

The Aristocratic Body and the Memory Politics of Church Reform, 900-1300 C.E.

by

Jonathan T. Sapp

Department of History
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Jehangir Malegam, Advisor

Constance Bouchard

Marcus Bull

Bruce Hall

Kristen Neuschel

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of
History in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2021

ABSTRACT

The Aristocratic Body and the Memory Politics of Church Reform, 900-1300 C.E.

by

Jonathan Sapp

Department of History
Duke University

Date: _____

Approved:

Jehangir Malegam, Advisor

Constance Bouchard

Marcus Bull

Bruce Hall

Kristen Neuschel

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
History in the Graduate School of
Duke University
2021

Copyright by
Jonathan Sapp
2021

Abstract

This dissertation examines the tools of memory creation in the context of church reform from the late ninth through thirteenth centuries. It argues that monastic communities and aristocratic households of the period used the human body as a touchstone for the discussion of memory as a key stake in the social and political life of the high middle ages. The argument centers around several key sites of analysis: excommunication, burial, bodily wounding and mutilation, and liturgical cursing. Centering the analysis on these sites of cultural activity allows close readings of the complex dialectic which develops around memory. Using memory as the central focus of the study allows insight into the ways in which the semi-literate communities of the secular nobility participated in and drove the course of church reform, rather than functioning as mere sources of converts or sources of gifts. Doing so allows an intervention that shifts the field of medieval memory studies away from manuscripts and narratives, and towards a methodology that puts activity and social practice at center stage.

Contents

Abstract	8
Acknowledgements.....	vii
1. Introduction – Summary of the Argument.....	1
1.1 Historiography: Property, Memory, and Lordship, 1000-1100 C. E.....	7
1.2 Property, Memory, and the Body Around 1100	13
1.3 Local Memory Politics, Peace Councils, and the Reform of the Church, 1000-1300 C. E.	22
2. Burial, Property, and Oblivion at Cluny, 1050-1200 C. E.....	34
2.1 Cluny’s Charters and the Military Aristocracy: Problems and Approaches.....	40
2.2 Castellans, Lordly Self-Presentation, and Oblivion	45
2.3 The Grossi Kindred and Its Churches.....	56
2.4 Conclusion.....	70
3. Displaced Bodies: The Advent of a Memory Economy in the Era of the Peace Councils, 989-1100 C. E.....	73
3.1 Relic Tours and the Humiliation of Saints: Vulnerability of Saintly Bodies and the Dialectics of Corporeal Movement	78
3.2 Burial, Excommunication, and the New Meanings of the Aristocratic Corpse	89
3.3 Conclusion.....	106
4. The Politics of the ‘Mnemonic Body’ in Medieval Ghost Narratives, 1050-1200 C. E.	108
5. Singing the Wounded Body: Mutilation and Memory in Medieval Europe, 900-1100 C. E.....	141

5.1 The Cadaver Synod of 897: A Laboratory of Embodied Memory in Post-Carolingian Europe.....	143
5.2 The Monastic Clamor and the Dismemberment of Aristocratic Memory, 900-1200 C. E.	150
5.3 The Aristocratic Body in Song: Monastic Curses and the Chansons de Geste	158
5.4 Conclusion.....	165
6. Aristocratic Burial, Cistercian Reform, and the Memory Politics of <i>detestande feritatis</i> , 1100-1300 C. E.....	167
6.1 The Oblivion of Cistercian Conversion in Twelfth-Century France.....	173
6.2 Cistercian Monasteries and Aristocratic Founders in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: The Tools of Memory	183
6.3 The Abbots of Charlieu and Sturzelbronn Dispute the Internment of the Duke of Lorraine.....	192
7. Conclusions – Memory Politics After 1300	208
Bibliography	201
Biography.....	215

Acknowledgements

This dissertation has been the work of many years. It would never have achieved its final form without the patient guidance and influence of Jehangir Malegam, who indulged my longstanding interest in the medieval aristocracy and stuck with this project far beyond the call of duty. I am happy to call him a colleague and friend. Connie and Bob Bouchard have long been academic family members since my days at Akron, and both offered support of all kinds during our email exchanges and over dinner. Marcus Bull, Kristen Neuschel, and Bruce Hall each contributed far more than they perhaps know with wonderful conversations at key points in the conception of the project, and have always been generous with their ideas and collegiality. My parents, Lane and Lilyann Sapp have been an incalculable means of support during some tough times, and even after years of reading and writing I can hardly find words to thank them. My brother Charles and his wife Libby have housed me frequently during stays in the Triangle, and their company inspires me to keep going, stay positive, and remember what is important. Tamara Rand has been a rock of support since Akron, and I truly don't know how to thank her. Others whose friendship I have cherished working on the dissertation are Thomas Barefoot, Aaron Colston, Abby Bernhart, Tom Weyant, Jay Lemanski, and the brothers of Mepkin Abbey. My gratitude to all cannot be matched.

Jonathan Sapp

(S. D. G.)

1. Introduction – Summary of the Argument

In the early twelfth century, the author of the anonymous Saxon Annals related a story about Eticho, the founder of the Welf dynasty, an important family of the secular nobility in the German Empire. According to the *Annals*, Eticho and his sons refused to do homage to Louis the Pious until Louis's wife Judith, a member of the Welf family convinced her brother to swear fealty to the emperor. In exchange for his loyalty, Louis allowed Eticho's son Henry to claim lordship over the amount of land Henry could plow. After changing horses several times, Henry circled his lordship of Ravensburg. Because Henry had done so in defiance of his father's refusal to do obeisance to Louis, Eticho retreated to the mountains with his household. The Saxon Annalist relates that his early twelfth-century contemporary, the Welf Henry the Black, had journeyed to the mountains and found the tomb of Eticho and built a church on the site of the founder of his lineage.¹

This passage in one fell swoop gives access to the central concerns of the high medieval nobility in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries when it came to family memory. Though rooted in the Carolingian past, the story of the founders of the Welfs and their twelfth-century descendant places property, lineage memory, and noble deeds

¹ MGH *Annalista Saxo* a. 741-1139, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH *Scriptores* 6 (Hanover, 1884), p. 763-5. Cited in John B. Freed, *The Counts of Falkenstein: Noble Self-Consciousness in Twelfth Century Germany* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 74: 6, 1984), pp. 40-2.

as part of one symbiotic and conceptual whole. It is significant that only after the tomb of Eticho is fortuitously discovered it a church built. Clearly, for the medieval secular elite, memory could be enhanced by ecclesiastical patronage, but certainly did not derive exclusively from it. Henry the Black's construction of a church on his ancestor's grave hints at what is a central concern of this dissertation, the relationship of aristocratic memory cults to institutional church reform from the eleventh through thirteenth centuries. Briefly stated, this dissertation examines the complex dialectic between localized institutional reform initiatives and the commemorative culture of the secular warrior aristocracy as each evolved over the course of the eleventh through thirteenth centuries. The purpose of this analytical approach is to better understand and evaluate the motives for lay participation in efforts for church reform. The centuries between 1000 and 1300 C.E. were a period of rapid and intense change in western Europe for all levels of society. New and more frequent forms of writing made several social groups, particularly the knighthood and the lower nobility more visible in the sources than they had been previously. The growing amount of documentation resulted in increased visibility of and interest in institutional and cultural memory among monastic communities, secular clergy, and the lay aristocracy.

As a consequence of the rise in documentation and ensuing visibility in the years surrounding the year 1000, secular elites of high and low status can be clearly seen engaging in virulent and longstanding conflicts with secular and regular churchmen

over issues regarding property and the rights associated with it. In this period, when sources of liquid wealth were of limited value to ecclesiastical and secular elites, the increasing number of disputes over property between monastic and aristocratic communities centered on intangible sources of power and prestige. The argument in the chapters that follow centers on one of these indices of intangible power, that of familial and institutional memory.

In the high medieval period, memory served as a touchstone for conversation between monastic communities and the lay elite because both groups were intensely interested in creating and maintaining different forms of corporate legacy. The warrior nobility of western Europe from the eleventh through thirteenth centuries had a complex relationship with the written word. Although they understood its value after a fashion, their culture was primarily an oral one, and as such it is a methodological challenge to access their agency. To do so, historians have had to rely on localized and anthropologically grounded analyses of aristocratic disputing practices, property donation, or marriage in order to sort out their social, political and cultural priorities.

This dissertation offers a new perspective on local instances of church reform, using memory as the central keystone through which reform initiatives were negotiated dialectically between aristocratic lordships and their monastic neighbors. In the chapters that follow, the principal players are seldom Emperors, popes, or bishops. Rather, reform is a conversation staked by both aristocrats and monastic communities in local

contexts dealing largely with issues of memory negotiated through social activity. Such an approach places the lay aristocracy in debate with monastic elites who interacted frequently with them. I hope to show that the knights, castellans, dukes, and counts of western Europe took part in discussing how, when, or if reform could be carried out through a specific set of actions and activities that for them had long held memory making power. Doing so places the lay elite in correspondence with the wider intellectual debate that undergirded reform initiatives, and allows the aristocracy to emerge as key players in the cultural stakes of reform efforts, rather than simply sources of monastic converts and property donatives.

For the newly visible warrior elite of the high medieval centuries, one's property and rights were fused with the body itself to become the defining elements of their memory-making methodology. The power articulated through property ownership, usage rights, and burial built and maintained a sense of familial legacy, offering the invaluable sense of place in which aristocratic memories were rooted. Donating, alienating, or claiming land and use rights in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were part of what historians have routinely called banal lordship, but in the following analysis these claims were also part and parcel of the maintenance of the lordly "memory economy."

The buried aristocratic body became the cornerstone of familial cults in these centuries, and the movement, disinterment, or displacement of the body similarly

became a central aspect of the memory-making vocabulary of the lay aristocracy. It is no accident that this vocabulary gained its greater visibility in the sources at the turn of the eleventh century, when monastic communities and local bishops reworked the ancient practice of stealing and moving saints bodies in their own efforts to convene peace councils for curtailing the perceived violence of the newly-visible and troublesome secular elite.

Excommunication and liturgical cursing, other ancient ecclesiastical censures, gained new cultural relevance in these centuries, since lay lords could be punished through the expulsion of their bodies from the sacred space of monastic cemeteries. The potential oblivion of this disinterment meant that lords often sought to re-bury kin illicitly in attempts to avoid being forgotten. At the heart of this grappling over a corpse's placement was a simple but profound dissonance. Excommunication, cursing, and other forms of censure in these centuries denied burial and threatened damnation to unruly secular elites. In charter narratives and curse liturgies monks frequently lamented the stubborn refusal of lay kin groups and disputants to be fazed by the threat of damnation after death. Part of the cultural dissonance between these intimate neighbors was the extent to which they differed on the nature of the afterlife. For the knights, castellans, dukes and counts of high medieval France, what was feared the most was not hell, but oblivion; the complete loss of memory and legacy.

The peace councils of the late tenth and early eleventh century serve as the starting point for the arc of the dissertation's argument, spanning three centuries. The following chapters center on property claims, excommunication, and burial as the three dominant and interrelated sites through which the memory economy was discussed, since they each serve as historical sites through which monastic institutional reform and secular memorializing culture intersected. As the argument develops and progresses, it will become clear that these elements of the memory economy and the stakes of debate about localized reform changed drastically over the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

As new monastic orders gained prominence, aristocratic access to burial rights and the all-important placement of their familial cults became more complex, demanding greater maneuvering or even violent action from lords seeking the proper placement of their bodies and memories in monastic cemeteries. Monastic writers utilized their chronicles to good effect to downplay or reorient aristocratic claims to memory, telling ghost stories that cast deceased secular lords as embodied dead whose memories could be erased through careful storytelling. Curse liturgies sang the destruction of the aristocratic body and attempted to unhinge the embodied nature of aristocratic memory cults, themselves often reiterated and embellished through romances and *chansons de geste*. The dissertation ends with the 1299 bull of Boniface VIII which forbade the nobility from mutilating corpses post-mortem, placing parts of the body in

separate graves in order to widen their options for memory making. After Boniface VIII issued the bull *detestande feritatis*, he effectively changed the conversation from a localized aspect of twelfth-and thirteenth-century lordship to an issue of increasing import for Boniface's own articulation of his own papal monarchy.

The importance of this thesis is historical and methodological. By placing memory at the heart of the argument, I hope to intervene in the historiography of reform in the high middle ages by demonstrating that the lay aristocracy took an active part in its formulation and process, rather than serving merely as brokers of property, resources or monastic converts. Similarly, this dissertation places analyses of social activity at the center of elite memory making in an effort to strategically re-orient the study of medieval memory away from texts and narratives. Part of this practice-based methodology is also an attempt to find the agency of a semi-literate lay elite through analytical means devised partially to study subaltern or disenfranchised non-elite groups. In many ways this is then a work of historiographical irony, yet if these methodological orientations prove useful or effective, they have the potential to offer a new perspective on the politics, culture, and society of the medieval secular and monastic elite in a period of rapid social change.

1.1 Historiography: Property, Memory, and Lordship, 1000-1100 C. E.

There is no question that property and the rights derived from it were central to expressions of power in the high medieval period. Due to the great increase in

documentation during the three centuries after 1000, the uses made of property by elite social groups becomes far more visible than it had been previously.² A result of the greater availability of source material has been that property itself has been more visible to historians as a nexus of elite power. The later half of the twentieth century saw medieval scholars attempting to wrestle with the implications of this visibility.

Charters, chronicles, saint's lives, and other genres of writing from the eleventh century on feature conflict between elite communities over property and rights as a central, indeed dominant feature. Historians have debated the extent to which the perceived increase in conflict in the sources is indicative of new structures of power or lordship in the high medieval centuries. Property ownership and rights have formed the historiographical raw material for discussion about when or if society underwent fundamental change in the centuries after 1000 C. E. The result has been a general fork in the literature as it relates to property holding. Historians have used the conflicts over property found in the sources to argue for wider structural or social change within postmillennial society. Another, and much smaller groups of scholars, have forgone such questions in favor of careful analysis of what property meant to the elites that claimed it, and how it contributed to the formation of elite identity and lordship. This

² Michael Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066-1307* 3rd. ed. (Wiley Blackwell, 2013), esp. Ch. 1 and 8. Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the 11th and 12th Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 42-58, 88-150. For another perspective discussed below, see Patrick Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

section argues that the latter question deserves a new perspective, without shelving the relevance of older questions.

The scholarship of French medieval historian Georges Duby remains hugely influential, and still provides the directing force for current research on the high medieval in the twenty-first century. Briefly stated, Duby and later adherents like Robert Fossier, Pierre Bonnassie and Thomas Bisson have argued that the turn of the year 1000 was a period of profound change for western Europe. For these scholars, this period saw a novel form of lordship arise in the Burgundian sources he worked with, as the aristocracy built private lordships based on the violent claiming of property and the privatized usage of old Carolingian rights of office. Recent publications by Thomas Bisson have loyally held to Duby in arguing that the twelfth century was a period when this new lordship style gradually became more accountable to the rising administrative authority of kings and popes.³

This new millennial lordship was expressed through the building of castles across the old Carolingian domains. The knights and castellans of the new order snatched judicial rights, privileges over toll collection, and rights over mints or mills from the Carolingian governmental elite, creating a new, privatized, and violent world

³ Thomas Bisson has published works that restate Duby's arguments in more nuanced form. See Thomas Bisson, "The Feudal Revolution," *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 6-42, and *Ibid.*, *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015). See also Robert F. Berkhofer III, *Day of Reckoning: Power and Accountability in Medieval France* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

of fortified lordship.⁴ Duby also argued that the aristocracy in Burgundy was a set of completely new men and women, with patrilineal lineages unbound to the Carolingian elite that allegedly preceded them.⁵ These new lords built lordships centered on castles and patrimonial modes of property inheritance, sought burial for their kin in monastic cemeteries, and in the process created familial cults centered on kin-based burial sites.⁶

Duby's work initiated a small renaissance in medieval regional studies by scholars hoping to widen the span of Duby's arguments, creating a new consensus about the nature of lordship in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Jean-Pierre Poly and Eric Bournazel restated Duby's arguments in a 1991 summary work, using Duby's theme of revolutionary millennial change to explain the Peace and Truce of God, the crusading

⁴ The debate surrounding a "feudal mutation" around the year 1000 sparked interest in legal and cultural anthropology as a methodological avenue to broaden discussions of conflict, lordship, power and property. Following is a sample of the main works, as the literature is vast. See Georges Duby, *La Société aux XIe et XIIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris: A. Colin, 1953), Thomas Bisson, "The Feudal Revolution," *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 6-42, Dominique Barthelemy and Stephen D. White, "The 'Feudal Revolution,'" *Past and Present* 152 (1996): 196-223, "The 'Feudal Revolution,'" *Past and Present* 155 (1997): 177-208. For recent work that has posited a Carolingian origin for certain millennial changes, see Charles West, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution: Political and Social Transformation Between Marne and Moselle, c. 800-c.1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

⁵ Criticism of Duby's characterization of the aristocratic family after 1000 C. E. has shifted this perspective. The noble family is now seen as more inclusive and largely descended from the Carolingian elite, despite a general move toward patrilineage. See Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Those of My Blood: Constructing Noble Families in Medieval Francia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), Theodore Evergetes, *The Aristocracy in the County of Champagne, 1100-1300* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

⁶ Georges Duby, *The Chivalrous Society*, trans. Cynthia Postan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977). See especially chs. 3, 6, and 9 on the necropoli of aristocratic kindreds.

movements, the Investiture Contest, and other historical events that fell beyond the scope of Duby's original arguments.⁷

By the end of the twentieth century, Duby's arguments began to fall under sharp criticism.⁸ The French historian Dominique Barthelemy argued through several publications that Duby had built his arguments upon a problematic reading of the Burgundian charters that formed his main source base.⁹ Barthelemy's perspective found a useful counterpart in Patrick Geary's 1994 monograph *Phantoms of Remembrance*, in which Geary argued that the eleventh century saw not just changes in the style and vocabulary of charters, but a profound change in the way monastic houses created archives in service of their own institutional memories.¹⁰ Stephen White critiqued Duby on a different level, arguing that his formulation of Carolingian juridical breakdown unhelpfully simplified and essentialized the nuance and cultural density of conflict resolution in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.¹¹

Barthelemy and White, along with other historians including Janet Nelson and Richard Barton, have argued that continuity with Carolingian lordship and juridical

⁷ This consensus is helpfully summed up in Jean Pierre-Poly and Eric Bournazel, *The Feudal Transformation, 900-1200* (Holmes & Meier, 1991). Duby himself addressed many of these changes in later essays, see *The Chivalrous Society*, chs. 7-8.

⁸ See also Charles West, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution Political and Social Transformation Between Marne and Moselle, c. 800-1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 1-9.

⁹ See Dominique Barthelemy, *La société dans le comté de Vendôme: de l'an mil au XIVe siècle* (Fayard, 1993). See also *Le mutation de l'an mil, a-t-elle eu lieu?: servage et chevalerie dans la France des Xe et XIe siècles* (Paris, 1997).

¹⁰ Patrick Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

¹¹ Stephen White's classic articles on elite feud, dispute processing, and emotional display can be found in Stephen D. White, *Re-thinking kinship and Feudalism* (Aldershot, 2005).

practices is more appropriate for the centuries after 1000 C. E.¹² Charles West has made a persuasive argument in a 2013 monograph that the myriad changes in the practice of lordship and property-holding were in fact the result of the reform-minded changes that took place under the auspices of Charlemagne and his immediate ninth-century successors. West's argument upholds Carolingian continuity in how lordship was practiced from the seventh through eleventh centuries, but he argues effectively that property and the social power it bestowed fused in the eleventh century in a manner clearly separated from Carolingian royal offices.¹³ West criticizes Barthelemy's methodological point that documentary shifts might obscure the reality of medieval social practice, positing instead that complaints about banal lordship shows up not just in charters but in many other sources, and the fact that these rights were the subject of intense debate, claim, and contestation indicates changes in social reality beneath the mediation of monastic scribal style and vocabulary.¹⁴

Duby has indeed been taken to task on many of his methodological assumptions, but it is clear that historians still take his lead in viewing the rising claims to property

¹² Richard E. Barton, *Lordship in the Country of Maine, c. 890-1160* (Woodbridge, 2004), Janet Nelson, review of *The Peace of God: Social Violence and religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992). *Speculum* 69 (1993): 163-169. See also 1990s debates in the Pages of *Past and Present* included in fn. 3 above.

¹³ Charles West. *Reframing the Feudal Revolution*, 4-9, 196-98, 255-263. West's arguments will be discussed more fully below. See also Elizabeth Magnou-Nortier, "Les mauvaises coutumes en Augvergne, Bourgogne méridionale, Languedoc et Provence au XIe siècle" In *Structures féodale et féodalisme dans l'occident méditerranéen (Xe-XIIIe siècles): Bilan et perspectives de recherches* Vol. 44 of Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome, pp. 135-172 (Rome, 1980).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution*, pp. 180-1.

rights and lordship as central to the changes taking place in the eleventh century. With a few exceptions, historians who directly critique Duby's arguments on their own terms tend to view property relations and claims as the underpinning of structural change in society, rather than ask the important question of what property meant to those who used it in these new ways. Whatever conceptual or methodological positions historians assert regarding ninth-century continuity or the reading of documents, it is clear that starting in the eleventh century, the aristocracy created burial-based necropoleis of lineage memory, continuously claimed and disputed property and rights, and built castles to fortify their lordships.¹⁵ Historians have indeed asked what these new practices surrounding property usage and claims meant for the identity and memorial culture of the secular elite, but they have done so in the process of asking questions not directly related to Duby's theses or those of his adherents.

1.2 Property, Memory, and the Body Around 1100

The question of the social or cultural meaning of property in the high medieval period is not a longstanding and established debate like the question of millennial societal change. Historians who have begged the question were themselves working on

¹⁵ See for example the Champagnois lineages compiled by Theodore Evergates, many of which trace their origins to the early eleventh century. Theodore Evergates, *The Aristocracy in the County of Champagne*, pp. 212-246. For a summation of the complex historiography of noble memory and lineage, see John B. Freed, *The Counts of Falkenstein: Noble Self-Consciousness in twelfth-century Germany* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984). For aristocratic memory claims in a later period and its relevance for the crusading movement, see Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: Crusade and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013).

different but interrelated themes. In the late eighties and early nineties, historians such as Stephen White, Barbara Rosenwein, and Patrick Geary made important arguments that articulated conflicts about property rather than social structures as the glue of social life and the building blocks of cultural identity. In the works discussed below, none of these historians directly address memory as a field in ways that they and their successors would in later years, yet each scholars' respective analyses has important implications for historians hoping to widen the study of aristocratic memory and property in the eleventh through thirteenth centuries. What each of these scholars have done is demonstrate that property and the human body became parts of one political essence in postmillennial centuries, in ways that echo Charles West's arguments concerning property rights around 1100.

Geary's 1978 monograph, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* reworked the place of the saint in medieval communities and endowed the placement of all medieval saintly and lay bodies with a radically new importance vital to historians of medieval social life, property, and memory.¹⁶ Because *Furta Sacra* deals with property, placement, space and place as central themes, the methodological intervention allows for a methodology that traces memory through the placement or displacement of the body.

¹⁶ Patrick Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).

A defiant critic throughout his work of old models of premodern belief that cast medieval religion as socially constitutive and superstitious, Geary saw the saint and its body as a central node of medieval cultural activity.¹⁷ Saints were believed to be active agents in their communities, and the movement of their bodies traced the will of the holy dead rather than the cynical greed of monastic communities and their *scriptoria*. Saintry bodies were stolen by monks from other houses, exhumed, moved and reburied by the will of the saint itself. The corpses of the holy dead were ceremonially humiliated to intimidate the monks' lay enemies into making peace.¹⁸ Geary notes that in the early medieval period, when the roadside burials favored by Roman custom were replaced by consecrated cemeteries, the place of the dead became a location for visitation and memorial.¹⁹ *Furta Sacra* shares the concern voiced in Geary's other later publications in upholding the dead as vital community members who influenced the activity of the living. At root of his argument is the idea that medieval communities did not dwell on the boundary between living and dead in the same way as modern communities do.²⁰

Geary places the saint's body and the property that was accepted by the saint as its resting place as the central source of monastic memory in postmillennial western

¹⁷ See also *Ibid.*, "Echanges et relations entre les vivants et des morts dans la société du haut moyen âge," *Droit et Cultures* 12 (1986): 3-17.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, "L'humiliation des saints," *Annales: ESC* 34 (1979): 27-42.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, *Living with the Dead*, 41. See also Heinrich Härke, "Cemeteries as Places of Power" In *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, pp. 9-30. esp. 16-17. ed. By Mayke de Jong and Frans Theuws (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

²⁰ *Ibid.*, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 1-5,

Europe, and the saintly body and its cult supported the institutional identity of the monastic houses who were able to keep their saints around. After Geary's work, historians cannot read the movement of any medieval corpse without care. His argument allows the possibility of using bodily movement as a methodology through which to trace societal change. By introducing the saint as a key embodied player in medieval politics, Geary allowed for new stakes in the study of medieval conflict in ways that are important for any historian wishing to understand the role of property in building memories and identities.

Geary's work through the mid-nineties directly addressed what was by then a burgeoning field of medieval memory studies. In his 1994 work *Phantoms of Remembrance* he read cartularies traditionally used to study property claims and argued that monastic archives themselves rewrote the past in order to claim institutional identity. For him, every charter is at its heart a memory claim rather than a transaction.²¹ In linking charters to the construction of memory and oblivion, Geary offered a methodological avenue for linking Michael Clanchy's studies of literacy and memory to monastic institutional claims in the texts of charters.²² Geary's main contention throughout his work is that in the eleventh century, monastic communities began to engage in a text-

²¹ Patrick Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 115-133.

²² See above, fn. 1.

based, archivally centered methodology of memory creation that had roots in the Carolingian world.

Stephen White complemented the interventions made by Patrick Geary in important ways in his 1988 monograph *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints* and an earlier article on dispute processing in eleventh and twelfth century western France. White was influenced by a key 1972 article by Aaron Gurevich, along with the arguments of Frederic Cheyette, a historian of medieval southern France.²³ Gurevich, a Russian medievalist, had postulated that for the medieval lay elite, property was fused to aristocratic identity in distinctly premodern ways. For Gurevich, property embodied the rights and privileges of the lay elite, it became inseparable from their identity and legacy in a way that was simultaneously embodied and trans-corporeal.²⁴

White's subtle thesis built on Geary's, Gurevich's and Cheyette's contributions in important ways. Indeed, most of these historians take Gurevich's ideas on property as a matter of course, in ways that are important for their respective arguments and the historiography of high medieval property. White's work begins as a study of a seemingly narrow legal term in the charters of a handful of western French monasteries,

²³ Stephen D. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The 'laudatio parentum' in Western France, 1050-1150* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1988), *Ibid*, "Pactum...legem vincit et amor iudicium": The settlement of disputes by compromise in eleventh-century Western France" *American Journal of Legal History* 22 (1978): 303-3, fn. 92. White's argument in the latter work is in direct dialogue with Frederic L. Cheyette, "Suum Cuique Tribuere," *French Historical Studies* 6 (1970): 287-299.

²⁴ Aron J. Gurvich, "Représentations et attitudes à l'égard de la propriété pendant le haut Moyen âge," *Annales: ESC* 27 (1972): 523-47, esp. 533. See also *Ibid.*, *Categories of Medieval Culture*, trans. G. L. Campbell (London: Routledge, 1985), 221-39.

but quickly evolves into an examination of the aristocratic family and the relationship of kin groups with the monks and saints they interacted with. White rejects a narrow legal definition of the *laudatio* or any structural coherence in the composition of the medieval family. For him, the medieval family was composed in accordance with particular social and political contexts.

A key point for White is that the family is in a sense constructed by property donation, because the exchange created a space in which to talk about and construct the family in the witness lists of charters and their narratives describing as if by oral means the family history of lay givers and takers. Aristocrats deployed ideas about patrilinearity and primogeniture in their songs and other sources but did not do so when giving the *laudatio*, the composition of which was never regular and always keyed to needs and concerns often hidden by the laconic nature of charters.²⁵ White is thus able to incorporate Duby's ideas about the aristocratic family and those of Duby's successors without formally rejecting his central arguments about aristocratic patrilineage.

The nature of medieval property transaction is key to White's analysis in the latter part of the work. In his view, property transactions with monks allowed a measure of stability in the volatile social life of the lay elite. Monks and lay lords saw these transactions as eternal, they critically bore on the descendants and ancestors of the givers. White incorporated Geary's arguments about the power of saints' cults by

²⁵ White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints*, 95-107, 125-6.

arguing that seizure of donated property by a son or nephew insulted the saint's monastic household and imperiled the salvation of the father or uncle. Without directly attaching himself to the study of medieval memory, White was discussing the role of property as an anchor of memory in the social and political life of the lay nobility.

Barbara Rosenwein brought the contributions of these scholars to a logical conclusion by examining in two close regional studies the ways that the monks of Cluny and her neighbors used property over the course of the tenth and early eleventh centuries. The role of burial in the social life of Cluny's neighbors through the tenth century was not great, but her work is in fact a prelude to a large increase in lay burial rates withing Cluny's cemetery in the eleventh-century abbacy of Hugh.²⁶ Rosenwein sees Cluny's property as a sort of social adhesive, at least from the monks' perspective, and the relationships that property canvassed and symbolized served to mollify the rapid social changes that took place over the course of the tenth century.²⁷ For the monks property was used to discuss bonds, indeed property becomes in Rosenwein's discussion almost indistinguishable from bonds. This stands in tension with Gurevich, and to a lesser extent Stephen White in that for lay communities the same property and the rights attached to it manifested their sense of self, especially in the eleventh century

²⁶ Barbara Rosenwein, *The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909, 1049* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 75-7.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), 101-112.

when conflicts between monks and lay litigants becomes more visible.²⁸ Rosenwein herself notes that by the eleventh century, Cluny's charters become short, clipped texts rather than expansive narratives, which corresponds with the expansion of burial claims among lay kin groups and may reflect the fact that the corpse and its placement was becoming more important as an avenue of legacy creation among Cluny's monks and her neighbors.²⁹

These historians of post-millennial diplomatics, property, saints' cults, and monastic culture have created a methodological space over the last decades of the twentieth century vital to the argument of this dissertation. In a sense, property was interpreted in vastly different ways by monastic and lay communities, and historians could benefit from putting these interpretations in dialogue. Crucially, for all property holders in post-millennial centuries the body and its placement were paramount. In addition, historians of medieval memory and property rights discussed above have constructed their arguments based on the close reading of diplomatic and other texts, broadening our understanding of the political nature of memory creation in these key centuries on the part of monastic communities and institutions.

In addition to the growing importance of the body in aristocratic life, both lay and ecclesiastical communities in the post-millennial centuries engaged in deep dialogue

²⁸ See Barbara Rosenwein, Thomas Head, and Sharon Farmer, "Monks and their enemies: a comparative approach," *Speculum* 66 (1991): 764-796.

²⁹ Rosenwein, *The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property*, 11, 202-07.

over the meaning of bodily mutilation as a way to talk about new ideas concerning memory. The highly-staged political mutilations of Pope Formosus and other Ottonian political figures in the late ninth and tenth centuries offered a way for ecclesiastical and monastic communities to erase the memories of popes and secular lords who engaged in misdeeds. Monastic communities and their aristocratic neighbors drew on the mnemonic associations of the high-profile late Carolingian political mutilations, using curse liturgies and other forms of oral song to transfer mutilation to a more abstract plane. Language of bodily mutilation in song targeted embodied memories rather than the physical body, creating a novel form of cultural dialectic between monks and aristocrats that was still eminently political in scope.

These same historians have also made room for a study of the ways in which aristocratic family memory could be created and contested outside the *scriptoria* of monasteries by lay aristocratic social actors. The exponential increase of textual production has understandably overemphasized the written word over the social action in this period. In their own ways, each of these historians have crafted interventions that place the movement and placement of corpses at the root of their studies. This clear emphasis creates a space where one can analyze the memory-crafting potential of aristocratic bodies in a way that complements their holistic view of their own proprietary lordships as extensions of their sense of self and legacy.

1.3 Local Memory Politics, Peace Councils, and the Reform of the Church, 1000-1300 C. E.

The use of the body to articulate a specific kind of memory politics is a methodological opportunity with a direct bearing on the efforts of reform of the church in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In this section, church reform is discussed alongside and on a continuum with the peace councils taking place in the late tenth and eleventh centuries, since both of these clerical initiatives intersect on key issues relevant to aristocratic life and develop along similar lines. Burial and property claims are at the root of the clerical and aristocratic involvement in monastic and institutional reform because it is at these sites that ecclesiastical and secular socio-political values intersect. Bishops, popes, castellans and knights all practiced various manifestations of lordship, and lordship in the post-Carolingian centuries was always intricately connected to land and its usage rights. In addition to property itself, older clerical methods of censure and peacemaking took on new meanings and purposes during this period when property rights became central to elite self-expression and memory culture. Excommunication, burial, and property claims are the main sites of analysis, and these sites have a bearing on other, wider issues of aristocratic familial memory.

The irony of the picture of monastic and church reform in the eleventh and twelfth centuries is that the aristocracy remains central for historians, but as yet only on

a material and functionalist level as a source of property and converts.³⁰ This dissertation takes a different approach, arguing that when bodies and burial are foregrounded, a space can be created in the historiography to examine how lay lords contributed to reform and reformed themselves on a local level.

Some notable exceptions to more functionalist perspectives include the monastic historian Jean Leclercq and Katharine Allen Smith, scholars who are both sensitive to the fact that knights and lay lords could contribute a Christianized warrior sensibility and a distinctive emotional praxis to the institutional culture of eleventh and twelfth century monasticism.³¹ As noted above, concerns over memory in the centuries after 1000 C. E. were in part canvassed through the diplomatically crafted dialectic between laymen and monks that resulted in the much larger number of cartularies and charters from this period. This fact becomes an even more present and relevant reality in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as new monastic orders like the Cistercians built new communities in Burgundy and eventually western France while contesting property rights and trying to deny burial to lay neighbors.³² Property, burial, and the memories aristocrats attached to

³⁰ An exemplary work which takes this perspective is Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword, Mitre, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), see also Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970-1130*.

³¹ See Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, trans. Catharine Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1961), Katherine Allen Smith, *War and the Making of Monastic Culture* (Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2011).

³² See Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in Twelfth-Century Burgundy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 160-184.

them can thus be used as useful inroads to a revision of reform and peace initiatives on the part of clerical and monastic reformers.

Early historians of reform such as Augustin Fliche and Gerd Tellenbach focused on Leo IX and Gregory VII's papacies and the activity of the great Benedictine monastery of Cluny as the epicenters of reform efforts and the conflict over investitures, casting the charismatic popes as the leader of initiatives read to prefigure the modern development of Catholic doctrine or the sixteenth century Reformation respectively. Lay control of church property remained central to historians in the early twentieth century only insofar as it related to the simoniac practices of the German emperors and the imperial princes. Property relationships were in fact the raw material through which ideas about power were realigned and clear drawn amongst different groups in society.³³ More recent analyses of papal reform still privilege what has been called by one historian a "thematic triumvirate of Leo-Gregory-Cluny."³⁴ Kathleen Cushing has similarly argued that despite a trend toward localized studies of reform and an emphasis on process over progress, many historians still intrinsically assume that peace

³³ Augustin Fliche, *la réforme grégorienne*, 3 vols. (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, études et documents, fasc. 6, 9, 13; Paris, 1924-37), Gerd Tellenbach, *Church, State, and Christian Society at the Time of the Investiture Contest*, trans. R. F. Bennett (Oxford, 1940). See also *Ibid.*, *The Church in Western Europe from the Ninth to the Early Twelfth Century* (Cambridge: 1993). For imperial control of church property, See Timothy Reuter, *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, 800-1056* (New York, Longman, 1991), pp. 236-246, See also Uta-Renate Blumental, *The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988).

³⁴ Jehangir Y. Malegam, "Pro-Papacy Polemic and the Purity of the Church: The Gregorian Reform, pp. 35-65. In *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy: Growth of an Ideology and Institution*, ed. by Keith Sisson (Brill: 2016).

councils and efforts at social change were normative rather than hotly contested and discussed by all clerical and lay parties involved. Reform efforts involved aspects of culture, society, and politics in ways that are difficult to understand for modern people, and as such they involved complex transactions between clerics and laymen that had much more at stake than banal power relationships.³⁵

Older studies of reform such as those of Augustine Fliche and Gerd Tellenbach privileged elite ecclesiastical actors such as bishops who were seen to oppose or endorse papal reform. Scholars in the last thirty years such as Maureen Miller, John Howe, John Ott and Stephen Vanderputten have recently challenged this approach from a clerical perspective, showing that charismatic bishops and abbots such as Richard of St. Vanne and Dominic of Sora drove regional efforts at reform that prefaced and complicated the perceived centrality of Leo IX's and Gregory VII's papacy.³⁶ What is important for these historians is not just the virulent local efforts of these charismatic abbots, but the physical presence of powerful reform-minded individuals as catalysts in the building of

³⁵ Jehangir Y. Malegam, "Pro-Papacy Polemic and the Reform of the Church: The Gregorian Reform," In *A Companion to the Medieval Papacy: Growth of an Ideology and Institution*, 37-8. Edited by Atria A. Larson and Keith Sisson, (Leiden: Brill, 2016). See Kathleen Cushing, *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change* (Manchester: The University of Manchester Press, 2006), pp. 34-5. (hereafter Cushing, *Spirituality and Social Change*).

³⁶ Maureen Miller, *The Formation of A Medieval Church: Ecclesiastical Change in Verona, 950-1150* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), John Howe, *Church Reform and Social Change in Eleventh-Century Italy: Dominic of Sora and His Patrons* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997), Stephen Vanderputten, *Monastic Reform as Process: Realities and Representations in Medieval Flanders, 900-1100* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013), *Ibid.*, *Imagining Religious Leadership in the Middle Ages: Richard of Saint-Vanne and the Politics of Reform* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015), and John S. Ott, *Bishop, Authority, and Community in Northwestern Europe, c. 1050-1150* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

monasteries and the strengthening of institutions. In addition to charisma and presence, these historians have kept property and rights central to their arguments about reform and the peace movements throughout the twentieth century. We must keep presence and property central in order to offer a new perspective on the stakes involved.

What is at root of these studies is a process-oriented approach to societal change and critique, rejecting the assumptions of earlier historians that often bore subtle confessional tinges.³⁷ This is important for our purposes because it places discussion and debate at the heart of reform, creating a space where other social actors such as the lay aristocracy may be inserted. As the lay elite of knights and castellans become more visible in the eleventh century, their activities become a central concern for the ecclesiastical elite because they were viewed as violent and inimical to the proper ordering of Christian society.

Kathleen Cushing and Geoffrey Koziol have foregrounded the prescriptive nature of papal legislation and peace council statutes in the eleventh century, arguing that papal ecclesiastic authorities were trying to redraw social groups and shift lay affective bonds in ways that served their purposes, even as they sought to create real legislation to curb the violent activities of lay lords in the late ninth and eleventh centuries. Indeed, these prescriptions are part of the purpose of the much used and abused tripartite social circumscription of Adalbero of Laon that oriented society into

³⁷ See Kathleen Cushing, *Spirituality and Social Change*, pp. 29-38, esp. 33-35.

oratores, bellatores, et laborares.³⁸ Historians have argued that over time, prescriptive legislation worked to curtail perceived lay abuses as they fused with the growing authority and peace of royal courts and communes. Carl Erdmann emphasized clerical attempts to use the legislation of the peace councils as a way to reconcile the newly visible activity of knightly communities with wider post-Carolingian society, even as he postulated that church reform, peace councils, and crusading were all part of a larger reform initiative.³⁹

It is time to rework the role of the aristocracy in the localized stories of the peace councils, as well as the institutional and monastic reform of the church from the tenth through thirteenth centuries. Property, rights, and corpses remain central to reform initiatives in these centuries and can complicate the role of the aristocratic and ecclesiastical elite in reform politics because they are sites where clerical and lay concerns intersect in important ways. Peace councils, like reform initiatives, were localized affairs that can be productively read as a series of debates and interactions about the meaning of property rights and the placement of corpses that have a critical bearing on aristocratic familial memory. At the same time as the peace councils began to convene in Aquitaine, knights and castellans became visible in the narrative and

³⁸ See Kathleen Cushing, *Reform and the Papacy*, 31-37, and Geoffrey Koziol, *The Peace of God* (Leeds: Arc Humanities Press, 2018), pp. 66, 89-94, 139-3. The idea of 'The Three Orders' has been densely analyzed in Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined* trans. Andrew Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

³⁹ Carl Erdmann, *The Origin of the Idea of Crusade*, trans. J. W. Baldwin and W. Goffart (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).

diplomatic documents of the period. As discussed above, these emerging elites fought over property and rights in efforts to build legacy for themselves and buried the bodies of their families in the soil of their own property and that of their monastic neighbors.

Ritual excommunication is one of the essential practices in which the ecclesiastical claims to reform and the lordship claims of the local aristocracy come together in a way that is methodologically productive. Excommunication was articulated as a disciplinary censure that denied burial to those punished in this way and barred them from the sacramental benefits of the Christian community. Excommunication is an ideal site for analyzing the ways in which the memory-making import of aristocratic burial and property ownership can problematize the narrative of the peace movements and church reform by showing how aristocrats drove the development of the case law of excommunication that in turn impacted the development of canon law in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as a part of the wider arc and evolution of reform from the ground up. Canon lawyers in the eleventh and twelfth century made use of older canons of councils regarding excommunication, which was partially formed over time by case law in Europe.⁴⁰

The emergent lay aristocracy took part in this case law by engaging in property disputes and arguing over the placement of corpses in cemeteries to insert themselves

⁴⁰ Anders Winroth, *The Making of Gratian's Decretum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 34-76. See also Uta-Renate Blumenthal, "The Papacy and Canon Law in the Eleventh-Century Reform," *Catholic Historical Review* 84: 2 (1998): 201-18, Jehangir Malegam, "Pro-Papacy Polemic," pp. 40-1.

into the politics of monastic and institutional reform by enhancing their own familial cults. Christian Jaser has recently demonstrated that a central feature of excommunication was the nested threat of perpetual oblivion that it purported.⁴¹ Although it is impossible to prove the relative effectiveness of excommunication as a deterrent, it is clear that its power lay largely in the maintenance of threat advantage on the part of clergy. It is no accident that when bishops and abbots sought to assault the violent contestation of property and the claiming of rights on the part of knights and castellans, they targeted the practice of lay burial by reorienting the key ecclesiastical censure of excommunication as a way to deny interment and legacy to the lay elite.

Canon law formulated excommunication as a performative censure by episcopal and papal authority that sought to sever an individual's ties to the Christian body in eager anticipation of his penitential surrender.⁴² The sacrament of the Eucharist was withheld from excommunicates, and monks ceased the performance of the divine office. Functioning on a continuum with older rituals of monastic *clamor* and the humiliation of relics, excommunication placed the penitent in a liminal state that called to mind

⁴¹ Christian Jaser, "Ritual Excommunication: An 'Ars Oblivionalis'?" In *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture*, 119-139, ed. Elma Brenner, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013). See also, *Ibid.*, 'Ecclesia maledicens': rituelle und zeremonielle Exkommunikationsformen im Mittelalter (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

⁴² Regino of Prüm, *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*, ed. F. G. A. Wasserschleben (Graz, 1964), lib. II, cc412-17; Burchard of Worms, *Decretum*, PL, vol. 161, lib. XIV, cc. 75-9; Master Gratian, *Decretum*, C.11 q.3 c.106 (Friburg, vol. 1, col. 674: 'Modus et forma excommunicationis'), C. 11 q.3 c.107 (Friburg, vol. 1, col. 674: 'De eodem').

damnation in the afterlife, and thus perpetual alienation from the community of the faithful.⁴³ As I will demonstrate, excommunication was a censure that is representative of the ways in which memory, lay property rights, burial claims, and reform initiatives intersected.

The first chapter of the dissertation is a regional study of the monastery of Cluny in the eleventh and twelfth century. I argue that the memory culture changed at the great reformed monastery. The increase of lay burial corresponded with a more laconic diplomatic language that emphasized the avoidance of oblivion for laypeople involved in land transactions. The placement of bodies became central to the familial cults of Burgundian laypersons at a critical time in which property and the rights attached to it encapsulated aristocratic senses of self. By presenting themselves as pious lords needing monastic intervention and forgiveness, aristocrats could insert their bodies into monastic cemeteries and enhance a sense of legacy for themselves and their families.

Chapter two argues that the placement and movement of bodies was central to the politics of the Peace movements in France in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The longstanding relic cult gave monastic communities a methodology in which moving saints' bodies to peace councils became a tactic of threat to an aristocracy increasingly

⁴³ For the ritual actions that accompanied an excommunication, see *Ordo Excommunicationis*, PL 138. 1123. For Ritual Excommunication in general, see Genevieve Steele Edwards, 'Ritual Excommunication in Medieval France and England, 900-1200' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1997), and Elisabeth Vodola, *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (University of California Press, 1986). See also Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

sing burial to build familial cults. Monks risked their prized relics in order to claim their role as supreme brokers of memory in their efforts to persuade lay lords to make peace.

Chapter three argues that ghost stories in monastic chronicles treat apparitions as fully corporeal presences, in an effort to erase the memories and legacies of lay lords by assaulting their bodies post mortem within their own story worlds. Chapter four is an analysis of the competing interpretations of bodily mutilation in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Monks and aristocrats drew upon the cultural oblivion of political mutilation of the late Carolingian period and grafted such associations in unique ways upon their own practices. I argue in this chapter that aristocratic *chansons de geste* used mutilation and wounding in their story worlds to enhance aristocratic memory. Monks took a different approach, writing curse liturgies that continued the practice of articulating mutilation within the world of the curse as an obliterating form of memory-mutilation.

Chapter five takes the story to the thirteenth century, examining the complex politics of burial in Cistercian houses in medieval Europe. Despite the clear Cistercian regulations forbidding burial of laypersons, ambitious lords sought to force their corpses into monastic cemeteries and practice separate burials of different body parts in order to bypass monastic legislations and expand their memory-making toolbox. Pope Boniface XVIII in 1299 issued the bull *detestande feritatis* that forbade the practice of separate

burial and changed the memory economy among aristocrats as the fourteenth century began.

To sum up, memory and legacy claims and the relevance of those claims to the lordship culture of the lay aristocracy are central reasons why the lay aristocracy participated in the politics and process of church reform in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. The proliferation of all types of documents precipitated a change in the memory cultures of medieval western Europe, and the explosion of diplomatic and narrative sources offer historians ways to look closely at how aristocrats secured argued about property, secured burial for themselves in support of their familial cults, and by doing so altered the course of local reform efforts. The virulence of ecclesiastical social critique and the persistent attempts to change lay behavior during the era of the peace councils merely underscores the memory politics under examination. Burial and property claims stayed vital to the lay memory economy, but the movement of bodies also played a large role.

Just as the bodies of the saints were moved to claim monastic institutional memory, lay lords also sought to use corpse moving to build their own legacies. Saints' cults and local lay lords thus developed similar attitudes toward the movement of the corpse, and in the eleventh and twelfth centuries moving bodies became a language that could make key statements concerning memory between secular and clerical elites. By looking at this kind of intimate memory politics, what this dissertation calls an infra-

language of bodily movement, it is possible to foreground aristocratic voices in the wider story of church reform in the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. Doing so reveals the ways in which elite but non-literate secular lords contributed to the changes in wider society but also gave ancient practices like burial and property ownership new meanings that were intimately tied to memory and self-expression in the post-Carolingian centuries.

2. Burial, Property, and Oblivion at Cluny, 1050-1200 C. E.

Towards the end of the eleventh century, two knights initiated quitclaims over property with the great monastery of Cluny in the Macônnais. In drafting the charters of these accords, the monastic scribe claimed that they were setting the quitclaims down in a charter in order to prevent the settlement from passing into oblivion.¹ The explicit mention of this kind of motivation had not been part of scribal practice or concern in the early centuries of Cluny's history. In citing a concern that conflicts, property, and rights might be forgotten if they were not confirmed in a charter, aristocratic litigants themselves indicated the ways in which memory itself was changing among the aristocratic elite at the turn of the twelfth century. The concern for alleviating the threat of oblivion reveals that disputes between monks and the arms-bearing aristocracy over issues of property had more at stake than simply maintaining sinews of banal power as modern people understand them.

This chapter is an attempt to reorient the role of aristocratic burial as central to the stakes surrounding conflicts of the abbey of Cluny with her powerful lay neighbors in the centuries surrounding the year 1100. It was in this period that the aristocracy of Burgundy became interested in their own legacies, while creating and maintaining them in idiosyncratic ways. For laymen and women around 1100, a sense of placement and

¹ Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel eds., *Recueil des chartres de l'abbaye de Cluny*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1876-1903), 3872, 3827. (hereafter, C).

control of space governed and created memory and legacy. For these elites, the high medieval centuries were a period in which the lay body, elite property, and genealogical memory fused to become a composite whole. Newly visible knights and castellans saw powerful monasteries such as Cluny as a resource for investment in their own nascent sense of legacy by initiating conflicts that would result in burial privileges or access to other memory-making spaces. Burial spaces like cemeteries existed alongside other memory-making sites like church altars and the increasingly important monastic technology of writing, but proper interment of the corpse became the keystone in these lay networks of memory and it was the most enduring special and mnemonic investment for centuries to come.

The knights, lords, and arms-bearers surrounding the abbey gave property and initiated conflicts or quitclaims with the abbey and its growing network of churches in an attempt to build a toolbox of memory creation built on various forms of placement that ultimately centered on the location of corpses in cemeteries and the control of memory-making spaces like church altars. Previous historians such as Barbara Rosenwein, Stephen White have shown that conflicts themselves were ways for the nobility to tell their own family histories within the context of disputing with monastic communities.² I hope to complement this view by emphasizing that warrior aristocrats

² Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909-1049* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), Stephen D. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The*

built legacies through utilizing space, place, and their own corpses rather than texts. In the years around 1100, before the compilation of the genealogical texts telling the stories of noble houses, aristocrats composed their genealogies in three dimensions.

At the end of the eleventh century, burial was not as frequent among the lay aristocracy as it had been at the turn of the millennium. While lay lords did continue to make gifts for burial and ensure that members of their families gained internment within Cluny's grounds, the hardening of Cluny's claims to property in its immediate neighborhood made the relatively straightforward system of property gifts in return for burial more difficult. Memories tied to the process of give and take that bound donors in close relationship with Cluny faded as Cluny's patrimony took shape, and as the abbey began to spread its particular brand of reformed monasticism and build a powerful lordship in the process.³ Dietrich Poeck has calculated that not only did outright gifts decrease as the eleventh century wore on, but gifts for burial became less and less prominent.⁴ Poeck showed that lay burial reached its apex around the year 1000 under

Laudatio Parentum in Western France, 1050-1150, Studies in Legal History (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988).

³ Barbara Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909-1049* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 202-07. See also Noreen Hunt, *Cluny under Saint Hugh, 1049-1109* (Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1967) for the new character of Cluny under Hugh.

⁴ Dietrich Poeck, "Laienbegrabnisse in Cluny," *Fruhmittelalterliche Studien* 15 (1981): 68-179. Poeck tabulated 637 donations under Abbot Mayeaul, of which 72 were gifts for burial. Under Odilo, the total number of donations rose to 1,018 acts, with 704 gifts of which 124 were offered for burial. Hugh the great's abbacy saw 898 acts, 654 acts of which 73 were given for burial. See Megan McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for*

Abbot Odilo during the heyday of the Feast for All Souls on the second of November. Powerful castellan families such as the Uxelles-Brancion kindred did still manage to attain burial for a number of family members. It is clear that in these centuries, as gifts in exchange for burial became less and less common, it became a much more valued commodity for enhancing lay legacy than the decades around 1000, when burial was far more frequent.⁵

These changes took place simultaneously with shifts in noble patronage practice and family structure that began to manifest in Cluny's cartulary around the end of the eleventh century. Local castellans in Cluny's neighborhood began to take patronymics often derived from properties or castles under their lordships. Taking a patronym from a piece of property was part of the process through which familial memory became associated not only with property and rights, but also with burial sites and spaces of interment that were themselves located on monastic property. As knights and castellans of lower status sought to marry into older noble families in a quest for higher prestige and status, aristocratic families across Western Europe expressed a concern to present themselves and their memorial legacy as part of a unified patrilineage in theory if not

the Dead in Early Medieval France (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994) for the Feast of All Souls instituted by Odilo.

⁵ Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel eds., *Recueil des chartres de l'abbaye de Cluny*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1876-1903), For the Uxelles-Brancion, see 1845, 2332, 3073, 4664. For Beaujeu, see 4504, 4754. (hereafter C).

often in practice.⁶ Patronage moved outward from Cluny's neighborhood at the same time as local lords began to make violent claims on monastic property in greater number than ever before. This is not to say that giving stopped, but those claiming power near Cluny in this period recast old practices of giving and taking property in new ways and for new purposes.

As Barbara Rosenwein, Andrew Cowell, and others have shown, giving and taking in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were practices that formed a symbolic nexus that aristocrats used to articulate their identity in new ways.⁷ For Rosenwein, Cluny's property served to bind the monks and their neighbors together, creating social coherence in the immediate post-Carolingian period. Rosenwein ends her account around 1050, noting that the narrative structure of Cluny's charters underwent significant change over the late eleventh century. The older charter narratives of the tenth and early eleventh century that described in elaborate detail the borders of or rights within properties shifted to terse notices that signaled gifts or the settlement of claims.

⁶ For good introductions to these vast topic, See the essays contained in Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Those of My Blood: Constructing Noble Families in Medieval Francia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), Stephen White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The 'laudatio parentum' in Western France, c. 1050-1150* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988), Theodore Evergates, *Aristocracy in the County of Champagne* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), Amy Livingstone, *Out of Love for My Kin: Aristocratic Family Life in the Lands of the Loire, 1000-1200* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010), Jonathan Lyon, *Princely Brothers and Sisters: The Sibling Bod in German Politics, 1100-1300* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013),

⁷ Andrew Cowell, *The Medieval Warrior Aristocracy: Gift, Violence, Performance, and the Sacred* (Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 2007). See also Aaron J. Gurevich, "Représentations et attitudes à l'égard de la propriété pendant le haut moyen âge" *Annales: ESC* 27 (1972): 523-47.

The shift toward more clipped narrative form in the charters corresponded with a dip in gifts from laymen around the turn of the eleventh century, and a rise in accounts of conflict over property within Cluny's cartulary.⁸ These changes indicate that by the eleventh and twelfth centuries, property became less of a societal adhesive between Cluny and her neighbors, and more of an extension of the noble self and the legacies of the castellan lineages that often fought with Cluny over property and rights in the high medieval period. What was fundamentally at stake at Cluny during this later period was memory and its extension in property and the placement of the aristocratic body. As the remembrance of old gifts passed out of monastic remembrance due to lack of challenge or confirmation, old patrons lost the hold they had once had on Cluny's corporate memory, and their descendants resorted to more aggressive means to secure burial and property rights for their kindreds.

Claiming of rights, property, and burial did work in tandem with older methods of memory creation such as burial, it is clear that the patronage networks which bound Cluny to its patrons in an earlier age facilitated the use of violence as a strategy to wrest rights, property, and legacy from Cluny's patrimony as those resources became less accessible and more intimately tied to aristocratic memory and selfhood, and embodiment. After a discussion of disputes and their implications for memory creation among Burgundian castle-lords, the discussion will then move to the activities of the

⁸ Rosenwein, *To Be The Neighbor*, pp. 199-200.

best-documented castellan lordship in Cluny's cartulary, the lords of Uxelles-Brancion. The acts of this kindred offer a case study for the role of church altars as sites of memory creation among lay lords and its implications for church reform in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

2.1 Cluny's Charters and the Military Aristocracy: Problems and Approaches

Cluny's cartulary is one of the richest sources for local life in medieval Burgundy and is the foundation for central studies of society from the tenth through thirteenth centuries. The cartulary contains thousands of charters and other documents arranged according to the archival practices of the monks at Cluny. In the late decades of the nineteenth century, Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel began the ambitious project of editing the charters of Cluny, eventually completing an edition in six volumes. However, many scholars both in the Anglo-American and European academy have noted that the edition contains dating errors.⁹ In addition, a final volume of the edition collating and cross-referencing donor names and locations within the texts was never completed. Given the editors' oft-inaccurate choices when deciding the specific dates of different documents, it is still possible to trace the flow of donations to Cluny and the ways in which those same properties were contested or seized by lay kindreds.

⁹ Barbara Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982), pp. 3-29, *Ibid.*, *To Be the Neighbor*, pp. 15-20, Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword Miter, Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 37-43. Maria Hillebrandt, "The Cluniac charters: remarks on a quantitative approach for prosopographical studies" *Medieval Prosopography* 3: 1 (1982): 3-25.

The study of charters and their arrangement into cartularies have become a cottage industry for historians interested in the methodology of monastic memory making, social legitimation, and archival practice. In keeping with other monastic cartularies of the period, Cluny's charters, document by document, build a narrative of the accumulation of property, rights, and privileges that are the idiosyncratic edifice of memory that circumscribed the monastic *ordo* and its place in the wider world.¹⁰

Yet these texts are central for the study of lay activity outside the monastery in this period as well. Locating a lay voice in charters may seem at first glance to be impossible, given the narrative purposes of the collected charters within the monastic archive. Indeed, it is often difficult to know precisely what parts of a charter derive from some outside influence such as lay testimony, or whether the historian is bound by the language of the document itself, leaving no possible windows into social realities and perceptions outside the text.¹¹

¹⁰ For examples of scholarship that elucidates the politics of monastic archives, see Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Rewriting Saints and Ancestors: Memory and Forgetting in France, 500-1200* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), Patrick Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 10-13, 26-30, 48-51, 114, 50-51, 70-71, 177-178. Amy Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.), 4. Constance Brittain Bouchard, "Monastic Cartularies: Organizing Eternity." In *Charters, Cartularies, and Archives: The Transmission and Preservation of Documents in the Medieval West*, pp. 22-32. Edited by Adam J. Kostó and Anders Winroth. Toronto, 2002, Amy Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past*, 6-12, 29-41, 109, 146-149, 209, 204-207.

¹¹ On methodologies and arguments that orient toward or depend upon the presence of lay voices in medieval sources, see Gabrielle Spiegel, "History, Historicism, and the Social Logic of the Text" In *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 22-25. Matthew Innes, "On the material culture of legal documents: charters and their preservations in the Cluny archive, ninth to eleventh centuries," In *Documentary Culture and the Laity in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Warren C. Brown, Marios Cotambeys, Matthew Innes, and Adam Kostó (Cambridge: Cambridge

Cluny's charters are difficult sources in other ways as well. The documents of the tenth and early eleventh centuries are often more elaborate when it comes to explaining lay motivation for giving or claiming, especially in the late eleventh and early twelfth century when scribal practice favored more constricted charter narratives. Because charters were drafted by monastic scribes, often according to relatively strict formulae, using them as a basis for studies of lay life is challenging. For example, it is a relative commonplace to find donors giving gifts *pro anima* and including conjugal relatives as beneficiaries of the spiritual gifts proffered by the monks. Historians have often concluded rightly that these kinds of notices reveal little about why laymen gave gifts.

Working in Burgundy, Constance Bouchard shifted the conversation about lay motivation in a new direction. With Cluny's cartulary as a major source among others, she took lay patronage of reformed monasteries such as Cluny along with patronage of new orders in the eleventh and twelfth centuries as an index of lay support of reformed monasticism. Marcus Bull's work in Gascony and the Limousin complemented Bouchard, effectively showing that patronage influenced lay participation in the First Crusade. These studies are valuable and influential in that they privilege the activities of

University Press, 2012), pp. 283-320. Adam Kosto, *Making Agreements in Medieval Catalonia: Power, Order, and the Written Word* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

laymen over what charters claim as motivation for patronage.¹² However, they place notions of piety at the center of their analysis of patronage, demonstrating that it was in quest of spiritual benefits of prayer and confraternity that motivated lay lords.

Focusing on these issues allowed new perspectives on the lay role in building an infrastructure of reformed monasticism or its implications for the progress of the crusading movement, but in other ways it occluded deeper cultural anxieties surrounding lay memory and legacy articulated within the nexus of give and take between monasteries and their donors. One of the surest ways to locate these kinds of conversations is to place conflicts over gifts of property at the heart of the analysis. Doing this is useful because gifts and claims act as a site in which issues of great importance to monastic communities and lay kindreds come together. Indeed, charters are the daily bread of historians interested in medieval modes of conflict precisely for this reason.¹³ Cluny's charters in particular are valuable for excavating a lay voice in conflicts during the eleventh and twelfth centuries because in this period certain families

¹² Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970-c.1130* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, Cloister*.

¹³ The debate surrounding a "feudal mutation" around the year 1000 sparked interest in legal and cultural anthropology as a methodological avenue to broaden discussions of conflict, lordship and power by taking note of cultural elements like emotions. Following is a sample of the main works, as the literature is vast. See Georges Duby, *La Société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris: A. Colin, 1953), Jean Pierre-Poly and Eric Bournazel, *The Feudal Transformation, 900-1200* (Holmes & Meier, 1991), Thomas Bisson, "The Feudal Revolution," *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 6-42, Dominique Barthelemy and Stephen D. White, "The 'Feudal Revolution,'" *Past and Present* 152 (1996): 196-223, "The 'Feudal Revolution,'" *Past and Present* 155 (1997): 177-208. For recent work that has posited a Carolingian origin for certain millennial changes, See Charles West, *Reframing the Feudal Revolution: Political and Social Transformation Between Marne and Moselle, c. 800-c.1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013). For an analysis of the contested nature of violence and its implications for medieval social and cultural history, See Jehangir Y. Malegam, *The Sleep of Behemoth: Disputing Peace and Violence in Medieval Europe, 1000-1200* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013).

began to violently claim monastic property more often than any other time in the monastery's history.

The monks of Cluny worked diligently to record such conflicts and preserve them in their archives because such conflicts had a large bearing on their own property rights and their sense of corporate identity. This may indeed mean that the privileged place of gifts and conflicts within monastic archives give historians a distorted perspective on the level of conflict in their society.¹⁴ However, precisely because records of dispute settlement, quitclaim, and gift confirmation are points at which the monastic litigants are reacting to the claims and self-presentation of lay neighbors, these methods of litigation do give access to a methodology of lay memory creation.

The same families who violently claimed property frequently confirmed gifts that their ancestors made in earlier centuries at the very point when new donations became far less frequent. Monastic textual hegemony might be part of the reasons why piety and sinfulness so often show up in the introductory clauses of charters instead of lordly honor and largesse. This is not to say that contrition was not part of lay motivation for giving and peacemaking. However, if we foreground the oral world of the story along with the gift in the analysis of gift and disputes at Cluny, it is possible to find new stakes, that of place, space and embodied memory.

¹⁴ See fn. 12 above, and Dominique Barthélemy and Stephen D. White, "The 'Feudal Revolution,'" *Past & Present*, no. 152 (1996): 196–223. See also Geoffrey Koziol *The Peace of God* (ARC Humanities Press, 2018), pp. 63–72.

2.2 Castellans, Lordly Self-Presentation, and Oblivion

Lambert of Ardres' *Chronicle of the Counts of Guines and the Lords of Ardres* is a noble genealogy written in Flanders at the end of the thirteenth century. Ostensibly written by Lambert, a clerk connected to these Flemish lords, the account contains one of the most unique descriptions of noble life in the high medieval period. Lambert describes how Arnold of Guines, Lambert, and the rest of Arnold's household spend their time while caught inside during a rainstorm at one of Arnold's residences.

So finally Walter of le Clud was asked by him and me [Lambert] and members of the household to tell and relate for us something about the family of Ardres and the deeds of the men of Ardres. The rains had not yet ceased, but as [Walter] began the wildness of the winds eased and softened a little, as if to let us listen. He put his right hand to his beard and combed and carded it with his fingers as old men often do; he opened his mouth in our midst, before me and all who were listening to this very thing and said: Reverend Fathers and Lords, since, then, your purposeful will is that, until the rains cease, I should recall to mind the history and deeds of the family of Ardres by this present narrative, as I have heard and known it from my fathers.¹⁵

It is noteworthy that Lambert himself was present, was listening to the tales within the court, and gave his narrative voice over to Walter of le Clud when he wished to get an insider's account of the noble family that was the object of his genealogy. What is even more important in this account is the subtle linking of family memory and storytelling with a strong sense of place. Throughout Lambert's account, he frequently

¹⁵ Lambert of Ardres *The History of the Counts of Guines and the Lords of Ardres* edited by Leah Shopkow (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 96-7. Hereafter (Shopkow, *Lambert of Ardres*) (Shopkow's translation.)

preludes his stories of member of the counts of Guines and the lords of Ardres with a short discussion of their holdings, their property, and the fortifications they built there.

When addressing the monks at Cluny, lords told similar stories as part of the drafting of charters, but they had to engage in an important form of self-presentation in order to get the sense of place they sought from the monks in the form of gifts or burial rights. In 1063, Roclenus, a local lord, gave a church in the villa of Cianis. When the charter relating his donation discusses his motivation for giving, what it relates is curious. Like many other Cluniac charters from the period, the document notes that Roclenus gave the church, “lest our good deeds suffer oblivion.”¹⁶ This short but indicative phrase would seem to be idiosyncratic if it were not coupled with the sudden appearance of many such phrases in the motivation clauses of the quitclaims and other acts of litigation between laymen and Cluny during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.¹⁷

Significantly, only two documents before the eleventh century contain formulae similar to these.¹⁸ If this taken in light of the fact that the total amount of donations decreased sharply at Cluny during this period, and the activity of the monastic chancery dipped as a consequence, why the change? After the 1063 charter mentions the avoidance of oblivion, Roclenus presents himself as a giver who hopes both to preserve

¹⁶ C. 3391 “...ne nostra bene gesta oblivionem paterentur.”

¹⁷ Other charters which feature similar phrases regarding oblivion and forgetting as motivation include C 2201, C 3060, C 3091, C 3149, C 3150, C 3364, C 3517, C 3576, C 3589, C 3609, C 3636, C 3724, C 3822, C 3827, C 3868, C 3928, C 4082, C 4127, C 4132, C 4140, C 4165, C 4206, C 4228, C 4243, C 4259, C 4269, C 4314, C 4329, C 4363, C 4382, C 4405, C 4435, C 4451, C 4536.

¹⁸ C 0002, C 0943.

the honor of his family and present himself as a sinner to the monks. Among his reasons for giving are “The honor of secular glory, [...] and besides this the renown of the body and other things of this sort seen for a brief time before the days of decay. [...] Roclenus also mentions his own sinfulness as a prelude to the gift, noting that he hopes his gift will earn heavenly rewards in the world to come.¹⁹

This is a complex exchange, and at root is a question of memory politics that is newly rooted in the aristocratic body and dependent upon a sense of place. Roclenus presents himself as a sinful layman in exchange for the rootedness which is symbolized for Roclenus through the giving of his own property in the form of the church at Cianis. Unlike the more relationship-oriented world of tenth century Cluny described by Barbara Rosenwein, the eleventh and twelfth centuries were a period when local lords saw the monastery as a resource for the building of their own legacies through properly conducted gifts of property. Aristocratic piety is clearly a vital part of transactions like Roclenus’s gift, but piety existed alongside an equally important nascent memory politics that increasingly became centered on the property and the bodies of aristocratic givers.

Gifts could garner an even deeper sense of placement for these aristocrats. When Durannus, lord of Berziaco, quitclaimed an allodial gift he made to Cluny in 1093, he

¹⁹ C 3391 “honorque secularis gloriae [...] preter hoc vis corporis aliaque huiusmodi brevi tempore in dies dilabi videantur.”

mentions two things of note. Not only was the charter itself “drafted lawfully in our house,” it was given to the monks “through the testimony of each of these lay persons.” The charter then lists the names of six laymen, presumably members of Durannus’s household. Durannus made the quitclaim in part as a way to conciliate himself with an enemy of his named Hugo, and this Hugo also gave testimony in support of the quitclaim, revealing that the two men were friends again. The charter also notes that others were present to give testimony as well, and that the resulting charter was formalized on Cluny’s altar.²⁰ Once again, the importance of space and place is manifest and clearly foregrounded. Durannus presents himself as a peacemaker to the monks of Cluny in reconciling with a former enemy. In return he and his friends are given access to the space of one of Cluny’s church altars that will allow him to cement his new relationship with Hugo and compose the story of his quitclaim to the monks upon an altar belonging to the monks.

The careful reader can see that memory and forgetting were all of a sudden very close to the hearts of monastic scribes at Cluny and the lay litigants who brought their cases to the abbey. For the lay parties, these concerns magnified the importance of the great abbey of Cluny. Local lay lords of all status groups, both petty knights and great castellan families must have had the threat of oblivion on their minds as they sought to

²⁰ C 3666. “sub testimonio quoque laicalium personarum istarum: Wichardi cognomento Nasuti, Hugonis Mediolanensis, Artaldi de la Bruiere, Humberti nepotis alterius Humberti prepositi, Roberti Calvi, Willelmi famuli Harditi, multorumque aliorum.”

litigate with their monastic neighbors and make use of the community to gain a sense of place for themselves as part of exchanges. It is important to remember as well that the generational memory of laymen was under threat in other ways. While monks used their cartularies, hagiography, and customaries to order their social life and their sense of institutional legacy, lay memories were mediated through the placement of the body and the spaces where conflicts took place. These points may in part explain the increase of violent claims in this period, as these same lords carved out domains while simultaneously attempting to ensure that they and occasionally their households were remembered in snapshot within the archival memory of Cluny's newly hardened lordship and the oral traditions of their contemporaries. In the above charter recording Durannus's quitclaim, he narrates the long feud with his neighbor Hugo with whom he reconciled as part of the quitclaim.

Quitclaims at Cluny during the eleventh and twelfth centuries sometimes serve as such snapshots of newly formed lordship communities, centered upon castles. Around 1103-1104, Guichard of Martiliaco and all the knights in two castles under his lordship offered a quitclaim of servants to Cluny. The charter mentions the fear that these deeds pass into oblivion, and the scribe made note that Guichard had presented himself and his knights as "detesting greed."²¹ Significantly for our purposes, the charter notes that the quitclaim was offered in order that the knights might all gain burial

²¹ C 3822 "detestanda cupiditate."

within Cluny's grounds by presenting themselves correctly as sinful knights who strove toward virtue. Listing the household members who participated, the charter mentions Guichard and his children, the brothers Hugo and Arleis along with their sisters Mirabilia and Bonitta. Also included were Bernard, known as Nigricorius, and Gaucerran, his brother, knights of the villa of Serniaco.²² Significantly, all the members of the household attain new burial rights for themselves in the hereafter of the settlement. What is stressed here is a decidedly non-patrilineal deployment of *familia*. It is the household as well as the patrilineal family who benefit by gaining burial at Cluny during what must have been a tight market for such rights by 1103-04.

Around 1100, Humbert, knight and lord of the castle of Borbonensis, quitclaimed rights he had usurped in the villa of Frantia. He mentions the gifts, concessions and *laudatio* of his brother Ansedus and also a certain knight Jocerann, called "Joperra," and his wife Odila. This latter couple in particular gave a church along with rights to the cemetery, an increasing common practice in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.²³ Listing his quitclaims villa by villa, Humbert notes not only the rights he is giving up, but also the former possessors and givers of those rights in each case. In one of Cluny's villas, for example, the charter relates that Guichard of Casellis and his wife Duranni had previously held rights there. In the villas of Comandrensi and Sarciaco, the charter

²² C 3822. "res oblivioni tradantur"

²³ C 3351, 3423, 3515, 3517, 3563, 3589.

mentions previous conflicts over rights involving one Guichard of Berciaco. In Sarciaco, Humbert notes that this same Guichard and his wife Blismodus held rights along with their children.²⁴ Humbert too receives burial rights for himself along with entrance into the society and fraternity of the monks at Cluny. Presumably, the gift-community mentioned in this charter pertains in whole or in part to Humbert's household or members of a household of which he is a part.

These documents give insight into the fact that patrilineage is not the only or even the primary means of building identity and memory among the newly powerful knights. The charters serve as rare but valuable snapshots of groups that have little purchase on the remaining sources, the castle lords and their *milites*. Having at this period a tenuous claim to the noble status that more powerful castellans in Burgundy enjoyed,²⁵ these castle lords were intent to include the rights and relations of the individuals of their household as well as their own rights in the quitclaims they made with Cluny. While the monastic scribes at Cluny during this period were content to record the shrinking number of outright gifts in brief notices, these quitclaim charters have the distinction of being comparatively long. It might be the case that the larger length of quitclaim charters may derive from lay efforts at telling of the gifts, deeds, and rights of their households and ancestors, something that was accepted by the monks at

²⁴ C 3806.

²⁵ See Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).

least in these instances and thus included in the charter narratives. Guichard of Martiliaco, Durannus, and Roclenus are clear examples of the fact that gaining proper placement of the aristocratic body involved complex politicized exchanges and positioning between the monks and their lay neighbors. It was lords who presented themselves as willing to submit to Cluny's reformed monastic program and prepared to talk about themselves as sinful lords in need of forgiveness in order to gain access to those spaces.

Burial was always important in these exchanges. Members of the households discussed above had new burial rights of their own included in the settlement. In a period where Cluny was in the process of rebuilding the monastic church under the vigorous leadership of abbot Hugh of Semur, burial rights must have become a memory commodity that became somewhat threatened, or at least something that had to be discussed and reconfirmed as part of the settlement of violent claims.²⁶ In addition, the granting of rights to burial within the cemeteries of donated churches is clearly a form of memory trading. Donors like Joceran "Joperra" and his wife sought to grant cemeteries as memory spaces to Cluny in exchange for the chance to be a part of the memory community surrounding Humbert of Borbonensis.

This tendency becomes even more apparent due to the fact that from the middle decades of the eleventh century, burial at Cluny itself ceased to be a personal business

²⁶ K. J. Conant, *Cluny: les église et la maison du chef d'ordre* (Mâcon, 1968)

solely between the donor and the monks. Many of the donations or quitclaims *in loco sepulture* during the late eleventh and twelfth centuries involved gifts for the burial of nuclear relatives of the donor rather than just the donor, as had been the case in earlier centuries.²⁷ This indicates that aristocratic givers were interested in spreading burial rights to nuclear relatives in an effort to secure the newly important sense of placement throughout the family. Such a shift in practice elucidates changes in memory-making strategies. Since nuclear relatives were likely the only members of kin for whom lay men and women could directly gain burial rights and memory through efficient gift giving, burial rights for household members who were not part of a powerful nuclear family had to be claimed and subsequently negotiated through more aggressive means.

A few documents even elaborate on the important place of this strategic positioning. When Guichard of Anton confirmed his father's gifts to Cluny on March 10, 1131, he confirmed the gifts of his father, also named Guichard. Significantly for our purposes, he made it clear that he was confirming his father's gifts on the day of his father's own death and burial. We are not told whether the senior Guichard was interred within Cluny's grounds, but it is clear that the knowledge and memory of his burial was important for the junior Guichard as he confirmed his father's gifts.²⁸ Scholars such as Stephen White have argued effectively that gift confirmations of this kind were an

²⁷ C 3023, 3032, 3096, 3104, 3125, 3147, 3161, 3192, 3233, 3251, 3265, 3284, 3287, 3650, 3214, 3756, 3763.

²⁸ C 4020.

attempt to avoid future claims to property and rights by younger relatives, often when they were nearing death themselves.²⁹ Yet it is also clear that gift confirmations of this kind were also a way to remind the monks of the placement of their relatives within Cluny's cemetery, and in the process emphasizing the growing importance of burial and the proper location of aristocratic bodies.

What is also noteworthy is that conflicts at Cluny reveal an effort on the part of laymen and their households to get the monastic community to accept their narratives about how they wished to be remembered. In Guichard of Anton's case, his own confirmation of his fathers' gift emphasizes his family as buried lords, those whose bodies are placed correctly and therefore worthy of continued relations with the monastery. It is important to note that these castle lords were themselves vulnerable on a mnemonic level in this period. In contrast, knights and castle lords such as Guichard of Martiliaco and Humbert of Borbonensis along with their households ran the serious risk of having their *familia* consigned to oblivion without the long ancestral memories of former gifts and burial rights available to their social superiors, the Burgundian castellanate. It is for this reason that we should take the charter preambles that display anxiety about oblivion as more than regional or temporal deviation from otherwise common scribal formulae. These castle lords sought to include the histories of gifts and

²⁹ Stephen White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints*, chapters 4-5, pp. 86-176.

subsequent burial from those within their households in order to create genealogies of gift giving in a horizontal rather than a vertical direction.

This approach to the gift or conflict as a prelude to burial and proper placement of the corpse makes the question of the rise in patrilineage in the eleventh and twelfth centuries in central France more complex. However, viewing memory as a kind of currency being traded from monastic to lay lordship also brings into question easy assumptions about aristocratic piety in this period. While the military aristocracy of the Maconnais was certainly keen to patronize Cluny in order to secure prayers and intercession in exchange for their gifts, historians cannot afford to view such activities through categories derived from the Reformation rather than the concerns and stakes of eleventh and twelfth century monastic and church reform.

This view is not meant to claim that lordly piety was simply instrumental. It is rather to say that laymen who interacted with Cluny did not see their own spiritual needs and the maintenance of their family legacies as mutually exclusive. Lay family groups certainly saw giving and taking as a central part of their means of identity formation. Memory and piety for them always had an element of exchange, even if it was not transactional in a modern sense. The final part of the chapter is a close reading of some of the activities of a powerful Burgundian family of lay lords who maintained a link with Cluny's churches in an idiosyncratic effort to gain their own sense of place.

2.3 The Grossi Kindred and Its Churches

The family that came to call themselves by the patronymic of “Grossi” are perhaps the best documented castellan kindred in the whole Cluniac ‘cartulary’, or archives. The lineage had antecedents in the male line going back to the tenth century, as well as a long history of donations that created social bonds with themselves and Cluny. However, the family gained a new sense of identity from the mid eleventh century on, adopting the patronymic that occurs in many of the family’s acts in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.

In this iteration of the family group, the Grossi created and maintained a compact lordship including allodial holdings to the northwest of the town of Macôn and Cluny, including their principal fortifications at Uxelles and Brancion. This family continued to be enthusiastic donors of larger tracts of land to Cluny in the tenth and early eleventh centuries, but their patronage practices changed around the middle of the eleventh century, usually involving the gift of tithes or single servants instead of entire *mansi*. This was due primarily to the lack of resources available to the family as the decades of giving waned. In addition, the Grossi made a few small donations of liquid property in the twelfth century to the new Cistercian foundation of La Ferté-sur-Grosne to the north of the town of Macon.³⁰

Significantly, from the late eleventh century on, around the time that the

³⁰ Georges Duby, ed., *Recueil des pancartes de l’abbaye de Le Ferte-sur-Grosne, 1113-1178* (Paris, 1953), 2, 99, 103, 116, 145.

patronymic began to label family members in the male line as “Grossi,” members of the kindred aggressively sought to claim land, rights, and churches in the Maconnais in a manner that echoes the castle-lords of lesser status discussed above. Analyzing the family’s activities in relation to Cluny is somewhat difficult in that the male members of the family tended to take the same names: Bernard, Landric, and Jocerann.³¹ Like their social inferiors, several members of the Grossi kindred attained burial at Cluny over the generations,³² and as their own capacity for patronage shrunk over the centuries, the Grossi continually sought legal actions with Cluny through dispute settlements or quitclaims in order to recite the history of their lineage through recounting past gifts.

The Grossi are in many ways an ideal case study for the ways in which a powerful castellan family can offer historians a more holistic picture of memory creation among the lay elite due to the fact that their pool of options was much greater than the Burgundian castle lords analyzed above. Their methodologies of memory creation and maintenance in many ways remained the same. Like other castle lords of the period, the Grossi frequently sometimes gave together or mentioned gifts made by contemporary family members in order to build horizontal recollections of giving among their own kindred. The three brothers Landric, Jocerann, and Bernard Grossus did this in the late eleventh century when making gifts of servants and rights to Cluny. When Landric

³¹ For a survey of the family history of the Grossi, along with a carefully researched modern genealogy that lays out the history of the family and its marriages, see Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, Cloister*, pp. 295-307. See also Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor*, pp. 59-60, 66-67.

³² C 1845, 2332, 2904, 3073, 4664.

Grossus gave farmland to sometime in the late eleventh century, he noted that his brother Jocerann III had given a male servant and his wife in the same territory.³³

Similarly, when this same Jocerann III took the monastic life sometime after this, he reiterated a simultaneous gift of property to the monks made by his brother Bernard.³⁴ In the late eleventh century, Bernard IV Grossus quitclaimed customs in the villa of Montiniaco and another property belonging to the lordship of St. Peter at Cluny. He notes that his brother Landric held rights in the area that he also quitclaimed, and reminds the monks that his son Jocerann II was buried there.³⁵ Thus even great castellan lords like the Grossi who had family members buried at Cluny over several generations felt the mnemonic pinch in the late eleventh century. Even though a handful of Grossi kin members were buried at Cluny, it was still an important investment in familial legacy that had to be reasserted in later generations when Cluny began to rebuild its *ecclesia* and strengthen its lordship.

In addition to burial privileges, the Grossi were able to build links with Cluny over the generations through alienation and reclaiming of property, much of which had ancestral mnemonic value. The Grossi of the twelfth century generation were frequent crusaders, able to utilize their pilgrimages overseas to insert themselves into the novel

³³ C 3066.

³⁴ C. 3077.

³⁵ C 3073.

economies of status enjoyed by crusader families.³⁶ While their zeal for pilgrimage never reached the level of their close neighbors, the lords of Nevers, journeys to Outremer expanded the mnemonic toolbox of the lineage.

Yet despite the options available to the kindred, the Grossi did have unique avenues of staking claims on the landscape of memory in Burgundy through a means seen only intermittently among their knightly neighbors. They seized churches. The significance of ecclesiastical property becomes all the more striking when viewed in light of the fact that many charters in Cluny's cartulary mention agreements being made and charters themselves drafted on church altars, whether at the *major ecclesia* at Cluny herself, or at her various dependencies.

Documents mentioning charters being formalized on church altars are a prominent feature of Cluny's cartulary in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.³⁷ If the careful reader privileges aristocratic perspectives alongside monastic, they can better understand why the donation of churches was so important to the lay community around Cluny's lordship. Just like concession of rights to burial in a church cemetery, the giving of churches by lay men and women consisted essentially of the offer of a memory space to the Cluniac *ecclesia*. In a period where the fear of being forgotten or

³⁶ For the status of returned crusaders in the honor economy of twelfth-century France, see James Naus, "Negotiating Kingship in France at the Time of the First Crusades: Suger and the *Gesta Ludovici Grossi*," *French Historical Studies* 36; 4 (Fall, 2013): 525-541, and Nicholas Paul, "A Warlord's Wisdom: Literacy and Propaganda at the Time of the First Crusade," *Speculum* 85 (2010): 534-566.

³⁷ C 3017, 3117, 3228, 3380, 3398, 3422, 3473, 3487, 3492, 3500, 3543, 3602, 3737, 3780.

consigned to oblivion was a very real presence among the many donors of Cluny's archive, churches and their altars played a unique role in the landscape of mnemonic potential embedded in lay social practice.

Altars themselves served as sites where memories were created and maintained through the drawing of charters and the agreements, rights, and gifts they recounted. Indeed, for lords like Jocerann "Joperra" and his wife along with many other lords who gave churches to Cluny, such gifts must have been in a very real sense the donation of memory to the monastery and its monks. The noted increase in donations of church spaces to Cluny in the eleventh and twelfth centuries can thus be viewed as a form of memory trading, wherein spaces like altars and cemeteries were given as part of the aristocratic endorsements of monastic and church reform initiatives.

Charters and altars together formed a mnemonic architecture wherein the key oral discussions about ancestral gifts, old conflicts, and past settlements anchored themselves in the memories of powerful lords like the Grossi and castle lords like Jocerann "Joperra." It is for this reason that conflicts over churches take pride of place in the litigation of the Grossi family with Cluny in the twelfth century. There is no doubt that the process of charter production and conflict settlement is in part a site where lords gained an opportunity to tell such stories about themselves. The central role of church altars as spaces on the landscape of lordships where stories were told and memories were created offers a methodological way around these problems. If church altars were

in part cites of memory creation among the burgeoning military aristocracy in the Maconnais, then we can gain new insight on lay giving and claiming of memory itself by focusing on giving and claiming of churches.

For the Grossi, just as with lesser Burgundian lords, the giving and claiming of churches was the giving and claiming of memory, and these activities served vital functions in the life of the lordship. Demonstrating the prominent place of altars in the memory landscape of the Grossi kindred is relatively straightforward. When Bernard V Grossus gave Cluny rights to some woodland at Bray in 1110, the monks gave him a counter gift of a thousand *solidi* and a horse. Bernard finalized the agreement “with my right hand on the sacred altar”³⁸ recounting in brief the history of the patch of woods in the genealogy of giving and taking among his father, grandfather (*avo*), and great-grandfather (*proavo*).

In the name of the Lord. Let it be known by all lovers of truth and peace that I, Bernard, known as Grossus, son of Landric Grossus, who was himself son of Bernard Grossus of Uxelles that I give to the great fathers of Cluny, to abbot Pontius and to the monks, and to all their successors, a woodland from my father, grandfather, and great grandfather. I thus make it known.³⁹

Just like Guichard of Anton in 1131, Bernard V is in some sense writing a family history mediated through the gift. In this text in particular, there are clear echoes of the

³⁸ C 3896 “et propter hoc a senioribus Cluniacensibus gratanter suscepi et habui mille solidos et equum unum, et juravi eis, manu mea dextera super sacrum altare et sanctas reliquias”

³⁹ C 3896 “In nomine Domini. Notum sit amantibus veritatem et pacem, quod ego Bernardus, cognomento Grossus, filius Landrici Grossi, qui et ipse filius fuit Bernardi Grossi de Ousiella, unum boscum a patre et avo et proavo meum, senioribus nostris de Cluniaco dono, Pontio abbati et monachis, eorumque successoribus in perpetuum, sic communem facio.”

story-world surrounding Walter of le Clud in Lambert's twelfth-century genealogy of the lords of Guines and Ardres. Bernard V's long generational memory is the exception rather than the rule in the twelfth century, and it is important to note several key points here. Not only do the woods at Bray carry memories for Bernard V, but altar on which the agreement was made cements the recollection and certainly plays a role in Bernard's ability to remember his kin for three generations. By the time of Bernard V in the early twelfth century, the Grossi kindred had all but exhausted its capacity for giving large *mansi*. Gifts during this period often were much smaller, such as the gift of income or the resources to support individual servants.⁴⁰ The gift of the woodland at Bray was in fact the last large tract of land that Bernard V gave to Cluny.

Peter the Venerable, the twelfth-century abbot of Cluny, recorded a story in his *de miraculis* that can give further insight in to the contested nature of this hard won, gift-based genealogy on the part of the Grossi lords. Certainly the most widely circulated of Bernard's writings, the *de miraculis* contains a story about Bernard V's ancestor, Bernard II. Interestingly, Bernard II is indirectly named in the above donation of the woodland at Bray in 1110. He is Bernard V's great grandfather. Peter has Bernard II appear as a ghost to one of Cluny's stewards conducting a survey near the towns of Uxelles and Brancion.

When the apparition, mounted on a mule and dressed in a cloak of new fox-fur, and remembering that Bernard was dead, the steward was at first struck with terror; but, overcoming his fear, he asked the apparition whether it was indeed

⁴⁰ Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, Cloister*, pp. 164.

the person whom it seemed to be, and why it had come back. This was the reply: “You should know that I am indeed Bernard, the former lord of this region. As many people know, I was the cause of many misdeeds and because of them I am suffering greatly now. Although it seems that, because at the end of my life I repented and did penance for my worst actions, I have escaped eternal damnation, I still have a great and present need of help to achieve a true liberation of my soul. For that reason, I have been given permission to come back to implore the forgiveness of the abbot of Cluny.”⁴¹

Bernard goes on to relate that he has followed the abbot’s retinue through his own former properties in an effort to communicate his needs. Here we see clear echoes of the Cluniac charter preambles emphasizing penance and contrition for violent deeds. It is possible that this story reached the ears of Bernard II’s descendants, since Peter the Venerable’s *de miraculis* text circulated a bit more widely than his other writings.⁴² Here, Peter clearly illustrates and critiques the growing lineage memories of the Grossi lords, and recasts Bernard’s postmortem story as a narrative of penance for violent activities.

Within this story-world Bernard II is begging Peter the Venerable for forgiveness even after death, and his ghostly journey as the living Peter’s shadow inverts the itinerant lordship of Cluny’s most powerful neighbors and reworks their tools of memory creation, namely violent claiming, as sins which will be punished in the afterlife. Here we can see why penance for sins and concern for ones’ ancestors appear together so frequently as motivations within Cluny’s charters as well as charters in other regions more generally. The motivation clause reflects a compromise between monastic

⁴¹ *De miraculis Petri Venerabilis*, PL, CLXXXIX, cols. 874-5.

⁴² Isabelle Cochelin, “Orders and exclusions” *Early Medieval Europe* (2005) 13:4 395-403.

scribes and lay litigants. Lords present themselves as pious yet sinful Christians in need of prayers and forgiveness, and in return the monks offer them a space to tell stories, crafting their own family narratives through the telling of previous gifts. These contested motivations and memory stylings both come together at the central site of peacemaking and charter formalizing in the high medieval Macônnais: the altars of churches.

The central role of church altars in this kind of history writing explains why the Grossi kindred were some of the most persistent claimers of churches from the late eleventh through the early thirteenth centuries. In particular, the charters record conflicts between the family and Cluny regarding two churches, one in the *villa* of Aina in the Macônnais and another called St. Hippolyte. In 1074, around the time that the kindred began to use the patronymic for which they are well known, Jocerann III Grossus gave the church at Aina. Jocerann III notes that he gave the church "*ab antecessoribus*."⁴³ A knight of his household named Dalmatius confirmed the gift. In addition, the charter notes that the gift of the church at Aina to Cluny was made in the church itself. Presumably the charter was discussed and formalized on the altar, although we are not directly told this.

Later the same year, Jocerann's brother Bernard IV quitclaimed rights that he held at the church of Aina. He makes sure to remind the monks that he is also alienating

⁴³ C 3472.

the rights that Jocerann III had given to the monastery upon the latter's conversion to the monastic life at Cluny in 1074. Significantly, Bernard IV is able even at this early stage in the life of the renewed Grossi lineage to recall the names of his grandfather Jocerann II and his own father Bernard III. This latter charter is not only confirmed by Bernard's brother Jocerann III, who apparently asked that the charter be drawn up, but it is also noted that the document was confirmed upon the altar of St. Peter at Cluny.⁴⁴ The donation and subsequent quitclaim of Aina reveals that both brothers were keen to reiterate the gifts that the other had given or the rights each had held.

The fact that the space on which the charter was confirmed shifted from Aina itself to the great Church of Cluny could indicate centralization of agreement-making spaces on the part of abbot Hugh of Cluny and the senior fathers of the monastery. It is clear that regardless of the place of formalization, the altar itself was the key memory space in the mind of the Grossi litigants, even this early on in the life of the renewed lineage. This is partly why Bernard V in 1110 could remember his own father, grandfather, and great-grandfather when his own gift of the woodland at Bray was formalized at Cluny.

Disputes between Cluny and the Grossi family over the church of St. Hippolyte took up much of the energy of the kindred through its whole existence, so much so that it clearly indicates stakes beyond simple possession or power politics. The church shows

⁴⁴ C 3473.

up first in Cluny's cartulary as a gift of an ancestor of the lords who would later take the patronymic of "Grossi." A charter dated 999-1027 records the gift of the church by one Gaucerann; whom modern historians refer to as Jocerann I.⁴⁵ The witness list contains several of his sons who helped confirm the gift of St. Hippolyte.

Even at this point, the church and the altar within it likely served as a gathering place for the family, likely as a center of devotion or worship. In 1074, Bernard III Grossus, Gaucerann's grandson, quitclaimed "bad customs" he held at St. Hippolyte in a short charter.⁴⁶ In this case, the quitclaim indicates that the conflict over St. Hippolyte was not always a matter of a rash younger son claiming what a father had piously given and thus threatening his eternal inheritance.⁴⁷ The quitclaim indicates Bernard III's discomfort with Cluny's possession of a church that had become a memory center in the landscape of the newly reconfigured Grossi lordship. It is significant that Bernard III's 1074 quitclaim of St. Hippolyte is contemporary with his quitclaim of the church at Aina discussed above. Since the quitclaim charters reflect agreements and settlements of claims made earlier, we can see in the documents that the Grossi did not see it as an issue to try and keep a valuable memory space in the family.

Two generations later in 1115, Abbot Pontius of Cluny settled a conflict with Bernard V Grossus concerning St. Hippolyte. We saw Bernard V earlier in 1110 donating

⁴⁵ Barbara Rosenwein helpfully glosses 'Gaucerann' as a variation on 'Jocerann.' Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of St. Peter*, pp. 56-60.

⁴⁶ C 3474.

⁴⁷ Stephen White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints*, pp. 170-176.

the woodland at Bray on the altar at Cluny's *maior ecclesia* and writing his family's history through their gifts. As part of the 1115 settlement of a claim on the church that Bernard V had doubtlessly made, the monks gave him a counter gift of a servant named Guichard. As in the gift at Bray, Bernard V notes that his grandfather, his own father and his maternal uncle had also quitclaimed rights over St. Hippolyte. In so doing he demonstrates characteristic capacity for long memory rooted in discussions of old claims and monastic settlements. The charter also tells a comparatively long narrative discussing Bernard's violent requisitions regarding St. Hippolyte.⁴⁸

Abbot Pontius was in fact compelled to excommunicate Bernard V "compelled by terror (of him)." Bernard had seized mules and laid claim to the land surrounding the church, and abbot Pontius previously tried to settle the conflict by attempting to get Bernard's friends (whom the charter is careful to name) to calm Bernard down and convince him to do what was needed to reverse his excommunication and make peace with abbot Pontius.⁴⁹ Eventually Bernard did so. Abbot Pontius then reiterates through his scribe that the Cluniac lordship extends throughout the whole Macônnais and surrounding areas.⁵⁰ It is notable that abbot Pontius had to resort to excommunication in this case, and that he had to explicitly lay out the extent of Cluny's ban.

Scholars have recently argued that excommunication was in part a memory

⁴⁸ C 3920.

⁴⁹ C 3920 "ille terrore compunctus."

⁵⁰ C. 3920 "Bannum Cluniaci infra metas istas consistit: Julliacus meta una, Sergi, Carrella, Sancta Maria de Bosco, Matisconum, Tornut."

censure in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, so it is no coincidence that Pontius chose to smite Bernard with such a punishment in light of his own violent efforts to continue holding a church that had bolstered his own sense of family memory.⁵¹ In this sense, Bernard V's excommunication is more tailor-made than one would imagine, with threatened erasure of memory is a fitting punishment for a lord who had built that memory over generations of disputing and settling disputes. Bernard V's continued reluctance to give up his claim on the church and resort to violence in the preservation of his memory landscape also perhaps indicates that the lordship landscape of Cluny under abbot Hugh and his successor Pontius was not as widely accepted outside the minds of the monks and the monastic scriptorium.

St. Hippolyte disappears from Cluny's documents until 1214, when Jocerann V gave up his claims on the church as part of an agreement mediated by the Archbishop of Lyons, Renaud II. In this case, part of the agreement was that Jocerann V would hold rights to the church from the Duke of Burgundy between the feast of Saint Michael and the feast of All Saints.⁵² This charter is short and to the point, and one would think that it perhaps marked the end of the long history of disputes between the Grossi and St.

⁵¹ Christian Jaser, "Ritual Excommunication: An 'Ars Oblivionalis'?" In *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture*, 119-139, ed. Elma Brenner, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013). For the ritual actions that accompanied an excommunication, see *Ordo Excommunicationis*, PL 138. 1123. For Ritual Excommunication in general, see Genevieve Steele Edwards, 'Ritual Excommunication in Medieval France and England, 900-1200' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1997), and Elisabeth Vodola, *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (University of California Press, 1986). See also Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

⁵² C 4481.

Hippolyte.

However, later that same year, Archbishop Renaud again oversaw a long settlement between Jocerann V and Cluny concerning the church. This final charter mentions the continued violent claiming of rights in the area of the church on the part of Jocerann V and his men. While the Archbishop respects Jocerann's rights in the area during the time specified by the earlier quitclaim, between the feast of Saint Michael and the feast of All Saints, the charter reiterates that neither Jocerann nor any of his successors may infringe the peace by continuing to claim St. Hippolyte.

Significantly, by the early thirteenth century, Jocerann V does not take the time his ancestors did to regale the monks with tales of earlier gifts and claims. Perhaps at this point the memories of the deeds of the kindred as articulated through their gifts had faded. Even so, St. Hippolyte's central role in cementing the story of the Grossi lords throughout the existence of the lordship meant that Jocerann V continued to violently claim it, even as the lineage faded and died out. This of course shows that even in the early thirteenth century, St. Hippolyte still served as an important hub and center of identity, if not memory, for the Grossi lords. A few decades later, Jocerann V's son Henry III sold both Brancion and Uxelles, the centers of the family lordship, to the duke of Burgundy in 1259 and effectively ended the lineage.⁵³

⁵³ Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, Cloister* pp. 306-307.

2.4 Conclusion

It has long been a commonplace among historians interested in the high medieval aristocracy that concerns for memory and lineage formed a central nexus of identity. Yet the precise means through which claims to memory were negotiated and discussed on the ground over generations has not taken pride of place in these assumptions, given the prevalent focus of modern historiography on the novel narrative genealogies of the twelfth century. Violent claiming and dispute settlement at Cluny from the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries served as a vital nexus wherein the newly powerful and mnemonically vulnerable castle-lords of Burgundy could tell their own stories about horizontal and vertical “families,” in furtively aggressive attempts to claim memory and status. They did this without the need to commission narratives, and in some cases likely initiated conflicts with Cluny in order to tell their family’s history *in lieu* of narrative texts.

In a period where the landscape of memory at Cluny was rapidly shifting in tandem with the construction of the new infrastructure of Cluny III in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries, lay lords shifted their own activities away from the comparatively straightforward memory making techniques and options of their tenth and early eleventh century ancestors. Gifts of property in exchange for the burial of oneself and one’s nuclear relatives could not continue as it had as Cluny’s abbots such as Hugh of Semur and Pontius strengthened Cluny’s patrimony as old memories and

bonds maintained through giving and taking began to disappear.

The shrinking size and relative paucity of donations effectively deprived lay lords of memory making opportunities, and due to this many turned to violence in order to write their own histories. This motivation was contested and by abbots such as Pontius and Peter the Venerable, indicating that even abbots recognized the power of the nascent methodology of aristocratic memory making and sought to rework it by recasting lay litigants like the Grossi as violent social actors who threatened Cluny's particular brand of reform.

As discussed above, lay lords of all kinds, from petty castle-lords and their knightly entourages to mighty castellan families internalized the central place of church altars as sites of memory production. The process of witnessing and confirming charters created clear associations between the altar and memory. For the lords of Burgundy, giving or claiming churches was in fact giving or claiming a memory space.

This perspective has wide implications for the processes of monastic and church reform writ large, including movements within the larger arc of reform, such as the Peace of God. Recent scholars of reform such as Steven Vanderputten have effectively argued that monastic reform at least was the product of often-divergent claims on the part of monastic, ecclesiastical, and secular actors rather than a top-down series of

changes.⁵⁴ If memory making could be foregrounded as partial motivation for the actions of these lay actors, then the processes of reform itself could be even further problematized. Finally, it would be fruitful as an analogue to this kind of study to compare the arguments of canon lawyers about the seizure of church land by laymen with the kinds of practices cited above. Doing so could better illuminate in back-door fashion the centrality of cultural claims to memory on the part of the military aristocracy, and the central role those often-misunderstood claims had for the processes of monastic and church reform in the high middle ages.

⁵⁴ Steven Vanderputten, *Monastic Reform as Process: Realities and Representations in Medieval Flanders, 900-1100* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013), *Ibid.*, *Imagining Religious Leadership in Middle Ages: Richard of Saint-Vanne and the Politics of Reform* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015).

3. Displaced Bodies: The Advent of a Memory Economy in the Era of the Peace Councils, 989-1100 C. E.

The Peace of God was a series of local councils convened by ecclesiastical communities in the tenth and eleventh centuries that sought to define and enforce particular ideas about violence, discipline, and purity within medieval society. It has long been a truism of the historiography of these councils and their regulations that one of the intended targets was the secular military aristocracy and the emerging knighthood of medieval France. Scholars have long debated the role of these councils in medieval society, often viewing them as evidence of deep social change around the year 1000 and a manifestation of early local efforts at church reform.

In a cogent recent summary, Geoffrey Koziol argues that the Peace of God served as a novel form of legislation that sought to limit and discuss new manifestations of lordship and dependency that arose in the late ninth century, while also negotiating other new identities and power dynamics that came to the fore in the period. The Peace and Truce of God became institutionalized over the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, informing ideas about royal peace or the peace of the communes.¹ A major

¹ This section owes much to Geoffrey Koziol, *The Peace of God* (Arc Humanities Press, 2018), p. 129-32, 89-122. (hereafter, Koziol, *The Peace of God*,) An older but still useful literature review for this section is Frederick Paxton, "History, Historians, and the Peace of God" p. 21-40. In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992). (hereafter, *Social Violence and Religious Response*), and Dolorosa Kennelly, "The Peace of God: Fact or Fiction?" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1962). For the influence of the Peace and Truce on the peace of the communes, see Dolorosa Kennelly, "Medieval Towns and the Peace of God," *Medievalia et Humanistica* 15 (1963): 35-53. The literature on medieval peacemaking is vast, and has been associated with

result of the peace movements and eleventh century church reform was what historian Kathleen Cushing calls a “reorientation of loyalties” within medieval society.² Clerical authorities defined social groups in opposition to themselves, and the new visibility of different lay and ecclesiastical groups allow historians to see how these groups built their own increasingly unique identities at a local level.

In keeping with Koziol’s recent perspective, this chapter examines the Peace and Truce of God as pieces of pragmatic legislation meant to limit the practices of secular lordship that were perceived as dangerous or violent by the abbots and bishops of tenth- and eleventh-century France. Feuds and disputes over property and rights remained vitally important for the practice of lay lordship and the maintenance of aristocratic identity, but the councils limited the *consuetudines*, or ‘customs’ of lordship, i.e. seizures, local warfare, and measures for defense of property. In doing so, the councils demarcated the boundaries of secular and ecclesiastical lordships in ways that made it advantageous for secular lords to heed conciliar peace legislation. Lords did so by

the dated ideas of societal ‘mutation’ around the year 1000. See Georges Duby, *La Société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris: A. Colin, 1953), Jean Pierre-Poly and Eric Bournazel, *The Feudal Transformation, 900-1200* (Holmes & Meier, 1991), Thomas Bisson, “The Feudal Revolution,” *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 6-42, Dominique Barthelemy and Stephen D. White, “The ‘Feudal Revolution,’” *Past and Present* 152 (1996): 196-223, Chris Wickham and Timothy Reuter, “The ‘Feudal Revolution,’” *Past and Present* 155 (1997): 177-208. Jehangir Y. Malegam, *The Sleep of Behemoth: Disputing Peace and Violence in Medieval Europe, 1000-1200* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013).

² Kathleen Cushing, *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 2005), pp. 34-7, John Howe, “The Nobility’s Reform of the Medieval Church” *The American Historical Review* 93 (1988): 317-339.

limiting warlike activities to certain places or times and only to relationships with one's peers or dependents. Practices of lordship which did not follow the regulations of the councils were labelled *malae consuetudines*, or "bad customs" by clerics.³

This chapter is an attempt to reframe some of the stakes involved in the practice of lay lordship and monastic peacekeeping during the period in which the councils for peace convened by demonstrating that memory and legacy was a vital part of the discussion. It was during the peace movements that the bodies of saints and elite laypeople became charged with a unique combination of associations deriving from contemporary social changes and ancient practices. discussion centers on three central and related practices that exemplified how corpse moving became a language for making memory claims during this period: the 'humiliation' of saints' relics as part of liturgical *clamors*, relic tours conducted for fundraising and peacemaking, and censures of ritual cursing and excommunication. For monastics and lay lords, properly placed saintly or lay bodies created and supported institutional or lineage memory.⁴ For both social groups, memory was embodied and carried through the corpse. Bodies that were not placed properly in cult sites or cemeteries risked loss, damage or destruction, and

³ Koziol, *The Peace of God*, 66-72.

⁴ For the rise of the knightly class and their move into the aristocracy, see Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 1-27. For the importance of burial in the commemorative traditions of the high medieval nobility, see Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), pp. 74-78, and Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), pp. 200-214. For the place of relics as anchors of monastic institutional memory, see Amy Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 76-78.

thus potential oblivion. When a body was in the process of being moved, it became highly vulnerable.

Monks and aristocrats used bodily placement and displacement in various forms to make dialectical memory claims to one another during the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries. Moving a body was understood by these different groups in various ways depending on context, but corpse moving was an activity that both monks and lay lords could use to talk to each other about memory and participation in local reform initiatives and peace councils. Using bodily movement as a way to discuss memory claims between these social groups is what I call in this chapter an 'infra-language' of bodily placement and displacement.

Monks engaged in the risky business of moving the valuable bodies of their saints during peace councils and relic tours in order to raise resources for institutional provender and offer peacemaking spaces for feuding local lords.⁵ Sainly bodies in their reliquary statues were also highly visible participants in peace councils.⁶ Monks moved

⁵ A notable example is the relics of St. Ursmer that were carried on peacemaking missions throughout Flanders. See *Miracula sancti Ursmeri in itinere per Flandriam facta*, chap. 1; MGH SS 15.2:837-38. See Geoffrey Koziol, "Monks, Feuds, and the Making of Peace in Eleventh-Century Flanders," pp. 239-258. In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* Ed. By Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).

⁶ See Bernard of Angers, *Liber mirac. S. Fidis*, edizione critica e commento a cura di Luca Robertini (Centro Italiano Di Studi Sull'alto Medioevo Spoleto, 1994). The English translation is *The Book of Saint Foy*, trans. Pamela Sheingorn (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1995). *Sacrorum consiliorum nova, et amplius collectio*. vol. 19, *Translatio sancti Viviani episcopi in coenobium Figiacense et eiusdem miracula. Analecta bollandia*, 8 (1889), 256-84. *Les miracles de Saint Benoit écrits par Andrevald, Aimon, Andre, Raoul Tortaire et Hugues de Sainte Marie, moines de Fleury*. Ed. Eugene de Certain. (Paris, 1858).

saints' bodies in attempts to communicate to laymen that only monastics could properly create or destroy memory by placing relics correctly. Moving relics had long been part of monastic institutional histories, and medieval people understood the saints to be active agents in the community and an embodiment of the power and will of God.⁷ Medieval people believed that saints could only be moved with their own approval, and displacing a relic implied the compliance and approval of divine authority. During this period, monks also raised *clamors* to their saints, displacing relics on the floors of their churches to force saints to take action against the violent claims of arms-bearing laypeople. Finally, as the peace councils convened and the relic tours continued, monks and bishops began to recast the ancient penitential censures of ritual excommunication as a displacement ritual that denied burial to aristocrats and threatened their bodies and memories with oblivion.

Monastic communities had no way of knowing whether the aristocracy accepted the arguments for their mnemonic supremacy embedded in these displacement activities, and displacing bodies was always read differently by different groups

Daniel Callahan, "The Peace of God and the Cult of the Saints in Aquitaine in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," pp. 165-183. In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).

⁷ For the relic trade itself, see Patrick Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991). For an wide introduction to the historiography of the relic trade, see *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge University Press, 1983).

depending on context. Nevertheless, displacing the relics of a saint was clearly and uniquely hazardous. Around 1000 C. E., monastic authorities began to draw on long traditions of saintly corpse moving, weaponizing relics themselves in new ways to assault the lineage memories of the castellans and knights whose violent practices of lordship they found disturbing and in need of regulation. Doing so made an argument for saintly monastic and primacy as memory brokers in a changing world. It is also clear that the aristocracy responded by moving corpses in ways that co-opted and engaged the assumptions of monastic and clerical neighbors. In doing so, the aristocracy showcased a cultural literacy and a political acumen that was complex and multi-faceted. Lay lords lacked the exact relationship to literacy and the written word that monks enjoyed but were just as capable of carrying on action-based arguments with their monastic neighbors.

3.1 Relic Tours and the Humiliation of Saints: Vulnerability of Saintly Bodies and the Dialectics of Corporeal Movement

Two of the key features of monastic dispute processing and peacemaking in the late tenth and early eleventh century were the itinerant tours of relics taken by monastic houses and the humiliation of relics. Both of these practices drew from the ancient monastic practice of founding houses by claiming or discovering saints' relics and placing them beneath the altars of their churches.⁸ From the monks' perspective, relic

⁸ See fn. 3 above.

tours and relic humiliation sought to create concord within a society that could barely free itself from the constraints of feud and social unrest. Prominent lords swore oaths to keep the peace at councils in which the bodies of saints figured prominently in peacemaking spaces. Monastic narratives and miracle collections foreground the fragmented bodies of the holy dead as powerful lords in their own right, members of the great cloud of heavenly witnesses whose presence on earth manifested in miraculous healings, arbitration of disputes and peacemaking.

The practice of moving relics for peacemaking purposes was risky business in the early eleventh century. Although the saints enjoyed great power within the texts and belief systems of monastic communities, relic tours placed the saints in an extremely vulnerable position. Taken outside the churches and cult sites that housed them, relics could be stolen by monks from other communities in attempts to gain prestige and legitimacy. Many of the foundation legends of monastic houses involved narratives called a *translatio*, stories intimately tied to the institutional identities and memories of abbeys that put the finding and moving of relics center stage. Monks who took part in relic tours in Aquitaine would have heard of the argument between the monasteries of Conques and Figeac over the stolen relics that defined each houses' relationships to the memory of Charlemagne.⁹

⁹ Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past*, 76-78, 259-285, 303, 308.

If read carefully, the councils and miracle stories that tell the story of relic itinerancy can elucidate the efforts monks took to protect the vulnerable bodies of their saints, and the efforts made by aristocratic witnesses to interact with saints in disapproved ways. Despite the fact that monastic chronicles argued forcefully for the omnipotence of their saintly patrons, taking relics outside the safety of their cult sites was only undertaken when the monks had powerful statements to make. Poorly handled relics could be lost, stolen, or damaged.

In the mid 990s, Letaldus of Micy wrote an account of the Council at the monastery of Charroux in which of the body of St. Julianus joined other relics from other southern French monasteries that were brought to enforce peace in the region.

...a large group of people gathered there from Poitou, the Limousin, and nearby regions. Many bodies of saints were also brought there. [...] Along with these various relics of the saints honored by God, the remains of the glorious father Julian were brought with proper honor. [...] At the place where the relics reposed, faithful Christians erected a sort of fence from twigs, so that the place where the holy body had lain might remain safe from the approach of men and animals. Many days later a wild bull came wantonly by and struck the same fence with his horns and flank, when suddenly he retreated from the fence, lay down, and died.¹⁰

¹⁰ Letaldus of Micy, *Delatio corporis s. Juliani ad Synodem Kartoffensem* (989), *Patrologia latina* 137:823-26. "...factusque est ibi grandis ex pago Pictavo et Lemovicino, et adjacentibus regionibus multorum concursus populorum. Nam et multa corpora sanctorum ibi allata sunt,[...] At vero inter caetera Deo digna sanctorum pignora, etiam gloriosi Patris Juniani exuviae cum decenti honore delatae sunt. [...] sed nihilominus in eodem loco quo quieverant reliquiae, fideles Christiani ex lento vimine quasi quoddam fecere peribolum, ut locus ipse quo sacra membra locata fuerant ab accessu hominum et animalium tutus remaneret. Post multos dies taurus ferox accessit et cornibus atque costis eadem sepe ludibundus concussit; sed mox ut a saepe recessit, corruit et exspiravit."

A similar council took place in 1012 at the council of Rouergue. The account derives from the miracle collection of Bernard of Angers concerning the cult of saint Foy. The reliquary statue of Sainte Foy participated in councils and often suffered provocations by laymen who sought to form bonds with her. At Rouergue, reliquaries in the form of statues and chests decorated the area, including Sts. Marius, Amantius, Saturninus, Mary and Ste. Foy.

Most revered bishop Arnald, bishop of Rodez, called a synod from his parishes, to which the bodies of the saints were brought in golden reliquaries, which took the form of chests and statues, from various communities of monks and canons. In the field of Saint Felix, which is around a mile from the town, the battleline of the saints was drawn up in tents and pavilions.¹¹

Bernard concludes the narrative of the council by writing that there were countless other relics besides these, almost without number. In these cases, the strength of the saints within the narratives belies their weakness. Monks had no way of knowing how secular lords would react to the relics they carried through the countryside of southern Francia, and even took measures to protect the reliquaries from wild animals. In the account from Charroux, Letaldus of Micy reassures his readers that the unpredictability typified by the wild bull was no match for the power of the gathered saints. If a wild bull was killed, capricious laymen could suffer the same or worse. The

¹¹ Bernard of Angers, *Liber mirac. S. Fidis*, edizione critica e commento a cura di Luca Robertini (Centro Italiano Di Studi Sull'alto Medioevo Spoleto, 1994), 1.28-29, pp. 132-133. "Reverentissimus igitur Arnaldus, Rotensium episcopus, suis tantum parrochianis conflaverat synodum, [...] sanctorum corpora sunt evecta. Erat autem distribute sanctorum acies in tentoriis et papilionibus, in prato Sancti Felicis quod disparatur ab urbe quasi uno tantum miliario."

enraged bull itself could almost symbolize or allude to the potential ravages of laymen.

Bernard of Angers's militant language conceals a fear that the treasures and resources of the saints' monastic household could be stolen, along with the holy bones of the saints themselves. Bernard of Angers again offers a display of strength in his narrative while being fully conscious of Sainte Foy's vulnerability.

For the aristocracy of southern Francia, the escorted reliquaries of saints were not immediately viewed as spaces for peacemaking, but rather opportunities to create personal bonds with the saint. One of the reasons why the peace councils of this period decried the plundering of churches on the part of lay lords reinforces the vulnerability of relics and showcases how lay lords perceived relic tours. King Robert the Pious's oath to bishop Warin of Beauvais begins with an explicit promise not to invade churches.

I will not assault a church for any purpose. Nor will I attack the warehouses on the campus of a church because of its sacred status, unless to apprehend someone who has committed murder, or a criminal who broke the peace, or a horse. But if I invade a warehouse for this reason, I will, to my knowledge, take possession of nothing more than that murderer and his effects. I will not attack an unarmed cleric or a monk, nor another walking with him who is unarmed, nor will I seize their horse unless they are committing a crime or unless it is in reprisal for a crime for which they would not make restitution, fifteen days after my admonition. I will not seize bulls, cows, pigs, sheep, lambs, goats, asses or burden they bear, mares or their untamed colts.¹²

¹² Vatican, Reg. lat. 566, fol. 38v. "Ecclesiam nullo modo infringam, Cellaria in circitu ecclesiae causa salmenti eiusdem non infringam, nisi propter illum malefactorem qui hanc pacem infregerit, aut propter factum homicidium aut propter comprehensionem hominis aut caballi. Et si propter has res eadem cellaria infregero, nihil aliud ex eis traham nisi illum malefactorem aut eis warnimentum me sciente. Clericum aut monachum arma secularia non portantem non assaliam neque ambulantem cum eis sine lancea et scuto, nec caballum eorum rapiam nisi talis presentialiter eorum culpa fuerit ut rectam rationem habeam illud faciendum, aut nisi talis eorum culpa fuerit quam post meam admonitionem infra dies XV emendare

The above quote is only a sample of the long and detailed nature of the oath. Robert the Pious's oath is a classic piece of monastic narrative rhetoric against the perceived violence of laymen in the late tenth century. However, it is worth noting that the oath displays the efforts taken on the part of lay aristocrats to invade saintly space in ways that they saw as essential to the maintenance of their own bond with the holy presence. Stealing goods, property, or wealth initiated a well-known process of feud which ultimately served to initiate a relationship with the saint and his or her household.¹³ Monastic efforts to protect saints' relics with fences to hinder plundering suggest that lords were not above breaking into consecrated space and violating the bodies of the saints in order to interact with the presence of the saint as fellow lords with whose households they often had disagreements.

As the above texts illustrate splendidly, the monks who moved the bodies of their own saints wished to make them visible to the lay community in a way that heightened the monks' claimed status as presence brokers. Taking relics on tours through the southern French countryside was indeed about peacemaking, but these movements also sought to make an argument to the wider community that the monks

noluerint. Praedam non faciam de bove, de vaca, de porco, de vervece, de agno, de capra, de asino et fasce quem portat, de equa ac pullo eius indomito."

¹³ For the power of the feud to create relationships, see Stephen D. White, "Feuding and Peace-making in the Touraine around the Year 1100" *Traditio* 42 (1986): 195-263, Stephen D. White, "The Feudal Revolution: Comment," *Past and Present* 152 (1996): 205-223, Frederic Cheyette and Howell Chickering, "Love, Anger, and Peace: Social Practice and Poetic Play in the Ending of *Yvain*" *Speculum* 80:1 (2005): 75-117.

themselves had the supreme right to place and displace the body of the saint and police the space around its relics. They were the true brokers of a saints' presence and its memory because they controlled access to the saint's body. This kind of argument on the part of the monks had little to do with texts. It was a tactic deployed in a particular time and place to make a statement about access in the face of church plundering by laymen. Saints could not be accessed whenever a layman wished; the saint's presence had to be mediated by its household.

Monastic communities would also 'humiliate' the bodies of their saints as part of a liturgical *clamor*.¹⁴ In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, a *clamor* was a general petition to divine, saintly, or secular authority for help against an oppressor. A relic humiliation took place in the context of a liturgical *clamor*, or a *clamor* that was formally written out in the liturgies of monastic communities. In the liturgical context, the *clamor* took place after the host was raised during the mass. Monks often included relic humiliation in their liturgical *clamors*. As Richard Barton and others have argued, the eleventh and twelfth century was a period in which the *clamor* carried quasi-legal force as both "complaint or accusation."¹⁵ Within this semi-legal framework, the humiliation of relics carried added force.

¹⁴ Patrick Geary, "Humiliation of Saints," pp. 95-115. In *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994). (hereafter, Geary, *Humiliation of Saints*).

¹⁵ Richard Barton, "Making a Clamor to the Lord: Noise, Justice, and Power in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France" pp. 217-18. In *Feud, Violence, and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White* edited by Belle S. Tuten and Tracey Billado (Burlington: Ashgate, 2010). The classic study of relic

A few years before the end of the first millennium, a pancarte of the cloister of Saint Martin recorded a curious incident of relic humiliation. Fulk Nerra, count of Anjou and lord in the Tourraine damaged the house of a canon of the cloister of Saint Martin of Tours during his siege of the city. In response to a perceived violation, the canons heaped thorns on the body of Saint Martin and refused entrance to the members of Fulk's household. Pilgrims and churchgoers could enter, however, and would circulate the humiliation of Martin and Fulk's incrimination throughout the Tourraine. After a time,

The count, regretting his actions not long after, and seeking forgiveness, by his own free will entered the cloister and went to the house of Secardus, the master of the students. From there, barefoot, he humbly entered the church with some of his followers. Stopping first before the Sepulcher of Blessed Martin, after giving sureties, he promised to God and Blessed Martin through the hands of bishop Rainald of Angers never to do such a thing again. Then he made satisfaction before the bodies of the saints and finally before the crucifix.¹⁶

humiliation remains Patrick Geary, "Humiliation of Saints" pp. 95-115. In Patrick Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994). On the influence of the *clamor* on liturgies supporting crusade, see Cecilia Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons: Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017), pp. 192-235. On the *clamor* and its close relationship to relic humiliation and ritual excommunication, see Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), pp. 20-44.

¹⁶ Gérard Jacquin, Louis Halphen, and René Poupardin, eds., *Chronique des comtes d'Anjou*, Collection "Textes rares" (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2017), 348-349. "Consul itaque, non multo post facti sui poenitens et misericordiam quaerens, sponte sua in claustrum et in domum domni Sicardi, magistri scholarum, venit ibique discalciatus, nudis pedibus, et quidam cumeo sui proceres in ecclesiam humiliter perrexerunt. Primum antebeati Martini sepulchrum, dato pignore, consul Deo et beato Martino per manum Rainaldi, Andegavensis episcopi, promisit se nihil amplius taie quid facturum deinde ante corpora sanctorum, ad ultimum ante crucifixum satisfactionem fecit."

What is notable about this incident is the fact that the basilica in Tours contained not only the body of Saint Martin but also the members of Fulk's own lineage, including its quasi-mythological founder, Enjeuger.¹⁷ Patrick Geary has used this incident as a classic example of relic humiliation and its utility in pacifying violent secular lords in the decades before and during the first peace councils. In the *Liber tramitis aevi Odilonis abbatis*, the widely-copied and disseminated customary of the Cluniac *ecclesia*, the ritual of relic humiliation was copied in its fullest form as part of a special liturgy.¹⁸ Liturgies for the censure of *anathema*, or monastic cursing sometimes called for a humiliation of the saints' relic. They were to be deposed on the floor of the church before the altar while the monks prayed for God's heavenly intercession against the monastery's enemies.¹⁹ At Tours, thorns were placed around the relics and tomb of Saint Martin, as well as on the silver crucifix on the altar itself.²⁰

In Geary's analysis, the ritual of relic humiliation often served as an attempt to coerce fractious lords and their companions from acting inappropriately, whether by harassing monastic property or the monks themselves. Chastising the saint exploited its

¹⁷ Louis Halphen and R. Poupardin, eds., *Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise* (Paris, 1913).

¹⁸ Patrick Geary, "Humiliation of Saints," pp. 95-115. In *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

¹⁹ Peter Dinter, ed. *Liber tramitis aevi Odilonis abbatis*, *Corpus consuetudinem monasticarum* 10, ed. Kassius Hallinger (Siegburg, 1980), 244-247. For the general history of the medieval monastic curse, or *clamor*, see Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993) (hereafter, Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*). See also Christian Jaser, *Ecclesia maledicens: rituelle und zeremonielle exkommunikationsformen im Mittelalter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

²⁰ Edmond Martène, ed., *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus* 3 (Rouen, 1702), 431-432.

bodily vulnerability for the purposes of making a quasi-legal argument to the communities outside the monastery and disciplining the monks within. However, the incident at Tours can also be read as an ambiguous ritual. It is hard to know whether Fulk Nerra saw the saint or his ancestors as the party he most needed to please, even as the canons wrote the scene showing Fulk under the power of Saint Martin and his monastic representatives. Nevertheless, when read alongside the practice of putting relics on tours, a wider theme emerges.

The humiliation of the saints was an attempt to use bodily displacement as an argument about monastic brokerage of saintly presence just as the relic itineraries did, but the ritual of humiliation attempted to make that displacement more threatening to the world outside the monastery. It is perhaps no accident that liturgies containing the ritual of humiliation of relics can be found in monastic communities with longstanding connections to prominent local secular lordships and their lineages. In Cluny's case, her cemetery was held the corpses of local knights, while the very floor of Tours cathedral housed the ancestors of Fulk Nerra's Angevin line.²¹ Bearing this in mind, the monastic liturgies for *clamor* at Tours and Cluny carry added significance. In a period when monks clearly sought to monopolize access to saintly bodies by taking them on peacekeeping tours and humiliating them on the floors of their own churches, bodily movement became a threatening gesture that would resonate widely and deeply with an

²¹ See fns. 10, 23 above and below.

aristocracy whose very sense of memory and legacy depended on the correct placement of their own dead. If monks could move the bodies of their saintly patrons through the land, and humiliate those same bodies in liturgies of chastisement, they could also displace the bodies of recalcitrant aristocratic patrons whose ancestors lay within monastic enclosures.

All these activities involving relics, their movement, and the ensuing threat carried by bodily displacement existed simultaneously with another form of displacement that developed alongside. The greatest penitential censure of ecclesiastical exclusion during the period of church reform was excommunication. Because a person who suffered death in a state of excommunication could not be buried within a consecrated cemetery, it is hard not to see excommunication as a further step forward in a growing infra-language of corporeal movement, placement, and displacement that created a conversation between ecclesiastical reformers and aristocrats over issues of memory. Yet, as we shall see, secular lords refused to remain passive sufferers within this new methodology. Ever the opportunists, knights and aristocrats redefined the terms of this infra-language even as it was being articulated. They did so in ways that can give the patient and close reader greater insight into how they adapted their practices of memory-making to enhance their own sense of lordship.

3.2 Burial, Excommunication, and the New Meanings of the Aristocratic Corpse

In the early twelfth century, the count of Anjou, Fulk Réchin, dictated a short account of the history of his ancestors to a Latin scribe. The account was written in first person, likely in partial dictation from the man himself. After noting the line of his ancestors through four generations, Fulk ceased his narrative on curious grounds. "Since the place where the bodies of these men might lie is unknown, we are not able to remember them worthily."²² Fulk's account illustrates that lay memory was anchored to places and objects.²³ For him, not knowing where generations of his family were buried placed limits on his own commemorative capacities. Fulk's chronicle betrays an anxiety over the fact that he could not personally access the presence and memory of his family members at their tomb. These tombs and the bodies they contained became the central *locus* of aristocratic family memory by the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

At the beginning of the eleventh century, the ecclesiastical proponents of the Peace councils sought to disrupt the mnemonic potential of the aristocratic corpse, denying proper burial and remembrance to the excommunicated dead. While burial, commemoration, and excommunication each had long histories within medieval

²² "Fragmentum historiae Andegavensis," in *Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise*, Ed. Louis Halphen and Renée Poupardin (Paris: 1913), 233. "ut etiam loca ubi corpora eorum jacent nobis incognita sint, digne memorare non possumus." For a reappraisal of the provenance of the text, see Nicholas Paul, "The Chronicle of Fulk le Réchin: A Reassessment," *Haskins Society Journal* 18 (2007): 19-35.

²³ For the place of objects as anchors of memory and identity throughout this period, see Elizabeth Van Houts, *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe, 900-1200* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), pp. 63-120. Kristen Neuschel, *Living by the Sword: Weapons and Material Culture in France and Britain, 600-1600* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2020). Patrick Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance*, pp. 48-80.

Christian thought, they each came together in the early decades of the eleventh century to initiate a memory economy among ecclesiastical and aristocratic communities focused centrally on the placement and displacement of the body. The resulting politics of bodily placement and displacement can be seen through the extant sources as an infra-language that informed the construction and maintenance of memory at all levels across medieval communities. Excommunication placed its victim in a state outside the Christian community, but it existed on the same continuum as the liturgical *clamor* and drew on the same pool of associations as relic humiliation and the relic tours of the eleventh century.

The relic humiliation ritual discussed above and the general traffic in saint's relics are examples of how this language of bodily movement informed the institutional fashioning of monastic communities throughout the middle ages, as historians like Patrick Geary and Amy Remensnyder have shown.²⁴ However, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries the infra-language became calibrated to target the growing lay sense of familial memory and the ancestral avatar.²⁵ This memory politics would remain central

²⁴ Patrick Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990). An excellent example is the use of the relic trade between the monasteries of Conques and Figeac, and their efforts to write their respective histories. See Amy Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), pp. 70-71, 271-276.

²⁵ This excellent phrase is borrowed from Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 21-54. (hereafter Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps*).

to the political culture of eleventh- and twelfth-century secular and ecclesiastical elites, and would inform local processes of church reform.

Aristocrats made agreements at the tombs of their ancestors, departed for crusade after visiting them, and even made sure to continuously renovate the burial sites of their forefathers.²⁶ While direct evidence for the commemorative value of aristocratic tombs becomes more plentiful during the twelfth century, it is clear that the practice had a long pedigree. Ecclesiastical communities since late antiquity had inherited a long history of discomfort with these burial customs of the lay elite, in which families and friends visited tombs and remembered their dead relatives.²⁷ Burial near the bodies of the saints (*ad sanctos*) was ideal, and this too had a history dating back to the meetings of the early Christian communities beneath the catacombs of Roman cities.²⁸

William X, the son of the troubadour-duke William IX, a former crusader, poet, and aristocratic *bon vivant*, visited his tomb two months after his death. His sons' first-person account of the visitation is given in a charter dated April 11, 1126. It is notable as a source for how William the Troubadour's tomb was utilized by the generation immediately following him.

²⁶ Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), pp. 27-35, 147-9. Stephen White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The 'laudatio parentum' in Western France, 1050-1150* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988) pp. 27, 34.

²⁷ Tombs and cemeteries of aristocrats were akin to the crypts of late Roman noblemen, a space that Peter Brown has aptly named "A fine and private place." Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. 23-49.

²⁸ Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1995), pp. 51-58, 201-213. (hereafter Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*).

But seeing the sepulcher of such a famous and victorious duke, I was touched by a heartfelt pain, and all my insides were stirred within on account of my father. And after many tears and mournful sighs and comforted by the consolation afforded by my barons and those standing about me, my spirit revived.²⁹

This account is valuable because as part of a charter it gets the historian close to the emotional life of the lay nobility and the ways that tombs could draw out feelings and emotions that were linked to family memory. What is important here is how and where the memory of William X's father is evoked. It is in viewing the tomb that William becomes able to contemplate the legacy of his troubadour father. For medieval elites like William and his family, memory and the affective response it elicited was often keyed to space and place. It is for this reason, among others, that the tombs of lords and the cult sites of saints

Twice in 1102, Hugo of Sainte-Maure visited the abbey of Noyers, where his two sons Goscelin and Hugo were interred. The charter attests to the role of the tombs of Hugo's sons in his own placement of his family's history. "Hugo of Sainte Maura by name, having bid farewell to two sons, Goscelin and Hugo. I have given an account of their deaths, and it has struck their father with a great sadness."³⁰ Hugo wished to give

²⁹ *Recueil des documents relatifs à l'abbaye de Montierneuf de Poitiers (1076-1319)*, publié par François Villard. (Poitiers, 1973), 115-116.

³⁰ *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Noyers* ed. C. Chevalier, *Mémoires de la Société archéologique de Touraine*, vol. 22. Tours, 1872. (nos. 307, 308) "quod quiddam vir nobilis, Hugo de Sancta Maura nomine, habuit duos filios valentes, Goscelinum videlicet et Hugonem, quibus furtim et in traditione interfectis, magnum de morte sua incussere patri dolorem."

gifts in their name and in the name of his ancestors. Later that same year, Hugo again visited his sons, this time to confirm the earlier gift and make a new one.

In the decades around the year 1000, the abbey of Cluny saw the greatest number of lay burials in its cemeteries, likely as a consequence of abbot Odilo's institution of the Feast of All Souls in the eleventh century.³¹ The *Ordo Cluniacensis* of Bernard of Cluny contains a liturgical tricennarium meant to celebrate not only the monks of Cluny who had died, but also the *familia* of the monastic community.³² It is an open question whether these efforts influenced or co-opted concerns for proper burial among the rising military aristocracy, but in any case both petty knights, castellans, and great lay lords saw proper burial as an important part of lordship.

Tombs like those of Hugo's sons served as a way to anchor the presence of one's ancestors after their death, in effect extending that presence as a part of aristocratic legacy. The lost aristocratic body was in consequence an abhorrent idea to the military aristocracy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Nicholas Paul has elucidated this anxiety within the lordship communities of twelfth-century crusaders. He references a later source, the mid-thirteenth century chronicle of John of Joinville. John's epilogue of

³¹ Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel eds., *Recueil des chartres de l'abbaye de Cluny*, 6 vols. (Paris, 1876-1903). Dietrich Poeck, "Laienbegrabnisse in Cluny," *Fruhmittelalterliche Studien* 15 (1981): 68-179. Poeck tabulated 637 donations under Abbot Mayeaul, of which 72 were gifts for burial. Under Odilo, the total number of donations rose to 1,018 acts, with 704 gifts of which 124 were offered for burial. Hugh the great's abbacy saw 898 acts, 654 acts of which 73 were given for burial. See Megan McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994) for the Feast of All Souls instituted by Odilo.

³² Bernard of Cluny, *Ordo Cluniacensis* 2:32, in *Vetus disciplina monastica*, ed. Marquard Herrgott (Paris, 1726), 354. See also Megan McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints*, 75-78.

the battle of Mansourah describes the drowned corpses of crusaders adrift in the Nile. He had witnessed many “searching for their friends among the dead. But I did not hear that anyone was found.” Indeed, identifying these bodies as Christians could only be done by verifying their circumcised status.³³

The twelfth century epic *Raoul of Cambrai* recorded a scene of death that surely echoed practices from earlier centuries. After the great final battle between Raoul and the sons of Vermandois in the climax of the poem, a truce is held after Raoul is killed.

They made a truce before midday had rung;/
Across the field they turned the dead face-up - /
And you can guess how deeply they were struck/
Each time they found a father or a son,/
A nephew, uncle, or companion./³⁴

These scenes seem innocuous enough, but they clearly illustrate that for aristocrats, personal presence and memory resided in the body and its proper identification. In *Raoul of Cambrai*, bodies are arranged to make identification easier, and not being able to identify or find relatives was deeply problematic for the nobility. Household members and those who knew the deceased had to confirm their identity by locating the body and being able to identify the individual. The memory-making power

³³ Nicolas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps*, 148-150, John of Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, ed. and trans. Jacques Monfrin (Paris, 1995), 142-144.

³⁴ *Raoul of Cambrai*, trans. Michael Newth pp. 267. In *Heroes of the French Epic: Translations from the Chansons de Geste* (Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 2005).

of aristocratic bodily presence existed in tandem with other mnemonic material: swords, material objects, and tombs.³⁵

The period between the point of death and the interment within a tomb served as a period of vulnerability in the commemorative efforts of the aristocracy and could serve as a launching point for any ecclesiastical efforts to rework, contest, or limit secular memory creation. Nicolas Paul has cited the widespread practice of tomb remodeling that took place across successive generations.³⁶ Such efforts illustrate that presence could find an eternal home in the tomb of the dead aristocrat as long as the lordly presence could be maintained by various interactions with the tomb. A tomb extended bodily presence and identity beyond the grave, but before a body was placed there it was vulnerable in much a similar way that saints' relics were during relic tours or relic humiliations. In this sense, the unburied corpse of an aristocrat became an ideal target for ecclesiastic reformers who sought to force the lay elite to make peace during the convening of councils. Because the period before burial was a period of mnemonic vulnerability for laypeople, it gave clerical elites a space within which to work.

During the early eleventh century, excommunication began to be used by churchmen as a way to displace the bodies of recalcitrant knights and aristocrats, target their memories, and make the argument that making peace with churchmen was the

³⁵ Kristen Neuschel, *Living by the Sword*, pp.

³⁶ Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps*, 148-150.

best way to secure commemoration.³⁷ Excommunication had a history derived from the letters of Saint Paul, and its nature as an penitential and exclusionary ritual was used since the sixth century to discipline monks within coenobitic communities under the Benedictine Rule.³⁸ Ritual excommunication after around 900 C. E. was formulated and performed as a reverse blessing, or *anathema* within monastic liturgies. It was a censure by episcopal or monastic authority that sought to sever an individual's ties to the Christian body in eager anticipation of his penitential surrender.³⁹ Denial of Christian burial was a feature of excommunication well before the first millennium. In the early eleventh century, excommunication began to be directed outward in a new way. During the Peace councils, ecclesiastical authorities sought to make peace in their conflicts with the lay elite by denying the regional aristocracy access to the bodies, memories, and presence of their families by expelling excommunicated remains from consecrated space.⁴⁰

³⁷ Thomas Callahan, "The Cult of the Saints in Aquitaine in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," p. 178-9. In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France Around the Year 1000* ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992). (hereafter Callahan, "The Cult of the Saints in Aquitaine")

³⁸ Charles A. Kerin, *The Privation of Christian Burial: An Historical Synopsis and Commentary* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1941).

³⁹ Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*, pp. 30-44. Christian Jaser, "Ritual Excommunication: An 'ars oblivionalis?'" In *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture*, p. 119-139, edited by Elma Brenner, Mary Franklin-Brown, and Meredith Cohen (Surrey: Ashgate, 2013). (hereafter Jaser, "Ritual Excommunication").

⁴⁰ For the ritual actions that accompanied an excommunication, see *Ordo Excommunicationis*, PL 138. 1123. For Ritual Excommunication in general, see Genevieve Steele Edwards, 'Ritual Excommunication in Medieval France and England, 900-1200' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1997), and Elisabeth Vodola, *Excommunication in the Middle Ages* (University of California Press, 1986). See also Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993). Patrick Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1994), 125-160, Jeffrey Bowman,

Ritual excommunication took place at a local level in the high middle ages and often carried a semi-legal cast just as the *clamor* did.⁴¹ Excommunication was intricately tied to the micro-politics of eleventh- and twelfth-century lordship. Many texts that describe ritual excommunication were laid out in liturgical texts across western France and England.⁴² During the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, ritual excommunication was distilled from the local monastic and episcopal contexts in which it originated and codified in the canonical collections of Regino of Prüm, Burchard of Worms, Ivo of Chartres, and Gratian.⁴³

A sentence of ritual excommunication varied regionally, but all of these censures had some common features. The sacrament of the Eucharist was withheld from excommunicates, and monks ceased the performance of the divine office. Ritual excommunication functioned on a continuum with older rituals of monastic curse

Jeffrey A. Bowman, *Shifting Landmarks: Property, Proof, and Dispute in Catalonia around the Year 1000*, *Conjunctions of Religion & Power in the Medieval Past* (Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 2004), 56-80. *Ibid.*, "Do Neo-Romans Curse? Christian Jaser, *Ecclesai maledicens: rituelle und zeremonielle Exkommunikationsformen im Mittelalter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

⁴¹ Sarah Hamilton, "Medieval curses and their uses" *Haskins Society Journal* 30 (2020 for 2018): 21-51. *Ibid.*, "Interpreting diversity: excommunication rites in the tenth and eleventh centuries" pp. 125-158. In *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation*, ed. Helen Gittos and Sarah Hamilton (London: Routledge, 2016).

⁴² Christian Jaser, "Ritual Excommunication," p. 123. See also Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 30-44. Genevieve Edwards. *Ritual Excommunication in Medieval France and England, 900-1200* (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University, 1997).

⁴³ Regino of Prüm, *De synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis*, ed. F. G. A. Wasserschleben (Graz, 1964), lib. II, cc 412-17; Burchard of Worms, *Decretum*, PL, vol. 161, lib. XIV, cc. 75-9; Master Gratian, *Decretum*, C.11 q.3 c.106 (Frieberg, vol. 1, col. 674: 'Modus et forma excommunicationis'), C. 11 q.3 c.107 (Frieberg, vol. 1, col. 674: 'De eodem').

liturgies. It placed the penitent in a liminal state that called to mind damnation in the afterlife, and thus perpetual alienation from the community of the faithful.⁴⁴ Several sources blend curse liturgies and ritual excommunication in ways that demonstrate that the monks and clerics who used or commissioned these texts thought about these censures as parts of a related toolbox of censures. A curse liturgy of the abbey of Saint-Martial liturgically punished wrongdoers with the following words. "May they be cursed, excommunicated and anathematized."⁴⁵ Lester Little has shown that a text drawn up by the abbey of Oña in 1116 placed both the curse and ritual excommunication under the heading of "creating a powerful curse."⁴⁶ Similarly, liturgical manuscripts from Jumièges, Compiègne, and Toul conclude a curse liturgy with an excommunication formula.⁴⁷

Christian Jaser has recently demonstrated that a central feature of ritual excommunication in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was a local and public sanction, but it also contained a nested threat of perpetual oblivion.⁴⁸ Mathieu Vivas has made a fine case for the fact that deprivation of burial for excommunicates was never final in the

⁴⁴ Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 30-44.

⁴⁵ Mansi 19:95-96. "Sint maledicti et excommunicati et anathematizati." See Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 30.

⁴⁶ MS, London, BL, Add. 30044, ff. 66v-72r. See Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*, p. 41, fn. 61.

⁴⁷ See Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*, p. 41, fn. 62, 63. For the Compiègne, Jumièges, and Toul texts, see MSS, Paris, BN, lat. 17319, f. 216r-v, and nouv. Acq. Lat. 2358, ff. 36v-37v. For the Jumièges curse liturgy, see MS Rouen, Bibliothèque Municipale, A 293, ff. 149v-150v.

⁴⁸ Christian Jaser, "Ritual Excommunication: An 'Ars Oblivionalis'?" In *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture*, 119-139, ed. Elma Brenner, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013). (hereafter Jaser, 'Ars Oblivionalis?').

high medieval period, even as part of an excommunication. Even the worst of excommunicates could rejoin the medieval church. Exclusion from the Christian community always held the promise of reintegration.⁴⁹ This is certainly true, but clerics at the time of the peace councils made every effort to emphasize the finality of oblivion as a punishment for those aristocrats who refused to heed the canons of the peace councils.⁵⁰ The treatment of the excommunicated body served as a deep threat to local aristocrats for whom the corpse carried powerful mnemonic potential by the eleventh century.

In 1027, at the peace council at Elne-Toulouges, the punishment of ritual excommunication targeted the maintenance of personal bonds within aristocratic communities and their households. The bishops and deacons of the council forbade association with or prayers for excommunicates, along with eating and drinking with them, or offering a kiss.⁵¹ These efforts were difficult or impossible to enforce, but they pale in comparison with the council's proposed fate for the excommunicated dead.

Nor should they be buried in churches if they die excommunicate, [...] And should they (may God prevent this!) die in this faithlessness, their bodies shall not be lead to burial with psalms and hymns or spiritual chants, and their names shall not be recited at the altar among those of the faithful dead.⁵²

⁴⁹ Mathieu Vivas, "Christian Burial Privation in the Middle Ages: An Interdisciplinary Approach (France, mid-10th-early 14thc.)" *Imago Temporis, Medium Aevum* 12 (2018): 191-210. (hereafter Vivas, "Christian Burial Privation")

⁵⁰ Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, 201-

⁵¹ Mansi 19:483-84.

⁵² Mansi 19: 483-84. "Neque si excommunicati defuncti fuerint, debentur ad ecclesias sepeliri [...] Et si, quod Deus avertat, in hoc perfidia obierint, corpora illorum cum psalmis et hymnis, vel spiritalibus canticis, non ducantur ad sepulturam nec inter fideles mortuos eorum nomina ad sacrum altare recitentur."

Refusal to recite the name of an excommunicate during liturgies in tandem with the denial of burial was a clear threat of memory erasure on the part of conciliar authorities as Elne Toulouges. In addition to the direct refusal of liturgical memory, the punishment of the statute operated by maintaining a threat of extreme bodily displacement. Ademar of Chabannes had this same sort of displacement in mind when he wrote of the Peace Council of Limoges in 1031. In his narrative, Ademar writes of a knight who died in battle under excommunication. The episcopal authority in the region of Aquitaine from which Ademar wrote, the bishop of Cahors, excluded the knight from burial as an example to other violators of the Peace.⁵³ The *familiares* of the dead knight reburied his body to consecrated ground, but the earth spat forth the intruding corpse. According to Ademar, the knight's body was buried five times and five times the earth itself rejected his body. No doubt exasperated by this point, the knight's friends decided to bury their excommunicated friend far from consecrated ground and observe the Peace.⁵⁴

It is worth noting that even at this point in the history of ritual excommunication, bodily displacement was only effective if the relatives of the dead lord did not seek to reinter the corpse. Ademar's description suggests that even at this early date, aristocrats

⁵³ Mansi 19: 541. Paris, BN lat. 2469, 96r, 96v. See the reference to this incident in Thomas Callahan, "The Cult of the Saints in Aquitaine in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries," p. 178-9. In *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France Around the Year 1000* ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992).

⁵⁴ Mansi 19: 541. Callahan, "The Cult of the Saints in Aquitaine", 179.

believed they could counter the efforts to disrupt their own memory culture if they could furnish support within their own households to defy the canons of the peace councils. The family of the excommunicated knight failed to place the body of their lords in consecrated ground at Limoges, but the effort was nonetheless important for having failed. Ademar's story demonstrates that these underhanded reburials were taking place or were feared to be taking place.

Burial deprivation always carried the potential for reintegration. However, in the rare cases such as the one at the council of Limoges, aristocratic households usurped the ecclesiastical prerogative to approve burial by moving excommunicated bodies back to consecrated spaces for proper internment in defiance of conciliar legislation. Ademar's story of the council at Limoges reveals a practice Ademar worried deeply about.

Laymen were choosing not to make peace in cooperative ways with clerical authorities in order to ensure burial for their lords and friends. They were being true to the practice of lordship as they understood it. To claim a right or privilege as a lord was to act as if you had it already and to be seen doing so by others.⁵⁵ Lay responses to being excommunicated and denied burial drew upon observed practices of monastic neighbors in their efforts at peacekeeping. If the monastic household of saints could place and displace relics at will, aristocratic households clearly believed they could do

⁵⁵ For the "performative" nature of lordship in this period, see Koziol, *The Peace of God*, 68, and Stephen White, "The 'Feudal Revolution' Comment," *Past and Present* 152 (1996): 209-223.

the same with the corpses of their friends. Reburial of an excommunicated friend or lord was a transposition of observed monastic practice with a new meaning that for laymen was the obverse of what the monks themselves meant to communicate during relic tours. Though accounts like this are rare in the sources, they grow more common as the twelfth century progressed. The events at Limoges emphasize the fact that excommunication and its consequences were always contested. During the peace councils, the corpse itself became political as a way of making memory claims.

In Ademar's sermons, he places the body of the excommunicate in an extreme state of displacement that would be familiar to John of Joinville surveying the battlefield of Mansuorah a century and a half later. "Just as the guilty souls of those convicted of crimes are exiled from this world by God, so are their bodies exempted from Christian burial."⁵⁶ A second of Ademar's sermons gives a powerful picture of the ideal fate of the excommunicated corpse that lies outside the proper burial ground.

All those who are to die [excommunicate], the bodies of the unburied and unfaithful are thrown into the streets across the earth. Many even now are made food for the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth. So thus may it be for all those who plunder the earth. The praise of the churches and of God were not heard.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Mathieu Vivas, "Christian Burial Privation," 194. Ademar of Chabannes, *Sermones* XLV, 11: "Ut sicut exigente reatu eorum animae in illo saeculo a Dei regno extorres sunt, ita corpora a christianitatis separentur sepultura." See Romanieux Zénaïde, *Édition d'un manuscrit autographe d'Adémar de Chabannes, BnF lat. 2469, ff. 76-112v. 23 sermons et du compte-rendu du concile de Limoges (18, 19, et 20 novembre 1031)*, Paris: École Nationale des Chartres (PhD dissertation), 2005: II, 103-104. (Hereafter Zénaïde, *Édition d'un manuscrit autographe d'Adémar de Chabannes*).

⁵⁷ Vivas, "Christian Burial Privation," 194. Zénaïde, *Édition d'un manuscrit autographe d'Adémar de Chabannes*, II, 108. Ademar of Chabannes, *Sermones* XLVI, 8: *Omnium qui ibi nunc moriuntur, insepulta*

What is important for Ademar is the clear emphasis on the equivalence between bodily and spiritual oblivion. Excommunication for him is equated with the eventual consumption of the body as well as the soul in hell. For the knights and lay lords who likely heard Ademar's sermons, this kind of bodily scattering and loss robbed them of their access to the bodies of their kindred dead. The message is clear. It is memory and legacy that is at stake here for lay lords who continue to plunder churches, flout saintly authority or harass God's poor.

As Thomas Callahan points out, the aristocracy in Aquitaine had by the time of the peace movements long built centers of household memory at the collective tombs of their forbearers. The counts of Angoulême were interred at Saint-Cybard,⁵⁸ aristocrats of the Augverne were buried close to the remains and cult of Saint Julien of Brioude.⁵⁹ The foundation of Saint Front was another frequent burial site,⁶⁰ and the castellans of Lusignan had developed a strong burial network by the 1020s with the central hub at the priories of Nouaillé.⁶¹ Standing on ground that could be mapped by lordly tombs in the early eleventh century, Ademar's words carried a powerful threat, deepening the scope and stakes of peacemaking in the Aquitaine.

super terram per plateas vulgo cadavera jacent. Multa jam facta sunt in escam volatilibus caeli et bestiis terrae, quia non est qui abigat. Signa ecclesiarum et laudes Dei non adiuntur."

⁵⁸ Ademar of Chabannes, *Chronicon* 3.66, 3.19, 3.20, 3.23, 3.28, 3.35 (pp. 192-93, 137, 138, 145, 149, 157).

⁵⁹ Gabriel Fournier, *Le peuplement rural en Basse-Auvergne durant le haut Moyen Âge* (Paris: 1962), 416.

⁶⁰ *Chartes de l'abbaye de Nouaillé*, nos. 104, 106, 107, pp. 172-179.

⁶¹ See Thomas Callahan, "The Cult of the Saints in Aquitaine," p. 178 for the references in fns. 23-26.

In a charter drafted in 1056 by Imbert, bishop of Paris, the canons of Ste. Marie de Vernueuil call out a local knight, Hugh, who was excommunicated and dies without doing penance. His body is left unburied and open to the appetites of wild beasts as his body rots inside a tree trunk. His family promises restitution, and the disputants meet at the trunk of the tree to decide how to resolve the conflict between the deceased Hugh and the canons. Mathieu Vivas makes the point that this charter reveals the impact of regional penitential practice on Ademar's sermon writing.⁶² The way Ademar and his peers blended new aristocratic anxieties and local practices with an ancient form of penitential censure created a brilliant new methodology for countering the memory making culture of the rising knighthood and established secular nobility. Ademar of Chabannes and his contemporaries used scriptural images of eating and bodily fragmentation from Isaiah and Jeremiah that were familiar in eleventh- and twelfth-century thinking about damnation. To the ancient prophets of the Hebrews, leaving

⁶² Vivas, "Christian Burial Privation," p. 195. *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Paris*, charter of 1056: "Quem archiepiscopus iterum et iterum ad justiciam vocans, cum nullatenus ejus auctoritati vellet obedire, excommunicavit, nobisque licentiam excommunicandi dedit. Diabolico instinctu ejus corde obdurato, cum minime respisceret, morte preventus, exitu miserabili anathematizatus vitam finivit. Cujus corpus insepultum atque in concavo trunco repostam, cum per tres menses avibus et feris esset expositum, conjunx ejusque parentes, miseratione moti, Odonem decanum ceterosque canonicos adierunt, et ut terre commendare liceret, per omnia satisfaciendo quicquid forisfecerat sese emendaturos promiserunt. [...] Post hec ad portum Taver convenientibus in unum, me videlicet Himberto, Parisiensi episcopo, cum Goiscelino preceptore et archidiacono, ceterisque archidiaconis Richerio et Bernuino, predicti excommunicati uxor Sanscelina, cum parentibus et amicis, inibi devenit, prenotata forisfacta ad integrum vadavit [...] *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Paris*, ed. Benjamin Guérard, Paris: Crapelet, 1850: I, 331-333 (doc. No. 26).

unburied bodies out in the elements as provender for animals was the appropriate fate for those who disobeyed God and incurred his anger.⁶³

Part of the reason why the threat of permanent bodily displacement for excommunicates was so artful was that churchmen could enforce disinterment by refusing burial in consecrated ground. While attempts to disrupt lordly bond communities through sociality, feasting, or the kiss were often doomed to failure, barring secular lords from burial near the saints could be enforced, and would be far more effective. Displacing the body during or after an excommunication was not a random punishment that existed solely due to the existence of a good biblical precedent. Excommunication during the centuries after the Peace councils engaged directly with the memorial culture of the rising military aristocracy. By denying bodily presence to excommunicated secular lords, churchmen like Ademar and his conciliar colleagues sought to play out their agenda of peacemaking and social reform at ground level. In a sense, the council appropriated and repackaged concerns about the placement of the

⁶³ Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, 201-213. I owe these biblical references and the following translation to Matthew Vivas, "Christian Burial Privation," 195, fn. 17. Isaiah 5: 25: "Therefore the anger of the Lord was kindled against his people, and he stretched out his hand against them and struck them; the mountains quaked, and their corpses were like refuse in the streets [...]." Jeremiah 7: 33: "The corpses of this people will be food for the birds of the air, and for the animals of the earth [...]" 8: 2: "[...] they shall not be gathered or buried; they shall be like dung on the surface of the ground"; 16: 4: They shall not be lamented, nor shall they be buried; they shall be like dung on the surface of the ground, [...] their dead bodies shall become food for the birds of the air and for the wild animals of the earth"; 16:6 "Both great and small shall do in this land; they shall not be buried[...]" 25: 33: "Those slain by the Lord [...] shall not be lamented, or gathered, or buried; they shall become dung on the surface of the ground"; 34: 20: "Their corpses shall become food for the birds of the air and the wild animals of the earth." See also Matthew Vivas, *La privation de sépulture au Moyen Âge. L'exemple de la province ecclésiastique de Bordeaux (Xe début du XIVe siècles)* (Poitiers: Université de Poitiers, PhD dissertation), 2012: 225-243.

body and ancestral memory that were already in evidence by the time the peace councils retooled excommunication as a memory censure.⁶⁴ Although excommunication was used throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries as a penitential censure of ecclesiastics as well as aristocrats, it carried special weight with the emerging aristocracy. Because the threat of oblivion and bodily displacement lay behind every sentence of excommunication, the liminal place of the excommunicated dead was a cause for alarm among an aristocracy that valued the proper placement and memorialization of ancestral bodies and deeply dreaded their displacement and absence.

3.3 Conclusion

The Peace movements and councils of the early eleventh century initiated a process in which bodies of saints and buried aristocrats were relocated and displaced in attempts to create politicized dissonance within the group of knights and castellans who interacted with saints in disapproved ways. Old rituals like excommunication and new ones like the humiliation of saints relics created an infra-language of bodily displacement that served as the methodology for a novel brand of memory politics and maneuver. This memory economy gained clout through the vulnerability of saints'

⁶⁴ For a cogent summary of the concerns facing dying noblemen, See Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 190-197, Jonathan Lyon, "The withdrawal of aged noblemen into monastic communities: interpreting the sources from twelfth-century Germany," pp. 143-169. In *Old Age in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to a Neglected Topic* ed. Albrecht Classen (Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture, 2) (De Gruyter, 2007).

relics. In casting their cult relics as powerful agents in movements for peace and discipline in secular society, monastic houses cleverly reworked the vulnerability of saint's relics for a wider purpose of societal and church reform. The distressing play on bodily presence and absence that caused social and cultural discomfort across eleventh-century society caused the secular aristocracy and the knighthood to rethink how they embodied and located their own memories.

The methodology using excommunication for targeting memory in order to enforce social reform onto the regional aristocracy of the Aquitaine had great implications for the later development of Gregorian reform and church reform generally throughout Francia. Excommunication continued to be used in this way throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In the twelfth century, secular lords continued to seek proper burial in monasteries with ancestral connections, and the moving of their excommunicated dead continued in an effort to avoid the shame of permanent bodily displacement and oblivion. However, these once-central practices began to become options in an ever-widening memory portfolio. In the century and a half after the peace councils, secular lords looked to other means to embody their ancestral memories and gain the upper hand in a generations-long process of avoiding the shameful fate of being permanently forgotten.

4. The Politics of the 'Mnemonic Body' in Medieval Ghost Narratives, 1050-1200 C. E.

Around 1170, Gerald of Wales composed a curious anecdote in his *expugnatio hibernica*, an account of the Anglo-Norman conquest of Ireland during the reign of Henry II. Drawing on classical tradition, he retells the story of the ancient Greek poet Simonides, who along with his comrades had buried the body of a dead man who had washed up on shore. In a dream the next night, Simonides is warned by the dead man not to go to sea the next day, to avoid the death at sea that his companions later suffer.⁶⁵ This incident is part of a series of short stories in which Gerald deals with the nature of memory, burial and the returning dead.

Gerald of Wales's retelling of the story of the poet Simonides in his twelfth-century narrative is not accidental. Quintilian and Cicero famously wrote of the poet's astonishing ability to remember the seating arrangements of famous boxers after the men had been brutally killed in the collapse of a banquet hall, and relate the identities of the mutilated dead to the boxers' grieving relatives.⁶⁶ Jody Enders, in her study of the violent origins of medieval rhetoric, drama and memory, reminds us that this incident reflects the fact that ancient and medieval theories of remembrance were at once tied to

⁶⁵ *The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis*, ed. and trans. T. Wright, (London 1863), pp. 244-6.

⁶⁶ Quintilian, *institutio rhetorica*. Ed. and trans. H. E. Butler, 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920) XI, 2. 11-13. Marcus Tullius Cicero, *de oratore* and *de partitione oratoria*. Ed. and trans. H. Rackham, 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976), II, 351-55.

burial, commemoration, and violent death.⁶⁷ As one of the fathers of the classical rhetorical tradition, Simonides and his perfect memory is a purposeful inclusion in Gerald of Wales's *Conquest of Ireland* because Gerald was dealing directly with technologies of memory creation of his own day that he understood well. Just like the bodies of the saints, deceased lords still functioned as members of their communities, serving as touchstones of family memory and political activity.⁶⁸

This chapter is a series of close readings of monastic ghost stories and tales of the returning dead from several surviving chronicles from western Europe in the high medieval period. Medieval ghosts and revenants had bodies that could be touched, marked, or harmed as much as living bodies could. This seems odd until one understands that ghost tales are flash points in the process of monastic engagement and dialogue with the memory culture of the lay aristocracy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The bodies of aristocratic family members and the proper burial of corpses remained central to noble self-fashioning in the eleventh- and twelfth centuries. By attempting to engage with the memory world of the aristocracy in attacking the bodies of dead aristocrats inside and outside their narrative accounts, these authors dealt directly with the relationship of ecclesiastical reform to secular lordship. Reform-minded writers sought not merely to place limitations on the lordship of the lay aristocracy, but

⁶⁷ See Jody Enders, *The Medieval Theater of Cruelty: Rhetoric, Memory, Violence* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 63-82.

⁶⁸ See Patrick Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 36.

also to understand the memory-making value of lay social activities and change their meanings.

Monastic tales of returning ghosts and returning dead are stories written out of real frustrations. Reform-minded monastic communities who sought to place limitations on the lordships of their lay neighbors struggled to understand how the legislation of peace councils or censures like excommunication had an uneven impact on aristocratic lordship and social behavior. For monastic authors, stories of the returning dead serve as story worlds hearkening toward the postmortem vindication of monastic institutional claims to mnemonic brokerage. Initially, monastic communities did not fully understand how the lay corporeal memory economy operated, and as it took shape, monastic authors sought to comprehend and undermine it. The embodied aristocratic ghosts in monastic narratives served as a laboratory for monastic engagement with the memory politics of their lay neighbors, and their own exasperation with its apparent success.

Ghost stories written in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries make clear that the living and ghostly bodies are spaces for discussing the making of memory before and after death. This use of bodies within narratives is what I call in this chapter the 'mnemonic body.' In their stories, material and spectral bodies are marked in curious ways, they are associated with manuscripts and textual objects. For medieval elites, the body could mediate memory across the boundary between life and afterlife. Many of these stories play with animal skins, manuscripts, texts, eyewitness testimony and other

symbols of literacy to enforce the argument that monastic narrative rather than lay social practice ought to articulate true and everlasting claims to memory.

Ghost narratives composed by monastic and clerical authors in these centuries manipulate the bodies of lay lords in various ways within their texts, writing the body as a shared space for creating, altering, and erasing the legacies of their noble opponents through symbolic and textual play. Monastic narrative efforts complemented social practices like excommunication, used by monastic and episcopal elites to deny lay burial in attempts to counter and rework the memory-making efforts of local aristocrats and the power of their regional family cults.⁶⁹ These narratives likely did not affect the practices of lordship that drew the ire of literate commentators in a practical sense, since the narrative form and literacy itself did not hold the privileged place that it did in the early modern and modern world.⁷⁰

Ecclesiastical communities in the high middle ages inherited a long history of discomfort with the burial customs of the lay elite, in which families and friends visited tombs and remembered their dead relatives. The custom of elite families visiting the graves of relatives outside formal ecclesiastical commemoration has a long history dating back to the Mediterranean world of the third century, a custom that historian

⁶⁹ See Ch. 2 above, as well as Christian Jaser, "Ritual Excommunication: An 'Ars Oblivionalis'?" In *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture*, 119-139, ed. Elma Brenner, Meredith Cohen, and Mary Franklin-Brown (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).

⁷⁰ See Michael Clanchy, *Memory and Written Record: England, 1066-1307* 3rd, ed. (London, Wiley Blackwell, 2013), pp. 7-20.

Peter Brown has linked to the development of the cult of the saints and the late antique rise of almsgiving for the dead. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, monastic ghost stories continued to deal with this concern for the elite lay dead and the commemorative uses of their bodies and graves.⁷¹

Historians have also dealt with how stories about ghosts and the returning dead can canvass the changing role of the dead and the corpse in the history of medieval and modern thought. Medieval historians demonstrated that using the choice of source base regarding can offer vastly different conclusions regarding popular and elite theological views on Purgatory in this period. Jacques Le Goff argued that Purgatory and the afterlife was not a canonical issue from the sixth to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, based on his reading of theological and scholastic texts drafted by the clerical elite.

Aaron Gurevich contested this view, demonstrating that medieval popular belief

⁷¹ Tombs and cemeteries of aristocrats were akin to the crypts of late Roman noblemen, a space that Peter Brown has aptly named "A fine and private place." Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp. 23-49. *Ibid.*, *The Ransom of the Soul: Afterlife and Wealth in Early Western Christianity* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015), pp. 25-56, 57-82. See also Frederick Paxton, *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1990), pp. 19-27. For lay tombs in the high medieval west, see Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), pp. 27-35, Brian Golding, "Anglo-Norman Knightly Burials," pp. 35-48. In *The Ideals and Practice of Medieval Knighthood: Papers from the First and Second Strawberry Hill Conferences* ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill and Ruth E. Harvey. (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell Press, 1986), Dietrich Poeck, "Laienbegräbnisse in Cluny," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 15 (1982): 68-179.

systems were complex composites of Christian teaching and folkloric, popular beliefs about the dead and the afterlife.⁷²

More recent scholars such as Jean-Claude Schmitt, Nancy Caciola, and Scott Bruce have also worked on the differences between the kinds of returning dead, be they ghosts or revenant corpses. Ghosts and the returning dead, or “revenants” are treated on a continuum by many historians under the rubric of “returned dead.”⁷³ Scott Bruce has translated many revenant tales and ghost stories from the high middle ages, as well as a Cluniac poem, the *relatio metrica de duobus ducibus*, that offers insight into the importance of the afterlife in Cluny’s lordship and the economy of salvation in monastic communities across medieval Europe.⁷⁴ Nancy Caciola has argued in a recent monograph that the returning dead in northern Europe returned in embodied form, while in the Mediterranean regions the dead returned as ghosts. Caciola is also concerned with the potential pagan influence on tales of the returned dead, and she divides the history of tales of the dead into two distinct periods, an “Augustinian” one

⁷² In a classic text, Jacques Le Goff locates emerging thought about Purgatory to the 1170s and 1180s. See Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory* trans. Andrew Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981). See Aaron Gurevich, “Popular and scholarly medieval cultural traditions: notes in the margins of Jacques Le Goff’s book,” *Journal of Medieval History* 9: 2 (1983): 71-90. This disagreement took place in the face of the important overview of the history of death in European thought. See Philippe Aries, *The Hour of Our Death* trans. Helen Weaver (New York: Vintage Books, 2008).

⁷³ See Jean-Claude Schmitt, *Ghosts in the Middle Ages; The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society*. trans, Teresa Lavender Fagan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999). Nancy Mandeville Caciola, *Afterlives: The Return of the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2016), Thomas W. Laqueur, *The Work of the Dead: A Cultural History of Mortal Remains* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

⁷⁴ Scott Bruce, *The Penguin Book of the Undead: Fifteen Hundred Years of Supernatural Encounters* (New York: Penguin Books, 2016), *Ibid.*, *The Penguin Book of Hell* (New York, Penguin Books, 2018), *The Relatio Metrica de Duobus Ducibus*, ed. and trans. Scott Bruce and Christopher A. Jones, Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin 10 (Turnout: Brepols, 2016).

in which the dead interacted little with the living, and a “Gregorian” one, in which the dead became members of the Christian community and informed ecclesiastical musings on the afterlife.⁷⁵

This chapter follows these previous scholarly views in treating tales of ghosts and the ‘revenant’ dead as points on a continuum throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries, treating all returned dead as sites where memory could be discussed. Likewise, this chapter does not focus on pagan or folkloric elements in these stories, since such distinctions if present are difficult to access methodologically and remain overemphasized or subsidiary to other eleventh- and twelfth-century social issues. The analysis will focus solely on Latin narratives from the Frankish lands of the former Carolingian Empire and the Anglo-Norman kingdom in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. This is due to the fact that the aristocratic corpse and its complex role in memory, secular lordship, and ecclesiastical reform remain relatively consistent throughout these regions.

The chapter ends at the beginning of the thirteenth century. While the aristocratic body still worked after this period in similar ways in regard to memory, the creation of formal canon legislation on purgatory began to change the discussion, albeit slowly. This chapter keeps clear of any formal discussion of purgatory, allowing for an analysis

⁷⁵ Caciola refers here to the different ways that Augustine of Hippo and Gregory the Great treated the dead. See Nancy M. Caciola, *Afterlives: The Return of the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016), pp. 63-65, 185-86, 211-212.

that places aristocratic memory and ecclesiastical reform at center stage. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, clerical efforts at limiting perceived overreaching of lay lordship took place at a local level, between ecclesiastical institutions and powerful laymen. The eleventh and twelfth centuries were a period of rapid change, with new lay and ecclesiastical social groups vying to validate new identities at the same time as those identities become newly visible to historians. Ghost stories provide insight into how this local politics affected reform initiatives and perceptions between monastic houses and their aristocratic neighbors. Monastic authors sought to dialogue with arguments aristocrats created concerning their own place in reform efforts and lineage memory embedded in their social practices.

The discussion moves chronologically through the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and as we shall see, each writer idiosyncratically inverts or plays with aspects of lay lordship that he sought to negate, change, or understand. When read closely, as a sort of textual photographer's negative, monastic ghost stories can also illuminate the fears and concerns of the lay elite concerning their own bodies and legacies. What results is a monastic textual play with issues of embodiment, memory, and oblivion. Both secular and ecclesiastical communities understood these principles well. Orderic Vitalis, William of Malmesbury, and Peter the Venerable, and Caesarius of Heisterbach are four medieval European chroniclers who serve as useful introductions to how ghosts were used. Orderic's story of "Herlechin's Hunt" serves as an introduction to the general

ways in which the marked body could mediate memory between the living and the dead.

Orderic was born in Shropshire, England on the Welsh March, a son of an English mother and a French priest. Orderic himself became a monk of St. Èvroult in Normandy, and his ghost stories take place near his monastery, in places he knew well. Orderic tells a story about a priest named Wachelin in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, written in the early twelfth century.⁷⁶ While making his way to Bonneville on New Year's Day, Wachelin witnesses a great ghostly horde that he recognizes as Herlechin's Hunt, a parade of representatives from all of Anglo-Norman society, from clerics to sinful women, giants and dwarves. Wachelin even recognizes local notables who had recently died, naming the names of bishops such as Hugh of Lisieux, the renowned abbots Mainer of Saint-Evroul and Gerbert of Saint-Wandrille, "along with many others whose names I can't remember."⁷⁷

This narrative strategy of endowing Wachelin with the ability to forget as well as recall the names of the dead is crucial to understanding how the priest interacts with the last group within the ghostly hunting party. Seeing finally a great troupe of knights who are suffering eternal punishment, Wachelin receives petitions to carry messages from the

⁷⁶ On Orderic and the *Historia Ecclesiastica*, see Marjorie Chibnall, *The World of Orderic Vitalis: Norman Monks and Norman Knights* (Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer, 1984), pp. 3-41. On Orderic's key place in the chronicle tradition of Normandy, see Leah Shopkow, *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1997).

⁷⁷ *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, Oxford Medieval Texts, 6 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968-1980), iv. pp. 240-242 (hereafter OV).

dead knights to their living wives. One knight in particular names himself to Wachelin, attempting to make his name and memory known. Before telling Wachelin about his unlawful dispossession of a mill from its rightful heir, William introduces himself in a manner reminiscent of the exchanges found in contemporary epic poetry. "I am William of Glos, son of Barnon, who was well-known as steward of Breteuil and, before him, his father William, earl of Hereford...You must send a message to my wife Beatrice and my son Roger that they should bring me comfort..."⁷⁸ Instead of offering William reassurance, Wachelin admonishes him, attempting to deliver his name into oblivion.

The priest replied: "The death of William of Glos occurred a long time ago, and no one who truly believes could carry a message such as this. If I were to give such a message to Roger of Glos and his brothers and mother, they would mock me as a fool [...] Under no circumstances will I carry out your orders or take your message."⁷⁹

Orderic has Wachelin deny the transmission of William's memory to his family, in a way that also undermines the efficacy of the oral transmission of familial knowledge and legacy between members of different aristocratic generations. Wachelin's refusal strengthens the penitential theme of Orderic's narrative, since it privileges a portrait of death and the afterlife emphasizing penance for sins and oblivion rather than the memory of the ancestral avatar. William of Glos reacts in visceral fashion. "Enraged, the knight reached out and seized the priest by the throat, pulling him along and making as

⁷⁸ OV vi, 246-48.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 246-48.

if to attack him.”⁸⁰ Orderic contrasts this violent behavior with the proper penitential attitude of another knight, Wachelin’s dead brother, Robert, son of Ralph the Fair-Haired. In contrast to William of Glos, Robert begs Wachelin to pray for him in order that he may be spared the fiery punishments of the afterlife.

It is important to note that, even as knightly penitence takes pride of place in Orderic’s story, the aggression of Robert of Glos is still remembered. When Orderic’s narrative switches back to the first person, Orderic notes that he spoke to Wachelin personally, “...and I myself heard from him everything that I have written down and saw the mark on his face left when he was touched by that dreadful knight.”⁸¹

Wachelin’s burned body carries the memory of William of Glos, but it is the memory of a damned man rather than an ancestral avatar.⁸² Orderic inverts the cultural praxis of his aristocratic neighbors by denying William memory on his terms, and that very denial is written forcefully on Wachelin’s face. Orderic here foregrounds the role of the body as a way to mediate memory between the living and the dead. Within his narrative, Wachelin’s body is a ‘mnemonic body’ that is marked in a way that offers visible proof of his story and experience.

Outside Orderic Vitalis’s acerbic chronicle, other writers display similar understandings of the body and memory that have a critical bearing on the

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 246-248.

⁸¹ OV, vi., 246-248. (**Latin**)

⁸² Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: Crusade and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), pp. 21-54.

interpretations of other writers from the mid-twelfth century and beyond. William of Malmesbury, a rough contemporary of Orderic, was a monk of Malmesbury abbey in Wiltshire, England. In his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, written in the mid- twelfth century, William of Malmesbury writes a story about two priests from Nantes who swore oaths to each other that after death one would return to visit the other. While this story does not deal directly with aristocratic memory technologies, it does play with the central role of bodily marking to medieval memory. When one priest died he appeared to the other, who refused to believe that his friend really had returned from the dead. In response, the ghost flicked three drops of pus onto his friend from a hand covered in open sores.

Two of them struck his friend on the temple, and the other on his forehead, so that they pierced his skin and flesh like cauterizing fire and made a hole the size of a walnut. This will mark you for as long as you live, It will serve as proof of my suffering...If you are in doubt about whether I am indeed transformed, miserable wretch, read these letters,' and at the same time he opened his hand to show a horrible inscription, in which Satan and his cohorts sent their thanks from the depths of Hell.⁸³

In this story, Satan himself has written words on his own body. The body of Satan's witness is likewise marked permanently during the encounter, creating a mnemonic marking on his body that will not fade with the passage of time. This theme stands in productive tension with the practical requirements of writing narratives and documents on parchment in the medieval period. As the treated hide of an animal,

⁸³ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum : The History of the English Kings*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thomson, and Michael Winterbottom, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford ; New York: Clarendon Press, 1998).

parchment is in a way a different kind of embodied potential memory. It makes sense then for Satan to mark the hide of a damned soul for the benefit of his friend, and to mark himself as a way of asserting proof of what happened.

This tale also plays on medieval concerns surrounding narrative texts and their role in supporting legal arguments between secular and ecclesiastic litigants. For William of Malmesbury, the devil is merely working on a cultural level that he and his monastic contemporaries would be familiar with, using a macabre version of an embodied narrative to prove his case. This kind of attitude toward the written word is important because text-based narrative and its relationship to truth claims remained in flux during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Monastic authors were only now beginning to view the written word as a guarantor of memory or anything resembling legal truth, as we do now. Because of this, ghost stories still rely on the body as a broker of truth.⁸⁴ Ghost stories during the twelfth century reveal the extent to which the written text was only one of many strategies and symbols that stood in tension with other more embodied ways of producing, negotiating, and erasing memory. William of Malmesbury joins Orderic Vitalis in this respect. These authors tell ghost stories that utilize the body as parchment in curious and useful ways.

⁸⁴ Michael Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record, England: 1066-1307*, 3rd. ed. (London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).

Stories involving marked bodies are told alongside those that include symbolic play with animal skins. In another section of the *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, William of Malmesbury relates a tale about a laywoman who maintained a close relationship with the devil as a soothsayer and augur. He writes that one day, as she was eating, her pet crow called out suddenly, heralding a messenger who comes to tell the woman of the death of her firstborn son, “and the catastrophic annihilation of all her family’s hopes.”⁸⁵ The woman calls her remaining children, along with a monk and a nun for good measure. Renouncing her intimacy with her demonic tutors, she pronounces a curious remedy for her impending damnation.

Sew me up in the hide of a deer, and then place me face upwards in a stone sarcophagus, the lid sealed with lead and iron [...]When I have lain secure in this way for three nights, bury me on the fourth day – although , so grave are my sins, I fear the earth itself might refuse to receive me to its warming bosom. ⁸⁶

On the surface, the story deals with the woman’s behavior in fashion similar to that of many other aristocratic wrongdoers. Indeed, William’s story clearly echoes the litigation of the peace councils of Limoges in 1031, in which stories were told of the bodies of excommunicate knights who were spewed from the earth that refused to receive them.⁸⁷ It is also important to remember that the stake in this case is the familial legacy of the sinful woman. It is this assault upon the integrity of her lineage memory as

⁸⁵ William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum* (Book II, sec. 204)

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, (Latin)

⁸⁷ For the account of the council of Limoges and the excommunicated knights, see Ch. 2 above, the account for the council can be found in *Sacrorum coniliorum nova et amplissima collection*, ed. Giovanni Doenico Mansi, 53 vols (Florence, 1759-1927), vol. 19, col. 541. (hereafter *Mansi*,).

contained in the body of her firstborn son that causes her to seek penance and alternate means of commemoration. In a period when the aristocracy began to favor primogeniture over other inheritance strategies, the narrative erasure of a firstborn son is all the more illustrative.⁸⁸ One of the other important ways in William plays with memory in his text is his use of the deerskin. William of Malmesbury includes the deerskin purposefully. As an object with the potential energy of a manuscript, it has a salvific effect for the sinful laywoman in the story because it symbolizes a concession upon death to the memory technologies of monastic communities, namely liturgical commemoration in an attempt to erase sin.⁸⁹

Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny in the mid-twelfth century, also makes use of an animal hide in a ghost story told in his book of miracle stories, the *De Miraculis*.⁹⁰ This miracle collection was written in a period in the history in the monastery of Cluny in which donations from aristocratic families were being diverted to local Cistercian houses and changing from large gifts of property to smaller gifts of liquid wealth. Local

⁸⁸ For the increasing turn toward inheritance practices favoring primogeniture, see Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), pp. 67-74, and Theodore Evergates, *The Aristocracy in the County of Champagne, 1100-1300* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

⁸⁹ Megan McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994).

⁹⁰ Peter The Venerable, *Petri Cluniacensis Abbatis De miraculis libri duo*, ed. Denise Bouthillier, *Corpus Christianorum* 83 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1988).

aristocrats who had acquired burial within Cluny's grounds in droves around the year 1000 sought other means of memory making by the middle of the twelfth century.⁹¹

In addition, southern Burgundy felt the influence of the heretic Peter of Bruys, who argued that material gifts for the dead played no role in salvation. Peter the Venerable's *De Miraculis* as well as his polemic tract, *Contra Petrobrusianos* countered Peter of Bruys, arguing strenuously for the validity of the old system of monastic commemoration in return for gifts.⁹² Peter the Venerable is thus working at a time when the memory economy of Burgundy and Cluny herself was in flux. His story concerns the return from the dead of Bernard II Grossus, an ancestor of a powerful castellan family who had a long history of property donation and dispute with the great abbey.⁹³ In Peter's story, a steward of Cluny meets the deceased lord on his travels at night from one of Cluny's domains to the other.

When he saw the apparition, mounted on a mule and dressed in a cloak of new fox-fur, [...] he asked the apparition whether it was indeed the person whom it seemed to be, and why it had come back. This was the reply: "You should know that I am indeed Bernard, the former lord of this region. As many people know, I was the cause of many misdeeds and because of them I am suffering greatly

⁹¹ Dominique Inga-Pratt, "The Dead in the Celestial Bookkeeping of the Cluniac Monks Around the Year 1000" pp. 340-362. In *Debating the Middle Ages: Issues and Readings* ed. by Lesker K. Little and Barbara Rosenwein (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998). Dietrich Poeck, "Laienbegrabnisse in Cluny" *Fruhmittelalterliche Studien* 15 (1982): 68-179.

⁹² Peter the Venerable, *Petri Venerabilis Contra Petrobrusianos hereticos*, ed. James Fearn, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis 10 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1968). See Dominique Inga-Pratt, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam* trans. Graham Robert Edwards (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).

⁹³ Georges Duby, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région maconnais* (Paris: 1971), p. 340, Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 295-307.

now. But what troubles me above everything else is the construction of the nearby castle, which, as you know, was built on my orders. [...] For a long time, I have been following the abbot's processional progress and last week, while he was lodged near Anse, I actually spent the night among the members of his household.⁹⁴

By writing, "I have been following..." Peter the Venerable inverts the itinerant lordship that Bernard Grossus would have practiced during his own life, making him a postmortem dependent of the abbot of Cluny.⁹⁵ The steward asks Bernard why he is wearing a fox-fur cloak, the apparition replies, "When I was still alive, I bought this fur, and on the very day that I wore it for the first time, I gave it to a poor man. Because it was new when I gave it away, it remains new even now. I cannot describe the comfort it brings me now in the midst of my torment."⁹⁶

The steward returns and tells of the appearance of Bernard II Grossus to abbot Hugh, who then mobilizes the liturgical engine of commemoration and prayer to release the castellan's tormented soul from his bondage.⁹⁷ Just as in William of Malmesbury's story of the impious woman who indulged in witchcraft, the animal skin plays a distinct role in the salvation of the aristocratic body. In Peter's story, the fox-fur is inverted from an item of status to an object of penitence and comfort after death. Bernard is rewritten as a dependent on the memory technology of the Cluniac *ecclesia* rather than a fully

⁹⁴ Peter The Venerable, *Petri Cluniacensis Abbatis De miraculis libri duo*, ed. Denise Bouthillier, *Corpus Christianorum* 83 (Turnholt: Brepols, 1988), cols. 874-5.

⁹⁵ John Bernhardt, *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany, 936-1075* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 874-5

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 874-5

remembered lord in his own right. It is worth noting that at the time Peter wrote the *De Miraculis*, the Grossi kindred had a longstanding tradition of remembering their ancestors through property claims and alienations with Cluny.⁹⁸ Peter is in this story working against this independent tradition of familial commemoration, arguing forcefully that only the Cluniac *ecclesia* can remember aristocratic donors properly.

A final story from a later author gives further perspective on the salvific power of animal hides and how they function in monastic narrative. Caesarius of Heisterbach, a Cistercian author writing in Germany in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, tells the story of a knight who appeared to Erkinbert, the father of a monk in Caesarius's community. The knight, named Frederic of Kelle, had died recently.

He [Frederic] appeared to be clothed in sheepskins and carried a great weight of muddy earth on his back. Erkinbert asked, "Are you the noble Frederic? Where have you come from and what does all this mean? The figure replied: 'I suffer deeply. These sheep-skins were stolen by me from a widow and now they burn red-hot upon me. I also made an unjust demand for a portion of land, and now I am crushed under its weight.'⁹⁹

This story finds an echo in Caesarius's later stories of an incestuous knight named Henry Nodus, who lived a life of adultery and rapine. After his death, "...he appeared to many in a sheep-skin and kept frequenting the house of his daughter, as he

⁹⁸ See Ch. 1, Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, Cloister*, Duby, *Macconnais*

⁹⁹ Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Caesarii Heisterbacensis Monachi Ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus Miraculorum*, ed. Joseph Strange (Cologne: Sumptibus J.M. Heberle (H. Lempertz), 1851).

had been wont to do when alive."¹⁰⁰ In Caesarius's story, Henry Nodus is a 'wolf in sheep's clothing' in a sense that moves beyond monastic rhetoric toward violent lay neighbors. Each of these authors: William of Malmesbury, Peter the Venerable, and Caesarius of Heisterbach utilize animal skins in a very particular fashion. Monastic parchment was typically made from sheep, calf, or deerskin,¹⁰¹ but using different animal skins in their stories played on the monastic association of animal hide with narrative text.

In William of Malmesbury's tale discussed above, the sinful laywoman wishes to have her postmortem body bound in a deerskin as well as submitting to the monastic memory technologies of the liturgy. Peter the Venerable and Caesarius of Heisterbach create characters who seek penitence for matters related to the wrongful use of property. In each case, the animal skin is a penitential object and a metaphor for the alimentary power of monastic texts as a more powerful memory maker. The aristocrats in these stories are metaphorically encased in the potential energy of a textual narrative symbolized by the skins of animals. These authors of the stories are at work in a world where property served to create and extend the legacy of aristocratic litigants, and proper burial offered an opportunity for familial commemoration around the grave.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ On the writing surfaces in use in the medieval period, including the hides used for creating manuscripts, see Raymond Clemens & Timothy Graham, *Introduction to Manuscript Studies* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), 3-17, esp. 9. See also Benjamin Vorst, "Parchment Making: Ancient and Modern" *Fine Print* 12 (1986): 209-11, 220-21.

Through the telling of ghost stories such as this, these authors were arguing for the superior authority of their text-based methods of memory making.

Authors of ghost stories took great effort to locate the telling of their tales in the mouths of eyewitnesses. Indeed, to the careful reader this is almost an obsession. Alluding to eyewitness testimony hearkens to the language of the court, in which different testimonies themselves created stories and narratives set in different time-scapes for legal advantage.¹⁰² In a sense this is to be expected, since Simonides himself was an eyewitness of the seating arrangements of the mutilated athletes, and his eidetic memory derives from the clarity of his sight. It would be easy to argue that monastic ghost stories are simply playing on this theme in an attempt to erase doubt and create faith in their accounts of the returning dead. Yet there is more to these accounts.

Calling upon eyewitness testimony is an old motif of the authors of saints' lives and miracle stories. Peter the Venerable's *De Miraculis* plays upon this issue as well. Eyewitness testimony is another tactic in the memory politics of the eleventh- and twelfth centuries. As we saw above in the narrative of Herlechin's Hunt in Orderic Vitalis's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, the priest Wachelin functions as an eyewitness, telling Orderic all that he saw and experienced. Wachelin's wound at the hands of the ghostly knight complements and enhances the value of his eyewitness testimony.¹⁰³ This

¹⁰² I owe this idea and its articulation to Jehangir Y Malegam, "Time Out of Mind: Remembering Justice and Constructing Law in Medieval Brittany (paper presented to the Sewanee Medieval Colloquium, 2018).

¹⁰³ *OV*, iv,

narrative strategy echoes the healings at saint's shrines after encounters with relics, in which the healed body carries the memory of the saint's holy actions.

When Peter the Venerable tells another ghost story in his *De Miraculis* that is set in Spain, he locates the story in the eyes of an informant named Pedro d'Englebert. Peter has Pedro relate, "I did not hear this from others, but actually saw all of this with my own eyes."¹⁰⁴ Pedro had sent one of his liegemen, Sancho, to the army of King Alfonso of Aragon. Sancho soon died of an illness in the service of the king. Four month later, Sancho appeared to his lord by the fire one winter night. "[Sancho] was seated next to the fire, turning over the coals as though to poke the fire into flame or to shed some better light, and gradually his appearance became more and more clear to me."¹⁰⁵ Pedro asks his man of the fate of other companions who left to join King Alfonso, including the king himself. When asked about the king, a voice calls out from above the hearth.

Do not ask him what he does not know, for he has arrived so recently among us that he has not yet had time to find out. As for myself, a stay of five years in the company of the spirits has taught me far more than he yet knows. I have some knowledge of what you ask about this king.¹⁰⁶

The story continues with ghostly witnesses who vie for the opportunity to tell the stories of dead lords during the king's expedition. Pedro asks another ghost, seated near the first, who he is. "he replied that he was a companion of Sancho, and that with him and with numerous others he was journeying to Castile." Sancho's ghostly

¹⁰⁴ Peter the Venerable, *De Miraculis*,

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*,

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*,

companion relates that King Alfonso escaped eternal punishment due to the prayers of the monks of Cluny.

Then, turning to his companion apparition who was seated by the fire, he said: "Come, we have begun our journey, and we must see it through to the end. The army of our fellows which was following us is on all the roads around the town, and they are now so far ahead of us that we must hurry to follow them.

The scene is a clever inversion of the oral world of storytelling that dominated the courts of the secular aristocracy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. For the importance of this oral world, one needs only to read the Lambert of Ardres's *History of the Counts of Guines and the Lords of Ardres*, composed in Flanders in the later twelfth century. In this genealogy of a local noble family, Lambert gives up narrative authority to Walter of Le Clud, a member of the courtly household, who proceeds to tell his own anecdotes about the families of Guines and Ardres on his own terms rather than Lambert's.

Walter of le Clud was asked by [...] [Lambert of Ardres] and those of the household to tell and narrate for us something about the family of Ardres and the deeds of the men of Ardres. The rains had not yet ceased, but as [Walter] began the wildness of the winds eased and softened a little, as if to let us listen. He put his right hand to his beard and combed and carded it with his fingers as old men often do; he opened his mouth in our midst, before me and all who were listening to this very thing.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁷ Lambert of Ardres, *Lamberti Ardensis historia comitum Ghisnensum*. Edited by Johann Heller, In *Monumenta Germanicae Historiae Scriptores*, 24: 607. "tandem rogatus ab eo et a nobis omnibusque familiaribus Walterus de Clusa, ut de Ardensibus et de Ardensium gentis aliquid revolveret nobis et explicaret, pluviis nondum cessantibus, sed ventorum rabie aliquantulum quasi ascultandi causa nobis pacificata atque mitigate, coram omnibus et nobis hoc ipsum audientibus, apposita ad barbam dextera et, ut sense plerumque facere solent, ea digitis insertis appexa et appropexa, aperto in medium ore incipit et dixit." (Shopkow's translation). See also Lambert of Ardres, *History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres*, ed. and trans. by Leah Shopkow (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 130.

It is this intimate world of aristocratic storytelling that Peter the Venerable seeks to subvert and lampoon with his story of Sancho and his ghostly companions. While making fun of the dubious nature of claims to truth in such a setting, Peter the Venerable is also broadcasting his own belief that eyewitness testimony, when laid down properly by the discerning monastic author, is the only account that can fully access the truth and make the best claims to the memory of events and individuals. In the conclusion to his story about Pedro, Sancho, and the other ghostly witnesses, Peter the Venerable writes that,

I have faithfully set down this significant and memorable account word for word for the education of the faithful and for the benefit of present and future generations, since it shows clearly, in the very words of the dead, what prudence is required of men while they are still alive.¹⁰⁸

On one level, this is part of Peter's wider argument concerning the necessity of gifts and prayers for the dead within Cluny's lordship. However, it is also a rebuttal of the oral world of the aristocracy, placing the true efficacy of memory creation within the scriptorium of monasteries like Cluny. Peter makes sure to remind the reader that he received the testimony of Pedro's story and transmitted it word for word, in contrast to oral storytelling, in which such exact retelling is virtually impossible. The ghosts, each fighting to correct Sancho or to tell the truth of Alfonso's expedition to Pedro, are incapable of offering proper claims to memory and truth through their oral narratives.

¹⁰⁸ Peter the Venerable, *De Miraculis*

Other twelfth-century writers echo Peter the Venerable in employing the theme of eyewitness testimony in their respective narratives. Guibert of Nogent writes a pseudo-ghost story witnessed by his mother in the late eleventh century. Guibert resided in the monastery of Saint-Germer from 1067-1105, and his mother lived in residence nearby. While Guibert does not overtly cite the firsthand knowledge of his mother's vision in his narrative, it is clear that his recollection of her visions derives from his conversations with her.

In his *De Vita Sua*, written in the early twelfth century in northwestern France, Guibert tells of a vision his mother had in which she witnessed the torments of her former husband at the bottom of a pit. She calls him by his name of Evrard, and he does not answer. "When she asked him how he was, he revealed his arm and his flank, which were both so torn and wounded that she was horrified and aghast."¹⁰⁹ Evrard endures these postmortem wounds as a marker of his marital infidelity. Evrard is in effect a noble erased. The only memory of him resides in the eyewitness testimony of Guibert's mother and Guibert's text. In Guibert's account, many of the themes discussed above are displayed in full circle. Evrard is denied his own name in death and refuses to answer to it. His body is marked with the memory of his unfaithfulness, and thus the stain on his

¹⁰⁹Guibert of Nogent, *Autobiographie*, ed. Edmond René Labande, Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Age, 34e v (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1981), Book I, Ch. XVIII

families' lineage. Most importantly, Guibert's mother is a witness who relates the story to Guibert himself.

Apart from these surface-level readings of eyewitness testimony in twelfth-century ghost stories, monastic use of eyewitness testimony dialogues with embodied aristocratic memory on a deeper register. Monastic authors sought to locate proper memory in the eye of the witness to ghost stories in an attempt to counter the function of the body in aristocratic memorial practice. Secular lords in the twelfth century located the memories of their lineages in the bodies of their relatives, but the memory resides in the body as a whole, not in any specific area. The efforts of Orderic Vitalis, Guibert of Nogent, and Peter the Venerable each in their own way attempt to locate the burden of proof and remembrance in the eye of the beholder, and encase that truth claim in a text. The fact that eyewitness testimony and the resulting narrative to modern senses is no better a truth claim matters less than the fact that monastic authors were attempting to use their own technologies to write the body in their own way, in opposition to that of their secular opponents and rivals.

The ultimate fear of any secular lord in the eleventh and twelfth centuries was to be forgotten *in toto*, submitting to a state in which body and memory suffered total loss. The fear of bodily loss can be glimpsed in contemporary illustrations of hell during the

twelfth century.¹¹⁰ As Caroline Walker Bynum has noted, damnation in the twelfth century carried distinct overtones of digestion and permanent bodily fragmentation, along with the permanent consumption suffered by bodily burning. Illustrations of hell often included images of the damned being cast into a great maw in which there was no escape. Scriptural references from the mouth of Christ described a version of hell characterized by burning in a lake of fire. In this “Gehenna,” a reference to the refuse piles outside the city of first-century Jerusalem, the body and soul would be consumed.

While it is debated by theologians what Christ might have meant by referencing Gehenna,¹¹¹ eleventh and twelfth-century authors believed no memory, recall, or legacy was possible in such a place. The consumption of the body in hell was linked with permanent and irrevocable oblivion. It is no mistake that when monastic chroniclers created such images, foremost among the damned were recalcitrant, kings, nobles and their household.¹¹² Such a concern with bodily eating and its links to oblivion goes a long way to explain the widely-narrated incidents of cannibalism by Frankish forces in the Outremer in the late eleventh century. In this case fear of oblivion and consumption translated as a shocking punishment for Islamic soldiers, reflecting the deep cultural fears of their Frankish enemies.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Caroline Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, pp. 200-209, 212-14.

¹¹¹ Matthew 10:28, Mark 9:43. For modern Christian interpretations of Christ’s references, see N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. II* (Fortress Press, 1997).

¹¹² Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body*, 119, 186, 190, 192-196, Plate 12.

¹¹³ See Jay Rubenstein, “Crusaders and Cannibals,” *French Historical Review*, pp. for a review of the large

The concern with the loss of the body and its memories find useful echoes even in the concluding clauses of charters all over western Francia in the eleventh and twelfth century. Monastic curses and excommunication *formulae* often included an exhortation that the earth ought to swallow the corpses of secular lords who suffered the censure, just as Dathan and Abiron suffered in the Old Testament book of Numbers. Having betrayed Moses, Aaron, and the people of Israel, "...the earth beneath their feet opened her mouth, and swallowed them along with their houses."¹¹⁴ An excommunication formula of 937 threatens the censured with a similar fate. "May it be the fate of excommunicates whose lives had been swallowed up by the earth for their arrogance, along with Dathan and Abiron, and with Judas the traitor who sold the Lord."¹¹⁵ Likewise, a late tenth-century curse formula of the monastery of St Martial explicitly ties Dathan and Abiron to the erasure of memory. "...may they burn in eternal fires with Dathan and Abiron. Amen. Amen. Thus may all memory of them be extinguished for ever and ever."¹¹⁶ The ending clauses of many charters from Cluny's cartulary drafted in the eleventh and twelfth centuries continue this tradition in a different key, equating

number of late eleventh and early twelfth century sources relating the cannibalism in Outremer by Frankish forces.

¹¹⁴ Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*. See also *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* ed, Robert Weber and Roger Gryson (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), p. 203, Isaiah 16:31 "terra sub pedibus eorum et aperiens os suum devoravit illos cum tabernaculis suis et universa substantia."

¹¹⁵ *Papsturkunden in Frankreich*, ed. Johannes Ramackers, 6 vols. (Göttingen, 1932), 5: 344-45. "Sit pars eorum cum Dathan et Abiron quos terra pro sua superbia vivos absorbit et cum

¹¹⁶ *Mansi*, 19: 95-96. "...cum dathan et abiron jeene ignibus cumburantur. Amen. Amen. Sic extingatur memoria eorum in secula seculorum."

aristocratic violators of charter agreements with the infamous brothers who betrayed Moses.¹¹⁷

While extensive exegetical work is beyond the scope of the present analysis, it is a clear implication of the story of Dathan and Abiron that their punishment extended to their own lineages. In like manner, branding or threatening sinful nobles with the story as part of curse *formulae* meant to call up these kinds of associations. For monastic authors, no burial ground could or should contain these kinds of dead, and oblivion was ever the ultimate price for the secular lord who refused to repent.

The monastic and clerical authors of ghost stories played upon this issue of the bodily loss of aristocrats as well, tying their tales neatly into the mnemonic register of fragmentation. Walter Map, a twelfth century clerical author, in concluding his account of the hero named Trinio Faglog, tells of rumors that after Trinio suffered defeat in battle he was saved by his mother, the Lady of the Lake. "I think this is a lie, and a falsehood to account for his body not having been found."¹¹⁸ As a literate member of the Angevin courtly society of the twelfth century, Walter Map certainly knew of anxieties concerning lost bodies among his aristocratic peers at court. His account of the death of

¹¹⁷ For many eleventh- and twelfth-century examples of these kinds of charters, see *Recueil des Chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny* ed. Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel (Paris: 1876-1903), 2838, 2886, 2896, 2923, 2936, 2947, 2949, 2962, 2983, 3194, 3274, 3346, 3380, 3405, 3407, 3469, 3568, 3590, 3736, 3737, 4046, 4513.

¹¹⁸ Walter Map, *Walter Map, De Nugis Curialium =: Courtiers' Trifles*, ed. M. R. James, Christopher Brooke, and R. A. B. Mynors, *Oxford Medieval Texts* (Oxford: New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1983), Part II, Ch. XI.

Trinio Faglog reveals that the story-world of noble society created legends to account for the inability to find and commemorate bodies.

William of Malmesbury appends a rumor concerning Charles Martel to another of his narratives, the aforementioned story of the woman who desired to be wrapped in animal skins in repentance for her sins.

Among the French also is told the story of Charles Martel, a man of such great prowess during his life that he forced the Saracens to retreat to Spain after their invasion of Gaul. Ending his days, he was buried in the church of Saint-Denis, but, because he had plundered the monasteries of Gaul to pay his soldiers, his body was snatched from his tomb, and he has never been seen since. This was later revealed by the bishop of Orleans, and the story has become widely known...¹¹⁹

William of Malmesbury offers a similar account of the themes found in Walter Map's story of Trinio Faglog. In this case, he references Charles Martel as part of Frankish oral tradition. This account creates tension between this tradition and his own narrative. While not a true part of a ghost story, its presence at the end of one does offer insight into the truth claims William of Malmesbury is making. In his account, written texts provide better access to the truth of events than those of courtly society. Placing the truth in the mouth of the bishop of Orleans adds weight to this claim, William of Malmesbury references the fact that secular oral tradition often sought to re-narrate the fates of great lords after their death if anything happened to the body.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, Book II, Section 204.

There was a possibility then that even if a lord's body was stolen, moved, or lost, his peers could sing songs that reworked his memory and even his bodily loss to subsequent aristocratic generations at court. These efforts became more explicit as the crusades developed, since military aristocrats had an even greater chance of dying far from familial centers of commemoration. Such a process finds an exemplar in Thomas of Marle, the excommunicated lord of Coucy who rebelled against king Louis VI.¹²⁰ Although he died under censure, his relatives subsequently moved his body to the abbey choir of Nogent-sous-Coucy, and songs continued to be sung of Thomas's valor in the siege of Antioch well into the thirteenth century.¹²¹ Walter Map tells a ghost story which addresses the contested nature of a lord's status after death.

Another example is to be found in a story told by the ancient Britons. A certain knight buried his wife, who was dead without a shadow of a doubt, but won her back again by snatching her from a band of dancers; and he was afterward presented by her with children and grandchildren. Their descendants survive to this day – indeed, a great many people claim to be part of their lineage – and all of them are called 'sons of the dead woman.'¹²²

Walter is here again telling a ghost story with his customary courtly bent. In this account, the knight delivers his wife from beyond death from the hands of a ghostly company only through his own prowess. There is no need to give succor to ecclesiastical

¹²⁰ Suger of Saint Denis, *Vie de Louis VI le Gros*, ed. and French trans. Henri Waquet (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1964); English trans. John Moorhead and Richard C. Cusimano, *The Deeds of Louis the Fat* (Washington D. C.: Catholic University Press, 1992), 144.

¹²¹ Toussaints Duplessis, *Histoire de la ville et des seigneurs de Coucy* (Paris: 1728), 150, no. 35., *La Chanson d'Antioch*, ed. S. Duparc-Quioc, 2 vols. (Paris: 1977-78), 1. 177, 450.

¹²² Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, Part II, ch. XIII.

authority or requiesce to their technologies of memory creation, unlike many of the ghost stories referenced above and throughout this analysis. Walter's story illustrates that not only the body but the taking of it was subject to reinterpretation and even a kind of epic playfulness.

The soul-snatching of the knights' wife can be read as akin to body snatching. This story also illustrates the belief embodied in the fate of the corpse of Thomas of Marle. One's familial legacy not only exists but can be expanded after death through song and deeds. Walter's account parallels the practice of exhuming and reburying the corpses of excommunicates that extended from local lords like Thomas of Marle up to key players in the Gregorian reform movement.

The Emperor Henry IV, dying excommunicate in 1106, Henry was initially buried in Liege cathedral, then was exhumed and placed in an unconsecrated chapel nearby. Henry V exhumed his father again to finalize his will, and buried Henry IV again in an unconsecrated chapel in Speyer. Several years later, Pope Pascal II gave permission for Henry IV to be buried properly next to his ancestors at Speyer.¹²³ Ghost stories like Walter Maps' alongside efforts by family members to properly bury relatives and place their corpses serve to illustrate the contested quality of death and the stakes involved. Monastic narratives and the place of the body within them were not fixed.

¹²³ I. S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 340-44.

Memory-making technologies were flexible and could be re-written or re-worked through texts or activities.

By the beginning of the thirteenth century, discussions of the relationship of the body to memory began to change slowly. Pope Gregory X effectively started alternative discussions regarding the status of the dead, the body itself, and the memories the body could evoke in convening the Second Council of Lyon in 1274 and drafting canon law on Purgatory. The memory politics of the preceding centuries still dealt with the same technologies that have by now become familiar. Aristocrats had been diversifying their memory making toolboxes as the twelfth century progressed. Lords like the counts of Anjou, the counts of Guines, and the lords of Ardres along with other contemporaries commissioned genealogical narratives of their lineages.¹²⁴ Castellan and knightly families converted to new monastic orders, patronizing these new foundations as well as their ancestral Benedictine houses. The proper burial and commemoration of the aristocratic corpse remained important.

However, the privileged place of the issues brought up by the ancient story of Simonides: memory, oblivion, and the remembrances potential of the mnemonic body changed. The flexible, almost playful world of mnemonic move and counter move changed its shape. Indeed, the story of church reform over the eleventh and twelfth

¹²⁴ For a comprehensive list of these genealogical texts, see Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps*, pp. 299-303.

centuries is on a certain level a story of changing attitudes toward memory, the body, and the text. Ghost stories can only partially unearth this process. Scholars have analyzed the increasing role of narrative, specifically prose narrative, in the aristocratic courts of the early thirteenth century.¹²⁵ The twelfth century is a part of that story. As the aristocracy became more comfortable with narrative itself as a complement to their memories and to their honor, it became a vital refuge as the vigor of secular lordship waned and changed shape in the thirteenth century.

¹²⁵ Gabrielle Spiegel, *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), pp. 20-55.

5. Singing the Wounded Body: Mutilation and Memory in Medieval Europe, 900-1100 C. E.

The idea of the wounded body has a long history in the medieval west, a history dominated by the study of the wounds of the crucified Christ or of the physical wounds endured by the often-nameless remains discovered at archeological sites. However, this very richness obscures a lacuna in the historical study of wounds as a site of meaning among lay people and monastic communities in the centuries around the year 1000. Scholars such as Larissa Tracy, Kelly Devries and others have recently invigorated the study of wounding as a space to do cultural analysis, usually holding to discussions of medieval battle trauma, spiritual wounding, or wounding as an object of medicine or law.¹²⁶ This chapter serves as a contribution to this kind of work by showing that monastic communities and aristocratic households both tied wounds and mutilations to memory-making, and debated those meanings among themselves throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

The military aristocracy and their monastic neighbors residing in the old Carolingian domains of the tenth and eleventh centuries made wounding and mutilation a powerful cultural language in their songs, liturgies, and imagery. Throughout this period, mutilation remained an openly political activity tied to

¹²⁶ Larissa Tracy and Kelly Devries, "Introduction: Penetrating Medieval Wounds" In *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*, 1-21. Edited by *Ibid.* (Leiden: Brill, 2015). See also Anne Kirkham and Cordelia Warr, eds., *Wounds in the Middle Ages* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2014).

legitimacy and remembrance. Mutilating the human body continued to allude to oblivion and political downfall, but at the turn of the millennium it became an activity with specific power to articulate a newly important set of issues regarding memory, legacy, and the human body in the post-Carolingian period. The knights and castellans who sought to join the ranks of the old Carolingian aristocracy during these centuries experienced violence on a regular basis, whether that violence took place during private wars and the *chevauchée* or sung in epic song. Benedictine monks in the centuries before the twelfth century chronicled the political mutilations of their own time and articulated a symbolic mutilation in their curse liturgies as a way to speak to the deep-seated concerns of a newly-visibly lay aristocracy.

The centuries around 1000 C. E. were increasingly a period when bodily fragmentation was a source of wonder and concern across the social spectrum, and offered a way to discuss a range of cultural, social, and religious concerns.¹²⁷ For monastic and lay communities, bodily political mutilation served as a common touchstone for a discussion about memory and legacy within an emergent aristocratic milieu. In the centuries around the turn of the millennium, the lay body became central to aristocratic familial cults, and the visceral bodily wounding and mutilation of lay epic poetry, monastic chronicle and liturgy supported a complex dialectic about memory and

¹²⁷ Caroline Walker Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone Books, 1992), pp. 270-1, *Ibid.*, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), pp. 201-213.

the human body itself. This chapter analyzes this dialectic surrounding wounding and mutilation in the centuries around 1000, arguing that accounts of political mutilation in clerical chronicles informed the composition of monastic curse liturgies as memory mutilation, which in turn fueled lay fascinations with memory and wounding in their own martial poetry over the course of the eleventh century.

5.1 The Cadaver Synod of 897: A Laboratory of Embodied Memory in Post-Carolingian Europe

Political mutilation already had a long history by the turn of the tenth century. Lellia C. Ruggini has shown how the ancients viewed the cutting off of ears, fingers or thumbs was a protest activity meant to avoid or derail episcopal ordination or the travails of military service.¹²⁸ Forms of bodily mutilations show up often in early medieval law codes and narrative texts.¹²⁹ Gregory of Tours endowed the Merovingian kings and lay elites he wrote about with a fondness for mutilating their political opponents, and in the High and late medieval periods, European monarchs increasingly claimed the exclusive right to mutilate, blind or dismember their enemies.¹³⁰ When the

¹²⁸ Lellia Cracco Ruggini, "Mutilation of the Self: Cutting of Fingers or Ears as a Protest in Antiquity," *Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei: Rendiconti. Classe di scienze morali, storiche, et filologiche*, ser. 9, 9.3 (1998): 375-85.

¹²⁹ Daniel O'Gorman. "Mutilation and spectacle in Anglo-Saxon legislation." In *Capital and Corporal Punishment in Anglo-Saxon England*, Edited by Gates, Jay Paul and Marafioti, Nicole. Anglo-Saxon Studies; 23, 149-164. (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2014), Lisi Oliver. "Genital mutilation in medieval Germanic law." In *Capital and Corporal Punishment in Anglo-Saxon England*, Edited by Gates, Jay Paul and Marafioti, Nicole. Anglo-Saxon Studies; 23, 48-73. (Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell & Brewer, 2014).

¹³⁰ Van Eickels, Klaus. "Gendered violence: castration and blinding as punishment for treason in Normandy and Anglo-Norman England." In *Violence, Vulnerability and Embodiment: Gender and History*, Edited by D'Cruze, Shani and Rao, Anupama., 94-109. (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), Bühner-Thierry, Geneviève. "'Just

youthful Ottonian emperor Otto III returned to Rome after an expedition in 998, he gouged out the eyes of the anti-pope John Philagathos, his former tutor in a fit of rage. Theitmar of Merseburg notes that John, "...thereupon lost his tongue, eyes, and nose."¹³¹ In the early twelfth century, the kings of England and France mutilated rebels who had consistently flouted royal authority.¹³²

One of the best-documented instances of mutilation in the late tenth century is the Cadaver Synod of 897, in which the deceased Pope Formosus (891-96) was exhumed by his political and papal rivals and his corpse put on trial by the current pope Stephen VI (896-97).¹³³ The reason given for Formosus's trial was that he had attempted to move his own see from Porto to Rome in a bid for papal authority. As Michael E. Moore has

anger" or "vengeful anger"? The punishment of blinding in the early medieval West." In *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, Edited by Rosenwein, Barbara H., 75-91. (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1998). There is much useful information on medieval blindness in the context of disability in Edward Wheatley, *Stumbling Blocks Before the Blind: Medieval Constructions of a Disability* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010).

¹³¹ Theitmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon*, MGH Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum, ser. 9. "Iohannes autem supplantor hiis appropinquantibus fugit; sed postea ad fidelibus Christi et caesaris captus, linguam cum oculis ac naribus amisit."

¹³² C. Warren Hollister, "Royal Acts of Mutilation: The Case Against Henry I" *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 10:4 (1978): 330-40.

¹³³ For an account of the Cadaver Synod in the context of wider papal history, see Brett Edward Whalen, *The Medieval Papacy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), pp. 81-2. For the context of the Synod within the power politics of East Francia in the later ninth century, see Timothy Reuter, *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, 800-1056* (New York: Longman, 1991) pp. 115-147. For the trial itself, See Michael E. Moore, "The Body of Pope Formosus," *Millennium. Jahrbuch zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. chr. / Yearbook on the Culture and History of the First Millennium C. E.* 9 (2012): 277-97., *Ibid.*, "The Attack on Pope Formosus: Papal History in an Age of Resentment (875-897)" pp. 184-208. In *Ecclesia et Violentia: Violence against the Church and Violence within the Church in the Middle Ages*, edited by Radoslaw Kotecki and Jacek Maciejewski Cambridge Scholars Publisher, (2014). (hereafter Moore, "The Attack on Pope Formosus,).

demonstrated, the trial itself should be best held within the tensions created by the fractalization of centralized power in Italy despite the continued relevance and influence of Carolingian political processes, what Moore aptly labels as an ‘age of resentment.’¹³⁴ As we shall see below, the Cadaver Synod is also important as an instance of political mutilation that included and foreshadowed the changes in attitudes toward the body and memory that would be further developed in the tenth and eleventh centuries.

The Cadaver Synod is unique in that it is very well documented for the late ninth century, and historians can make use of several chronicle narratives that offer varying perspectives on Formosus’s macabre trial. It is important to note that most of the texts narrate the trial differently in order to make claims about the body of Pope Formosus that either uphold his pontifical legitimacy or deride him as a papal usurper. In these accounts the body of Formosus and his memory become one and the same within the narratives. The *Annales Laubacensium* offers arguably the darkest take on events.

[Pope] Stephen [VI] dragged Pope Formosus from his sepulcher and set him on the throne, and a deacon was established for him, so that he might give the defense; and having deposed him, he had the pope dragged across the basilica and thrown into the river [Tiber], and gore was flowing out of his mouth onto the pavement.¹³⁵

¹³⁴ Moore, “The Attack on Pope Formosus, 198-202. See also

¹³⁵ *Annales Laubacenses*, ed. Georg H. Pertz, MGH SS, 1: 53 (*sub anno 896*) “Et Stephanus papa Formosum de sepulcro eiecit eumque super locavit, atque diaconum pro eo constituit, ut responsum dedisset, et eo devicto, fecit papam per basilicum trahere atque in flumen proicere; et ex ore eius cruor per pavimenta fluebat.”

What is noteworthy for our purposes is that Formosus's corpse is treated in this account (and in all those that follow) as if he were a living human being. Giving the dead pontiff an advocate for his defense indicates that it did not matter much what the Formosus's defense may have been. What is important is how his body is treated during and after the trial. It is clear from the account of the *Annales* that the litigious veneer serves as a pretext for the bodily disgrace to follow. It is also clear from this account that the author of the *Annales* does not consider Formosus to be a worthy or saintly Pope, as his decomposing body is just that, a source of effluvia rather than the sweet scents of holy men. His body's ambiguous rest in the Tiber is intentional, since it is not known from this account whether the body of the exhumed pontiff was found. The Bavarian continuation of the *Annales of Fulda* for the year 896 gives a similar account of the trial with some revealing differences.

Stephen [VI] succeeded, a man of notorious reputation, who in unheard-of fashion put his predecessor, Formosus, out of his grave, had him deposed using an advocate to make his response, and buried outside the usual place where popes are buried.¹³⁶

In this account, Formosus ends up not in the waters of the Tiber, but he is reinterred outside consecrated space. This last disgrace complements the *Annales Laubacensium* in that both authors are concerned with the directing Formosus toward

¹³⁶ *Annales Fuldensis*, ed. Rau, 412 (*sub anno 896*) "In cuius sedem successit apostolicus nomine Stephanus, vir fama infamandus, qui antecessorum suum, Formosum videlicet, inaudito more de sepulchroieiectum et per advocatum suae responsionis depositum, foras extra solitum sepulturae apostolicus locum sepeliri precepit." See *The Annales of Fulda*, trans. Timothy Reuter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992), 135. I owe this reference and to Michael E. Moore, "The Attack on Pope Formosus," fns. 112, 113.

historical oblivion by implying that his body was relocated in places where it would not be remembered properly. It bears repeating that for contemporaries, body and memory became one ontological entity. It clearly did not matter whether the trial of Formosus was described in narrative or whether these texts describing the events would complement Formosus's memory rather than his consignment to oblivion. What matters for our purposes is that Formosus's contemporaries were creating a novel form of theatric forgetting that directly involved the body and made symbolically weighted statements about memory in attacking it. This new mnemonic assault carried additional force in the late ninth and early tenth century. Frankish society was not yet divided into distinct social groups by ecclesiastical elites as it was in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. As a consequence, the mutilation of Pope Formosus and the message of oblivion it bore could be easily understood by a broad range of persons.¹³⁷

The narratives of the Cadaver Synod by the anonymous authors of the *Annales Laubacensium* and the *Annales of Fulda* are opposed by the *Antapodosis* of Liutprand of Cremona. Liutprand, a savvy commentator on Italian and imperial politics in the century after the Cadaver Synod, offers a starkly different take on Formosus. His chronicle is in part an effort to rehabilitate the erstwhile pope. His account offers further insight into the novel memory politics of his era.

¹³⁷ Heinrich Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

Once [Sergius was] appointed, as if impious and ignorant of holy doctrines, [he] ordered Formosus to be extracted from his tomb and placed on the seat of the Roman pontiffs, dressed in his priestly attire. To him he said, “When you were bishop of Porto, why did you usurp the universal Roman see in a spirit of ambition?” Once these things were done, he ordered the corpse, stripped of its holy vestments and with three fingers cut off, to be tossed into the Tiber [...]¹³⁸

Liutprand’s narrative emphasizes the mutilation and loss of Formosus’s fingers, an act that made a clear statement that Formosus ought to be deprived of the means to carry out his sacral office. Liutprand wrote his *Antapodosis* several decades after the Cadaver Synod, and his inclusion of the mutilation narrative could indicate the extent to which mutilation continued to be intricately tied with memory, forgetting, and the body in the decades after the event. It is also significant that in Liutprand’s account, Formosus is presented in the trial fully clothed as a priest, and the clothing in this account complements and enhances Formosus’s clerical selfhood and identity. Liutprand asserts to his reader that Formosus lost his vestments, an action designed to better articulate the assault on the former pope’s memory to a tenth-century clerical audience.¹³⁹

¹³⁸ Liutprand of Cremona, *Liutprandi Cremonensis Episcopi Historia Gestorum Regum et Imperatorum sive – Antapodosis* MGH vol. 136, col. 0804B “Serguisque papa per Adelbertum constituitur. Quo constituto, ut impius doctrinarumque sanctarum ignarus, Formosum e sepulcro extrahere atque in sedem Romani pontificatus sacerdotalibus vestimentis indutum collocare praecepit. Cui et ait: «Cum Portuensis esses episcopus, cur ambitionis spiritu Romanam universalem usurpasti sedem?» His expletis, sacratis mox exutum vestimentis digitisque tribus abscisis, in Tiberim jactare praecepit [...]” See *The Complete Works of Liutprand of Cremona* ed. Paolo Squariti (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007), p. 64. (hereafter *The Complete Works of Liutprand of Cremona*).

¹³⁹ For the significance of clothing to clerical identity in this period, See Maureen Miller, *Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800-1200* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014), pp. 11-50. (hereafter Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*).

Following his account of Formosus's trial and the pope's posthumous mutilation, Liutprand effectively reverses the assaults on Formosus's corpse described by earlier annalists.

Of what great authority and observance Pope Formosus was we may deduce from this: that when his body was later found by fishers and taken to the church of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, certain images of saints greeted him reverently when he was placed in the tomb. For this fact I heard repeated very often by very observant men of the city of Rome.¹⁴⁰

Here Liutprand, perhaps without realizing that he was doing so, offers an invaluable corrective to the earlier narratives of the fate of Formosus's body after his trial. Rather than being consigned to the oblivion of an unconsecrated grave or the ravages of the Tiber, Formosus's body is found and reinterred in an appropriate burial space suitable for his status as an apostolic successor of the apostle Peter. What is important for our purposes is that Liutprand has fully internalized the memory politics of mutilation in his own account, and found a way to rehabilitate Formosus using an account of bodily discovery and movement that were increasingly familiar to elites across the social spectrum by the first decades of the tenth century.

It is important to keep in mind many of the mnemonic registers of the acts of disinterment, mutilation, and bodily disposal or reburial that are described in the

¹⁴⁰ Liutprand of Cremona, *Liutprandi Cremonensis Episcopi Historia Gestorum Regnum et Imperatorum sive – Antapodosis* MGH vol. 136, col. 0804C-0804D. "Quantae autem esset auctoritatis, quantaque religionis papa Formosus fuerit, hinc colligere possumus, quoniam dum a piscatoribus postmodum esset inventus atque ad beati Petri apostolorum principis ecclesiam deportatus, sanctorum quedam imagines hunc in loculo positum venerabiliter salutarunt. Hoc namque a religiosissimis Romanae urbis viris persepe audivi."

sources narrating the trial of Pope Formosus's corpse. The Cadaver Synod is a useful laboratory in which bodily mutilation and the disposal of the former pope's body carried new and forceful arguments about how memory could be erased or negotiated through the treatment of a human body. In the centuries following the Cadaver Synod the same associations of memory, oblivion, and the body continued to inform aristocratic and clerical discourse throughout the high medieval period.

The trial and mutilation of Pope Formosus and the debate surrounding the ultimate fate of his mortal coil was a clearly political move during an unstable period of the Roman see. However, the trial also effectively ushered in the beginning of a more abstract dialectic concerning the same issues that the trial of Formosus raised. In later centuries, monastic and aristocratic actors and writers would shift the associations of political mutilation to an abstract plane in their liturgies and songs, discussing the mutilation of the body in a symbolic and metaphoric sense. Yet at the root of the emergent dialectic about abstract forms of political mutilation was a concern for memory and oblivion. As the defining figure of the high medieval economy of memory, Pope Formosus did indeed speak again from beyond the grave.

5.2 The Monastic Clamor and the Dismemberment of Aristocratic Memory, 900-1200 C. E.

Debates about memory and dismemberment deepened and rearticulated the relationships between the nobility and clerical communities during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, in large part through the sung liturgies of the monastic *clamor*.

Contemporary with the songs that livened the halls of aristocratic courts, other and far more dire songs also echoed in a much different rhythm in church spaces during the liturgies of monastic communities. These songs were the liturgical *clamor*. Beginning around the start of the tenth century, monastic liturgies of western France began to contain liturgical elements that sought to call upon divine authority for help against those who attacked monastic property, assailed monks, and generally disrespected the monastic calling to be the ears, hands, and mouths of the saints themselves. Monks of the tenth through twelfth centuries enjoyed and often suffered from the deep and longstanding relationships with their secular neighbors.

Many abbots and monks were drawn from the very aristocratic circles that assailed the monasteries. This close relationship is the defining element of conflict between these communities. It is not the intent of this section of the discussion to directly compare the monastic liturgical curse with forms of secular song the developed after 1100, but it is clear that these texts shared a common concern to use the mutilation of the body to discuss memory and create a dialectic between aristocrats and monks that spanned several centuries. The genealogy of these more abstract and symbolic mutilations is part of the same lineage as the political mutilations of Pope Formosus and others from Late antiquity to the turn of the tenth century.

It has often been a historiographical truism of the *clamor* that antagonism or discipline characterized this relationship, but in fact these arguments often obfuscate the

relational quality of conflict in this period between secular and monastic actors.¹⁴¹ The *clamor* was an effort to gain leverage in this longstanding relationship by targeting and interacting with aspects of the memory culture of the aristocracy outlined above.

Historians have often over-emphasized the materialist nature of these conflicts, focusing on property ownership or resources as the central stakes. While it is important to centrally locate these issues, it is equally important to understand that memory itself was at stake in the often-fraught relationship of monks and their lay neighbors. The monastic *clamors* can give insight into how monks attacked aristocratic memory and sought to rework it for their own advantage.

It is important to note at this point that liturgies of *clamor* worked on a continuum with the practice of liturgical excommunication, a disciplinary practice in which churchmen ritually separated those perceived as malefactors from the body of the church. In an overwhelming number of cases these malefactors were members of the lay aristocracy. Liturgical curses attempted much the same ends as excommunications, but with subtle differences that are important for our purposes.¹⁴² It is important to note that from the early drafting of curse formulae in monastic manuscripts around the year 900,

¹⁴¹ As dialectical as the feud relationship was, it existed at the elite level at the cost of the property and lives of peasant tenants. See Gadi Algazi, "Pruning Peasants: Private War and Maintaining the Lord's Peace in Late Medieval Germany, pp. 245-74 In *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context* edited by Ester Cohen and Mayke de Jong (Cultures, Beliefs, and Traditions: Medieval and Early Modern Peoples, 11) (Leiden: Brill, 2001). Barbara Rosenwein, Thomas Head, and Sharon Farmer, "Monks and Their Enemies: A Comparative Approach," *Speculum* 68: 4 (1991): 764-96.

¹⁴² The best summary of the liturgical *clamour* from the ninth through twelfth centuries is Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), 17-51. (hereafter Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*).

both excommunication and the liturgical curse were characterized specifically as spiritual weapons. Cecilia Gaposchkin has recently demonstrated that liturgical violence continued as a form of ecclesiastical punishment well into the thirteenth century.¹⁴³ These liturgies were copied in large number throughout the high middle ages, and they were widely used in subsequent centuries whenever the monastic communities who drafted them need to call upon spiritual weaponry to counter the perceived oppression of lay neighbors.

It is also no coincidence for the historian of *clamors* that the tenth century saw the appearance of knights and castellans in the charters of monastic houses. The rise of knights as a group of social actors has wide implications for the development and use of curse liturgies, since noble households with their knightly retainers were the central objects of complaints, curses, and derision by monastic houses. Initially members of the households of the old Carolingian nobility, castellan and knightly lineages increasingly gained higher status over the course of the tenth through twelfth centuries through intermarriage with the old nobility. The knighthood and nobility of Francia eventually fused into a single class of militarized knighted nobles by the thirteenth century, but at this early date knights were ever-present members of noble households.¹⁴⁴ Though

¹⁴³ Cecilia Gaposchkin, *Invisible Weapons: Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017), pp. 192-235.

¹⁴⁴ For concise reviews of knighthood and nobility in this period, see Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), 67-102, and David Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France, 900-1300* (Edinburgh:

separated by several centuries, liturgical cursing and the poetic violence of the *chanons de geste* do indicate deep-seated and persistent societal values and attitudes that linked memory with the mutilation of the body from the tenth through twelfth centuries. Curse liturgies widen the historical perspective on the memory-world of these early household communities, revealing the means through which they created memories of their own without the kind of access to texts that we find familiar.

In the *Sens Pontifical* of about 900, housed in the Russian National Library of St. Petersburg, the *clamor* and excommunication work together and blend into one censure within the text itself. After naming the malefactors specifically, the liturgy continues.

We excommunicate them and strike them with the sword of anathema...May they be tortured in eternal fire with Dathan and Abiron...May they be cursed in the cities and in the fields. May they be cursed in the road and on the path, in water and on earth. May they be cursed in their castles, may the fruit of their wombs be cursed. May they be cursed in living and leaving. May they be cursed. May they be cursed in eating, in drinking, standing, seated, walking, and lying

Pearson, 2005). See the essays contained in Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Those of My Blood: Constructing Noble Families in Medieval Francia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), Stephen White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The 'laudatio parentum' in Western France, c. 1050-1150* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988), Theodore Evergates, *Aristocracy in the County of Champagne* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), John B. Freed, "Reflections on the Medieval German Nobility," *American Historical Review* 91: 3 (1986): 553-575, esp. 560-564. Georges Duby, "Structures de parenté et noblesse, France du Nord, XI-XII siècles," In *Miscellanea Medievalia in Memoriam Jan Frederik Niermeyer* (Gröningen, 1967), *La société aux Xie et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnais* (1953; repr., Paris, 1971). Leah Shopkow, "Dynastic History," in *Historiography in the Middle Ages*, ed. Deborah Mauskoph Deliyannis (Leiden, 2003), 217-248. Gabrielle Spiegel, "Genealogy: Form and Function in Medieval Narrative," In Spiegel *The Past As Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, 1997), 104; and *Ibid, Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France* (Berkeley, 1993), 351. Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps. Lands of the Loire, 1000-1200* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010), Jonathan Lyon, *Princely Brothers and Sisters: The Sibling Bond in German Politics, 1100-1300* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013),

down. May they be cursed in wakefulness and in sleep. In all places may they be cursed.¹⁴⁵

This blending of excommunication and curse within a single text is also an aspect of an excommunication placed against the *familiares* of the counts of Provence in 1014 by Pope Benedict VIII.¹⁴⁶ In fact, these liturgies often blend with excommunications that deny burial rights to those under censure. As noted above, secular lords created memories through wounding and dismemberment, and curse texts reveal how much wider this memory-world was. The denial of burial rights and the subsequent displacement of the aristocratic corpse was a powerful way to alter the stakes of the relationship of monastic houses to their lay neighbors, the curse liturgy worked on an even wider register.

Although it is useful to think of these texts operating on many different levels, memory and legacy are one of the clear targets. Indeed, the “sword of anathema” language is no mere metaphor. Monks who were often raised in or descended from the houses of local lay lords would have little problem linking memory to the violent strokes of weapons. In a sense the solemn liturgies of the curse form the inverse of the ebullient songs of the *chansons*. For the monks who drafted the texts of these liturgies, curse and

¹⁴⁵ MS St. Petersburg, Russian National Library, lat. 4v.I.35, ff. 101v-103v; Fiat pars eorum et hereditas ignis perpetui cruciatus cum dathan quoque et habbiron... Maledictus sint in civitatibus, Maledictus sint in agris, Maledictus sint in viis, Maledictus sint in semitis, Maledictus sint in aquis, maledictis sint in terra, Maledictis sint in castellis, Maledictus fructus ventris illorum, Maledictis sint in domibus et egredientes, Maledictis sint ingredienti, Maledictus sint, Maledictus sint, manducando, Maledictis sint bibendo, Maledictis sint stando, [...] sedendo, [...] ambulando, [...] iacendo, [...] vigilando, [...] dormiendo, [...] in omnibus omnino locis.”

¹⁴⁶ Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*, p. 43.

excommunications drew on a language of bodily presence and absence, motion and activity that was familiar to their lay relatives and neighbors. This seemingly idiosyncratic focus of the curse demonstrates the nature of the punishment it meant to produce, and the work that punishment was meant to do. The aristocratic victims of these curses created memories through bodily presence and absence, bodily activity and bodily dismemberment. The curse negates this very culture of memory creation offering a punishment that sought to mutilate the memory of a malefactor by ritually denying the aristocratic body its vital memory-making power.

In many ways the Sens Pontifical echoes later versions of curse liturgies, and it is certain that the eerie rhythm of these curses traveled widely in the monastic networks of western Francia from the ninth through the twelfth centuries.¹⁴⁷ As the Sens Pontifical makes clear, the target of the curse is also the lineage of the layman in question. Monastic curses and excommunication liturgies often included an exhortation that the earth ought to swallow the corpses of secular lords who suffered the censure, just as Dathan and Abiron suffered in the Old Testament book of Numbers. Having betrayed Moses, Aaron, and the people of Israel, "...the earth beneath [Dathan and Abiron's] feet opened her mouth, and swallowed them along with their houses.¹⁴⁸ While extensive

¹⁴⁷ For the geographical spread of the liturgical curse in monastic manuscripts, see Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*, Appendix F, pp. 280-285.

¹⁴⁸ Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*, See also *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* ed, Robert Weber and Roger Gryson (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), p. 203, Isaiah 16:31 "terra sub pedibus eorum et aperiens os suum devoravit illos cum tabernaculis suis et universa substantia."

exegetical work is beyond the scope of the present analysis, it is a clear implication of the story of Dathan and Abiron that their punishment extended to their own lineages. In like manner, branding or threatening sinful nobles with the story as part of curse *formulae* meant to call up these kinds of associations.

Curse formulas from western Francia are often tediously repetitive, but they do often contain subtle shifts in emphasis that can alert the reader to the ways in which monks established a dialectic with the longstanding culture of political mutilation among their aristocratic neighbors. A similar excommunication from around 900 differs from the Sens Pontifical in that it targets the whole body of the malefactor.

May they be cursed wherever they are, in house and fields, on roads and in paths, in forests and on the water, or in Church. May they be cursed in living, dying, eating, drinking, when hungry, when satisfied; in fasting, in idleness, in sleeping, and in wakefulness; in walking, standing, sitting, lying down, working; in resting and in urinating, defecating, and bleeding. May they be cursed in their whole body.¹⁴⁹

This curse liturgy continues by creating an almost itemized list of body parts and bodily functions that find curious if distant echoes with the mutilations of figures like Pope Formosus or John Philagathos discussed above. The specificity of curse liturgies and their intense efforts to employ the sword of anathema against the actions and bodies

¹⁴⁹ *Capitularia regum Francorum ab anno 742 ad annum 922*, ed. Etienne Baluze, 2 vols. (Venice, 1772-1773), 2:469-470. Latin edition contained in Little, *Benedictine Maledictions*, Appendix C, p. 256. "Maledictus sit bicunque fuerit, sive in domo, sive in agro, sive in via, sive in semita, sive in solva, sive in aqua, sive in Ecclesia. Maledictus sit vivendo, moriendo, manducando, bibendo, esuriendo, sitiendo, jejunando, dormitando, dormiendo, vigilando, ambulando, standeo, sedendo, jacendo, operando, quiescendo, mingendo, cacando, flebotomando. Maledictus sit in totis viribus corporis."

of their censured lay neighbors introduces the historian to the decidedly oral and practice-based world of the aristocracy. In these cases, it is the memory curse of the curse that asserts the dialectical force of embodiment, presence, and mutilation for the secular aristocracy and their own lineage cults. It is on this register that monastic communities also worked when they cursed aristocratic malefactors.

5.3 The Aristocratic Body in Song: Monastic Curses and the *Chansons de Geste*

The wounded aristocratic body was not simply a symptom of tournaments, a form of gratuitous entertainment, or the ancestor of modern pulp fiction or action films. Rather wounding have much to tell the historian about how the medieval elite sung the body as a memory technology. These men and women had a limited engagement with the written word during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but they used their own bodies as text through which to tell stories about themselves and their deeds. During these same centuries, shrewd monastic writers engaged with this lay culture of the mnemonic wound through the practice of liturgical cursing.

Liturgical curses, called down as part of monastic *clamors* from the ninth through thirteenth centuries, were monastic efforts to call upon divine authority to punish those who assailed monastic property or rights.¹⁵⁰ While the *clamor* was taken generally to

¹⁵⁰ On the *clamour* in general see Richard Barton, "Making a Clamor to the Lord: Noise, Justice, and Power in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century France" pp. 217-18 In *Feud Violence, and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White* ed. Tracey Billado and Belle S. Tuten (Burlington: Ashgate, 2010). For curse

mean a call to authority for retribution, monastic *clamors* often contained liturgies that cursed the enemies of monastic communities, effectively serving as a kind of negative blessing. Monastic curses operated on a continuum with older penitential censures such as excommunication, and the practice arose roughly contemporary with the humiliation of saints' relics also done as part of a *clamor* against misbehaving lay opponents. Like the humiliation of relics, the *clamor* sought to symbolically displace the aristocratic body and attack its mnemonic potential.

The dismemberment of memory claims inherent in the curse liturgies was not so much an attempt to discipline lay aristocrats, it was rather part of a holistic effort to gain advantage in an ongoing relationship with people who were just as often patrons and partners as enemies. When read closely, the *clamor* and the lay responses to it can tell the careful reader not only how monks wished to attack their enemies and assail them on a deeper cultural register, but also how laypeople articulated and changed their embodied memories in the face of these measures.

liturgies, see Sarah Hamilton, "Medieval curses and their uses" *Haskins Society Journal: Studies in Medieval History* 30 (2020 for 2018): 21-51. *Ibid.*, "Interpreting diversity: excommunication rites in the tenth and eleventh centuries" pp. 125-158. In *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation*, ed. Helen Gittos and Sarah Hamilton (London: Routledge, 2016). For later but still useful studies of cursing in the centuries around 1000 C. E., see Jeffrey Bowman, *Shifting Boundaries: Property, Proof, and Dispute in Catalonia around the Year 1000* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), 56-80. *Ibid.*, *Do Neo-Romans Curse? "Law, land, and ritual in the Midi (900-1100)," Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 28 (1997): 1-32. Lester Little, *Benedictine Maledictions* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993), p. 30-44.

One of the ways that lay aristocrats responded to and engaged with monastic attempts to symbolically displace or mutilate memory is through their own cultural work expressed in forms of secular song, the *chansons de geste* and the courtly romance. Following the approaches of recent scholars of medieval literature, this chapter treats these genres with a light hand as points on an evolving continuum.¹⁵¹ A potent characteristic of noble song is the almost comically violent mutilation that occurs in the warfare of the story-worlds. It will become clear below that aristocratic song of the high medieval period foregrounded a view of the body that was more subject to being pierced, wounded, and mutilated than those of monks. Upon reading many of these texts, it is impossible not to notice the taglines of their oral origin. Much of the activity is repetitive and crafted with phrases that introduce an epic rhythm to the story. These tags likely acted as an aid to the poet, who had the arduous task of singing songs for entertainment while changing and shifting events and characters to suit the audience.¹⁵² Yet it is at these poetic junctures that one can make the link between the violence of the song and aristocratic memory. One of the central aspects of the popular late-eleventh century epic *The Song of Roland* is a scene like the one below:

¹⁵¹ A useful summary of the changing views regarding the genres of medieval lay literature can be found in *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval French Literature*, edited by Simon Gaunt and Sarah Kay (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 139-152, and Sarah Kay, *The chansons de geste in the age of Romance: Political Fictions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

¹⁵² Albert B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* 2nd ed. edited by Stephen Mitchell and Gregory Nagy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960, 2003), pp. 99-123, 198-221. Lord is known for his work on the Oral tradition of Homer, but he comments frequently on medieval secular poetry and song, and his work has much that is valuable for medieval historians.

Spurs straight at Chernuble and swings his blade,/
Breaks through the helmet's carbuncle and jade,/
Slices down through the hair and scalp and brain,/
Dissects between the eyes the pagan's face,/
Unstitches all the closely-linked chain mail,/
Splits downward to the juncture of the legs/
And the gold-braided saddle, and it stays,/
Not there, but cleaves the horses spine and lays/
Man and horse lifeless on the grassy plain.¹⁵³

Examples of this type could be repeated throughout *The Song of Roland* as well as many songs of epic verse in the twelfth century. These scenes were repeated at a rhythmic rate and served to blend the mnemonic capacity of the verse with the memories not only of the poet but also of the audience. In this instance, the aristocratic body blends almost seamlessly with its mount and accouterment, and the body itself is a space to be explored, negotiated, expressed, and ultimately remembered on the part of other aristocratic actors.¹⁵⁴

This point gains force in the face of the historiography of eleventh and twelfth century ecclesiastical culture. Monastic communities defined themselves from their restraint and emotional reserve, and monks joined clerics and pedagogues of cathedral schools in using their bodies as texts of display and mimesis among their own communities.¹⁵⁵ For example, when the Cistercians changed their habit from the

¹⁵³ *The Song of Roland* trans. by John DuVal, introduced by David Staines (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2012), p. 39, sec. 105. (hereafter *Song of Roland*,).

¹⁵⁴ Cohen, *Identity Machines*, 71-77.

¹⁵⁵ Lester Little, "Anger in Monastic Curses" pp. 1-35. In *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* ed. by Barbara Rosenwein (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), Miller, *Clothing the Clergy*, C.

traditional Benedictine black to white, it was partially to disrupt this ancestral monastic bodily display and assert what they saw as a more intense and reform-derived return to the pure spirit of the Rule of Benedict.

It is clear from excerpts like this that aristocrats viewed their own bodies in a starkly different fashion than their monastic contemporaries, and to lesser extent members of the secular clergy. Aristocratic bodies were often subject to violent mutilation within their story worlds. As a result, the noble body was a far more flexible container of personhood and was often joined symbiotically with other bodies; those of horses for instance.¹⁵⁶ For modern audiences, the mutilated or wounded aristocratic body at first looks like a source of shame. For the contemporary hearers of these songs, wounding and dismemberment does indeed impart the stigma of humiliation and defeat, but modern audiences can miss the other registers upon which these stories work. Great deeds of the *chansons de geste* allow the historian to view the ways in which memories were created and maintained through the body in the thought-world of the aristocracy, both in the court and on the battlefields of the *chevauchée* and feud.

Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994), pp. 96-117.

¹⁵⁶ Jeffrey Cohen, commenting on this very bodily flexibility regarding noble man and noble horse, calls it an "identity machine." See Jeffrey J. Cohen, *Medieval Identity Machines* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), pp. 35-77. (Hereafter Cohen, *Identity Machines*.)

A later scene in the *Song of Roland* confirms this. At the end of the great battle against the Saracens in the poem, Oliver nears death and begins a final attack against his pagan enemies.

Oliver feels his wound and knows he's dying./
His will for vengeance isn't satisfied./
In the crush of battle he strikes and thrusts and strikes./
He hacks off lances, shields, and bucklers; slices/
Feet and fists, saddles, ribs, and sides./
Whoever saw him dismembering pagan knights/
And flinging their bodies into ghastly piles/
About the battlefield would call to mind/
All past chivalric deeds.¹⁵⁷

The important point here is not only that the remembrance of great deeds becomes fused to Oliver's bodily activity and the dismemberment of his enemies, but also that Oliver intends to increase the likelihood that his peers will remember his great deeds when he is nearing the point of his own death. A scene which appears to modern audiences as a typical 'last stand' so familiar in our films and stories is for eleventh and twelfth-century aristocrats a calculated move with wide implications for cultural memory. Once again, bodily dismemberment plays an important part in the creation of these memories and in this instance, it plays a central role in forging of Oliver's legacy among his Frankish peers in the story-world of *The Song of Roland*.

Sources like the *chansons de geste* often blend reality with fantasy, but they can give historians insight into other ways of preparing for death and beginning a legacy of

¹⁵⁷ *Song of Roland*, p. 56, sec. 146.

memories among aristocrats that have little to do with deathbed donations for or conversion to monastic communities. Oliver's example is no doubt ideal, but the bloodbath that preludes his death and those of other characters in the *chansons* demonstrates that aristocratic memory has intimate and close links with violence in general, and dismemberment in particular. Another example of this kind of memory work shows up in a central point in the plot of *The Song of Roland*. One of Roland's most noteworthy deeds in the poem is his dismemberment of the Saracen King Marsille.

My lord rode out to battle and they failed him./
Look at him now-Count Roland amputated/
The king's right fist. Now Spain is Charlemagne's.¹⁵⁸

This particular quote is noteworthy because it takes place *before* the actual amputation of King Marsille's hand in the story narrative. Such placement may seem odd, but it clearly shows how the Saracen's dismemberment was centrally located in the courtly memory of the *chanson* even as the song itself was written down in a textual form. Marsille's lost right hand is important because it demonstrates clearly what Frankish aristocratic hearers deemed important. Modern readers might be ambivalent about Marsille's dismemberment, because it seems like another last stand that preludes the catastrophic eventual Frankish defeat for which the *chanson* is famous. For its contemporary audience, however, the dismemberment is centrally important because it creates a point upon which to remember an even greater and culturally contingent loss.

¹⁵⁸ *The Song of Roland*, p. 76, sec. 194.

By dismembering the body of the enemy King, Roland mitigates his own defeat and secures his own legacy in much the same way as Oliver. These scenes gain force in the rhythmic backdrop of the singing of the *chansons*. In a sense, the memories of eleventh and twelfth century aristocrats were songs, in that they were created and maintained in very important ways by the cadences of epic verse. Such tales blended memory and dismemberment in important ways that became central to aristocratic culture in the same period. As the argument of this chapter develops, it is important to keep these points at the forefront, since it is upon this cultural register that conflict and negotiation between the aristocracy and their ecclesiastical neighbors was played out.

5.4 Conclusion

It is often difficult to account for the effectiveness of monastic cursing, and perhaps historians who attempt this are asking the wrong questions. In the tenth and early eleventh century, memory formed a specific context through which monastic communities and aristocratic households could articulate their ever-deepening relationships. From the ninth through the eleventh centuries, mutilation as a political activity upon physical bodies was adopted as part of liturgical cursing by monks who sought to mutilate the memories of their lay opponents. While liturgical cursing and the *clamour* continued in truncated form into the thirteenth century, it is during the early period of its use that memory began to be used as a fulcrum on which elite relationship turned. In dialectic with monastic neighbors, aristocratic households of Francia

continued to identify memory with various forms of mutilation in their own epic songs throughout the High Middle Ages.

The rhythmic framework of epic poetry and the brutal dismemberment of aristocratic bodies continued to play a large part in the forging of lineage memory in these later centuries, especially in a period when family memories could be augmented by the establishment of a crusading pedigree. Aristocratic song itself reworked the associations of oblivion that monastic communities bound up with the symbolic mutilations of the curses. For hearers of the song of Roland around 1100, bodily mutilation had become a literary device for the enhancement of family memory within the aristocratic community. Aristocratic singers created vivid descriptions of their own wounding as well as those of their pagan enemies in order to drive this point home in an entertaining way to the audiences of their listening peers. While these same listeners perhaps suffered as the victims of monastic clamor as the eleventh century shifted into the twelfth, they had created an effective and creative methodology for sustaining their own memory cults in a period of rapid change.

6. Aristocratic Burial, Cistercian Reform, and the Memory Politics of *detestande feritatis*, 1100-1300 C. E.

In 1299, the aged Pope Boniface VIII drafted *detestande feritatis*, a bull forbidding the post-mortem dismemberment of corpses for the purposes of burial in different cemeteries. Historians call this form of aristocratic burial ‘separate’ burial, in contrast to the ‘singular’ burial of interring a body as a whole.¹ Boniface reissued this bull in 1300, and it likely reflected Boniface’s concern with his own advancing age and declining health.² For many modern readers *detestande feritatis* seems a mere curiosity rather than the cultural and political statement it was meant to be. For those warrior aristocrats who had their corpses cut apart and interred in separate places, the bull was a direct challenge to memory-making technologies, and the longstanding economy of memory that had been a part of aristocratic socio-political practices since the turn of the millennium. Calling corpse-moving and ‘separate’ burial practices fit only for barbarians, Boniface continued:

The bodies of the dead are often transferred to far off places, boiled in water, divided into pieces, or burned [...] These abuses, or similar ones, are by no means to be observed, lest the hands of the faithful suffer such brutality, and in

¹ See Danielle Westerhof, “Celebrating Fragmentation: The Presence of Aristocratic Body Parts in Monastic Houses in Twelfth-and Thirteenth-Century England” *Citeaux: Commentarii cisterciensis* t. 56, fasc. 1-4 (2005), 27-45, *Ibid.*, *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England* (Woodbridge ; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2008). See also Nicholas Paul, *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013), 33, 74-6, 134-5.

² See Elizabeth A. R. Brown, “Authority, the Family, and the Dead in Late Medieval France,” *French Historical Studies* 16: 4 (Fall 1990): 803-832. *Ibid.*, *Death and the Human Body in the later Middle Ages: the legislation of Boniface VIII on the division of the corpse*,” *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 12 (1981): 221-270.

order that the bodies of the dead are not treated savagely or impiously, dragged about from one place to another between the places at which the living wish to be buried; Neither to cities, fortified places, or nearby places at the time the corpses are given over for ecclesiastical burial. Finally, the burning of the body ought not to be observed, nor choosing to bury the body in separate places, or transporting bodies for burial.³

For the century and a half before the Boniface's draft of *detestande feritatis*, burial in various forms had been central to the social life of the warrior elite. As an anchor for lay memorial cults, burial served to establish spaces and places where lay lords could remember their lineages and maintain their familial memories.⁴ Before lords began to cut the corpses of relatives apart and bury them separately, burial had been a target of monastic reformers such as the Cistercians in their early texts and later legislation.⁵

The white monks from their early days forbade the burial of noble patrons within their enclosures and discontinued the practice of patron commemoration based on internment that had been the enduring legacy of the great Benedictine houses such as

³ Caesar Baronis and Odoricus Reynaldus, *Annales ecclesiastici*, 34 vols. (Lucca, 1738-1756) 1299 no. 36, p. 256. "defunctorum corpora, in longinquas terras transferenda, aqua ferventissima decoqui, concidi, vel exuri consueverant; [...] circa corpora defunctorum huiusmodi abusus vel similis nullatenus observetur, nec fidelium manus tanta immanitate saedentur : sed ut defunctorum corpora sic impie ac crudeliter non tractentur, deferantur ad ad loca, in quibus viventes elegerint sepeliri : aut in civitat, castro vel loco vicino Ecclesiasticae sepulturae tradantur sad tempus ; ita quod demum incinerates corporibus, aut alias ad loca ubi sepulturam elegerint, deportentur et sepeliantur in eis." (translation slightly adated).

⁴ Brian Golding, "Anglo-Norman Knightly Burials," In *The Ideals and Practice of Medieval Knighthood – Papers from the First and Second Strawberry Hill Conferences*, ed. Christopher Harper-Bill and Ruth Harvey (Oxford, 1986), p. 35-48. Michel Lauwers, *La mémoire des ancêtres, le souci des morts. Morts, rites et société au Moyen Age, diocèse de Liège, xi^e – xiii^e siècles*, (Paris, Beauchesne, 1997).

⁵ Janet Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 155-168, 169-191. See also Elizabeth Van Houts, *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe, 900-1200* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 8-9.

Cluny in Burgundy.⁶ Cistercians altered this practice by forbidding aristocratic burial in order to display the rigor of their reformed monastic life.⁷ As we shall see, Cistercians from their early days developed a culture centered on the forgetting of one's life before conversion. The early and charismatic abbots of the early order, Stephen Harding and Bernard of Clairvaux believed the selective forgetting of a converts' early life to be a crucial aspect of early Cistercian conversion. This culture of forgetting from its inception directly addressed the knightly families who served as the Order's first converts, threatening the erasure of their hard-won lineage memories after they converted.⁸ Cistercian institutional forgetting changed lay burial practices and initiated a dialectic over memory and interment that Boniface sought to end in the drafting of *detestande feritatis*.

This chapter reads the practice of lay burial in Cistercian monasteries in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries against the efforts of the wider Order to erase or rework the memories of knightly and aristocratic converts to their monastic life. In the early days of the Cistercian order, the majority of monastic converts came from knightly

⁶ Dietrich Poeck, "Laienbegrabnisse in Cluny," *Fruhmittelalterliche Studien* 15 (1981): 68-179,

⁷ The Legislation concerning the burial of laypeople within Cistercian enclosures can be found in *Sepulturae Cisterciensis: Burial, Memorial, and Patronage in Medieval Cistercian Monasteries* Ed. by Jackie Hall and Christine Kratzke Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses, 2005 (Forges-Chimay, Belgium), t. 56 facs. 1-4.

⁸ For the overwhelming contribution of knights to the early Order, see Constance Brittain Bouchard, "Knights and the Foundation of Cistercian houses in Burgundy," In *Erudition at God's Service: Studies in Medieval Cistercian History XI* Edited by Jhn R. Sommerfeldt (Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1987), pp. 315-322. See Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998) and David Crouch, *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France, 900-1300* (Longman, 2005).

families from Burgundy, the same social groups who had an early and vigorous interest in building lineage cults through securing burial sites.⁹ As we shall see, Cistercian statutes of the mid twelfth century initially forbade lay burial in any form. By the late twelfth century, burial of lay patrons within Cistercian cemeteries began, but allowance was often given only to aristocratic founders of Cistercian houses or relatives of founding kindreds, as well as royalty.

Bernard of Clairvaux and other early Cistercians like Stephen Harding saw their monastic vocation largely as a process of obviating the self upon conversion, consigning former secular and knightly lives to oblivion and remaking a new monastic selfhood in a reformed monastic image that corresponded to the unfallen state of Adam and Eve.¹⁰ The Cistercians, as a reformed order of monks practiced this form of selective forgetting within their own communities and manifested such oblivion externally through the restriction of lay burial. A careful examination of the statutes of the Cistercian General Chapter through the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries indicates that aristocrats immediately began to claim status as founders in efforts to persuade abbots of monasteries to bury them in defiance of the Cistercian culture of

⁹ Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Change in Twelfth-Century Burgundy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 165-184. *Ibid.*, "Knights and the Foundation of Cistercian Houses in Burgundy" In *Erudition at God's Service: Studies in Medieval Cistercian History XI*. Ed. John R. Sommerfeldt, (Kalamazoo, 1987). *Ibid.*, *Sword, Miter, Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).

¹⁰ Wim Werbaal, "Bernard of Clairvaux's School of Oblivion" pp. 228 In *Negotiating Heritage: Memories of the Middle Ages* edited by Mette B. Bruun and Stephanie Glaser, *Ritus et Artes 4* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008). Mary Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 95.

forgetting. By the end of the thirteenth century, lords began to cut their corpses apart post-mortem and bury body parts separately in order to intensify the sense of their familial cults at Cistercian houses to counter the culture of forgetting within the houses of white monks.

The practice of multiple burial that Boniface condemned in 1299 had a long history. These early instances are what historians call 'multiple burial,' what became known by pope Boniface's time as the *mos teutonicum*. In essence, the practice involved burying a body in separate parts in different places, usually by burying organs separately from the rest of the corpse. Theimar of Merseburg recorded that upon the death of the Emperor Otto I in May of 973 and his burial at the cathedral at Magdeburg, the emperor's body was opened and his entrails were removed from his body to be buried at the church of St. Mary at Memleben.¹¹ Similarly, the great lord of western Francia, Fulk Nerra had his own remains divided after his own death in 1040. Fulk's viscera were interred at the monastery he built at Beaulieu-lès-Loches east of Tours.¹² Otto's descendant Henry III gave explicit instructions for his heart and intestines to be

¹¹ Alain Erlande-Brandenburg, *Le roi est mort. Étude sur les funérailles, les sépultures et les tombeaux des rois de France jusqu'à la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Geneva, 1975), p. 479-481.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 481.

buried at Goslar, while his other remains were interred in the imperial mausoleum at Speyer.¹³

The examples were expressions of dynastic reinforcement of legacy upon the death of a great lord. For example, reform-minded popes had excommunicated all the Holy Roman Emperors from Henry III through Henry V at least once, and it is perhaps no accident that these Emperors created a relatively short-term tradition of multiple burial likely in an effort to deal with the obviating effects of excommunication. After Henry V's death in 1125, the only abbeys who commemorated him were the imperial abbey of Niederaltaich and the abbey of Gladbach. The town of Speyer lost its status as a site of the imperial lineage cult until several generations had elapsed after the death of Henry V.¹⁴ Henry V's long status as an excommunicate certainly contributed to this temporary oblivion following his death. It is easy in the case of the Imperial lineage to see why the stakes of memory creation and maintenance were so high, and what could be lost regarding immediate or even long-term memorial and legacy.

In many ways, single and fragmented burial served many of the same purposes of traditional forms of aristocratic internment. Both sought to express and cement the bonds of patronage and familial association with particular monasteries, and both were integral aspects of the memorial cults of aristocratic lineages. However useful the *mos*

¹³ "Fragmentum historiae Andegavensis," in *Chronicques des comtes d'Anjou et des seigneurs d'Amboise*, Ed. Louis Halphen and Renée Poupardin (Paris: 1913), 233. For a reappraisal of the provenance of this text, see Nicholas Paul, "The Chronicle of Fulk le Réchin: A Reassessment," *Haskins Society Journal* 18 (2007): 19-35.

¹⁴ I. S. Robinson, *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

teutonicum was for lay lords in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it served to partially mollify the Cistercian culture of forgetting. Its utility for creating new memory networks through burial made it a prime target for Boniface VIII in 1299.

6.1 The Oblivion of Cistercian Conversion in Twelfth-Century France

It is important to keep this tension between the oblivion of conversion and the practical realities of Cistercian relationships with lay patrons in mind as the analysis develops through the late twelfth and thirteenth century sources. One of the most remarkable aspects of the Cistercian order in the twelfth century is the early concern for selective forgetting, especially when the white monks dealt with the Burgundian knighthood who served as the initial and vigorous first wave of converts.¹⁵ This concern was often in direct contravention of the older Benedictine efforts to commemorate donors and neighbors in their liturgies. The white monks initially refused burial to aristocratic patrons. Burial restrictions were the external manifestation of the oblivion of Cistercian conversion. Aristocrats could not use the patronage of Cistercian houses as an investment in their own familial cults and burial practices as they had done with the Cistercians' Benedictine forebearers.

Practices outside Cistercian houses reflected the nature of Cistercian monastic life and conversion within the communities themselves. The Cistercians from the first

¹⁵ See fn. 9 above.

accepted only adult converts from lay life rather than child oblates, their monastic conversion had to be accompanied by a contemplative forgetting of their former knightly lives. Many converts came to the white monks with pasts that were stained in the eyes of the Cistercians with violence, frivolity, unrestrained sexuality, and sin. Janet Coleman has analyzed this concern for forgetting and the oblivion of Cistercian conversion at great length, arguing that the order constantly wished to cleanse or 'blanch' the memories of converts from a lay life as a part of their monastic conversion.¹⁶

It is important at this point to address the fact that Constance Berman has forcefully challenged the early narrative of Cistercian origins, complicating any subsequent analysis of the early years of the white monks. For Berman, the Cistercians existed as an order only after the 1160s, when their foundational documents such as the Charter of Charity and the *exordia* narratives were written down.¹⁷ A large part of Berman's thesis derives its force from the re-dating of several of these early documents, which she posits as being drafted in the mid-twelfth rather than the early twelfth century. This argument remains controversial, and has been critiqued in detail by historians such as Brian Patrick McGuire and Constance Bouchard, as well as

¹⁶ This discussion owes much to Janet Coleman, "Cistercian 'Blanched' Memory and St. Bernard: The Associative, Textual Memory and the Purified Past," In *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 169-191. See also *Ibid.*, "Monastic Memory in Service of Oblivion," In *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 155-168. (hereafter "Cistercian 'Blanched' Memory and St. Bernard," and "Monastic Memory in Service of Oblivion," respectively).

¹⁷ Constance H. Berman, *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Monastic Order in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).

Chrysogonus Waddell.¹⁸ The scholarly discussion concerning these issues is ongoing, and for this reason this essay will be confined to sources from the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, periods when Cistercian institutional identity was reasonably well formed. In addition, while remaining deferential to the force of Constance Berman's arguments, it is still possible to argue that the twelfth-century Cistercian communities were intensely concerned with dealing with the mnemonic equipage of their adult converts and their own lay patrons, even if the early documents of the Cistercian communities need re-dating or were subject to forgery. In any case, by the late twelfth century, the sermons of Bernard of Clairvaux and his formulations of Cistercian conversion remained part of the wider identity of Cistercian houses, which caused longstanding debates both within the cloister and outside it, involving the monks and abbots as well as aristocratic founders and patrons.

The pedigree of the early Cistercian concern for forgetting is attested through the quasi-mythic activities of the founders of Cîteaux. A text associated with Stephen Harding, one of the foundations' early abbots, demonstrates this concern for forgetting on an even more minute level. An early Cistercian bible, drafted in 1109 and purported to be Stephen's own copy, was allegedly produced in consultation with local Jewish

¹⁸ For other discussions of the disagreements regarding the early Cistercian documents, see the following: Brian McGuire, "Charity and Unanimity: The invention of the Cistercian Order: A Review Article," *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cistercienses* 51 (2000): 285-297, and, in the same issue, Chrysogonus Waddell, "The Myth of Cistercian Origins: C. H. Berman and the manuscript sources," p. 299-386, Martha G. Newman, "Foundation and twelfth century," pp. 25-37, esp. 27-30. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order* edited by Mette Birkeedal Brunn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

communities in either Burgundy or wider Francia. According to early Cistercian legend and some modern codicologists, Stephen Harding extensively edited the text of the bible to bring Jerome's initial Vulgate translation of the texts of the Books of Kings closer to Hebrew and Chaldean sources. Those parts of the Old Testament that did not conform to the Hebrew texts Stephen erased from bible, physically scraping the ink from the parchment and ordering future monks not to add the old passages back in or put any annotations in the margins that might indicate what had been erased.¹⁹

This sort of biblical editing was a novel undertaking in Harding's day, even if it is an open historical question as to whether the bible just referenced was his at all. Indeed, Constance Berman's aforementioned work has problematized much of what historians can claim for the early twelfth-century Cistercian history. At first glance it may not matter much what one of Cîteaux's early abbots did to his personal bible, but it reflects the daring Cistercian concern from their early days to separate themselves from the wider arc of Benedictine monasticism and enhance their perception of their own austerity and faithfulness to the original spirit of the Benedictine Rule. From Stephen Harding on, forgetting was central to Cistercian monastic identity.

The pivotal Cistercian author who forged a unique program for selective forgetting among lay converts was Bernard of Clairvaux, abbot of Clairvaux in the mid-

¹⁹ On the corrections in Stephen Harding's bible, see Christopher De Hamel, *The Book: A History of the Bible* (London: Phaidon Press, 2001), 76-78. The manuscript of Harding's bible is located in Dijon. See Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, mss. 12-15, Pl. 52. See also Walter Cahn, *Romanesque Bible Illumination* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982), 138, 245, 270-1.

twelfth century. As one of the central preachers and the most famous convert to the order, Bernard offers much to the historian of Cistercian memory practices. Bernard's works are the place to start for a discussion of conversion to the houses of the white monks because he was a descendant of the lords of Fontaines-lès Dijon.²⁰ His father Tescelin and his mother Aleth of Montbard, along with their seven children followed Bernard into the cloister, allegedly drawn in by his zeal for the monastic life.²¹ Tescelin was a knight in the household of the duke of Châtillon in the early twelfth century, and had likely raised the young Bernard in the aristocratic society of the time.

In many ways, it was his own aristocratic background and the memories that the converts to the Cistercian houses in Burgundy took with them to the monastery that Bernard sought to deal with. Berengarius, one of the friends of Peter Abelard, wrote in his *Apologeticus* that while a young man in the courts of Burgundy, Bernard would compose secular songs, likely in the style of the troubadours of northern and southern France.²² A slur like this reflects the antagonistic relationship between Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux, men who frequently differed on the finer points of theology during their careers. What this reveals for our purposes is that despite his clear reformed monastic program designed to erase the memories and former secular lives of lay converts, Bernard of Clairvaux was still subject to derision and suspicion by ecclesiastic

²⁰ Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 329-331.

²¹ William of St. Thierry, *Vita prima Sancti Bernardi* 1, PL CLXXXV:523-24.

²² PL 178, 1857. See Coleman, "Cistercian 'Blanched' Memory and St. Bernard," p. 173.

and monastic rivals who were clearly uncomfortable with what they saw as the sordid knightly pasts of Bernard and his supposedly austere white monks. Thus the effort to erase the past memories of lay converts, many of whom were knights, was supported by real stakes involving real prestige and the burgeoning reputation of Cistercian houses in the twelfth century.

This concern for memory was central to Bernard's understanding of his own conversion and Cistercian conversion as a whole. His *De Conversione* demonstrates his points on the oblivion of the monastic life in detail.²³ Monks of the twelfth century read saints' lives, *exempla*, the works of the church fathers, and especially scripture in a special way. Drawing from Augustine of Hippo's writings on memory in his *De Trinitate*, twelfth century near-contemporaries Bernard of Clairvaux and Anselm of Canturbury argued that the reading of sacred texts in a sense took place outside of time and space. Memory itself was an activity that took place in the present time. Mary Carruthers has shown indeed that such a process was the nearest analogue to modern ideas about creativity.²⁴

²³ Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermons on Conversion*, trans. Marie-Bernard Said, OSB (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1981). (Hereafter Said, *Sermons on Conversion*.)

²⁴ See Brian Patrick McGuire, *Bernard of Clairvaux: An Inner Life* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2020), Jean Leclercq, *Bernard of Clairvaux and the Cistercian Spirit*, trans. by Claire Lavoie (Cistercian Publications: Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1976), pp. 75-78, Janet Coleman, "Monastic Memory in Service of Oblivion," p. 155-57, Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: 2008), 1-17. See also Wim Verbaal, "Bernard of Clairvaux's School of Oblivion," pp. 221-237. In *Negotiating Heritage: Memories of the Middle Ages* edited by Matte Bruun and Joseph Glaser (Brepols, 2008).

Historians have argued that for Augustine, the Trinity existed in a constant state of remembering one another. Anselm and Bernard took Augustine's formulation of the mutual remembering that was constituent of the three persons of the Trinity and saw love itself as a process of memory-mimesis in the likeness of the Trinity. Human memory itself, especially for monks and their communities in the twelfth century, mirrored this mutual remembering of the Godhead in a lower sense. Human, and thus monastic memory engaged in a constant process of meditative remembrance that sought mimesis with the memory of God. Bernard of Clairvaux was also influenced by Augustine's thoughts on memory as expressed through Anselm's *Monologion* and through Augustine's own writings on the subject in his *De Trinitate*.²⁵

Bernard's sermons on conversion bear these themes out from the early church fathers. Bernard likens his memory to parchment with old writing. Discussing the state of the convert's mind once he has turned his will to the contemplation of God, Bernard relates:

Once the will has been turned and the body subdued to service, as if the fountain were dry and the breach filled up, a third and very serious thing remains still to be done: the memory must be purified and the bilge water drawn off. But how am I going to cut my life from my memory? The dark ink has drenched my cheap, flimsy parchment: by what technique can I blot it out? ... But to leave my memory intact and yet wash away its blotches, what penknife can I use? Only that living and effective word sharper than a two-edged sword....[God's]

²⁵ Janet Coleman, "Monastic Memory in Service of Oblivion," 164.

forbearance wipes away sin, not by cutting it out of the memory, but by leaving in the memory what was there causing discoloration, and blanching it thoroughly.²⁶

Like the recycling of old parchment, Bernard sought to rid his memory of the secular sins and pleasures that made him an object of suspicion among clerics like Berengarius, Abelard, and their circle. In many ways the parchment metaphor in this sermon hearkens to Stephen Harding's bold editing of his personal Bible discussed above. Bernard's charisma and the intense lay enthusiasm for the Cistercian community by the mid-twelfth century had much to do with this. For Bernard, what was important for the conversion of laymen into Cistercian communities was the practice of meditatively reading scripture outside the bounds of secular time. Monastic meditation created continuous access to eternity and replaced the memories of a convert's former life with the words of Scripture. Perhaps Bernard sought to 'blanch' his own memory in order to repel the criticisms and suspicions of his contemporaries. But it is clear that for him Cistercian conversion was of a kind specially keyed to the needs of adult male converts, most of whom had enjoyed lengthy careers as knights and lords in secular courts. Drawing on the mythology of the founding of the Cistercian communities in

²⁶ Bernard of Clairvaux, *De conversione ad clericos sermo seu liber*. Capitula XV *Patrologia Latina cursus completus*. Series Latina. Supplementum. (Paris: Garnier Frères, 1858), cols. "Caeterum jam et voluntate mutata, in servitutum redacto corpore, velut siccato jam aliquatenus fonte, et oppilato foramine, tertium adhuc, idque gravissimum restat, de purganda scilicet memoria et exhaurienda sentina. Quomodo enim a memoria mea excidet vita mea? Membrana vilis et tenuis atramentum forte prorsus imbibit: qua deinceps arte delebitur?... Caeterum ut memoria integra maneat, et ipsius maculae deleantur, quae novacula posset efficere? Solus utique sermo vivus et efficax et penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti....Hujus indulgentia delet peccatum, non quidem ut a memoria excidat, sed ut quod prius inesse pariter et inficere consuevisset, sic de caetero insit memoriae, ut eam nullatenus decoloret." See also Said, *Sermons on Conversion*, p. 64.

Burgundy, he seeks to empty the minds of converts to the new community by drawing off the bilge water of secular memories, much as the earliest Cistercians had fixed their presence in Burgundy on the swamp-laden landscape underlying the monastery of Clairvaux.

It is extremely important for our purposes that Bernard's ideas about the 'blanching' of memory were expressed in sermons likely given publicly to lay audiences in the vernacular before they were transcribed into Latin. The force of Bernard's personality and the ardency of his preaching introduced his ideas about memory and conversion to an audience that found such ideas extremely troubling. Even before the quasi-mythic founding of the Cistercian community in 1098, lay nobles across Europe worked tirelessly to build memorial legacies for themselves and their ancestors in large part by ensuring burial for their kindreds in monastic enclosures. Bernard's ideas about the 'blanching' effects of conversion to Cistercian life were in harmony with the earliest statutes forbidding lay burial. In essence, true Cistercian conversion and monastic community was in part an assault upon the longstanding memory culture of the aristocracy.

Traditionally, lords had patronized older Benedictine monasteries in order to enhance or claim lineage memory for themselves and their ancestors. For this reason, the zealotry of the new Cistercian community from its legendary early days proved to be a special challenge for their aristocratic neighbors. While lords and knights sought the

association of the white monks and converted in large numbers throughout the twelfth century, the maintenance of mnemonic links with their kindreds and ancestors continued to haunt the social engagements of the Cistercian houses, much as Bernard of Clairvaux's secular past and apparent enthusiasm for troubadour song haunted him. Bernard's vigorous efforts to cleanse the memories of knightly converts to the Cistercian life was an obstacle that the Order had difficulty with after the death of Bernard in 1153. In many ways, the Cistercians after Bernard of Clairvaux's departure never fully erased their deep connections to the knighthood of Francia that formed the bedrock of the Order's early members. It is this continued and troubled relationship with the lineages of their neighbors and converts that informed the development of the legislation of the Cistercian General Chapter from the mid-twelfth to the end of the thirteenth century.

The next section analyzes the statutes of the Cistercian General Chapter on lay burial from the mid- twelfth to the late thirteenth century in an attempt to see how lay lords dealt with the restrictions imposed on their own interment. We shall see that lords were active agents in influencing the development of the case law of the General Chapter, exploiting what the statutes did not say or emphasize in order to gain burial rights and maintain their own legacies within the reformed communities of the Cistercian Order. In addition, we shall see that a split took place between abbots of individual houses and the General Chapter over questions of burial. Many abbots actively disobeyed the statutes of the Chapter, burying laymen and women and

claiming their corpses. The resulting dialectics inside and outside the General Chapter have to be teased out carefully from the sources. Paying close attention to the aristocratic voices in these texts as outlined in their activities can offer a glimpse into the memory politics of monastic reform in the high medieval period.

6.2 Cistercian Monasteries and Aristocratic Founders in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: The Tools of Memory

The first discrete mention of the burial of lay founders of Cistercian houses is found in the statutes in the mid-twelfth century. The earliest statute, drafted in 1136, is roughly contemporary with the earliest narratives discussing the quasi-mythic origins of Cîteaux and the Cistercian Order.²⁷ The appearance of statutes nearly forty years after the Order's beginning in 1098 indicates that by the mid-twelfth century the Cistercian Order had enough institutional coherence to be able to make statements from Cîteaux that applied to all the foundations of the Order throughout Europe. The statute of 1136 expressly forbade lay burial, excepting those who died as guests inside the monastery:

For confession, for Holy Communion and for burial, we do not receive any outsider except for our guests and hired hands, that is, those dying inside the monastery; neither do we receive offerings at the conventual Mass.²⁸

²⁷ Chrysogonus Waddell and Brian McGuire have made fine cases for accepting the dating of the earliest General Chapter Statutes. See fn. 16 above. For the early narratives of Cistercian foundation, and another argument for their reliability, see Martha G. Newman, "Foundation and Twelfth Century," pp. 25-37. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order* ed. Mette Birkedal Bruun (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

²⁸ *Twelfth-Century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter*, ed. Chrysogonus Waddell, *Studia and Documenta 12* (Brecht, 2002) (hereafter TSCGC), p. 516. "Ad confessionem, ad sacram communionem, ad sepulturam, neminem extraneum preter hospites et mercenarios nostros intra monasterium videlicet morientes recipimus; sed nec oblationem ad missam in conventu." The Cistercian Statutes for the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries are collectively edited in the following editions. For the sake of convenience and

Such a statute owes its emphasis to the *exordia* narratives of the early Order, and the enthusiastic concern of the Cistercian order with the austere memories of its foundation in the closing years of the eleventh century. It is a scholarly commonplace to cite these early texts to argue for lay exclusion from Cistercian burial. The exclusion of laypeople from interment complements the efforts at memory 'blanching' of converts by the early mythic abbots of the early community discussed above. These two central provisos of Cistercian memorial culture were almost immediately contested by the activities of local laypeople and, rather embarrassingly, by local Cistercian abbots.

If read carefully, the statutes reveal a politics of memory creation between lordly patrons and local abbots that would endanger and problematize the mnemonic oblivion of Cistercian conversion and institutional culture advocated by the austere twelfth-century abbots Stephen Harding and Bernard of Clairvaux. Both abbots in their different ways left legacies and myths that redefined Cistercian institutional identity as completely disconnected from the older Benedictine traditions of patron commemoration. However, Cistercian insistence on adult conversion and the almost

ready access, I have followed the abbreviations of Jackie Hall, Shelagh Sneddon and Nadine Sohr. See *Ibid.*, "Table of Legislation Concerning the Burial of Laity and other Patrons in Cistercian Abbeys," *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cisterciensis* 56, 1-4 (2005): 373-418. TSCGC, *La codification cistercienne de 1202 et son évolution ultérieure*, ed. Bernard Lucet (Paris, 1977) (hereafter *La codification de 1202*). *Statuta Capitulum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad Annum 1786*, ed. Joseph-Maria Canivez, 8 vols (Louvain, 1933-1941). (hereafter *Statuta*). *Les codifications cisterciennes de 1237 et de 1257*, ed. Bernard Lucet (Rome, 1964). (hereafter *Les Codifications*).

immediate encroachment of aristocratic patrons into the burial spaces of the white monks made these austere ideals almost impossible to maintain, as we shall see.

In a statute dated from the mid twelfth century, between 1157-1179, the General Chapter made a partial about-face from the hardline position of 1136. "For burial, none may be received except founders."²⁹ This statute was also copied in full in the Codification of 1202.³⁰ Importantly for our purposes, the earliest statute allowing lay burial did not yet specify who exactly counted as founders of Cistercian houses for the purposes of internment. What caused this sudden change in legislative attitudes? It is possible that the death of Bernard of Clairvaux in 1153 was a factor in the change, since Bernard himself was one of the loudest voices in favor of aristocratic exclusion. In any case, after about 1150, laypeople could and did insert themselves into Cistercian burial spaces in ways they had not attempted previously.

The place of founders and patrons in Cistercian establishments continued to cause tension both with the aristocratic kin groups themselves and with abbots who attempted to secure the bodies of patrons for the prestige and institutional memory of their own houses. The ambiguity that resulted from the 1157-1179 statute immediately resulted in a politics of burial that the General Chapter tried somewhat unsuccessfully to contain and prevent. At the same time this statute was issued, an abbot from an

²⁹ TSCGC, p. 606. "Ad sepeliendum nonisi fundatores recipiantur." (translations are adapted)

³⁰ *La codification de 1202*, 127-8.

unnamed monastery was put on light penance because he “buried people killed by the sword in his house...”³¹ From 1190-1191, three abbots were put on light penance for burying laypeople contrary to the statute.³² Similarly, two women were illicitly buried in the 1193 and 1196, respectively, and the statute makes clear that in 1196 the abbot of the monastery of Valroy had interred the laywoman, “to whom he owed nothing while she was still alive.”³³

It is not clear whether these early statutes involved laypeople illicitly claiming to be founders in order to gain special burial privileges for themselves. What these statutes do illustrate is that individual abbots of local Cistercian monasteries were not above flouting the statutes of the General Chapter and using the bodies of patrons to the advantage of their own houses. An 1180 statute expanded the statutes of 1157 through 1179 in declaring that, “No-one except for a king or queen, or archbishops and bishops, is to be buried in our churches.”³⁴ The 1180 revision was copied multiple times and quoted verbatim throughout the thirteenth century (re-copied in 1202, 1220, 1237, 1257, and 1289) Thus in these early decades the General Chapter unintentionally created another useful loophole that could be exploited by the lay neighbors of local Cistercian monasteries as well as local abbots.

³¹ Vauclair. 131 “Abbas qui mortuos occisos gladio sepelivit in domo sua.”

³² TSCGC, p. 206, 221-224.

³³ TSCGC, 263, 361. “qui mulierem mortuam cui nil debebat dum adhuc viveret.”

³⁴ TSCGC, p. 88. “Nullus preter regem sive reginam sive archiepiscopos et episcopos in nostris sepliantur ecclesis.”

The ambiguity of the twelfth-century statutes allowing the burial of founders, kings, queens, and bishops resulted in the internment of several laypeople who claimed to be founders in the late thirteenth century. Although it is difficult to locate the activities of local lords in these documents, the deeds of abbots can be seen clearly. In 1197 and 1198, the abbots of the monasteries of Clairmont and Vauluisant were made to do penance for illicitly burying founders of their houses. In the two succinct and nearly identical statutes, the two abbots were out on a penance of bread and water by the General Chapter for their infraction.³⁵ Indeed, two other statutes disciplining abbots for burying laypeople against the will of the General Chapter indicate that false claims of identity could be made. In 1206, the abbot of Barbeaux buried a woman who allegedly claimed to be the foundress of the abbey. The laconic statute allowed the burial, but made note that, "...It is not established that she was a foundress of the abbey of Barbeaux."³⁶ A decade later, in 1215, the General Chapter issued a statute punishing the abbot of Fontfroide that gives more insight into the ambiguous claims made by lords who sought to place their corpses within Cistercian enclosures.

The abbot of Fontfroide, who buried a woman in the oratory who was publicly called Queen, because he could have been fooled by a name, is to be six days in

³⁵ *TSCGC*, p. 386, 407.

³⁶ *Statuta*, I, p. 325 "Sepultura domine regina minime revocatur, nec constat, eam fuisse fundatricem monasterii Sacrii Portus."

light penance, two of them on bread and water, and forty days outside the abbot's stall; and the convent is to abstain from wine for six Fridays.³⁷

The statutes are often very clipped documents, revealing little to the reader beyond infraction and punishment. Yet these texts just cited offer insight into the moves and countermoves that built into a subtle dialectic between patrons, abbots, and the Cistercian General Chapter. The space of a monastic enclosure was vital to the maintenance and improvement of aristocratic memorial and legacy. The new Cistercian houses were valuable opportunities for securing the burials that solidified lay familial legacies, and clearly the legislation of the General Chapter was no practical obstacle to these maneuvers.

Often patrons claimed a status that the Chapter refused to recognize or that was unproven at the time of burial in order to place their bodies within the monasteries of the white monks. Patrons claimed to be founders, as in the cases at Barbeaux, Valroy, and other houses, and at Fontfroide a local *domina* of great prominence had the charisma and strength of lordship to be called Queen, if in name only. These statutes of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries illustrate that patrons almost immediately contested the Order's position on lay burial given in 1157-1179 by convincing local abbots to bury them. In several cases, this involved the patrons claiming identities that

³⁷ *Statuta*, 1215.31, p. 439-441. "Abbas Fontis frigidi qui mulierem que regina publice vocabatur, in oratorioseplevit, quia in nomine potuit decepi, sex diebus sit in levi culpa, duobus eorum in pane et aqua, et quadraginta diebus extra stallum abbatis; et conventus sex sextis feriis abstineat a vino."

would give them access to burial. Abbots themselves could have chosen to bury patrons and later claimed they had been 'fooled' when facing citation by the general chapter.

The texts of the statutes reveal that abbots themselves had an interest in at least claiming to have secured the corpse of a founder. While the General Chapter made clear that opportunistic lords could fool abbots, it is also possible that the abbots themselves acquiesced to these spurious claims in an effort to bolster the institutional memories of their own houses by claiming to have access to a founding patron's body. In this sense the statutes of the Cistercian General Chapter repeatedly discipline abbots in order to protect the integrity of the Cistercian network as a whole. The Chapter was careful to cast abbots who engaged in illicit burial as recalcitrant and in need of penance. Yet the frequency of these kinds of citations illustrate that the bodies of patrons or any layperson who could claim a status worthy of interment was a valuable commodity for abbots eager to enhance the status of their monasteries.

In the statutes of the General Chapter, such conflicts become almost commonplace during the thirteenth century. In 1205, such a conflict over the body of a founder impacted the most ancient house of the order, the monastery of Cîteaux.

The abbot and convent of Mazières, who presumed to receive for burial Alexander, a man of good memory, to the prejudice of the monastery of Cîteaux, since he was the son of the Duke of Burgundy and of the founder of Cîteaux, although the prior of Cîteaux and certain of his brothers objected to this burial, are ordered by the authority of the General Chapter to restore the buried body at once to Cîteaux and to the tomb of his fathers, the founders. If this body is retained, divine service shall not be celebrated there. And that such a thing shall not be presumed in the future, it is decreed and established by the chapter that

founders or heirs of founders are no longer to be received for burial, except by the consent and license of those whom they are known to be founders.³⁸

This statute is of note for several important reasons. It demonstrates that despite the efforts of the early Cistercian community in the mid-twelfth century to exclude patrons from burial, the memory of the Duke of Burgundy offered as much prestige for Cîteaux as it did for the founders' family. Alexander was indeed a distant relative of Odo I, duke of Burgundy, who had supported the early community of Robert of Molesme at Cîteaux.³⁹ There was surely tension between these efforts to secure access to the body of a founder and the oblivion of Cistercian conversion. The statutes indicate that lay burial, along with the internment of founders was taking place in the twelfth century, and certainly by the thirteenth. The end of the 1205 statute hints at competition for prominence among Cistercian abbeys as reflected in the bodies of lay founders. The latter part of the 1205 statute disallowing the burial of lay lords without consent of founder families was repeated in the codifications of 1220. In 1237, 1257, and 1289 the General Chapter repeatedly clarified the issue further by stating that, "None, however, of our order may encourage founders of abbeys of the order to choose burial for

³⁸ *Statuta*, I, 1205 Statutes, p. 310-11. "Abbas et conventu Maceriarum qui in preiudicium Cisterciensis monasterii virum bone memoriae Alexandrum, cum esset filius ducis Burgundie et fundatores Cistercii, as sepulturam presumpsit recipere, et priore Cistercii et quibusdam suis fratribus contradicentibus, auctoritate capituli generalis precipitur humatum corpus in presenti restituere Cistercioet sepulture patrum suorum fundatorum. Quod si contigerit retineri, divina ibidem minime celebrentur. Et ne tale quid presumatur in posterum, statutumest et firmatum a capitulo ne fundatores seu heredes fundatorum ad sepulturam aliquam recipiantur ulterius, nisi de consensu et licantia eorum quorum eos esse constiterit fundatores."

³⁹ Constance Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. 257-261.

themselves other than in the abbeys whose founders they are.”⁴⁰ The frequent reformulations of case law regarding the burial of patrons and founders by the Cistercian General Chapter make it clear that lay lords claimed burial within Cistercian enclosures, claiming to be *fundatores* of the house or descendants of founders.

The statutes indicate a split between local abbots and the General Chapter regarding the place and status of the aristocratic corpse. Local abbots like the lord of Mazières and Fontfroide sought the body of a descendant of the founder of Cîteaux perhaps to establish a bond with that more ancient and prestigious abbey, giving his own house an intangible sense of filiation with the mother house. Similarly, in 1208, the Cistercian abbeys of Savigny and Fontaine-Daniel each claimed the body of a still-living lord by the name of Juhel. Juhel’s own wish was to be buried at Fontaine-Daniel, since he was the founder, but the case was put off until the next meeting of the general chapter.

The conflict over a still-living lordly patron serves as useful prelude to the most virulent and longstanding debates between thirteenth-century Cistercian abbots over such desirable corpses. The debate between the abbot of Charlieu and the abbot of Stürzelbronn over the body of the deceased Duke of Lorraine brings our story full circle in a sense. Abbots had sought to place founders within their houses at the turn of the

⁴⁰ *Les Codifications*, 1237: Dist. IV.9, p. 245, 322. “Nullus, autem de ordine nostro procuret ut fundatores abbatiarum ordinis alibi quam in abbatibus quarum fundatores existunt sibi eligant sepulturam.”

twelfth century. Similarly, the argument that consumed much of the energies of the Cistercian General Chapter in the second decade of the thirteenth century shows how the bodies of lay founders became so central to the identity, prestige, and institutional memory of houses that they were subject to fierce disputes. This particular case study took place between two Cistercian abbeys located far from each other, at almost opposite ends of thirteenth century Francia.

6.3 The Abbots of Charlieu and Stürzelbronn Dispute the Internment of the Duke of Lorraine

Despite the likelihood that individual lay men and women tried to hoodwink Cistercian abbots under the authority of the General Chapter in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries in an attempt to disguise themselves as patrons, the lineage of the duke of Lorraine were truly founders of the Cistercian abbey of Stürzelbronn. The roots of the conflict between the Cistercian abbey of Stürzelbronn and the abbey of Charlieu derive from practices within the ducal and other lordly lineages common in this period. The lineage of the dukes of Lorraine had a longstanding relationship with these two monasteries in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. Simon of Lorraine had founded Stürzelbronn in the early twelfth century and had secured burial there for himself in 1139.⁴¹ His son Matthew I succeeded him in 1138 and chose burial at Charlieu

⁴¹ The Origins of the German Principalities: Essays by German Historians Ed. by Graham A. Loud, and Jochen Schenck (New York, Routledge, 2017).

in Burgundy upon his death in 1176.⁴² Matthew had patronized both monasteries, giving property and confirming rights in an effort to honor the legacy of his father and the memory of his lineage.⁴³ Matthew I's second son and his grandson, both named Frederick, also chose burial at Stürzelbronn. Matthew's second son Frederick I had patronized Charlieu, much as his father had done.⁴⁴

These patronage practices were entirely typical for lay lords in this period. Patronizing different houses served the purpose of consolidating lordships and honors according to situations in the life of the lordship that the sources often frustratingly do not reveal.⁴⁵ However, patronage also served to establish and secure the memorial legacy of the lineage, which may have been another reason why different houses were patronized. In the case of the dukes of Lorraine, the multiple networks of patronage between different monasteries, including Charlieu and Stürzelbronn, left a conflicted legacy. In the early thirteenth century, these two monasteries fought over the bones of

⁴² Henry Bogdan, *La Lorraine des ducs sept siècles* (Librairie Académique Perrin, 2005), p. 37.

⁴³ Franz Xaver Remling, *Geschichte der Bischöfe zu Speyer* (Mainz: Kirchheim und Schott, 1852-1854), p. 91. Augustin Calmet, *Histoire De Lorraine: Qui Comprend Ce Qui S'est Passé De Plus Mémorable Dans L'Archevêché De Trèves, & Dans Les Evêchés De Metz, Toul & Verdun, Depuis L'entrée De Jules César Dans Les Gaules, Jusqu'à La Cession De La Lorraine, Arrivée En 1737, Inclusivement : Avec Les Pièces Justificatives À La Fin, Le Tout Enrichi De Cartes Géographiques, De Plans De Villes & D'églises* (Nouvelle édition, A Nancy: Chez A. Leseure, imprimeur ordinaire du Roy, 1745-1757), vol. vi, col. vi.

⁴⁴ Georges Poull, *Le Maison ducale de Lorraine devenue la Maison impériale et royale d'Autriche, de Hongrie, et de Bohême* (Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1991), p. 54.

⁴⁵ Stephen D. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The 'Laudatio Paentum' in Western France, 1050-1150* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), pp. 19-20, 27-8, 155-63, 164-8. Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1187* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), pp. Barbara Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of St. Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909-1049* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp. 44-5, 121-3. Marcus Bull, *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970-c. 1130* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 157-66.

Frederick II of Lorraine. The body of disputes created by this conflict speaks volumes about the changing tenor of the memory economy in this period. At issue was the ownership of the body of Frederick II of Lorraine, the descendant of Simon of Lorraine, the mutual patron both of Charlieu and Sturzelbronn.

Frederick II of Lorraine died in 1213, and a year later, the Cistercian General Chapter cited the abbot of Charlieu and put him under a penance of bread and water for allowing the burial of Frederick at the French monastery, rather than the abbey of Stürzelbronn, the ancestral burial place of his lineage where he had located his own internment. The General Chapter demanded of the abbot of Charlieu that the abbot of Stürzelbronn be allowed to come and remove the body when convenient.⁴⁶ A year later, in 1215, the General Chapter again cited the abbot of Charlieu, who clearly did not return Frederick's body:

The abbot and convent of Charlieu are ordered, by the authority of the General Chapter, to return the body of the Duke of Lorraine peacefully, and to bring it out of the abbey to the abbot and monks of Stürzelbronn, before the octave of Easter. If they do not do this, they are laid under interdict by the authority of the General Chapter, that they may not presume to celebrate divine service in their church, as long as the body of the Duke lies there.⁴⁷

⁴⁶ *Statuta* I, 1214 Statutes, 421-22. "Abbas de Claroloco qui corpus ducis Lotharingiae, qui sepulturam elegerat in Stulcerburna, tumulari se presente permisit in ecclesia sua, sex diebus sit in levi culpa, duobus eorum in pane et aqua; et corpus permittat tollere abbati Stulcerburne cum voluerit."

⁴⁷ *Statuta* I, 1215 Statutes, 439-441. "Precipitur abbati et conventui de Claro loco, auctoritate capituligeneralis, ut corpus ducis Lotharingiae pacifice reddant, et extra abbatiam efferant abbati et monachis de Turceburne, usque ad octavam Pasche. Quod si non fecerint, interdicatur eis, auctoritate capituli generalis, ne divina in ecclesia presumat celebrare, quamdiu ibi fuerit corpus ducibus."

Clearly the body of Frederick of Lorraine had in many ways a life of its own. The refusal of the abbot of Charlieu to give up the body of its patron and return the corpse of the duke to his homeland reinforces the troubles of the Cisterican General Chapter years before regarding the burial of founders. Fredrick was not the founder of Charlieu, but his body was a useful commodity that could enhance the status of the French abbey. The case demonstrates that abbots of monasteries were not above adopting or imitating cadaver stealing in the service of their own institutional prestige.

If the abbot of Charlieu kept the body of the Duke of Lorraine, the General Chapter would place the house under interdict and potentially shut off the liturgical life and patronage networks, in effect threatening the memorial life of the abbey. Lords had moved excommunicated bodies in earlier centuries in the interests of their own memorial legacies, and in the early thirteenth century, abbots themselves were excommunicated for doing the same thing. In this way, abbots and churchmen became the victims of the penitential toolbox of excommunication and memory erasure utilized by their forebearers in earlier centuries, shifting the disciplinary object of these practices to the intricacies of Cistercian institutional and political discipline. Given the deep stakes at hand, it is surprising that the abbot of Charlieu refused to give up the body, at least according to a disciplinary statute issued by the General Chapter a few years later in 1217.

The abbot of Charlieu, who arose in disobedience three times against the General Chapter and who has celebrated Eucharist under the interdict of the Chapter,

because he had dared to keep the body of the Duke of Lorraine contrary to its prohibition, and still keeps it, shall be deposed instantly. The prior moreover, and the subprior and the other officials, if they have not carried back the body to a safe place in good faith, are to be sent from their own house never to return in perpetuity, and the house is to lie under interdict until the body has been carried back. If however, they are obedient, following the order of the General Chapter, they may stay in their own house, their punishment at the judgment of the father abbot.⁴⁸

While it is difficult to know for certain, it is tempting to begin viewing this dispute in the light of the disputes over the bodies of the saints analyzed so thoroughly by Patrick Geary.⁴⁹ The kinds of associations surrounding the moving of bodies, whether saintly or secular, definitely informed disputes like these. No member of the General Chapter or either abbey involved would miss these associations, and it seems as though the General Chapter is tightening the disciplinary screws applied to the abbey of Charlieu by associating their illicit behavior with narratives of the indulgent retaining of saintly bodies from earlier centuries in the world of monastic memory.

In the statute of 1217, there is evidence of a split between the abbot of Charlieu and other monastic officials. The statute offers a window into the politics of Charlieu. Perhaps the prior and subprior would be more sympathetic to the position of the General Chapter. In any case, it is clear from the statute cited above concerning Cîteaux

⁴⁸ *Statuta* I, 1217 Statutes, 482. "Abbas Calri loci, qui ter inobediens extitit capitulo generali, et sub interdicto capituli celebravit, eo quod corpus ducis contra inhibitionem retinere presumpsisset, et adhuc retinet, deponitur in instanti. Prior autem et pubprior et ceteri officiales si corpus non reportaverint ad tutum locum bona fide, eliminentur a domo propriamquam in perpetuum reversuri, et domus subiaceat interdicto donec corpus fuerint, exequendo mandatum capituli, licebit eis remanere in domo propria ad arbitrium patris abbatis puniendis."

⁴⁹ Patrick Geary, *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978).

in 1205 that the prior and members of the community disapproved of the illicit burial of Alexander at Mazières rather than Cîteaux. Yet in that case, it is important that the abbot was not mentioned, implying either that the abbot of Cîteaux was complicit in Alexander's burial at Mazières or did not bear the burden of agency in claiming the body of a descendant of the Duke of Burgundy. In 1219, two years after the last word on the subject by the Cistercian General Chapter and six years after the death of Frederick II of Lorraine himself, the final statute concerning this issue was issued. In many ways it demonstrates the longstanding tensions that this dispute created.

Concerning the bones of the Duke of Lorraine: because the convent of Charlieu swore that they believed them to have been translated to the house of Stürzelbronn, the General Chapter orders that in any one from either of the two houses now brings the question up in General Chapter, if he is an abbot, he is to be deposed without reconsideration, and if a monk, to be sent from that house, only to return with the permission of the General Chapter. The subprior however, through whom the house has been defamed, is never to be recalled.⁵⁰

It is important to note here that it is in no way clear if Frederick II of Lorraine was even moved to his ancestral monastery of Stürzelbronn. In many ways the issue is unresolved, even to the point that monastic officials and monks themselves face displacement from either of the respective houses if they dare to make the bones of the Duke of Lorraine live again. Once again, the statutes reveal the political splits within the

⁵⁰ *Statuta* I, 1219.63, p. 516. "De ossibus ducis Lotharingiae: quia iuravit conventus Clari loci quod credebant esse translata ad domum de Estorceborne, precipitur a capitulo generali ut si quis modo de utralibet domo super hoc in capitulo generali moverit questionem, si abbas fuerit, sine retactione deponatur, et si monachus, de domo illa emittatur, non nisi de licentia capituli generalis reversurus. Subprior autem, per quem domus diffamata fuit, numquam ulterius revocetur."

monastery of Charlieu. The General Chapter seems to have either recalled the abbot or come to believe that the subprior is the true source of fault. In any case, it is clear that in the case of the debate between Charlieu and Stürzelbronn that the thirteenth century was a period when the bodies of lords could influence the ways in which monastic houses viewed their own institutional identities and memories, eventually in this case become a wedge through which monastic houses could stand divided. The statutes of the Cistercian General Chapter can in this sense be viewed as a body of case law in which the beliefs of luminaries of the early Order such as Stephen Harding and Bernard of Clairvaux changed slowly over the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to accommodate the reality of memory politics between Cistercian houses and their lay neighbors.

The practice of honorably splitting the body after death had a long if patchy history among the military aristocracy by the thirteenth century. The lordly body itself serves as a central component of lineage maintenance throughout the period. As with any social practice in the high medieval period, single and multiple burial took on new meanings and new social force in a context when monastic orders like the Cistercians sought to restrict the memory culture of the aristocracy. As we have seen, the case law of the Cistercian General Chapter was in part shaped by the maneuverings of secular lords themselves, who sought to take advantage of the prestige of their Cistercian neighbors and gain internment within the enclosures of the white monks, directly challenging the

cultural dissonance of Cistercian conversion relative to old aristocratic memories and identities. Arguments over the burial of lordly corpses, inter-monastic intrigue, and the machinations of warrior aristocrats against the legislation of the Cistercian General Chapter is rare overall in the surviving documentation. The rarity of these cases belies their importance. Through their schemes and maneuvers, the warrior aristocracy gained a voice in the development of the Cistercian Order, its identity, and its legislation.

7. Conclusions – Memory Politics After 1300

This dissertation argues that this dialectic between monks and laypeople was in large part about forcefully claiming legacy and avoiding oblivion. As Danielle Westerhof has shown, multiple burial was even more popular with aristocratic patrons of the mendicant orders than it was for patrons of the Cistercians.⁵¹ The late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century papal bulls issued by Boniface VIII forbade the practice of multiple burial in part to issue a final end to the opportunistic use of corpses by the lay elite for the maintenance of their own legacies. As Elizabeth A. R. Brown has deftly argued, Boniface VIII issued the drafts of *detestande feritatis* for various and complex reasons, not the least of which was his own discomfort with his own death and his own

⁵¹ Danielle Westerhof, "Celebrating Fragmentation: The Presence of Aristocratic Body Parts in Monastic Houses in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century England" *Cîteaux: Commentarii cisterciensis* t. 56, fasc. 1-4 (2005), 43.

body.⁵² It is also worth noting that the bull itself was largely ineffective. Lay lords and patrons continued to split their corpses among different orders and communities in efforts to build their legacies. In a larger sense, *detestande feritatis* is a useful endpoint for this study because it showcases direct papal involvement in issues concerning the aristocratic body, its disposal, and concordant issues of legacy. After the 1300 reissue of the bull in the last years of Boniface VIII's tenure as pope, the papacy had a direct interest in enforcing and policing the division of the body by the aristocracy. In many senses these changes produced a shift in longstanding conversations about memory and the secular corpse. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the debates about burial and aristocratic legacies were the business of local patrons and houses. The direct intervention of the pope on these issues shifted the conversation to a different register. For these reasons, the early fourteenth century was a period in which lay lords seeking to build legacies with their bodies and tombs had to deal with the arguments of papal monarchy in ways that differed starkly from earlier periods.

⁵² Elizabeth A. R. Brown, "Authority, the Family, and the Dead in Late Medieval France," *French Historical Studies* 16: 4 (Fall 1990): 803-832. *Ibid.*, "Death and the Human Body in the later Middle Ages: the legislation of Boniface VIII on the division of the corpse," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 12 (1981): 221-270.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- Auguste Bernard and Alexandre Bruel. *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny*. 6 vols. Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France. Première série, Histoire politique. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1876.
- Bernard Lucet, ed. *La Codification Cistercienne de 1202 et Son Évolution Ulérieure*. Rome: Editiones cistercienses, 1964., 1964.
- Bernard, Marie-Bernard Saïd, and Bernard. *Sermons on Conversion*. The Cistercian Fathers Series, no. 25. Kalamazoo, Mich: Cistercian Publications, 1981.
- Bernardus, and Luca Robertini. *Liber Miraculorum Sancte Fidis*. Biblioteca Di "Medioevo Latino" 10. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto medioevo, 1994.
- Bruce, Scott G., ed. *The Penguin Book of the Undead: Fifteen Hundred Years of Supernatural Encounters*. New York: Penguin Books, 2016.
- Bruce, Scott G., and Christopher A. Jones, eds. *The Relatio Metrica de Duobus Ducibus: A Twelfth-Century Cluniac Poem on Prayer for the Dead*. Publications of the Journal of Medieval Latin 10. Turnhout: Brepols, 2016.
- Caesar Baronis and Odoricus Reynaldus, Annales Ecclesiastici, 34 Vols. (Lucca, 1738-1756)*.
- Caesarius of Heisterbach. *Caesarii Heisterbacensis Monachi Ordinis Cisterciensis Dialogus Miraculorum*. Edited by Joseph Strange. Cologne: Sumptibus J.M. Heberle (H. Lempertz), 1851.
- Catholic Church. "Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio ...," no. 36 v. (1759): 36.
- Dionysius, and Earnest Cary. *The Roman antiquities. 2: Books III - IV*. Reprinted. The Loeb Classical Library 347. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 2001.
- Dom P. de Monsabert, ed. *Chartes de l'abbaye de Nouaillé de 678 à 1200*. Poitiers: Société des archives historiques du Poitou, 1936.
- DuVal, John, ed. *The Song of Roland*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publications, 2012.

- Fischer, Bonifatius, and Robert Weber, eds. *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. Ed. quartam emendatam. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- François Villard, ed. *Recueil Des Documents Relatifs à l'abbaye de Montierneuf de Poitiers (1076-1319)*, Poitiers, 1973.
- Gerald of Wales. *The Historical Works of Giraldus Cambrensis, Containing: The Topography of Ireland, and The History of the Conquest of Ireland*. Edited by Thomas Forester. London: H. G. Bohn, 1863.
- Gregory of Tours. *The History of the Franks*. The Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth ; Baltimore : Penguin, 1974.
- Guibert, of Nogent. *Autobiographie*. Edited by Edmond René Labande. Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Age. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1981.
- Hermann Meinert, Johannes Ramackers, and Dietrich Lohrmann, eds. *Papsturkunden in Frankreich. Neue Folge*. 7 vols. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1972.
- Jackie Hall, Shelagh Sneddon and Nadine Sohr. "Table of Legislation Concerning the Burial of Laity and Other Patrons in Cistercian Abbeys." *Cîteaux: Commentarii Cisterciensis* 56, no. 1–4 (2005): 373–418.
- Jacquín, Gérard, Louis Halphen, and René Poupardin, eds. *Chronique des comtes d'Anjou*. Collection "Textes rares." Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2017.
- Joinville, Jean, and J. Monfrin. *Vie de Saint Louis*. Classiques Garnier. Paris: Dunod, 1995.
- Joseph-Maria Canivez, ed. *Statuta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis Ab Anno 1116 Ad Annum 1786*. Bibliothèque de La Revue d'histoire Ecclésiastique. Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1933.
- Lambert of Ardres. *The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres*. Edited by Leah Shopkow. The Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Liudprand, and Paolo Squatriti. *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona*. Edited by Paolo Squatriti. Medieval Texts in Translation. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.

- Map, Walter. *De Nugis Curialium : Courtiers' Trifles*. Edited by M. R. James, Christopher Brooke, and R. A. B. Mynors. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Migne, J.-P., and Chadwyck-Healey, Inc, eds. *Patrologia Latina database*. Alexandria, VA: Chadwyck-Healey, 1995.
- Newth, Michael A., ed. *Heroes of the French Epic: A Selection of Chansons de Geste*. Woodbridge, UK ; Rochester, N.Y: Boydell Press, 2005.
- Odilo of Cluny. *Liber tramitis aevi Odilonis Abbatis*. Edited by Peter Dinter. Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum, t. 10. Siegburg: Schmitt, 1980.
- Ordericus Vitalis. *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*. Edited by Marjorie Chibnall. 6 vols. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Peter the Venerable. *Petri Venerabilis Contra Petrobrusianos hereticos*. Edited by James Fearn. Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Medievalis 10. Turnholt: Brepols, 1968.
- Quintilianus, Marcus Fabius. *The institutio oratoria of Quintilian: in four volumes. 1: Books I - III*. Edited by H. E. Butler. Reprinted. The Loeb classical library 124. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1996.
- Reuter, Timothy, ed. *The Annals of Fulda*. Ninth-Century Histories, v. 2. Manchester ; New York : New York, NY, USA: Manchester University Press ; Distributed exclusively in the USA and Canada by St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Romanieux Zénaïde. "Édition d'un Manuscrit Autographe d'Adémar de Chabannes, BnF Lat. 2469, Ff. 76-112v. 23 Sermons et Du Compte-Rendu Du Concile de Limoges (18, 19, et 20 Novembre 1031)." École Nationale des Chartres, 2005.
- Suger of Saint-Denis. *The Deeds of Louis the Fat*. Edited by John Moorhead and Richard Cusimo. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1992.
- Suger of Saint Denis. *Vie de Louis VI Le Gros*. Edited by Henri Waquet. Paris: H. Champion, 1929.
- — —. *Vie de Louis VI Le Gros*. Edited by Henri Waquet. Paris: H. Champion, 1929.

Suzanne Duparc-Quioc. *La Chanson d'Antioche*. 2 vols. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste P. Guethner, 1976.

The Venerable, Peter. *Petri Cluniacensis Abbatis De miraculis libri duo*. Edited by Denise Bouthillier. Corpus Christianorum 83. Turnholti: Brepols, 1988.

Thietmar of Merseburg. *Die Chronik des Bischofs Thietmar von Merseburg und ihre Korveier Überarbeitung*, Edited by Robert Holtzmann. 1955.

Waddell, Chrysogonus, eds. *Twelfth-century statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter: Latin text with English notes and commentary*. Cîteaux. Commentarii cistercienses. Studia et documenta, v. 12. Brecht, Belgium: Cîteaux, Commentarii cistercienses, 2002.

William, of Malmesbury. *Gesta Regum Anglorum =: The History of the English Kings*. Edited by R. A. B. Mynors, Rodney M. Thomson, and Michael Winterbottom. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford ; New York: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Secondary Sources:

Alain Erlande-Brandenburg. *Le Roi Est Mort : Étude Sur Les Funérailles, Les Sépultures et Les Tombeaux Des Rois de France Jusqu'à La Fin Du 13e Siècle*. Geneva: Droz, 1975.

Ariès, Philippe. *The Hour of Our Death*. Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1982.

Barthélemy, Dominique, and Stephen D. White. "The 'Feudal Revolution.'" *Past & Present*, no. 152 (1996): 196–223.

Berman, Constance H. *The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe*. The Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Bernhardt, John William. *Itinerant Kingship and Royal Monasteries in Early Medieval Germany: C. 936-1075*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 4th ser., 21. Cambridge : New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Bogdan, Henry. *La Lorraine Des Ducs: Sept Siècles d'histoire*. Pour l'histoire. Paris: Perrin, 2005.

Bouchard, Constance Brittain. *Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in Twelfth-Century Burgundy*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1991.

- — —. *Rewriting Saints and Ancestors: Memory and Forgetting in France, 500-1200*. 1st ed. Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.
- — —. *Spirituality and Administration: The Role of the Bishop in Twelfth-Century Auxerre*. Speculum Anniversary Monographs 5. Cambridge, Mass: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1979.
- — —. *Strong of Body, Brave and Noble: Chivalry and Society in Medieval France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016.
- — —. *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980-1198*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- — —. *Those of My Blood: Constructing Noble Families in Medieval Francia*. The Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Bowman, Jeffrey A. "Do Neo-Romans Curse? Law, Land, and Ritual in the Midi (900-1100)." *Viator* 28 (1997): 1-32
- Bowman, Jeffrey A. *Shifting Landmarks: Property, Proof, and Dispute in Catalonia around the Year 1000*. Conjunctions of Religion & Power in the Medieval Past. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 2004.
- Brenner, Elma, Mary Franklin-Brown, and Meredith Cohen, eds. *Memory and Commemoration in Medieval Culture*. Farnham, Surrey, UK England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013.
- Brian Patrick McGuire. "Charity and Unanimity: The Invention of the Cistercian Order: A Review Article." *Citeaux: Commentarii Cisterciense* 51 (2000): 285–97.
- Brown, Elizabeth A R. "Authority, the Family, and the Dead in Late Medieval France." *French Historical Studies* 16, no. 4 (1990): 803-832.
- — —. "Death and the Human Body in the Later Middle Ages: The Legislation of Boniface VIII on the Division of the Corpse." *Viator* 12 (1981): 221.
- Brown, Peter. *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Enlarged edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2015.
- — —. *The Ransom of the Soul: Afterlife and Wealth in Early Western Christianity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2015.

- Bruun, Mette Birkedal, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*. Cambridge Companions to Religion. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Bruun, Mette Birkedal, and Stephanie Glaser, eds. *Negotiating Heritage: Memories of the Middle Ages*. Ritus et Artes : Traditions and Transformations 4. Turnhout : Abingdon: Brepols ; Marston [distributor], 2008.
- Bull, Marcus Graham. *Knightly Piety and the Lay Response to the First Crusade: The Limousin and Gascony, c. 970-c. 1130*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- — —. *The Miracles of Our Lady of Rocamadour: Analysis and Translation*. Woodbridge, Suffolk ; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 1999.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*. New York : Cambridge, Mass: Zone Books ; Distributed by the MIT Press, 1991.
- — —. *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200-1336*. Lectures on the History of Religions, new ser., no. 15. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- Caciola, Nancy. *Afterlives: The Return of the Dead in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017.
- Cahn, Walter. *Romanesque Bible Illumination*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Calmet, Augustin. *Histoire de Lorraine: Qui Comprend Ce Qui s'est Passé de plus Méorable Dans l'Archevêché de Trèves, & Dans Les Evêchés de Metz, Toul & Verdun, Depuis l'entrée de Jules César Dans Les Gaules, Jusqu'à La Cession de La Lorraine, Arrivée En 1737, Inclusivement: Avec Les Pièces Justificatives à La Fin, Le Tout Enrichi de Cartes Géographiques, de Plans de Villes & d'églises ... 7 v.* A Nancy: Chez A. Leseure, imprimeur ordinaire du Roy ..., 1745.
- Carruthers, Mary J. *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400 - 1200*. Reprinted. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 34. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999.
- Cassidy-Welch, Megan. *Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries*. Medieval Church Studies 1. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2001.

- Charles A. Kerin. *The Privation of Christian Burial: An Historical Synopsis and Commentary*. Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1941.
- Cheyette, Fredric L., and Howell Chickering. "Love, Anger, and Peace: Social Practice and Poetic Play in the Ending of Yvain." *Speculum* 80, no. 1 (2005): 75–117.
- Chibnall, Marjorie. *The World of Orderic Vitalis: Norman Monks and Norman Knights*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 1996.
- Chrysogonus Waddell. "The Myth of Cistercian Origins: C. H. Berman and the Manuscript Sources." *Citeaux: Commentarii Cistercienses* 51 (2000): 299–386.
- Clanchy, M. T. *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066-1307*. Electronic resource. 3rd ed. Chichester, West Sussex, UK ; Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Classen, Albrecht, ed. *Old Age in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to a Neglected Topic*. Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture 2. Berlin ; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.
- Clemens, Raymond, and Timothy Graham. *Introduction to Manuscript Studies*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. *Medieval Identity Machines*. Medieval Cultures, v. 35. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- Coleman, Janet. *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Crouch, David. *The Birth of Nobility: Constructing Aristocracy in England and France: 900-1300*. 1st ed. Harlow, England ; New York: Pearson/Longman, 2005.
- Cushing, Kathleen G. *Reform and the Papacy in the Eleventh Century: Spirituality and Social Change*. Manchester Medieval Studies. Manchester; New York : New York: Manchester University Press ; Distributed by Palgrave, 2005.
- D’Cruze, Shani, and Anupama Rao, eds. *Violence, Vulnerability and Embodiment: Gender and History*. Oxford, England: Blackwell, 2005.
- De Hamel, Christopher. *The Book: A History of the Bible*. London ; New York: 2001.

- Deliyannis, Deborah Mauskopf, ed. *Historiography in the Middle Ages*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Dietrich Poeck. "Laienbegrabnisse in Cluny." *Fruhmittelalterliche Studien* 15 (1981): 68–179.
- Enders, Jody May. *The Medieval Theater of Cruelty: Rhetoric, Memory, Violence*. 1. print. Cornell Paperbacks. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 2002.
- Evergates, Theodore. *The Aristocracy in the County of Champagne, 1100-1300*. The Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Fichtenau, Heinrich. *Living in the Tenth Century: Mentalities and Social Orders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Freed, John B. "Reflections on the Medieval German Nobility." *The American Historical Review* 91, no. 3 (1986): 553–75.
- Gabriel Fournier. *Le Peuplement Rural En Basse Auvergne Durant Le Haut Moyen Âge*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1962.
- Gadi Algazi. "Pruning Peasants: Private War and Maintaining the Lords' Peace in Late Medieval Germany." Edited by Ester Cohen, Mayke de Jong. *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, 2001, 245–74.
- Gaposchkin, M. Cecilia. *Invisible Weapons: Liturgy and the Making of Crusade Ideology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017.
- Gates, Jay Paul, and Nicole Marafioti, eds. *Capital and Corporal Punishment in Anglo-Saxon England*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 23. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2014.
- Gaunt, Simon, and Sarah Kay, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval French Literature*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Geary, Patrick J. *Furta Sacra: Thefts of Relics in the Central Middle Ages*. Rev. ed. Princeton Paperbacks. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- — —. *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages*. 2. printing. Medieval Studies Religion, Anthropology. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1996.

- — —. *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Genevieve Steele Edwards. "Ritual Excommunication in Medieval France and England, 900-1200." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1997.
- Georges Duby. *La Société Aux Xie et XIe Siècles Dans La Région Mâconnais*. Paris, 1953.
- — —. "Structures de Parenté et Noblesse, France Du Nord, XI-XII Siècles." In *Miscellanea Medievalia in Memoriam Jan Frederik Niermeyer*. Gröningen, 1967.
- Gittos, Helen, and Sarah Hamilton, eds. *Understanding Medieval Liturgy: Essays in Interpretation*. Farnham Burlington, Vt: Ashgate, 2016.
- Hall, Jackie, and Christine Kratzke. *Sepulturae Cistercienses Sépulture, Mémoire et Patronage Dans Les Monastères Cisterciens Au Moyen Âge = Burial, Memorial and Patronage in Medieval Cistercian Monasteries = Grablegen, Memoria Und Patronatswesen in Mittelalterlichen Zisterzienserklöstern*. Forges-Chimay: Citeaux commentarii cistercienses, 2005.
- Head, Thomas, and Richard Landes, eds. *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- Hollister, C. Warren. "Royal Acts of Mutilation: The Case against Henry I." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 10, no. 4 (1978): 330–40.
- Howe, John. "The Nobility's Reform of the Medieval Church." *The American Historical Review* 93, no. 2 (April 1988): 317.
- Iogna-Prat, Dominique. *Order & Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism, and Islam, 1000-1150*. Conjunctions of Religion & Power in the Medieval Past. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- Jaeger, C. Stephen. *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200*. Middle Ages Series. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1994.
- Jaser, Christian. *Ecclesia Maledicens: Rituelle Und Zeremonielle Exkommunikationsformen Im Mittelalter*. Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation = Studies in the Late Middle Ages, Humanism and the Reformation 75. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

- Karl Schmid. "Welfisches Selbstverständnis." Edited by Josef Fleckerstein, Karl Schmid. *Adel Und Kirche: Gerd Tellenbach Zum 65 Geburtstag Dargebracht von Freunden Und Schülereen*, 1986.
- Kay, Sarah. *The Chansons de Geste in the Age of Romance: Political Fictions*. Oxford [England] : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Kennelly, Dolorosa. "Medieval Towns and the Peace of God." *Medievalia et Humanistica : An American Journal for the Middle Ages and Renaissance* 0, no. 15 (1963): 35.
- Kirkham, Anne, and Cordelia Warr, eds. *Wounds in the Middle Ages. The History of Medicine in Context*. Farnham, Surrey ; Burlington, VT USA: Ashgate, 2014.
- Kotecki, Radosław, and Jacek Maciejewski, eds. *Ecclesia et Violentia: Violence against the Church and Violence within the Church in the Middle Ages*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.
- Koziol, Geoffrey. *The Peace of God. Past Imperfect*. Leeds: Arc Humanities Press, 2018.
- Lambert, and Leah Shopkow. *The History of the Counts of Guines and Lords of Ardres. The Middle Ages Series*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001.
- Laqueur, Thomas Walter. *The Work of the Dead: A Cultural History of Mortal Remains*. First paperback printing. Princeton, NJ Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2018.
- Lauwers, Michel. *La Mémoire Des Ancêtres, Le Souci Des Morts: Morts, Rites, et Société Au Moyen Age: Diocèse de Liège, XIe-XIIIe Siècles*. Théologie Historique 103. Paris: Beauchesne, 1997.
- Le Goff, Jacques. *The Birth of Purgatory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Leclercq, Jean, and Claire Lavoie. *Bernard of Clairvaux and the Cistercian Spirit*. Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1979.
- Lellia Cracco Ruggini. "Mutilation of the Self: Cutting off Fingers or Ears as a Protest in Antiquity." *Atti Della Accademia Nazionale Dei Lincei: Rendiconti. Classe Di Scienze Morali, Storiche, et Filologiche* 9, no. 3 (1998): 375–85.
- Little, Lester K. *Benedictine Maledictions: Liturgical Cursing in Romanesque France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

- Liudprand, and Paolo Squatriti. *The Complete Works of Liudprand of Cremona*. Medieval Texts in Translation. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 2007.
- Lord, Albert B. *Singer of Tales: Third Edition*. 76. 76. Harvard University Press, 2017.
- Loud, G. A., and Jochen Schenk, eds. *The Origins of the German Principalities, 1100-1350: Essays by German Historians*. London ; New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2017.
- Lyon, Jonathan Reed. *Princely Brothers and Sisters: The Sibling Bond in German Politics, 1100-1250* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.
- Malegam, Jehangir Yezdi. *The Sleep of Behemoth: Disputing Peace and Violence in Medieval Europe, 1000-1200*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.
- Matthew Vivas. "La Privation de Sépulture Au Moyen Âge. L'exemple de La Province Ecclésiastique de Bordeaux (Xe Début Du XIVe Siècles)." PhD dissertation, Université de Poitiers, 2012.
- McGuire, Brian Patrick. *Bernard of Clairvaux: An Inner Life*. Ithaca [New York]: Cornell University Press, 2020.
- McLaughlin, Megan. *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Megan Cassidy-Welch. "Emotion, Place, and Memory at the Royal Abbey of St Denis." In *Performing Emotions in Early Europe*, edited by P. Maddern, J. McEwan, and A. M. Scott, 185–99. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2018.
- Michael E. Moore. "The Body of Pope Formosus." *Millenium. Jahrbuch Zu Kultur Und Geschichte Des Ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. / Yearbook on the Culture and History of the First Millennium C. E.* 9 (2012): 277–97.
- Miller, Maureen C. *Clothing the Clergy: Virtue and Power in Medieval Europe, c. 800-1200*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2014.
- Neuschel, Kristen Brooke. *Living by the Sword: Weapons and Material Culture in France and Britain, 600-1600*. Ithaca, [New York]: Cornell University Press, 2020.
- Paul, Nicholas. "The Chronicle of Fulk Le Réchin: A Reassessment." *Haskins Society Journal* 18 (2007): 19–35.

- — —. *To Follow in Their Footsteps: The Crusades and Family Memory in the High Middle Ages*. Ithaca : London: Cornell University Press, 2013.
- Paxton, Frederick S. *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Poly, Jean-Pierre, and Eric Bournazel. *The Feudal Transformation: 900-1200*. Europe Past and Present Series. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1991.
- Poull, Georges. *La Maison Ducale de Lorraine Devenue La Maison Impériale et Royale d'Autriche, de Hongrie et de Bohême*. Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1991.
- Remensnyder, Amy G. *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Reuter, Timothy. *Germany in the Early Middle Ages, c. 800-1056*. London ; New York: Longman, 1991.
- Reuter, Timothy, and Chris Wickham. "The 'Feudal Revolution.'" *Past & Present*, no. 155 (1997): 177–208.
- Robinson, I. S. *Henry IV of Germany, 1056-1106*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Romanieux Zénaïde. "Édition d'un Manuscrit Autographe d'Adémar de Chabannes, BnF Lat. 2469, Ff. 76-112v. 23 Sermons et Du Compte-Rendu Du Concile de Limoges (18, 19, et 20 Novembre 1031)." École Nationale des Chartres, 2005.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H., ed. *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- — —. *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909-1049*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H., Thomas Head, and Sharon Farmer. "Monks and Their Enemies: A Comparative Approach." *Speculum* 66, no. 4 (1991): 764–96.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H., and Lester K. Little, eds. *Debating the Middle Ages: Issues and Readings*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.

- Sarah Hamilton. "Medieval Curses and Their Uses." *Haskins Society Journal* 30 (2018): 21–51.
- Schmitt, Jean-Claude. *Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Shopkow, Leah. *History and Community: Norman Historical Writing in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Washington, D.C: Catholic University of America Press, 1997.
- Sommerfeldt, John R., and Western Michigan University, eds. *Erudition at God's Service*. Studies in Medieval Cistercian History 11. Kalamazoo, Mich: Cistercian Publications, 1987.
- Spiegel, Gabrielle M. *Romancing the Past: The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France*. The New Historicism 23. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- — —. *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography*. Parallax. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Strawberry Hill Conference, and Christopher Harper-Bill, eds. *Papers from the First and Second Strawberry Hill Conferences: Held in the Spring of 1983 and 1984*. The Ideals and Practice of Medieval Knighthood, Vol. 1. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1986.
- Tracy, Larissa, and Kelly DeVries, eds. *Wounds and Wound Repair in Medieval Culture*. Explorations in Medieval Culture, volume 1. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2015.
- Tuten, Belle S., Stephen D. White, and Tracey L. Billado, eds. *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White*. Farnham, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub, 2010.
- Van Houts, Elisabeth M. C. *Memory and Gender in Medieval Europe, 900-1200*. Toronto ; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- Vivas, Mathieu. "Christian Burial Privation in the Middle Ages: An Interdisciplinary Approach (France, Mid-10th–Early 14th)," no. 12 (2019).
- Vodola, Elisabeth. *Excommunication in the Middle Ages*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

- Waddell, Chrysogonus, and Cistercians, eds. *Twelfth-century statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter: Latin text with English notes and commentary*. Cîteaux. Commentarii cistercienses. Studia et documenta, v. 12. Brecht, Belgium: Cîteaux, Commentarii cistercienses, 2002.
- Westerhof, Danielle. *Death and the Noble Body in Medieval England*. Woodbridge ; Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2008.
- Whalen, Brett Edward. *The Medieval Papacy*. Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Wheatley, Edward. *Stumbling Blocks before the Blind: Medieval Constructions of a Disability*. Corporealities: Discourses of Disability. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2010.
- White, Stephen D. *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to Saints: The Laudatio Parentum in Western France, 1050-1150*. Studies in Legal History. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.
- White, Stephen D. "Feuding and Peace-Making in the Tourraine around the Year 1100." *Traditio* 42 (1986): 195–263.
- Wilson, Stephen, ed. *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Wright, N. T. *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. 1st North American ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Biography

Jonathan Sapp attended the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, graduating in 2011 with a Bachelor's in History and Classical Studies. From 2011 to 2013 Jonathan attended the University of Akron, graduating with a Master's in History in 2013.