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Abstract

The goal of this project is to isolate Cluniac attitudes towards violence and the use of martial force in the tenth through twelfth centuries, first by determining in what situations Cluniac authors deemed the shedding of human blood was permissible, and second by tracking the evolution of these attitudes from the abbey’s foundation to the height of its influence. Given Cluny’s role in European society, there is a rich and longstanding body of scholarship which examines Cluny’s support or rejection of force as a means of conflict resolution. This study demonstrates a consistency over time in Cluniac attitudes on the motivations and limitations of violence which governed warfare in Europe, leading eventually to the codification in Cluniac texts of acceptable uses of force, and establishing a clear pathway to salvation for the warrior caste whose lives and fortunes revolved around being effective in the execution of warfare. This thesis employed a combination of corpus linguistics and word embedding as its primary methodology. The usage frequency of a list of twenty-four Latin roots relating to concepts of warfare, violence, use of force, justice, and power was determined in order to identify and quantify the use of martial language in Cluniac texts of a variety of genres (legal texts, hagiography, history, sermons, and poetry). The opportunities for greater understanding of historical texts are almost limitless as scholars explore ways to use these exciting new interpretive methods.

The patterns of target root occurrence strongly imply a distinctly Cluniac culture in the manner in which Cluniac authors thought about violence which does not appear to
be fully in line with existing scholarship. Cluny’s message was not about eye-for-an-eye equivalency, or Christ’s vengeance on wrongdoers, but the salvation of all mankind. This result makes sense, both spiritually and pragmatically, as it was only fair that those Christian knights and rulers who fought and protected others—so long as they followed the rules for the just and justifiable use of force—should not be excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven. The results provide a way to draw back the curtain of public speech to reveal the thought patterns behind it and to quantify our subjective understanding of these texts. In seeking to understand the mentalities and motivations of the producers of the historical record, whether a sermon intended to give warriors hope for salvation or a public address to discuss the response to a global pandemic, word choice, as this thesis demonstrates, matters.
Dedication

For everyone who ever wondered if it was too late to chase a dream.

(Spoiler: It’s not!)

_Semper deinceps_

Never give up! Never Surrender!
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Introduction

Those who feast themselves on the rapine of the poor ought to be opposed very severely. For, in truth, even those who do not afflict the poor but nevertheless do not care to resist such afflicters, are seriously sinning in any event.1

In late January 1145, Peter the Venerable (1122-1156), the abbot of the great monastery of Cluny, summoned the townsfolk of the village of Cluny.2 The abbot, as the earthly representative of the pope and St. Peter himself, was arguably the most powerful man in town. Likely curious and eager to find out why they had been called, the people assembled, possibly in the grand church on the abbey grounds, or perhaps in the village square, to hear what the abbot had to say. Abbot Peter’s purpose was to ensure the physical protection of the abbey, its brothers, and its many valuable properties and vast lucrative holdings scattered throughout the forested hills and valleys of Cluny’s remote domain from the ambitions and greed of neighboring military leaders. The abbot’s method of assuring this protection was to make a pact, secured by an oath, with the townsmen of Cluny. If any of them should die having been called up by the abbot to face the enemies of the abbey or the church, the abbot guaranteed absolution and a free burial in sacred monastic ground with a full death ritual and commemoration. The abbey would provide sanctuary from retribution against those abiding by their oath, and committed the


abbey or the church to pay any death penalties demanded. A fine was established for anyone aiding those deemed by the abbot to be enemies of the abbey or church. This type of oath, which laid out the duties and responsibilities of a lord to provide protection and support to his subjects, be they vassals or dependents, and in return for which his followers vowed to take up arms in defense of the lord and his holdings, was not uncommon by the twelfth century. For an abbot, as a monastic paragon forbidden to bear arms or to exercise violence, to explicitly cast himself in such a worldly and potentially violent role by demanding such an oath, was unusual and unexpected. Even more surprising, two decades later, in the Spring of 1166, when the duke of Chalon captured and occupied a Cluniac castle, Abbot Stephen (1163-1173), after exhausting all spiritual means of punishment, called upon the townspeople of Cluny to honor this oath.³ Abbot Stephen himself led them to confront the duke’s far superior, armed, and undoubtedly Christian, mercenary force.⁴

Was this willingness to employ force something new for the leaders of Cluny’s monastic community? Perhaps these two abbots were reflecting a change in Cluniac policy toward justified violence in light of changes in societal attitudes due to the crusade movement, with its emphasis on vanquishing those deemed inimical to the Christian faith. Or was this exercise of the more secular powers of the abbot, as lord of his territory, in addition to his duty and authority to exercise spiritual warfare, bringing to bear ius

---

bellum, or just war, in defense of abbey holdings? Perhaps this sequence of events was not as aberrant as it might first appear. Daniel Gerrard describes “a developing body of canon law provisions aimed to define more clearly the role of monks and priests as apart from worldly activities, including the prosecution of warfare,” which indicates that there was a need to address such activities. The answer to the genesis of this apparent contradiction can be found and supported by a close examination of Cluniac literature, from the very earliest days of the abbey’s foundation in 909/910 through to the events of the mid-twelfth century described above. This examination will entail a close linguistic analysis quantifying the use of selected Latin target roots relating to peace, order, power, and violent action. (See Appendix D for the complete list.)

**Ius bellum: Just War**

Recognition of humanity’s tendency to address conflict with violence has been a concern of the Christian clergy from the earliest glimmers of Christianity as an organized system of theology. There were Christians in the Roman army from at least the mid-second century. The term “sacrament” was used in reference to military and civic oaths by this time. This was well before Emperor Constantine the Great’s (307-337) conversion superimposed largely pacifist Christian rhetoric onto the position of secular war lord in the early fourth century, which was a century before Augustine codified a

---

Christian concept of “just war” in the fifth century.\(^8\) As late as 867, Pope Nicholas (r. 858-867), explicitly demanded a total separation between “secular affairs” and “spiritual business.” Despite all the efforts to keep the clergy untainted by violence, it was not uncommon to have bishops and even abbots recorded as part of armies at war.\(^9\)

It is likely that some sort of “just war theory” has existed since mankind first discovered the ability to hurt others. The parameters used to justify doing unto others something one definitely does not want done to oneself were no doubt less complicated prior to the advent of Christian theology and its awkward attachment to peace as the ultimate societal goal. Even as parameters were being discussed and imposed, pragmatism and situation often determined what was just.\(^{10}\) As Christianity came to be ever more dominant, both socially and politically, in Western Europe, the question arose of how to reconcile political, territorial conflict with the pacifistic teachings of the church. While the smiting of evil in the form of hostile non-believers was permissible, the moral gymnastics required to justify the use of force by one Christian against another Christian were much more challenging. “Just war theories,” according to Frederick Russell, “were the best compromise between human aggression and Christian pacifism that the church could devise. Even so, the problem defied consistent and sustained

\(^8\) Gerrard, *The Church at War*, 10.
\(^9\) Gerrard, *The Church at War*, 17, 33. Referring to Pope Nicholas’ *Clericum qui paganum* addressed to Bishop Geoffrey of Thérouanne. Evidence is given from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for the participation of both bishops and abbots in ninth-century warfare in the kingdom of Wessex.
\(^{10}\) Gerrard, *The Church at War*, 20, 29.
philosophical attempts at solution.”

While never explicitly offering a treatise on when war was acceptable, St. Augustine (354-430 CE) did address both the concepts of *ius ad bellum*—the just initiation of warfare—as well as *ius in bello*—how to wage war in a just manner—throughout his description of his “*City of God*” in sufficient detail to allow for the construction of a Christian theory of just war. *Ius bellum*, specifically as it relates to Abbot Peter foreseeing a situation where Cluny might need to resort to martial means to protect its demesne, and Abbot Stephen’s fulfillment of that foresight, will be the focus of this project.

Frederick Russell outlines “the basic Augustinian criteria for just war” as “just cause, proper authority, and right intention.” A truly just war could only be instigated in defense or response to some threat to the state (although what constituted a “state” is open to debate, especially between the end of the Carolingian Empire and prior to the gradual centralization of administrative authority in the late Middle Ages). War was permissible to right a wrong, protect citizenry, or to achieve or restore peace (theologically, the peace of Eden before the fall and the peace that would eventually reign again after the second coming and Judgment Day). War for the sake of expanding territory or personal gratification, glory or wealth was not justified and was a grievous sin.

---

12 Russell, “Just War,” 593.
against both God and those wronged by such action. A just war could only be initiated by a legitimate authority—a recognized ruler (even further limited over time to a ruler without a superior) or God. A just war was waged with the intent of furthering the greater good, especially of the weak and defenseless. Furthermore, “right intention utterly prevents one from taking delight in any kind of violence,” says John Mark Mattox, who continues, “Violence, even when justly undertaken, is not supposed to be a source of enjoyment or amusement.” Augustine also limited the physical execution of just warfare to laymen, and only then after all ecclesiastic means to rectify wrongs had been exhausted. Clergy were explicitly enjoined from fleeing, however, unless specifically targeted for persecution. They were to “remain to supply spiritual food to their fellow-servants.” The question of how force could be used without jeopardizing one’s salvation over the two and a half centuries considered here is complicated by many factors, including the changing definitions and many evolving degrees of sanctity, an ever more dense and complex ecclesiastic hierarchy, and the explicit rejection of worldliness by monastic communities.

**Historiography of Benedictine and Cluniac Monasticism and Violence**

It should be no surprise that the history of the abbey of Cluny, its abbots, policies,
and influence over medieval Christian society is a field of study which has attracted the attention of historians and scholars for nearly a millennium. Although anglophone scholarship, in particular, has decreased over time, Cluny has continued to fascinate scholars of monasticism, church reform, medieval politics and diplomacy, social history, art and architectural history, and the crusades, among other fields of study, up to the present day. The monastic community at Cluny, through its many subordinate, affiliated, and associated houses, exercised significant influence over much of monastic thought and practice throughout the entirety of medieval Europe, especially in the eleventh and the first half of the twelfth century. Its abbots were called upon to enact monastic reform, mediate disputes, and participate in major canonical councils and decisions. The abbots of Cluny also exercised influence through personal relationships with other power brokers and their aristocratic blood kin in both secular and ecclesiastical positions of power. While not necessarily the sole driving force behind eleventh- and twelfth-century monastic and church reform, as was once depicted, the influence of the values and goals held by the Cluniac community was undoubtedly strong enough to alter the course of events and public opinion.

Much work has been done on the concept of *ius bellum* in respect to the *Pax dei* and *Treuga dei* movement(s), Gratian’s *Decretum*, and crusade, as a means of achieving remission of sins. Less attention has been given to how these concepts evolved and were viewed, defined, and described from a purely monastic—and even more specifically, Cluniac—point of view, especially prior to Peter the Venerable’s abbacy and the First
The abbots of Cluny, as the heads of Cluny’s vast network of dependent, affiliated, and reformed houses, commanded great respect and influence throughout Europe by the time of the emergence of the \textit{Pax dei} (during the abbacy of Maiolus, Cluny’s fourth abbot, in 998), and even more so by the call for crusade by former Cluniac brother and prior, Pope Urban II (1088-1099) at Clermont in 1095. Understanding Cluniac thought/mentality regarding legitimate use of force helps to illuminate the underlying structures which regulated the violence that was integral to the frequent warfare in tenth- and eleventh-century Europe, and would, eventually, bring about codes of chivalry and a secular codification of how best to exercise the use of force.

Early-twentieth-century Cluniac scholars rejected the idea that Cluny played any direct role in the genesis or encouragement of the crusades, arguing that this would be incompatible with monastic precepts against the use of violent force. Nevertheless, Cluny’s unique position at the crossroads of secular power—through the lordship of the abbey’s extensive land holdings—and outside and above the mundane concerns of worldly competition, made the Cluniac abbots uniquely qualified and highly sought after to serve as counselors, advisors and mediators. Joan Evans (1931) does not speak directly to Cluniac views on just (or unjust) warfare, but, although the evidence is highly circumstantial, closely links Cluny with the advent of crusade. She points to Urban II as a Cluniac pope who maintained close ties with his earlier monastic community, and points

\begin{itemize}
  \item The exception being Barbara Rosenwein’s work in the 1970s and early 1980s, before she took up her work on the history of emotions.
  \item During the abbacy of Hugh I (1049-1109).
\end{itemize}
to the many Cluniac houses on Urban II’s procession to Clermont in 1095 as evidence of
at least acceptance of his call for crusade, though not direct support. Carl Erdmann (1935)
and Robert Southern (1953) both held similar views of Cluny’s involvement with the
origins of the crusade movement. Erdmann saw no evidence for Cluny’s abbots directly
encouraging war for any reason, even for the sake of vanquishing or converting non-
Christians. He did not see even Adalbero of Laon’s (950/957–1031) scathing satirical
poem of “King Odilo” (fifth abbot of Cluny, 994-1049) and his warlike monks as having
any literal interpretation, but felt it was meant as a purely metaphorical criticism of
Cluny’s secular entanglements, possessions, and distractions.21 To Erdmann, Abbot
Odo’s (927-942) literary creation of the first holy knight, St. Gerald of Aurilliac (c.855-
c.909), did not indicate an acceptance of the necessity of war on occasion, but by design
offered proof that sanctity and bloodshed were not compatible.22 Erdmann saw Abbot
Odilo’s prayers for the victory of Christian monarchs in Iberia over their Muslim
neighbors as the only indicator of early Cluniac attitudes toward warfare.23 Even after
Urban II called the crusade movement into being and laid the groundwork for a “new
ethic of war,” Erdmann maintains that despite Cluny’s strong influence over the lay
warrior classes, they consciously avoided direct participation in armed conflict.24

Southern is firmly in the “indirect influence” camp as well. According to him, Cluny was

---

22 Odo of Cluny, Being the Life of St. Odo of Cluny by John of Salerno and the Life of St. Gerald of
24 Erdmann, Idea of Crusade, 72.
fully focused on the ordering of God’s Kingdom on Earth and “fought” for their values with piety, contemplation, and prayer—not arms—and any aspects of monastic culture or administration with a resemblance to secular structures of governance or conquest was purely a coincidence born of environmental conditions and language. These scholars saw Gerald of Autrillac’s, Odo’s template for a saintly knight, refusal to use lethal force in battle as a refusal to exercise the direct influence of violence and an indication of Cluny’s leadership to use or encourage the exercise of violent force, even in the service of justice.

Continuing in the vein of earlier scholarship, H.E.J. Cowdrey, whose long and productive academic career spanned from the late 1960s into the early 2000s, felt it was “…unlikely that Cluny played a considerable positive part in shaping the ideology of the holy war and of the crusade which developed from it.” He argues that Cluny’s priorities of spiritual and moral instruction and the establishment of social order to promote peace were antithetical to violent action. In contrast to Southern and Erdmann, Cowdrey saw St. Gerald as an illustration of armed force as a last resort. After all other diplomatic and ecclesiastical options had been exhausted, a worthy warrior resorting to armed conflict was the indicator that a conflict is serious enough to die for. Cowdrey did recognize the thin line separating an unarmed warrior on pilgrimage and a crusader, and saw Cluny’s grudging acceptance of warfare, expiated by crusade rhetoric, as the ultimate pilgrimage, and another means to address pastoral care and access to salvation for the warrior

Cluny’s acceptance is further evidenced by its participation in *Pax/Treuga dei movement(s)*, which recognized the inevitability of conflict and allowed for the continuation and expansion of acceptable social violence.

Jean Leclercq by contrast describes violence and force as being acceptable to Benedictine communities, even expected, due to the “ideas and morals of the times.”\(^{27}\) Biblical passages which describe violence as a means of divine justice or retribution were often utilized to explain and justify the use of force against other Christians. Monastic communities, although proscribed from the use of earthly weaponry, were not without their own defensive resources—the favors of their patron saints, elicited through prayer and backed up by the presence of relics, were their spiritual armor, often resulting in the violent deaths of their enemies. For the sons of aristocratic kin-groups, martial training began early and military prowess was the means to greater power. Jean Leclercq, in reference to Benedictine monasticism at large, said, “As the monks were drawn from such a society, it is no surprise that we see in them a mixture of ruggedness, sometimes severity, and spirituality.”\(^{28}\) It makes sense that they would use military terminology, even when discussing or describing the divine acts of the saints to defend or avenge the members and properties of communities under their protection. Leclercq continues,

---

\(^{26}\) Cowdrey, “Cluny and the First Crusade,” XV, 303; Cowdrey cites two 1096 and one 1101 charters in which Cluny agrees to assist (no doubt to the profit of the abbey in the long run) with the financial costs of outfitting crusaders for their undertaking, as well as an account of St. Hugh consecrating a crusade-bound knight by placing the ring and cross of a crusader on his person.


“these contemplative souls shared in the roughness of the age; and yet they strove to mitigate it in themselves and those about them. Although violent like the main body of their contemporaries, these men were relatively peaceable.”

Barbara Rosenwein agreed with Leclercq’s characterization of tenth-century Western European society as being steeped in violence. She describes a more conscious rejection of violent force as an acceptable means to resolve disputes by church leaders, while recognizing the paradox this posed with respect to their sometimes vast territorial and political properties. Although their participation in secular matters made it impossible for high-ranking ecclesiastics to avoid warfare completely, so long as they avoided physically carrying arms or participating in battle “they were absolved from the moral consequences of participating in war.” Rosenwein continues her examination of the conflict between the pragmatic need to exercise violent force—in self-defense, if nothing else—even against fellow Christians, and the responsibilities of high status, socio-political lords, and especially abbots and bishops:

The theories of the churchmen about war were not spun forth in the isolation of the cloister, unnoticed and unheeded. They were living ideas, and they affected prevailing values just as they were themselves a product of their times. The interests of churchmen and secular rulers were closely entwined; one individual often played both these roles at once. For this reason, some of the warfare in which the petty rulers engaged raised problems of conscience. Since the weak central authority could not stop a lord from encroaching on nearby lands, neighbors fought and plundered each other during, and even long after, the Viking invasions. But unlike the Vikings, these neighbors were Christians, and prevalent Christian values

—

dictated against such fighting.\textsuperscript{31}

Even an abbot could be placed in a position where force was the only option to defend his abbey’s holdings and the people, monastic and lay, who considered him their lord.

Rosenwein sees a strong correlation between the tenth-century decentralization of power and political administration and the popularity of monasticism, as evidenced by the growth of great monastic houses and networks such as Cluny. The dispersal of power amongst a wider percentage of the aristocracy meant more members of the aristocracy faced a conflict between protecting (and expanding) their holdings and the church’s condemnation of physical violence, especially violence directed at other Christians. Cluny’s reputation of exceptionally effective prayer led many of these aristocratic warrior lords to make donations to the abbey in return for inclusion in commemorative liturgy for themselves and their families, and to eventually even retire to the cloister at the end of their lives to expiate the sins they committed as warriors.\textsuperscript{32}

Rosenwein continues her examination and contemplation of Cluniac attitudes towards violent force by investigating the use by Cluny’s second abbot, Odo (927-942), of his personal patron St. Martin as a model of a just Christian knight. Martin had been a Roman soldier, though his fourth-century hagiographer, Sulpicius Severus, places more

\textsuperscript{31} Rosenwein, “Feudal War and Monastic Peace,” 149. Rosenwein here makes a direct connection to Gerald of Aurillac and the inherent conflict between his duties as a good lord and his desire to enter into monastic life.

emphasis on his spiritual potency than his physical might. Martin’s sanctity is proven in his rejection of military life, which results in God’s intervention and the full surrender of his enemies to assure he is not injured, “lest those holy eyes be violated by other men’s deaths.”

Odo used the trope of the (miraculous) bloodless victory, modeled on a similar account of a bloodless victory of St. Martin, when he composed his hagiographical account of St. Gerald of Aurillac around 931. Dedicated to St. Martin as a boy, and having trained before his entry into monastic life, as most aristocratic sons did, in the martial arts, Odo found in St. Martin a bridge between the martial and the holy man. His later hagiographical depiction of St. Gerald, a secular lord with wealth and power who is both holy and just, served as an “instruction manual” of best practices for Gerald’s peers.

Rosenwein later expands upon her examination of Odo’s views on the origins and function of violence in human society. Like ecclesiastic writers before him, Odo believed violence arises from malice endemic in man’s fall from grace and is seen biblically in the story of Cain and Abel. Both men of privilege and power, one is patient and charitable, while the other, driven by jealousy and malice, takes his brother’s life. Abuse of power is the outcome of a “... sequence in which wealth and power led to pride, pride to avarice, and avarice to malice.”

It was this malice that induced men of power and position, the only ones with means, to exploit and oppress the poor and needy.

In 1991, Barbara Rosenwein, Sharon Farmer, and Thomas Head published a

---


comparative study of how the monastic communities at Cluny, Fleury, and Marmoutier dealt with conflict. They found that the means of dealing with enemies and violent attack was different for each community and was highly dependent on the political context, as well as their familial and donor networks. At Cluny specifically, the kin bonds of the aristocratic families most Cluniac monks came from, and especially the donor bonds which linked the monastery to even more families of moderate to significant social and political means, were frequently both the source of conflict (for example, unfulfilled or lapsed donations) and the means through which resolution was achieved. Negotiation and compromise as a means of dispute resolution was fostered by the extensive interconnectivity and lack of a centralized power. Cluniac spiritual coercion also came into play:

... local conditions tended to limit the monks’ opportunities and therefore their responses to conflict. The vast arsenal of methods of dispute settlement available to monks in the period – cursing, negotiating, compromising, appealing to political and supernatural powers, seeking mediators, performing rituals – was not drawn upon randomly but rather deployed as their situation mandated. Moreover, local structures influenced not only the methods but also the objectives of dispute settlement.35

Of the three monasteries included in the comparison, according to Rosenwein, Cluny was the most likely to compromise and rely on informal agreements based on pre-existing bonds. Fleury, for a variety of reasons, was characterized by Head as most likely to respond to conflict, and certainly violence, with violence. The monastery of Marmoutier, the subject of Farmer’s examination, fell between the

almost paternal, less formal, and consensus-driven methods of Cluny and the unambiguous winner vs. loser outcomes favored at Fleury.

The great historian of medieval monasticism, Giles Constable, published works on Cluny spanning more than half a century from the 1950s through the 2010s. Although he saw indirect evidence for Cluny’s acceptance of violence, he saw many problems with framing Cluny’s relationship with warfare based on the abbey’s involvement in the crusade movement. The first of these was how to define “Cluny.” By the eleventh century, Cluny’s network—the beginning of a Cluniac order—was already too big and too geographically widespread for any monolithic point of view to be assumed or assigned. He also felt that it was problematic to temporally define the crusade movement. Even the “First Crusade,” which could be said to have begun with Urban II’s speech at Clermont in 1095, took many participants years to embark upon. Not everyone packed up and left at the same time. Urban II’s call might be understood as a pebble dropped in a vast lake (western Europe), the ripples moving outward in successive waves and taking significant time to reach the distant shore (the Holy Land). Charters provide scant evidence linking Cluny to specific crusaders, beginning in early 1096. They document a small number of mortgages, loans, and bequests in return for financial and spiritual support. Cluny also appears to have capitalized on the conflicts at the birthplace of Christianity as an opportunity to gain (or, in their terms, protect) relics for the benefit of

the abbey. Despite these benefits, no crusade chronicles or accounts appear to have been housed or produced at Cluny.

By the eleventh century, Constable argued, it was impossible for Cluny to be considered as separate from the secular world. The abbey simply had too many financial, spiritual, and political ties to secular power structures. The far-flung holdings upon which the abbey depended for income funded the extensive Cluniac liturgy and prayer as well as generous alms to the poor, thus satisfying the abbey’s pastoral and spiritual goals. In the first 300 years of the abbey’s existence, five of the first seven abbots, arguably some of the most influential clerics of their time, expended a great deal of effort contemplating “holy war.” Odo’s depiction of St. Gerald gives us a very good view of his opinions on the nature of acceptable violence, and on good and bad use of power/authority. Maiolus—after his capture and ransom in 972—saw the Christian nobles of Provence make war upon and expel Muslims from their lands. Odilo was present at the genesis of, and therefore presumably a vocal participant in, the Pax dei and Truega dei movements which specifically penalized certain types and times of violence. Hugh I (1049-1109) forged close ties with the Christian monarchs of northern Iberia, expanding Cluny’s network into Iberia for the purpose of converting Muslims and raising the funds to enlarge the abbey church, making it the grandest in all of Christendom. Peter the Venerable (1122-1156) had the Qu’ran translated so that he might formulate rational, text-based refutations to the Islamic faith, viewing “holy war” through the lens of

37 Constable, “Cluny and the First Crusade,” VII, 184, 192.
theology, before turning his efforts to other heretics, more dangerous by virtue of their proximity, relative wealth, and acceptance in society.39

Dominique Iogna-Prat’s *Order and Exclusion* (1998; translated into English, 2002) separates the development of Cluny’s attitudes towards those outside the abbey and the abbey’s influences in wider Christendom into two, roughly defined and not entirely compatible eras.40 Prior to the twelfth century and Peter the Venerable’s abbacy, Iogna-Prat sees Cluny’s abbots as world-builders, attempting to include all under their umbrella of Christian order, and thereby create a unified and somewhat standardized Christendom. After the astoundingly profitable and, by these metrics, successful abbacy of Hugh I, Cluny’s power and influence waned and, according to Iogna-Prat, focus shifted to exclusion and defense of Cluny’s prestige. Iogna-Prat sees Peter the Venerable’s campaign to understand, define, and debate “others” (heretics, specifically the Petrobrusians, Jews, and Muslims) on the basis of reasoned theology as illustrating this almost polar shift in focus. He tells us, “Cluny’s contribution to the First Crusade was fairly modest,” with his focus largely on the first quarter of the twelfth century and Peter

---

39 Petrobrusians and Jews, specifically. The Petrobrusian sect was composed of followers of Peter of Bruys (1117-1131), whose teachings included cross-burning, destruction of churches, and denial of baptism and the Eucharist in support of the idea that salvation was to be based solely upon faith and belief, not ritual or any other earthly acts, including monastic prayers; "Petrobrusians." in *The Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages*: Oxford University Press, 2010. https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198662624.001.0001/acref-9780198662624-e-4573.

40 Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000-1500)*, trans. Graham Robert Edwards (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), Iogna-Prat looks at the infancy of Cluny in the tenth century as a model of medieval monasticism. He then skims through the eleventh century, including the abbacies of Cluny’s saintly abbots—Odo, Odilo, Maiolus, and Hugh I—and the abbey’s rise to preeminence and the beginning of the crusade movement, before focusing in on Peter the Venerable’s abbacy, which began in 1122. Tenth-century Cluny was a very different community in a very different social environment than twelfth-century Cluny.
the Venerable’s texts.\textsuperscript{41} It is almost as if, for Iogna-Prat, continuity and two hundred years of Cluniac authority and influence on society is only felt once it reaches its apogee. Cluny’s sway over church and secular leadership wanes in the twelfth century after the abbacy of Hugh I, and the abbey’s place at the top of monastic society comes under attack on many fronts from other monastic orders, secular clergy, and the encroachment of lay leaders jealous of Cluny’s wealth and territory. Iogna-Prat maintains that despite this, “The direct use of force was not the office of clerics. Peter always held very firmly to this principle.”\textsuperscript{42} Peter’s intellectual methodology for disputing heresies, seeking first to understand and then rationally dismantle their errant beliefs, is seen by Iogna-Prat as proof of Peter’s rejection of violent opposition to non-Christians, regardless of perceived threat to the abbey or to Christendom as a whole.

Gregory Smith (2002) ascribes a more active role to Abbot Peter. He characterizes the letters, miracle stories, and treatises of Abbot Peter the Venerable as “the record of a man concerned about peace and order, who found himself in the midst of violence and disarray” which plagued twelfth-century Burgundy.\textsuperscript{43} He describes Peter as “a keen observer” whose conclusions are “rooted in observed realities of will, force, and power,” and whose goal was to protect his people and holdings, revealing “much about

\textsuperscript{41} Iogna-Prat, \textit{Order and Exclusion}, 329.
\textsuperscript{42} Iogna-Prat, \textit{Order and Exclusion}, 334. This assertion is severely weakened a scant two lines later with a (throw-away) reference to the oath of defense which enabled a later abbot to exercise the direct use of force against a threat to the abbey”s holdings.
the way things worked when rhetoric and ritual were not enough.”

Smith characterizes Peter’s prescription for the epidemic of social violence as the imposition of a specific set of parameters on the acceptable use of force. The sole acceptable goal of violence was the restoration of peace, the natural order in the Kingdom of God as described by St. Augustine. The restoration of peace and order allowed one to defend one’s own holdings—whether land, commodities, livestock, or people—so long as this was always done impersonally and with the governance of controlled, rational thought. In keeping with Augustinian parameters of just war, a warrior’s intent must be devoid of personal gratification or selfish motivation of any kind, his actions must be governed by the bounds of custom, and his expectations of the response from both friend and foe must not be unreasonable. Under these conditions, “soldiers of Christ,” the foremost of which were monks, would be justified to take up physical arms in defense of peace, order, and the church.

Writing as the same time as Smith, Michael Meckler (2002) examines Cluniac attitudes towards those who fight through an analysis of Abbot Odilo’s (r. 994-1049) allegory of “Fulcher and the wolf” or “the warrior in sheepskin,” found at the end of his hagiographical vita of Maiolus. Although likely intended as a parable focused on the heathen Saracens (Meckler is more interested in the depictions of Muslims), qualities of acceptable and unacceptable uses of force can be gleaned from Odilo’s descriptions of

44 Smith, “Sine rege, sine principe,” 2.
the positive and negative traits of the antagonists: the just and noble lord, Fulcher (who is
presented as the saintly Maiolus’ father), and the ravaging pack of wolves. The negative
model is wild, intemperate, unrestrained, animalistic, and ferocious. The heroic role is
assigned to Fulcher. His actions are graphically described in a way that makes them
easily as violent as the depredations of the wolf. However, Fulcher acts not out of any
self-interest, but for the good of his people. He is patient, rational. He drafts a carefully
considered plan which he executes with consideration, and, at least at first, with some
restraint. Though his enemies, the enemies of his community, are not portrayed as
human, they present a formidable challenge to Lord Fulcher. Using deception and
cunning to lure the wolves in, he uses his skills as a warrior to vanquish them. Unlike
Gerald of Aurillac, this warrior does not spurn gore or deny his pride in his victory.
While this may seem a relatively minor piece of scholarship, it directly addresses the
language and imagery used to describe a worthy warrior, the father of a saintly abbot of
Cluny, exercising his violent might in a work written by another saintly abbot of Cluny,
and intended for a primarily Cluniac monastic audience.

A fuller synthesis of the place of warrior values in monastic culture was published
by Kathleen Smith in 2011. Smith interprets monastic language as presenting the monk as

---

46 He covers his armor with sheepskin and waits with the flock for the wolves to attack. He then singles out
the pack leader, the strongest and most vicious, and captures him alive. This wolf is taken back to the
village, where the villagers who had lost livestock to the marauding wolves get their revenge, killing the
wolf, disemboweling it, and stringing its empty carcass up as a warning. Meckler, “Wolves and
Saracens,” 123-126.

47 “By becoming wolf-like in thought while becoming sheep-like in appearance, Fulcher is finally able to
the model of a “soldier of Christ” and the prayers and liturgical observances of monastic communities as their only acceptable weaponry. Using these spiritual weapons, however, the monks saw themselves as engaged in a literal combat with evil.\textsuperscript{48} She cites Peter the Venerable’s own words from a letter to Bernard of Clairvaux, denying all resort to physical weaponry or even harsh language, to make much the same judgment of Peter’s rejection of physical force as Iogna-Prat.\textsuperscript{49} This interpretation stands in direct opposition to the Peter the Venerable who compelled an oath of armed defense from his lay dependents. Smith acknowledges the presence and esteem of “martial values” in monastic leadership, but still rejects a literal interpretation of these war-like abilities.\textsuperscript{50} Even though medieval monasteries have traditionally been portrayed as islands of peace and order in a world prone to violent conflict, monastic identity was strongly informed by the monks’ own experiences with warfare, both before and after entering monastic life. She sees the concept of “spiritual warfare” as present in some form in nearly every aspect of monastic life, but asserts that taking the step across the line to physical force, even in extreme cases such as a defense of the Holy Land, would have been precluded.

Most recently, Scott Bruce takes up earlier scholarship and is primarily focused on Cluniac attitudes toward Islam and the crusade movement. Cluny, Bruce argues, with its Augustinian underpinnings and obvious self-interest in protecting and maintaining its communities and property, was more concerned with keeping the peace than “settling

\textsuperscript{49} Smith, \textit{Medieval Monastic Culture}, 47-48.
\textsuperscript{50} Smith, \textit{Medieval Monastic Culture}, 141.
scores.” The tenth century, when Cluny was founded, was characterized by an absence of strong local authority and traumatized by the recent collective memory of the chaos of Viking/Norman depredations. Violence was risky, destabilizing, and to be avoided. According to Bruce, this comes through clearly in Cluniac literature: “Cluniac hagiographers were, in fact, very specific about their literary depiction of the authors of violence: they were always the enemies of their abbey.”

This tendency to reserve depictions of selfish and unjust use of violent force for their enemies, while characters put forth as worthy of emulation trust in God for protection, was already established by the tenth century, as seen very clearly in Odo’s prototype of the saintly warrior, Gerald of Aurillac.

Although Saracen pirates and raiders were already a known hazard to trade and shipping along the Provençal coast by the early tenth century, possibly the first direct contact between Cluny and Islamic peoples was the capture and ransom of Abbot Maiolus in late July, 972. This incident, which nearly impoverished the abbey, was unquestionably traumatic for the community. No less than five separate Cluniac authors addressed it directly: in four versions of the Life of Maiolus (the Anonymous Vita brevior, Syrus, Odilo, and Nalgodus), and in the chronicle by historian, Rodulfus Glaber. Bruce references a letter detailed in Glaber’s chronicle in which Maiolus

---

53 Bruce, “An Abbot Between Two Cultures,” 427, 427n.
characterized his Islamic captors as “men of Belial,” equating them with “the polar opposite of Christ, and a spirit synonymous with iniquity, darkness, and false belief [i.e., heresy].” Given the depth of the communal trauma and the graphic nature of the image of Muslims, Cluny’s acceptance of Islam as the enemy of the greater church, and specifically an enemy of Cluny, does not require any great speculative leap. Despite this negative contact, Bruce argues, “Cluniac leaders generally agitated for peace rather than war, especially in the late tenth century, when the dissolution of local authority increased the vulnerability of monastic communities and their land holdings.”

In the early eleventh century, Cluny forged a strong donor bond with Iberian monarchies and monastic houses, bringing the abbey once again into an arena of direct conflict with followers of Islam. While Muslims were definitely seen as enemies of Christianity, Cluniac efforts seemed to be more concerned with the conversion of Muslims and pastoral responsibility than violence or retribution. While on a visit to Iberia in 1142/3, Abbot Peter the Venerable commissioned a Latin translation of important Muslim religious texts, including the Qu’ran. This translation appears to have been the first of its kind, intended to be used to understand, debate, and convert. In speaking of Abbot Peter’s apparently contradictory and complex intentions for this text, Bruce cautions against seeing true religious tolerance in Peter the Venerable’s methods,

54 Bruce, “An Abbot Between Two Cultures,” 437.
55 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 5.
56 James G. Clark, The Benedictines in the Middle Ages (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011), 53.
57 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 6.
58 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 10.
though Bruce does assert that “his [Peter the Venerable’s] work stands alone in the era of the early crusades for the depth of its engagement with Muslim religious texts and for its reasoned approach to a rival system of belief based on primary source research.”

Unable to find a suitable advocate to make use of the translation to discredit and refute the foundations of Muslim belief, in around 1146 Peter turned his attention to what he saw as potentially even greater threats: Christian heretics and Jews. Despite characterizing them as “vile blasphemers and far worse than the Saracens,” he proposed to weaken them financially, not kill them, instructing the king to “Spare their lives, but take away their money.”

Despite scholars’ long-standing denial of Cluny’s active participation in urging or supporting warfare, martial language and symbolism abound in Cluniac texts. As the majority of its brothers, and certainly abbots, came from aristocratic families steeped in martial culture, and as it was not uncommon for noble warriors to retire to Cluny for the sake of expiating the sins of a violent life, this is not at all surprising. Nevertheless, according to Bruce, there was but a “[s]ingle concrete portrayal of a Cluniac abbot as a military leader in the decades before the First Crusade.” A satirical poem written by a bishop, Adalbero of Laon (977-1031) describes Abbot Odilo as a “prince of war” who

---

59 Bruce, “An Abbot Between Two Cultures,” 17.
60 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 11.
61 Scott Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 11, quoting letter (no. 130) of Peter the Venerable to King Louis VII (1137-1180).
62 Multiple references to soldiers of Christ (milites Christi) or spiritual soldiers or armies (spirituali militum) are found in most (75%) of the texts analyzed.
63 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 6.
had allowed the abbey to become too entangled in secular matters. Bruce feels the evidence is lacking for Cluny being a driving force of the crusade movement and sees the Cluniacs more as “opportunistic beneficiaries” than authors. By the mid-twelfth century, Abbot Peter the Venerable shifted his focus from the spiritual goal of the movement—imposing Christianity upon Muslims—to a concern with heresies closer to home. Bruce asserts that Peter favored a rational conversion based on understanding and debate, rather than a physical, violent solution to the existence of heresy within Western European society.

The onset of the crusade movement and mentality, especially following the demoralizing defeat of the Second Crusade in 1149, brought with it a new “vision of Christian knighthood,” as described in the Cluniac poem the *Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus* (referred to below as *The Two Dukes*). The *Relatio metrica* is seen by Bruce as a condemnation of warfare which causes even good men to lose their restraint and indulge their darker traits. In this Cluniac version of a known legend, we see another holy warrior of Cluniac creation, Eusebius, though unlike Odo’s paragon, St. Gerald, his soul is tainted by bloodshed. He is able to redeem his bloody transgressions through his faith in God and steadfast focus on protecting the weak and the church. According to Bruce, this text’s depiction of both the just use of force, in defense of the weak, and unjust, unrestrained violence to satisfy bloodlust and greed, offers a clear view of Cluniac

---

64 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 6.
65 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 3.
66 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 14. See below on this work, which was written at the end of Peter’s abbacy around the same time he wrote his anti-Muslim treatise.
mentality at the time. He attributes “a leading role in the formation of a penitential spirituality for lay people” to Cluny, but specifically exempts them from an explicit role in the crusade movement.

There is no disputing that “the Cluniac way” was primarily intellectual and contemplative. The order, as it would become by the end of Hugh I’s abbacy, sought to change minds and cleanse souls through prayer and instruction rather than humble labor or impressive deeds. However, the inclusion in Cluniac texts of such martial language from the abbey’s very foundation, supported by the oath more than two centuries later, indicates that they were not opposed to the use of violent force in defense of the church. Cluny may not have “started” the crusade movement—though even that argument is dubious considering Urban II’s Cluniac background—but they were also not opposed to it. Peter obviously felt people had to know why orthodox Catholic Christianity was the right “choice,” but does that mean he was necessarily opposed to a physical confrontation in support of Christian control of the Holy Land? Perhaps it was a recognition that physical confrontation was inevitable that led to a pragmatic acceptance that theology and scholarship alone were not enough, which certainly accounts for both Odo’s purpose in his depiction of St. Gerald, the holy knight, and Peter’s in assuring the physical defense of the abbey’s holdings through the sworn oath of the abbey’s townsmen.

Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 13-14.
Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 16.
Questions and Thesis

The goal of this project is to isolate Cluniac attitudes towards violence and the use of martial force—notably by determining in what situations or against which enemies was the shedding of human blood permissible—and to track the evolution of these attitudes from the abbey’s foundation in 910 CE over its rise to the height of its influence in the first half of the twelfth century. Close examination of the specific language of the selected texts will lead to a clearer understanding of Cluniac thought/mentality regarding where the lines were drawn between compromise and conflict. Given Cluny’s central role in European religious culture between c. 900-1150, this will provide valuable insight into the motivations and limitations of violence and violent forces that governed the frequent warfare in Europe, and would, eventually, bring about codes of chivalry and a secular codification of how best to exercise the use of force. The data gathered through a close examination of Cluniac texts will be analyzed with several questions in mind:

- How do Cluniac texts characterize the attitudes of the abbey/order towards violence and use of force?
- Does this language change in any way over the abbey’s early history?
- Is there significance to the change, or lack of change, especially in the wider social environment? How does Peter’s oath (1145) and the subsequent battle under Stephen’s abbacy (1166) fit this framework?
- Can we speak of a consistent Cluniac “culture” around notions of violence/use of force (and those who use it)?
- How did Cluniac attitudes towards violence fit with the abbey’s wider mission of contemplation and universal access to salvation?

The answers to these questions will provide insight into Cluny’s participation in social debates on acceptable violence and how to make salvation possible to a warrior caste whose lives and fortunes revolved around being the most effective at physical
conflict and the execution of warfare. This insight will in turn help us understand the possible mindset of Abbot Peter the Venerable when he contemplated the need to exercise violent force to protect abbey holdings, and the choice of Abbot Stephen I (1163-1173), who ultimately led the townsmen of Cluny into battle in defense of the abbey’s territorial autonomy. Moreover, digging deeper into the specific language (via word choice) allows us to see behind the “curtain” of public-facing doctrine and actions into the more personally held values of Cluny’s leaders. While any definitive judgments of the inner thoughts of long dead historical figures is not possible, the linguistic data compiled and analyzed for this study show that this leadership was not averse to direct actions against those they saw as threats to their community, in both the sense of their local holdings and dependents and Christendom as a whole.

An assortment of Cluniac texts written between the abbey’s foundation in the early-tenth century and the mid- to late-twelfth century, by which time Cluny’s influence was being eroded by the growth of other powerful and distinct orders such as the Cistercians, were chosen for this study. The criteria for selection were based on access and diversity. The intent was to study overall language use rather than the vocabulary of a specific literary genre. Four texts from the tenth century were selected for analysis. These are the foundation charter of 910 CE, a collection of Abbot Odo’s sermons or Collationes, and two hagiographical works—the Vita Geraldi by Abbot Odo and the Vita Odonis by John of Salerno. Eleventh-century texts selected include three hagiographies—two vitae of Abbot Maiolus by Abbot Odilo and a Cluniac monk called Syrus, and a vita
of Abbot Odilo, written by the Cluniac monk Iotsald—and Rodulfus Glaber’s universal history in chronicle form, the *Historiarum Libri Quinque*. The twelfth century is represented by a hagiography of Abbot Hugh I, three sermons of Peter the Venerable, a poetic version of the Cluniac legend of the two dukes of Sardinia, *The Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus*, and the charter that records the oath of defense which Abbot Peter the Venerable extracted from the residents of Cluny in 1145.

**Methodology**

The methodology used was a simplified version of the combination of corpus linguistics and word embedding.69 Corpus linguistics, simplified, is the designation of a set of texts upon which to base studies on the vocabulary contained within them. Word embedding is a way of representing the frequency of usage (which is the basis of this paper) and the relationship of words or phrases within a corpus linguistics to each other.70 Its most familiar and simple form, which has seen much recent popularity, is the word cloud. These methods are known to digital humanities scholars and with advances in

---

69 Kalani Craig, email message to author, October 22, 2021. This paper was done without access to the specialized computing resources that would be necessary to fully exercise these methodologies. I essentially used the “stone knives and bear skins” version—word searches and hand tallies to assemble datasets.

computing technology and access, will likely become much more prevalent. The opportunities for greater understanding of historical texts are almost limitless as scholars explore ways to use these exciting new interpretive methods.

For this study, I compiled a list of twenty-four Latin roots (see Appendix D) relating to concepts of warfare, violence, use of force, justice, and power. This list was based on my own reading of the texts and the valuable suggestions of knowledgeable colleagues. The initial pool of target texts consisted of only eighteen target roots, but during the process of analysis, an additional six roots with interesting rates of usage were identified and added to the list. After the texts were converted to a searchable format appropriate for text-mining, I used this technique to identify and quantify the use of martial language in Cluniac texts of a variety of genres (legal texts, hagiography, history, sermons, and poetry) spanning three centuries of authorship. The rate of occurrence of the target roots in each text was noted as a percentage of total word count. These texts vary so greatly in length—from as little as 690 to as many as 47,000 words—that the percentage of target word occurrence (of the total word count) was used for the sake of comparison across texts and time frame. These linguistic data were analyzed to determine the vocabulary early and later Cluniac authors associated with the use of force, violence, warfare, and order to provide insight into the patterns of language usage as an indicator of early and evolving attitudes. (See appendices D and E for the complete list and results.)

Several interesting patterns of usage emerged. The usage of words of the target roots increased across the centuries. This increase was slight but consistent (from 0.94%
to 1.03% to 1.08%) from century-to-century and did not deviate from the overall total percentage of usage (1.00%) by more than 0.08%. The *ius*/*iud* root was the most frequently used over all three centuries (0.25%), even though usage declined from 0.31% in the tenth century to 0.20% in the eleventh century, and 0.19% in the twelfth century. It is also interesting to note that although self-defense is the only justifiable use of violence or force per St. Augustine, the *defen* root is not frequently used (0.02% overall average). But what do all these percentages, averages, and deviations mean really? Breaking down to the tenth of a percentage point the word choices made by these abbots on warfare and violence, or any other topic for that matter, gives us a glimpse into not just what they said about the topic, but how they thought about it and how that internal bias changed in response to the changes in the world around them. Analyzing word choice allows us to get behind the public facing agenda of a text and see the motivations and true concerns of the authors more clearly.

The words we choose to use matter. How people choose to say things, to describe others and their actions is significant. The specific semantics exercised to describe important concepts can tell us things about a speaker (or authors), their state of mind, and baseline values that a simple translation does not transmit. Looking at the specific words chosen to express and discuss key ideas is a way of getting around the curtain between the public speech of prominent individuals and their more personally held opinions. Figures of influence choose their words carefully for the greatest impact on their audience and are influenced in those word choices by the society in which they exist.
Looking for patterns over time in word choice provides evidence for the answer to the question if Cluny had a distinctive culture and mode of thought about important social issues (It did.), including just warfare and use of violent force, and what values that institutional culture was based on. Changes in patterns of language usage are directly tied to changes in mentalities, ideas, and values. Recognizing and understanding the connection between word choice and implicit bias is a vital skill. In this age of instantaneous transmission, the specific benefits—or damage—of how those in positions of power chose to say what they say has been illustrated with graphic clarity. Seeing behind the public face to the motivations behind the words used has never been as important as it has been in our most recent history.
Chapter One: Tenth Century

*It would be more holy and honest that he should recognize the right of armed force, that he should unsheathe the sword against his enemies, that he should restrain the boldness of the violent; it would be better that the bold should be suppressed by force of arms than that the undefended districts should be unjustly oppressed by them.*

Order in the Midst of Chaos

Life in the geographic area we now think of as “France” was, in the tenth century, a fragile thing. The dissolution of the centralized administrative and judicial powers of Charlemagne’s empire resulted in a fragmentation of secular authority and in some regions a near total power vacuum. The remaining secular institutions were unable to act with much effectiveness to temper or restrain the use of force, and the judicial responses which would emerge from this post-collapse period had not yet developed sufficiently to make much effect. Posturing and squabbling between the minor magnates and local power-mongers who did remain was common, banditry was rampant, and the weak—peasants, the poor, and the unarmed, notably clerics and monks—often paid the price. Add to this the constant fear and threat of Viking invaders and the approaching apocalyptic milestone of the turn of the millennium, and we begin to get a picture of the pervasive unrest and violence that have contributed to popular depictions of this era as

---


“the Dark Ages.”

All was not completely dark, however, despite the periodic chaos caused by these disruptive forces. The ecclesiastical and monastic power structures, although shaken, were mostly unbroken. Monasticism, in particular, with its emphasis on order through a “regular” life and avoiding strife and worldly concerns, became an attractive option for many. It was into this world of change and flux, as new norms of power, inheritance, and justice were growing out of the ruins of the Carolingian order, that Cluny was founded by William, Duke of Aquitaine. Cluny, with its strict adherence to the Rule of Benedict and reforming goals, would become a beacon of legalism and stability—almost a symbol of the lost traditions of Carolingian life.73 These connections to past glory not only boosted the authority of its aristocratic donors and their families, it provided the promise of salvation despite their frequently violent efforts to enhance the prestige and influence of their families through expanding their territorial holdings.74 The powerful influence of Cluny’s abbots is evidenced by their extensive political and diplomatic connections; the rapid increase in the population at the mother house; and the growth of a network of affiliated and subordinate houses. Cluny’s influence would continue to grow for more than two and a half centuries after its foundation. Uncovering the attitudes of Cluny’s abbots toward the use of violence is extremely valuable in developing an understanding of how violent force would have been viewed, regulated, and justified throughout Cluny’s vast network of influence through subordinate priories, affiliated houses, and

74 Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of St. Peter*, 38, 44.
allied monastic and aristocratic houses which would come to span the length and breadth of Christendom.

Four texts were chosen to represent tenth-century Cluny and its rise to become an institution of influence. These include the foundation charter recording the agreement between Abbot Berno (c.850-927; abbot of Baume, 886-925; abbot of Cluny, 910-925); a collection of (probable) sermons of Cluny’s second abbot Abbot Odo (b. 878, abbot of Cluny, 925-942), known as the Collationes; Odo’s Vita Sancti Geraldi—firmly establishing the Cluniac archetype of a worthy knight—and John of Salerno’s Vita Odonis, written shortly after Odo’s death with a great deal of first-hand knowledge.75 These were chosen for their variety and accessibility in an effort to include a wide range of literary styles and therefore be more representative of general vocabulary/word choice.76

*Foundation Charter (910 CE)*

William of Aquitaine (875-918) was a wealthy and powerful duke with far-flung holdings, a warrior’s past, and very little family. Nearing the end of his life in 910, he began to worry about what awaited him beyond his earthly existence. Joan Evans paints an idyllic picture of the foundation of Cluny as two old friends helping each other further their personal goals. William of Aquitaine needed to expiate sins of violence, especially
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76 Odo’s Collationes is not available in English translation and is a long text (the second longest at 47,066 words). The word counts were done on the 1614 *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, Latin edition. Unless otherwise stated, sections in translation come from Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound*. 
that “of a murder committed in a fit of passion.” His friend and fellow nobleman turned monk, Berno, had already successfully established abbeys at Gigny and Baume, renowned for their strict observance of the Benedictine Rule, and he was eager for a new challenge. Gigny and Baume were dedicated solely to St. Peter and had immunity from all oversight but that of St. Peter’s earthly representative, the pope. William had land to spare and Berno was the abbot he chose to turn some of it into a monastic house of sufficient piety and persistence to balance out his violent life. Berno chose a spot in a beautiful wooded valley, far from any significant settlements. When William objected that it was his favored hunting grounds, Berno reminded him of what was at stake, and “William, with murder upon his conscience, could only agree.”

The charter records the donation as including:

The town of Cluny, namely, with the court and demesne manor, and the church in honour of St. Mary the mother of God and St. Peter the prince of the apostles, together with all the things pertaining to it, the vills, indeed, the chapels, the serfs of both sexes, the vines, the fields, the meadows, the woods, the waters and their outlets, the mills, the incomes and revenues, what is cultivated and what is not, all in their entirety.

With these resources, “a regular monastery” was established where “the monks shall

---

77 Evans, Monastic Life at Cluny, 3.
78 Evans, Monastic Life, 4.
79 Patrick Geary, ed., Readings in Medieval History (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 281.

Cluniacvm scilicet quæ sita est super fluuium qui Grauna vocatur, cum cortile et manso indominicato, et capella quæ est in honore Sanctæ Dei Genitricis Mariæ, et Sancti Petri Apostolorum principis, cum omnibus rebus ad ipsam villam pertinentibus: villis siquidem, capellis, mancipiis vtriusque sexus, vineis, campis, pratis, sylvis, aquis, aquarumque decursibus, farinariis, exitibus et regressibus, cultum, et inculturn cum omni integritate. M. Marrier and A. Du Chesne, eds., Bibliotheca Cluniacensis (Paris: 1614), cols. 1-4. (https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k10862197rk=21459-2). What exactly is meant by “villis” is unclear. It could refer to the village, the farms with permanent residents, or be a more general reference to “developed land.”
congregate and live according to the rule of St. Benedict.”

This “venerable house of prayer” will direct “to God prayers, beseechings and exhortations” for the souls of William and his wife, King Odo, William’s parents, his sister Ava, all the rest of his relations, his followers, and all of humanity “according to the order in which mention has been made of them.” Cluny’s very powerful immunity from any earthly oversight is detailed by William in very specific terms:

I warn and abjure that no one of the secular princes, no count, no bishop whatever, not the pontiff of the aforesaid Roman see, shall invade the property of these servants of God, or alienate it, or diminish it, or exchange it, or give it as a benefice to any one, or constitute any prelate over them against will.

William, perhaps with Berno whispering in his ear, attempted to anticipate threats to Cluny’s independence and to protect the new abbey from things William had seen happen to other monastic communities. William spends the final third of the charter laying out the punishments to be levied against anyone “whether he be a neighbor or a stranger, no matter what his condition or power, [who] should, through any wild attempt [...] do any act of violence contrary to this deed.” These punishments began with excommunication and damnation. If that was insufficient motivation for malefactors to repent, the

---

80 Geary, Readings in Medieval History, 281.
81 Geary, Readings in Medieval History, 281.
82 Geary, Readings in Medieval History, 282: Neque aliquis Principum securalium, non Comes quisquam, nec Episcopus quilibet, non Pontifex supradicte sedis Romanæ, per Deum, et in Deum omnesque Sanctos eius, et tremendi iudicij diem contestor, deprecor, ne inuadat res ipsorum Dei servorum. Non distrahat, non minuat, non procamiet, non beneficiet aliquam personam, non aliquem Prelatum super eos contra eorum voluntatem constituat. Marrier and Du Chesne, eds., Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, col. 3. (https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/ark6k1086219?rk=21459;2)
83 Geary, Readings in Medieval History, 282; vel ex propinquis vel extraneis, vel ex qualibet conditione, siue potestate, qualicunque calliditate contra hoc Testamentum. Marrier and Du Chesne, eds., Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, col. 3.
consequences escalated as exemplified by some very graphic descriptions of a variety of torments of hell which must be endured until he “come[s] to his senses,” and finished up with a stiff material fine of “a hundred pounds of gold to those whom he had harmed.”

William left nothing to chance as his own salvation was on the line. Two and a half centuries later, in 1166, William’s fears would be fully validated and the abbot, monks, and lay folk of Cluny would be forced to physically protect their independence against a powerful neighbor’s encroachment.

**Odo’s Collationes (c. 925 CE)**

This collection of sermons, strongly influenced by the teachings of St. Augustine, was written shortly before Odo assumed the abbacy of Cluny as Berno’s chosen successor. It was written at Baume at the request of his friend Turpio, bishop of Limoges. Having been ordained to the priesthood by Turpio, essentially involuntarily as a priest’s duties would necessitate time away from his humble and contemplative monastic life, Odo was in great distress. He was sent to Turpio by his abbot to seek solace. Turpio was so impressed by Odo’s “sombre elegance” on the subject of “the evil condition of the church,” he asked that Odo put his words on paper to be shared with others. Despite his noble birth and upbringing, Odo was sensitive to the chaotic

---

84 Geary, *Readings in Medieval History*, 282.
86 Turpio, his brother Aimo, abbot at Tulle, and Odo were all actively involved in reforming monastic houses that had wandered away from strict observance of the Benedictine rule. Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound*, 46.
87 Smith, *The Early History of the Monastery of Cluny*, 33-34.
conditions of his time and the effect this had on layfolk who did not have access to power or plentiful resources. He took these prevailing conditions into account, and his writings reflect his awareness and sympathies for the suffering of the oppressed. Odo expressed the difference between those who were in danger of damnation and those who would be chosen for salvation to be “precisely the difference between men who persecuted others, and men who were the objects of persecution.”

According to Barbara Rosenwein, for Odo, good versus evil was a matter of power, how power was used (or abused), and the power differentials that, in essence, engendered different classes of oppressors and the oppressed. The proper use of power was to engender a just and ordered world, to come as close to an Augustinian utopia as possible in a flawed world of men subject to original sin. Power was to be used to care for the weak and powerless, not to lord over one’s lessers. Odo called the misuse of power he saw rampant in his world “malice” (malitia or malevolentia). This same basic precept regarding the proper use of power, force, or violence is evident in his record (or perhaps, creation) of the life of St. Gerald, written only a few years later.

---

88 Rosenwein, Rhinoceros Bound, 66.
89 The Collationes comprises the longest text of all studied at 47,066 words (Bibliotheca Cluniacensis). Odo’s Latin has been called “difficult” and “challenging” by both Sitwell and Rosenwein. As my goal was to focus in on the usage of specific words, I focused my translation efforts on passages rich in target roots and relied on the experts, especially Rosenwein, for commentary and translations, for the most part. A clean edition and translation would be a worthy, and possibly career-long, project for a devoted Latin scholar to take on.
Odo, Vita Sancti Geraldii (c. 930-931)\textsuperscript{90}  

The *Life of St. Gerald* was written sometime between 930-942 by the second abbot of Cluny, St. Odo, also at the request of Odo’s friend Turpio and his brother Aimo.\textsuperscript{91} It is possibly the earliest account of a layman who is truly a just knight. Odo’s Gerald is a count who literally wields the power of life and death over his people. He rules his domain in a rough and violent world and yet manages to avoid shedding blood. Gerald longs to retreat to the peace and contemplation of a monastic life, but feels the weight of his worldly responsibilities and obligations to his people too heavily to abandon them.\textsuperscript{92} Gerald only enters into conflict to protect the weak—including clergy and monks—and the poor. He *never* uses force for personal gain and severely punishes (through his judicial powers) those who do.\textsuperscript{93} He carefully carries out his duties to protect and judge, and leads his life as closely to his own version of “secular monasticism” as he can. Even after death, he is prepared for burial much as a monk would be.

Gerald has many qualities which make him worthy of praise and emulation. He never fights when diplomacy can be used instead.\textsuperscript{94} When he is forced into an armed conflict, he uses the flat of his sword to avoid killing, even though it may look silly.\textsuperscript{95} He

\textsuperscript{90} Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound*, 57.  
\textsuperscript{91} See note 12 above.  
\textsuperscript{92} “Dragged down to earth, he yearned for this spiritual refreshment, but his household and dependents demanded that he should break into his repose and give himself to the service of others.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 1.6, 98-99.  
\textsuperscript{94} “He therefore exerted himself to repress the insolence of the violent, taking care in the first place to promise peace and most easy reconciliation to his enemies.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 1.8, 99.  
\textsuperscript{95} “…when the unavoidable necessity of fighting lay on him, he commanded his men … to fight with the backs of their swords and their spears reversed.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 1.8, 100.
exercises such a degree of compassion and mercy that his subordinates express concern that he is being taken advantage of.  

96 He is secretly tonsured and strictly chaste.  

97 His humility is unshakeable and he almost frantically avoids praise, even for the miraculous healing properties of his wash water, until he is finally convinced that, in some cases, refusing God’s graces is in itself a form of pridefulness.  

98 Even in death, his monastic modesty asserts itself.  

99 An important key to understanding Odo’s portrayal of Gerald lies with his audience and the purpose he had in speaking to them in the way in which he did. His audience would have included the abbot to whom Odo dedicates his “little book” on Gerald, as well as other monastic and ecclesiastical readers. Hagiographical texts were a popular genre for religious authors. More than just descriptive works elucidating the saintly virtues, great suffering, many challenges, and good works of their subjects, they

---

96 “For his dependents pleaded querulously saying, “Why should a great man suffer violence from persons of low degree who lay waste to his property?,” adding that, when these discovered that he did not wish to take vengeance they devoured more greedily that which was rightfully his.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 1.7, 99.

97 “…he was tonsured in such a way that it remained hidden from men, though known to God.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 135, 2.2; “But Christ, the Son of the Virgin, had ever imbued him with the love of chastity, which he so embraced from his earliest years that he would not allow himself to be diverted from it.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 1.34, 123.

98 “… deigned to honor His servant with the gift of healing. And the manner of healing was such, that although he refused through humility to lay hands on the sick, he nevertheless frequently helped them, although he was absent and not desiring to do so. The sick used to steal the water with which he had washed his hands; and many were cured.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 2.10, 141.

99 “For he feared nothing more than praise.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 2.11, 142; “…a certain nobleman… saying that perhaps he was acting against the will of God, when he neglected a grace given from heaven under the pretext of indiscreet humility… It was better to give those who asked what they need, since perhaps this grace was given to him for their sakes. … At length convinced by reason and by entreaty….” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 2.13, 143.

100 While Gerald’s body is being prepared for burial, Gerald’s hand moves three time to cover his genitals: “…it was being divinely shown that his flesh … was always anxious to preserve the modesty of chastity.” Odo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Gerald*, 3.10, 170.
were prescriptive documents laying out values and directives for those seeking guidance on how best to live. These *vitae*, John France asserts, are part of the internal conversation within specific communities, namely the wider monastic community, and the wider circle of ecclesiastics as a whole. This makes the ideas and exempla found in them likely to be largely unfiltered and illustrative of the opinions of their creators.101

But even more than these religious readers, Odo was directing his work to Gerald’s secular peers. Stuart Airlie sees Gerald’s *vita*, particularly, as being intended for aristocratic laymen. Airlie describes Odo’s purpose as instructive—to provide this armed and powerful audience with a model on the proper use of their might.102 France agrees with the classification of Gerald’s life as a model and directly addresses the Cluniac perspective, noting specifically the large number of wealthy and powerful secular authorities included (mostly by donation) in Cluny’s wider pastoral community.103 To be relatable to this audience, however, meant that Gerald could not be removed entirely from his secular context. To “get” his message, Odo’s intended audience had to be able to see themselves in at least some part of Gerald. In service to this requirement, Airlie makes the point that, “Odo’s concept of Gerald’s sanctity had Gerald’s secularity,


however problematic that might be, at its core.”

In order to achieve this “connection” between his subject and his aristocratic target audience, Odo had to include aspects of Gerald’s life, character, and social context that correlated to their own, tempered in large part by much more saintly qualities.

Not much is known about the historical Gerald of Aurillac. He was born around 855 and lived until around 909. He was certainly of noble birth and may have had Carolingian connections. He inherited extensive lands and properties—with all the incumbent responsibilities for the population, administration, and justice associated with secular lordship. He founded the church and monastery of Aurillac, though the monastery was not a fully functional house until sometime after his death. For the rest of the details of Gerald’s life, we have to depend on Odo to tell us.

Many of Gerald’s copious virtues are lifted straight from church doctrine. His humility, modesty, chastity, and (moderately) ascetic physical denial can be seen in the earliest descriptions of Christian saints. His liberality in providing alms—in the forms of feeding the poor at his own table and always carrying coins he could disperse—was a means of mitigating his privilege and making just use of his wealth. His refusal to take a life, even in battle or as a judicial punishment, is, alongside his extreme chastity, one of

---

104 Airlie, “The Anxiety of Sanctity,” XIII, 374. Airlie addresses objections that the text would not be accessible to lay aristocracy as a result of illiteracy by pointing out, “Rosamond McKitterick’s recent work on the extent of literacy among the Carolingian ruling class suggests that the secular aristocracy was perfectly capable of reading the advice of its clerical counterpart.” Airlie. “The Anxiety of Sanctity,” XIII, 379. Kuefler has his doubts, however. Kuefler, The Making and Unmaking of a Saint, 54.

his most monastic virtues. Still, as Derek Baker puts it, “It is difficult to reconcile Odo’s Gerald with the anarchic, feudal world in which he lived, and, apparently, flourished, and it is clear, even from Odo, that there was much more to Gerald than the piety and sanctity which he set out to record.”

One unescapable aspect of the lives of land-holding nobles in this era was warfare. As stated above, this was a time when violence was often the order of the day. For these landed lords to be successful, they had not only to be able, but also be willing, to engage in warfare—and an unsuccessful lord would not be an attractive model. Gerald was successful in growing and holding his lands, which posed some problems for Odo’s case for sainthood, benefitting directly from his abilities as a warrior. Odo’s challenge, then, was to reconcile this conflict between armed aggression and defense of the powerless. To do so, Odo had to provide proof that the cause was just and that there was no higher authority to whom he could appeal for redress or authorization—hence the pervasive chaos and lack of central authority described repeatedly, as well as Gerald’s over-the-top charity and mercy. Odo strictly defines Gerald’s motivations and goals when he had no other choice—having exhausted all diplomatic avenues—but to use force.

Gerald, the knight, always acted as if God were his liege lord. As knight and

---

109 Odo of Cluny, The Life of St. Gerald, 91, Preface; 100, 1.8; 112, 1.8; 116, 1.24; 121-129, 1.32-33, 34-40; 134, 2.2.
vassal, he was obligated to do God’s work and defend God’s holdings and properties. These holdings included church and monastic lands, rights, and personnel, as well as his own God-given demesnes (and those of his aristocratic superior, the king).\footnote{Kuefler points out that which king, the Carolingian contender or the Capetian challenger is, possibly quite carefully, never specified; Kuefler, \textit{The Making and Unmaking of a Saint}, 53.} His motivation for the use of force was always to defend the defenseless, weak, and poor, \textit{never} for personal interests or gain. Those who did resort easily to violence for their own profit were the negative examples, the pariahs, against whom Gerald, as a paragon, was contrasted. Add to this Odo’s breathtakingly radical (and visually ridiculous) solution for a knightly saint in battle against other Christians, using only the flat of his sword and blunted spears.\footnote{Airlie, “Anxiety of Sanctity,” 385.} Odo openly acknowledges the ridiculousness of this tactic, so that he can explicitly counter the objections of the warriors he was speaking to. Gerald is, of course, victorious, and righteous victory is never ridiculous. Ultimately, Gerald’s success itself was held up as the principal indication of God’s favor, which, in the end, is the source of all things and the only thing that truly mattered. Odo’s creation of Gerald was an early and explicit attempt by a significant Cluniac figure to provide practical guidance on combining a lord’s responsibility to both God and his people. It was ideal for this study.

\textit{John of Salerno, Vita sanctissimi Patris Odonis (878-942 CE)}

The \textit{vita} of Abbot Odo provides much information on early Cluniac attitudes
toward lordship, knighthood, the use of force, and concerns related to the common laity in this period of Cluny’s growing influence. According to Gerard Sitwell, no complete manuscript copies of John of Salerno’s vita of Saint Odo have survived. His translation into English (published in 1958) is based upon Migne’s edition in the Patrologia Latina (volume 133) with Maurier’s Bibliotheca Cluniacensis consulted for clarity. Sitwell notes another vita attributed to the monk Nalgodus, as well as two anonymous versions, which do exist in manuscript form. All of these are credited as being based on John of Salerno’s vita and contain substantially the same information.¹¹²

John of Salerno’s Life of St. Odo was written shortly after Odo’s death in 942. John knew Odo personally and fairly well, having accompanied him on several journeys between Cluny and Rome in the years immediately preceding the abbot’s death. The work has a very personal tone and is centered mostly on Odo’s last few years, as that is the period of his life of which John had direct knowledge. Many of John’s stories of Odo are placed in the abbot’s own mouth and framed as conversations he and John shared, much like student and master dialogues. We are told of Odo’s spiritual experiences with various saints (from a young age), his wisdom and good nature, his diplomatic talents and missions, and his frustrations with his fellow monks, who often failed to live up to his high standards of Benedictine observance. John tells us that Odo was born noble and raised in the household of William, the Duke of Aquitaine (the same William that would found Cluny by donation in 910 CE). Not originally intended to pursue an ecclesiastical

life by his parents—despite being dedicated to Saint Martin as an infant—he was trained as a young nobleman in martial matters and participated in appropriately noble leisure activities, specifically hunting, much the same upbringing that Saint Gerald would have had. However, his destiny, John tells us, had been determined as an infant when he was consecrated to Saint Martin. Odo was tonsured at Saint Martin’s in Tours when he was eighteen. Over the next twelve years, he was educated in Tours and Paris before arriving at the monastery of Baume, under Abbot Berno, and was quickly appointed the master of the monastery school. He lived at Baume for fifteen years before following Berno as the second abbot at Cluny. He worked hard and devoted most of the order’s resources to enlarging the abbey and building a new church, always turning to God (successfully) to provide when the coffers ran low.

According to John, Odo, as would be expected of such a holy man, fulfilled the requirements of a “good death.” Odo was in Rome when he felt his death approaching and made all speed for Tours to celebrate his beloved St. Martin’s feast day (November 11) one last time. Arriving in time to participate in the celebrations, he managed to convey blessings upon the assembled brothers, before he was “freed from the corruptible flesh, [and] departed freely to the skies.”\(^{113}\)

Odo’s abbacy ended in 942 CE, approximately four and a half decades prior to the declaration of the first peace council (989 CE). It is fairly clear that the Church was already beginning, however, to seek to mitigate social violence by offering pious

---

\(^{113}\)John of Salerno, *Being the Life of St. Odo*, 3.12, 86.
exemplars of, and acceptable justifications for, the use of force.\textsuperscript{114} While Odo’s description of St. Gerald is one path to combining piety and conflict, monasticism under Benedict’s rule was another. Odo saw Benedictine monks as being members of a Christian militia who were tasked with fighting for the supremacy and expansion of not only orthodox Christianity, but proper, regulated monasticism as well.\textsuperscript{115} This militia \textit{christi} (army of Christ), per Odo, was “composed of the chosen few (\textit{hominis electi}), that is, monks who had “liberated themselves from the slavery of the worldly way of life.”\textsuperscript{116} Many monks had begun their lives as aristocrats and had trained as warriors prior to taking vows—given access to arms, they were not always willing to acquiesce when challenged. This was a danger faced by Odo first-hand when he sought to reform the abbey of Fleury and impose a stricter observance of Benedict’s Rule. Although the brothers of Fleury were willing to physically contest changes to their way of life, Odo’s reputation and force of personality disarmed the recalcitrant monks. With the aid of the spirit of Benedict himself in support, Odo was able to not only convince the monks of Fleury but “many from the surrounding regions” to join his Benedictine-regulated holy militia.\textsuperscript{117} Odo was armored by piety and virtue, and armed with the will of God and St. Benedict, as well as a the power of oratory, but he was more than willing to take the field of battle and fight those who opposed him. The imagery invoked may be symbolic, but it

\textsuperscript{115} Smith, \textit{Medieval Monastic Culture}, 123.
\textsuperscript{117} Smith, \textit{Medieval Monastic Culture}, 43; John of Salerno, \textit{Being the Life of St. Odo}, 3.8-3.10, 79-82.
made perfect sense to a tenth-century warrior.

**Data Analysis**

There is not a unanimous opinion on William’s purpose in his donation to found Cluny—he may have been motivated by pure piety, familial duty, or specifically to expiate violent sin, or some combination. The foundation charter, though very short at only 1,019 words total, contains eight of twenty-four target roots. (See Appendix A.) Words from the target list make up .18% of the content of the foundation charter. The two target roots with the highest incidence are *potesta* (power, frequently in reference to political power) with six appearances (0.06%), and *ius/iud* (justice and judgment) occurring four times (0.04%). The remaining six target roots which show up in this charter are: *defen* (defend or defense), *ordin* (order, organized), and *temer* (rash, unrestrained) with two occurrences each for 0.02%; and *invas* (invade, invasive), *rap* (rapacity, rape, greed), and *vis/vim/vi/vires* (force, violence, might) which both appear once. These results would support the interpretation of William’s mindset regarding his generous donation as being focused on reconciling his actions as a man of violence and political leader with concerns regarding his eventual judgement before St. Peter. William, unlike Odo’s depiction of St. Gerald, did not limit himself to the flat of his sword and was even rumored to have committed murder out of anger.118 While his generosity toward the church was expected of the wealthy and powerful, the linguistic evidence—

---

118 Evans, *Monastic Life at Cluny*, 3.
nearly double the overall average of target root usage at 1.86%—reveals he had more on his mind at the time than simply the fulfillment of pious duty.\footnote{The average of target root usage across all studied texts is 1.00\%.}

The longest of all the texts analyzed, the third book of Odo’s \textit{Collationes} (his collected sermons) contains twenty-two of twenty-four target roots. The target root \textit{ius*}/\textit{iud*} (justice, judgement) occurs a staggering two hundred and twenty-six times in Odo’s \textit{Collationes}. This is nearly ten times the occurrences of the next most frequently utilized root, \textit{rap*}, at twenty-seven occurrences.\footnote{The target root \textit{rap*} shows up in various forms: the verb \textit{rapio}, \textit{rapere}; \textit{rapacitatem} (rapacity); and \textit{raptiores} (robbers), for example, making uncontrolled greed and seizure of resources the most prevalent form of the oppression as discussed at length by Rosenwein in \textit{Rhinoceros Bound}.} \textit{Ius*}/\textit{iud*} has the highest percentage of usage (0.48\%) of all twenty-three target roots across all twelve texts considered (the overall average being 0.25\%). “\textit{Ius}” is a complex concept with a sense which is overall less legalistic and more personal than our modern, more institutional notion of justice. It invokes a sense of “rightness” and control, order, the God-given powers of secular rulers (including ecclesiastics such as abbots and bishops with secular responsibilities to the layfolk on their lands), and adherence to both secular and ecclesiastical tradition.\footnote{\textit{Lewis and Short Latin—English Dictionary}, https://www.latinitium.com/latin—dictionaries?t=lsn25394,lsn25395,\textit{jus}: That which is binding or obligatory; that which is binding by its nature; right, justice, duty; legal right, power, authority, permission.} All of these ideas would have been very appealing to Odo as a sensitive and educated man seeking to bring the world into a state of grace where the true peace of God and heavenly order allowed all men to achieve salvation. If the general category of peace and order is applied to the target list, the occurrence rate jumps up to 0.54\% (258 occurrences).\footnote{\textit{ius*}, \textit{iud*}; \textit{mili*}, \textit{mile*}; \textit{ordin*}; \textit{pax}, \textit{paci*}}
Applying this same sorting of general categorization, themes of power occur fifty times (0.10%).

Roots associated with violence, force, and chaos or lack of control occur 130 times (0.27%). The data fully support Rosenwein’s characterization of this text as being largely concerned with power and oppression. It also indicates an awareness of the many threats to order as indicated by a fairly even spread across nine target roots and the uniformity of power (two targets with equal occurrences).

Another interesting linguistic finding in this text is its use of wolves as symbols of uncontrolled violence or appetite. This image of the rapacious wolf appearing at dusk—which is taken from scripture—will be used in later texts as a direct indictment of the violence of Islamic warriors, unbounded by the leash of Christianity. While this image would be further developed by later Cluniac hagiographer abbots, Odo describes his wolves of chaos (and oppression) specifically as *lupos vespertinos*. Operating from the viewpoint of word choice revealing deeper meaning, the use of *vespertinus*, which has a secondary meaning as “of or belonging to the west, western,” is very interesting. While lupine imagery is later used in Cluniac writings to reference a threat of Eastern origin, Odo is here characterizing the threat in a way which could be read as being

---

123 *potens*, *potestas*
124 *bellus*, *furo*, *impetus*, *intempet*, *pell*; *rapi*; *saevus*; *temerus*; *violus*; *visus*, *vimus*, *viros*
126 *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, col. 199; “Hos nimimum propter impudentem rapacitatem lupos vespertinos propheta appellat.” These the prophet rightly called evening (or western) wolves on account of their shameless avarice.” Translation mine.
127 Specifically in the parable of “Fulcher and the Wolves” in the *Life of Maiolus*, which is one of the eleventh-century texts analyzed for this project; Bruce, *Cluny and the Muslims of La Garde-Freinet*, 55-57.
specifically of Western origin. The threat is from “armed knights on the inside.” Not from a created other, but from those who share Odo’s own noble background, heritage, and religion.

In Odo’s vita of St. Gerald of Aurillac, justice and judgement are, again, the most frequently occurring targeted concepts, along with eighteen other target roots. It is not surprising to see a high rate of occurrence of milit*, mile* and poten*, potesta* as Gerald is explicitly both count and warrior. What is, perhaps, more unexpected is the scarcity of specific references to malice (malit*) considering that this text was written only five or six years after Odo set down his ideas of oppression and abuse of power in the Collationes. In setting up Gerald as the opposite of his powerful oppressors, Odo appears to have avoided tying his story too closely in the minds of his readers (or more likely those who had it read to them) with malice, as he defined it. “Malice” carries with it the connotation of evil and ill will. While Odo eschewed the use of “malice” (maleficia) in the specific, he does explicitly deny Gerald’s subjection to “the domination of vices.” Submission to the pleasures of vice is an inherently human failing, although subject to absolution with appropriate remediation and penance, still entirely inappropriate for the saintly Gerald. He does provide numerous examples of the

---

129 The full title of the text is, De vita Sancto Geraldi Auriliacensis Comitis, and see also 1.32: “Sed... Comitis nuper usurpato...” “But as he had recently taken up the title of Count...” and 1.33, 1.35, and 1.36, where Gerald leads and participates in military campaigns. Latin passages from Bibliotheca Cluniacensis. English translations from Sitwell.

130 The root malit* only appears six times (0.03%) in the text.

131 1.11: “Valde enim indigne ducebat, vt qui multis prelatus erat et dominus, vittorum dominationi fieret servus.” “Very unworthy he thought it that he was the lord of many people should become a slave to the domination of vices.” Latin from Bibliotheca Cluniacensis. English translation from Sitwell.
malicious acts of several of Gerald’s enemies. Gerald’s position as a man of power, specifically a *comes* or count, is vital to his value to Odo as a positive role model. By tying together these two themes, Gerald’s rejection of vice and his power as secular and judicial lord, along with Gerald’s obsessively pious devotion, we see the highest and most noble embodiment of “just force.” Far from oppressing his people, and indeed even his enemies and those subject to justice for wrongdoing, Gerald seeks to protect them and give them every opportunity to improve. He uses only such force as is necessary to protect his lands and people, setting aside his pride to use unconventional methods to avoid bloodshed—sometimes to the chagrin of his followers—and yet always leading his forces victoriously. Odo’s most clear and accessible expression of the highest, and therefore most right, most just, use of the power of force and violence, is found in his characterization of St. Gerald. This text is the Cluniac manual on how to be a man of power without being an oppressor of the weak.

132 For example, 1.7: “*...illius iuris esset mordacius devasterent...*” “...they (enemies) devoured the more greedily that which was rightfully his.” 1.8: “*Cum vero inexplebilis malitia quorumdam pacificum hominem irriteret...*” “When insatiable malice poured scorn on peaceful men...” 1.37: “*Godefredus ille Torennensis Comes, quandam vice, collecto militum agmine, festinebat, ut hunc virum. Dei bellando lacessiret, aut quæerant iuris illius deuasteret.*” “Godfried, the count of Turenne, on one occasion collected a force of troops and hastened to provoke the man of God to war, and to lay waste to the districts under him.” 1.40: “*Nonumquam inuitus cogebatur potentiæ vires exerere, et prauorum ceruicem vi bellica curuare....*” “Sometimes he was compelled unwillingly to show his strength and to bow the neck of the wicked by force of arms...” Latin passages from *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*. English translations from Sitwell.

133 1.8: “*Igitur ad insolentiam violentorum reprimandam se iam exercebat, id in primis obseruans, vt hostibus pacem, facillimanque reconciliationem promitteret.*” “He therefore exerted himself to repress the insolence of the violent, taking care in the first place to promise peace and most easy reconciliation to his enemies.” 1.20: “*Illas autem personae, quæ non per consuetam malitiam, sed qualibet, malum aliquod perpetrasse dirimine, indemnes dimittebat. Numquam tamen audium est vt se præsente quilibet morte punitus sit, aut truncatus membris.*” “But those who had done wrong not through seasoned malice, but inadvertently, he set free uncondemned. It was unheard of, nevertheless, that anyone was punished by death or maiming in his presence.”
In John of Salerno’s *vita* of Odo, nineteen of the twenty-four target roots are used, with *ordin* being the root with the highest rate of occurrence (twenty-two times for 0.12%; higher than the tenth-century average, 0.05%, and the overall average of 0.08%). This is reasonable considering much of Odo’s time as abbot was spent building and consolidating Cluny’s identity and influence. The abbey was enhanced with new buildings to support the physical and spiritual needs of the community. This, of course, required resources. Building Cluny’s reputation and influence gave the community greater access to these resources. Odo’s lifelong connections to the aristocracy and his reputation as a level-headed, just peacemaker, was an important factor in increasing the perception of Cluny’s exceptionality. A strong indicator of this respect were the requests for Odo’s personal oversight and assistance in the reformation of no less than fifteen monasteries across modern France and northern Italy in the last six years of his abbacy (936-942 CE).\(^{134}\) Expanding from a community of thirteen living in the repurposed buildings of a hunting lodge to being the favored instrument of order and salvation as (roughly) defined by St. Benedict in slightly more than three decades was a surprisingly swift change of status. While the “Cluniac style” of monasticism with its strong emphasis on liturgical commemoration was still not considered an “order” as we define the term today, Odo definitely set the path for the formation of a network of hundreds of monastic houses at the height of Cluny’s influence—including the addition of female monastic communities in the twelfth century—which looked to Cluny for some degree of

\(^{134}\) Sitwell, *St. Odo of Cluny*, xiii.
leadership, regulation, and inspiration.\textsuperscript{135}

The next most frequently appearing target root in John’s \textit{vita} of Odo is \textit{milit*}, \textit{mile*}. These references to matters martial occur slightly more frequently (ten occurrences for 0.05\%) than concepts referring to justice (used nine times for 0.05\%). Half of these are in reference to \textit{miles Christi} (warrior of Christ), and four others in close proximity to another target root.\textsuperscript{136} The most interesting of these combinations referring to Odo are:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Interea dum ego observarem egressum, vidi illum venientem post pusillum a longe, et quasi precinctus \textit{miles ad bellum}, incedebat stipatus cuneis pauperum.\textsuperscript{137}
\item Enimvero nondum tyrunculi, bravium usurpant victoris, atque indocta manu \textit{arma} fortissimi \textit{militis} arripere non verentur, negligentes ea quae dicit Scriptura, Qui regulariter non subest, regularibus præesse non debet.\textsuperscript{138}
\end{enumerate}

The image these passages bring to mind is more appropriate to Odo’s St. Gerald, the count, than to St. Odo, the monk dedicated to a saint (though a saint with a martial background, St. Martin) as an infant. The description is more suited to a popular leader being surrounded by a well-trained and regulated fighting force of formidable warriors, rather than a scholarly, gentle abbot caring for the poor or swallowing his own pride to delay discipline in order to preserve the sanctity of Sunday.

\textsuperscript{135} Rosenwein, \textit{Rhinocerous Bound}, xiv, xv.
\textsuperscript{136} For \textit{miles Christi}, see 1.16, 18-19; 1.18, 21; 1.26, 28; 1.29, 31; 1.36, 36-39.
\textsuperscript{137} \textit{Bibliotheca Cluniacensis}, col. 35; “Meanwhile I was watching for him to come out of the city, and I saw him coming a little way off surrounded and thronged like a soldier going to war by crowds of poor men...” John of Salerno, \textit{Being the Life of St. Odo}, 2.7, 50.
\textsuperscript{138} \textit{Bibliotheca Cluniacensis}, col. 40; “Not yet recruits they snatch up the victor’s crown, and with untrained hand are not ashamed to take up the arms of the strongest soldier, ignoring what the Scripture says: He who does not submit to rule ought not to take the lead among rulers.” John of Salerno, \textit{Being the Life of St. Odo}, 2.23, 66-67. The reference is to a “contumacious monk” who broke the abbey’s silent hours to correct a fellow monk and arrogantly refused correction by Odo in the chapter. He was struck dumb and died three days later.
Conclusions

The concept of the Christian soldier is a long-established trope, and here it is applied explicitly to a monastic figure, one otherwise seen as a peacemaker and intellectual. The *militia Christi* was not solely metaphorical, and by the early-twelfth century would begin to take on a more literal connotation in reference to participants in the crusading movement, and eventually would encompass monastic military orders like the Knights Templar. The obligations of a Christian soldier or warrior, in the monastic sphere, would be very familiar to Odo and the monks under his leadership. In the words of Kathleen Smith, “If the significance of the martial imagery in the *Rule* was lost on new monks, it would have been made clear to them through conferences with *seniores*, the reading of commentaries on the *Rule* during chapter, and sermons honoring Benedict, which often featured exegesis of his *Rule*.”

One possible explanation for the prevalence of this language in these texts is a turn from the seeking of order in the midst of chaos—Berno’s desire to found an abbey dedicated to strict observance of the *Rule* in such an isolated location—to other priorities. Having firmly established the community, guaranteeing its safety with plentiful holdings and income, Odo turned his eyes outward to further the realization of God’s peace. His first circle of influence beyond the abbey walls would have been among the armed and powerful aristocracy of his birth. Or, perhaps, this is just the voice of the author, John of Salerno, who had only known Odo personally for a relatively short time at the end of his

---

life, overlaying his own filter as a papal legate on the life of Cluny’s second abbot.

The language of these tenth-century texts reflects the concerns of a young, but quickly developing, monastic community. It also provides us with connections between the concerns of the monastic community and those of the wider world outside the walls of the abbey. While seeking to retreat from direct and daily contact with the chaos of secular society, the brothers at Cluny were still a part of that society. They were aware of the suffering of the weak at the hands of those with power, physical or political. They sought to understand the motivations of oppression and to provide role models for a better way of living for the powerful. Having found some of these answers, the focus turned to disseminating them through the reform of other monastic communities and by strengthening their reputation and influence over secular rulers.

An overwhelming concern as evidenced by the data is with justice with 274 (0.31%) uses of the ius/iudic target root.\(^{140}\) Justice in the Christian, largely European world of the tenth century was most often a matter of violent response or material reparation, often adjudicated or overseen by clerics. Neither of these responses fit within the Benedictine monastic ideal Berno and his early successors envisioned for the community at Cluny. And yet the data shows the significant presence of justice-related themes in surviving texts (three of which are literary and not legalistic in intent).\(^{141}\) These texts make it clear Cluny has established a relationship with society’s fighters. Concerns

\(^{140}\) The next most prevalent target root is host*, with fifty-nine occurrences (0.07%).

\(^{141}\) The highest is in Odo’s sermons, the Collationes, with 226 uses for 0.48%. This is followed by four uses in the foundation charter (0.39%) and thirty-five occurrences in the Vita Geraldi (0.17%).
with power (*potesta*) and order (*ordin*) also stand out in the data, which is not surprising as the just use of power and the establishment of order are mandatory for mankind to achieve the universal divine justice necessary to the kingdom of God.¹⁴² The words of the texts tell the story, the language reflects the underlying concerns, providing us, as readers out of context with the author’s inner dialog, the “color” and emotion to make the story more complete. The linguistic data from the later texts will reveal how that inner dialog shifts in tone in concert with social change.

¹⁴² See Appendix E for complete data.
Chapter Two: Early Eleventh Century

*When that man heard and saw that this problem, this great disaster, was daily growing worse, he began to think not only about his own interests, but also about those of others.*

**On the Cusp of the Millennium**

By the year 1000, the abbot of Cluny was the fully empowered lord of his earthly demesne. By 1010—the first centenary of the abbey’s foundation—the Cluniac network had grown from seventeen houses (c. 935) to several hundred affiliated houses. Despite the very secular need to rule and administer a great and constantly increasing worldly estate, however, the abbots were monks first. Dominique Iogna-Prat characterizes “the distinguishing feature of their [Cluniac] lordship” as “the protection of their liberties by primarily “spiritual means,” such as defending church enclosures during the movements of the Peace and the Truce of God, or later creating the Cluniac “sacred ban” during the papacy of the Cluniac Pope, Urban II (1088-1099).” These attempts to regulate social violence using novel legislative/procedural/quasi-institutional means tell us three things very clearly. Violence was widespread and costly enough to be a concern. The bishops

---


144 Clark, *The Benedictines*, 41.

145 Dominique Iogna-Prat, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam (1000-1150)* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 28. The Pax dei (Peace of God), limiting the acceptable victims or targets of violence, was first documented as such in 989 CE, and Treuga dei (Truce of God), limiting the days when violence in all forms was permissible, in 1027 CE. Iogna-Prat gives no further detail what this “sacred ban” entailed, but it likely refers to a local “peace zone” intended to protect Cluny’s holdings and dependents from violence. The ultimate “spiritual means” of defense would have been excommunication, which could be exacted against an individual, or a recalcitrant noble and all his fighters, or even broadened to include all of his dependents throughout his holdings.
who initially drove these movements, and the abbots (including Cluniac abbots) who
joined with them slightly later, felt it was within their power to affect the violent behavior
of laymen.\textsuperscript{146} The movement was not as successful as they hoped at first or they would
not have had to come up with another way to curb behaviors thirty years after their first
attempt.

The Frankish king at the turn of the millennium was Robert II (r. 996-1031), the
second of the Capetian dynasty, who would not have a legitimate heir until 1007.
Dissatisfied with his reduced geophysical and political influence (in comparison to the
vast holdings and strong hierarchy of the Carolingian dynasty), his reign was marked by
extensive warfare and personal conflict. This volatility was fueled by his desire to add the
Duchy of Burgundy to his holdings (finally achieved in 1016), his marital woes with his
three wives and rebellious sons, and conflicts with the papacy over the practice of simony
(trading church offices for profit) and the legitimacy of his three marriages.\textsuperscript{147} Robert II
would himself become subject to a Peace Oath in 1023 at Beauvais.\textsuperscript{148} The existence of
this oath is evidence both of Robert’s otherwise unrestrained violence and his recognition
and reliance upon the support of the church in his endeavors. A year later, he would
increase his investment in the \textit{Pax dei} by swearing an oath of “universal peace” with the
Holy Roman Emperor, Henry II.\textsuperscript{149} Attracting of the support of the church and saints

\textsuperscript{146} Head and Landes, eds., \textit{The Peace of God}, 92-93.
\textsuperscript{147} Jim Bradbury, \textit{The Capetians: Kings of France 987-1328} (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2007),
\textsuperscript{148} Head and Landes, eds., \textit{The Peace of God}, 262-263, 332.
\textsuperscript{149} Head and Landes, eds., \textit{The Peace of God}, 6.
(obtained by swearing such an oath upon saintly relics) and decreasing the threat of such a powerful potential combatant made the limitation of his own aggression worthwhile. The concern for the prevalence of social violence as a catalyst for social change is clear in the attempts made to rein it in.

By the year 1000, the abbey at Cluny was no longer a small, isolated community living in simple wooden structures in the wilderness. Abbot Maiolus was greatly respected and in demand as an advisor and mediator to popes and princes. He made many trips to centers of secular and ecclesiastical power, each one enhancing Cluny’s reputation and influence. Donations and requests to reform monasteries which had grown lax in their practices extended Cluny’s authority, connections, and resources. The turn of the millennium came and went without the world ending as many had expected, and the pursuit of salvation became a much more open-ended quest. Cluny was quickly developing a peerless reputation as the experts in how to achieve salvation. By the end of the eleventh century, 1095 to be precise, salvation and warfare will be inextricably bound together by the emergence of the crusade movement, something only barely hinted at in Odo’s creation of Gerald as a holy warrior. This was the environment in which the various hagiographical works on the life of Cluny’s third abbot, Maiolus (954-994) were composed. With all these changes in circumstances, both for the abbey and greater Christian Europe, it would not be surprising if there were some change in the focus of Cluniac authors, which we would expect to see reflected in their use of language. And, in fact, the data supports this hypothesis with an increase in the usage of target roots from
each century’s texts to the next.

_Vitae Sancti Maioli: Eleventh-century Lives of a Tenth-century Abbot_

The earliest life of Maiolus, credited to the Cluniac monk Syrus, was begun shortly after the abbot’s death and likely completed not long after 995 (Maiolus died at Souvigny in May 994.)\(^{150}\) Dominique Iogna-Prat dates the composition of Syrus’ _vita_ after the death of Holy Roman Empress Adelaide in December 999, based on references to her as a saint. Iogna-Prat goes into great detail about the differences among the three versions (based upon six manuscripts) of this text, which are substantially the same but contain unique prefaces and the placement/inclusion of verse sections.\(^{151}\)

Syrus wrote his _Life of Maiolus_ in rebuttal to the city of Pavia’s claim on Maiolus. This claim, and the genesis of a local cult of Saint Maiolus, was in large part a result of his close relationship with Emperor Otto I and his wife, the aforementioned Adelaide, and through them, a number of connections to their capital city.\(^{152}\) Described as well documented and carefully written by Bernard De Vregille, the text was enhanced after Syrus’ death by a known Cluniac scribe, Aldebald. Aldebald added in bits of other hagiographical works and catchy prologues, and attributed the heroic good deeds and


\(^{151}\) Iogna-Prat, _Agni immaculati_, 11, 71. Five _vitae_, a book of miracles, and a separate addendum have been recognized by the Bollandists. The three versions of the Syrus text are (_Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina_) BHL 5177 (editio prior, ed. Mabillion, 1685), BHL 5178 (editio altera, ed. Waitz, 1841), and BHL 5179 (editio tertia, _Acta Sanctorum: Maii_, v. 3, 1680).

\(^{152}\) Bruce, “An Abbot Between Two Cultures,” 427n; Bruce, “Cult of Maiolus,” 181-182.
miracles of these other holy men to Maiolus, turning his version of the Life of Maiolus into an exciting and sensational (even by monastic standards) superhero tale.\textsuperscript{153} This “new and improved” Vita Maioli was finished in 1000-1010.\textsuperscript{154}

Abbot Odilo (r. 994-1049), successor to the much beloved and respected Maiolus, had been carefully and formally elected in the chapter as coadjutor three years before Maiolus’ death.\textsuperscript{155} Odilo composed his Vita Beati Maioli Abbatis at the height of his power and influence in approximately 1032/33, about forty years after Maiolus’ death.\textsuperscript{156} The preface tells us he was sleepless one night, worrying about the effects of a major famine. After praying to Maiolus for consolation, the spirit of his friend and former abbot came in answer to his prayers. He was encouraged to “fill [his] soul with his (Maiolus”) praises” and he would quickly find comfort.\textsuperscript{157} This short life of Maiolus—intended to be read as part of the commemoration of his feast day—is not highly biographical or historiographical and includes only a sketch of the historical Maiolus.\textsuperscript{158} It is “notable for its more flowing and literary style” than many other monastic works, which would likely have made it a favorite to hear read along with the evening meal.\textsuperscript{159} It was intended to serve as a monastic mirror—written to be read (or heard) and emulated by Cluniac

\textsuperscript{153} De Vregille, “Aldeald,” 93-94.
\textsuperscript{154} Bruce, “An Abbot Between Two Cultures” 427n; The manuscript is identified as BHL 5179, though Bruce does not mention Aldebald”s enhancements. De Vregille, “Aldeald,” 93n; Bruce, “An Abbot Between Two Cultures,” 432.
\textsuperscript{155} Evans, Monastic Life, 17 and note.
\textsuperscript{156} Odilo, “The Life of St. Maiol,” 250. Evans, Monastic Life, 105. Nalgonus based his eleventh-century “digest” version, the Vita brevior, on this version. Iogna-Prat, Agni immaculati, 64.
\textsuperscript{157} Odilo, “The Life of St. Maiol,” 251.
\textsuperscript{158} Evans, Monastic Life, 105.
\textsuperscript{159} Evans, Monastic Life, 105.
brothers and noble donors.\textsuperscript{160}

Odilo was a zealous reformer of Benedictine monasteries which he felt had lapsed in their observance of the Rule. Unlike his predecessors, however, he was much more likely to make these reformed institutions direct dependencies of Cluny. The concept of Cluny as the founding monastery of a distinct order of Benedictine monasticism began to form under Odilo’s leadership, replacing the earlier house-by-house autonomy. As Joan Evans puts it, this deeper hierarchical organization was

[a] reflection of a time when … the whole social fabric was gradually organized on a larger scale: when kingdoms were being built up out of duchies, when great estates were being brought together out of lesser holdings, when the foundations of feudal integration were being laid.\textsuperscript{161}

Abbot Odilo worked, seemingly tirelessly, to bolster Cluny’s growing presence and political influence across the European continent. He became a frequent advisor to the papacy and participant in papal and episcopal councils. Bishops with Cluniac roots became common in some of the most influential sees in the early eleventh century. By the end of the century, Cluny would have strong representation among the cardinals of the Roman curia and a Cluniac pope, Urban II.\textsuperscript{162} Cluny under Abbot Odilo was so involved in the political fabric, including the disagreements which often led to armed conflict, and

\textsuperscript{160}Odilo, “The Life of St. Maiol,” 250.
\textsuperscript{161}Evans, \textit{Monastic Life}, 18.
\textsuperscript{162}Clark, \textit{The Benedictines}, 51.
so accustomed to the use of martial language, the bishop Adalbero of Laon felt justified in his satirical depiction of the monks of Cluny as knights, led to battle by their lord, Abbot Odilo.\textsuperscript{163}

Odilo begins his \textit{Vita Maioli} with the lineage and foundation of the monastic community of Cluny—both spiritually, through Benedict’s Rule, and physically, through William of Aquitaine’s donation. He continues with a brief description of Maiolus’” illustrious stock” and “noble parents,” and then spends some time describing his education in both sacred and secular literature and philosophy, and music.\textsuperscript{164} The theme of Maiolus” nobility is revisited, and further emphasized, later in the work.\textsuperscript{165} It was important that he be seen as a both aristocrat and monk, understanding the needs and challenges of both groups. We are told Maiolus spent his early career as a member of the secular clergy, rising to archdeacon of Besançon before being convinced to retreat from secular life and join the brothers at Cluny. He was elected co-abbot with Aymard, who was quite frail and blind, despite his considerable resistance to taking up such an honored position—as appropriate for a future saint—in his sixth year as a monk. That is the last biographical information Odilo provides until he tells us of Maiolus” death at Souvigny in 994. In between, we are told of his great virtues, holiness, and healing miracles at some length.

Odilo’s \textit{vita} does provide us with a detailed, eleventh-century exemplar of a

\textsuperscript{163} Smith, \textit{Medieval Monastic Culture}, 123.
\textsuperscript{165} Odilo of Cluny, \textit{The Life of St. Maiol, Bibliotheca Cluniacensis}, col. 256.
worthy lord and knight using his might in service to his people in its closing chapters. Odilo closes with a last bit of biographical information and the parable of “The Knight in Sheepskin.” He gives an account of Maiolus’ capture and captivity by Saracens returning from Rome in 971/2, his ransom by his monastery, and the subsequent expulsion/defeat of the Saracens. He follows this with a thickly symbolic parable of a knight who frees his people from the ravages of a pack of wolves by putting sheepskin over his armor to trick them. Of particular interest are the depictions of the hero, Fulcher (said to be the father of Maiolus) and his adversaries, a pack of savage wolves, and especially the pack leader, the largest and most fierce of them all. Even in this short excerpt, we are given a fairly detailed description of a worthy knight and lord and his contemptible opposite.

Fulcher has many traits in common with Odo’s tenth-century worthy warrior, Gerald of Aurillac. He looks to God for guidance (implying piety), is nobly born, wealthy, and a strong leader. Notably different, however, is his propensity for violence. His antagonist, the lead wolf, is literally a “beast” (and the symbolic stand-in for a non-Christian). Fulcher slaughters him, dismembering and disemboweling him before stringing him up as a trophy display. It is hard to picture Gerald, even at his most exercised, getting his hands that bloody. While Gerald must obviously have been a proficient warrior, this side of him was minimized by Odo. Odilo, writing a hundred years later, describes Fulcher as a “most excellent warrior,” who, fully armored, faces his

---

opponent—the vicious leader of the wolf pack—in single combat before capturing and finishing him off in a most graphic manner. The will of God and selfless intent win the day.\footnote{168}

The very end of the eleventh century, only about sixty years after Abbot Odilo composed the above sketch, saw a Cluniac pope, Urban II, issue a call for crusade by pious warriors to gain Christian control of the Holy Land. Urban II essentially made the undertaking of a crusade by a Christian knight the equivalent to a pilgrimage—although one where arms were more vital than alms—for the remission of sins.\footnote{169} In contrast to Cluny’s long-term message of peace and avoidance of conflict, and emphasis on prayer and commemoration as a certain path to a sinner’s salvation, later abbots did exhibit a degree of support for the crusade movement. There are several recorded instances of knights trading, selling, or mortgaging lands to Cluny in return for horses, arms, and armor both before and during crusade.\footnote{170} And one abbot, Pontius—although deposed and disgraced at the time—did make the journey east.\footnote{171}

Data Analysis and Conclusions

At 0.74%, the early-eleventh-century \textit{Vita Sancti Maioli} by Syrus has a lower

\footnote{171} Iogna-Prat, \textit{Order and Exclusion}, 331; Hayden V. White, “Pontius of Cluny, the \textit{Curia Romana} and the End of Gregorianism in Rome,” \textit{Church History} 27, no. 3 (1958): 196. Pontius (also known as Pons) of Melgueil was the seventh abbot, 1109-1122.
percentage of target occurrences than any of the other eleventh-century texts analyzed, despite including twenty of twenty-four target roots.\textsuperscript{172} Even though Syrus was writing about the same subject as Odilo, who wrote his version about twenty years later, Syrus used the *ius*/\textit{iud}* root (twenty-one occurrences for 0.17\%) and *ordin* (eleven occurrences for 0.09\%) much more frequently than is seen in Odilo’s version (0.34\% and 0.21\%, respectively) of the life of the same individual.\textsuperscript{173} The next highest occurring target root is *poten* (ten occurrences for 0.08\%).\textsuperscript{174} The *poten* root, however, is less reliable in reference to the earthly, human power, and power structures related to this study in later texts. It is often difficult to differentiate the mundane earthly concept of power or authority from spiritual or supernatural powers. Syrus uses it in both the political/physical sense and in the spiritual sense, and sometimes denotes both at once, as all power is seen to originate with God.

Odilo’s \textit{Vita Beati Maioli Abbatis} includes thirteen of the twenty-four target roots for a fairly high 0.94\% of the total text. The *ius*/\textit{iud}* root is the highest occurring (sixteen occurrences for 0.34\%), followed by *ordin* (ten occurrences for 0.21\%), and *potesta* (six occurrences for 0.13\%). Of the twelve texts analyzed in this thesis, this text ties with one other—\textit{Vita Beatissimi Odilonis} by Iotsald—for the highest appearance rate of *ordin* at 0.21\%. This result clearly reflects Odilo’s focus on building a network of monastic houses directly affiliated with and subordinate to Cluny and Cluny’s abbot, i.e.,

\textsuperscript{172} Versus thirteen of the twenty-four targets which appear in the later version by Odilo.

\textsuperscript{173} The total occurrence rates for all tenth-century texts are: *ius*/\textit{iud*}, 0.34\%; *ordin*, 0.05\%; and *poten*, 0.06\%. The rates across all texts are: *ius*/\textit{iud*}, 0.25\%; *ordin*, 0.08\%; and *poten*, 0.06\%.

\textsuperscript{174} See Appendix E for complete data.
a singular and explicit monastic order (as opposed to earlier reform efforts which did not necessarily emphasize or formalize this hierarchical organization with Cluny at the top).

Odilo’s success in nurturing a reputation of Cluniac exceptionalism and capitalizing on that reputation to extend Cluny’s network of influence across the continent is also a result of the relative stability of political structures, increases in agricultural productivity, and the concentration of wealth which allowed for an inpouring of donations, large and small. In turn, Cluny exerted influence over those political structures to further protect the abbey’s broad immunities from oversight, interference, correction, and taxation by secular leaders and clergy.

It is notable that Odilo makes explicit the difference between spiritual arms (*spiritalibus armis*)—appropriate and available to monks—and the military arms (*armis militaribus*) of the secular warrior.\(^{175}\) Along with praising the quality and nobility of Maiolus’ parentage, the story of the “Knight in Sheepskin,” gives us the name of Maiolus’ father along with specific details of how violence can be made to serve the interests of all, and not just its wielder. In this tale, the wolves are no longer “*lupos vespertinos*,” but savage, fierce, and beastly stand-ins for the Saracens, who will be the focus of the church-sanctioned violence of the crusades by the end of the eleventh century.\(^{176}\)

---

\(^{175}\) *...cum suis omnibus viciis et illusinibus spreto, celesti virtute et spiritalibus armis subacto...* (“He spurned all his vices and illusions, which were overcome through celestial virtue and spiritual arms.) *Deinde armis militaribus, loricæ videlicet, et galea, indutus...* (“Then fitted out with military arms, that is, with breastplate and helmet...”) Odilo, *The Life of St. Maiol*, col. 264; and Odilo of Cluny, *The Life of St. Maiol*, Bibliotheca Cluniacensis, col. 290.

\(^{176}\) Smith, *Medieval Monastic Culture*, 155.
Chapter Three: Post-millennial Eleventh century

A roll divided into headings was drawn up, giving a list of all that was prohibited, and a record of what men had, by sworn undertaking, decided to offer Almighty God. The most important of these was that the peace should be preserved inviolate so that all men, lay and religious, whatever threats had hung over them before, could now go about their business without fear and unarmed. The robber and the man who seized another’s domains were to suffer the whole rigour of the law, either by a heavy fine or corporal punishment.¹⁷⁷

Social and Monastic Evolution Later in the Eleventh Century

Social mobility for laymen in the eleventh century was fostered by a combination of many vectors of change, though none of them were singularly revolutionary. The lack of cataclysm at the turn of the millennium, in itself, was a driver of change. The Frankish Capetian kings had a much narrower range of authority, both territorially and politically than their Carolingian predecessors. The dukes and counts who traditionally were their inferiors came to exercise much more direct control over their demesnes, and developed ever broader and deeper hierarchies beneath them to administrate and control their holdings. Over the course of the eleventh century, their holdings would become increasingly consolidated, contiguous, and hereditary, though still not to the degree seen later, and primogeniture was not a common vehicle of inheritance. The gradual end of the

Little Ice Age improved growing conditions, agricultural productivity, eventually allowing for a surplus to feed a growing trade economy. The spread of the use of heavier plows, access to draft animals (which required more than subsistence level resources to support), and the clearing of forest lands increased agricultural production. The combination of all these factors—both climactic and man-made—contributed to the resolution of the famines that had plagued Western Europe in the tenth century. An increase in available food led to increases in population, other resources, and even small surpluses above subsistence levels which collectively had a significant impact on society. Urbanization accelerated due to a variety of factors, including the increased acreage of tillable land and increased yields per acre. This led over time to a shift of power away from the rural land-owning elite to a developing urban elite dependent on trade and specialized, trained crafts (for whom safe roads and supply lines were a priority). New religious communities in the form of regular and secular canons living in active, daily contact their urban neighbors and pastoral communities, and governed by a rule (often adapted from an existing monastic rule), were becoming more and more common. Communities of regular canons made it more difficult for monastic networks, especially those with the range, influence, and wealth of Cluny, to differentiate themselves. As the holdings of Cluny and other great abbeys had grown, so had their points of contact with the earthly realms outside the abbey walls. What it meant to be a monk would soon be called into question.178

178 Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of St. Peter*, 203-207; Rosenwein concludes her study of the significance of donations of property to Cluny by explicitly describing a shift in the nature of donations
With the explosion of monastic communities supported directly by donations in return for salvatory prayer, abbots began to consider how to provide security and protection for the people (lay and monastic) and lands they presided over. Keeping their responsibility for intercessory prayer and obligation to protect entirely separate was impossible. Language referring to holy men as spiritual warriors was deeply ingrained in Christian society. The concept of an abbot-as-war-leader teaching and modeling behavior appropriate to the militia Christi was widely accepted.179 Already in the abbacy of Odilo (994-1049), Cluny’s holdings, wealth, and dependents had grown so vast that Adalbero of Laon wrote a scathing satirical poem lampooning “King Odilo of Cluny” leading knights to defeat against Saracens threatening Tours, only to immediately call for another campaign against them.180 By the abbacy of Hugh of Semur in 1049, Cluny’s resident population had grown to nearly 100 brothers (from the original founding twelve181). The abbey’s holdings had grown from the original donation to a vast, contiguous property which stretched from the immediate environs of the abbey and town for 300km to the south.182 (The exact size of the original donation is not recorded, but other estates in the

---

179 Smith, Medieval Monastic Culture, 141.
area ranged from 300-500 hectares.) The monastery was well on its way to the height of the wealth and influence that it would come to exercise in twelfth-century society, notably as a participant and major motivator of monastic and social reform, and the weight of its influence something of a prize for the winner in the conflict between the papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor over the rights of investiture. This great wealth and the inability to remain completely separate from the secular world outside the abbey walls would be one of the prime arguments levelled against Cluniac monasticism by Bernard of Clairvaux and Cistercian critics in the twelfth century, and would lead to Cluny’s gradual decline in influence and prestige, relative to the abbey’s earlier glory, in later centuries.

As Cluny’s fortunes evolved, so, too did the political and military composition of the surrounding landscape. The increase in available resources led to castles springing up all over the countryside in order to fill the administrative vacuum which resulted from the decreased royal oversight of the Capetians (in contrast to the much more robust Carolingian bureaucratic structures). While castles and fortified keeps were not a new concept, they came to be more than just defensive and military in nature. The relationship between the castellans put in charge of the castles (and the territory around them from which they drew resources) and the dukes who appointed them echoed the

---

184 Rosenwein, To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter, 9, 74; Head and Landes, eds., The Peace of God, 12-17, 135-164.
relationship of those dukes to the king. They provided support to their overlord in armed men when called and paid a certain portion of each year’s earnings—usually. Otherwise they were largely independent, overseeing their holdings, recruiting followers, and forming ties to the communities in their territories. They settled into their castles, which became more residential, domesticated, and heritable over time. Many of them were referred to as knights, as were the armed followers they gathered around them.

Knighthood—still mostly undefined and unregulated—was a popular path, chosen by many of those with the right genealogy, appropriate training and skills, and, at least, moderate resources, but little political power. Anyone who had resources to “afford a warhorse, armor, equipment, and peasants to work his lands in his absence” had a chance of improving his standing by taking up arms in support of a cause or ruler, or if the situation demanded (or presented itself), to empty the coffers of insufficiently protected travelers. By the second half of the eleventh century, itinerant mercenaries—whose relationship to their commanders was purely economic and contractual—who signed on for a single war season, or even a single battle, before moving on to another conflict had become much more common. These trained and experienced fighters contributed to the dangers faced by anyone with something to take but without the means to protect it—merchants, travelers, clerics, villagers. The Pax dei and Treuga dei movements attempted to address this growing threat and had some success in curbing the violence enacted upon the defenseless, even going so far as to arm bands of layfolk. However, the primary

---

means of censure for these movements was excommunication.188 As those who killed others were, without intercession, considered already damned, this threat was not entirely effective against unemployed and hungry mercenary bands. This was the milieu in Burgundy and much of Western Europe in 1095, providing context to Pope Urban II’s sermon at Clermont calling for the First Crusade.

Rodulfus Glaber, Historiarum Libri Quinque

Rodulfus Glaber was a first-hand witness to these social disruptions and left us with a decidedly monastic history of his times. He was born circa 985, likely in the duchy of Burgundy.189 As a young, high-spirited boy of twelve, on the recommendation of an uncle who was monk, he was sent to the monastery of Saint-Germain at Auxerre. He was educated there and benefitted from contact with the works bequeathed by the Carolingian masters of that celebrated monastic school.190 Unable to overcome his own pride and rebellious spirit, he was eventually expelled for disobedience and subsequently spent much of his life moving from one monastery to another.191 In the first quarter of the eleventh century, he joined the abbey of Saint-Bénigne, near Dijon.192 There he met the

188 The Pax dei was first referenced at Charroux in 989 CE, the Treuga dei at Elne/Toulanges in 1027, and armed response at Le Puy in 990 and Bourges in 1038. Erdmann, Idea of Crusade, 63; Head and Landes, eds., The Peace of God, 6-7.
189 France, Historiarum Libri Quinque, Introduction, xix.
191 MacErlean, “Raoul Glaber.”
192 France, Historiarum Libri Quinque, Introduction, xxxiii.
reform-minded cleric from Piedmont, Abbot William of Volpiano, who was impressed with his abilities as a writer and encouraged him to write his universal history, the *Historiarum libri quinque*.193

Written over the course of at least fifteen years (before 1030-1046) at three different monasteries (Saint-Bénigne at Dijon, Cluny, and Saint-Germaine of Auxerre), Glaber began this chronicle account of the events that happened around the millennium of Christ’s birth and passion (1000 and 1033) accompanied by a profound meditation on the order of the world in 1028.194 His views on these events were strongly rooted in the “cultural aftershocks” of the world not ending in the year 1000.195 He continued to work on his ambitious project during sojourns at various monasteries, including five years spent at the abbey of Cluny.196 He finished at Saint-Germaine of Auxerre, back where he started, in 1047, not long before his death.

The chronicle is dedicated to Abbot Odilo of Cluny. Initially intended to be an ecclesiastical history, Glaber focused on events in the center of France, but occasionally ranged as far as Scotland and Southern Italy.197 Although his work chronicles events which pre-dated the year 1000, his descriptions of violent and chaotic events, divine omens, famines, and widespread panic and fear, serve to foreshadow the apocalyptic

---

193 Full title: *Historiarum libri quinque ab anno incarnationis DCCCC usque ad annum MXLIV* (History in five books from 900 AD to 1044 AD. McErlean, "Raoul Glaber."


disturbances which were expected to occur at, or as a result of, the turning of the millennium.\textsuperscript{198} Due to its narrow chronology and geographic focus, and strong monastic bias and apocalyptic filter, Glaber’s \textit{Historiarum} is of limited value as a source of information on historical events or even widespread trends in thought and mentalities. It is, however, a significant text in the study of the cultural history of monasticism, especially Cluniac monasticism of the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{199}

\textit{Iotsald, Vita Beatissimi Odilonis (c. 962-1049 CE)}

Abbot Odilo’s hagiographer and contemporary, Iotsald, left us with another eyewitness account of this period. Not much is known of Iotsald, variously of Cluny and Saint-Claude. He was born around 975, entered the community at Cluny around the turn of the millennium, and likely worked in the scriptorium at Cluny, possibly at the same time as Rodulfus Glaber.\textsuperscript{200} A close disciple of Odilo, who accompanied him on many of his diplomatic and reform-oriented journeys, he also appears occasionally in the


entourage of Abbot Hugh I.\textsuperscript{201} He is absent from Cluniac records after 1040, but shows up in the records of the abbey of Saint-Claude (centered between Dijon and Lyon to the west), as abbot, between 1040/1041 and 1052/1054.\textsuperscript{202} His \textit{vita} of his mentor and friend, Abbot Odilo, was probably written at some point after Odilo’s death on January 1, 1049, and late 1051/1052.\textsuperscript{203} He died at Saint-Claude on March 8 of the year 1052 or 1054, at nearly 80 years of age.\textsuperscript{204}

Iotsald’s subject, Odilo, as would be expected for the fifth abbot of Cluny, is better known. Odilo was born into a large noble family (eight sons and two daughters) of the Auvergne in c. 962.\textsuperscript{205} Dedicated to the church as a young man—having been miraculously healed of paralysis by the Virgin herself—he began his ecclesiastical life as a member of the community of secular canons at Saint-Julien in Brioude (east of Lyon).\textsuperscript{206} Seeking isolation from the secular world, he arrived at Cluny in 991.\textsuperscript{207} He so impressed the Abbot Maiolus and the Cluniac brothers that he was shortly elected, over his own objections, coadjutor to the aging and increasingly frail Abbot Maiolus.\textsuperscript{208} He was made abbot and received holy orders shortly before Maiolus’ death in 994.\textsuperscript{209}

Despite being of small stature and (apparently, notably) unimposing appearance, Odilo was perceived as “a man of immense force of character.” Odilo established All Souls” Day on the liturgical calendar at Cluny and its monasteries, and it was soon adopted in the whole church. He had a profound effect on the physical abbey itself, as well as building Cluny’s network and influence through the reform of Benedictine monasteries which had strayed away from their observance of Benedict’s rule. Odilo, paraphrasing Augustus Caesar (and revealing his familiarity with classical texts), “found Cluny made of wood, and left an abbey of marble.” He had many opportunities to exhibit his charitable priorities in response to the famine years of the Little Ice Age experienced in Western Europe in the early eleventh century, at times to the point that some of his efforts were seen as extreme. In 1006, for example, he sacrificed both ornamental and ritual objects belonging to the abbey church in order to raise funds to feed as many of those suffering hardship as possible.

His kind heart and belief in the power of charity, along with his energy and administrative abilities, are cited as primary factors in his successes, both within and without the abbey walls. It was during his abbacy that Cluny became arguably the most

---

212 Löffler, “St. Odilo.”
213 Smith, Early History, 148; Thurston and Attwater, Butler’s Lives, 9; Baring-Gould, “Saint Odilo.”
214 Smith, Early History, 173; Löffler, “St. Odilo.”
216 Löffler, “St. Odilo.”
important monastery in western Europe.\textsuperscript{217} Under his leadership, the number of monasteries in the Cluniac network increased from thirty-seven to sixty-five, of which five were newly established and twenty-three had followed the reform movement.\textsuperscript{218} Along with numerous “French” monasteries, he also reformed or founded monasteries in Iberia and in the territories of the German emperors. (The German communities, however, with their tradition of autonomy and inclinations towards individualism, did not remain dependencies of Cluny in the long term. \textsuperscript{219} ) With his vision of a network of reformed monasteries, all with permanent dependence on the mother-house, Cluny, Odilo prepared the way for a formal order or union of Cluniac monasteries, established by his successor, Hugh I, for maintaining order and discipline. Odilo also exercised the influence of his office in efforts to reform the church and society as a whole. These efforts were focused on offenses such as simony, marriage of the clergy, the uncanonical marriage of the laity, and his early involvement in the Peace of God movement.\textsuperscript{220} His determination to promote these reforms led Bishop Fulbert of Chartres (1006-1028) to characterize him as the "archangel of the monks."\textsuperscript{221} His many close relationships, both personal and clerical, with the popes, rulers, and prominent bishops in power during his abbacy, played a strong part in his successes, growing Cluny’s influence, and with that

\textsuperscript{217} Smith, \textit{Early History}, 193; Löffler, “St. Odilo.”


\textsuperscript{219} Löffler, “St. Odilo.”

\textsuperscript{220} Smith, \textit{Early History}, 149-150.

\textsuperscript{221} Löffler, “St. Odilo.”
influence the wealth and holdings of the abbey.\textsuperscript{222} It was also due to these many ecclesiastical and diplomatic connections with the most powerful rulers and leaders of the time that Abbot Odilo was able to protect Cluny’s ever-growing wealth and holdings from attack. He acquired multiple confirmations of Cluny’s immunities from both papal and royal courts, as well as papal censure of bishops and secular lords who tried to violate these immunities.\textsuperscript{223}

Odilo died while on a visit to the monastery of Souvigny (southwest of Dijon) on December 31, 1048.\textsuperscript{224} After some minor protest by Cluny, he was buried at Souvigny. By 1063, less than twenty years later, Peter Damian composed a short life (a condensed version of the work by Iotsald) in support of his canonization.\textsuperscript{225} Tragically, French revolutionaries burned, among other irreplaceable treasures, the relics of both Maiolus and Odilo "on the altar of the fatherland."\textsuperscript{226}

Iotsald’s \textit{Vita Beatissimi Odiloni} begins with a prologue in the form of a dedication to Stephen I, Odilo’s nephew, who was bishop of Le Puy-en-Velay (1031-1052). This dedication dates the work with surprising precision to the first half of the year 1052.\textsuperscript{227} The study of the manuscript tradition reveals two versions: the long version, which was the original composition of the author, and a short version, from which local references specific to Saint-Claude were removed. This second version, produced at

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{222} “Odilo, St.,” in \textit{The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church}.
\textsuperscript{223} Smith, \textit{Early History}, 155-169.
\textsuperscript{224} Löffler; Listed as January 1 in \textit{Butler’s Lives of the Saints}, 10.
\textsuperscript{225} Löffler, “St. Odilo.”
\textsuperscript{226} Löffler, “St. Odilo.”
\textsuperscript{227} Iogna-Prat, “Review.”
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Cluny not long after Iotsald’s death (1055-1060), served as the source for Peter Damian’s abbreviated *vita* in support of Odilo’s canonization in 1063.\textsuperscript{228}

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Rodulfus Glaber’s *Historiarum libri quinque* is the only one of all twelve texts analyzed in which all twenty-four of the target roots appear. At first glance, this may not seem all that surprising, considering Glaber’s stated intent to write a universal chronicle:

... *qui futurus post nos multiplicia haec uidentur fieri tam in ecclesiis Dei quam in plebibus minime abenda qualicumque still pernotatione mandaret... videlicet constet tam in orbe Romanum quam in transmarinis seu barbaris provinciis perplura deuenisse quae, si memoriae commendarentur quibusque cautelae studium potissimum iuuarent ... quatuor mundani orbis partium euentibus relaturi sumus...*

... *[F]or those who will come after us all the many things, not in the least negligible, which are seen to take place in the churches of God and amongst the peoples... it is evident that many things have happened in the Roman Empire and in distant and barbarous provinces which, if only they were recorded, would be very profitable for men and would serve as a mighty lesson for everyone in prudence and caution. ...*[W]e are going to tell of what happened in the four parts of the globe...* \textsuperscript{229}

It becomes notable, however, when factoring in the subject matter of the tenth-century *Vita Geraldi* and, as we shall see in the next chapter, the *Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus*. As stated above, Gerald was a count and warrior and his *vita* was largely focused on his use of and reactions to violence, while the *Relatio metrica* is a dramatic and poetic account of unabashed warfare between the two eponymous dukes. Along with

\textsuperscript{228} Löffler, “St. Odilo,”; Iogna-Prat, “Review.” Opinions vary +/- five years.
\textsuperscript{229} Rodulphus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque*, 1.1, 4-5.
the great variety of means to express concepts associated with war, violence, power and force, there is a significantly higher rate of occurrence of *bell* with forty-one occurrences for a rate of 0.13%. This is a minimum of four times the rate of occurrence in any other of the other texts except for the *Relatio metrica*, which is explicitly the tale of a localized war. Glaber used the greatest variety of forms of *bell* in all these texts, implying a greater depth and scope of Glaber’s understanding and opinions of warfare.230 There is also a slightly higher rate of occurrence of *milit* than the other eleventh-century texts.231 This, again, speaks to Glaber’s broader concept of warfare in its many forms, as well as to the turbulence of Burgundian society at the millennium.

The nearly unbroken trend of *ius/iud* having the highest rate of occurrence is continued with fifty-six occurrences for 0.18%.232 *Ordin* (order) follows *bell* (war, warfare) and “justice” with thirty-four occurrences for 0.11%, indicating, perhaps, that chaos vs. order is laying less heavily on Glaber’s mind as Christian society in Europe evolves to allow for a second millennium, which they had never anticipated seeing. This does not necessarily equate to a more peaceful society, indicated by the (almost) novel appearance of *ulci*/*ulti* (vengeance) with seventeen occurrences for 0.05%.233 This root

---

230 In addition to *bell*, he also uses: *rebel*—renewal of war or rebellion—2.1, 2.8, 3.1, 3.2 x3, 3.8, 4.8; *debell*—thoroughly executed or completed warfare, an unconditional victory—once in 3.9; and *imbell*—not warlike, pacifist—once in 5.2. Twice he also uses *bellu* (2.2, 4.4) with its connotations of bestial behavior, unrestrained warfare gone amok.

231 Odilo’s *Vita Beati Maioli*, two occurrences for 0.04%; *Syrus*’ *Vita Sancti Maioli*, four occurrences for 0.03%; Lotsald’s *Vita Beatissimi Odilonis*, no occurrences; and *Historiarum Libri Quinque*, nineteen occurrences for 0.06%.

232 The exception is the tenth-century *Vita Sanctissimi Patris Odonis* in which *ius/iud* comes in second, with 0.05%, to *ordin*, with a 0.12% rate of occurrence.

233 There are twenty occurrences in the tenth century texts, which still only amounts to 0.00%, and it is used twice in *Syrus*’ *Vita Sancti Maioli* (c. 995).
appears eight times with *vindico*, giving it the connotation of redress for transgressions or vindication from accusations of wrong-doing through reciprocal violence. The only other time this combination is found in the studied texts is once in Odo’s *Collationes*. This spike in usage of *ulti*/ulci*, not only alone, but as part of a frequent combination that both intensifies and formalizes the idea of how vengeance is achieved, incorporating the notion of exoneration, and indicates a change in the way vengeance is thought of. It is becoming a process of exacting justice which is becoming recognized and discussed in monastic communities which combines retaliation and remission for the just use of violent action.

The following three excerpts illustrate Glaber’s usage of this combined construction. It is also interesting to note that in two of the three excerpts (numbers one and two), it is explicitly God or the saints themselves exercising vengeance or retribution on behalf of those who have been wronged. Excerpts numbers one and three also directly reference the justness of this combined form of vengeance. Excerpt number three references the *Treuga dei* (1027). The connection of this more complex idea of vengeance (more complex simply through the need of two words instead of one to express it) with an earlier attempt to institutionally limit violence is strong support for the

---

234 Iotsald, *Vita Beatissimi Odilonis* 1.5 (retribution of God), 3.8 x2 (Epicurean heresy re: carnal sins; heresy at Orleans in 1023), 4.4 (famine of 1033 as punishment), 4.8 (Emperor Conrad”s victory over pagan Slavs in 1035), 5.1 x3 (vengeance and blessing of monks of St. Germaine at Auxerre; penance for dropping chalice at mass; *Treuga dei*)

235 “Inde est quod nec ipsa perituri, que tam cito Deus punire solebat, iam manifesta vltione vindicat, immo vero ea, quasi non punienda sint, multiplicari permittit.” “That is why it is not swearing falsely itself, which God became accustomed to punishing swiftly, but is more proper that clear retribution be exacted now, for if they should not be punished [the transgression] is allowed to multiply/increase.” Translation mine. *Collationem Sancti Odonis, Bibliotheca Cluniacenensis*, col. 176.
regulation and institutionalization of retaliatory violence, i.e., vengeance.

(1) Sed tamen occulta illius dispensatio, cui semper et simul totum, quidquid esset habet, praesto fuit, ac cui nihil defuit, ostendit spaciati per incrementa temporum sese omnipotentem solum bonum atque veracem, tam per opera pietatis quam per ultionem vindictae justae retributionis. Non enim principalis bonitas aliquando vacat a pietatis opere, quin imo semper aggregat plerosque ex massa filiorum praevacariatoris in sinum filii suae Deitatis.236

(2) Clarere igitur locum praedictum diutine meritis beati Germani ac caeterorum sanctorum ibidem quiescentium, signis et prodigiis, tam in donis sanitatum quam in ultionum vindictis ad se pertinencia diripientium, manifestum est. Si qui nempe de primatibus patriae hujusce loci rerum invasores seu diremptores increverunt, Deus exinde ultor ipsorum genus cum suis rebus in oprobrium et pene ad nichilum redigere consuevit.237

(3) Contigit vero ipso in tempore, inspirante divina gratia primitus in partibus Aquitanicis, deinde paulatim per universum Galliarum territorium, firmari pactum propter timorem pariter et amorem, taliter ut nemo mortalium a feriae quartae vesperae ad secundam feriam incipiente luce ausus temerario praesumeret quippiam alicui hominum per vim auferre, neque ultionis vindictam a quocunque inimico exigere, nec etiam a fideiussore vadimonium sumere. Quod si ab aliquo fieri contigisset contra hoc decretum publicum, aut de vita componeret, aut a Christianorum consortio expulsus patria pelleretur. Hoc insuper placuit universis, veluti vulgo dicitur, ut Treuga Domini vocaretur, quae videlicet non solum humanis fulta presidiis, verum etiam multoties divinis suffragata terroribus. Nam plerique vesani audaci temeritate prescriptum pactum non timuere transgredi, in quibus protinus aut divina vindex ira seu humanus gladius ultor extitit. Et hoc passim tam frequentuer contiguit ut pre sui multitudine singulatim non queant

236 “His secret providence, in which everything that has being was present at one time and always, and which nothing was lacking, truly reveals at intervals and as time goes on that He is the one Almighty God of truth and goodness, both through His works of fatherly kindness and His most just vengeance and retribution.” Rodulfus Glaber, Historiarum Libri Quinque, France, ed. and trans., 1.5.25, 42-43.

237 This monastery [St. Germain in Auxerre] has long been famous for signs and prodigies because of the merits of the blessed Germanus and the other saints who rest there; the gift of healing has been offered and equally they have taken vengeance upon those who pillage their goods. Whenever any of the magnates of that region have invaded their [the saints”] property or plundered their goods, God the avenger has cast their posterity into dishonour and almost destroyed them and their goods. Rodulfus Glaber, Historiarum Libri Quinque, 5.1.8, 224-227.
The appearance of this concept of a socially acceptable use of violence implies an increased institutionalization of reprisal (enacting or obtaining justice for a wrong done) that requires, at least, some centralization of administrative and judicial authority.

Iotsald’s *Vita Beatissimi Odilonis* has fewer notable “peaks and valleys” or word/root associations. Only twelve of twenty-four target roots appear. Specifically, there are no occurrences of *milit*, *bell*, or *ulci*/ulti*, which stands out in contrast to Glaber’s work, completed less than a decade before. In fact, this text has the fifth lowest rate of occurrence for all roots combined across all twelve texts, with thirty-four occurrences for 0.61%, and the second lowest of the four eleventh-century texts analyzed. The top two roots are no surprise, at this point. The highest occurring root is *ius/iud* with fourteen occurrences for 0.25%, followed by *ordin* with twelve occurrences for 0.21%. These are followed by *temp* with four occurrences for 0.07% and *potesta* with three occurrences for 0.05%, not significantly higher than the

---

238 At that time, by divine inspiration, a pact was confirmed first in Aquitaine and then gradually throughout Gaul; according to this men agreed, through both love and fear of the Lord, that from Wednesday evening to dawn on the following Monday no man might presume to steal by force from another, or wreak vengeance upon an enemy or even take surety from an oath-taker. Whoever broke this public decree was to pay for it with his life or be driven from his own country and the company of Christians. It was further unanimously decided that this law should be called, in the vulgar tongue, the Truce of God. It was not merely upheld by human sanctions, but also, as has frequently been demonstrated, by divine vengeance. Various madmen in their folly did not fear to break the pact, and immediately divine punishment or the avenging sword of men fell upon them. This happened so often in so many places that the frequency of the event deters me from recording individual instances. This is only just. Rodulfus Glaber, *Historiarum Libri Quinque*, 5.1.15, 236-238.

239 *Vita Geraldi*, eighty-eight times for 0.42%, *Vita Odonis*, sixty-six times for 0.31%, *Vita Sancti Maioli*, sixty-two times for 0.50%, and the twelfth-century oath, seven times for 0.02%.
remaining eight roots that Iotsald utilized. It would seem that Iotsald chose to tell a very Cluniac story, focused on the antitheses to social violence—justice and order.

\[240\] In the negative, intemperantius, once, and temperantus, temperantia, and temperabat. Chapter titles were not included in the target root counts as it is difficult to know if these were part of the original text or added by subsequent editors. It is notable, however, that the title of 1.13 is “De temperantia.”
Chapter Four: Twelfth Century

At great expense I have a horse, have arms, have a sword; these exist to give provision to the widow and to clothe the flesh [i.e. of the indigent]. We would assail [the enemy] more effectively if we do so defending the widow. Let us arm ourselves at once and be emboldened by fair hopes; with a ready heart, let us seek a holy fight for holy Jesus’s sake. For ourselves we do nothing, yet for him we will go to war; happy the struggle, blessed the warfare that is on Jesus’s behalf. Death is better than life, so long as death is sought for the sake of the law...\(^{241}\)

The miles Christi Come of Age

At the beginning of the twelfth century, life in Burgundy and most of the former Carolingian realm was becoming less chaotic and subject to generalized violence and disruption. Although private wars of conquest and vengeful vendettas between rivals still occurred, they had become less common, and were less likely to result in chain reactions and never-ending cycles of retaliatory violence. On the monastic front, the numbers of those seeking entry into the established monastic communities like Cluny were declining, as was the disparity between life in these long-standing monastic communities—now quite wealthy and powerful—and the life of a wealthy noble, aging warrior, or successful merchant. Instead, those converts to monasticism seeking a “more holy way of life”—in

\(^{241}\) “... hec in prebendam uidue carnemque tegendam. 
Si defensemus uiduam, melius tribulemus; 
ilicet armemur spebusque bonis animemur; 
Iesu pugna sacri sacra corde petatur alacri. 
Nobis nil gerimus; tamen sibi bella subimus; 
felix conflictus pro Iesu, Mars benedictus! 
Mors melior uita, dum mors pro lege petita; 
hanc uotis mille sitio, peto, ni uetat ille.” Christopher A. Jones and Scott G. Bruce, eds. and trans., The Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus: A Twelfth-century Cluniac Poem on Prayer for the Dead (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016), lines 432-439.
contrast to a fully secular life—were favoring the newer, more austere orders such as the Cistercians and the, later, mendicant orders. Overall, differences between classes—social, ecclesiastic, economic, political—were becoming more clear, distinct, and defined. This included those who were tasked with the exercise of force or warfare. “The warrior class” says Ernst-Dieter Hehl, “emerged as a group whose position in society was determined by their ability and duty to bear arms, which gave them a claim to nobility.”

This access to violent force was indeed a double-edged sword. As Katherine Smith describes it:

War ... causes Christians to shed one another’s blood and oppress the poor, and promotes the sin of pride (whereas *patientia*, endurance, breeds humility); but war is also potentially an instrument for restoring order and protecting the innocent, provided warriors fight defensively rather than for vengeance or gain.

This was the milieu in Burgundy and much of Western Europe at the turn of the twelfth century, the time of the First Crusade.

*Hildebert, Vita sanctissimi patris Hugonis* (1024-1109 CE)

The biographical information on the life of Hugh de Semur, the sixth abbot of Cluny, is transmitted through four complete *vitae* and two incomplete texts (characterized by Noreen Hunt as “excerpts”). The *Vita sanctissimi patris Hugonis abbatis*

---


Cluniacensis by Hildebert of Le Mans is the text chosen to represent the abbacy of Saint Hugh as the entire Latin text was easily accessible online in the Bibliotheca Cluniacensis. Born in 1024, Hugh was the eldest son of Count Dalmatius of Semur and Aremberge (Aremburgis) of Vergy, heir to these great, noble houses of Burgundy.245 Hugh’s four brothers and four sisters further connected Hugh’s family by marriage to other powerful aristocratic families. His father planned on his heir becoming a strong ruler and knight, and sought to have trained him accordingly. Hugh, much more intellectually than physically inclined, and his mother, however, had a different vision for Hugh’s future as a leader among the clergy in the service of God. Hugh was still quite young when his vocation became apparent in his deep piety and scholarly habits, and his aversion for the martial arts and hunting skills, which were expected of young noblemen. He eventually convinced his father, and Hugh was sent to the monastery school at the priory of St. Marcellus at Chalon to receive an education suited to a clerical calling.246 The priory was overseen—and gifted to Cluny—by his grand-uncle, Hugh, the bishop of Auxerre and simultaneously count of Chalon (999-1030).247 He entered the novitiate at Cluny when he was eighteen, and displayed such commitment and zeal for his vocation that he was able to make his final monastic vows in only one year—an exception to the Cluniacs’ long and strenuous novitiate. He was still only eighteen when he was elected as a deacon of

246 Hunt, Cluny under St. Hugh, 26-27; Kennedy. "St. Hugh the Great."
247 The counts of Chalon would not always be friends of Cluny. It was the seizure of the Cluniac castle of Lourdon by the count of Chalon’s son that would lead to the massacre of the men of the village of Cluny in 1166.
the community, and was ordained as a priest (able to preside over the Eucharist among other duties and responsibilities normally reserved for more mature individuals) at twenty. He was soon also elected as the abbey’s grand prior, with responsibility for administration and leadership of the entire community of Cluny during the many journeys of Abbot Odilo. Hugh was unanimously elected abbot on January 1, 1049, upon the death of Odilo, at only twenty-five years of age. Although his prior appointments made it clear he was Odilo’s preferred choice, his election did require the participation of all of the monks of Cluny and was confirmed by Archbishop Hugh of Besançon on February 22, 1049.

Hugh would reign as Cluny’s abbot for an astounding sixty years, giving him ample time to put his stamp on both the physical and spiritual natures of the order. Under Hugh, the third, and final, abbey church at Cluny—the largest structure in Europe for several centuries—was begun, largely with funds donated by Ferdinand I of León. This unsurpassed monument to the glory of God (and Cluny) was consecrated on October 25, 1095. Pope Urban, himself a former prior at Cluny, surrounded by a bevy of cardinals and bishops, performed the ritual.

Abbot Hugh (and his strong and lucrative relationship with Iberian nobility) was the driving force behind the spread of the Cluniac monastic movement during the last quarter of the eleventh century, greatly expanding the reach of the motherhouse. A great

249 Kennedy, "St. Hugh the Great."
250 Hunt, Cluny Under St. Hugh, 146; Evans, 34-35.
number of existing monastic communities chose to become affiliated with Cluny through the adoption of the Cluniac customary or liturgical calendar and practices. Thirty-two major additions to the Cluniac network were recorded between 1052 and 1083.  New houses were opened in France, Germany, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, as well as St. Pancras, near Lewes, the first Benedictine house in England. Hugh established the first Cluniac female monastic community at Marcigny in 1055. Hugh’s sister became the first prioress of Cluny’s female community in 1061. Concerned with providing care for all (or at least all Christians), and especially the poor and defenseless, Abbot Hugh also established a hospital for lepers at Cluny in 1065, where he is recorded to have performed the most menial duties.

Cluny’s anachronistically egalitarian leanings can be seen in the expansive personal and civic freedoms extended to the common folk living on Cluniac holdings and the fostering of tradesmen’s guilds under Abbot Hugh. The townsmen of the village of Cluny and the farmers working in the fields and vineyards fared well under the abbey’s authority, providing a model for a positive relationship between a monastic landlord and tenants. Spiritually, Hugh was animated with a burning zeal to reform the rampant

251 Hunt, Cluny Under St. Hugh, 125.
252 Hunt, Cluny Under St. Hugh, 125; Kennedy, "St. Hugh the Great."
253 Hunt, Cluny Under St. Hugh, 186.
254 Kennedy, "St. Hugh the Great." His mother would eventually retire to Marcigny. His father retired to Cluny.
256 Constable, “Abbot and Townsmen,” XIII,156.
abuses he saw compromising the authority and purity of the clergy—simony, luxury, and sexual indulgence being chief among these. Hugh was a model of pious discipline and unhesitating obedience to the Holy See. He worked with no fewer than six popes to regain and retain the right of investiture for the church alone. He fought tirelessly “to rescue Christian society from the confusion into which the reckless ambition and avarice of rulers and the consequent political instability had thrown it.” These efforts would come to cause succession issues and conflict both within the abbey and between future abbots, popes, and secular rulers on both sides of the debate.

Early in 1109, Abbot Hugh, feeling the weight of his eighty-five years, sixty of them as abbot—administering the growing Cluny network and its flock of monastic brothers, advising great leaders and pushing for reformation in clerical and secular behaviors and relationships—knew his energy was waning. He called together the brothers of Cluny and requested Last Sacrament and the initiation of Cluny’s formal death ritual. Upon being carried to the Lady Chapel, he was dressed in sackcloth and ashes, and laid before the altar, where psalms and prayers were said around the clock. Hugh died on the evening of Easter Monday, April 28. His tomb in the church was, not

257 Leo IX (1002-1054; elected to the papacy 1049), Victor II (1018-1057; elected 1055), Stephen IX (c. 1020-1058; elected 1057), Nicholas II (990/995-1061; elected in 1058 at the behest of the future Gregory VII in direct opposition to Benedict X), Alexander II (1010/15-1073; elected 1061), and Gregory VII (c. 1015-1085; elected 1073).


259 For an extensive study and description of the liturgy and ritual performed on the death of a member of the community, see Frederick S. Paxton and Isabelle Cochelin, The Death Ritual at Cluny in the Central Middle Ages: Le rituel de la mort à Cluny au moyen âge central, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014).

260 Kennedy, "St. Hugh the Great."
surprisingly, soon the scene of miracles, recorded prior to Hugh’s canonization on January 6, 1120, at Cluny by Pope Callixtus II.\footnote{Hunt, \textit{Cluny Under St. Hugh}, 14, 16.} In honor of St. Hugh, Callixtus declared that the abbot of Cluny was to be accorded the title and dignity (including garments) of a cardinal.\footnote{Kennedy, "St. Hugh the Great."}

\textit{Peter the Venerable (1092/4-1156): Sermons, Epic Poetry, and Cooperative Defense}

Peter the Venerable (born 1092/4; abbot of Cluny 1122-1156), having come to Cluny in 1109 from Sauxillanges, was abbot of Cluny when the ill-fated Second Crusade (1147-1149) was undertaken.\footnote{John Joseph Hodnett, \textit{A Study of the Latinity of the Sermones and Carmina of Peter the Venerable}. PhD. dissertation (Saint Louis University, 1938), 7.} Of seven sons born to the noble Montboissier family of Auvergne, he was one of five who would chose a life of monasticism.\footnote{Hodnett, \textit{A Study of the Latinity of the Sermones}, 6-7; The other two brothers took up arms and pursued more martial careers. All of the Montboissier brother monks rose to positions of authority within their chosen communities, all becoming abbots and/or priors.} Hugh I’s monumental new abbey church having finally been completed, Peter sought to direct the community back to the more intellectual, literary and contemplative pursuits of earlier abbbacies (namely that of Odilo).\footnote{Hodnett, \textit{A Study of the Latinity of the Sermones}, 7-8.} He was likely the presiding abbot when an anonymous Cluniac monk composed the \textit{Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus}. He welcomed the notorious intellectual Peter Abelard into the community when he was unwelcome elsewhere. He became a skilled apologist and both dear friend and vocal adversary to Bernard of Clairvaux over the course of their debates on proper monasticism.
and how best to interpret and live by the Rule of Benedict.

Abbot Peter left a rich collection of correspondence, theological treatises, verse, legal statutes, sermons, and other works. He was a man of deep thought and bold words. He was very vocal about his views on violence and warfare, including when, why, and how they could and should be exercised. Gregory Smith’s insightful and detailed analysis of Peter’s collection of letters offers a very clear picture of Peter’s strong opinions in regard to violence in its many forms, its just and appropriate use, and the responsibilities of those in positions of power over others. A common theme in Peter’s letters is that greed prompts violence. Smith characterizes Peter’s point in this respect as, “The force of greed is too often inexorable, even for the resolute.”266 This makes monastic lords, as a matter of course, better than secular lords, as they are less likely to be corrupted by greed and secular concerns. Peter directly and explicitly addresses the oppression of “male and female peasants” and “peasants, farmers, the poor, widows, orphans, and every kind of common person” through violence and unjust or unwarranted exactions.267 He qualifies banditry, stealing/robbery, and a lord’s unjust or illegal exactions in excess of custom as all equally bad. In fact, lords or any “Christians who turn on their own people are worse than the Saracens.”268 Peter is also harsh towards those who see bad lordship in their peers or subordinates and do nothing. They are complicit in the offense. He asserts that the higher one’s status and the more power one wields, the higher the responsibility to do

right and exercise just rule over others. The use of violence for the restoration of order and peace is the responsibility of a good lord, in his own lands or in those ruled by unworthy lords. All other avenues of resolution, namely secular diplomacy and spiritual interventions—the most extreme of which was excommunication—having been exhausted, warfare was justified to restore uncorrupted rule. However, only laymen were permitted the use of force to defend themselves and their rights against an oppressive lord. Monks and clergy must trust in God’s justice alone. The evidence of the unusual oath exacted from the townsfolk of Cluny by Peter indicates that he did not see lay support for ecclesiastic petitions to God for redress as crossing this line. While unable to bear arms themselves, the recruitment of those who could arm themselves was not only permissible, but appropriate, for an abbot acting as a territorial lord.

Three sermons of Peter the Venerable were chosen for this study as likely to voice directives or instruction he felt were important to pass on to his audiences—primarily Cluniac monks and lay folk attending services in Cluniac churches. Giles Constable’s 1954 edition of these texts was chosen for analysis as the most complete and authoritative available.²⁶⁹ Per Virginia Berry, Peter likely composed these sermons in Paris in 1147, for Easter celebrations at St. Denis, in conjunction with a council where, among other things, Louis VII, representatives of the Holy Roman Emperor, Conrad, and Pope Eugenius III (r. 1145-1153) were meeting to set up and agree upon the plans for the

Second Crusade. Constable agrees with the mid-eleventh-century dating, but is not as specific regarding the time and place of their creation. The transmission of these texts, despite their apparently limited circulation in institutions associated closely with Cluny, is still fairly tangled. The surviving copies were likely bound, rebound, lost, and re-found multiple times. There is no single, complete, surviving copy. Constable reconstructed the complete sermons from three surviving manuscripts, none of which were “perfect matches.”

These four twelfth-century representatives of Cluniac literature are of completely different genres—hagiography, sermons, an epic poem, and a legal document—though all but the hagiography have close connections with Peter the Venerable. All were written after the emotional beginning of the crusade movement made it even more socially and theologically necessary to find a way to reconcile sanctity and violence. Cluny’s vast wealth and power was coming under criticism from a new generation of monastic reformers who felt that its monks had wandered too far from the simplistic life of labor and prayer envisioned by St. Benedict. Although justice is still a primary value, themes of war, order, and enmity are seen with increasing rates of frequency in the data, as these twelfth-century Cluniac thinkers reflected the changing complexities of the society around them.

---


271 Manuscripts currently available as BNF NAL 1436 (gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10033084q/f1.item), BNF Latin 12410 (gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b105467826/f3.item), and BM Douai 381 (bvmirht.cnrs.fr/consult/consult.php?reproductionId=19554).
Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus: Violence in Its Most Just and Holy Form

The *Relatio metrica* is a short, mid-twelfth-century poem which has survived in a single late-twelfth or early-thirteenth-century manuscript. The events in the poem are described in the first person voice of the fourth abbot of Cluny, Maiolus. That this story was fairly well-known and widespread throughout medieval Europe is attested to by the numerous prose versions which have survived in manuscripts across Europe. The *Relatio metrica* was written during the abbacy of Peter the Venerable, at a time of religious unrest and violent social movements, including the persecution of Jews, the threat of perceived heretics in Languedoc, and the disastrous Second Crusade. It can be reasonably assumed that the abbot’s opinions on these matters influenced the poet’s attitudes. The specific qualifications of just war, presumably representative of the poet, Peter, and perhaps the greater part of all those espousing affiliation with Cluny, are very interesting and important findings in this analysis of the *Relatio metrica*. Augustinian just war requires the absence of any singular interest. It must be in defense of a greater good (defined by crusade rules as the church and/or Latin Christendom) and under direction of a superior lord.

The *Relatio metrica* is attributed to an anonymous Cluniac monk, though it has many features which indicate its composition by a known Cluniac scribe, Bernardus.

---

272 Translation: *A verse account of two dukes.*
273 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, Introduction, 9-16.
274 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, Introduction, 57.
This scribe may possibly have been the much more celebrated poet, Bernard of Cluny, early in his career—though this cannot be definitively established. The Cluniac imperative of the efficacy of the prayers of the living, along with good works and charitable deeds to effect the release of souls from purgatory, is the focus. Although the original source of the legend of the battle to reclaim Sardinia from evil and the presence of a young (St.) Maiolus most likely originates with Cluniac oral tradition and its veneration of the much earlier abbot, this poetic version is based on prose versions with non-Cluniac origins.

The anonymous poet restructured the story found in contemporary manuscripts to emphasize common crusade-text themes of just war and the *militia Christi*, including: the condemnation of luxury and ostentation, especially by knights; the denunciation of specific types of unjust warfare; and reference to the character of the virtuous duke Eusebius” besieged stronghold as a “city of God” (a common way to refer to Jerusalem in crusade texts). In their introduction, Jones and Bruce point out multiple distinct similarities between the speeches credited to Eusebius and the rhetoric of Pope Urban II’s call for crusade at Clermont in 1095. There is also a strong possibility it was written in response to Petrobrusian criticisms rejecting the efficacy of monastic intercession in expiating sin for the sake of salvation.

The poem itself is only 827 lines, but the poet makes the most out of each one.

---

275 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, Introduction, 64.
276 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, Introduction, 9-16, 23-29.
278 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, Introduction, 19.
The first 119 lines are the poet’s introduction, in which he praises and establishes the credibility of Maiolus. After this he provides a general critique of war and violence, including, by implication, Eusebius’ participation, providing the basis for Eusebius’ past sins and need for penance and repentance. This condemnation of wrathful violence specifically refers to the suffering and losses experienced by “the people” and “the common folk.” Following this come 200 lines primarily describing Eusebius’ many virtues as a lord and knight, including exceptional piety, his many good deeds, and his remorse and confession of past sins. The majority of his good deeds support his most vulnerable and humble citizens (the poor, sick, widows, orphans, and destitute humanity are mentioned explicitly). He is exceedingly liberal in giving alms. He funds churches, hospitals, and innumerable masses for the souls of the dead, and goes humbly among his people attending to their needs.

The poet then turns his attention to Ostorgius. The scathing condemnation of the villain of the piece is much shorter, occupying fewer than thirty lines. Of these two opposing portrayals, Jones and Bruce say, “If in all these respects Eusebius embodies the poet’s ideal of a Christian potentate and wager of holy wars, Ostorgius stands as his foil. The Relatio-poet makes Ostorgius a composite of negative commonplaces about tyrannical lords or violent knights.” The remainder of the story gives an account of Ostorgius’ occupation of Eusebius’ city by deceit, Eusebius’ rousing speech to his troops in the face of daunting odds, the appearance and introduction of the heavenly host, their

---

279 Jones and Bruce, Relatio metrica, lines 121, “populi,” and 124, “plebi.”
280 Jones and Bruce, Relatio metrica, Introduction, 24.
bloodless victory, Ostorgius” surrender and twice-over reparation of his spoils, and promise to mend his ways. Their task complete, the heavenly host begin to take their leave, but not before Eusebius hesitantly expresses doubt and curiosity over the nature of his rescuers. He is told it is good to question, if only to be sure his help comes from good and not evil. His saviors are the spirits of souls he has freed from torment through his good works, prayers, and many masses. (To mix theologies, they are his karma personified.) Readers are issued another warning to not only live virtuously, but also never assume they have done enough and can relax their vigilance against sin. And with a final pitch for the efficacy of prayers for the remission of sin for all people—very much in line with Cluny’s egalitarianism—so “ends the account of two dukes.”

Oath: “Break Glass in Case of Emergency”

In late January, 1145, every male resident of the village of Cluny over the age of fifteen swore an oath which specified and quantified their responsibilities to the abbot, Peter the Venerable (and his successors) as both spiritual and secular overlord. An oath of this type, between an abbot or a monastic community and a lay community, was unusual. The ritual mechanism of giving or taking an oath provided an unequivocal connection to higher powers, engaging with God and saints in an overt and powerful way. Oaths also served to connect people and create or confirm medieval communities of all

---

281 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, lines 734-747.
282 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, lines 755-758.
283 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, lines 824-825.
284 See Appendix C for full text and translation.
kinds. Abbot Peter must have feared that his holdings were threatened and been unsure of the support of secular lords, or perhaps wary of the price of their support. In this environment, “The magic of the oath and the aristocratic values it served to internalize worked, however haltingly, to counteract those threats of disintegration.”

His solution was to look to the villagers of Cluny, those who lived almost in the shadow of the abbey walls, for aid and support should it be needed. Peter’s own words from his sermon De Sancto Marcello appear to reveal his plan, “the king readies his men to fight, and his swords to subjugate, whereas the master readies his disciples, and the Lord his servants.” The oath taken by both the monastic and lay communities of Cluny was Peter’s means of readying his people for defense.

The oath between the townsmen of Cluny and Peter the Venerable embodies a ritualized confirmation of the interdependence of the monastic and lay communities of Cluny. The first responsibility specified for the people of the lay community is fidelity (fidelitatem) to both abbot and the church. Fidelity entailed shunning all contact, shelter, and aid to anyone who had been denounced as an enemy of the church. Violation of this part of the oath was subject to a fine which would benefit the townsfolk and not the abbey, incentivizing self-policing by the lay community. This would have included not heeding the call of a secular leader who had been excommunicated. Denunciation for

---


violation of the oath, and the social ostracization that would result, did not affect the
collection of debts, however. Creditors could still interact with debtors and collect what
they were owed. The oath then comes to its main focus—all signers are obligated to
provide manpower for defense should the monastic community have need. One clause
illustrates this very clearly:

Afterward, by the council of the lord abbot and of the better townsmen, those who
were chosen to protect the town [or farm] or who sent other worthy men in their
place, either because he was more afraid of them or because they were less
worthy were able to remain behind.287

In this clause, the cooperative nature of the oath (or at the very least, the desire that the
oath appear cooperative) is clearly demonstrated.

The abbot and town leaders likewise collaborated on the specifics of how the
responsibility of the townsmen, acting as vassals to the abbot, was to be met. The defense
of the abbey, its holdings and commerce—markets are specifically mentioned—and the
monks, was not to come at the expense of keeping the town and farms safe and
productive. If a townsman could send a better fighter in his place, everyone benefited.
Also covered in this oath were the benefits for those who showed up if called upon. It
spells out exactly how fines and death penalties were to be divided between the church
and the responders, depending on the victim’s and transgressor’s relationship to the
monastery and their means of payment. Penalties accrued in the abbey’s defense by a

287 Translation mine (with assistance from T. Nidever and J. Ott); “Postea consilio domini abbatis et
meliorum burgensium poterunt remanere qui electi fuerint ad custodiendam villam vel qui alios pro se
ydoneos miserint.idea vel quod de eis magis timeatur vel quod ipsi minus ydonei sint.” BN NAL 2265,
no. 7. See Appendix C for complete text.
resident of the village were to be paid by the abbey. Fines and penalties levied against
townsmen unrelated to the abbey’s defense or by outsiders (*deforis*) were to be paid by
the offender. The oath goes so far as to protect responders’ heirs if they should die in
defense of the abbey. If pursued for their actions by those opposing the abbey, they
would be given sanctuary and kept safe from harm. The townsmen were also entitled to
what amounts to “burial insurance.” Those killed while honoring the oath would have the
right to burial on sanctified monastic ground and inclusion in the monastery’s necrology
and annual remembrances, a privilege that would have been far beyond the reach of the
average townsman. Being buried in such close proximity to all the holy men of Cluny—
living and dead—and inclusion in their prayers would be seen as almost assuring
salvation.

This is not a unilateral dictation from a superior under pain of punishment. In fact,
there is no specific mention of punishment for townsmen who might choose not to
respond when called. (The threat of the ire of the abbot and the church is, of course,
present and powerful, but it remains implied.) The needs and fears of both the lay and
monastic communities are addressed and their joint participation is explicit. The abbey
got what it could not otherwise provide: an on-call defense force of men permitted to bear
arms. The townsmen were, in turn, protected from any financial burden resulting from
their fidelity and given the salvatory bonus of a monastic burial and liturgical
remembrance.

That Abbot Peter felt such a defense plan was necessary indicates his uneasiness
with the secular lords in his vicinity. He had witnessed violent confrontation between monks on the actual abbey grounds during the contentious succession to Abbot Hugh’s sixty-year abbacy in 1122. Cluny had three different abbots that year—with Pontius attempting to be reinstated and ending up dying in a papal prison—fueled in no small part by the ugly disagreements between the papacy in Rome and the Holy Roman (Germanic) emperors over the powers of investiture. He could obviously foresee a situation in which the abbey would be threatened and have no nearby friendly lord or monarch to call on for help. At the very least, his local nobles might be so embroiled in their own conflict that they would have no troops to spare. At worst, greed and avarice for the abbey’s rich holdings might tempt them to risk the wrath of God.

In the Summer of 1145, Abbot Peter’s fear came to pass. The son of Count William I of Chalon (d. 1174), also William, occupied the Cluniac property of the castle of Lourdon. As recorded in Hugh of Poitiers” *Chronicle of the Abbey* of Vézelay, the villagers elected to honor the oath made a generation before:

[T]he older men and youths marched out from Cluny. But since they were a rash and unskilled throng, a skilled band of the count’s soldiers met them at once and compelled them to fly, and almost all were slaughtered.

---


289 John Scott, John O. Ward, and Eugene L. Cox, eds. and trans., *The Vézelay Chronicle and Other Documents from Ms. Auxerre 227 and Elsewhere*. (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1992), 309. Suger, *Selected Works of Abbot Suger*, 152-153. The procession described in the *Vie de Louis* account bears a strong resemblance to other processions organized and made in response to unrest or disaster and as part of the Peace of God movement more than a century earlier.
The account in the continuation of the *Vie de Louis le Gros*, by Abbot Suger of Saint-Denis (1081-1151), paints a slightly different picture:

[N]ews of a despicable deed, unheard of in our times, circulated throughout various parts of the realm. Count William of Chalon, who followed in the footsteps of the devil, dared provoke the Lord by flagrantly persecuting the church of Cluny. To carry out his tyrannical cruelty he assembled countless numbers of brigands, commonly called Brabantines, who had no respect for God or any desire to act righteously. Relying on his criminal henchmen, William set out to plunder and loot the church of Cluny. The monks serving God in that church had no sword or shield to protect themselves; but clad only in divine armor and clerical vestments, they carried relics of the saints and crosses as they marched out, with a great multitude of people, to confront the tyrant. However, William’s wicked mob of henchmen stripped the monks of their sacred vestments; and like ravenous wild beasts that pounce on carcasses they viciously slaughtered five hundred or more burghers of Cluny as if they were sheep.  

*The Chronicle of Vézelay* records that it took until the following Spring for an effective response to arrive when, “the king [Louis VII], advancing with his army, occupied the count’s fortification and defenses and the city of Chalon itself. All his [the count’s] land as far as the river Saône he laid waste.” The Vézelay account is much briefer, and portrays the townsmen of Cluny as more of a mob. Other than a single reference to “the evil massacre,” the devastating loss of life for the village of Cluny seems to be considered secondary to the loss of territory and resources. Even acknowledging that Vézelay and

---

290 Suger, *Selected Works of Abbot Suger*, 152. Suger was not a first-hand witness. The *Vie de Louis* was apparently added (anonymously) to his other works at some point after his death and is frequently included in collected editions of his works. The “five hundred or more burghers” killed in this battle/massacre, according to calculations made by Giles Constable, would have been essentially the entire adult population, out of a total of around 2000, of the village of Cluny. This number is likely high, though “even allowing for exaggeration, the loss must have been devastating.” See Constable, “Abbot and Townsmen,” XIII, 164; Michel Jones, “Small-town life in a late medieval Burgundy: the case of Cluny,” *Revue belge de philologie et d’histoire* 78, no. 2 (2000), 368.
Cluny were “competitors” of a sort and had a history of not-always-veiled hostility, this comes across as severe. The depiction of the event in the Vie de Louis is much less hostile to Cluny. It portrays the Cluniac response as more of a holy procession, complete with chanting, relics, and crosses, and puts the loss and suffering of the people, both of the monastic and lay communities, along with the insult to the church, front and center.291

**Data Analysis**

The Vita sanctissimi patris Hugonis abbatis Cluniacensis by Hildebert of Le Mans, one of six existing vitae of Hugh I, includes twenty of the twenty-four target roots, although none of these has a rate of occurrence above 0.09%.292 The Vita sanctissimi patris Hugonis is unique in its variety of target roots for the twelfth-century texts, with twenty of the twenty-four target roots appearing. Even with this high diversity and its relatively high average rate of occurrence (1.14%), it still has the lowest overall average of target root usage of the twelfth-century texts.293 This high overall occurrence rate rests predominately on three roots, the only roots to achieve a rate of occurrence above 0.08%. The root with the highest rate of occurrence for this text is ius*/iudic* with twenty-six occurrences for 0.25%, which is slightly lower than the average rate of occurrence (0.26%) for this root. The second root with a notably high rate of occurrence is milit*/mili*/mile*, with sixteen occurrences for 0.16% (second only to this root’s rate of
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291 Hugh of Poitiers, Chronicle of Vézelay, 4.74, 309.
292 bell* (0.09%), feroe* (0.02%), ulti*/ulci* (0.02%), and furo* (0.01%) are absent from the text.
293 One of Peter’s sermons (De laude Dominici sepulchri) has a lower rate (0.52%) which brings the aggregate rate for all three sermons down to an average of 0.89%.
occurrence in the *Relatio metrica* at 0.17%), which is significantly higher than the average rate of occurrence for this root (0.06%). The third most frequently occurring root in this text is *ordin*\(^*\). This root occurs fifteen times for an occurrence rate of 0.15%, nearly twice the average overall rate of 0.08%.

Three of Peter the Venerable’s sermons were also analyzed, producing some very interesting results.\(^{294}\) (Four sermons survive as recorded in the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, but those versions are superseded by Giles Constable’s 1954 critical edition of three of the four in *Revue bénédictine*.)\(^{295}\) The sermons were considered both as a single unit and as individual text examples. When considering all three sermons as a single unit of text, the target roots are used 142 times for a rate of 0.88%. This is less than any of the other twelfth-century texts, as well as the twelfth-century average of 1.08% and the overall average of 1.08%. By far, *ius*/iud* had the highest usage (thirty-seven occurrences), with 0.23% (the twelfth-century average is 0.19% and the overall avg. is 0.28%). The next highest rate of occurrence root is *poten* with fifteen occurrences for 0.09% (twelfth-century average 0.07% and overall avg. 0.06%), followed by *pug* with twelve occurrences for 0.07% (twelfth-century average 0.07% and overall avg. 0.48%). When considered together, the word usage in the sermons is not exceptional. Seen separately however, there are some significant variances.

\(^{294}\) Constable includes *De laude Dominici sepulchri, De Sancto Marcello papa et martyre*, and *Sermo cuius supra in honore sancti illius cuius reliquiae sunt in presenti* (in reference to relics of St. Marcellus). He does not include *De transfiguratione Domini* as he was unable to locate any earlier corroborating copies than the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* transcription.

\(^{295}\) Giles Constable, “*Petris Venerabilis sermones tres*,” 224-272.
Peter’s *De laude Dominici sepulchri* has the lowest overall occurrence rate of all three sermons (0.52%) far less than half the average rate of occurrence achieved by the other two and the overall average of all texts analyzed.\(^{296}\) Thirteen of the target roots appear, but three roots appear significantly more often than the rest. The highest number of occurrences is *ius*/*iud*\(^*\), which appears fifteen times (0.16% which is lower than the overall averages across all three centuries of 0.28%). The *poten*\(^*\) root has the next fewer appearances, occurring twelve times (0.13%; overall average of 0.07%). The last outlier among the thirteen appearing roots is *host*\(^*\), which shows up seven times (0.08%; overall average of 0.11%). There are two roots, *intemp*\(^*\) and *temer*\(^*\), which do not appear at all in the other two sermons.

The second of the sermons analyzed is *De sancto Marcello papa et martyre*.\(^{297}\) This sermon has the highest percentage of target roots of the three sermons at 1.53%. It also has the greatest variety of target roots (fourteen of twenty-four) despite being less than half the length (4,182 words) of *De laude Dominici sepulchri* (9,250 words). Two roots, *pax/paci*\(^*\) and *pug*\(^*\), appear ten times (0.19%; much higher than the 0.04% overall rate of occurrence for both) and two others, *milit*/*mili*/*mile*\(^*\) and *ordin*\(^*\), appear nine times each (0.17%; more than double the overall averages of 0.06% and 0.08% respectively).

The last sermon included in Constable’s edition, and the shortest at only 2,635

---

\(^{296}\) Translation: *Concerning the praise of the Lord’s sepulcher*

\(^{297}\) Translation: *Concerning Saint Marcellus pope and martyr.*
words, is the *Sermo cuius supra in honore sancti illius cuius reliquiae sunt in presenti.*

The variety of target roots used in this sermon is half that of the other two. Only seven target roots appear and none are unique among the three sermons. Even so, the percentage of target roots used is more than double *De laude Dominici sepulchri* at 1.18%, also significantly exceeding both the twelfth-century and overall averages. The *ius*/*iudic* root accounts for nearly two-thirds of this high percentage with nineteen occurrences (0.72%).

In just 827 lines and 5,322 words, the *Relatio metrica* includes sixteen of the twenty-four target roots, adding up to sixty-three occurrences for 1.12% of the text. This is the third highest percentage of target root occurrence behind the Foundation Charter (at 1.77%) and the *vita* of Hugh (at 1.40%). Of the sixteen target roots, five exceed an initial filter of 0.10% and show a significantly greater rate of occurrence than their overall averages. These are: *bell**, occurring twenty-seven times for a 0.51% rate of occurrence (overall average of 0.06%); *host*, occurring seventeen times for a rate of occurrence of 0.32% (overall average of 0.10%); *arm*, occurring sixteen times for a rate of occurrence of 0.30% (overall average of 0.06%); *pug*, occurring eleven times for a rate of occurrence of 0.21% (overall average of 0.03%; and *pax/paci*, occurring ten times for a rate of occurrence of 0.19% (overall average of 0.06%).

Despite being an oath designed with a fear of violence, warfare, and conquest in mind, intended to codify the responsibilities of the monastic and lay communities of
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298 Translation: *Concerning those we honor as saints whose relics are present.*
Cluny for raising an armed force for the defense of abbey holdings and clergy, only six of the twenty-four target roots occur within the text, greatly concentrating the focus of the text’s intent. These spare six roots only occur ten times for a total rate of 0.02% in the text. It is the shortest of the texts analyzed (690 words), but considering the purpose, it would be reasonable to expect the language to reflect that purpose more explicitly. Given its brevity, even these few appearances translate to a fairly significant rate of occurrence. *Host* is used three times (0.43%; overall average rate of occurrence of 0.10%), *pax/paci* (overall average of 0.06%) and *ulti/ulci* (overall average of 0.03%) are used twice (0.29%), and *defen* (overall average of 0.04%), *arm* (overall average of 0.06%), and *invas* (overall average of 0.02%) are each used once (0.14%). All occur at a significantly higher rate than the average across the twelve texts.

**Conclusions and Interpretation**

The rate of target root occurrence in these selected twelfth-century texts is only slightly above the overall average (1.08% vs. 1.00%). The distribution of these “hits” does seem to indicate some interesting patterns and avenues which warrant further targeted study. The decline in usage of warlike language is consistent from century to century (2.25% > 1.51% > 1.00%). This is possibly a reflection of increasing confidence and security as Cluny’s influence grew to its height. This decrease in average is also due to the relatively low rate of target roots in a single sermon, *De laude Dominici sepulchri*.
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299 The only other text with a comparable lack of variety is the foundation charter, with eight roots occurring, but they appear eighteen times for a much higher overall occurrence of 1.77%.
When the results of this text are excluded from calculations, the average rises to 1.46. This is still a decrease, but a much less significant drop-off. This is puzzling, considering this particular sermon is cited by Constable as being representative of Cluny’s enthusiastic support of the crusade movement. While all roots appear at least twice, there are only four which occur in all the selected texts: host* (forty-two occurrences for 0.11%), pax/paci* (twenty-five occurrences for 0.07%), defen* (seven occurrences for 0.02%), and arm* (nineteen occurrences for 0.05%). The relatively high rate of occurrence of the host* root is only surpassed by the ius/iud* root, which occurs 104 times (0.24%), despite not being used at all in the text of the townsmen’s oath.

If we posit the most frequently occurring target roots as being higher priority, then the primary focus of Hildebert of Le Mans’ version of Saint Hugh’s (1024-1109) vita would be justice (ius*/iudic*; 0.25%), followed by matters martial (milit*/mili*/mile*; 0.16%) and order (ordin*; 0.15%). Both Hugh’s background as the born heir to a noble house of great power and his stature as a mediator and peacemaker across western Europe make this a reasonable assumption. The breadth of Hugh’s experience and influence is also reflected in the diversity of target roots Hildebert used (twenty-one of twenty-four). Looking at the data, evidence of Hugh’s sixty years of dealing with conflict and men of power seems clear: impet* (0.08%); rap* (0.08%); host* (0.07%); potesta* (0.06%); and intemp* (0.05%). Abbot Hugh felt entirely secure in his abbey’s influence and safety. He was free to turn his eyes outward to work on easing the insecurities of others.

---

300 Constable, “Petri Venerabilis sermones tres,” 228-229.
Peter’s *De laude Dominici sepulchri* is perhaps Peter’s most well-known sermon and is often cited as evidence for Peter’s (and thus Cluny’s) support for the crusades, in principle. Giles Constable wrote:

The sermon “*de laude sepulchri Domini*”... is of interest especially for the evidence it gives of Peter’s attitude towards the crusades and of crusading concepts in the first half of the twelfth century. Although perhaps not, strictly speaking, itself a crusading sermon, it is representative of a type of sermon, of which relatively few have survived, that aroused enthusiasm for the Holy Land and the Holy Sepulchre and that influenced the religious and intellectual attitudes upon which the crusades were based. In no other of his works did Peter write with such warmth of the crusading movement, which he treats elsewhere with a certain degree of coolness.⁴⁰¹

Virginia Berry also talks of this sermon as providing at least implied support for the crusade movement in the form of “prayer, advice, and aid,” including some financial backing. Abbot Peter also voiced support for a heavy levy on Jews to provide additional resources.⁴⁰² Despite this characterization as a sermon in support of warfare, written to be given during the course of a council preparing to wage war, this sermon has approximately half as many occurrences of target roots (0.52%) as the six twelfth-century documents (1.08%), or the overall average (1.00%).

This relatively low percentage of target roots is even greater when *De laude Dominici sepulchri* is compared with the other two sermons, either individually (1.53%; 1.18%) or combined (1.35%). These other two surviving sermons, *De sancto Marcello* and *Sermo cuius supra in honore sancti* have, apparently, been untouched by scholars since Constable included them in his 1954 transcription. The data accumulated for this
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⁴⁰¹ Constable, “*Petri Venerabilis sermones tres,*” 228-229; Smith, “*Sine rege, sine principe,*” 25n.
⁴⁰² Berry, “Peter the Venerable and the Crusades,” 142, 144, 149, 151-155.
study indicate this is a huge gap in Cluniac studies and ripe for future consideration. All three sermons warrant scholarly translation and consideration as a glimpse of the voice and views of Cluny’s last truly influential abbot.

The most frequently occurring target root in *Sermo cuius supra in honore sancti*, once again *ius*/*iudic*/*, accounts for nearly two-thirds of the total. In the absence of other more essentially war- or violence-associated roots, *bell*/*, host*/, *mili*/*mile*/*, or *pug*/* for example, *ius*/*iudic*/* appears to be less strongly a function of conflict. And in fact, if we pull the nineteen occurrences of this root out of the hits for this text, the twelve occurrences of six other roots amount to less than 0.01%. This only places it in an even stronger place of interest. The data from *Sermo cuius supra in honore sancti* show not all of Peter’s sermons were written with a martial mindset. Without the contrast, it would be difficult to argue that the frequency data from *De Sancto Marcello* are all that notable.

*De Sancto Marcello* has the second highest rate of target roots of the twelfth-century texts and the highest among the three sermons analyzed. The six highest occurring target roots show a certain symmetry: Peace and fighting (*pax*/*paci*/* and *pug*) are each used ten times; military and order (*mili*/*mile*/* and *ordin*) each occur nine times; and war and defense (*bell*/* and *defens*) are each present five times. In a passage that seems to echo back to St. Gerald and the restrictions he placed on his exercise of violent force, we see some of these dichotomies expressed explicitly:

Moreover, we mean “to defend” not by fighting but by sustaining, not resisting (forcefully) but by making peace, not in killing others but by manfully putting [our] body before/in front of the killers... Christ taught that this type of conquering is new; the heavenly king instructed his army in this novel kind of
fighting in order that he might teach wickedness to be overcome by patience, pride by humility, evil by innocence.  

Peace, order and the defense of Christianity are the ideal. Still, sometimes a man of the church is called upon to act more forcefully “by placing one hand on those carrying the burdens, and the other on his sword.” Abbot Peter wanted this message to be crystal clear:

Neither is it fitting to serve/minister to [Christ] [only] in peace, but necessity also requires fighting. Nor to look forward to it [as to] a familiar thing, but as a proven and skillful soldier of wars; the commander of the heavenly army is made in the great dangers of battles.

Saint Marcellus was an early fourth-century bishop of Rome (pope) credited with leading and reorganizing the Christians of Rome after the persecutions of Diocletian. He was elected in 304 CE, denounced in around 308 CE, exiled and enslaved by Emperor Maxentius, and died in 310 CE. It is interesting that Peter chose him as the subject of this fiery sermon at Cluny as there is little evidence for a particularly close tie to him, though at some point there could have been an altar to Marcellus in the great Cluny III church, consecrated by Urban II in 1095. Peter’s predecessor, Hugh, received his early education at the priory of Saint Marcellus, and there was a priory of Saint-Marcel in Chalon where
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303 Defensare autem dicimus non pugnando sed sustinendo, non resistendo sed paciendo, non alios occidendo sed occisoribus corpus uiriliter supponendo... Novum hoc uincendi genus Christus docuit; hac insolita pugnandi arte celestis rex suum exercitum instruxit, ut pacientia malitiam, humilitate superbiam, innocentia doceret superari nequittiam. Constable, “Tres sermones,” 259-260.

304 Impleta est in beato uiro Marcello uetus hystoria que de aedificatoribus muri Hierusalem in libra Ezrae ita legitur: “Et princeps in domo luda aedificantium in muro, et portantium honera et imponentium, una manu sua faciebat opus, et altera tenebat gladium.” Hierusalem, hoc est uisionem pacis, ecclesiam esse, in qua nunc uera pax Deus per speculum et in enigmate uidetur. Constable, “Tres sermones,” 259.

Peter Abelard lived under Peter the Venerable’s abbatial oversight from 1140/1141 until his death there in 1142. Yet, for some reason, not only did Abbot Peter chose him for a sermon (which has somehow survived), but he made that sermon a call to protect and defend the church and Christianity full of martial imagery and fighting words:

Listen, beloved, how he provided for those entrusted to him: and hear how he resisted his adversaries. You will hear of the pastor’s solicitude; listen to the power of the military leader. You will hear how, ever vigilant, he guarded the sheepfold for the sheep; hear how powerfully he invaded the castles of his enemies. For he strived according to the prophet’s sermon to rise up against his enemies, and labored to stand as a wall for the house of Israel and to stand in battle in the day of the Lord.

Peter continues his usage of the good shepherd/wolves and sheep symbolism as his sermon continues. The image of a shepherd protecting his flock from the wolves is very well known. It is something of a Cluniac tradition, harking back to the parable of “Fulcher and the Wolves” from the Life of Maiolus, to recast the shepherd as a strong and just warrior. In “Fulcher and the Wolves,” the wolves are generally perceived to represent

---


Muslim raiders who held Abbot Maiolus hostage. If we extend that same interpretation to this text, this sermon quickly becomes a “crusade sermon” much more explicitly than De laude, either as a call for or in support of the Second Crusade (1147-1149). It can also be seen as supporting Abbot Peter’s action in binding the men of Cluny in an oath of protection, especially if he were responding to a specific threat or fear of persecution.

While Cluny and the western European church were not in anything like the precarious position of St. Marcellus and his early congregation, the situation in the Holy Land was perhaps more dire. It is also quite possible that Abbot Peter was beginning to fear for his abbey’s extensive and very prosperous holdings or simply reacting to the general milieu of conquest and violence prevalent at the time. The imagery invoked by Abbot Peter conjures a vision of all-out, bloody warfare:

The kings of the land stood by and the princes came together as one against the Lord and against his Christ. They drew forth their swords, they prostrated the army and they slew its leader. They scattered those remaining, who fled everywhere. But our soldier called back the fled, gathered together those called back, established the line/ranks of battle, and urged them to war. He called together the hosts, he fought sharply, he won victory, and as victor he exulted. Thus blessed Marcellus performing in the spiritual battle, shone forth, distinguished, in Christ’s army with the virtue of the spirit....
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309 See Meckler, “Wolves and Saracens in Odilo’s Life of Mayeul."

310 Interestingly, Gregory Smith disagrees, saying, “Peter’s four surviving sermons (the first published in Bibl. Clun., cols. 1231-48 [PL 189:953-72]; the rest by Constable in ”Petri Venerabilis sermones tres,” Revue benedictine 64 [1954], 224-72) have still less to do with the theme of violence,” comparing the sermons with Peter’s tracts Adversus Iudeorum inveteratam duritiem and Contra Petrobrusianos hereticos. Smith, “Sine rege, sine principe,” In.

Abbot Peter chose Marcellus as the exemplar of how to reconcile the power of violence with the goal of peace and order. The language he chose to celebrate Marcellus, like the language he chose to bind the layfolk of Cluny, gives us insight into how he viewed the balance between power and peace.

Of the meager six target roots which do appear in the townsmen’s oath (host*, pax/paci*, defen*, ulti*/ulci*, arm*, and invas*), all except arm* have the highest rate of occurrence across the twelfth-century texts. This finding largely validates this method of analysis, as the oath was demanded/given specifically for the purposes of ensuring the defense and just retribution by an armed force of townspeople of a violation of the abbey’s holdings. It is also interesting that justice (or injustice) is not a conscious matter of concern here, despite ius/iudic* being the root with the highest overall rate of usage in the twelfth-century texts (0.19%), as well as across all the selected texts (0.26%). There was no need to highlight the injustice of attacking clergy or abbey holdings, or to justify use of the abbey’s lay subjects for defense. The relation of these acts to the pursuit of justice is a given. While the justice in defending abbey holdings is implicit, the desire to honor a sense of fairness is seen explicitly in the responsibilities of both the abbot and oath takers—both sides should benefit from the agreement. Even in the face of imagined disaster, the Cluniac concern for “the common man” is a guiding principle. This seemingly anachronistic thread of incipient egalitarianism is seen in Cluniac texts from its earliest days: all men have the right to access the means of salvation; the strong have the responsibility to care for and protect the weak. The latter belief expands upon
Augustinian principles governing the just use of physical or political strength. These same basic Augustinian values are repeated in the *Relatio metrica*, the last of our texts to be analyzed, along with the vision of a “city of God” ruled by a powerful, but wholly just, leader.

Scott Bruce describes the *Relatio metrica* poet’s goal as “recast[ing] the 1500-word narrative [of the prose source] into a much ... more complex 827-line poem that amplified a theme absent in the original: the value of war and the moral conduct of warriors, on and off the battlefield.”312 As a supposedly first-hand account of warfare and a battle, however bloodless, of good versus evil, it is reasonable to expect a fairly high concentration of target roots. This expectation is upheld by the data, with the highest rate of occurrence of target roots across all of the selected tenth-, eleventh-, and twelfth-century documents (2.46%). The two highest contributors to this concentration are *bell* (0.51%) and *arm* (0.30%).

Many of the target roots which were not used by the poet to tell his tale (*viol*, *intemp*, *saev*, *impet*, and *temer*) are associated with lack of restraint or control. The poet uses such words very sparingly and only in reference to dangers of getting lost in the bloodlust of battle and the misuse of military and political power. Duke Eusebius, the focus and hero of the poem, is characterized as steady, thoughtful, and balanced in his actions. Even his sins are balanced by his good deeds. Despite spending much of his life engaged in warfare, he is deserving of salvation through his thoughtful life and the power

312 Bruce, “Cluny and the Crusades,” 13.
of his just and charitable actions. Ostorgius, the antagonist, on the other hand, is introduced using *trucis* (wild, savage) and *rabiei* (mad, rabid).

This duke is a rabid, uncontrolled, gluttonous beast who violates the ideal society of Eusebius’ “City of God” and abuses his power to exploit and harm his own subjects. Ostorgius is almost unreachable, though not totally irredeemable, once he sees reason and repents, thus holding out the hope of redemption and salvation for even the worst abusers of power.

The only two target roots to have a rate of occurrence of 0.10% or higher among these twelfth-century texts are *host* (0.10%) and *ius*/iudic* (0.19%). Despite this, the aggregate average for the twelfth century (1.09%) is higher than the overall average for all texts (1.04%). Justice is still a foundational value of Cluniac authors, but the justice now has a defined foil in the form of explicitly-labelled enemies. The increased complexity of the language relating to violence mirrors the increased complexity of social acceptance and condemnation of violence, depending on situation. The predictability of the results validates the methodology.
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313 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, line 332.
Chapter Five: Language, Violence, and the Cluniac World-view

This project’s stated goal is to isolate Cluniac attitudes towards violence and the use of martial force and to track the evolution of these attitudes from the abbey’s foundation in 910 CE over its rise to the height of its influence in the first half of the twelfth century. Data was gathered and analyzed toward this end with several specific questions in mind:

- How do Cluniac texts characterize the attitudes of the abbey/order towards violence and use of force?
- How did Cluniac attitudes towards violence fit with the abbey’s wider mission of contemplation and universal access to salvation?
- Does this language change in any way over the abbey’s early history?
- Can we speak of a consistent Cluniac “culture” around notions of violence/use of force (and those who use it)?
- Is there significance to the change, or lack of change, especially to the wider social environment? How does Peter’s oath and the concomitant battle fit this framework?

The mountain of statistical data points gathered, when compared, pondered, and considered in light of the social, political, and religious context provided by the texts from which they derived, eventually begins to resolve into patterns that reveal answers to these questions and serve to reconcile Cluny’s monastic integrity with its place in a world rife with violent conflict. These patterns evolve consistently over time to reflect the changes in western European Christian society in the tenth through twelfth centuries.

Violence, as a basic aspect of human society and strong factor in the environment into which Cluny was founded and developed, is represented in documents from the very
beginning of the abbey’s existence (1.86% of the foundation charter’s 1019 words). Certain of the texts analyzed deal explicitly with matters of interpersonal and societal violence, namely Odo’s *Vita Geraldi* (tenth century), the accounts of Abbot Maiolus’ capture and ransom by Islamic bandits in his *vitae* by Odilo and Syrus (eleventh century), and the *Relatio metrica* (twelfth century). These four texts not only acknowledge violence, but embrace violence—so long as it is contained, restrained, or directed within set bounds of acceptability. Readers (or more likely, listeners) are not told to deny the existence or function of violence; instead, scenes in which violence and conflict are clearly the focus are very consciously included. Audiences are unambiguously instructed on situations and tactics in which violence, even bloodshed or the taking of a life, may be justified. Many scholars argue that these texts would have been heard primarily by monastic audiences and therefore would have had little impact outside monastic circles. These monastic circles, however, stretched far beyond the abbey walls and included those with ties to the abbey through other than monastic vows. 2197 charters record 3257 land transfers between Cluny and other land owners in the period between 909 and 1049 (encompassing the first five abbacies). Visitors and pilgrims, those seeking the assistance of the Cluny’s hospitals and charity, townsfolk and merchants with material ties to the abbey, among others, would also have been exposed to and influenced the
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314 Although this is a significantly higher percentage than the overall average of 1.00%, and the texts themselves vary in percentage from a low of 0.52% (John of Salerno’s tenth-century *Vita Odonis*) to a high of 2.46% (the twelfth-century *Relatio metrica*), the averages for each of the three groups of texts does not deviate from that 1.00% by more than 0.10%.

315 Rosenwein, *To be the Neighbor of St. Peter*, 215.
abbey’s opinions. Aging warriors turned to the “value-added sanctity” of monastic communities for their last chance at salvation. The attitudes of the members of the communities in which they placed their hopes for eternal life would have mattered a great deal to them.

Early ascetic and eremitical Christians, the much respected “Desert Fathers,” made some of the earliest attempts to minimize their participation in and contact with worldly aspects of human society. They withdrew from contact with other humans on their rocks and pillars in attempts to cast off or surpass the faults they saw in humanity. Even their extraordinary devotion was not enough to allow them to overcome their own humanity. Completely alone, denying their physical needs (miraculously, by many accounts) they were still unable to quash their violent and material selves, as evidenced by the violent demonic battles they frequently described, often waged against the ultimate carnal motivator, lust. Later, communal monasticism also sought isolation from the greater human world in order to minimize the temptations or distractions of secular relationships. They devised rules for their communities in an attempt to reorder human society within their cloisters and to reject problematic aspects of humanity. Lust, gluttony, avarice, sloth, anger, envy, and pride were all specifically addressed, as were the violent emotions and actions these undesirable earthly distractions often provoked.316

When Abbot Berno (910-927) negotiated with Duke William of Aquitaine (also

known as William the Pious, 875-918) for the donation of his Cluniac holdings, he was seeking such a place for a religious community devoted to contemplation of the divine, prayer, commemoration, and, eventually, the salvation of all mankind. “All mankind” included a large portion of Christians whose function in society was to fight. These fighters could be a threat or a boon to religious institutions. The Church’s power lay in its ability to provide salvation for its followers. For Cluny to fulfill its goal as the foremost religious community at saving otherwise lost souls, a means to incorporate this warrior class into the ranks of those eligible for salvation needed to be found.

Cluny’s early acceptance of violence as an endemic and inevitable consequence of life on Earth is seen in Abbot Odo’s tenth-century elevation of Gerald of Aurillac to the rank of a saintly warrior. Odo’s template for a warrior worthy of salvation required that the knight or lord be truly and deeply pious, and that he never put his own interests above the interests or needs of those over whom he ruled or who looked to him for defense or protection. Gerald, as depicted by Odo, served as the model of a worthy lord and holy knight, a paragon created to reconcile the goal of salvation for all and the inexorable violence in human society by establishing a defined and acceptable path to salvation. In many ways, Odo established a new way to be a monk, a new “order” of warrior, in his very distinct descriptions of the tenets by which Gerald lived, fought, and

317 While it is very likely that Cluniac abbots and authors were not blind to the fact that many of their richest donors and most powerful (potential) protectors fell into this category, Cluny’s concern for the salvation of all as the community’s ultimate priority is most patently proven by the addition of All Souls’ Day to the Cluniac liturgical calendar by Abbot Odilo in c. 1030. Scott Bruce, The Penguin Book of the Undead: Fifteen Hundred Years of Supernatural Encounters (New York: Penguin Random House, 2016), 95-97.
ruled, thereby enabling his eventual salvation.

We see a reiteration of many of these same rules in the eleventh century with the depictions of Fulcher, the father of Abbot Maiolus, the fierce warrior who takes on the appearance of a sheep in order to protect his people from ravaging wolves. Fulcher has many things in common with his tenth-century corollary, Gerald. He looks to God for guidance (strongly implying piety), is nobly born, wealthy, and a strong leader. Notably different, however, is his propensity for violence. Although his antagonist is literally a “beast” (and the symbolic stand-in for a non-Christian), Fulcher slaughters him, dismembering and disemboweling him before stringing him up as a display. It is not likely that Gerald, even at his most exercised, would make such a gory mess, even with the blood of a beast. While Gerald must obviously have been, at the least, a crafty warrior, his hagiographer, Odo, minimized this aspect. Fulcher is termed a “most excellent warrior,” who, fully armored, faces his opponent in single combat before capturing and finishing him off in a most graphic manner.

The third explicit round of rules among the studied texts for how to fight and still find salvation is found in the twelfth-century *Relatio metrica*. In this text, our unknown Cluniac poet not only gives us a model of a holy warrior, but also provides his audience with a very clear counter-example. He provides a general critique of war and violence, including, by implication, Eusebius’ participation, providing the basis for Eusebius’ past sins and need for penance and repentance. This condemnation of wrathful violence specifically refers to the suffering and losses experienced by “the people” and “the
common folk." This is followed by almost 200 lines, nearly a quarter of the total line count, describing Eusebius’ many virtues as a lord and knight, including exceptional piety, his many good deeds, and his remorse and confession of past sins. The majority of his good deeds are in support of his most vulnerable and humble citizens (the poor, sick, widows, orphans, and destitute humanity are mentioned explicitly). Eusebius is exceedingly liberal in giving alms. He funds churches, hospitals, and innumerable masses for the souls of the dead, and goes humbly among his people attending to their needs. Eusebius follows in the literary footsteps of Gerald and Fulcher, compelled to fight in defense of his (Christian) people. His power, both physical and political, is used for the good of the church and all his people, especially the most vulnerable among them.

The poet then turns his attention to Ostorgius, introduced as the opposite of Eusebius in every way except for his great skill and ferocity as a warrior. The scathing condemnation of the villain of the piece, “a composite of negative commonplaces about tyrannical lords or violent knights,” is much shorter, occupying fewer than thirty lines. He indulges his human weakness by committing many of the most egregious sins—gluttony, avarice, sloth, anger, envy and pride are cataloged specifically—and as a result, loses twice what he has illicitly seized. Even Ostorgius, however, is not immune to the desire for salvation. He undergoes an epiphany and changes his ways when faced with the awesome presence of the heavenly host and the promise that he is (possibly) still redeemable after all his transgressions. Their task complete, the heavenly host begin to
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318 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, 83, lines 121, “populi,” and 124, “plebi.”
319 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, Introduction, 24.
take their leave, but not before Eusebius hesitantly expresses doubt and curiosity over the nature of his rescuers. He is urged by the leader of his rescuers to “labour to know greater things little by little, and do not feel ashamed to be taught what you ought to know,” if only to be sure his help comes from good and not evil. His saviors are revealed to be the spirits of those he has assisted to salvation by his many good and pious deeds on their behalf. We are offered one last warning to not only live virtuously, but also never assume we have done enough or relax our vigilance against sin. With a final pitch for the efficacy of prayers for the remission of sin for all people, including those who fight by the rules, so “ends the account of two dukes.”

Two fundamental principles remained unchanged from Odo’s St. Gerald in the tenth century, through Odilo’s rendering of Fulcher in the eleventh century, to our unnamed Cluniac poet’s account of good vs. evil in the twelfth century. First, just rule required the powerful to serve not their own earthly/human interests, but the needs of the church and the people, most especially the weakest and most vulnerable. This responsibility to the common folk, to their welfare and security, is explicitly stated in all three exemplars, showing an unfailing interest on the part of the Cluniac community in the good of all, not solely the rich and powerful friends of the abbey. Second, the reward of the good lord or knight who followed the rules and looked out for those dependent on him would be spiritual, being paid out in the afterlife and worth far more than any earthly advantage he might achieve. The language used became more complex and the
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320 Jones and Bruce, *Relatio metrica*, lines 730-731.
vocabulary more varied, but the basic principles remained consistent. The statistical measure of word choice over time, analyzed in this paper, supports this consistent messaging. Across all roots and all texts for each century, the utilization of target roots is within 10% (0.10) of the overall average across all three centuries. There are no target roots which do not appear in all three centuries” texts. The texts with the lowest percentages are from the tenth and twelfth centuries respectively: Salerno’s *Vita Odonis* and Peter the Venerable’s sermon *De laude Domini sepulchri* (0.52%). The highest percentage of target roots is found in the twelfth-century *Relatio metrica de duobus ducibus* (2.46%). So while there is a slight but steady increase, the language used does not vary greatly across the centuries.

Numerical results for Odo’s *Collationes* (a collection of sermons) in an isolated comparison with the aggregate numbers for Peter the Venerable’s sermons, as a comparison of early and later “internal messaging,” also illustrate significant congruity. The root with the highest percentage for both collections is *ius*/iudic*. This root has a 0.48% rate of occurrence in Odo’s *Collationes*, the highest rate of occurrence for this root across all texts. The *ius*/iudic* root’s percentage for Peter’s sermons is 0.23%, which is slightly higher than the twelfth-century average for this root (0.19%). The usage rate
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321 The tenth-century average is 0.94%, the eleventh-century average is 1.03%, and the twelfth-century average is 1.08%. The average for all roots/all texts/all centuries is 1.00%.
322 The Constable edition of Peter’s sermons has an aggregate 0.89% rate of occurrence of target roots. 226 occurrences in 47,066 words. This is a significantly higher rate than the 0.31% tenth-century average.
323 Thirty-seven occurrences in 16,067 words, which is right in line with the overall average of 0.25% across all the texts (450 uses in 175,259 words).
for all target roots for Odo’s sermons is 1.11% and for Peter’s 0.89%. Odo used a richer variety of target roots (21 of 24) in his Collationes than his successor, Peter, did in his sermons (19 of 24). The second most frequently appearing root in Odo’s Collationes, inimic*, is not found at all in the twelfth-century sermons, with thirty occurrences for (0.06% in the Collationes, 0.04% in the tenth-century source, and 0.03% overall). Also used by Odo—but not by Peter—are: impet* (0.01%); saev* (0.03%); viol* (0.04%); and vis/vim/vi/vires (0.03%). Two roots, feroc* and ulti*/ulci*, were each used twice in Peter’s twelfth-century sermons (0.01%), but do not appear at all in Odo’s Collationes.

The strong degree of overlap in word (target root) choice and consistent percentage of target root occurrence strongly implies that there was a distinct Cluniac “culture” in the manner in which Cluniac authors thought, and therefore wrote, about violence. The strongest correlation in target root usage over the first three centuries of the community’s existence is seen with ius*/iudic*, which was the most used root in each century’s texts and overall. Cluny’s message was not about eye-for-an-eye equivalency, or Christ’s vengeance on wrongdoers, but the salvation of all mankind. The Cluniac concept of salvation was as a right open to all, not strictly the privilege of a select few, and the Kingdom of Heaven was an inclusive—not exclusive—realm. All other social upheavals and issues aside, this result makes sense, both spiritually and pragmatically. The Cluniac emphasis on assuring the possibility of salvation to all Christian souls is largely a matter of justice, after all. It is only fair that those Christian
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325 0.31% in the tenth century; 0.20% in the eleventh century; and 0.19% in the twelfth century.
knights and rulers who fight and protect others—so long as they follow the rules for the
just and justifiable use of force—should be included among those who at least have a
chance to be eligible for a glorious afterlife in the Kingdom of Heaven. Why would they
choose Christianity with all its restrictions on behavior and earthly reward otherwise?

As a movement based upon texts which seemingly revere the brutally violent
sacrifice of its most holy figure, it should not be surprising that the language of Cluny
should be teeming with bellicose imagery. The abbey was founded in a time of great
political and social distress. The Carolingian administrative monolith had been shattered
and “little” wars were ongoing to redistribute power and authority among the emerging
aristocracy. The Norsemen (Vikings) were extending their raiding range down Europe’s
western coast and waterways, plundering riches and resources. The promises (and
threats) of the end of the world became more pressing as the year 1000 approached.

Cluny’s brotherhood came together to create a community to support each other in the
creation of a better model of human society, with the goal of getting as many Christians
admitted into the Kingdom of Heaven as possible. Founded on these principles, the abbey
experienced great growth in numbers of brothers and affiliated houses, wealth, and
geopolitical influence providing two centuries of stability, and, for the most part, peace
for both the monastic house and the townsfolk of Cluny. In 1122, for the first time in the
abbey’s history, an abbot was replaced prior to his death. Abbot Pontius (of Melgueil),
who had succeeded the sainted Abbot Hugh I, who had served his community for sixty
years (1049-1109), resigned from office and set off for the Holy Land. He was replaced first by Hugh II for a mere three months, and then Peter (the Venerable). In about 1123, Pontius returned, “seized it [the abbey] by force of arms,” and sought to take up his position again. The faction supporting Pontius, which included a great many townsfolk, and those loyal to Peter came to blows when Peter refused to step aside. It is easy to imagine the effect the desertion of the townsfolk and violent conflict within the abbey walls would have had on Peter’s sense of security and control. This traumatic event, along with the tension between the Frankish and Holy Roman monarchies and concerns over maintaining Cluny’s vast wealth, could all easily have combined to create a feeling of fear and disorder not dissimilar to the impending end-times anxiety of the tenth century for Abbot Peter, as well as both the monastic and lay communities of Cluny. It was under this dark shadow of fear and doubt, in 1145, that Peter demanded the oath of his lay dependents. Peter’s insecurities proved valid in 1166, when the duke of Chalon (or perhaps his son) occupied the castle at the Cluniac holding of Lourdon. Abbot Stephen (1163-1173) responded to this insult and threat to the sovereignty of Cluny by calling upon the sworn loyalty of the townsfolk, who were sworn to fight, if needed, and even kill if necessary, but with sworn assurance that these actions would not endanger

326 White, “Pontius of Cluny,” 196.
327 White, “Pontius of Cluny,” 196-197. He was summoned to Rome by Honorius II, tried for treason, and died in prison in December, proclaiming to the end that only St. Peter had the right to judge or censure him. His body was interred at Cluny by Peter the Venerable, where something of a local cult developed.
328 Constable, “The Abbot and Townsmen of Cluny,” 159-160; Iogna-Prat, Order and Exclusion, 29-30, 93, 333-334. Constable attributes Pontius” (1109-1122) popularity to “his open-handedness” vs. “Peter”’s policies of economy and of excluding laymen from the abbey; Iogna-Prat theorizes that the conflict was the result of the loyalties of the monks of Cluny having become divided between differing aristocratic houses. Pontius died in a papal prison in 1126.
their salvation. Stephen, acting as the just lord of his God-given demesne, was following
the path of Fulcher and Gerald before him, resorting to force only as a last resort and then
only in response to the illegitimate aggression of a less honorable antagonist.

This shift towards accepting that men who perform violence are worthy of
redemption, and that they can be heroic while at the same time blemished by the sin of
their profession, would have made it much more likely they would seek and follow the
guidance and intercession of the monks of Cluny (and other orders). By giving these men
hope, they gained something to lose, and that made them much more likely to listen, and
donate lands and wealth; but it also made the restrictions placed on forgivable violence
more likely to be followed. If one benefits by doing good, as Eusebius did, there is no sin.

The depictions in these texts is, of course, the monastic ideal of knighthood and
lordship. They were presented as models to emulate with exceedingly high standards to
strive for. It is unlikely that many, if any at all, of the intended audience ever completely
realized the perfection of the literary paragons. For example, widespread achievement of
Gerald’s extreme chastity would have wiped out the aristocratic families and warrior
classes entirely. The continued attention of our Cluniac authors to presenting templates
for proper and worthy knighthood and lordship is itself evidence of their disappointment
that the archetypes remained unrealized, even when they were adjusted over time to
better fit the realities of the life of a warrior. Cluny did not seek physical confrontation,
even with enemies of the church. Despite this, the language of warfare and violence, the
recognition of the more violent aspects of human society, and the desire to provide even
the most violent sinner with a path to salvation was so pervasive in Cluniac thought from the abbey’s earliest days, that it is also impossible to say that Cluny did not accept the inevitability of bloodshed, and through its extensive influence allow for the genesis of violent social movements.

The “how,” or methodology, of this study is data mining a specific set of texts (i.e., corpus linguistics) to quantify the language usage and relationships, (i.e., word embedding). The “what,” or results, show that Cluniac authors never rejected violent force outright, but instead adjusted their messaging regarding the just use of violent action to reflect both wider social evolution outside the institution and the changing needs of the community in response to the prevailing social conditions. That leaves the question of “why.” Why look at texts in such a way? Why should we, as historians, concern ourselves with such a fine-grained study of language and statistical analysis of the rates of usage of specific words to describe complex concepts? The results of this type of analysis provides us with a way to draw back the curtain of “public speech” to reveal some of the thought patterns behind it. Linguistic analysis offers a method to quantify our subjective understanding of these texts. In seeking to understand the mentalities and motivations of the producers of the historical record, their word choice matters. Whether a sermon intended to give warriors hope for salvation in the twelfth century or a public address to discuss the response to a pandemic which threatens every aspect of society world-wide, as this thesis has demonstrated, word choice matters.
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Appendix A: Medieval France, c. 1000

Appendix B: Abbots of Cluny through c.1166

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Abbots</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>Berno</td>
<td>From Baume; multiple simultaneous abbacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>927</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>(Saint) Odo</td>
<td>Followed Berno from Baume; 931 – Right to reform on request of lay abbot and right to admit monks from non-reformed abbeys granted by Pope John XI &lt;br&gt;Author of Life of St. Gerald (855/909) &lt;br&gt;John of Salerno, Life of St. Odo (943)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>Aymard of Cluny (co-abbot with Maiolus from 954)</td>
<td>Increased property/holdings through donation and the addition of other communities under the Cluniac umbrella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>954</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>(Saint) Maiolus</td>
<td>Began Cluny II in 981; acquired relics of Sts. Peter and Paul &lt;br&gt;Two vitae by Odilo and Syrus &lt;br&gt;Appears in Relatio Metrica, Bernard of Cluny (??), 12th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>994</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>Odilo</td>
<td>Pax dei proclaimed 998 &lt;br&gt;Exemption from Gregory V in 998, confirmed and extended by John XIX in 1024 &lt;br&gt;Treuga dei proclaimed 1027 &lt;br&gt;Cartulary begun &lt;br&gt;De vita et virtutibus sancti Odilonis, Iotsalsus, c.1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td><strong>(Saint) Hugh I</strong></td>
<td>Semur; Began construction Cluny III; Cartulary and Customaries; Cluniac pope (Urban II) and call for Crusade (1095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncle was Count of Chalon and Bishop of Auxerre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vitae x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frankish (Capetian) Kings: Henry I (1030-1060), Philip I (1060-1108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td><strong>Pontius (Pons) of Melgueil</strong></td>
<td>Completed Cluny III; deposed/resigned due to disagreement with papacy over the Investiture Controversy, and then tried to come back during P the V’s abbacy leading to a violent confrontation between monks inside abbey walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1122</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>Hugh II</td>
<td>3 months only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1122</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td><strong>Peter the Venerable</strong></td>
<td>Oath given (1145); Letters with Bernard of Clairveaux; Witness to Pontius kerfuffle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>Robert Grossus</td>
<td>Semilaicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>Hugh III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1163</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>Stephan I</td>
<td>Exercised the oath given in 1145 leading to battle/massacre with supporters of the Duke of Chalon at Lourdon (1166)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Oath of protection between Abbot Peter the Venerable and the townsmen of Cluny
Manuscript: BNF NAL 2265, no. 7.
Latin Transcription

FORMA SACRAMENTI QUOD PETRUS VENERABLIS BURGENSIBUS
CLUNIACENSIBUS ET HOMINIBUS DECANIARUM IMPOSIUS.

29 janvier 1145.

Iste est modus sacramenti vel paccionum quas ex precepto domini Petri,
Cluniacensis abbatis, tam burgenses Cluniacenses quam cuncti homines de decaniis
fece rant. Sacramenti forma talis fuit. Universi a quinto decimo anno etatis et supra ista
juraverunt. In primis domino abbati et ecclesie fidelitatem. Item si quando publice
denunciatus fuerit hostis ecclesie, deinceps eum nec hospicio suscipiant, nec sub tecto,
necque ei sua donent vel cum eo contrahant, vel aliquo modo auxilium vel consilium
scienter prebeant vel per se vel per alium. Si tamen ei aliquid debent vel ipse eis, hoc ei
reddere vel ab eo accipere liceat vel persuadere ut a male facto ecclesie desistat. Item si
per nuncium domini abbatis commoniti fuerint alicubi armati exire, ut omnes exeant, nisi
aliquis adeo infirmus sit quod nullo modo egredi valeat. Postea consilio domini abbatis et
meliorum burgensium poterunt remanere qui electi fuerint ad custodiendam villam vel
qui alios pro se ydoneos miserint ideo vel quod de eis magis timeatur vel quod ipsi minus
ydonei sint. Quod si aliquis in congressu illo vel alibi propter defensionem ecclesi
mortuus Cluniacum delatus fuerit, a toto conventu dignissime susceuptus gratis sepeletetur
nisi sponte sua aliquid dare voluerit. Postea in capitulo absolutus, tam pro ejus anima
quam pro requie parentum suorum officium et missa in conventu celebrabitur eruntque
exinde participes tocius benefacti ecclesie. Si quis vero tam de burgensibus quam de aliis
hominibus qui de sacramento sunt, hostes ecclesie occiderit, ceperit, vulnaverit, percusserit, seu aliquid damnum intulerit quod sine dacione pecunie pacificare non possit, ista erit racio. Ipse quidem qui hoc fecit nichil dabit, nec ecclesia sine illo vel herede ejus, si ille interim mortuus fuerit, pacem cum adversario faciet. Quod si his (sic) interim in suo loco securus manere non potuerit, tunc decanus ad cujus obedienciam pertinet, eum ad se deductum viriliter manuteneat et qu ejus sunt pro posse integre custodiat. Quod si nec ibi securus fuerit, tunc decanus suus ducat eum Cluniacum et ibi tam decanus Cluniacensis quam camerarius et alii eum constater manuteneant quousque pace facta ad propria redire et ibi secure manere valeat. Si causa illa pro qua pecuniam dari oportebit specialis fuerit Cluniacensis ecclesie, eam solummodo ecclesia persolvat. Si vero burgensium, ipsi eam tantummodo solvant. Quod si eorim qui deforis sunt, et ipsi similiter per se ipsos tantum persolvant. Sed si causa burgensium fuerit et aliquis eorum qui deforis juraverunt ulcionem fecerit, communiter utique solvent quod prestandum fuerit. E converso si causa eorum qui deforis sunt fuerit, et hoc burgenses ulti fuerint, pari modo communiter solvent quod dandum fuerit. Preter hec si quis infra apostolicum bannum aliquem Cluniacum venientem ceperit, vel ei aliquod damnum intulerit, si hoc aliquis burgensium vel eorum qui deforis sunt infra eundem bannum vel extra ultus fuerit pro quo pecunia danda sit, terciam partem ejusem pecunie ecclesia, duas tam burgenses quam illi qui deforis sunt prestabunt. Si autem extra metas banni ad mercata sive ad nundinas venientes aliquis depredatus fuert vel aliquid eis mali fecerit, quicumque supradictorum tunc adcurrere potuerit, eis totis viribus auxiliabitur et contra invasores
illos a domino abbate et a fratribus Cluniacensibus ecclesiastica ultio studioissime requiretur. Sacramenta suprascripta ab hoc instantne Pascha usque ad sextum vin\textsuperscript{329} (sic) suam plenissime obtinebunt, salvo sacramento fidelitatis erga dominum abbetem et ecclesiam, quod non usque ad sextum Pascha tantum, sed semper vin suam conservabit. Et quia supradicta omnia pro bono pacis et communi utilitate constituta sunt, concessit dominus abbas burgensibus, ut ex his paccionibus prefixo tempore transacto nulla consuetudo possit ab eis exigi vel eis imponi seu ad lesionem ipsorum vel heredum suorum aliquo modo retorqueri. His additur\textsuperscript{330} (sic) quod si quis eorum qui Cluniaci morantur denunciatum hostem ecclesie contra suprascriptum modum hospicio susceperit vel in aliquo consilium ei vel auxilium prebuerit, xx solidorum pena damnetur. Que tamen pecunia ad supra nominatas secundum jam dictam distinctionem burgensium expensas servabitur. Actum est hoc anno ab incarnatione Domini millesimo centesimo quadragesimo VI\textsuperscript{331}, anno primo donni Lucii pape secundi, IIII\textdegree kalendas febroarii.

Charte partie par le mot cirografum.

\textsuperscript{329} vis
\textsuperscript{330} additur
\textsuperscript{331} Although the charter is dated 1146, the pontificat of Lucius II (1144-1145) requires a date of January 29, 1145, according to Leopold Delisle, \textit{Inventaire des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale. Fonds de Cluni}, Paris: Bibliothèque nationale (France). Département des manuscrits, 1884, 281.
English Translation

The form of the binding oath/vows which Peter the Venerable imposed upon the burgesses of Cluny and the men of the deaneries.

January 29, 1145

This is the form of the vow or pacts which was made by the order of the lord Peter, abbot of Cluny, by both the burgesses of Cluny and all the men of the deaneries. Such was the manner of the oath. All those of 15 years and more made this vow. Firstly fidelity to the lord abbot and the church. Also if at any time anyone has been publicly denounced as an enemy of the church, thence forward [they] neither welcome in the household, nor under shelter/roof, nor to give him anything they own, nor contract with him, nor knowingly offer any other means of aid or counsel, by himself or through another/third party. If however either they owe something to him or he to them, let it be permitted either to render back or to take from him in order to persuade him to withdraw from evil towards the church. Likewise if the lord abbot has admonished them by a messenger to go forth, armed, then all shall go out, unless he is so ill/weak that he is in no way is able to go out. Afterward, by the council of the lord abbot and of the better townsmen, those who were chosen to protect the town [or farm] or who sent other worthy men in their place, either because he was more afraid of them or because they were less worthy were able to remain behind. And if anyone having died in that conflict in defense of the church and his body shall be carried back to Cluny, and having been received by the full community as most worthy of receiving free burial by all assembled unless someone wished to give something voluntarily. Afterwards in the chapterhouse absolved, both for the sake of his
soul and the repose of his own parents the office and mass will be celebrated by the community, and they then will share blessings for the good deeds in benefit of the church. If either any of the townsfolk or of the other men who are bound by this oath, kill, capture, wound, strike, or inflict any other injury upon enemies of the church who it is not possible to settle without payment, this will be the procedure. Namely he who has done this will pay nothing, nor will the church settle with his adversary without him or his heir if he has died in the meantime. But if he in the meantime he has not been able to remain secure in his own residence, then the dean to whom he owes obedience, shall maintain him properly after he has been brought to him, and let him keep his dependents/household whole as to the extent of his [the dean’s] ability. And if even there he is not safe, then let his own dean bring him to Cluny and there let both the dean of Cluny as well as the chamberlain as well as others will consistently maintain him until peace being achieved he is able returned to his own [residence] and there to stay in safety. If that case/situation for which it is suitable for money to be paid pertains particularly to the church at Cluny, then let only that church alone resolve it. But if it is solely relating to a townsman, then he himself only pays. But if it is a case involving those who are outsiders, let them pay solely on their own. But if it is a case of the townsfolk and one of those who has made an oath on the outside [of this agreement] swears retribution, then they will resolve to pay that which must be paid in common that which stands before. And conversely if the fault is of those who are of the outside, and the townsfolk have avenged this, they will likewise resolve together what will be paid.
Furthermore if anyone under apostolic ban [excommunication] takes someone coming to Cluny, or if they do some injury/condemnation to him, and if someone of the townsmen or of those who outside under ban or not exact retribution concerning that if money is to be paid, the church will pay one third part of this money, and two parts both the townsmen and those who are outside will pay. If on the other hand someone outside the boundaries has preyed upon a man coming to the market or the fair or has done any harm to him, then any of those mentioned whoever is able will hasten there and with all their strength give aid and against those attackers [the predators] the strictest ecclesiastical vengeance of the lord abbot and those of brotherhood of Cluny will be required. The oath written above, from this Easter until the sixth will preserve its full force, without the oath of safety and loyalty towards the lord abbot and clerics/church being impaired, which is not only to the sixth Easter, but being kept always. And everything set out above was established entirely for the sake of peace and the common welfare, the lord abbot has agreed with the townsmen, that after the time previously established for these oaths comes to an end no customary payments shall be required from them or imposed upon them or turned back upon them in any way to the detriment of them or their heirs. In addition to these things that if anyone who is of Cluny should either receive into their household or in any way give counsel or aid to anyone denounced as an enemy of the church, a 20 solidi penalty will be exacted. Such money named above, however, in accordance with the above—written provision shall be set aside for the specific expenses of the townspeople. This was set down in the year of the incarnation of the Lord 1146,
first year of lord pope Lucius II, 29th of January.\textsuperscript{332}

Charter divided on the word \textit{cirografum}\textsuperscript{333}

Translation by Amanda Swinford (with extensive assistance from Tim Nidever, John Ott, David Cole, RCP Russell, and Karen Ready)

\textsuperscript{332} See note 330, above.

\textsuperscript{333} A means of verifying the authenticity of multiple copies of a legal document. Multiple copies would be made on a single sheet and “chirograph” written in the margin(s) between copies. The copies would be cut apart for distribution to interested parties. If there was a need to verify copies were authentic, the cut sides could be matched up.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Roots</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arm*</td>
<td>armed, armor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bell*</td>
<td>war, warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defen*</td>
<td>defense, defend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feroc*</td>
<td>ferocious, unrestrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furo*</td>
<td>fury, rage, uncontrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host*</td>
<td>enemy, hostile(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impet*</td>
<td>impulsive, thoughtless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inimic*</td>
<td>enemy, enmity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intemp*</td>
<td>uncontrolled, unrestrained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invas*</td>
<td>invade, attacker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ius*/iudic*</td>
<td>justice, judgement, right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mili*/mile*</td>
<td>soldier, military, martial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordin*</td>
<td>order, to order, regulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pax/ paci*</td>
<td>peace, order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pell* (compello, impello, repello, expello)</td>
<td>to force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poten* (excluding reference to God)</td>
<td>power, force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potesta*</td>
<td>power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pug*</td>
<td>fight, fighter, brawl, brawler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rap*</td>
<td>seize violently and/or hungrily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saev*</td>
<td>cruel, cruelty, rage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temer*</td>
<td>rash, uncontrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulti*/ulci*</td>
<td>vengeance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viol*</td>
<td>violence, violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vis, vim, vi, vires</td>
<td>physical force, strength</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Linguistic Data

The tables in Appendix E are available as supplemental files:

Linguistic analysis 10th c. 130222.csv, Excel spreadsheet, 2.46 KB
Linguistic analysis 11th c. 130222.csv, Excel spreadsheet, 2.53 KB
Linguistic analysis 12th c. 130222.csv, Excel spreadsheet, 3.53 KB
**10th Century Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Root</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>10th c. Texts</th>
<th>10th c. Totals</th>
<th>3884 words</th>
<th>17,997 words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arm*</td>
<td>armed, armor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bell*</td>
<td>war, warfare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defen*</td>
<td>defense, defend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feroc*</td>
<td>ferocious, unrestrained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furo*</td>
<td>fury, rage, uncontrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host*</td>
<td>enemy, hostile(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impet*</td>
<td>impulsive, thoughtless</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inimic*</td>
<td>enemy, emnity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intemp*</td>
<td>uncontrolled, unrestrained</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invas*</td>
<td>invade, attacker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ius*, iudic*</td>
<td>justice, judgment, right</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milit*/mile*</td>
<td>soldier, military, martial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordin*</td>
<td>order, to order, regulate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pax/paci*</td>
<td>peace, order</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pell</em></td>
<td>(compello, impello, repello, expello) to force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>poten</em></td>
<td>power, force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potest*</td>
<td>power</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pose</em></td>
<td>pose</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seav*</td>
<td>cruel, cruelty, rage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temer*</td>
<td>rash, uncontrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulti*/ulci*</td>
<td>vengeance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viol*</td>
<td>violence, violent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vis/vim/vi/vires</td>
<td>physical force, strength</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 100% c. Totals | 18,868 words | 104 | 0.55% | 854 | 0.97% | 1823 | 1.04% |

**Notes:**
- The table provides a count of occurrences and percentages for various target roots across 10th-century texts, comparing them to all texts.
- The data includes translations of root forms and their occurrences in various contexts.

**References:**
- Foundation Charter (1,019 words of text)
- Vita Geraldi (21,172 words)
- Life of Odo (19,011 words)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column Title</th>
<th>11th Century Texts</th>
<th>10th Century Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Root</td>
<td>All Occurences</td>
<td>% Occurences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm*</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bell*</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defen*</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feroc*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furo*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host*</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impet*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inimic*</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intemp*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invas*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ius*, iudic*</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milit*/mile*</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordin*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pax/paci*</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pell</em></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>poten</em></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potesta*</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pug*</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rap*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saev*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temer*</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulti*/ulci*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viol*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vis/vim/vi/vires</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Root</th>
<th>22nd c. Data</th>
<th>12th c. Texts</th>
<th>All Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>arm*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bell*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defen*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feroc*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrestrained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furo*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>host*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impet*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thoughtless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inimic*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intemp*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrestrained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invas*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>justice, judgment, right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>milit*/mile*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordin*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pax/paci*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pell</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to force</td>
<td>impello, repello, expello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potesta*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pug*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reference to God)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rap*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saev*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ultra*/ulci*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viol*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vis/vim/vi/vires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10th c. Totals**
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**12th Century Data**

Twelfth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>De laude Domini sepulchri</th>
<th>Vita Sanctissimi Patris Hugonis</th>
<th>Peter the Venerable Congregate of Constable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forma sacramenti quod Petrus</td>
<td>Relatio metrica de duobus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10,306 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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