

Manuscript Layout and Réécriture. A Reconstruction of the Manuscript Tradition of the *Vita Secunda Gisleni*

Tjamke Snijders

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Snijders Tjamke. Manuscript Layout and Réécriture. A Reconstruction of the Manuscript Tradition of the *Vita Secunda Gisleni*. In: Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire, tome 87, fasc. 2, 2009. pp. 215-237;

doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2009.7672>

https://www.persee.fr/doc/rbph_0035-0818_2009_num_87_2_7672

Fichier pdf généré le 17/04/2018

Manuscript Layout and Réécriture. A Reconstruction of the Manuscript Tradition of the *Vita Secunda Gisleni*

Tjamke SNIJDERS
Universiteit Gent

Recently a new field of research dealing with the way in which scribes of the Middle Ages rewrote narrative texts has developed within medieval studies ⁽¹⁾. Prompting the discourse is the work of Genette, a literary theorist, who in 1982 defined the term rewrite as “every relationship between a text B (the hypertext) and an older text A (the hypotext), whereby text B adds something to text A in a way that does not have the nature of a commentary” ⁽²⁾. In historical circles, however, Genette’s definition has created tension between two possible interpretations of the word “text”, neither of which are unproblematic.

Some historians interpret Genette’s “text” as an individual redaction. From this point of view, studies of rewritten material concern the additions and changes a scribe made to a text whilst copying it. As these variants can occasionally determine the development of a textual tradition, they are considered just as important and meaningful as the larger changes an author could make. This detail-oriented approach to rewrites can yield results that are both interesting and illuminating ⁽³⁾. The downside is that it tends to elevate

(1) Monique GOULLET, *Écriture et réécriture hagiographiques. Essai sur les réécritures de vies de saints dans l'Occident latin médiéval (VIII^e-XIII^e s.)*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2005 (Hagiologia. Études sur la sainteté en Occident/Studies on Western Sainthood, vol. 4), p. 318 ; Anne-Marie HELVÉTIUS, “Réécriture hagiographique et réforme monastique. Les premières *vitae* de saint Humbert de Maroilles (X^e-XI^e siècles). Avec l’édition de la *Vita Humberti Prima*”, in Monique GOULLET & Martin HEINZELMANN, eds., *La réécriture hagiographique dans l'Occident médiéval. Transformations formelles et idéologiques*, Ostfildern, Jan Thorbecke, 2003 (Beihefte der Francia, vol. 58), p. 195-230 ; Martin HEINZELMANN, “La réécriture hagiographique dans l’œuvre de Grégoire de Tours”, in GOULLET & HEINZELMANN, eds., *La réécriture hagiographique, op. cit.*, p. 15-70 ; Jeroen DEPLOIGE, “Écriture, continuation, réécriture. La réactualisation des miracles posthumes dans l’hagiographie des Pays-Bas méridionaux, ca 920 - ca 1320”, in Monique GOULLET & Martin HEINZELMANN, eds., *Miracles, vies et réécritures dans l'Occident médiéval. Actes de l'atelier "La réécriture des miracles" (IHAP, juin 2004) et SHG X-XII. Dossiers des saints de Metz et Laon et de saint Saturnin de Toulouse*, Ostfildern, Jan Thorbecke, 2006, (Beihefte der Frankia, vol. 65), p. 21-65.

(2) I will use the term ‘rewrite’ as equivalent for ‘réécriture’ or rewritten material. Gérard GENETTE, *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*, Paris, Seuil, 1982, p. 13. For an application on medieval sources, see GOULLET, *Écriture et réécriture* (n. 1 above).

(3) An example of a redaction-centred approach can be found in Linda NIX, “Early Medieval Book Design in England. The Influence of Manuscript Design on the Transmission of Texts”, in Robin MYERS & Michael HARRIS, eds., *A Millennium of the Book. Production, Design & Illustration in Manuscript & Print, 900-1900*, Winchester, Publishing Pathways, 1994, p. 1-21.

every scribe to the level of author. This implies that every redaction constitutes a unique entity and that it is hardly possible to compare two “redactions” of the same “text” to one another, rendering it difficult to survey the manuscript situation.

Others interpret the “text” in Genette’s definition not as an individual redaction but as a group of redactions, which is situated on a higher level of abstraction. Such a “text group”⁽⁴⁾ takes the average, as it were, of a number of redactions that largely resemble one another, although they may differ in details that seem unimportant from the point of view of a certain line of questioning. Thus, an edition in its classic form is based on similarities with regard to the content of several redactions. For research into rewrites, this point of view means a concentration on the transition from an older text group A (say, the *Vita Prima* of a certain saint) to a new text group B (the *Vita Secunda* of the same saint). This methodology has the benefit of a wider and more thorough ability to survey, but can occasionally lead to a high level of abstraction as the discussion completely situates itself on the immaterial level of the text as an abstract object of study. Consequently, the text group approach tends to ignore the material (dis)similarities between the redactions and the consequences thereof.

In this article, I will combine both levels of interpretation. First, I will survey the various redactions of a text, examining both their material and textual qualities. This text is the *Vita Secunda Gisleni*, which deals with the life and miracles of Gislenus, a seventh-century saint from Hainaut. It was written in the first quarter of the eleventh century and was shortly afterwards split into two different text groups called *Vita Secunda A* and *Vita Secunda B*⁽⁵⁾. I will argue that the materiality of the *Vita Secunda*’s redactions had a profound influence on the text’s reception and the context in which it was used. Focussing on the moment of rewriting on a manuscript level, we will see how the material aspects of the redactions subtly influenced the contents of each subsequent rewrite, eventually causing significant differences between the *Vita Secunda A* and *B*. More generally, I will analyse the extent to which the redaction’s material aspects are meaningful components in the study of medieval rewriting processes.

After introducing the text and the monastery for which it was produced, I will focus on the exemplar of the *Vita Secunda B* and the redactions that were based on it. Thereupon, I will analyse the *Vita Secunda A* redactions, compare the two text groups, and discuss some explanations for their divergent development.

(4) There is no accepted term for the phenomenon that I here call a ‘text group’. Various possibilities are a ‘work’ or ‘polytext’ (MCGANN, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*), a ‘transhistorical verbal text’ (NICHOLS, ‘Philology and its Discontents’), a ‘reified text’ (INNES, ‘Memory, Orality and Literacy in an Early Medieval Society’) and an ‘objectified text’ (ILLICH, *In the Vineyard of the Text: A Commentary to Hugh’s Didascalicon*). Also see my forthcoming doctoral dissertation, *Ordinare & Communicare*.

(5) Anne-Marie HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques. Une politique du pouvoir en Hainaut au Moyen Âge (VII^e-XI^e siècle)*, Brussels, Crédit Communal, 1994, p. 332. Also see note 12.

The *Vitae Gisleni*

Gislenus was the patron saint of Saint-Ghislain, close to present-day Mons. Around 930, duke Giselbert of Lotharingia (re)founded this monastery, in collaboration with the reformer Gerard of Brogne⁽⁶⁾. Giselbert and Gerard needed a patron saint for their new abbey, so that the discovery of human remains within the monastery grounds soon led to the recognition of a new saint, Gislenus, whose name may have been created because it is a hypocorism of Giselbert⁽⁷⁾. The cult around Gislenus soon started to flourish and all efforts were made to maintain it. Between 930 and the beginning of the twelfth century, no fewer than ten different text groups were written about the life and miracles of Gislenus⁽⁸⁾.

Shortly after the foundation of the monastery, the so-called *Vita Prima* was recorded⁽⁹⁾. It presented Gislenus as a seventh-century saint from Greece. His parents were not particularly well off, but Gislenus proved a very good student who was soon taken into the care of Athenian philosophers. Not long after that, he adopted Basil's rule and left for Rome, where the Pope ordered him to Gaul to preach to the heathens. Once there, he struck up a friendship with a number of regional saints (Amandus, Waldetrudis, Aldegundis, Vincentius Madelgarius) and built a monastery cell, which was eventually expanded into a flourishing monastic community.

This fairly basic *Vita* was the foundation of a substantial number of rewrites. Firstly, after a few years a section was added to the *Vita Prima* to explain what exactly had happened to Gislenus' body after his death⁽¹⁰⁾. A monk named Rainerus, from the monastery of Saint-Amand or Sint-Pieters⁽¹¹⁾, re-

(6) HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 224-231; Ursmer BERLIÈRE, «Abbaye de Saint-Ghislain», in *Monasticon Belge*, Maredsous, Abbaye de Maredsous, 1890-1897, t. I, 2, p. 244-270.

(7) HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 229; Eduard HLAWITSCHKA, "Herzog Giselbert von Lothringen und das Kloster Remiremont", in *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins*, vol. 108, 1960, p. 422-465; Karine UGÉ, "Relics as tools of power. The eleventh-century *inventio* of St Bertin's relics and the assertion of abbot Bobo's authority", in Henk B. TEUNIS, Andrew WAREHAM & Arnoud-Jan BIJSTERVELD, eds., *Negotiating Secular and Ecclesiastical Power*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1999 (International Medieval Research, vol. 6), p. 53-54.

(8) An overview and several editions of the *Vitae Gisleni* can be found in Albert PONCELET, "*Vita et miracula sancti Gisleni. Ursidongi, nunc Gislenopoli, in Hannonia. Confessoris, auctore Rainero monacho*", in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. 5, 1886, p. 209-294 and ID., "*De vita sancti Gisleni a Rainero monacho conscripta*", in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. 6, 1887, p. 209-302. To ensure some convenience of comparison, I have adopted Helvétius' terminology regarding the *Vita Prima*, *Vita Secunda* and *Vita Tertia*. Poncelet refers to these texts as the *Vita Secunda*, *Tertia* and *Quinta*, respectively. See HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 213-234.

(9) *Acta Sanctorum*, October 4, p. 1030-1035; HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 223.

(10) The so-called '*Additamentum*', *Acta Sanctorum*, October 4, p. 1034 (chapter 17).

(11) In the dedicatory epistle to the *Vita Secunda*, the author identifies himself as Rainerus and relates that abbot Simon of Saint-Ghislain asked abbot Rathbodus to have a monk compose a new *Vita*. Rathbodus could either refer to the abbot of Saint-Amand (996-1013) or the abbot of Sint-Pieters in Ghent (995-ca. 1029 & ca. 1032-1034/5). The abbot of Sint-Pieters is mentioned in the Saint-Ghislain obituary (1041), so Saint-Ghislain and Sint-Pieters probably had strong ties.

wrote the text in its entirety into the so-called *Vita Secunda A* around 1000-1013⁽¹²⁾. He enlivened the style of the existing story, composed a sermon and added a number of miracles to Gislenus' *curriculum*. Gislenus' most famous miracle, the saving of a woman who was about to die in childbirth, dates from this rewrite⁽¹³⁾. Around 1035, Rainerus again rewrote the *Vita Secunda*. The result of his effort was a new text group, the *Vita Secunda B*⁽¹⁴⁾. The difference between the two text groups lies in a few new miracles, multiple changes in terms of style and some alterations to the *Vita*'s contents. Rainerus also incorporated two miracles that a monk from Saint-Ghislain had written between 1000/1013 and 1035 and were inextricably linked to the institutional and financial difficulties the monastery had to contend with at the time⁽¹⁵⁾.

The redactions of the *Vita Secunda A* and *B* in various manuscripts are at the core of this article. For the sake of completeness, I will mention the other eight text groups connected to Gislenus here. They include two rewrites in rhyme (the *Vitae Octava* and *Nona*, dating from the eleventh and fourteenth century, respectively), one rewrite in prose by Philippe de Harvengt (the *Vita Septima*, twelfth century), and two *abbreviationes*, short texts in which the central points of Gislenus' life are summarised (the *Vitae Quarta* and *Sexta*). In the tenth and eleventh centuries, three further texts were written in other hagiographical genres, namely an *inventio*, a *homelia* (the *Vita Tertia*), and an *officium* (the *Vita Decima*), to ensure that the liturgy was properly conducted on Gislenus' feast day.

The Mons Manuscript: a content-oriented text group

Because Rainerus' *Vita Secunda* has been preserved in many more manuscripts than the other *Vitae Gisleni*, this text pre-eminently lends itself to a manuscript analysis. The oldest and most important redaction is ms Mons, Bibliothèque d'Université de Mons-Hainaut 27/221, which I will designate the "Mons manuscript". This manuscript was at the basis of an extensive manuscript tradition. I will begin by discussing the material and textual characteristics of the *Vita Secunda* in the Mons manuscript, before

(12) HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 332 quotes Van Overstraeten's unpublished thesis, stating that the *Vita Secunda A* was composed between 1000 and 1013. However, the author of the *Gesta episcoporum Cameracensium* (written in 1024/5) mentions that a *Vita Gisleni* was being written at that time: *sancti Gisleni...Qui quantus vel qualis vixerit, liber qui de vita ipsius componitur, largiter edixerit*. This can refer to either the *Vita Secunda A* (as version B contains miracles that took place in 1035) or the *Vita Tertia*; but the tenses might have been chosen because of their esthetic value. Cfr *Gesta Pontificum Cameracensium*, ed. L. C. BETHMANN, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, vol. 7, Hannover, Impensis Bibliopolii Aulici Hahniani, 1846; see Erik VAN MINGROOT, "Kritisch onderzoek omtrent de datering van de *Gesta Episcoporum Cameracensium*", in *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, vol. 53, 1975, p. 318; Daniel VAN OVERSTRAETEN, *L'abbaye de Saint-Ghislain, des origines au milieu du XIV^e siècle*, unpublished PhD thesis, Brussels, ULB, 1985.

(13) PONCELET, "*Vita et miracula sancti Gisleni*" (n. 8 above), p. 225-226 (*De muliere a partu erepta et prole divino famulatui mancipata*).

(14) HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 340.

(15) BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Saint-Ghislain" (n. 6 above), p. 248-249.

looking at the extent to which these characteristics have influenced the shape and/or content of the other redactions.

The Mons Manuscript (Mons BUMH 27/221)

An unknown *scriptorium* produced the Mons manuscript for the monastery of Saint-Ghislain between 1035 and 1075. This may have been done in Ghent, like the composition of the *Vita Secunda* itself⁽¹⁶⁾. The relatively small manuscript (238 x 160 mm) consists of three codicological units that were all written by one and the same scribe, and that exclusively contain material that was devoted to Gislenus and his monastery. The first unit (fols. 1r-7v) gives the office for the feast of Gislenus, complete with neumes. The second unit (fols. 8r-143v) contains the *Vita Prima* and the *Vita Secunda B*, and the third unit (fols. 144r-155v) consists of the most important part of the life of the monastery's first abbot, Gerard of Brogne⁽¹⁷⁾. As Gislenus was the patron saint of Saint-Ghislain, his *Vitae* were important in forming the group identity of the monks⁽¹⁸⁾. Undoubtedly, this was the most important reason for them to possess a codex that was completely dedicated to the saint and the early history of Saint-Ghislain.

The Mons manuscript may also have been a reaction to contemporary tensions between the monastery, the local population, and count Rainerus IV of Hainaut, who was anxious to gain the right to appoint Saint-Ghislain's abbot⁽¹⁹⁾. For instance, one of the miracles of the *Vita Secunda B* relates a serious incident in which the locals accuse Gislenus of failing to secure the peace, casting doubt on the effectiveness of his relics as a source of miracles. However, its author depicts the story in such a way that it sheds a relatively positive light on the monastery⁽²⁰⁾. It can be assumed that the codex was at least partly intended to establish this favourable interpretation in the collective memory of the monks.

(16) The Mons manuscript has a format, layout and color scheme that does not recur in any of the manuscripts that were produced in the St.-Ghislain scriptorium, but are strikingly similar to that of ms. Ghent, University Library, 308; a manuscript that was produced in the abbey of Sint-Baafs, Ghent, to honor its patron saint (1010-1050). Mons BUMH 27/221: 238 x 160 mm, the text is 175 x 110 mm with 17 lines and ca. 80 words/page. Ghent UL 308: 237x170 mm, the text is 156 x 100 mm with 18 lines and ca. 75 words/page. Also see note 11.

(17) Gerardus ab. Broniensis, '*Vita*', BHL 3422.

(18) For the importance of monastic group identities, see Ineke VAN 'T SPIJKER, "Model Reading. Saints' Lives and Literature of Religious Formation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries", in Étienne RENARD et al., eds., "*Scribere sanctorum gesta*". *Recueil d'études d'hagiographie médiévale offert à Guy Philippart*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2005 (Hagiologia. Études sur la sainteté en Occident/Studies on Western Sainthood, vol. 3), p. 135-165; Karine UGÉ, *Creating the Monastic Past in Medieval Flanders*, York, York Medieval Press, 2005, p. 9; Steven VANDERPUTTEN, *Sociale perceptie en maatschappelijke positionering in de middeleeuwse monastieke historiografie (8^{ste}-15^{de} eeuw)*, Brussels, Algemeen Rijksarchief, 2001 (Algemeen Rijksarchief en Rijksarchief in de Provinciën, Studia, vol. 87), p. 25 & 55.

(19) HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 126.

(20) PONCELET, "*Vita et miracula sancti Gisleni*" (n. 8 above), p. 282-283.

Furthermore, the codex also served a liturgical purpose, as it centralised the texts the monks used on Gislenus' feast day. In order to celebrate this feast, they needed twelve hagiographical readings. These readings were chosen from the chapters of the *Vita Secunda*, and were indicated in the manuscript by means of a capital letter L (for "*lectio*") and a number: L.I to L.XII. The *responsorium*, hymns and other songs these readings had to be alternated with, could be found in the office at the very beginning of the manuscript⁽²¹⁾.

The fact that the office and the readings were located in different parts of the codex caused practical difficulties, as it meant that alternating between song and prose demanded a lot of hasty page-turning during service. Yet it was highly important that everything went smoothly⁽²²⁾. After all, Benedict's rule stipulated that an incorrect execution of the liturgy was a punishable act (*Si quis dum pronuntiat psalmum, responsorium, aut antiphonam, vel lectionem fallitur, nisi per satisfactionem ibi coram omnibus humiliatus fuerit, maiori uindictae subiaceat; quippe qui noluit humilitate corrigere quod in negligentia deliquit*)⁽²³⁾. The layout of the Mons manuscript seems designed to maximize the efficiency with which a monk could leaf from reading to response and back again.

The scribe of the Mons manuscript has made use of a combination of visual and content-oriented systems of organisation that enabled the lector to read the required text without making unnecessary mistakes. The beginning of every new text has an exceptionally clear visual marking. The *Vita Prima* starts with a small portrait of Gislenus and the *Vita Secunda* begins with a title written in four colours, which takes up almost an entire page. The sermon immediately stands out because of a large initial in the form of a monogram. Every section has an initial of its own, brightly decorated with abstract motifs in red, yellow, green, blue and purple. All these decorations have an obvious character of their own and are easily memorized. They enable the lector to localise the beginning of a particular text fragment on a purely visual basis, without actually having to read anything. This considerably increased the efficiency of the search process.

Naturally, the visual organisation of the Mons manuscript was applied in accordance with the contents of the text. The large initials were not randomly placed within the text, but always at the beginning of a new unit of significance, such as a new text or a new section. Furthermore, every section initial (and there are more than thirty in the *Vita Secunda* alone) was linked to a title of its own. In each title, a brief summary is given of the content of the chapter concerned, such as *Quod oratorium construxerit et Cellam Apostolorum vocaverit*⁽²⁴⁾. Finally, the scribe included a table of contents at the beginning

(21) Ms Mons, BUMH 27/221 (Appendix, Ms1) fols. 1r-7v (*Officium*), fols. 29r-61v (*Lectiones*).

(22) Anna A. GROTHANS, "'Sih der selbo lector'. Cues for Reading in Tenth- and Eleventh Century St. Gall", in *Scriptorium*, vol. 51, 1997, p. 252-253.

(23) Adalbert DE VOGÜE & Jean NEUFVILLE, eds., *La règle de Saint-Benoît*, vol. 2, Paris, Cerf, 1972, (Sources Chrétiennes. Série des textes monastiques d'Occident, vol. 35), chapter 45.

(24) Ms Mons, BUMH 27/221 (Appendix, Ms 1), fols. 34r, 36r, 38v.

of the text, in which he systematically lists the section titles. In this way, he linked visual aids to a clear, content-oriented system of descriptive titles.

The intervention on the level of manuscript redaction in the Mons manuscript made sure that the monks could simultaneously use the *Vita Secunda* as a practical liturgical text and as a text that formed an identity and offered an interpretation of contemporary events. The efficient visual and content-oriented system of organisation not only enabled alternation between prose and poetry during matins, but also made sure that the monks could easily locate the specific anecdotes, miracles or fragments from the sermon that they needed in some other context. Such a system, aimed at the navigation between different texts within a manuscript, was still relatively rare in the middle of the eleventh century⁽²⁵⁾. Even within the Mons manuscript, the system was not indiscriminately applied but only extended to the texts that were actually used by the monks. Even though the scribe who filled the first part of the codex also wrote the life of Gerard of Brogne in the third codicological unit, this less important text did not share the other texts' layout. This leads to the conclusion that this layout was not something the scribe routinely applied to all his redactions. On the contrary: it was a conscious intervention aimed at facilitating the multifunctional nature of the manuscript, set in the context of the veneration of Gislenus.

The Mons Manuscript and its Text Group

Five manuscripts have been preserved which were based on the Mons manuscript, from the Benedictine monasteries of Saint-Amand (12th century), Saint-Ghislain (13th century), Saint-Ghislain (14th century), Anchin (14th century) and a fifth, unknown monastery (15th century). These are manuscripts 2-5 and 13 in the appendix. Within this group of manuscripts, three tendencies can be discerned: the maintaining of the content-oriented subdivision, the removal of the liturgical layer, and a profound but critical interest in the actual deeds of the saint.

The fact that scribes chose to maintain the visual and content-oriented subdivision of the *Vita Secunda* was far from unusual. Once an organisational apparatus had been applied to a text, it did not vanish easily in subsequent redactions⁽²⁶⁾. The disappearance of the liturgical context of use, which was still so important in the Mons manuscript, is far more remarkable. Not only was the office not copied anywhere (not even in the thirteenth-century copy from Saint-Ghislain itself), but the subdivision of the *Vita Secunda B*

(25) For the changes in ordering and layout of manuscripts in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, see Richard H. ROUSE & Mary A. ROUSE, "*Statim invenire*. Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page", in Robert L. BENSON, Giles CONSTABLE & Carol D. LANHAM, eds., *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, reprint, Toronto, Toronto University Press, 1991 (Medieval Academy Prints for Teaching, vol. 26), p. 201-225.

(26) Malcolm B. PARKES, "The Influence of the Concepts of *ordinatio* and *compilatio* on the Development of the Book", in Malcolm B. PARKES, ed., *Scribes, Scripts and Readers. Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts*, London, Hambledon continuum, 1991, p. 56.

into lectiones was lost as well. The scribes that copied the Mons manuscript obviously did not do this with matins in mind.

The copyists seem to have actively considered the text's worth for a new audience. This is most visible in manuscripts two and five, from Saint-Ghislain and the Benedictine monastery of Anchin, respectively. In both manuscripts, a miracle that had lost most of its relevance was left out. The scribe from Saint-Ghislain chose to delete the miracle in which Gislenus fails to keep the peace. This miracle had related how the monastery of Saint-Ghislain laboured under the rule of an incompetent abbot named Simon around the first decade of the eleventh century⁽²⁷⁾. During his abbacy, a violent dispute between the local villages of Mons and Hornu had broken out. The villagers had begged Gislenus to end the feud between their communities, but the saint had not succeeded and men had lost their lives because of that. The inhabitants subsequently accused Simon of having sold the relics of Gislenus to the count of Hainaut: *Indigenae etiam Hainacenses in ipsis diebus quadam falsa frustrabantor opinione, mussitantes alterutrum, quod venditum haberetur corpus sancti Gisleni comiti Balduino ab abbate Simone, quod postea rei exitus promendaci probavit existimatione*⁽²⁸⁾. The situation was not resolved until God himself, by means of a well-timed thunderbolt, made it clear that Gislenus' body was still present in St.-Ghislain. This miracle was obviously important to the eleventh-century monks of Saint-Ghislain as it stressed that they still possessed their saint. Without his precious relics, the abbey could hardly expect to keep attracting pilgrims and gifts. In the course of the thirteenth century, however, the monks of Saint-Ghislain appear to have decided that the miracle shed an exceptionally positive light on neither Gislenus nor the monastery. Perhaps the incident had been forgotten by then – or would have been forgotten if it were not for the miracle in the *Vita Secunda* that kept reminding the monks of that inconvenient chapter in the abbey's history. Saint-Ghislain's monks could only delete this miracle from the *Vita Secunda* by producing a new manuscript, which they subsequently did.

The fourteenth-century monks from the monastery of Anchin had another miracle suffer a similar fate. This miracle relates how Gislenus' monastery had decayed after his death and that utterly immoral canons had inhabited the monastic ruins⁽²⁹⁾. Around 930, however, duke Giselbert had a vision, in which Gislenus appeared to him and asked him to take care of the old abbey. The Duke did this by convincing Gerard of Brogne to become abbot of the new Benedictine monastery⁽³⁰⁾. The miracle shed a very positive light on duke Giselbert, for it implied that the Duke did everyone a great favour by replacing these immoral canons in a ruin by decent monks in a well-led

(27) PONCELET, "*Vita et miracula sancti Gisleni*" (n. 8 above), p. 282-283; *Gesta Episcoporum Cameracensium* (n. 12 above), p. 472; Denys DE SAINTE-MARTHE & B. HAURÉAU, eds., *Gallia Christiana*, vol. III, Paris, Apud Victorem Palmé, 1725, p. 90; BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Saint-Ghislain" (n. 6 above), p. 248-249.

(28) PONCELET, "*Vita et miracula sancti Gisleni*" (n. 8 above), p. 282, lines 33-35.

(29) A discussion of this topos can be found in Ch. DEREINE, "Chanoines (des origines au XIII^e siècle)", in Alfred BAUDRILLART, A. DE MEYER & Ét. VAN CAUWENBERGH, eds., *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, vol. 12, Paris, Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1950, p. 370-373.

(30) PONCELET, "*Vita et miracula sancti Gisleni*" (n. 8 above), p. 274-275.

monastery⁽³¹⁾. The greatest importance of the miracle, however, lay in the emphasis it placed on the Duke's protecting the monastery without interfering in daily management, which he left entirely to the abbot. This was extremely important to the eleventh-century monks from Saint-Ghislain, who had become entangled in a power struggle around their abbots and *advocati*⁽³²⁾. However, for monks in monasteries that had little to do with the institutional cares of Saint-Ghislain, this miracle was none too relevant. The fourteenth-century scribe from Anchin based his work on the manuscript from Saint-Ghislain and copied the entire *Vita Secunda* as well as the *Vita Gerardi*, but purposely excluded the miracle regarding the Duke of Lotharingia. For him, the miracle concerning the fight between Mons and Hornu must have been interesting and spectacular, whereas the story concerning the long dead Duke of Lotharingia had but little significance for the text's new audience⁽³³⁾. Evidently, the scribes that copied the *Vita Secunda* were interested in its contents and actively considered the text's worth and relevance to a new audience. The redactions from Saint-Ghislain and Anchin both show how the contents of the *Vita Secunda B* were adjusted in such a way that the text could function optimally within the context of a new monastery, or a new joint in time.

Content-Oriented and Visual Methods of Organisation

The redactions that were based on the Mons-manuscript share three important characteristics: a sophisticated layout (the extensive organisation of the text through rubrics and initials), a context of use that was non-liturgical, and indications that the *Vita*'s public had a critical interest in its contents. This raises the question of the interdependence of these characteristics.

A redaction's method of subdivision could certainly have implications for the way in which a text could be read⁽³⁴⁾. A manuscript could be subdivided in terms of content, in a visual way, or in a mixture of both. An organisation according to content is closest to the way in which a modern textbook is organised, in which a text is subdivided into coherent sections. A section can be defined as the smallest unit of content within the hierarchy of a text (although nowadays it tends to consist of several paragraphs). The sections of the text were generally indicated by means of a title, which gives a brief summary of what is going to happen (such as *Quod Cameracum iubente praesule Autberto adierit et ab eo digne susceptus dignius autem remissus sit*)⁽³⁵⁾. A subdivision

(31) *Ibid.* For the struggle between canons and Benedictines see Ch. DEREINE, "La réforme canoniale des XI^e et XII^e siècles", in Ch. DEREINE, ed., *Les chanoines réguliers au diocèse de Liège avant saint Norbert*, Brussels, Palais des Académies, 1952 (Mémoires de la Classe des Lettres, vol. 47), p. 18 & 29.

(32) HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 231-234.

(33) Ms Douai, BM 500 (Appendix, Ms 5).

(34) Joseph-Claude POULIN, "Un élément négligé de critique hagiographique. Les titres de chapitres", in Étienne RENARD et al., eds., *"Scribere sanctorum gesta"* (n. 18 above), p. 329.

(35) Ms Mons, BUMH 27/221 (Appendix, Ms 1) fol. 39v.

visual contribution (for instance, by using red rubrics or an initial to distinguish the sections of a text). When looking at them superficially, there is but a subtle difference between a purely visual and a more content-oriented layout. In both cases, the text is divided in manageable bits of text. However, the difference lies in the fact that the sections of a visually organised text are not coherent in content. In a visual organisation, the “sections” are not largely independent parts of the text, but clusters of sentences that have more or less accidentally been put together.

These two methods of subdivision entailed their own methods of reading. A purely visual organisation contributed little to the ease of searching through a text ; as it is impossible to locate a particular fragment of the text by means of initials or titles. To give a specific example: a monk that was interested in the construction of Saint-Ghislain could leaf through the *Vita Secunda* in the content-oriented Mons manuscript, in search of the text fragment with the already mentioned rubric *Quod oratorium construxerit et Cellam Apostolorum vocitaverit*. In other words, he could read the manuscript “consultatively”⁽³⁸⁾. However, if the manuscript in front of the monk was visually organised, he would not have been able to find the fragment he wanted in an efficient way. Assuming he could not rely on his memory (as he may not have read or listened to the text before), it would have been necessary for him to start reading the first folio, and he would have happened upon the fragment he wanted to find only after a while. In such a visually ordered manuscript, the monk could only consult the individual deeds of Gislenus within the context of the *Vita* as a whole: the text could only be read in a so-called “meditative” way⁽³⁹⁾. The way in which the monk was able to approach the life of Gislenus was therefore to a large extent determined by the layout of the manuscript text in front of him.

The Liège Manuscript: A Liturgical Text Group

In the Mons manuscript, a combination of visual components and a content-oriented subdivision enabled consultative reading. The situation was very different in an eleventh-century manuscript in which the *Vita Secunda A* was included: Ms Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek/Bibliothèque Royale Albert I, 9636-37. This manuscript came from Saint-Laurent, a Benedictine monastery near Liège (which I will therefore designate the Liège manuscript). It was a somewhat larger codex (330 x 234 mm) that was produced between 1076 and 1100 and contains more than 50 different hagiographic texts,

(38) Marco MOSTERT, “What Happened to Literacy in the Middle Ages? Scriptural Evidence for the History of the Western Literate Mentality”, in *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, vol. 108, 1995, p. 323-335.

(39) MOSTERT, “What Happened” (n. 38 above), p. 323-335. Alternative terms are ‘monastic reading’ (for meditative reading) versus ‘scholastic reading’ (for consultative reading), see Jean-François GENEST, “Types de livres et de lecteurs en Occident”, in Jean GLENNISON, ed., *Le livre au Moyen Âge*, Paris, Presses du CNRS, 1988, p. 95-108. Of course, monks could read ‘scholastically’ and scholastics could read ‘monastically’.

among which the lives of more or less regional saints (such as Waldetrudis, Hucbertus, Amandus, Vedastus, Vincentius Madelgarius, Gislenus, and Bavo) make up a significant part.

The scribe of the Liège, using a no longer extant exemplar, had started out to copy the text with a content-oriented subdivision similar to the one that characterised the *Vita Secunda B* in the Mons manuscript. Yet because of negligence or perhaps an untimely death, he never completed his work: the initials were never drawn, the rubrication was never introduced⁽⁴⁰⁾. His readers were therefore confronted with a text that was regularly interrupted by empty bits of parchment, the meaning of which only became clear on comparison with manuscripts that had been completed. In other words, it was not possible to read the Liège manuscript consultatively.

The differences between the Mons manuscript and the Liège manuscript are significant. The Mons manuscript was divided in more than thirty chapters, had an extensive content-oriented and visual subdivision that enabled consultative reading, and was divided into lectiones. The Liège manuscript had fewer than fifteen chapters, and those only in the first part of the text. It could not be read consultatively and it was never divided into lectiones. In view of this series of differences, it is not surprising that the Liège manuscript laid the foundation of a manuscript tradition that was fundamentally different from the Mons tradition.

Organisation and Liturgy

Five copies of the Liège manuscript have been preserved, from the monasteries of Saint-Sépulcre (12th century), Clairmarais (first half of the 13th century), Vaucelles (13th century), and two from the Cathedral of Cambrai (13th and 15th century): manuscripts 8 through 12 in the appendix. It is characteristic of these redactions that none of them have a detailed content-oriented subdivision, and that they shared a strongly liturgical context of use: they all seem to have been used during matins. Again, there is the possibility of a correlation between the manner in which the exemplar was subdivided and the presence of a liturgical context of use in these redactions.

Such a correlation between a rudimentary layout and a liturgical context of use can be explained by the fact that the use of a hagiographical text in the liturgy required a very particular way of reading. Hagiographical texts were read aloud during matins, one of the most important of the hours. This was done in a way that held the middle ground between reading and singing. (In the words of Isidore of Seville: *Lectio dicitur quia non cantatur, ut psalmus vel hymnus, sed legitur tantum. Illic enim modulatio, hic sola pronuntiatio*

(40) A fate that was shared by many of the texts in this manuscript. Marie-Rose LAPIÈRE, *La lettre ornée dans les manuscrits mosans d'origine bénédictine (XI^e-XII^e siècles)*, Paris, Belles Lettres, 1981 (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, 1981), p. 146.

(41) W.M. LINDSAY, *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911, liber VI, chapter XIX.

quaeritur)⁽⁴¹⁾. The reading was recited at a fixed keynote, giving it a greater force of sound (*Schallkraft*), which also meant the texts could be presented in a slow and meaningful way⁽⁴²⁾.

However, there was an important difference between the matins celebrations of patron saints and that of less-important saints. The readings for patron saints were often meticulously selected from luxury *libelli* such as the Mons manuscript.⁽⁴³⁾ The audience was impressed by the richness of the codex in front of them and underwent a didactic experience as the saint's most relevant deeds were presented to them and they joined in with responses, hymns and psalms that were tailored to enhance the significance of the readings.⁽⁴⁴⁾ The lectures for saints of secondary importance were usually incorporated in large liturgical manuscripts, called *lectionaria*. They presented the texts in reading order, so that it was not necessary for a lector to leaf through the codex in search for the needed text. All he had to do was open his codex at the text that was to be read on that particular day (something that would be indicated in the title of the text). The lector then started to read at the text's first sentence and continued reading until the text ended or he ran out of time. He would not usually spend time selecting the most meaningful anecdotes to incorporate in the matins celebration, and the responses, hymns and psalms would not be tailored to fit the readings.⁽⁴⁵⁾ In short, the lector approached the readings for saints of secondary importance in a meditative way. The layout of the *lectionaria* reflects this approach. Although they often have a table of contents at the beginning of the codex that indicate which saint can be found in what part of the manuscript or on what date, the lives themselves are but rarely subdivided with regard to content⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Liturgical Tradition and Content Reduction

As we have seen, the Liège redaction had no extensive content-oriented subdivision that enabled monks to search the text. This not only reduced the efficiency with which the text could translate specific information but also

(42) Heinrich FICHTEAU, "Monastisches und scholastisches Lesen", in Georg JENAL & Stephanie HAARLÄNDER, eds., *Herrschaft, Kirche, Kultur. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters. Festschrift für Friedrich Prinz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1993 (Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, vol. 37), p. 320-321.

(43) Other examples from this area are Mss Douai BM 849, Boulogne-sur-Mer BM 107, Valenciennes BM 500 and 501, Arras BM 734 and The Hague KB 10 B 2.

(44) Susan BOYNTON, *Shaping a Monastic Identity. Liturgy & History at the Imperial Abbey of Farfa, 1000-1125*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 2006 (Conjunctions of Religion and Power in the Medieval Past), p. 280.

(45) The argument that there is a profound difference between the structure and meaning of matins readings for patron saints and other saints has been presented by the undersigned in a lecture at the conference 'Understanding Monastic Practices of Oral Communication (Western Europe, Eleventh-Thirteenth Centuries)' (Ghent University, 23-24 May 2008). A published version will be included in the congress proceedings (in the series *Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy*).

(46) For an overview of the layout of medieval liturgical manuscripts, see Andrew HUGHES, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office. A Guide to their Organization and Terminology*, Toronto & Buffalo, Toronto University Press, 1982.

seriously limited the number of contexts of usage in which the text could successfully be incorporated. Therefore, the scribe that wanted to make a copy of the Liège redaction was faced with two choices. He could (again) apply content-oriented organisation in the text, or he could copy the text as it was. Applying a new content-oriented organisation would have made the *Vita Secunda* more versatile, but it would also have been a fairly labour-intensive occupation as the scribe would have had to read through the text a number of times in order to rediscover its logical structure and to come up with suitable subtitles. Perhaps unsurprisingly, not a single scribe chose to re-adjust the layout of the text to a desired context of use in this manner. Instead, they chose a context of use in accordance with the given layout. In other words, the scribes from Saint-Sépulcre, Clairmarais, Vaucelles and the Cathedral of Cambrai all incorporated the *Vita* in *codices* that were read meditatively: *lectionaria*.

An interesting consequence of this liturgical specialization in the Liège tradition is that it might have had an influence on the content of the *Vita Secunda*. The table below makes it clear that a large part of the text did not survive the liturgical tradition. The Liège manuscript itself was relatively broad, containing the life of Gislenus itself (*Vita* 1-18), plus a *proemium*, a *sermo*, and a large part of the miracles performed by Gislenus after his death. In the copies that were subsequently made of the Liège manuscript, the miracles and the sermon were omitted at best (ms 10), and everything was omitted except the life of Gislenus itself at worst (mss 8, 9, 11 and 12).

| | Ms Mons 11 th c. | Ms Liège 11 th c. | Ms 10 12 th c. | Ms 9 13 th c. | Ms 8 13 th c. | Ms 11 13 th c. | Ms 12 15 th c. |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>Epistola</i> | X | | | | | | |
| <i>Proemium</i> | X | X | X | | | | |
| <i>Index</i> | X | | | | | | |
| <i>Vita 1-2</i> | X | X | X | X | X | (x) | (x) |
| <i>Vita 3-7</i> | X | X | X | X | X | | X |
| <i>Vita 8-10</i> | X | X | X | X | X | (x) | X |
| <i>Vita 11-18</i> | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| <i>Sermo</i> | X | X | | | | | |
| <i>Index</i> | X | X | | | | | |
| <i>Miracula 1-24</i> | X | X | | | | | |
| <i>Miracula 25</i> | X | | | | | | |
| <i>Miracula 26-32a</i> | X | X | | | | | |
| <i>Miracula 32b-37</i> | X | | | | | | |
| <i>Officium</i> | X | | | | | | |

The eighteen chapters describing the life of Gislenus were also further and further reduced. The mss from Liège, 10, 8 and 9 still contain the complete life of Gislenus. Ms 12 leaves out part of the prologue as well as the last eight chapters of his life. These chapters contain a miracle about

jumping fish, a fight with king Dagobert and the relationships Gislenus maintained with local saints Amandus, Waldetrudis, Aldegundis and Vincentius Madelgarius. These chapters were not essential to understanding Saint Gislenus himself, and they were not the stories for which Gislenus remained famous in later centuries. Deleting them saved space without touching the core of the *Vita Gisleni*. Ms 11 is an even more pronounced example of this mechanism of reduction. No more than five chapters of the old text were included in this manuscript, and even then only partly. The scribe of Ms 11 was only interested in a few essential spear points of Gislenus' life: his youth, the construction of the monastery, and his confrontation with bishop Autbertus (probably because Gislenus here utters the winged words *natione sum Graecus, dignitate christianus, religione vero monachus*)⁽⁴⁷⁾. Finally, the scribe includes the miracle in which Gislenus saves a pregnant woman who faced certain death in childbirth – the miracle Gislenus became best known for⁽⁴⁸⁾. All further deeds of Gislenus, his relationships with other people and saints, as well as all paratextual elements of the *Vita*, were reduced out. In this way, all form of contextualisation was slowly thrown overboard and only the core of Gislenus' life remained. The same reduction is not present in the manuscripts that were based on the Mons manuscript and retained its layout.

Traditions, Interpretations and Consequences

Several approaches could explain the divergence between the Mons text group (broad with regard to contents and probably read consultatively) and the Liège text group that was heavily reduced and read meditatively. Most of these stem from considerations of a redaction's proximity vis-à-vis the heart of the cult. Generally, one could argue that a codex from Saint-Ghislain itself obviously wished to recount Gislenus' life in its entirety because the saint was highly important to the formation these monks' identity, whereas Gislenus was probably less important to other monasteries. In this line of reasoning, monasteries that were temporally or spiritually removed from Saint-Ghislain would probably be more inclined to apply the strong reduction of content than the monasteries that were close to Saint-Ghislain.

In a temporal sense, the argument would be that the further a manuscript was removed in time from the eleventh-century Mons manuscript, the stronger would become its content reduction. However, the table below illustrates that there was no diachronic trend towards a reduction of content as the heaviest reductions took place in the thirteenth (and not in the fourteenth or fifteenth) century.

(47) PONCELET, "*Vita et miracula sancti Gisleni*" (n. 8 above), p. 224.

(48) Daniel VAN OVERSTRAETEN, "Note sur les dévotions populaires à Saint-Ghislain au Moyen Âge", in *Valenciennes et les anciens Pays-Bas. Mélanges offerts à Paul Lefrancq*, Valenciennes, Aux bureaux de la société, 1976 (Publication du Cercle archéologique et historique de Valenciennes à l'occasion de son cinquantenaire, vol. 9), p. 217-229.

| Ms | Monastery | REDUCED | Century | Text version | Benedictine monastery | Liturgically used |
|----|--------------------------|----------|---------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| 01 | Saint-Ghislain [Ms Mons] | No | 11 | B | X | X |
| 07 | Saint-Laurent [Ms Liège] | Slightly | 11 | A | X | |
| 04 | Saint-Amand | Slightly | 12 | B | X | |
| 10 | Saint-Sépulcre | Somewhat | 12 | A | X | X |
| 09 | Clairmarais | Heavily | 13 | A | | X |
| 02 | Saint-Ghislain | Slightly | 13 | B | X | |
| 08 | Vaucelles | Heavily | 13 | A | | X |
| 11 | Cathedral of Cambrai | Heavily | 13 | A | | X |
| 03 | Saint-Ghislain /Lobbes | Somewhat | 14 | B | X | X |
| 05 | Anchin | Slightly | 14 | B | X | |
| 12 | Cathedral of Cambrai | Heavily | 15 | A | | X |
| 13 | (unknown) | Slightly | 15 | B | ? | |

From a spiritual point of view, the matter is more complicated. Firstly, all non-Benedictine houses possessed a heavily reduced version of the *Vita Gislēni*, whereas the situation for the Benedictines is more varied. Four of those abbeys possessed a broad version (Saint-Amand, Saint-Ghislain, Saint-Laurent and Anchin) but the version in Saint-Sépulcre was reduced in content, as was a version from fourteenth-century Saint-Ghislain. This last redaction, incidentally, seems to have been written by a monk of Saint-Ghislain (as it is entitled *Dulcis et egregii vita Gislēni patroni ad laudem domini sic incipit omnipotentes*) but has been preserved in a codex from Lobbes and therefore may have been produced at Lobbes' request⁽⁴⁹⁾. This raises the question whether or not the abbeys of Saint-Sépulcre and Lobbes, like the non-Benedictine houses, were spiritually further removed from Saint-Ghislain than Saint-Amand, Saint-Laurent and Anchin.

The monastic landscape of the Southern Netherlands and the North of France from the tenth to twelfth century was characterized by various movements of religious renewal that produced continually shifting local pockets of reform. One such movement centred around abbot Gérard of Brogne, who reformed Saint-Ghislain in the years after 931⁽⁵⁰⁾, and steered the reform in Saint-Amand (952)⁽⁵¹⁾. He may even have had some influence

(49) Ms Brussels, KBR 14924-34 (Appendix, Ms 3).

(50) Ursmer BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Saint-Gérard", in *Monasticon belge*, vol. 1 (n. 6 above), p. 31; HELVÉTIUS, *Abbayes, évêques et laïques* (n. 5 above), p. 228.

(51) Henri PLATELLE, *Le temporel de l'abbaye de Saint-Amand des origines à 1340*, Paris, Librairie d'Argences, 1962 (Bibliothèque Elzévirienne, nouvelle série. Études et documents), p. 113 and 115.

on the abbot of Lobbes, Stephen (901-920)⁽⁵²⁾. In the eleventh century, noted reformer Richard of Saint-Vannes reformed Saint-Amand (1013-1018)⁽⁵³⁾ as well as Lobbes (1020-1032)⁽⁵⁴⁾, and Saint-Laurent through one of his disciples⁽⁵⁵⁾. However, none of the spiritual alliances that resulted from the shared customs between these tenth- and eleventh century reformed houses seem to correspond directly to the divergence between the text groups from Mons and Liège.

The twelfth century witnessed a vogue of Cluniac reforms, in which all Benedictine monasteries that possessed a redaction of the *Vita Secunda* were involved. Abbot Alvisus of Anchin (1111-1131) was one of the major advocates of these reforms⁽⁵⁶⁾, as well as abbots Hugo II (1085-1107) and Bovo II (1107-1121) of Saint-Amand⁽⁵⁷⁾. Saint-Laurent had already embraced the Cluniac customaries around 1077, and Saint-Ghislain probably followed only a year later⁽⁵⁸⁾. Abbot Walter of Lobbes tried to resist Alvisus' attempts to reform his community. He invited monks from Saint-Laurent and Saint-Jacques in Liège to evaluate the community's customs in an attempt to hold off Alvisus; and the monks from Liège predictably stated they could find nothing wrong in Lobbes before returning home⁽⁵⁹⁾. Several years later, abbots from Saint-Ghislain, Saint-Denis-en-Broqueroie and Saint-Amand were mobilized to expedite the election of a reform abbot in Lobbes⁽⁶⁰⁾. In 1131, the monks from Lobbes finally bowed to the inevitable and agreed to

(52) Joachim VOS, *Lobbes, son abbaye et son chapitre, ou histoire complète du monastère de Saint-Pierre à Lobbes et du chapitre de Saint-Ursmer à Lobbes et à Binches, avec cartes, vues et portraits*, vol. 1, Louvain, Peeters, 1865, p. 192-193; Mariken TEEUWEN, "Geleerde cultuur in Lobbes. De verbondenheid met de Luikse school", in *Aanzet*, vol. 10, 3, 1992, p. 232.

(53) Steven VANDERPUTTEN, "Fulcard's pigsty. Cluniac reformers, dispute settlement, and the lower aristocracy in early twelfth-century Flanders", in *Viator*, vol. 38, 1, 2007, p. 95.

(54) Ursmer BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Lobbes", in Ursmer BERLIÈRE, ed., *Monasticon belge*, vol. 1 (n. 6 above), p. 209-210.

(55) Fernand VERCAUTEREN, "Note sur les origines de Saint-Laurent de Liège", in Rita LEJEUNE, ed., *Saint-Laurent de Liège. Église, abbaye et hôpital militaire. Mille ans d'histoire*, Liège, Solédi, 1968, p. 20; Jacques STIENNON, "Les manuscrits à peintures de l'ancienne bibliothèque de l'abbaye Saint-Laurent de Liège", *Ibid.*, p. 143-144.

(56) See Steven VANDERPUTTEN, "A Time of Great Confusion. Second-generation Cluniac Reformers and Resistance to Monastic Centralization in the County of Flanders (c. 1125-1145)", in *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, vol. 102, 1, 2007, p. 47-75.

(57) PLATELLE, *Le temporel* (n. 47 above), p. 125-32. VANDERPUTTEN, "Fulcard's pigsty" (n. 49 above), p. 99.

(58) Ursmer BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Saint-Laurent à Liège", in *Monasticon belge*, vol. 2, Maredsous, Abbaye de Maredsous, 1928, p. 37; E. SABBE, "Note sur la réforme de Richard de Saint-Vanne dans les Pays-Bas", in *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, vol. 7, 1928, p. 563; BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Saint-Ghislain" (n. 6 above), p. 252; Anne-Marie HELVÉTIUS, "Aspects de l'influence de Cluny en Basse-Lotharingie aux XI^e et XII^e siècles", in *Publications de la Section Historique de l'Institut Grand-Ducal de Luxembourg*, vol. 106, 1991, p. 65.

(59) VANDERPUTTEN, "Great Confusion" (n. 52 above), p. 54. See Jacques STIENNON, "Cluny et Saint-Trond au XII^e siècle", in *Anciens Pays et Assemblées d'Etats/Standen en Landen*, vol. 8, 1955, p. 55-86; HELVÉTIUS, "Aspects de l'influence" (n. 54 above), p. 49-68.

(60) BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Lobbes" (n. 50 above), p. 212-213; VANDERPUTTEN, "Great Confusion" (n. 52 above), p. 55-56.

choose a new abbot from a shortlist that Alvisus of Anchin had provided. Meanwhile, Saint-Sépulcre was administrated by one of Alvisus' disciples for eight years before the monks had him deposed on charges of bad management and squandering the abbey's possessions⁽⁶¹⁾.

The monasteries that actively resisted Alvisus' candidates (Saint-Sépulcre and Lobbes) or belonged to a non-Benedictine grouping altogether (Vaucelles and Clairmarais, the Cathedral of Cambrai) possessed a reduced version of the *Vita Gisleni*, whereas all monasteries that embraced the reform were in possession of the entire text. The correlation between these twelfth-century reforms and the contents of the *Vitae Gisleni* in the various abbeys consequently seems pronounced. However, strong arguments can be made against the significance of this correlation. Lobbes enjoyed intimate relations with Saint-Laurent and Saint-Jacques, both reformed houses. After having accepted Alvisus' choices of an abbot, it even became a centre of reform in its own right, sending monks to other abbeys to aid them in their reforms and even providing a reformed abbot for Florennes⁽⁶²⁾. Lobbes and Saint-Sépulcre were part of a *fraternitas* that also included Saint-Amand and Anchin⁽⁶³⁾. In 1180, Lobbes and Saint-Ghislain shared the same abbot for a period of seven months, and the two abbeys remained close throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth century⁽⁶⁴⁾. The spiritual difference between Lobbes and Saint-Sépulcre on the one side and the rest of the Benedictine abbeys on the other is therefore not as clear-cut as it might seem. Secondly and more importantly, Saint-Ghislain/Lobbes, Saint-Sépulcre, Vaucelles, Clairmarais and the Cathedral of Cambrai did not form a coherent pocket of monasteries that shared and copied texts from each other. As the table shows, Lobbes possessed the so-called version B of the *Vita Secunda*, whereas the others possessed version A. The Lobbes-redaction therefore belongs to an entirely different textual tradition.

As proximity vis-à-vis the heart of the cult does not seem to have been decisive, a second approach investigates the differences between the *Vita Secunda A* (written by Rainerus between 1000 and 1013) and the *Vita Secunda B* (the 1035 rewrite). As the table shows, every manuscript containing version A (excepting the Liège Ms) has been reduced in content, whereas most of the manuscripts containing version B have remained broad. However, the difference between the *Vita Secunda A* and *B* are tantamount to an angel that was added to the chapter in which Gislenus decides to go to Gaul, a few miracles, and stylistic changes in several words and sentences. These relatively minor changes do not seem to constitute an adequate explanation for the important divergence between the two text groups.

A third approach revisits the proposed correlation between layout and context of use. All redactions of the *Vita Secunda* that were not (exclusively) used in the liturgy retained a content-oriented layout, whereas the

(61) VANDERPUTTEN, "Great Confusion" (n. 52 above), p. 51.

(62) BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Lobbes" (n. 50 above), p. 213.

(63) PLATELLE, *Le temporel* (n. 47 above), p. 183.

(64) BERLIÈRE, "Abbaye de Lobbes" (n. 50 above), p. 216; VOS, *Lobbes, son abbaye* (n. 49 above), p. 221-231.

exclusively liturgical manuscripts are not layed out in such a manner. The liturgical context of use in turn encouraged a reduction of the text, so that it could be read within the timeframe of the office. This resulted in a tendency to keep only the basic elements of a saint's life: his birth, calling, preaching and construction of the oratory, a single miracle, and his death⁽⁶⁵⁾. The more versatile redactions from Saint-Ghislain, Saint-Amand and Anchin on the other hand were only pruned of small fragments of text that were irrelevant to a new audience. The textual mechanisms of reduction functioned in very different ways in the two text groups from Mons and Liège because of the allied characteristics of layout, the way in which a text could be read, and its context of use.

Conclusion

After Rainerus composed the *Vita Secunda Gisleni* in the eleventh century, the text soon broke up into two text groups. One contained the older *Vita Secunda A* and encompassed six manuscripts from Saint-Laurent in Liège, Saint-Sépulcre, Clairmarais, Vaucelles, and the Cathedral of Cambrai. The other text group contained the rewritten *Vita Secunda B* and encompassed six manuscripts from Saint-Ghislain, Saint-Ghislain/Lobbès, Saint-Amand, Anchin, and one unknown institution. The differences between the *Vita Secunda A* and *B* were not overly large, textually speaking: some stylistic variations and a few added miracles were among the most remarkable differences. However, the two manuscript traditions have evolved in such a way that they grew worlds apart in terms of functionality. The *Vita Secunda A* was only included in lectionaries and breviaries, and evolved into a life that became functional exclusively within the liturgy. The *Vita Secunda B* developed a different functionality, in the sense that it did not become glued to one single context of use. This version of the *Vita Secunda* was usually incorporated in legends and libelli, books that could be used in the liturgy as easily as they could be put into service in the refectory, the chapter or be used for private reading. The textual mechanisms of reduction functioned differently in the two manuscript traditions. The liturgically used *Vita Secunda A* was being subjected to systematic excision⁽⁶⁶⁾ when it came to the contextualisation of Saint Gislenus' deeds, whereas the others were pruned only because a part of the *Vita* that once had great relevance would become obsolete and somewhat irrelevant to a new audience of the text. This manner of excision depended more on the individual judgment of a scribe and was much less systematic.

(65) BOYER, "The Typology" (n. 43 above), p. 32; Alison G. ELLIOTT, *Roads to Paradise. Reading the Lives of the Early Saints*, Hannover & London, University Press of New England, 1987, p. 59-60.

(66) Monique GOULLET, "Vers une typologie des réécritures hagiographiques, à partir de quelques exemples du Nord-Est de la France. Avec une édition synoptique des deux vies de saint Èvre de Toul", in Monique GOULLET & Martin HEINZELMANN, eds., *La réécriture hagiographique* (n. 1 above), p. 110-111.

Trying to find an explanation for the emergence of these two very different manuscript traditions, several possibilities have been examined. Among them were chronological or spiritual proximity to the heart of the cult as well as the textual difference between the *Vita Secunda A* and *B*. However, none of these approaches seemed to have sufficient explanatory power. Another line of thought, which deserves our attention, was provided by an analysis of the layout of the different traditions, as they correlate with the observed functional diversity. The Mons tradition combined a sophisticated layout with a wide range of functions - it simultaneously formed an identity, offered an interpretation of contemporary events and served as a liturgical text - whereas the strictly liturgical Liège tradition had but a rudimentary layout. That a liturgical context of use did not require an extensive, content-oriented organisation can be gathered from the fact that the scribes never felt the need to implement a new layout in the new redactions. This practice precluded the possibility of consultative reading to a considerable extent. Therefore, we might hypothesize that the emergence of the two manuscript traditions was at least partially determined by the way in which the layout of the Mons and Liège manuscripts enabled or precluded certain methods of reading. The content-oriented layout of the Mons manuscript promoted textual versatility whereas the rudimentary layout of the Liège manuscript effectively limited its functionality. Future research into medieval rewriting processes and the development of text groups could benefit from taking such material aspects of manuscript redactions into account.

APPENDIX – THE MANUSCRIPTS

The manuscripts containing a *Vita Secunda A* or *B* have all been given a number from 1 to 13 for convenience. Numbers 1 to 9 are based on Poncelet⁽⁶⁷⁾. Another survey of these texts can be found on the website of the *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Manuscripta*, excluding the numbers 4, 6, 10, 11, 12 and 13.

Vita Prima [BHL 3552] (also known as *Vita Secunda*)

| Nr | Year | | ID, olim, fol. |
|------------|-----------|--|---|
| 01 Mons | 1035-1075 | | Mons, BUMH [Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire] 27/221, fol. 8r-23v. Olim Saint-Ghislain |
| 04 | 1130-1147 | | Valenciennes, BM [Bibliothèque Municipale] 514, fol. 24r-32r Olim Saint-Amand (possibly Index Maior, CXLVI), prologue only |

Vita Secunda : Vita [BHL 3555] (also known as *Vita Tertia*)

| MS | Year | Vita | ID, olim, fol. |
|-------------|-----------|------|--|
| 06 | 1000-1100 | | Brussels, KBR [Koninklijke Bibliotheek/Bibliothèque Royale Albert I] 6777-6827, single folio |
| 01 Mons | 1035-1075 | B | Mons, BUMH 27/221, fol. 23v-61v Olim Saint-Ghislain |
| 07 Liège | 1075-1100 | A | Brussels, KBR 9636-37, fol. 149v-156r Olim Saint-Laurent |
| 04 | 1130-1147 | B | Valenciennes, BM 514, fol. 24r-32r Olim Saint-Amand (possibly <i>Index Maior</i> , CXLVI), without the prologue |
| 10 | 1100-1200 | A | Cambrai, BM 855, fol. 51r-55v Olim Saint-Sépulcre |
| 09 | 1200-1250 | A | Saint-Omer, BM 716 (V), fol. 84v-89r Olim Clairmarais |
| 02 | 1200-1300 | B | Mons, BUMH 229/222, fol. 1r-23r Olim Saint-Ghislain |
| 08 | 1200-1300 | A | Brussels, KBR 7460, fol. 46r-51r Olim Vaucelles |
| 11 | 1200-1300 | A | Cambrai, BM 93, fol. 403r-404r (Breviary) Olim Cathedral of Cambrai |
| 03 | 1300-1400 | B | Brussels, KBR 14924-34, fol. 1r-8v Olim Saint-Ghislain/Lobbes ⁽⁶⁸⁾ |
| 05 | 1300-1400 | B | Douai, BM 500, fol. 103r-149r Olim Anchin |

(67) PONCELET, “*De vita S. Gisleini*” (n. 8 above), p. 217.

(68) The *Vita Secunda Gisleini* can be found on a quire that was added to Brussels, KBR 14924-34 from eleventh-century Lobbes. The *Vita* is titled *Dulcis et egregii Gisleini vita patroni ad laudem domini sic incipit omnipotentis*, suggesting it was produced in Saint-Ghislain.

| MS | Year | Vita | ID, olim, fol. |
|----|-----------|------|--|
| 12 | 1400-1500 | A | Cambrai, BM 806, fol. 273r-275v Olim Cathedral of Cambrai |
| 13 | 1438 | B | Douai, BM 848; fol. 325r-236v Olim (unknown) |

Vita Secunda : Miracula [BHL 3556] (also known as Vita Tertia)

| Nr | Year | Vita | ID, olim, fol. |
|-------------|-----------|------|---|
| 01 Mons | 1035-1075 | B | Mons, BUMH 27/221, fol. 262v-143r Olim Saint-Ghislain |
| 07 Liège | 1075-1100 | A | Brussels, KBR 9636-37, fol. 156v-171r Olim Saint-Laurent |
| 02 | 1200-1300 | B | Mons, BUMH 229/222, fol. 23r-67v Olim Saint-Ghislain |
| 05 | 1300-1400 | B | Douai, BM 500, fol. 103r-149r Olim Anchin |

ABSTRACT

Tjamke SNIJDERS, *Manuscript Layout and Réécriture. A Reconstruction of the Manuscript Tradition of the Vita Secunda Gisleni*

This article examines the interaction between text and layout in some medieval hagiographical writings from the Southern Low Countries in the High Middle Ages. The basis for this analysis is the *Vita Secunda Gisleni*, a first version of which (A) was written around the year 1000 and which was re-written as version B around 1035. Textually speaking, the differences between the *Vita Secunda* A and B were limited. However, the two subsequent manuscript traditions came to differ in terms of layout and functionality. Manuscripts containing version A tended to have a very sober layout and were used mostly in a liturgical context, whereas those containing version B had a sophisticated layout and a much wider range of functions within the monastic community. This article argues that the layout of the earliest manuscripts of the *Vita Secunda Gisleni* may be at the root of this divergence, and can shed light on the intentions of the scribes and the anticipated function of their texts.

Monastic culture – manuscripts - *Vita Gisleni* – rewriting

RÉSUMÉ

Tjamke SNIJDERS, *Mise en page de manuscrits et réécriture. Une reconstruction de la tradition manuscrite de la Vita secunda Gisleni*

Cet article examine les interactions entre le texte et sa mise en page dans quelques écrits hagiographiques des Pays-Bas méridionaux durant le Haut Moyen Âge. La base de cette analyse est la *Vita secunda Gisleni*, dont une première version (A), écrite vers l’an Mil, a servi de base à une version B vers 1035. Du point de vue du texte, les différences entre les deux versions de la *Vita secunda* (A et B) ne sont

pas très importantes. Par contre, les traditions manuscrites de ces deux versions diffèrent considérablement en ce qui concerne la mise en page et la fonctionnalité. Généralement, les rédactions contenant la version A présentaient une mise en page fort sobre et elles étaient utilisées dans un contexte liturgique. Quant aux rédactions possédant la version B, elles montraient une mise en page sophistiquée et témoignaient de fonctions plus larges dans la communauté monastique. Cet article avance l'hypothèse que la mise en page des premières rédactions de la *Vita Secunda Gisleni* pourrait être à la base de l'apparition des deux traditions et peut éclaircir les intentions des auteurs et la fonctionnalité prévue de leurs textes.

Culture monastique – manuscrits - *Vita Gisleni* - réécriture

SAMENVATTING

Tjamke SNIJDERS, *De layout van manuscripten en 'Réécriture'. Een reconstructie van de handschriftelijke traditie van de Vita Secunda Gisleni*

Dit artikel onderzoekt de interactie tussen tekst en lay-out in een aantal hoogmiddeleeuwse hagiografische redacties uit de Zuidelijke Nederlanden. De basis voor deze analyse wordt gevormd door de *Vita Secunda Gisleni*, waarvan een eerste versie (A) rond het jaar 1000 is geschreven en die rond 1035 is herschreven tot versie B. Op het vlak van de eigenlijke tekst zijn de verschillen tussen de *Vita Secunda A* en *B* niet buitengewoon groot. De handschriftelijke tradities die uit deze twee versies voortkwamen verschilden echter sterk van elkaar in termen van lay-out en functionaliteit. Redacties met versie A hadden gewoonlijk een zeer sobere opmaak en werden in een liturgische context gebruikt, terwijl redacties met versie B een gesofisticeerde opmaak hadden en veel breder werden ingezet binnen de monastieke gemeenschap. In dit artikel wordt de hypothese voorgesteld dat de lay-out van de vroegste handschriften van de *Vita Secunda Gisleni* ten grondslag ligt aan het ontstaan van de twee tradities en licht werpt op de intenties van de scribenten en op de bedoelde functionaliteit van hun werk.

Monastieke cultuur - handschriften - *Vita Gisleni* - herschrijven