SEGUE CHAPTER)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Segue: importance of meritorious acts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(the following was related to me by good men, or viewed by me)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 4</td>
<td>Vitae, birth and youth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vitae (youth)</td>
<td>Laon</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 5</td>
<td>Vitae, education</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>vitae (apprenticeship)</td>
<td>Rheims</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, conversion to monasticism</td>
<td>fear vs. love, tears</td>
<td>vitae (monastic conversion)</td>
<td>Rheims</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, entrance to SMdC</td>
<td>fear vs. love</td>
<td>vitae (conversion to SMdC)</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, being Prior</td>
<td>contrition, tears (207)</td>
<td>vitae (spiritual exercises)</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, conduct towards subordinates</td>
<td>vitae (prior)</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Peter witnesses this</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, conduct with others</td>
<td>love, charity</td>
<td>vitae (love for others)</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, restoring discipline</td>
<td>love,</td>
<td>vitae (called to Cluny)</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, schism fomented by Pons, election of Hugh II, Peter,</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>vitae (peter vs Pons)</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Pons, Pope and Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, schism ended</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vitae (peter vs Pons)</td>
<td>Cluny/ Rome</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Pons, Peter and Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, chosen as bishop of Albano</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vitae (leaves Cluny but does not abandon monastic habits)</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, as prior would not borrow money from Jews</td>
<td>love through hatred</td>
<td>vitae (hates Jews)</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew (anterior to the previous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, defence of Innocent II in papal schism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>vitae</td>
<td>Pisa/ Cluny</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew, Innocent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, his glorious end</td>
<td>love</td>
<td>vitae</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vision, of deceased Matthew</td>
<td>joy, surprise</td>
<td>vision of Matthew entering</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Prior of St. Zenon, Pisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 19</td>
<td>Vision, of deceased prior seeking Matthew</td>
<td>heaven (proof of sanctity)</td>
<td>vision of Matthew being brought to Heaven (proof of sanctity)</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>monk of St. Michel, Pisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 20</td>
<td>Demons, exorcized by Matthew</td>
<td>no fear</td>
<td>vitae (his death); proof of sanctity in exorcizing of demons</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew (anterior to two above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 21</td>
<td>Vision, of white figure, of afterlife</td>
<td>happiness, love</td>
<td>vision = proof of sanctity; sanctity of Cluny be association</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 22</td>
<td>Vitae, death of Matthew</td>
<td></td>
<td>vitae (death);</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 23</td>
<td>Vitae, burial of Matthew</td>
<td></td>
<td>vitae (burial);</td>
<td>Pisa</td>
<td>PV himself</td>
<td>Matthew and cluniac monks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 24</td>
<td>Death, of monk</td>
<td>fear</td>
<td>[recalls II, 3 about order] death; vision and experience of Hell (bad monk)</td>
<td>Lihons-en-Santerre (subjected to Cluny)</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>anon. Monk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 25</td>
<td>Vision of deceased prior</td>
<td>love, fear</td>
<td>vision of dead monk; providing justification of Cluniac order</td>
<td>Santa Maria Nouvella, Rome</td>
<td>PV himself</td>
<td>Peter sees William prior, abbot of Moissac, oblate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vision, of deceased knight</td>
<td>veracity of visions; defence of intercessory prayer</td>
<td>Cluny</td>
<td>Enguizo to PV</td>
<td>Enguizo, monk, ex-knight sees ex-comrade Pierre dela Roche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Exempla, La Chartreuse</td>
<td>example of holy man (like Matthew)</td>
<td>La Chartreuse</td>
<td>PV himself</td>
<td>Cathusian monks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, anon. Monk</td>
<td>love, fear</td>
<td>La Chartreuse</td>
<td>PV himself</td>
<td>anon. Monk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vitae, continued; vision of deceased pupil</td>
<td>love, fear</td>
<td>La Chartreuse</td>
<td>none explicit</td>
<td>anon. Monk, peasant and son educated by monk in religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Candles, perpetually lit each year</td>
<td>love, charity</td>
<td>Santa Maria Majore, Rome</td>
<td>everybody knows</td>
<td>Church of Santa Maria Majore (in Rome)-altar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Vision, of deceased prior</td>
<td>fear, no fear</td>
<td>Charlieu</td>
<td>from the infant monk himself to PV</td>
<td>&quot;infant monk&quot; sees prior Achard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ressucitation of dead child</td>
<td>love, surprise, faith</td>
<td>Souvigny</td>
<td>mother of children to PV</td>
<td>child, St. Majolus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Demons, appear to ensure proper confession</td>
<td>fear, responsibility</td>
<td>Reuil, a Cluniac monastery dependent of LaCharité</td>
<td>PV himself</td>
<td>Bernard, prior (exemplar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: ABBATIAL AUTHORITY IN THE ADDITIONS TO THE *DE MIRACULIS*

Chapters twelve and thirteen in the second book of the *De miraculis* ostensibly contain Peter the Venerable’s description of the Pontian schism. As Dider Méhu has suggested however, these chapters are almost certainly later additions not written by Peter, but the product of late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century Cluniac historiography. ¹ This insertion explains why in one chapter (*DM*, II, 11) Peter asserts that he wishes to pass over certain problems at Cluny and in the next the *De miraculis* launches into a criticism of Pontius. These two chapters, which have attracted considerable attention of modern historians due to the information given about the circumstances of Peter’s election and Pontius’ deposition, remain valuable to explain later conceptions of the relationship between abbot and community. The author legitimizes Peter the Venerable’s abbacy (*DM*, II, 12-13) by discrediting Pontius. He uses this negative portrait of Pontius’

---

abbacy to provide a justification for Peter's reform efforts vaguely defined in chapter eleven.² Though the author denies that he writes for the purpose of "criticizing my predecessors", this is clearly the result of the depiction.³ The stated intent (to demonstrate how Matthew helped solve the Pontian schism) seems difficult to accept when Matthew does not even appear within chapter twelve.

Pontius, the text asserts, was at first a very good abbot. Only newly arrived and recently professed at Cluny before his election by his brothers, Pontius is portrayed as chosen (despite his youth) on account of the community's "hope" in his good character.⁴ His unfamiliarity with Cluny, the text implies later, was to cause problems when he would not listen to his brothers. After a short time, "due to the levity and the great fickleness of his soul," Pontius was accused by "almost all the brothers" that he was leading the monastery to ruin since he did not take the counsel of suitable monks.⁵ The author identifies this time as a period of decline at Cluny, not, as Odericus Vitalis asserts, the beginnings of dissent.⁶ Almost all the monks under Pontius’ rule, the text remarks, began to murmur about the decline in observances to such an extent that the scandal reached those outside the monastery, including the laity, distant monasteries and even the pontiff. Despite resisting his recalcitrant monks for a dozen years, as soon as Pontius

---

² On the demonization of Pontius, cf. below. We can see perhaps in the pejorative depiction of Pontius the success of a rhetoric of fear, such as in DM I, 14, (pp. 48-49 [124]) where Peter discusses the utility of evil within God's providential order. Pontius can be seen as an evil bringing about a good, i.e. the rejuvenation of Cluniac monasticism under Peter. This connection seems to be implied at the end of the chapter when the text explicitly relates attacks on Cluny as the work of Satan.

³ DM, II, 12, II. 4-5, p. 117 (217-18); Quod ne priores carpere videar, quantum ad presentem matheriam pertinet, succincte describo.

⁴ DM, II, 12, II. 12, p. 117 (218); Hic valde iuuenis, a fratribus Cluniacensibus spe bone indolis eius inductis, in abbatem electus.

⁵ DM, II, 12, II. 18-19, p. 117 (218); multa mobilitate et levitate animi nullis honorum consiliis adquiescendo, ut dicebant res monasterii pessumdaret, nunc inter se pauci, nunc plurimi tandem pene uniueri, murmurabant.

⁶ Odericus Vitalis, for example, comments that Pontius was deposed by his monks while on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land (Hist. Eccl. XII, 30, vol. VI, pp. 312-14).
realized that the scandal had become public, he resigned and went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Whether or not this account is a convenient fiction, the story itself reveals much about what was considered the proper relationship of abbot and community at Cluny after Peter. Pontius is seen to govern badly because he did not take into account the wisdom of the “good” brothers and acted too imperiously, too willfully and too independently for the monastic community.\textsuperscript{7} This last issue – Pontius’ lack of attention to the community and its counsels – is emphasized by its contrast with the account of Hugh II’s and his own abbacies.

The consent of the Cluniac monks is emphasized in the three different abbatial elections described in chapter twelve, a difference from the norm of nominating successors under the previous abbots.\textsuperscript{8} As noted above, Pontius received the free and full consent of his brothers. His successor, Hugh II, was accepted as a “man of complete religion and of religious thinking” and was elected by the brothers as abbot by a common accord (\textit{pari assensu}).\textsuperscript{9} The monks, however, only chose an abbot for themselves only upon receiving the Pope’s command to do so.\textsuperscript{10} Peter is differentiated by being elected not only by the brothers at Cluny, but by a crowd of bishops, abbots and monks from across the land, gathered together agreeing upon “the author of these lines” (i.e. Peter) as abbot.\textsuperscript{11} The pope is informed of the community’s (or communities’) decision and he

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{7} Pontius’ return to Cluny many years later establishes his overtly evil nature within the narrative. In 1126, he returned acting like a haughty noble: he threatened monks with torture, he sent away all monks who did not swear allegiance to him and finally he seized anything and everything made of gold. This depiction recalls the image of the arrogant grasping counts (\textit{DM}, II, 1) who despoiled churches and monasteries for their personal benefit (and then were punished by divine vengeance).
\item \textsuperscript{8} On the power and election of the abbot at Cluny before Peter the Venerable, cf. chapter one.
\item \textsuperscript{9} \textit{DM}, II, 12, ll. 43-44, p. 118 (219); \textit{totius religionis ac religioso opinionis uirum}.
\item \textsuperscript{10} The passage seems to suggest that it was \textit{post preceptum} of the pope to elect an abbot and \textit{accepto consilio}, the monks elected Hugh II (ibid.).
\item \textsuperscript{11} \textit{DM}, II, 12, ll. 52-53, p. 118 (219); \textit{in praesentium scriptorum conueniunt}. Ralph of Sully expands on the text’s brief description of his election and adds that the election of Hugh II’s successor was contentious and
\end{itemize}
confirms Peter's election, thereby bestowing on Peter a twofold legitimacy. Peter receives a mandate, in this description, not only from Cluny, but from Cluniac priors, ecclesiastical dignitaries and the pope himself. His constituency therefore is vast. Peter's election, the text continues, allowed the community of Cluny to be at peace for several years, during which, "as if former evils had been laid to rest", tranquility reigned and much "advance flourished in the successes of the good". The assertion of this peace becomes another signal of the righteousness of Peter and a validation of his good rule.

According to this account, the tranquility following Peter's election (which corresponds to the time described by Peter in chapter eleven when he instituted reforms assisted by Matthew) came to an end when Pontius returned years later. However, the time between Peter's election (1122) and Pontius' return to Cluny (1126), as we noted in chapter eight, was a time filled with anxiety for Peter, during which his power was questioned and contested by his monks. This account telescopes years into a few lines, where Pontius' return from his journey in the Holy Land (ca 1123), occurs almost simultaneously with his return to Cluny (1126) and his death in Rome (1127). The author describes events divided by years as if contemporaneous, thereby giving a distinct sense of immediacy, suggesting the quickness of Pontius' punishment and the briefness of the problems suffered at Cluny. While in the De miraculis Peter is reticent about the specific issues of reform (DM, I, 11), this account memorializes Pontius' downfall and Peter's legitimization, at the end of chapter thirteen, stating, "I feared lest the affair, as it seemed to me something not to be kept silent and of considerable use for the cautioning of future

debated until Peter arrived. Upon seeing him, all those disagreeing were unified and in agreement (VPV, I, col. 18A).

12 DM, II, 12, II. 56-57, p. 119 (220); Mansit deinde aliquot annis res Cluniacensis in pace, et uelut sepultis prioribus malis, optimo quietis ac honorum proutiun successu florebat.
monks, disappear from the memory of our successors.” This version, offers “security”, but not necessarily fact.

The metaphor of sickness, which closes off the treatment of Pontius in these interpolations to the *De miraculis*, links Pontius’ death, Peter’s recuperation from sickness and the disease from which Cluny itself is healed and made stronger. When Pontius is in Rome appealing his condemnation he is struck ill by disease and dies soon thereafter. This account, however, omits that Pontius had already been languishing in prison for some time before falling sick. At the same time, Peter falls ill but soon recovers. The text wishes to draw a clear parallel between Pontius (evil) and Peter (good), one unrepentant, the other obedient to God (and the pope). Peter’s health is restored by the prayers of his brothers, Pontius dies without support. Pontius’ death, the author seems to imply, leads to Peter’s and Cluny’s restored health:

> With God being propitious, I eventually eluded [death] and through His grace, that great place of religion [i.e. Cluny] recovered with amazing quickness from the debasement of the mob of [Pontius’] type and from the disease of schism; it returned to its former state—and perhaps in some ways a better state—of religion, reputation, and affairs.

Peter, who has had no role in the story until this point, comes as its conclusion, not as an action but as a symbol. The abbot is the monastery; Peter is sick when the monastery is disturbed. When Peter recovers, so too does the state of Cluny. Without proper leadership (Pontius), Cluny is subject to decline and disruption. With the proper abbot (Peter), pristine religion and glory is attained.

---

14 *DM*, II, 13, II. 66-68, p. 123 (226); *rem ut michi uidetur non reticendam et pro futurorum cautela perutilm, a subsequentium memoria perire timebam* [...].
16 *DM*, II, 13, II. 62-65, p. 123 (225-26); *Euaei tandem Deo propitio, ac per ipsius gratiam maximus ille religionis locus, a sui generis pessimo turbationis, et scismatis morbo, mira celeritate conualuit atque ad pristinum et fortissis ex parte meliorem, religionis, fame uel rerum statum, peruenit.*
The correction, undertaken by God and symbolized in Peter, returns Cluny to its former state and even perfects it. This evolution at Cluny suggests an ideal of reform that is based not merely on a reclamation of the past (here a pre-Pontian Cluny), but on an improvement upon it. We also likely perceive here a concern for reputation, something Peter himself rebuilds with the *De miraculis*. As a result of the papal condemnation of Pontius, we learn in chapter thirteen, “they were united who had been divided” and “the Cluniac body” was made whole again (*reintegratus*).\(^{17}\) The removal of Pontius thus becomes, in this narrative, the means for the restoration of proper Cluniac monasticism; further reform was done under the authority of the harmonizing abbot Peter.

Pope Honorius II’s condemnation of Pontius, which is transcribed within the text, confers further legitimacy on Peter. Not only was “Cluny, its monks and all things pertaining to this monastery” restored to him, but so too was the full power of the papacy placed behind him.\(^{18}\) Within the narrative framework, the papal judgment serves not only to ground the legitimacy of Peter’s abbacy (vis-à-vis Pontius), but confers upon him a reason and legal basis for its reform. Peter does not merely represent, however, a return to the *status quo*. Instead, he is described as the symbolic medium for a restored Cluniac harmony and the means to improve his monastery. Just as he attends to the Cluniac “weeds” described in chapter eleven, the end of chapter thirteen shows him embodying Cluny’s recovery from Pontius’ interventions. The person of the abbot, significantly, is conflated with the state of the institution.

\(^{17}\) *DM*, II, 13, ll. 40-43, p. 122 (224-25); *Data sententia, uniuntur qui diuisi fuerant, et uelut in momento redintegrato Cluniacensi corpore, tantus tamque diutinus malorum turbo sedatur.*

\(^{18}\) *DM*, II, 14, ll. 38-39, p. 122 (224); *Cluniacum, monachos, vel cuncta ad idem monasterium pertinentia.*
APPENDIX D: LIST OF STATUTE TITLES (TRANSLATED)

Apologetic Preface
1. Concerning the pause of the singers.
2. Concerning the Dominical Office for Feasts with 12 Readings.
3. Concerning the commemoration of the Lord’s Day.
4. Concerning genuflecting on the Lord’s day.
5. Concerning the Transfiguration of the Lord
6. Concerning private masses
7. Concerning the sounding of the signal before the major mass.
8. Concerning anniversaries.
9. Concerning the first Sunday of Advent.
10. Concerning abstaining from lard on the sixth ferial day.
11. Concerning abstaining from spiced wine.
12. Concerning the abstinence from meat.
13. Concerning the fasts of vigils of feasts.
15. Concerning the abstinence from lard in Advent.
16. Concerning the prohibition of clothing.
17. Concerning the prohibition of furs.
18. Concerning prohibited bedding.
19. Concerning silence in the monastery.
20. Concerning silence during Lent.
22. Concerning silence during the meal.
23. Concerning the enclosure of the regular houses
24. Concerning servants in the infirmary
25. Concerning the bell in the infirmary
26. Concerning the midday siesta of fasts.
27. Concerning the vases of wine
28. Concerning the washing of shoes.
29. Concerning the clothes of equestrian brothers
30. Concerning leg coverings
31. Concerning the psalms for feast days with 12 lessons.
32. Concerning anniversaries
33. Concerning leftovers of the refectory and the infirmary.
34. Concerning the times of shaving.
35. Concerning the reception of monks
36. Concerning not receiving boys.
37. Concerning the time of probation.
38. Concerning the blessing of the novices
40. Concerning monks undertaking travels
41. Concerning the maintenance of a full compliment [of monks].
42. Concerning silence in small monasteries.
43. Concerning the age of priests
44. Concerning the donations and sales of lands and chattel
45. Concerning the proctors
46. Concerning the servants of the priors
47. Concerning the dwellings of nuns
48. Concerning familiars [of the monastery]
49. Concerning lights in the dormitory
50. Concerning readings between the octave of the Assumption and of the Apostles Peter and Paul.
51. Concerning grace after dinner
52. Concerning the raising of the crown of candles.
53. Concerning the enclosure of the new monastery.
54. Concerning the daily mass in honour of the Blessed Mary
55. Concerning the abbot coming to chapter.
56. Concerning the schoolboys.
57. Concerning the Credo at the major mass.
58. Concerning the prose, Caeleste Organum on the Nativity of the Lord.
59. Concerning the five ferial antiphonies during Lent.
60. Concerning the hours of the Blessed Mary in the infirmary church.
61. Concerning Prime to be recited in the chapel of the infirm.
62. Concerning the cross for the unction of the infirm monks.
63. Concerning the wearing of tunics during whippings
64. Concerning the baskets for offering leftovers
65. Concerning seating at mass.
66. Concerning the schoolboys.
67. Concerning the pneumes
68. Concerning proper hymns
69. Concerning the custodians of the dormitory
70. Concerning the clothes of the servants
71. Concerning saying Ipsum Audite in responsaries and antiphons
72. Concerning private masses on the Nativity of the Lord
73. Concerning wine at the mass of the Birth of the Lord
74. Concerning singing the Kyrie in the five chief feasts.
75. Concerning the feasts of the Holy Cross
76. Concerning the antiphon, Salva Regina
A1. Concerning genuflections on the Lord’s day (Pontius)
A2. Concerning monks waiting outside.
APPENDIX E: CHRONOLOGY OF REFORM AND WRITINGS

1122  Election of Peter the Venerable as Abbot of Cluny.  
      Matthew of Albano aids in the reform of Cluny.

1124  Bernard writes to his cousin Robert recently transferred to Cluny.

1125  Bernard writes *Apologia.*  
      Ex-abbot Pontius returns to Cluny.  
      Matthew becomes Cardinal Bishop of Albano.

1126  Papal legate is sent by Pope Honorius II to investigate Pontius’ return to 
      and behaviour at Cluny.  
      Peter the Venerable secures condemnation of Pontius at Rome.

1127  Peter writes letter 28.  
      Pontius dies.

1131  First chapter of Benedictine Abbots convenes at Rheims.

1131/40 Peter writes to Cistercians abbots and priors about tithes refused to Cluny.

1132  Peter convenes general chapter of Cluniac abbots and priors with the 
      intention of promulgating reform statutes.  
      Pope Innocent II grant Cistercians a universal exemption from paying 
      tithes.

*ca 1134*  Peter begins work on the *De miraculis.*

1135  Bernard and Peter meet at the Council of Pisa.

1135-1137 Dispute over tithes between the Cluniac Gigny and the Cistercian Le 
       Miroir.

1140  Peter writes to the Chapter General of Citeaux.

1142/4 Bernard writes *De praec esto uel dispensatione.*  
      Peter produces the second redaction of the *De miraculis.*

1144  Peter writes Bernard letter 111.
Peter codifies his abbatial statutes in the *Statuta*.

Peter codifies his administrative changes in the *Dispositio rei familiaris*.

Peter writes letter 161 urging greater austerity in food to all Cluniac monks.

Peter writes letters 149 and 150 to Bernard of Clairvaux complaining about the lack of hospitality shown to Cluniac monks in Cistercian monasteries.

Violence escalates between Gigny and La Miroir.

Peter the Venerable dies (†25.12.1156)

Both Bernard Grossus (†1157) and Hugh III is elected abbot of Cluny.

Stephen I de Boulogne becomes abbot of Cluny (†12.8.1173) after Pope Alexander III deposes Henry III as abbot.

Ralph of Sully becomes abbot of Cluny (†20.9.1177)

Ralph resigns and Gautier de Châlons is elected abbot (†6.9.1177)

William I is elected abbot (†11.1.1179)

Thiebaud de Vermandois is elected abbot (†4.11.1188)

Hugh IV de Clermont is elected abbot (†8.4.1199)

Hugh V de Anjou is elected abbot (†29.8.1207)

Hugh V promulgates a corpus of statutes.

Hugh V promulgates a new corpus of statutes.
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