

Introduction: withdrawal and engagement

METTE BIRKEDAL BRUUN AND
EMILIA JAMROZIAK

How are we to comprehend the Cistercian Order? How do we examine and represent a phenomenon which has existed for over 900 years and spread across the world, which has built monumental architecture and produced a wide array of texts, tilled land and cultivated minds, seen schisms and sought concord? How do we grasp the basic tenor, the fluctuations, the varied responses to widely different conditions within one overall scholarly framework?

An influential trend in Cistercian scholarship has viewed the history of the White Monks as a tug-of-war between 'ideals' and 'reality'. The assumption is that the Order was founded on a set of ideals, crystallised in twelfth-century legislation and foundation narratives: lofty aspirations – whether for isolation from the world and its ways, for repudiation of tithes, ownership of serfs and other allegedly corrupting practices or for harmony and uniformity within the Order and its communities. The reality is, then, all those factors which cause appropriation, modulation and abolition of these ideals, synchronically as well as diachronically: local conditions, extramural powers, pragmatism or the impact of individual figures. Louis Lekai, seminally, set the dichotomy as a motto for his momentous *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (1977) and, in a definitive article, employed the collision between ideals and reality as a key to the dating of the Cistercian decline: the Order's fourteenth-century fall from its initial ideals, pushed by the overpowering force of reality.¹ Seen in this light, ideals become synonymous with 'true Cistercianness' in the shape of unanimity, strictness and absence of ambiguity, whereas reality stands for distortion, deviation and equivocation.

Recent scholarship has challenged Lekai's dichotomy. There is a growing sense that its robust segregation produces a fragmented understanding of the Cistercian history and culture.² But much remains to be done if we want to understand the complexity of the Order, its history and its relation to society without losing sight of its fundamental ideas:

if we want to examine, in an integrated way, its matter without neglecting its spirit – and vice versa.

The Cistercian Order is multifaceted, and the field of Cistercian studies is broad and complex. One of the roads to an integrated approach to the White Monks goes by way of consciousness of the different disciplinary approaches, their interrogatory horizons and scholarly aims. Riding roughshod over nuances and specialisations, we may divide Cistercian studies into two overall approaches: two groups of scholars with different objectives, methodologies and questions for the material. Each of the groups is too heterogeneous to be seen as a single scholarly unit, school or tradition, but let us, briefly and for the sake of overview, consider the composite corpus of Cistercian scholarship as two distinct approaches.

One approach, involving historians, archaeologists and historians of architecture and art, focuses on organisation and materiality, on Cistercian life as it was lived at a particular time and place. These scholars study their material in its historical and physical context as shaped by contemporary conditions. They search for the political, economic, social and spiritual *Sitz-im-Leben* of the Cistercians' texts, buildings and artefacts, and their search may be informed by theories formulated within, for example, sociology, anthropology and cultural studies. This approach has brought forth studies of watermills and granges, of individual houses and their edifices, and it has fostered monastic archaeology as a specific discipline.³ Twentieth-century pioneers are scholars such as the British historian David Knowles (1896–1974) and the American historian Bennett D. Hill (1934–2005), whose specialised research focused on particular national or regional aspects.

Earlier generations of scholarship took their cue directly from the Cistercian legislation and material remains, but since the 1970s a broader variety of sources have been employed to throw light on the Order and its handling of land, buildings, production and societal relations. This change of focus has come with a shift from an interest in unity to an interest in diversity – and with an ambition to comprehend the medieval idea of unity in diversity.

The other approach, represented by historians, theologians, philologists and literary scholars, centres on the spiritual world and religious mentality of the White Monks. These scholars study the handling of the biblical and patristic legacy and examine the Cistercians as students and teachers of doctrinal issues such as the image of God in man or the relationship between Fall, restoration and beatitude, and they examine differences in the teaching of, for example, Bernard of Clairvaux,

William of Saint Thierry and Aelred of Rievaulx. Their methodological tools come from philology, rhetoric, literary studies, philosophy and theology, and a considerable portion of their work has been carried out in connection with editions and translations.

Some of these scholars are concerned with the systematisation of spiritual categories such as the Bernardine degrees of love, and they seek more or less coherent representations of the spiritual worldview that underpins Cistercian life. The French historian of philosophy Étienne Gilson (1884–1978) may be considered a founding figure for such a systematising approach.⁴ Others are interested in the Cistercian texts as palimpsests of biblical, liturgical and patristic utterances, rhetorically complex and carefully edited. Scholarly foundations for this approach have been laid by, for example, the Dutch philologist Christine Mohrmann (1903–88) and the Benedictine scholar Jean Leclercq (1911–93).⁵ The issues studied in this scholarly area are examined as themes which have been conceptualised and formulated in a specific intellectual and religious climate, but connections can also be traced across centuries in, for example, a search for Augustinian influences, ruptures and continuities in anthropology and ecclesiology across the Christian tradition, or the reception of biblical phrases through liturgical texts. Focus is directed to systems of belief as well as to linguistic, rhetorical and literary structures.

Evidently interests overlap: scholars concerned with legislation look at religious motivation and rhetorical strategies; scholars orientated towards spirituality may take manuscript traditions and the material embeddedness of spiritual principles into consideration. The idea is not to make strict divisions but to sketch various perspectives within Cistercian studies.

A central motif in Cistercian scholarship is the tension between withdrawal and engagement, between the wilderness and the world. On the one hand, foundation narratives and legislation state repeatedly that the White Monks must found, and do found, their houses in inhospitable areas far from human habitation. On the other hand, historical and archaeological evidence attests to an abundance of cases where Cistercians appropriated land which was already cultivated, or took over existing monastic houses; and charters, wills and letters point to a wide range of interactions between abbeys and the surrounding society.

At a first glance, the tension between wilderness and engagement may seem like a case of ‘ideals’ versus ‘reality’: as if the Cistercians aspired to withdrawal from society but in reality succumbed to engagement with it. In fact, withdrawal and engagement are two sides of one

and the same thing: the Cistercian ethos in its field of tension between earthly life and heavenly beatitude, between the monastic tradition and the conditions of a specific time and place and between the individual houses and the Cistercian Order at large – at a given moment and across the ages.

It takes both approaches to understand this ethos. The idea of the wilderness is soon dissolved if examined from the point of view of physical and material conditions. But if considered as a 'written world', the trope of the wilderness abounds in information about the Cistercians – and information about their societal relations too. Engagement is best approached from a perspective attuned to social exchange, authority and power. When examined from this angle, it does in fact turn out that the Cistercian engagement with the world hinges on both significant spiritual factors and elements central to the monastic tradition.

MBB/EJ

WITHDRAWAL

Older historical scholarship took the Cistercian wilderness mythology at face value. But in the 1980s the narrative of the Cistercian settlement in the desert was increasingly contested and it has now been abandoned, owing to archaeological evidence, the redating of key documents and a less literal reading of the narrative sources.⁶ After this turn, the Cistercian claim that the Order settles in the wilderness has appeared somewhat dubious. The suspicion of hypocrisy is not new. It was voiced already by Walter Map, ever critical of the Order:

So they choose a proper place to abide in, a place not uninhabitable but inhabited, clean, fertile, responsive to tillage, receptive of crops ... a place outside the world in the heart of the world, remote from men in the midst of men, as wishing not to know the world yet to be known of it.⁷

But how are the references to Cistercian solitude to be understood if we want to move beyond scepticism? Ernst Robert Curtius has already warned us that medieval descriptions of landscapes are permeated by rhetorical principles and elements inherited from Antiquity.⁸ Seen in this light, it is unsurprising that the representations of Cistercian sites are shaped less by topographical than by rhetorical factors. When dealing with Cistercian descriptions of wildernesses, we are not looking at physical circumstances or literal meaning, but at the spiritual and rhetorical mentality of the Order – in Waddell's words: a spiritual climate,

in Newman's: a metaphorical condition⁹ This is a condition imbued with the language of the Bible and the early Christian Fathers.

In *Exordium Cistercii* from the mid or late 1130s (that is, the second generation of the Order),¹⁰ Robert of Molesme and his monks are described as purposeful *milites Christi* (soldiers of Christ):

After many labors, therefore, and exceedingly great difficulties ... they at length attained their desire and arrived at Cîteaux – at that time a place of horror and of vast solitude. But judging that the harshness of the place was not at variance with the strict purpose they had already conceived in mind, the soldiers of Christ held the place as truly prepared for them by God: a place as agreeable as their purpose was dear.¹¹

The place is in concordance with their aim. The passage hinges on the phrase *locum tunc scilicet horroris et vastæ solitudinis* ('at that time a place of horror and of vast solitude') from Deuteronomy 32.10, which was to become a key reference in Cistercian foundation narratives.¹² In its biblical context the phrase alludes to the desert where God sustained his people during their forty years of wandering. In *Exordium Cistercii* it conveys the hostility of the terrain (which did in fact accommodate a chapel, a cabin for three serfs and a main road),¹³ but in a way which lifts the site into a typologically tinged sphere.

The conglomeration of desert asceticism and *militia Christi* harks back to the Egyptian Desert Fathers, and the text makes the Cistercian founders heirs to both Moses, the desert-wanderer, and Anthony, the paradigmatic fourth-century hermit. Such aspirations belong to the second generation of Cistercians rather than the first,¹⁴ but when ascribing them to the first generation, the authors secure a connection between themselves, the founders, the early Christian Fathers and the biblical text. Their portrait of the wilderness of Cîteaux and its cultivation posits a past for the Order, which is in keeping with its mid-twelfth-century present and constructs a topographical antecedent in harmony with the Order's ethos at this point. Later foundation narratives took the cue and thus stressed the association of new houses with the primordial foundation at Cîteaux.

The wilderness hovers between the literal and the metaphorical. It represents the site and may take its bearings from a physical topography, but its key function is to point out spiritual and ascetic co-ordinates. The wilderness is a pliant narrative topos. On the one hand, it brings with it a cluster of basic implications: withdrawal from society and exposure to harsh climates and hostile forces. On the other hand, it is

easily modulated and transferred: the sylvan thickets or soggy marshlands of Western Europe can readily be seen as analogous to the stony desert of Thebes, the habitat of the Desert Fathers, or to the unspecified desert of Exodus. The wilderness may even be invested with different qualitative nuances: it can be hostile and diabolic, but it can also be contemplatively flavoured and indicate proximity to God.

In short, the wilderness is a topos, which connotes the weight of legitimacy and the power of uniformity; it is stamped with the mark of constancy that comes with prescriptive and normative genres. The idea of the wilderness links Cistercians everywhere and at all times to a legacy and a 'foundation mythology'. But at the same time it functions as a repository of various characteristics and implications, and it may easily be adapted to different circumstances and rhetorical needs.

Already the two foundation narratives *Exordium Cistercii* and *Exordium Parvum* represent two different shades of wilderness representations. They agree that the nature of Cîteaux was hostile and uninhabitable and thus in concord with the ascetic aim of Robert and his companions. They also agree that no sooner had the monks reached the wild than they began to cut it down and create a monastic civilisation. But whereas *Exordium Cistercii* stresses the *militia Christi* motif, *Exordium Parvum*, which dates from before 1147, directs its focus to the life of the men of God (*virī Dei*) in its contrast to secular life:

Understanding upon arrival that the more despicable and unapproachable the place was to seculars, the more suited it was for the monastic observance they had already conceived in mind, and for which sake they had come there, the men of God, after cutting down and removing the dense grove and thornbushes, began to construct a monastery there.¹⁵

The place is fitting because it is the exact opposite of the world, just as Cistercian life in its orientation towards God – as envisaged by the founders, according to the second-generation authors – is the exact opposite of secular life.

Surprisingly, perhaps, Bernard of Clairvaux is no great champion of the wilderness. He associates the desert with the life of the hermit as opposed to the cenobitic (communal) life in the monastery, and he warns against it. To a nun in Troyes, who was tempted by the hermitage, he writes, for example: 'For anyone wishing to lead a bad life the desert supplies ample opportunity. The woods afford cover, and solitude assures silence.'¹⁶ But it is telling of the flexibility of the topos that

when he does describe the Cistercian monastery as a desert, it is a desert which is almost unrecognisable as such:

The southern region is the cloister or the desert ... and the 'southern plain' [Gen. 13.1] represents the communal life, a spiritual mode of living among good people. The paradise of the cloister, facing the sweet mildness of the favourable south wind, flourishes, as it were, with as many flowers as it abounds in virtues.¹⁷

Bernard turns the desert into a blossoming paradise; nonetheless, it retains an associative connection to the basic idea of the Cistercians as desert-dwellers.

Whenever there is a need to assert monastic legitimacy, the foundation is called upon. It is typical that Armand-Jean de Rancé's (1626–1700) reform at La Trappe engendered not only a renewed interest in the Rule of Benedict and its proper meaning, but also an evocation of the wilderness topos and its inherent link to the origin of the Order. Two examples will suffice. La Trappe was founded in the 1140s, and Rancé was not a cultivator in the same way as the first founders. Nonetheless, the official visitor Dominique Georges, abbot of Val-Richer, comes close to making such a claim in the report he presented to the General Chapter in 1686. In the section dedicated to the material state of the monastery, Georges describes La Trappe before and after Rancé's reform. The 'before' conjures up a wilderness, which is the consequence of material and spiritual decay: nature is creeping in and has overtaken monastic civilisation – a well-known topos of deterioration.¹⁸ The passage is so vivid that we almost forget that Georges's visitation took place in November 1685, more than twenty years after the situation he describes:

When entering the cloister you saw a completely ruined roof, which, at the slightest rainfall, would cause flooding of the cloister ... parlours served as stables for the horses. The refectory was a refectory in name only. Monks and seculars gathered there to play *boules* when heat or bad weather prevented them from playing outside. The dormitory was abandoned and uninhabited; it served as a retreat only for night birds ... The monastery had no garden; it was surrounded by poor soil, in which grew thorns, bushes and trees. But the worst thing was that, owing to the highway built around a hundred years earlier close to the monastic walls, you saw nothing there but vagabonds, criminals and assassins. Men and women gathered in the woods nearby and there, as in a safe haven, hid to commit every sort of crime.¹⁹

Rancé had the highway relocated and thus reinforced the withdrawal by, so to speak, moving the world further away. The passage describes the wild muddle of animals, climatic elements, plants and vices allegedly disciplined by the reformer. In his portrait of the transformation of this Babylonian anarchy into an orderly and well-structured civilisation, Georges brings Rancé's reform close to the foundation at Cîteaux despite widely different circumstances. The visitor was countering the internal scepticism as to the reform voiced at the General Chapter of 1684 and elsewhere; the wilderness topos corroborates his comprehensive vindication of its genuine Cistercian character.²⁰

In 1670, sixteen years before Georges's report, Louis XIV's historiographer André Félibien des Avaux visited La Trappe.²¹ He penned his impressions in a *carte de visite*, the *Description de l'abbaye de la Trappe*, which was printed in several editions and translated into English. Félibien recounts his first impression of the scenery with verve:

This monastery is situated in a wide valley, and the forest and the hills that surround it are so positioned that they seem to want to hide it from the rest of the world. They ... make access so difficult that it is hard to get there without the directions of a guide. There once was a road from Mortagne to Paris that ran behind the garden walls ... the Abbot had it redirected so that the surroundings of their monastery were less frequented. Thus there is nothing more desolate than this desert. And even though there are several towns and villages around it at a distance of three leagues, it seems that one is in an unknown region in another country.²²

La Trappe remains a wilderness, but the tenor of Félibien's wilderness differs significantly from Georges's. It is represented as so far removed from the world that it almost seems to hover in a tension between absence and presence.

In fact, hundreds of visitors travelled to La Trappe each year,²³ and it is difficult not to agree with the nineteenth-century theologian and abolitionist Mary Schimmelpenninck's dry remark:

It is repeatedly said that, on an average, this seclusion is visited by six thousand strangers every year; and that from 12 to 15 hundred poor are fed there ... twice every week. It seems difficult to conceive how a road can be untracked, which is passed a hundred and sixty thousand times every year.²⁴

But, again, the description is about spiritual temper rather than topographical layout. Rancé's reform revolved around withdrawal from

the world through penitence, silence and fasting; the *carte de visite* is permeated by this drift which, in Félibien's version, makes for joyful tranquility. The description of the wilderness which accommodates the monastery chimes in with the visitor's overall description of the ascetic regime at La Trappe as a serene haven: it is a place in harmony with the spirit of the reform.

Félibien's text was sometimes paired with an apocryphal volume of regulations and thus made to serve an internal purpose for the monks of La Trappe.²⁵ But it was written for an external addressee, Jeanne de Schomberg, duchesse de Liancourt (1600–1674), who belonged to the lay entourage of Port-Royal. The historiographer begins his description with a concession: 'Madame, it is not without reason that I fear not to be able to satisfy entirely your pious curiosity, for I have difficulties making you a description of La Trappe which corresponds to the elevated idea one must have of it.'²⁶ Félibien portrays both La Trappe and his own awe of its life while feeding the duchess's vision of austere penance. His aesthetically flavoured representation of the severe isolation of La Trappe caters to a taste for penitential piousness and solitude which was in fashion among the duchess and her peers.²⁷ People talked about Rancé and La Trappe, and the monastery and its reformer seem to have qualified as interesting news; for example, Marie Dupré attached a *carte de visite* from La Trappe to a letter to the comte de Bussy-Rabutin alongside gossip about deaths, love affairs and new admissions to the Academy.²⁸

Rancé maintained a comprehensive correspondence and offered moral instruction to men and women, lay as well as religious.²⁹ Many aristocrats came to the monastery for retreats, partaking for a while in its withdrawal from society. The guests were met with signboards instructing them not to address the monks and later had their own refectory so as not to disturb the community. They were lodged immediately outside the walls in the former abbatial lodge with its own garden (a favourite retreat for Louis XIV's cousin, Mme de Guise), in an apartment which traversed the wall or more centrally next to the lay brothers' quarters.³⁰ Together with Rancé's extensive correspondence and reputed charisma, representations such as Félibien's extended the penitential spirit of La Trappe beyond the monastic walls, thus, as it were, inverting the withdrawal it celebrated. For the king it even became possible to pay a virtual visit to La Trappe by way of a model (fourteen by sixteen feet), complete with needy people at the gate made of enamel, with fruit trees and flowers made of silk. It was offered to the monarch in 1708 with the words: 'Now your Majesty can visit this famous monastery in one glance.'³¹

There are five centuries between the uninhabitable thickets of the foundation narratives and Bernard's allegorical desert-paradise on the one hand and Georges's Babylonian chaos and Félibien's peaceful solitude on the other. There are differences of genre between the foundation texts, the draft sermon, the visitation report and the description intended for an aristocratic laywoman. There are differences of historical context between the twelfth-century textual consolidation of a successful Order, or the rhetorical mastery of its primary figure, and the texts written in the seventeenth-century cultural and religious climate with its particular aesthetic and penitential preferences and the specific textual needs provoked by Rancé's reform. Finally, there are significant differences between the wildernesses represented; from the impenetrable vegetation of Cîteaux to the flowery fertility in Bernard's text, from the degeneracy and villainy of La Trappe before Rancé to the placid isolation that, according to Félibien, came after. Nonetheless, they all qualify as wildernesses. Each of these representations of a monastic site makes a claim to an overall desert mythology that connotes ascetic estrangement from the world and spiritual aspiration for the love of God. They all play a part in the construction of uniformity, coherence and legitimacy, but they also represent widely different individual emphases and adaptations.

As Félibien's *carte de visite* shows, the written wildernesses are not only employed to reinforce the internal coherence of the Order. Paradoxically, the solitude, this icon of isolation, may also play a role in the engagement of the monastery with the surrounding society – and in the engagement of this society with the monastery.

MBB

ENGAGEMENT

The withdrawal from the world is only half of the Cistercian story. Engagement and service to the world was just as important as being 'in the desert'. The nature of the Cistercian obligations to the wider society and the connections resulting from them was a subject carefully rethought and reshaped by the Cistercian leaders. The precise form of the monastic engagement in the individual abbeys was linked to the character of different regions and localities and strongly rooted in the pre-existing monastic traditions and expectations of the lay world.

The central role of the monks has always been to intercede on behalf of the world, a tradition of which Cistercian were a part. At the core of the monastic–lay relationships was the reciprocity in the form

of material support given to the monasteries in return for the prayers. By giving donations to the monasteries lay people acknowledge the ideals and vocations, which they themselves could not attain, but through their material gifts they could directly benefit from monks' prayers and good works.³² Sometimes the grant from a lay person was accompanied by counter-gift from the monks for the donor, which marked the formation of the reciprocity obligation. It was usually a small amount of money, an object, a pair of gloves or cloak, or more valuable items such as a horse or cow, which not only represented the good will of the monks, but were also a symbolic representation of the transfer of property and promise of prayers. The counter-gift emphasised the lasting nature of the relationship resulting from the donation. When given to the close relatives of the donors, especially children or spouses, they were meant to prevent their objections to the alienation of the family inheritance.³³ We can find examples of substantial counter-gifts for the relatives of the donors in many parts of Europe. In Burgundy a late twelfth-century grant of pasture to Reigny Abbey was accompanied by a series of counter-gifts to the relatives of the donor. His wife received a cow, his oldest son a brooch, his second son a cape and each of his daughters two *sol-di*.³⁴ In the charters of grants to Yorkshire Cistercian houses in the twelfth and thirteenth century we find relatively frequent references to the circumstances of the counter gift – the donors received them because of 'necessity' or even 'pressing necessity', so a fairly substantial counter-gift allowed them to become benefactors of a Cistercian monastery even if their resources were very limited.³⁵ Donations accompanied by counter-gifts were not 'secret sales', but even outright sales to a monastery were believed to provide spiritual benefits. In the eyes of the monks and the laity alike, material and spiritual gains were not mutually exclusive.

The donation ceremony, a solemn ritual, was a method of strengthening the security and permanency of the grant. It was a common practice across Europe that the donor, his family, kin group, witnesses, local people, the abbot and representatives of the monastic community took a walk along the boundaries of the donated land (known as the *perambulation*), often marking it in some way, for example by crosses cut on the trees, later replaced by permanent stone markers. In this way the line was entrusted to the memory of the locality as the agreed boundary in order to prevent future conflicts. At the time of the emergence of the Cistercian Order the use of charters was already fairly widespread in Western Europe, whilst in Central-Eastern Europe in the twelfth

century charters became increasingly important and valued as legal proof of rights to a property. The charters were sealed by both the recipient and the donors, if he, or she, had their own seal. A further solemn act of the donation ceremony required donors to place the charter of grant on the high altar of the abbey as a promise that its terms would not be broken. It was one of the very few situations when a lay person was allowed into the most sacred space of the Cistercian church, which was normally out of bounds to outsiders. The act, on one hand, gave a sense of prestige and privilege, and on the other, evoked the fear of ecclesiastical punishment if the grant was revoked.

The circle of benefactors and neighbours who formed a sphere of the abbey's friends and supporters was very important in the life of any Cistercian community. The bond was particularly valued if there was continuity over several generations. Neighbours and friends frequently witnessed charters issued by and for the abbey. Even when such individuals ceased to be active benefactors themselves, their presence as witnesses was a manifestation of their continuing support. As in any human relationship, the links between Cistercian houses and lay people were subject to change. There never was a perfect uniformity in the attitudes of particular families or kin groups within the same generation and across time. As Constance Bouchard describes it, 'the laymen, especially with the change in the generations, had a continually shifting view of what their relationship could or should be'.³⁶ With the decrease in land donations in the thirteenth century in most of Western Europe, the support for Cistercian houses was manifested by the witnessing already mentioned, smaller piecemeal donations, exchanges of property, grants of objects, especially church furnishings, windows, liturgical vessels, vestments or books.

Within the monastic tradition there were a number of established forms of liturgical commemoration, which the Cistercians continued. One of the oldest practices was writing down the names of individuals in special books. Such volumes (or sometimes rolls) are named differently by the historians – *libri vitae*, *libri mortuorum*, obituary or mortuary rolls or necrologies – but the function was the same: commemorating friends and supporters of an abbey. Prayers for the dead were not only an obligation on the living, but also helped to create ties between monasteries and subsequent generations of benefactors' families and were the key element of the reciprocity circle. The Cistercian Order inherited a long and established Benedictine tradition of commemoration, which Cluniac houses had developed further – not only performing daily liturgy for the benefit of an ever-growing number of individuals, but also

distributing charity to the poor in the name of their dead benefactors and friends.³⁷

The Cistercians introduced radical changes to this burdensome custom. They abolished the principle of individual commemoration, replacing it with annual cumulative prayers for different groups of people. On 11 January the White Monks prayed for all the benefactors of the Order and on 20 November for the members of other Orders, which were in prayer confraternity with the Cistercians – Cluny, Carthusians, Augustinian Canons and Premonstratensians, the Benedictine abbey of Monte Cassino and several houses in Burgundy.³⁸ The individual *familiares* of the Order were prayed for on 17 September (from 1187 on 15 September). Each day the Cistercians celebrated a special mass, except on certain holy days (Good Friday, Holy Saturday, Christmas, Easter and Pentecost), for all the dead members and *familiares* of the Order. Later, an additional mass was added, in honour of the Virgin Mary, for all the benefactors of the Order. Despite these provisions, there was a strong demand for individual commemoration, and the General Chapter had granted such a privilege by 1200 to some fifty individuals – royalty and high nobility – including King Louis of France, King Richard I of England and Matthew, chancellor of the king of Sicily. Individual houses also compiled their own list of benefactors, but excluded individual commemoration of the monks' relatives, causing protestations and discussions at the General Chapter in 1180.³⁹ The belief in the great intercessory power of Cistercian prayers is also exemplified by a flurry of requests in the thirteenth century for prayers directed to the General Chapter from various European monarchs for their own and their families' salvation – Philip III of France (1270–1285), Charles I of Sicily (1266–1282), Alfonso X of Castile (1252–1284), James I of Aragon (1213–1276) and Edward I (1272–1307).⁴⁰

This particular exclusivity of entry into the Cistercian prayer community made it very desirable and gave the abbeys a useful tool for 'rewarding' individuals, who were, for a variety of reasons, particularly significant.⁴¹ From the thirteenth century noting down names of departed friends and supporters and their commemoration became an established element of the Cistercian role. In the early fifteenth-century copy of the necrology from Pelplin Abbey in Pomerania, the scribe added an explanation of the privileges which the lay people who were members of the fraternity would receive. By the agreement of the Chapter and according to the regulations of the Order, the confraters were granted the spiritual benefits derived from all the masses, vigils, alms, prayers and charitable works performed by the monks in Pelplin Abbey 'until

the end of the world'.⁴² The entry into individual lists kept at particular abbeys was so advantageous for the salvation of the soul of those people listed because they automatically partook in the benefits of all activities of the Cistercian abbeys.⁴³ In the late Middle Ages many houses entered into 'individual agreements' with lay people to set up permanent liturgical commemorations. King Valdemar IV Atterdag of Denmark (d. 1375) bequeathed 50 silver marks for daily masses for his soul and a yearly pittance for all the monks in his remembrance consisting of a three-course meal and a barrel of German beer at Esrum Abbey.⁴⁴

Burials were one of the principal manifestations of the intercessory function of the monastic houses. In principle, Cistercian monasteries were very restrictive in allowing access for lay people; in practice, we can observe a great variety of attitudes towards lay burials in the abbeys. As in many other aspects of the relationship with the wider world, the Cistercians inherited an established tradition. Burials in close proximity to the relics of the saints 'benefited' from closeness to regularly performed masses and other liturgical activities. As such, they were much desired by lay people for their intercessory power and social prestige. The Benedictine and Cluniac houses were real 'magnets' for lay burials, and commemoration was central to their monastic role. When the Cistercian movement emerged, there was clearly an idea that patrons are entitled to be buried in 'their' monasteries. The General Chapter was well aware of these expectations, but for the donors burial in a Cistercian monastery was not an automatic privilege. In 1180 a Cistercian statute forbade secular burials in the monastic churches except for kings, queens, bishops and archbishops; this prescription was frequently repeated until 1316.⁴⁵

Early on, there was a clear understanding of the importance of such burials as a tool for creating and sustaining key relationships with the outside world, as clarified by several statutes. By c. 1147 an abbey's servants who died within the precincts were allowed to be buried in the monastic cemetery alongside a limited number of 'friends' and *familiars* and their wives. As a response to growing pressure the General Chapter allowed burials of founders and anybody else who could not be refused without 'causing a scandal' in 1179. The codification of 1202 listed types of people who could be buried in Cistercian houses – founders, their descendants (patrons) and guests, two familiars with their wives, servants and travellers. Further clarification issued in 1217 by the General Chapter indicated that, by the early thirteenth century, lay burials were a widespread phenomenon. The statute stated that lay people in Cistercian cemeteries were subject to a licence from the parish priest

of the 'applicant' in question.⁴⁶ Many of the early regulations appear not to have been implemented with great vigour, and in fact there was a widespread acceptance of lay burials. For example Melrose Abbey in Scotland accepted a significant number of male and female interments in the 1180s, several of them in the chapter house.

The position of the General Chapter appears to have changed in the course of the thirteenth century. The explicit prohibitions ceased; instead, the specific locations of the burials came under sustained scrutiny. The statutes focused on the ban on interments in chapter houses and churches. We have a number of General Chapter rulings to punish abbots who allowed lay burials in chapter houses or monastic churches in the late twelfth and first half of the thirteenth century, but there was clearly no consistency. The cases involved only houses in France and Germany, not elsewhere, where burials of laity were rife. It was a process that could not have been stopped, and by 1300 Cistercian churches were open to a much wider spectrum of lay people. This created a further need for more burial spaces, which led to the creation of special chapels located on the parameter of the east end and the nave.⁴⁷

The influence of older traditions also led to foundations of Cistercian houses specifically as family necropoleis just as had been the case amongst Benedictine houses. Sorø Abbey, founded by the Hvide family in the early 1160s, was described in the Sorø Donation Book (created c. 1210) as founded 'in honour of God and as a family sepulchre', whilst Bishop Peder of Roskilde described the monastery in his charter thus: 'as is well known, [it] was founded by our ancestors as a burial for our family'.⁴⁸ Sometimes this role was remarkably long-lasting. Doberan Abbey was continuously used by the patrons, the dukes of Mecklenburg, as their necropolis until the Reformation. Not only male houses functioned as multi-generational mausolea. It was even more common for nunneries to have such a role. The Cistercian nunnery in Trzebnica was founded by Duke Henry the Bearded of Silesia and his wife Hedwig in 1202 as their burial place. The founders were particularly generous in the endowment and the subsequent grants, whilst the monastic church provided an impressive setting for the ducal mausoleum and the liturgical commemorations. The first abbess was Gertrud, the daughter of the founders. She succeeded in securing the canonisation of her mother in 1268, thus making Trzebnica Abbey a thriving pilgrimage destination.⁴⁹

By the late thirteenth century Cistercian houses were not only accessible for burial to those at the very top of society. Many abbeys across Europe attracted lay burials of lesser nobility or even wealthy

peasants. Such burials were frequently a type of 'counter-gift'. References to lay burials appeared in the charters of grants with the phrase 'with the body', which means that the donor expected burials as a counter-gift.⁵⁰ Such individuals were usually buried in the monastic cemetery outside the walls of the church. The thirteenth-century requests for burials in Fountains Abbey show a cross-section of Yorkshire society, including a substantial number of peasants and several cases of burials from the same family over three generations.⁵¹

Unsurprisingly, monastic chronicles, such as the *Chronicle of Melrose Abbey*, noted who was buried and where as a reminder of the commemorative obligations. The *Liber ordinarius* of Bebenhausen from the fifteenth century reminded the community about its obligation to perform masses for the dead for those 'who are lying with us in the chapter house'.⁵² Whilst the eternal presence of patrons and benefactors through burials left many physical remains and written references, the presence of living lay persons within the Cistercian precincts was also very important yet left far less evidence in the sources.

Among many of the 'founding myths' of the Cistercians in the *Exordium Parvum* is a story that until the abbacy of Harding the dukes of Burgundy held court in Cîteaux, but then the practice was abolished, which symbolised the end of lay interference.⁵³ It is true that the Cistercians were protective of their own spaces and selective in the admission of outsiders, but they were also guided by the Rule of Benedict and their own regulations – especially *Ecclesiastica Officia* – which put hospitality among the chief monastic obligations. The prescription to show kindness to guests was frequently repeated by the General Chapter.⁵⁴ The number of guests at Cistercian houses was probably lower than in the Benedictine houses, but they remained an important part of the White Monks' ethos. In their hospitality rituals Cistercians tried to follow precisely the prescriptions of the Rule of Benedict, for example the custom of prostration before guests and washing of hands and feet as symbols of humility. These were practised by the Benedictines and Cluniacs in an abbreviated form, for which Cistercians criticised them harshly.⁵⁵

The guests were accommodated in the guest houses, which were located in such a way, usually west of the lay brothers' range, as to minimise contact with the monastic community. Food played a major role in the hosting of guests and a separate kitchen catered for the abbot and his guests. They were offered much richer food than the community, but had to fast on the prescribed days. One of the reasons for the development of impressive abbatial residences was precisely

the need for providing high-status space for entertaining important guests. It is clear that the practice of eating with lay guests was common in Cistercian monasteries but it continued to be a 'grey area' for the Order's authorities. During the visitation of Hailes Abbey conducted by Abbot Herman of Stratford in 1394, he reminded the community that secular persons must not eat regularly in the monastery, which was qualified by the statement that this can be done if 'very great advantage to the community would come from this'.⁵⁶ Not all guests were equal, and the type and quality of the accommodation and food made a clear differentiation. By the end of the twelfth century Cistercian and Benedictine abbots operated 'a two-tier system of hospitality': selected guest dined with them, whilst the common guests ate in the guest hall.⁵⁷

Engagement in the world, bonds with patrons and benefactors and the intercessory obligations of the White Monks were not a contradiction of the ideal of withdrawal, but a central element of being a Cistercian community. Prayers for lay people, burials and hospitality were all key elements of an ancient monastic tradition which the White Monks inherited in the same way as the desert imagery. At the same time it was also a pragmatic tool for creating and sustaining relationships with the outside world without which no religious institution could survive. Across Europe, in different regions and localities, Cistercian abbeys encountered well-established ideas of their potential benefactors about their function as monastic houses. The idea of desert and withdrawal, engagement with and connection to the world were equally important aspects of 'Cistercianness' and we must not try to separate them, even if this is so alien to our modern sensibilities.

EJ

Notes

- 1 The work was a revision of *The White Monks: A History of the Cistercian Order* (Okauchee, WI, 1953), elaborated and translated into French (1957) and German (1958). See also L.J. Lekai, 'Ideals and Reality in Early Cistercian Life and Legislation', in *Cistercian Ideals and Reality*, ed. J.R. Sommerfeldt, CS 60 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1978), pp. 4–29; K. Elm *et al.* (eds.), *Die Zisterzienser: Ordensleben zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit* (Cologne, 1981); and F.J. Felten and W. Rösener (eds.), *Norm und Realität: Kontinuität und Wandel der Zisterzienser im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 2009).
- 2 For instance C. Bouchard, 'Cistercian Ideals versus Reality: 1134 Reconsidered', *Cîteaux*, 39 (1988), 217–31; C. Bouchard, *Holy Entrepreneurs: Cistercians, Knights, and Economic Exchange in*

- Twelfth-Century Burgundy* (London and Ithaca, NY, 1991), pp. 185–7; M.G. Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform 1098–1180* (Stanford, CA, 1996); J. Burton and J. Kerr, *The Cistercians in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2011); E. Jamroziak, *Survival and Success on Medieval Borders: Cistercian Houses in Medieval Scotland and Pomerania from the Twelfth to the Late Fourteenth Century* (Turnhout, 2011).
- 3 See Thomas Coomans's chapter in this volume.
 - 4 É. Gilson, *La théologie mystique de Saint Bernard* (Paris, 1934), trans. *The Mystical Theology of Saint Bernard* (London, 1940; repr. Kalamazoo, MI, 1990).
 - 5 C. Mohrmann, 'Observations sur la langue et le style de St Bernard', *SBOp* 2, pp. ix–xxxiii; J. Leclercq, *Recueil d'études sur Saint Bernard et ses écrits*, vol. III (Rome, 1969).
 - 6 See, for example, for Great Britain, R.A. Donkin, *The Cistercians: Studies in the Geography of Medieval England and Wales* (Toronto, 1978), pp. 31–51 and 179–80; for Scandinavia, J. France, *Cistercians in Scandinavia*, CS 131 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1992), pp. 10–11; for eastern central Europe, W. Schich, 'Zum Wirken der Zisterzienser im östlichen Mitteleuropa im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert', in *Zisterziensische Spiritualität: Theologische Grundlagen, funktionale Voraussetzungen und bildhafte Ausprägungen im Mittelalter*, ed. C. Kasper and K. Schreiner (St Ottilien, 1994), pp. 269–94 (pp. 279–81); and for Germany, W. Ribbe, 'Die Wirtschaftstätigkeit der Zisterzienser im Mittelalter: Agrarwirtschaft', in *Die Zisterzienser: Ordensleben zwischen Ideal und Wirklichkeit*, ed. K. Elm et al. (Cologne, 1981), pp. 203–36 (pp. 203–4). See further C.H. Berman, *Medieval Agriculture, the Southern French Countryside, and the Early Cistercians* (Philadelphia, PA, 1986), pp. 7–10, and the chapters by Constance H. Berman and Emilia Jamroziak in this volume.
 - 7 'Locum igitur ad habitaculum habilem eligunt; eligunt non inhabitabilem sed inhabitatum, mundum, fecundum, responsalem frugibus, non ineptum seminibus ... locum extra mundum in corde mundi, semotum ab hominibus hominum in medio, seculum scire nolentes, a seculo sciri uolentes.' Walter Map, *De nugis curialium* 1.24, ed. and trans. M.R. James et al. (Oxford, 1983), pp. 74–5.
 - 8 E.R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (Princeton, NJ, 1973; first pub. in English 1953; first pub. in German 1948), pp. 183–202.
 - 9 Waddell, *Narrative*, p. 401, n.8; Newman, *The Boundaries of Charity*, pp. 69, 94–6.
 - 10 Waddell, *Narrative*, p. 161.
 - 11 *Exordium Cistercii* 1: 'Igitur post multos labores ... tandem desiderio potiti Cistercium devenerunt, locum tunc scilicet horroris et vastæ solitudinis. Sed milites Christi loci asperitatem ab arcto proposito quod iam animo conceperant non dissidere iudicantes, ut vere sibi divinitus præparatum tam gratum habuere locum quam carum propositum.' Trans. Waddell, *Narrative*, p. 400.

- 12 See J.-B. Auberge, *L'unanimité cistercienne primitive: mythe ou réalité?* Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta 3 (Achel, 1986), pp. 121–4, and E. Freeman, *Narratives of a New Order: Cistercian Historical Writing in England, 1150–1220* (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 158–9.
- 13 Waddell, *Narrative*, p. 401, n.8.
- 14 B. Ward, 'The Desert Myth', in *One Yet Two: Monastic Tradition East and West*, ed. B.M. Pennington, CS 29 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1976), pp. 183–99 (pp. 183–6); H.E.J. Cowdrey, 'The English Background of Stephen Harding', in *The New Monastery*, ed. E.R. Elder, CF 60 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1998), pp. 57–77 (p. 68); Auberge, *L'unanimité*, for instance pp. 173–4; M.B. Bruun, 'The Wilderness as *lieu de mémoire*: Literary Deserts of Cîteaux and La Trappe', in *Negotiating Heritage: Memories of the Middle Ages*, ed. M.B. Bruun and S. Glaser (Turnhout, 2008), pp. 21–42.
- 15 *Exordium Parvum* 3: 'Ad quem viri Dei venientes, locumque illum tanto religioni quam animo iamiamque conceperant, et propter quam illuc advenerant, habiliorem quanto sæcularibus despicabiliorem et inaccessibilem intelligentes, nemoris et spinarum densitate præcisa ac remota, monasterium ibidem ... construere cœperunt.' Trans. Waddell, *Narrative*, p. 421; for the dating see p. 230.
- 16 'Nam volenti perperam agere, et desertum abundantiam habet, et nemus umbram, et silentium solitudo.' *Ep* 115.1; SBOP 7, p. 294; B. Scott James (trans.), *The Letters of St Bernard of Clairvaux*, intro. B.M. Kienzle (Stroud and Kalamazoo, MI, 1998; first pub. 1953), p. 180.
- 17 'Regio australis est claustrum, vel eremus ... et per australem plagam socialis vita et spiritualis bonorum conversatio designatur. Claustralis vero paradisus ad suavem spirantis austri clementiam, quasi tot floribus vernat, quot virtutibus abundat.' *Sent* III.91; SBOP 6.2, p. 140, trans. F. Swietek, *The Parables and the Sentences*, CF 55 (Kalamazoo, MI, 2000), p. 290; see also *Div* 42.2; SBOP 6.1, p. 258.
- 18 See Peter King's chapter in this volume.
- 19 'En entrant dans le Cloître on voyoit un toit ruiné, qui à la moindre pluie le remplissoit d'eau ... les Parloirs servoient d'écuries. Le Refectoire n'en avoit plus que le nom. Les Moines & les Seculiers s'y assembloient pour jouer à la boule, lorsque la chaleur ou le mauvais temps ne leur permettoit pas de jouer dehors. Le Dortoir estoit abandonné & inhabité; il ne servoit de retraite qu'aux oiseaux de nuit ... Le Monastere estoit sans jardin, & il estoit environné d'une terre ingrate, plantée d'épines, de buissons & d'arbres. Mais le comble des maux estoit, que par le moyen du grand chemin qu'on avoit fait depuis environ cent ans auprès des murailles du Monastere, on ne voyoit que vagabonds, que scelerats, qu'assassins. Les hommes & les femmes s'assembloient dans le bois qui est tout proche, & là comme dans un azile assuré ils se cachoient pour commettre toute sorte de crimes.' Dominique Georges, 'Proces Verbal de l'état spirituel & temporel de l'Abbaïe de la Trappe', in Pierre Maupeou, *La vie du très-reverend père dom Armand Jean Le Bouthillier de Rancé* (Paris, 1709), Book 4, pp. 251–71 (pp. 265–6).

- 20 J.D. Leloczky (ed.), *Constitutiones et Acta Capitulorum Strictioris Observantiae Ordinis Cisterciensis (1624–1687)* (Rome, 1967), pp. 223–4.
- 21 C. Waddell, 'The Cistercian Dimension of the Reform of La Trappe', in *Cistercians in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. E.R. Elder, CS 64 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1981), pp. 102–61 (p. 129); D.N. Bell, *Understanding Rancé: The Spirituality of the Abbot of La Trappe in Context*, CS 205 (Kalamazoo, MI, 2005), pp. 312–13. 'Avaux' is sometimes written 'Abaux'.
- 22 'Cette Abbaye est située dans un grand valon; & la forest, & les colines qui l'environnent, sont disposées de telle sorte, quelles semblent la vouloir cacher au reste de la terre. Elles ... rendent les aproches si difficiles, qu'il est même mal-aisé d'y arriver sans le secours d'un guide. Il y avoit autrefois un chemin pour aller de Mortagne à Paris ... Monsieur l'Abbé neantmoins l'a fait changer, afin que les environs de leur Monastere soient moins frequentez. Aussi n'y a t'il rien de plus solitaire que ce desert; car encore qu'il y ait plusieurs Villes & Bourgades à trois lieuës à l'entour, il sembles pourtant qu'on soit dans une terre étrangere, & dans un autre pays.' Félibien des Avaux, 'Description de l'abbaye de la Trappe a Madame la Duchesse de Liancour', in *Reglemens de l'Abbaye de Nôtre-Dame de la Trappe* (Paris, 1718), pp. 3–4.
- 23 A.J. Krailsheimer, *Armand-Jean de Rancé, Abbot of la Trappe: His Influence in the Cloister and the World* (Oxford, 1974), p. 84.
- 24 M.A. Galton Schimmelpenninck (trans. and commentary), *Narrative of a tour taken in the year 1667, to La Grande Chartreuse and Alet by Dom Claude Lancelot* (London, 1813), p. 254.
- 25 Krailsheimer, *Armand-Jean de Rancé*, pp. 85–7.
- 26 'Madame, ce n'est pas sans raison que je crains de ne pas contenter entierement vôtre pieuse curiosité, parce qu'il est bien difficile que je vous fasse une description de l'Abbaye de la Trappe, qui puisse répondre à la haute idée qu'on en doit avoir.' Félibien, 'Description', p. 1.
- 27 B. Beugnot, *Le discours de la retraite au XVIIe siècle: loin du monde et du bruit* (Paris, 1996), esp. pp. 235–56; D. Stanton, 'The Ideal of of "repos" in Seventeenth-Century French Literature', *L'Esprit Créateur*, 15 (1975), 79–104.
- 28 Letter of 22 June 1672; *Lettres de Mademoiselle de Montpensier ... Marquise de Lambert* (Paris, 1806), p. 180.
- 29 A.J. Krailsheimer (ed.), *Armand-Jean de Rancé: Correspondance*, 4 vols. (Paris and Cîteaux, 1993); trans. (partial) A.J. Krailsheimer, *The Letters of Armand-Jean de Rancé, Abbot and Reformer of La Trappe*, 2 vols., CS 80 and 81 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1984).
- 30 Plan in *Description du plan en relief de l'Abbaye de la Trappe présenté au Roy par le Frere Pacôme* (Paris, 1708); Bell, *Understanding Rancé*, pp. 327–8.
- 31 *Description du plan en relief*, pp. 19–20.
- 32 I.F. Silber, *Virtuosity, Charisma, and Social Order: A Comparative Sociological Study of Monasticism in Theravada Buddhism and Medieval Catholicism* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 37–172.
- 33 Bouchard, *Holy Entrepreneurs*, pp. 87–94.

- 34 *Ibid.*, p. 89.
- 35 E. Jamroziak, 'Making and Breaking the Bonds: Yorkshire Cistercians and Their Neighbours', in *Perspectives for an Architecture of Solitude: Essays on Cistercians, Art and Architecture in Honour of Peter Fergusson*, ed. T. N. Kinder (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 64–5.
- 36 Bouchard, *Holy Entrepreneurs*, p. 175.
- 37 J. Wollasch, 'Gemeinschaftsbewusstsein und soziale Leistung im Mittelalter', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 9 (1975), 268–86.
- 38 Waddell, *Statutes*, 1192:12, 1193:5, 1194:9, 1196:61, 1198:14, 1200:1, 1201:4, 1201:50.
- 39 *Ibid.*, 1180: 8.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 1273: 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73.
- 41 J. Wollasch, 'Neue Quellen zur Geschichte der Cistercienser', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 84 (1973), 188, 227, 230–1; Canivez, *Statuta*, 1187: 9, 1180: 8; B. Lackner, 'The Liturgy of Early Cîteaux', in *Studies in Medieval Cistercian History Presented to Jeremiah F. O'Sullivan*, ed. M.B. Pennington (Shannon, 1971), p. 29; P. Orliński, *Cysterskie nekrologi na Pomorzu Gdańskim od XIII do XVII wieku* (Toruń, 1997), pp. 32–3.
- 42 'Liber mortuorum Pelplinensis', in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. iv, p. 124: 'de communi consensus nostri capituli omnium missarum, psalmodiarum, vigiliarum, disciplinarum id est castigacionum corporum, elemosinarum, oracionum, laborum et omnium spiritualium beneficiorum ac omnium bonorum, que fiunt in ecclesia nostra et que nunc procurata sunt et usque in finem mundi procurari poterunt, participes facimus fraternitatem in predictis omnibus secundum Cisterciensis ordinis consuetudinem largientes.'
- 43 Orliński, *Cysterskie nekrologi*, p. 43.
- 44 K. Erslev (ed.), *Repertorium Diplomaticum Regni Danici Mediaevalis* (Copenhagen, 1896–8), vol. II, no. 3210; B. P. McGuire, *The Cistercians in Denmark: Their Attitudes, Roles, and Functions in Medieval Society*, CS 35 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1982), p. 223.
- 45 Waddell, *Statutes*, 1180:5; codifications in 1202, 1220, 1237, 1257, 1289 and 1316.
- 46 J. Hall, 'The Legislative Background to the Burial of Laity and Other Patrons in Cistercian Abbeys', *Cîteaux*, 56 (2005), 364–9; J. Hall *et al.*, 'Table of Legislation Concerning the Burial of Laity and other Patrons in Cistercian Abbeys', *Cîteaux*, 56 (2005), 373–418.
- 47 M. Untermann, *Forma Ordinis: Die mittelalterliche Baukunst der Zisterzienser* (Munich and Berlin, 2001), pp. 89–90.
- 48 K. Esmark, 'Religious Patronage and Family Consciousness: Sorø Abbey and the "Hvide Family", c. 1150–1250', in *Religious and Laity in Western Europe 1000–1400: Interaction, Negotiation, and Power*, ed. E. Jamroziak and J. Burton (Turnhout, 2006), p. 101; *Scriptores rerum Danicarum*, vol. iv, p. 476; *Diplomatarium Danicarum*, first series, vol. iv, no. 41.
- 49 M. Kutzner, *Cysterska architektura na śląsku w latach 1200–1330* (Toruń, 1969), p. 22; P. Wiszewski, 'Cysterki trzebnickie w społeczeństwie

- śląskim (czwarta ćwierć XIII wieku – pierwsza połowa XIV wieku)', in *Cystersi w Społeczeństwie Europy Środkowej*, ed. A.M. Wyrwa and J. Dobosz (Poznań, 2000), pp. 705–6.
- 50 J. Wardrop, *Fountains Abbey and Its Benefactors*, CS 91 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1987), pp. 260–75.
- 51 *Ibid.*, pp. 263–75.
- 52 'apud nos in capitulo legitur', J. Sydow, *Die Zisterzienserabtei Bebenhausen*, Germania Sacra NF 16: Bistum Konstanz (Berlin, 1984), p. 118.
- 53 *Exordium Parvum* 17.4; C. Rudolph, 'The Principal Founders and the Early Artistic Legislation of Cîteaux', in *Studies in Cistercian Art and Architecture*, 3, ed. M.P. Lillich (Kalamazoo, MI, 1982), pp. 16–17.
- 54 *RB*, chapter 53; 'Instituta Generalis Capituli apud Cistercium', in Waddell, *Narrative*, clause 1, p. 454; Choisselet/Vernet, chapters 87, 120.
- 55 J. Sonntag, *Klosterleben im Spiegel des Zeichenhaften. Symbolisches Denken und Handeln hochmittelalterlicher Mönche zwischen Dauer und Wandel, Regel und Gewohnheit* (Münster, 2008), pp. 582–96.
- 56 C. Harper-Bill, 'Cistercian Visitation in the Late Middle Ages: The Case of Hailes Abbey', *Historical Research*, 53 (1980), 103–14 (p. 110).
- 57 J. Kerr, 'The Symbolic Significance of Hospitality', in *Self-Representation of Medieval Religious Communities*, ed. A. Müller and K. Stöber (Berlin, 2009), pp. 125–41 (p. 130).

Primary sources

- Félibien des Avaux, A., 'Description de l'abbaye de la Trappe a Madame la Duchesse de Liancour', in *Reglemens de l'Abbaye de Nôtre-Dame de la Trappe* (Paris, 1718)
- Georges, D., 'Proces Verbal de l'état spirituel & temporel de l'Abbaïe de la Trappe', in Pierre Maupeou, *La vie du très-reverend père dom Armand Jean Le Bouthillier de Rancé* (Paris, 1709), Book 4, pp. 251–71
- Krailsheimer, A.J. (ed.), *Armand-Jean de Rancé: Correspondance*, 4 vols. (Paris and Cîteaux, 1993); trans. (partial) A.J. Krailsheimer, *The Letters of Armand-Jean de Rancé, Abbot and Reformer of La Trappe*, 2 vols., CS 80 and 81 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1984)
- Leloczky, J.D. (ed.), *Constitutiones et Acta Capitulorum Stricterioris Observantiae Ordinis Cisterciensis (1624–1687)* (Rome, 1967)
- Waddell, C. (ed.), *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta 9 (Brecht, 1999)
- Twelfth-Century Statutes from the Cistercian General Chapter*, Cîteaux: Studia et Documenta 12 (Brecht, 2002)