Columbanus wore a single cowl, not a double one. The *Vita Deicoli* and the Legacy of Columbanian Monasticism at the Turn of the First Millennium

Steven Vanderputten (Ghent University)

Sometime in the 970s or 980s Abbot Werdolph of Lure, a small Benedictine house in a region of present-day France where the plain of the Saône River meets the low wooded mountains of the Vosges region,[1] commissioned a cleric by the name of Theoderic to write a *Life* of his institution's Irish founder St Deicolus (d. presumably around 620).[2] The resulting *Vita Deicoli,* a narrative of about 9000 words in the longer of two known versions,[3] was part of a surge in the continental production of *Lives* of Insular saints around the turn of the millennium. Some of this hagiographic activity was surely inspired by a recent 'wave' of religious migrants from the British Isles, particularly in the former middle kingdom of Lotharingia and (from c. 1000 onwards) east of the Rhine, and by the fact that a number of these individuals achieved prominent roles in ecclesiastical contexts, as abbots, teachers, and intellectuals.[4] And this writing was also influenced by the strong interest at the time in how older narratives depicted heroic acts of ascetic self-abnegation, religious peregrination, eremitical withdrawal, and apostolic action, all of which were themes that appealed greatly to contemporary audiences.[5]

But in addition to these impulses, the new literary production was driven by the sheer plasticity of the memory of Irish saints and their achievements, whether in the conduct they promoted, their relationships with other *peregrini* and with various continental agents both lay and religious, or in their long-term impact on the religious landscape. Late tenth- and early eleventh-century authors who were looking to address then-current questions on the historicity, organization, and spirituality of religious communities discovered that this plasticity allowed

them to project institutionally and ideologically convenient answers to these questions onto a legitimizing past.[6] Previous research on the *Vita Deicoli* has revealed that it too was influenced by this malleability of memory. Besides celebrating St Deicolus's significance as a disciple of St Columbanus, his virtues, and his achievements first as a hermit and then as a monastic founder, it also includes a long and detailed postscript that recounts the secularization of Lure's estate in the latter decades of the ninth century; the devastating impact of an assault by Hungarian invaders in 937; and the 959 re-foundation under the auspices of the German King Otto I. Because this postscript is so extensive, scholars have been able to establish in considerable detail how Theoderic tailored his account of the abbey's early seventh-century origins to reflect two things. One, the circumstances of Lure's 'resurrection' as a monastic institution in the tenth century; and two, Abbot Werdolph and his monks' subsequent relationship with former and then-current stakeholders in their institution.[7]

This 'local' interpretation of the *Vita* is relevant to our understanding of the narrative's content and context of creation. But its success with scholars is probably also the reason why other parts of the narrative have so far eluded detailed investigation. Of particular note is the inclusion after the brief prologue of a long introductory section that is known to scholars as the 'second prologue'. In its first part, Theoderic gives an overview of major landmarks in West Francia, Burgundy, and Lotharingia's religious landscape by listing fourteen episcopal centres and three monastic ones (the latter at Fleury, Sankt Maximin in Trier, and Luxeuil, a selection that may be surprising given the towering reputation of major 'reform centres' Cluny and Gorze in traditional accounts of tenth-century monasticism), naming for each of them the principal saints whose relics they kept.[8] And in the second part of this second prologue, the hagiographer also provides a prequel-like account to his description of Deicolus's achievement as a monastic founder: the foundation of Luxeuil abbey by St Columbanus, the latter's relationship with his disciples Gallus and Deicolus, and the two men parting company from Columbanus soon after

his exile from Luxeuil. In addition to these features, the *Vita* is also notable for a number of remarkable statements on monastic identity and practice that are scattered throughout this and other parts of the text. In one of these, Theoderic makes a point of noting that Columbanus had chosen to wear the *cuculla*, a hooded cowl, instead of the *cucullus*, a two-part garment consisting of a cowl and a separate hood.

It is tempting to dismiss both the entire second prologue and the scattered comments about monastic identity and practice as a routine mix, part hagiographical commonplace, part demonstration of authorial erudition, and part talking up an obscure local saint and his minor foundation to give the appearance of broader relevance.[9] In particular the quip about Columbanus's style of dress may strike the modern observer as profoundly anachronistic. Yet as this paper hopes to show, these aspects of the text, along with its early transmission history, and the context in which this and related narratives as well as several manuscript compilations originated, reveal to us how Theoderic and some of his contemporaries used the plasticity of the memory of Columbanian monasticism in order to mobilize it for institutional purposes without being limited by it spritually. Put differently, Theoderic did not feel constrained by the 'neo-Columbanian' tradition in which he embedded his account of St Deicolus's life and Lure's origins and expanded it with other elements as he saw fit.

Each of the five sections in this paper considers a different aspect of the *Vita Deicoli*'s multi-layered message. In the first we take a new look at the narrative's discourse from a strictly local viewpoint of the community of Lure, arguing that the goal of ensuring the future stability of the abbey's administration drove the narrative's creation. And in the next four sections we each time take a step further back from this local viewpoint, in order to consider Theoderic's ulterior motives. The first focuses on his argument about Luxeuil abbey and what it might tell us about his response to then-current abbatial policies at Luxeuil and Lure. The next section expands evidence of this relationship to include indications of Luxeuil's efforts to establish

links with a number of 'Columbanian' foundations in West Francia and Burgundy, hypothesizing on efforts to establish an 'imagined community' of such institutions with Luxeuil at its centre. Any conclusions that one might be tempted to draw about the impact of these links on the spirituality and self-understanding of different communities is nuanced in the final two sections. One of these considers Theoderic's references to the abbeys of Fleury and Sankt Maximin and unpacks their relevance to his perception of institutional and spiritual renewal in late tenth-century monasticism. And the other is about how the *Vita*'s outlook on ascetic spirituality bears a striking resemblance to contemporary accounts from the wider milieu around the Lotharingian abbey of Gorze.

Lure Abbey and the *Vita Deicoli*

Although the *Vita Deicoli* extensively discusses the origins of Lure abbey as an early 620s foundation by Irishman Deicolus, neither that event nor the existence of an individual of that name among Columbanus's followers can be verified through other sources.[10] It is possible, but far from certain, that Lure was founded by an Abbot Deicolus who lived about two generations later and is named (albeit without mention of his institution) in the dedication note of the late seventh-century *Life* of Germanus, a former monk of Luxeuil and abbot of Grandval (d. 675).[11] What we do know for certain is that by the early ninth century there existed a religious institution of unknown affiliation and membership on the same site that Abbot Werdolph and his monks occupied at the end of the tenth century.[12] The earliest reliable reference to it is in the 819 *Notitia de servitio monasteriorum*, a list of monastic houses and the services Emperor Louis the Pious expected to receive from them, for his own benefit and that of the Empire.[13] In the *Notitia*, Lure abbey is mentioned in the category of institutions that were exempt from providing any financial or military aid and owed prayers only. We can assume, therefore, that

the membership and estate were quite small and that the community could not afford any extra charges.

In line with what happened to countless monasteries across the Carolingian Empire, the abbey's situation in the mid-to-later ninth century subsequently shifted as the emphasis of political power moved from the royal court to territorial entities. Lure abbey briefly re-emerges from documentary silence in an eleventh- or twelfth-century forgery of a charter by King Lothar II, which is dated 865 and may or may not derive from an authentic document.[14] According to the *Vita Deicoli* Lure abbey was one of the institutions Lothar subsequently gave to his concubine Waldrada (d. 869), who allegedly chased off the incumbent Abbot Icho and appointed her relative Eberhard as advocate. Following her death, the text continues, Eberhard "invaded" the abbey and turned it into a private estate.[15] Whatever may be the truth value of these latter two statements, we do know that between c. 885 and 959 Lure was held by Eberhard's family, a branch of the Etichonids, as a heritable property. In this period they acted as counts of Alsace: Eberhard's son Hugo succeeded him as count and retained ownership of the estate after his father's death in the early part of the tenth century.[16]

Still according to the *Vita*, this state of affairs ended when Hugo's three sons fell ill, due to their sacrilegious conduct at Deicolus's grave. All four of them did penance by taking monastic vows and by subsequently calling on Abbot Baltramn of Alanesberg to come to Lure and re-establish Deicolus's old monastery.[17] And they also sought the German King Otto I's formal approval of the re-foundation, which was duly granted. However, a charter by Otto dated 6 April 959 gives a completely different account.[18] It claims that the king, on finding that Abbot Baltramn and his *congregatio* of Benedictine brothers were living in conditions that were "very unsuitable for use by monks", allowed them to relocate to Lure "so that they can abandon the world and follow the precepts of the *Rule of St Benedict* faithfully".[19] This was possible, the charter continues, because two of Hugo's sons, Hugo and Eberhard, had previously transferred

the estate of Lure into his, Otto's, hands. Besides adding two properties to the original estate – one in the locality of Wolfisheim, the other near Rosheim – Otto also proclaimed his protection and that of his successors over the abbey. He transferred the abbey's ownership (*jus proprietatis*) to the Apostolic See, awarded the monks the right to freely elect their abbot, and prohibited any bishop or archbishop from making undue claims over it. According to the *Vita*, Baltramn's tenure began auspiciously with the construction of a new sanctuary, but was cut short by his death on 15 August 960.[20] He was succeeded by his nephew Werdolph, who set out to consolidate the abbey's estate and later also commissioned the *Vita Deicoli*.[21]

Hans Hummer's analysis has shown that Lure abbey's 're-foundation' must be understood in the light of growing East Frankish influence in the former kingdom of Burgundy. This process had been ongoing for several decades, but in the middle of the century King Otto drastically expedited it by taking an active interest in the restoration of former monastic institutions and by strategically reshaping their relationship with the region's aristocratic stakeholders. When one of Hugo's sons, Guntramn, fell out of favour with the king, his siblings Hugo and Eberhard were likely pressured to transfer control over Lure's estate and to allow for the foundation of a Benedictine monastery that was graced with an exceptionally generous set of liberties and privileges.[22] Judging by the *Vita Deicoli*, the monks subsequently felt a great deal of resentment at the Etichonids' alleged abuse of their institution pre-959. And they remained alert about challenges to their newly won status, with good reason so it turns out: in 1016, then-incumbent Abbot Immo had to ask for an intervention by King Henry II of Germany to undo Count Eberhard's (a grandson of Count Hugo's) usurpation of Lure's estate.[23] In response to these fears and tensions, in the 970s or 980s Theoderic crafted the *Vita Deicoli*, an ingenious account of the abbey's early seventh-century origins that legitimized Otto's intervention and buttressed the community's privileged status. For this he relied on the *Vita Galli II* (in particular its foundation account of the abbey of St Gall), possibly the *Vita Antidii*

(for Deicolus's journey to Rome), the *Vita Ursicini* (for the theme of persecution and conflicts with outsiders), and finally also Otto's charter (for the claim that the Merovingian King Chlotarius had granted a similar privilege in the early 620s).[24]

In light of these strategies, it may seem surprising that the *Vita* gives the Ottonian sovereign only a subsidiary role in the story of the re-foundation.[25] Hummer speculates that Theoderic, even though he deliberately cast the Etichonids' memory in the worst possible light, wanted to make an exception for Hugo and his three sons because they had shown compunction for their crimes by taking vows and had possibly even joined the monastic community after Baltramn had taken office. Yet if we consider the short time that had elapsed between the events of 959 and the *Vita*'s redaction in the 970s or 980s, it becomes obvious that a more substantial reason must have driven him to intervene so drastically in narrating events that were still within living memory. Indeed, it appears that Theoderic's goal was to normalize relations with members of Hugo's family who felt humiliated or short-changed by Otto's intervention. This he did in two ways. One was to give a less inflammatory reading of the re-foundation than the one in Otto's charter.[26] And the other was to avoid making overt references either to the sovereign's intervention or to the charter itself.

This interpretation is backed up by a 1016 charter by King Henry II, which takes a similar narrative position. It rehearses the contents of Otto's earlier grant but makes no mention of it (or of Otto) and claims to derive three privileges from Carolingian rulers Pippin, Charlemagne, and Louis the Pious.[27] Evidently Abbot Immo and his monks were looking to bring an end to the dispute with Count Eberhard and relied on Otto's charter to make their case. But they probably also realized that explicitly referring to that document and to Otto's aggressive action against Eberhard's relatives would have still been painful for family members, regardless of their current relationship with the abbey by this point. Judging by the similarities in argument between Henry's charter and the *Vita*, Immo inherited this strategy of

reconciliation from his predecessor Werdolph, possibly because he realized that it had been effective with at least one branch of the Etichonid family. In Wibert's mid-eleventh-century biography of Pope Leo IX, a descendant of Hugo's son Hugo, we read that Hugo's sons Hugo and Eberhard had entered the monastery late in life and that other Etichonid relatives of Leo's had generously patronized the abbey.[28] And Leo himself also confirmed the abbey's privileges and took additional measures to protect it from undue demands by the local advocate.[29] In the meantime, Lure's leadership had also taken steps to normalize the relationship with the region's clerical authorities, despite its exempted status. In 1031 the newly elected Abbot Durand made the traditional promise of obedience before the bishop of Strasbourg, even though he was not technically obliged to do so: a written record of that promise was duly entered in the bishop's archives.[30]

Lure's written legacy from the decades around the year 1000 thus shows itself to be part of an effort to establish and legitimize a vision of the abbey's status as an independent institution. It was also one amongst several attempts to erase the bad auspices under which its relationship with former lay and clerical stakeholders had started, a published token of good will. This 'local' interpretation reflects the discourse of the *Vita Deicoli* as it is known to us through manuscript copies from the twelfth century onwards.[31] However, it does not explain all the details of the text as Theoderic wrote it and in fact narrows down our understanding of a considerably more complex narrative. Certainly the *Vita* presents a well-conceived if fairly straightforward (and for the time very common) argument about a minor abbey's invented seventh-century origins and its mid-tenth-century 'resurrection' as a highly emancipated institution, but it does much more besides. This becomes obvious if we consider the *Vita* in its original form.

Co-Creating a New 'Columbanian' Tradition

The early eleventh-century codex London, BL, Add. 21917 is the only manuscript version of the *Vita* that includes the second prologue, mentioned at the beginning of this paper.[32] This block of text of more than 2000 words begins (as we already saw) with the overview of fourteen urban centres and three monastic ones. The final stop on its literary journey, Luxeuil abbey, is also the hagiographer's destination, for his stated purpose in the next part of the second prologue is to explain why "(Luxeuil) is spiritually known as light of the sheep" (*lux ovium*).[33] It briefly describes the poor state of religious life in Gaul at the turn of the sixth century; Columbanus's origins as a *Scottus*, his education, and his early ascetic career as described in Jonas's *Vita Columbani*; and the fact that he was joined by his followers Gallus and (so the author claims at least) Deicolus on a *peregrinatio* to Burgundy. Here Columbanus initially became a hermit but soon decided to "construct the Lord's sheepfold, in this place that henceforth became known as the name Luxeuil".[34] After having founded Luxeuil, he was soon forced into exile together with Gallus and Deicolus. Both these men shortly went their own way: Gallus was the first to leave his master and departed into the land of the *Suevi* and *Alemanni*, where he preached among the heathen. Deicolus, who was already an old man, preferred to remain in the region and look for a place to withdraw to a cell of his own. At this point the two versions of the *Vita* become (nearly) identical again.

In this second prologue we can see a major second discourse in the *Vita*, one that pertains to Lure's connection with Columbanus's legacy and especially also with Luxeuil. Yet so far, it has received no in-depth attention from scholars. In part this is due to the fact that lengthy arguments about monasticism's past and invented links between a minor saint and one or several famous contemporaries are common tropes in hagiographies from the late tenth and early eleventh centuries.[35] And another reason for the scholarly silence is that Luxeuil's history in the decades around the year 1000 is (comparatively speaking) poorly documented, among

other things as a result of a fire that raged through the convent buildings in 1200.[36] Nonetheless there is enough evidence to say that the abbey had gone through a difficult period in the later ninth and early tenth centuries, for reasons that were probably quite similar to those that we find described in the *Vita Deicoli*.[37] And we also know that mid-to-late tenth-century abbots worked towards a restoration or at least a reorganization of their institution's dispersed estate. Two documented trades of properties with the abbey of Cluny from the years 942/63 and 984 fit that objective.[38] And in his *Vita Waldeberti* (a collection of miracles attributed to Waldebert, Luxeuil's third abbot), former Luxeuil oblate Adso of Montier-en-Der (d. 992) focussed heavily on protection and restoration of monastic properties, presumably in an attempt to bolster Luxeuil leadership's confidence in their ongoing efforts to protect and augment the monastic estate.[39]

Alongside these indications of attempts at institutional restoration or renewal, we also have scattered glimpses of moves to revitalize the abbey's spiritual and intellectual life. A tenth-century manuscript of Smaragdus's commentary on the Epistles and the Gospels may have originated in such a context.[40] But our best evidence relates to the work and impact of a local priest and schoolmaster named Constantius. According to a late medieval report he was the author of a treatise on the properties of liquids,[41] and in 1004 he finished working on a copy of Boethius's *Geometry* and various other texts on related subjects.[42] And when he died a few years later, a monk named Gudinus was moved to compose a poetic lament (*planctus*) in which he expressed the monks' shock at the loss of their master.[43]

As these processes of restoration and renewal were unfolding, the Luxeuil monks also began taking an active interest in promoting their institution as a major regional centre of intellectual and spiritual life. In his *planctus* Gudinus makes a highly exaggerated comment that Henry II, on hearing the news of the schoolmaster's death, had said that he feared there would never again be such a highly learned man in his realm.[44] And not long after Constantius's death

his copy of the *Geometry* ended up in the collection of Bishop Weinhar of Strasbourg (1001–1028), possibly as a result of the abbey's above-cited attempts to establish a friendly relationship with the local episcopate.[45] At the same time, the community also fostered awareness of Luxeuil's significance as the most prominent institution in the Columbanian tradition and their own role as custodians of the saint's institutional legacy. Although they did not produce any new hagiographical narratives for that purpose, they did rely on a method of co-creation of such texts with authors who were working in other places. Adso's *Vita Maldeberti*, which was written roughly around the same time as the *Vita Deicoli*, alludes several times to the fact that the Luxeuil monks informed its contents, which is not surprising given the author's personal links to his former institution.[46] That text, alongside Adso's *Lives* of Frodobert of Moutier-le-Celle and Bercharius of Montier-en-Der, celebrates early medieval Luxeuil's reputation as a highly efficient organization, strict in its observance of Columbanus's *Rule,* and famous for the ascetic fervour of its members and the quality of its education.[47] And on re-reading the *Vita Deicoli*, one cannot help but notice the discursive similiarities with, and the way it complements, Adso's work. More specifically the *Vita Deicoli* implies that Luxeuil, besides its monumental historical significance, was *still* a major beacon of monastic spirituality and a source of inspiration for monastic communities across the wider region, and as such belonged to an elite cohort of monastic centres alongside Fleury and Sankt Maximin.[48]

Based on these indications, we can reasonably argue that Theoderic's hagiographic work for Lure abbey deliberately echoes a contemporary Luxeuil discourse about that institution's past and present significance. The resulting marriage of institutional narratives in the *Vita Deicoli* should not surprise us. From a slightly later period we have several hints that the institutional destinies of the two monasteries had started converging. In the 1010s and again in the 1040s–50s they were probably implicated in a multi-abbacy.[49] And during these phases both institutions also obtained major privileges that confirmed their freedom from lay and

(especially) clerical interference, which adds further credence to the notion that their governance was very much aligned at the time.[50] Furthermore, Theoderic's profile as a well-travelled individual and a prolific hagiographer does make some sort of joint hagiographical venture between Lure and Luxeuil at the very least plausible. Hartmut Hoffmann's reconstruction of Theoderic's biography reveals him to have been a native of "Gaul" (which could mean any region west of the Rhine), who started his career working either in a cathedral community or as a parish priest, subsequently moving to Lure abbey in the 970s/80s. After this he made profession at Fleury in the 980s/90s (but not later than 992), travelled several times to Italy (visiting, among other places, Rome and Monte Cassino), in 1006 ended up at Sankt Maximin in Trier, and probably ended his career at Amorbach, where he died at some point after 1018. Along the way, Theoderic created multiple hagiographical texts for his hosts, having each time familiarized himself with local hagiographic traditions and historical memories, plus also drafting Fleury's oldest customary.[51] One can easily imagine that someone with his profile, on arriving at Lure, would be drawn to Luxeuil. Without a doubt, Theoderic will have had contact with the other abbey and will have learnt of Luxeuil's ongoing efforts to change its institutional fortunes and revive its intellectual and spiritual life. In the course of such contact, he could have first absorbed the monks' then-current discourse of institutional and cultural renewal, and then been invited to assist them (as Adso did) in their efforts to co-create new texts that helped broadcast that narrative. As we shall see in the next section, the oldest manuscript of the *Vita Deicoli* makes this connection even more plausible.

'Neo-Columbanian' Networking and Its Limits

Even if we were to find that the *Vita Deicoli* or even the *Vita Waldeberti* were written without any direct involvement from the Luxeuil monks, we still know that they took a keen interest in

these narratives and acquired copies very soon after their completion. We know too that the members of this community were also quick to insert these *vitae* into a 'Luxovian' collection of old and new hagiographies that celebrated both the abbey's venerable origins as a foundation of Columbanus, and the saint's legacy as the originator of several lineages of charismatic monastic leaders at Luxeuil and other places. Our key witness to this effort is the above-mentioned London manuscript. British Library, Add. 21917, which in all likelihood was made in the early eleventh century for use at Luxeuil,[52] is a composite of two distinct codicological units. The first of these (on fol. 6–71) brings together Jonas of Bobbio's *Vita Columbani* and his *Life* of Luxeuil's second abbot, Eustace; Adso's *Vita Waldeberti*; a *Life* of Philibert, Columbanus's disciple and the first abbot of Jumièges; *a Life* of the fourth-century Bishop Taurin of Evreux by the monks of Fécamp, a foundation by Columbanus's follower Audoenus;[53] and finally also the *Vita Deicoli*. The second codicological unit comprises a miscellaneous collection of Passions and *Lives* that are unrelated to the 'Columbanian' hagiographic tradition.

The former small assemblage of texts lends credence to the hypothesis that the Luxeuil monks were putting efforts into renewing a Columbanian hagiographic tradition. In all likelihood this renewal was designed to do three things. One, make a statement about Luxeuil as Columbanus's principal foundation and support abbots' ongoing efforts to regain some of its former prestige as a major institutional and spiritual centre. Two, argue that Columbanus's disciples and followers had perpetuated his charismatic legacy after his departure from Luxeuil and, ultimately, his death. And three, suggest that the institutions that were implicated in this charismatic legacy (either as Columbanus's own foundations or as those of his followers) remained part of an 'imagined community' of Columbanian institutions that was centred on Luxeuil abbey. But instead of rewriting older texts such as Jonas's *Vita Columbani* (which would have been a problematic tactic given the venerable status of that text and the fact that it

was widely disseminated at the time),[54] or creating new narratives of their own, they achieved their objective by bringing together in one collection old and new narratives that revealed the existence, in different parts of Burgundy and West Francia, of communities that kept alive the legacy of Columbanus and his followers.

The result, even though the BL manuscript is incomplete at the beginning and the end, shows us that the Luxeuil monks were open to the idea of exchanging (and in some cases possibly even co-created) hagiographies with authors working at other institutions, as a means of fostering a sense of shared 'Luxovian' historical and cultic identity. It brings to mind hagiographical efforts at late tenth- and (especially) early eleventh-century Cluny to promote the notion of a 'charismatic genealogy' of monastic leaders there and foster a sense of shared identity between Cluniac institutions.[55] And it also reminds us of a contemporary trend to retool existing links between monastic institutions and establish new ones, in order to facilitate the exchange of people, know-how and other resources, and in some cases even restructure the governance of multiple institutions at the same time.[56] The exchange of hagiographical narratives and manuscripts played an important part in setting in place these institutional connections, the nature and implications of which differed from one institution to the next. Except for the likely indications of Lure and Luxeuil's converging destiny in the first half of the eleventh century, unfortunately we remain in the dark about the intended scope of this 'Luxovian' network and about its operational implications. But we can say at least one thing, which is that the London manuscript reflects the networking ambitions of Luxeuil's leadership at the time and that some communities in West Francia and Burgundy had apparently responded to these ambitions positively.

The notion of (in)formal networking through the compiling and copying of Columbanian hagiographies is not speculative. We can tell this because the 'Luxovian' attempt to renew Columbanian tradition coincided with a contemporary 'eastern' effort in which the

abbeys of St Gall and Reichenau played a prominent part, producing new texts, assembling manuscript collections, and disseminating them in various parts of the Empire.[57] In the final quarter of the tenth century, scribes at Reichenau emblematized the resulting cultic and institutional connections by producing a manuscript that comprised Jonas's *Life* of Columbanus, Walahfrid Strabo's *Life* of Gallus, a *Life* of Otmar of St Gall, and a ninth-century *Vita Tripartita* dedicated to Omer of Saint-Bertin in Flanders.[58] The inclusion of this latter text is important, for it pertains to an institution that was technically part of West Frankish territory but had strong links to the Empire. Saint-Bertin had been involved in a confraternity agreement with St Gall since the late ninth century, and in the later tenth and early eleventh centuries, imperial agents were intensely involved in the abbey's administration and patronage.[59] These connections had an impact on local hagiographical tradition, which celebrated St Omer's putative links to an 'eastern' or 'Sangallian' branch of Columbanian monasticism (the result of confusing him with the eighth-century St Gall abbot, Otmar) and which fed back into the Reichenau collection.[60]

Yet the houses whose cultic traditions are represented in these western and eastern collections definitely did not view the associated 'imagined communities' as the only space in which they established contacts and mutually beneficial links with other monasteries. For instance, Saint-Bertin was also implicated in institutional and personal networks that reached deep into West Francia, including with representatives of the above-mentioned 'Luxovian' movement. A passage in Adso's *Vita Maldeberti* alludes to properties owned by the abbey in the region of Saint-Bertin, which tells us that the Luxeuil monks remembered their early medieval connection to the Flanders coastal region.[61] Furthermore, we have reason to suspect that the late tenth-century monks of Luxeuil established a direct connection with Saint-Bertin. Around this time an astronomical manuscript made at Saint-Bertin ended up in the Alsace region, possibly as part of an exchange of manuscripts between the two institutions.[62] And a

few decades later, a rewritten hagiographical tradition emerged at Saint-Bertin that mistakenly claimed that its patron, like Omer, had been a disciple of Eustace's at Luxeuil.[63] Yet another testimony to how 'western' and 'eastern' Columbanian traditions were blended at the Flemish abbey is a later eleventh-century manuscript that is now preserved at the Royal Library in The Hague.[64] Charles Mériaux recently highlighted the 'East Frankish' focus of the collection, which he inferred from the fact that it contains extracts from Jonas's *Life* of Eustace, Jonas's *Lives* of Columbanus and Abbot Attalla of Bobbio, a *Life* of Abbot Bertulf of Bobbio, as well as hagiographies relating to locally venerated saints Bertulf, Gerulf, and Bertuin. However the volume also holds a *Life* of the Irish saint Burgundofara, a follower of Eustace of Luxeuil who founded the double monastery of Faremoutiers and allegedly subjected its inmates to Columbanus's *Rule*. Also present in the Reichenau manuscript is Adso's text on Maldebert. This shows that the collection's compilers had been looking to latch onto a western strand of Columbanian hagiographical renewal too.[65]

Even at Luxeuil itself, abbots were reluctant to bet on one horse when it came to establishing mutually beneficial links with other monastic institutions. We already heard about property trades between Luxeuil and the Burgundian abbey of Cluny. And if we look to Lotharingia in the north, there is plenty of evidence of connections with institutions in that region too. Adso's career at Saint-Evre in Toul as a schoolmaster and then as a monk and later abbot of Montier-en-Der (which at the time was subject to the bishop of Toul); his links as hagiographer to the abbeys of Saint-Mansuy (in the diocese of Toul) and Saint-Basle (in Reims); his correspondence with highly placed intellectuals and political figures such as Abbo of Fleury, Richer of Saint-Rémi, Archbishop Adalbero of Reims, and (via Adalbero) Gerbert of Aurillac: all these connections must have given special significance to his interactions with his former community at Luxeuil.[66] Meanwhile, some of the scribes who worked on the London codex wrote in a style reminiscent of contemporary manuscripts from Metz, more specifically

from the abbey of Saint-Symphorien.[67] Other connections and influences reached further east. When the mid-eleventh-century Abbot Gerard of Luxeuil commissioned an evangeliary for donation to the local church of Saint-Peter, the end product likewise featured a script that again resembled the Metz style, as well as decoration that reminded the French codicologist Jean Vezin of the famous 'school of Echternach'.[68] Furthermore, Luxeuil had been in a prayer fraternity with the abbey of Reichenau since the ninth century.[69]

The creation and dissemination of hagiographies and hagiographical collections allowed monastic groups that saw themselves as (co-)custodians of a charismatic founder's legacy to foster sentiments of historical interconnectedness with other communities. But the resulting links were hardly exclusive, as they routinely overlapped and sometimes even competed with ones that derived from other personal, institutional, and ideological connections. And they also did not determine the particpating communities' outlook on monastic identity and practice. In this sense too the *Vita Deicoli* is precious to us. It shows an author who is eager to tell his readers that the Luxeuil and Lure monks do not feel limited by a shared Columbanian past and that the attitudes and self-understanding of these communities and their leadership aligns with the most prominent and influential of his era's 'reform monasteries'.

Selective Visions of Institutional and Spiritual Renewal

We already saw that in the second prologue of the *Vita Deicoli*, Theoderic mentions not only Luxeuil as prominent monastic centre, but also the abbeys of Fleury and Sankt Maximin in Trier. Fleury had been reformed by Odo of Cluny in 930 and subsequently became a centre from which monks were recruited to assist in various interventions in monasteries of the wider region.[70] Theoderic celebrates its achievement as a spiritual community and a moral point of reference, by describing it as "a spiritual school for monks and an invincible and always open

asylum for the miserable". And he also alludes to adversities that continuously beset the defiant community, stating that the monks "reject the world and its desires" whilst "steadfastly break(ing) a wedge in the devil's battle line".[71] Since its own reform in 934 under the auspices of Duke Giselbert of Lotharingia, Sankt Maximin had enjoyed a similar reputation for spiritual excellence. And it had likewise fulfilled a similar role as a recruitment centre for abbots and other 'reform agents'.[72] Theoderic undoubtedly refers to those two things when he praises the abbey as a "mirror for monks" (*specular monachorum*).[73]

One likely reason why Theoderic chose to single out these two institutions is that he wanted to make a record of his own personal beacons of monasticism and possibly even indicate where his ambitions lay for his future career as a monk and an author. As we know, in the 980s or early 990s Theoderic, then a cleric, moved to Fleury, and made profession there. And we also saw that he ended up at a prominent Trier institution (albeit not at Sankt Maximin) after spending several years as a wandering author in 1002-1005.[74] But Theoderic surely also mentioned these two places in order to conjure a double 'reform agenda' that was eminently relevant to Luxeuil and Lure's situation at the time of writing. This situation was in part formed by the determination of charismatic abbots to aggressively pursue the restoration of monastic properties, to defend the privileges of their institutions, and to ward off unwanted secular interference. More specifically, there is little doubt that the above-quoted passage about Fleury refers to Abbot Abbo (988-1004) or his predecessor's defence of his institution's estates and rights. But we must also take into account the leading role some monastic communities played in disseminating a specific understanding of monastic identity and practice, and in creating links between communities across institutional boundaries: the choice to include Sankt Maximin in representing those principles was definitely an apt one.[75] As such, the references to both Fleury and Sankt Maximin were a seamless (if implicitly stated) fit with the *Vita Deicoli*'s institutional and 'Luxovian' discourses discussed earlier in this paper.

While these references seem clear enough, we may wonder why the second prologue makes no mention of other major 'reform houses', particularly the abbey of Cluny. Its strand of monastic administration and spirituality was well represented in the Alsace region with the abbeys of Baume and Gigny.[76] Furthermore Luxeuil's abbots (we already saw) had recently witnessed the Burgundian abbey's proprietal policies at first hand and undoubtedly knew about its rising prestige as a religious centre. But Werdolph and especially his colleague at Luxeuil may have resented Cluniac monasticism's success and stellar reputation, which came to the expense of a number of prominent Carolingian houses.[77] Presumably they were also eager to keep the Cluniacs at arm's length, given Abbot Maiolus's ongoing efforts to incorporate other monastic houses within his abbatial lordship.[78] And conceivably they were careful not to let overt references to Cluniac liberties and abbatial leadership deteriorate a fragile relationship with Alsace's aristocratic and clerical elites. But in addition to these institutional concerns we may also suspect a tendency to reject the Cluniacs' view on Benedictine spirituality and practice. At the beginning of this paper we saw how Theoderic in the *Vita Deicoli* states that Columbanus founded Luxeuil abbey after "having put on the *cuculla* and not the *cucullus*".[79] The *cuculla* was a mantle with a hood attached to it, whereas the *cucullus* was a combination of a hooded garment worn with a separate mantle. While the former had been prescribed by the early ninth-century reformer Benedict of Aniane (d. 821) and remained widely in use into the eleventh century, a number of monastic communities (including Cluny) over time took to wearing the separated version.[80] Late tenth- and early eleventh-century authors, including at Saint-Rémi in Reims, St Gall, and (as we see here) Lure, used monastic clothing as a metaphor to express their adherence to Benedict of Aniane's views on Benedictine spirituality and their rejection of experiments with monastic organization, liturgical practices, and observance.[81] While none of these commentaries were explicitly directed at the Cluniacs, it is quite obvious that they were designed to promote a specific view of the authority of the *Rule of St Benedict*. This included

the need to observe certain aspects of the Carolingian reformers' reading of the *Rule*, and to express rejection of what was seen as undue innovation.

This 'conservative' outlook on monastic spirituality and practice brings us to a second omission of a prominent reform institution, namely the abbey of Gorze in the diocese of Metz. In the traditional view of scholars, Gorze in the tenth century was the institutional and ideological epicentre of a Lotharingian reform movement that closely aligned its ideal of the monastic life with that of the Carolingian reformers.[82] Recent studies have nuanced this classic perception of the abbey as a major 'reform centre', which makes it easier to understand why Theoderic picked not Gorze but the more influential abbeys of Fleury and Sankt Maximin to represent principles of institutional and spiritual renewal.[83] Nonetheless, the absence of any reference to Gorze in the *Vita Deicoli* is still notable for a number of reasons. To begin with, in the second prologue, Theoderic dwells longer on the Metz diocese's cultic identity than on that of any other episcopal centre. It is also quite likely that he was familiar with a number of 'Gorzian' literary traditions from the third quarter of the tenth century. Apart from the ideological matches discussed in the next section of this paper, in one of just a handful of references to Irish hagiographic tradition the *Vita* contains a passage where the saint hangs his mantle on a sunbeam. This rarely encountered narrative motif is also featured in the 980s *Life* of Caddroë (which was likely written at Metz and which the anonymous author dedicated to Abbot Immo of Gorze), and its presence in Theoderic's work may link the creation of the *Vita Deicoli* to a Gorzian milieu.[84] The inspiration for it came from the hagiographic tradition about the Irish St Brigida, who at the time was a popular figure of veneration in the area. At this point the diocese of Metz had three churches dedicated in her honour, one of which was actually owned by Gorze abbey.[85] Although this has to remain pure speculation, Theoderic's familiarity with the region and its literary traditions (and, it may be noted, his interest in Irish saints) may

indicate that prior to coming to Lure he had spent time in the Metz area, possibly working as a priest at one of these three sanctuaries.

Furthermore, in addition to these possible connections between Theoderic and the Metz area, we also know that there existed strong links between the abbeys of Luxeuil and Gorze. At least one monk from Luxeuil became a member of Gorze in the 940s or early 950s, and subsequently was sent to Rome to assist with the transformation into a Benedictine monastery of the canonical house of San Paolo fuori le Mura.[86] And more generally speaking Luxeuil also had an institutional connection to the diocese of Metz,[87] where the local Bishop Adalbero (929–62) had staged a series of interventions in religious communities, imposing strict observance of the *Rule of St Benedict*, appointing a regular leadership, and reorganizing (and to an extent restoring) estates. Particularly his involvement in the 934 transformation of Gorze into a Benedictine monastery was vividly remembered.[88] But also remembered were Adalbero's ruthless actions against religious men and women who resisted his reform policies, and the battles he and the monks of Gorze fought over his reluctance to return lost estates.[89] The *Vita Deicoli* actually mentions the prelate as one of two clerical leaders who harassed Baltramn's monks at Alanesberg with undue demands prior to their transferral to Lure.[90] And while Theoderic might have known about and admired Abbot John of Gorze's defiant stance against Adalbero, later in the century bishops at Metz remained as determined as their predecessor to protect their vested interests.[91] Furthermore, Abbots Odalbert (976–82) and Immo (982–c. 1015) were unable to retain the abbey's stellar renown, and Immo's leadership decisions appear to have caused controversy and further damage to the abbey's reputation.[92]

Conceivably Theoderic had witnessed or heard about some of these developments and was disappointed with the observance of the Gorze monks, the conduct of their leaders and their clerical lords, any maybe even at how his personal relationship with the institution had played out. Whatever the exact reason, as a potential exemplar of reformed governance and spirituality

Gorze's status and reputation were apparently too compromised to justify an explicit mention in the *Vita*. But as we shall see in the next section, this did not prevent Theoderic from echoing literary representations of monastic identity and practice as we find them in the written output of that institution and of related houses in the area.

Columbanian Monasticism's Benedictine Afterlife

In the passage about Columbanus's dress style, Theoderic gave a subtle but clearly understandable hint to his readers that the saint's account of monastic practice and spirituality came second to that of St Benedict.[93] He also indicated that despite their self-assigned role as co-custodians of the legacy of Columbanus and his followers, the monks of Lure and Luxeuil aligned with the views of a conservative strand of 'reformist' contemporaries. Theoderic's account of Luxeuil's founder as a monk who followed the precepts of Carolingian lawmakers on monastic dress is matched by several emphatic references to the figure of St Benedict (as *patrem atque monarcham*) and to the *Rule of St Benedict*.[94] And like the *Rule*, the *Vita* conceptualizes conversion to the monastic life as an act of penance that transforms the individual's inner self and outer appearance.[95] Its principal characters excel because of their determination to put up inner ramparts against "secular filth" and temptations, in particular caused by the polluting presence of women.[96] When the lay nobleman who owned Lure sends out one of his aides to castrate Deicolus as punishment for invading his estate, the saint expresses his joy at the prospect of being freed from sexual temptation: this attitude will subsequently allow him to reveal his saintly powers during an interaction with the late nobleman's widow.[97] His disciple and successor Columbinus avoids the company of women even after death, miraculously repelling one from his grave site, "since monks have the habit of declining to converse with women".[98] And Abbot Werdolph is twice characterized as

coelibatus. [99] Presumably this last comment is an allusion to his many interactions as institutional leader with the secular world and with individuals who pursued an ascetic lifestyle outside of the cloister.

At the same time, Theoderic's view on the need for physical ramparts between the secular and the religious is notably nuanced. Grounded in the vow of stability, life in the cloister is described as a "paradise of monks... a divine school of service" and a place removed from worldly distractions.[100] But entering that unpolluted space is not a guarantee of inner peace. Once he has become the leader of a consolidated institution, Deicolus longs for a hermit's life because it allows him to trade Martha (the active life) for Mary (a contemplative life), and pursue "a more hidden and a stricter existence".[101] Nor is the enclosed environment of the cloister necessarily the key to the monastic *propositum*. Although a monastic in the Benedictine tradition, Deicolus is quoted as saying: "I am a *peregrinus* and I live the monastic life".[102] And his distant successor Baltramn is viewed by his contemporaries as an ideal candidate to become leader of a re-founded Lure abbey precisely because of his virtue and his eremitical practice.[103] Even the laymen Hugo and his sons return to live in their homes following their conversion, after having made the appropriate vows and having received the key outward markers (the tonsure and the habit) of their new purpose in life.[104]

These arguments about the authority of the *Rule of St Benedict* and about permeable boundaries between monastic and other religious lifestyles echo key arguments in texts that were either intensively studied or written in prominent religious centres of Upper Lotharingia, particularly in the Metz region. One such commentary is Grimlaicus's *Regula solitariorum,* an adaptation of the *Rule of St Benedict* in which the author insists on the notion that anchorites ought to follow Benedict's precepts.[105] Another is the 970s or early 980s *Life* of St Arnoul by an anonymous monk of Saint-Arnoul in Metz, which emphasizes that the saint "took the monastic habit as a hermit".[106] And yet another is Adso's *Vita Basoli*. This too addresses themes

of adult conversion, the relationship between the cenobitical and eremitical life, the need to strictly observe the *Rule of St Benedict*, pollution of monastic space, restoration of monastic properties and renewal of virtues, and finally also conflicts with secular agents.[107] But none of these nor any other known commentaries show such startling matches with the *Vita Deicoli* as John of Saint-Arnoul's 970s *Life* of John of Gorze.[108] Both texts address prominently and in very similar ways a range of themes, offering together a conservative interpretation of Benedictine tradition along the lines of Benedict of Aniane's vision.[109] They examine the risk of pollution of monastic space and of its inhabitants, paying particular attention to the danger of interacting with (unveiled) women and offering a positive comment on the putative consequences of castration.[110] Both also explore the theme of adult conversion. And both focus on aligning the outward appearance of monks with the requirements of an inward religious vocation.[111]

The most striking resemblance, however, lies in the two authors' portrayal of how and by whom the monastic *propositum* can be pursued. While both texts celebrate *stabilitas* as a virtue, and while they also indicate that the cloister offers a safe haven from worldly interference, at the same time they also state that the monastic life can be pursued in many different ways. Both *vitae* are preoccupied with describing a variety of ascetic pursuits and decline to rigidly distinguish between eremitical, canonical, and cenobitical lifestyles, as long as such lifestyles are communal and regulated.[112] Both the *Vita Deicoli* and the *Vita Johannis* also depict people who move back and forth between these lifestyles, as if to indicate that an individual's spiritual journey can take them to different religious destinations, over the course of a lifetime moving between active engagement and contemplation.[113] And the two texts also acknowledge the legitimacy of an 'open' spiritual environment where vowed 'household ascetics', monks living in a cloistered setting, and hermits can all pursue the same fundamental ideals based on the *Rule of St Benedict*.[114]

This raises the question of whether the *Vita Deicoli* represents a 'Gorzian' view of monastic identity and practice.[115] Not necessarily, I would argue. The discourse in the *Vita Johannis* is so distinct from the majority of contemporary commentaries that it is difficult for us to judge how typically 'Gorzian' was John of Saint-Arnoul's outlook, or even how individually personal. And it is also important to realize that we do not know if the views and practices that are described in the *Vita Johannis* and in other cited texts reflect then-current attitudes at the Metz abbey and associated community, or whether they were intended as a record of those held by an earlier generation of monastics. Far more relevant than finding an answer to the question of whether Theoderic aligned his argument with then-current Gorzian ideas is the observation that the *Vita Deicoli* represents an attempt to reconcile a Columbanian legacy as celebrated at late tenth-century Luxeuil and Lure, with a complex understanding of 'reformed' Benedictine identity as we find it addressed in late tenth-century narratives from Upper Lotharingia. That message surely must have been obvious to contemporary readers, but we can also understand why later audiences of the *Vita*, including modern observers, might have struggled to decipher it.

Conclusions

Theoderic's *Vita Deicoli* emerges as an ambitious hagiographic attempt to address multiple concerns and discourses in late tenth-century monasticism. The first and so far best-understood of these was the Lure monks' focus on grounding their institution's exceptional situation in a legitimizing seventh-century past and on managing the fragile relationship with the former lay proprietors of their estate. But as I hope to have shown, alongside that local focus we can discern three further arguments: about then-current trends in monastic networking, about institutional and spiritual renewal, and about ascetic identity and practice. Regarding the first, monastic

networking, the second prologue and the London codex help us to substantiate the hypothesis that the *Vita* was conceived as part of a broader project of hagiographic co-creation. The aim of that project, I argue, was to establish a 'Luxovian' imagined community of abbeys that self-identified as custodians of the Columbanian legacy in the French-speaking part of the Latin West.

But the *Vita* also bears witness to a trend where monastic groups resisted the idea that membership of this 'Luxovian' community was strictly exclusive. Instead they persisted in forging other institutional connections and declined to define their identity as a spiritual cohort solely in terms of this Columbanian legacy. Theoderic makes this point by referring to Fleury and Sankt Maximin in Trier in order to suggest contemporary 'reform' strategies by the abbots of Lure and Luxeuil. And he also tailors his account of monastic identity and practice to echo then-current thinking about these issues, particularly in a milieu of 'conservative' authors from the wider Metz area. As such, the *Vita* should be regarded as a warning against defining monastic identities around the year 1000 in terms of mutually exclusive networks and movements. Rather, it is an invitation to adopt a more flexible perspective where multiple overlapping institutional connections, personal links, and ideological influences uniquely shaped the self-understanding of each religious community.

[1] The early history of Lure abbey is discussed in Gérard Moyse, "Les origines du monachisme dans le diocèse de Besançon (Ve-Xe siècles)", *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* 131 (1974): 21-104 (1) and 369-485 (2); Bernard de Vrégille, René Locatelli, and Gérard Moyse, *Gallia pontificia. Répertoire des documents concernant les relations entre la papauté et les églises et monastères en France avant 1198, Vol. 1: Diocèse de Besançon* (Göttingen, 1998), 165-71; and Hans J. Hummer, *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe: Alsace and the Frankish Realm, 600-1000* (Cambridge, 2005), 224 and 234-6.

[2] For a reconstruction of Theoderic's life and literary work, see for now Hartmut Hoffmann, "Theoderich von Fleury/Amorbach/Trier", *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters* 71 (2015): 475-526. Jeroen De Gussem and I are working on a separate study in which Theoderic's life and literary output are re-investigated in detail.

[3] The longer and older version of the *Vita Deicoli* (BHL 2120) was published in *AS Januarii* 2 (Antwerp, 1643), 200-210 (henceforth *Vita Deicoli*), while an abridged one (BHL 2121) last appeared in an edition by Georg Waitz in *MGH Scriptores* 15/2 (Hanover, 1888), 674-82. On this remarkable narrative, Heinrich Zinzius, "Untersuchungen über Heiligenleben der Diözese Besançon", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 46 (1928): 380-95; Heinz Thomas, "Der Mönch Theoderich von Trier und die Vita Deicoli", *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 31 (1966/67): 42-63; Id., *Studien zur Trierer Geschichtsschreibung des 11. Jahrhunderts insbesondere zu den Gesta Treverorum* (Bonn, 1968), 162; Tuomas Heikkilä, *Vita S. Symeonis Treverensis. Ein hochmittelalterlicher Heiligenkult im Kontext* (Helsinki, 2002),

91-93; Hummer, *Politics* (n. 1 above)*,* 224 and 234-6; Friedrich Lotter and Sabine Gäbe, "Die hagiographische Literatur im deutschen Sprachraum unter den Ottonen und Saliern (ca. 960-1130)", in *Hagiographies. Histoire internationale de la littérature hagiographique latine et vernaculaire en Occident des origines à 1550*, vol. 4, ed. G. Philippart (Turnhout, 2006), 286-9; and Hoffmann, "Theoderic" (n. 2 above), 483-4.

[4] Steven Vanderputten, "Reconsidering Religious Migration and Its Impact. The Problem of 'Irish Reform Monks' in Tenth-Century Lotharingia", *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 113 (2018): 588-618.

[5] Anne Wagner, "Les moines irlandais dans la réforme monastique", in *Les moines irlandais dans la Lorraine médiévale*, ed. F. Kurzawa (Metz, 1999), 183-202; David N. Dumville, "St Cathróe of Metz and the Hagiography of Exoticism", in *Studies in Irish Hagiography. Saints and Scholars*, ed. John Carey, Máire Herbert, and Pádraig Ó Riain (Dublin, 2001), 172-88; and Jean-Michel Picard, "The Cult of Columba in Lotharingia", Ibid., 230-3.

[6] Charles Mériaux, "*Multorum coenobiorum fundator et innumerabilium pater monachorum. Le culte et le souvenir de saint Colomban et de ses disciples dans le Nord de la Gaule du haut Moyen Âge*", in *L'eredità di san Colombano. Memoria e culto attraverso il medioevo/L'héritage de saint Colomban. Mémoire et culte au Moyen Âge/Saint Columbanus' Legacy. Memory and Cult in the Middle Ages*, ed. E. Destefanis (Rennes, 2017), 85-98.

[7] Hummer, *Politics* (n. 1 above), 234-6.

[8] The episcopal centres are Paris, Tours, Poitiers, Limoges, Bourges, Orléans, Lyon, Reims, Soissons, Toul, Metz, Trier (which the author refers to as a "second Rome"), Strasbourg, and Vesoul; *Vita Deicoli*, 200-201. Theoderic included a similar list of prominent cultic centres (but omitted the references to Sankt Maximin and Luxeuil) in a later work of his, the *Illatio Sancti Benedicti*; Ernst Dümmler, "Über Leben und Schriften des Mönches Theoderich (von

Amorbach)", *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin* 2 (1894): 1-38, at 25-26.

[9] In later centuries the geographical scope of Deicolus's cult was mostly limited to Alsace and parts of rural Switzerland; Georg Schreiber, *Irland im deutschen und abendländischen Sakralraum: Zugleich ein Ausblick auf St. Brandan und die zweite Kolumbusreise* (Cologne, 1956), 48.

[10] In Zinzius's opinion, the life description of Deicolus is "for the most part totally invented" (*zum grossen Teile glatt erfunden*) and on that basis he deems it worthless as a historical source; "Untersuchungen" (n. 3 above), 390. For a more benign assessment, refer to Moyse, "Origines" (1) (n. 1 above), 47-48.

[11] Hummer, *Politics* (n. 1 above), 224. The relevant passage from the *Vita Germani* was edited by Bruno Krusch in *MGH Scriptores rerum Merowingicarum* 5 (Hanover and Leipzig, 1910), 33.

[12] The *Vita* refers to a church dedicated to St Martin, which may indicate that Lure's origins as Christian site of worship went back to late antiquity or the early Middle Ages; *Vita Deicoli*, 203 and the commentary in Moyse, "Origines" (1) (n. 1 above), 94.

[13] *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum. 1: Initia consuetudinis Benedictinae: Consuetudines saeculi octavi et noni*, ed. K. Hallinger (Siegburg, 1963), 496.

[14] *Die Urkunden Lothars I. und Lothars II.*, ed. T. Schieffer, MGH Die Urkunden der Karolinger (Berlin and Zürich, 1966), nr. 38, pp. 448-51. The latest possible date for the forgery is 1179, when it was used to draft a privilege by Pope Alexander III; Jean Girardot, "L'étymologie de Lure et la charte de Lothaire", *Mémoires de la Société d'Emulation du Doubs* (1934): 51-53; *Die Urkunden*, ed. Schieffer, 449; and Moyse, "Origines" (1) (n. 1 above), 30-31.

[15] *Vita Deicoli*, 207.

[16] Hummer, *Politics* (n. 1 above), 224. Also the discussion of the Etichonid family in Frank Legl, "Die Herkunft von Papst Leo IX", in *Léon IX et son temps: Actes du colloque international organisé par l'Institut d'Histoire Médiévale de l'Université Marc-Bloch, Strasbourg-Eguisheim, 20 - 22 juin 2002,* ed. G. Bischoff and B.-M. Tock (Turnhout, 2006), 61-76.

[17] Presumably *Alanesberg* was a short-lived settlement of a group of eremitical practitioners. It is undocumented in other sources and has eluded precise geographical identification; Frank Legl, *Studien zur Geschichte der Grafen von Dagsburg-Egisheim* (Saarbrücken, 1998), 183.

[18] *Die Urkunden Konrad I, Heinrich I. und Otto I.*, ed. T. Sickel, MGH Diplomata regum et imperatorum Germaniae 1 (Hanover, 1879), nr. 199, p. 279 and again in *Chartes originales antérieures à 1121 conservées en France*, ed. C. Giraud, J.-B. Renault, and B.-M. Tock (Nancy, 2010), nr. 546 (http://www.cn-telma.fr/originaux/charte546/, accessed 7 October 2020).

[19] The description of Lure as a "most suitable location" (*locum aptissimum*) to host a monastery seems to carry the implication that no earlier buildings that could serve that purpose had survived into the middle decades of the tenth century; *Vita Deicoli*, 201 and Moyse, "Origines" (1) (n. 1 above), 93.

[20] *Vita Deicoli*, 210. Baltramn is named in two separate versions of Fulda's necrology, once as *Baldara(m) confessor Christi* and another time as *Baldram solitarius*; *Annales necrologici Fuldenses*, ed. G. Waitz, *MGH Scriptores* 13 (Hanover, 1881), 199, with notes in *Die Klostergemeinschaft von Fulda im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. K. Schmid (Münster, 1978), 2/1:362. The absence in these sources of any reference to Baltramn's status as abbot of Alanesberg or Lure suggests that his posthumous reputation outside of Lure rested on his achievement as a practitioner of the eremitical life and on his personal charisma, rather than on his leadership of a community of hermits or a consolidated monastic institution.

[21] The chronology of abbatial tenures at Lure eludes detailed reconstruction. Werdolph's year of death is unknown, as are the dates of the accession and death or resignation of his successors Milo (attested 1016), Durand (1031), and Gerard (1051); *Gallia Christiana* 15 (Paris, 1860), c. 166.

[22] Hummer, *Politics* (n. 1 above), 242-5 and (for the context) Legl, *Studien* (n. 17 above), 183-6.

[23] *Die Urkunden Heinrichs II. und Arduins*, ed. H. Bresslau, MGH Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 3 (Hanover, 1900-1903), nr. 353, p. 452.

[24] Moyse, "Origines" (1) (n. 1 above), 92-93 and (2)*,* 480.

[25] The hagiographer justifies Otto's intervention in Burgundian territory by implying that the sovereign had acted in a manner befitting of an emperor, even though he had still been only a king at the time ("Quapropter si in praesentia Principis Ottonis, locum redhibere voluerint, et pristinae libertati reddere, ab ipsa imperatoria manu recipiamus illum"); *Vita Deicoli*, 209. His argument about Otto's imperial status aligns with that of former Luxeuil oblate Adso of Montier-en-Der in his *Libellus de Antichristo*; Thomas, "Der Mönch" (n. 3 above), 52.

[26] Refer also to the commentary in *Die Urkunden*, ed. Schieffer (n. 14 above), 449.

[27] *Die Urkunden*, ed. Bresslau (n. 23 above), nr. 353, pp. 451-2. All three of these earlier documents no longer exist; that by Louis the Pious is listed, without questions about its authenticity, as a *deperditum* in *Die Urkunden Ludwigs des Frommen*, ed. T. Kölzer et al., MGH Die Urkunden der Karolinger, 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, 2016), 2:1106-1107.

[28] *Die Touler Vita Leos IX*, ed. D. Jasper and V. Lukas, MGH Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi 70 (Hanover, 2007), 88 and 90.

[29] *Papsturkunden in Frankreich: Reiseberichte zur Gallia Pontificia*, ed. W. Wiederhold, 2 vols (Vatican City, 1985), 1: nr. 3, pp. 21-22; discussed in Hummer, *Politics* (n. 1 above), 70-71; Bernard de Vrégille, "Léon IX et le royaume de Bourgogne", in *Léon IX et son temps,* ed.

Bischoff and Tock (n. 16 above), 331-41, at 334; and Jörg Oberste, "Papst Leo IX. und das Reformmönchtum", Ibid., 405-33, at 429-30. Leo's distant relatives kept acting as Lure abbey's lay advocates into the twelfth century; Legl, *Studien* (n. 17 above), 185-6.

[30] The written record of that promise was printed in François Ignace Dunod de Charnage, *Histoire de l'église de Besançon, ville et diocèse*, 2 vols. (Besançon, 1750), 1:215.

[31] *Vita Deicoli*, ed. Waitz (as in n. 3 above), 674-82.

[32] London, BL, Add. 21917, fol. 51r-71v. On dating, provenance, and contents of this manuscript, Leopold V. Delisle, "Notice sur un manuscrit de l'abbaye de Luxeuil copié en 625", *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliotheque Nationale et autres bibliothèques* 31 (1886), 163; Hugh J. Lawlor, "The Manuscripts of the Vita S. Columbani", *The Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* 32 (1902-1904), 9-11; Leslie W. Jones, "Dom Victor Perrin and Three Manuscripts of Luxeuil", *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (Manchester)* 23 (1939): 166-81, at 174-78; *Adso Dervensis opera hagiographica*, ed. M. Goullet, CCCM 198 (Turnhout, 2003), introduction at 65-67; and Hoffmann, "Theoderic" (n. 2 above), 483.

[33] *Vita Deicoli*, 201: "Est nempe in territorio antetactae ciuitatis locus admodum spiritalis, situs in ipso margine Vosagi saltus, cui ob experimentum plurimarum virtutum aptissimum est inditum vocabulum; appellatur quippe spiritaliter lux ouium: et quare, non renuo paucis explicare".

[34] Ibid., 202: "ad construendum ouile Domini, in loco, qui Luxouium exin nomen ademit... omnimodis nisum dedit". On the historicity of claims that Gallus was one of Columbanus's first disciples, Ernst Tremp, "Columbans Vermächtnis im Widerstreit. Die Rechtfertigungsrede des Gallus vor der Gesandtschaft aus Luxeuil im Jahr 629", in *Gallus und seine Zeit. Leben, Wirken, Nachleben*, ed. F. Schnoor, K. Schmuki, E. Tremp, P. Erhart, and J.K. Hüeblin (Sankt Gallen, 2015), 243-66, at 256-66.

[35] 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 Evre de Toul", in *La réécriture hagiographique dans l'Occident médiéval: Transformations formelles* et idéologiques, ed. M. Goullet and M. Heinzelmann (Ostfildern, 2003), 109-44, at 123-24.

[36] Moyse, "Origines" (1) (n. 1 above), 31.

[37] de Vrégille, Locatelli, and Moyse, *Gallia Pontificia* (n. 1 above), 175. According to H. Boumont, in 948 a mere sixteen monks were living at the abbey; *Etude historique sur l'abbaye de Luxeuil 590-1700* (Luxeuil-les-Bains, 1895), 8. Around the same time Luxeuil's oblate Adso was sent to Saint-Evre, where he became a schoolmaster under the auspices of Bishop Gozelin of Toul before transferring to the abbey of Montier-en-Der; *Adso Dervensis Opera hagiographica*, ed. Goullet (n. 32 above), introduction.

[38] *Recueil des chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny, Tome premier 802-954*, ed. A. Bernard and A. Bruel (Paris, 1876), nr. 650, pp. 605-606 (charter dated 943-964) and *Tome deuxième, 954-987*, ed. Iidem (Paris, 1880), nr. 1702, pp. 725-6 (October 984).

[39] *Adso Dervensis Opera hagiographica*, ed. Goullet (n. 32 above), 79-100 and the commentary at VII-XXVI. A similar strategy underpinned the redaction of a collection of a roughly contemporary collection of miracles by St Columbanus from the saint's other foundation of Bobbio; Alexander O'Hara and Taylor Faye, "Aristocratic and Monastic Conflict in Tenth-Century Italy: The Case of Bobbio and the Miracula Sancti Columbani", *Viator* 44 (2013): 43-61.

[40] London, BL, Add. 21914; Jones, "Dom Victor Perrin" (n. 32 above)*,* 168-74. A handful of other tenth- and eleventh-century manuscripts from Luxeuil are discussed Ibid., 166-81 and in Jean Vezin, "Les manuscrits en Lotharingie autour de l'an mil", in *Religion et culture*

autour de l'an mil. Royaume de France et Lotharingie, ed. D. Iogna-Prat and J.-C. Picard (Paris, 1990), 314.

[41] Boumont, *Etude* (n. 37 above), 8-9.

[42] Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 87, colophon on fol. 17v. The manuscript further contains geometric and gromatic excerpts from Cassiodorus, Isidore, and the Agrimensores, as well as Easter tables for the years 1004-1025; a description may be found at http://katalog.burgerbib.ch/detail.aspx?ID=129185 (accessed 7 October 2020).

[43] Giuseppe Vecchi, "Il "planctus" di Gudino di Luxeuil: Un ambiente scolastico, un ritmo, una melodia", *Quadrivium* 1 (1956): 19-40, at 25-27 and Mia Münster-Swendsen, "Medieval Virtuosity: Classroom Practice and the Transfer of Charismatic Power in Medieval Scholarly Culture c. 1000-1230", in *Negotiating Heritage. Memories of the Middle Ages,* ed. M.M. Bruun and S. Glaser (Turnhout, 2008), 43-64, at 53-54.

[44] Vecchi, "Il "planctus"", 26.

[45] Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 88; a description may be found at http://katalog.burgerbib.ch/detail.aspx?ID=129186 (accessed 7 October 2020).

[46] Katherine Allen Smith, "Ungirded for Battle: Knightly Conversion to Monastic Life and the Making of Weapon-Relics in the Central Middle Ages", in *Between Sword and Prayer. Warfare and Medieval Clergy in Cultural Perspective*, ed. R. Kotecki, J. Maciejewski, and J. Ott (Leiden, 2017), 182-206, at 195.

[47] *Adso Dervensis Opera hagiographica*, ed. Goullet (n. 32 above), XLII.

[48] On Fleury's status in these decades, see in first place *Abbon, un abbé de l'an mil*, ed. A. Dufour-Malbezin and G. Labory (Turnhout, 2008); and on Sankt Maximin, Michel Margue and Jean Schroeder, "Aspects du rayonnement intellectuel de Trèves dans la deuxième moitié du Xe siècle", in *Echanges religieux et intellectuels du Xe au XIIIe siècle en Haute et en Basse-Lotharingie: Actes des 5es Journées Lotharingiennes 21 et 22 octobre 1988, Centre*

Luxembourgeois de Documentation et d'Études Médiévales (Luxembourg, 1991), 71-131 and Anne Wagner, *Gorze au XIe siècle: Contribution à l'histoire du monachisme bénédictin dans l'Empire* (Turnhout, 1995), 30-1.

[49] Homonyms of Lure's abbots Milo (who is mentioned in 1016) and Gerard (in 1049) are on record as abbot of Luxeuil (respectively in 1018 and 1051); de Vrégille, Locatelli, and Moyse, *Gallia Pontificia* (n. 1 above), 166.

[50] Abbot Milo is listed as the recipient in a 1016 privilege for Lure by King Henry II (*Die Urkunden Heinrichs II. und Arduins*, ed. H. Bresslau, MGH Die Urkunden der deutschen Könige und Kaiser 3 (Hanover, 1900-1903), nr. 353, pp. 451-52) and in another from 1018 for Luxeuil by Pope Benedict VIII (edited in de Vrégille, Locatelli, and Moyse, *Gallia Pontificia*, pp. 180-81). Gerard obtained a privilege for Luxeuil from Pope Leo IX in 1049 (*Papsturkunden in Frankreich: Reiseberichte zur Gallia Pontificia*, ed. W. Wiederhold, 2 vols (Vatican City, 1985), 1: nr. 2, p. 20) and one for Lure in 1051, also from the same prelate (Ibid., nr. 3, pp. 21-22). Gerard's combined tenure at Lure and Luxeuil is further substantiated by evidence pertaining to his interactions with Abbess Oda of Remiremont and Pope Leo IX; Steven Vanderputten, "Against the Custom. Hagiographical Rewriting and Female Abbatial Leadership at Mid-Eleventh-Century Remiremont", *The Journal of Medieval Monastic Studies* 10 (2021), in press.

[51] Hoffmann, "Theoderich" (n. 2 above).

[52] Even though the oldest explicit reference linking the manuscript to Luxeuil is a fifteenth-century owner's note, according to Jean Vezin the eleventh-century script strongly resembles that which is found in another manuscript that Abbot Gerard of Luxeuil donated to the local church of Saint-Peter; below, n. 69.

[53] Fécamp around the turn of the millennium was granted authority over the abbey of Saint-Taurin of Evreux, where an earlier version of the *Life* of St Taurin had been written in the tenth

century. Early in the eleventh century the monks of Fécamp obtained a copy of that text, revised it, and apparently sent out copies of that new version; Felice Lifshitz, "La Normandie carolingienne, essai sur la continuité, avec utilisation de sources négligées", *Annales de la Normandie* 48 (1995): 505-24, at 518.

[54] Alexander O'Hara lists no fewer than twenty-nine known tenth- and eleventh-century copies of Jonas's *Vita Columbani*; *Jonas of Bobbio and the Legacy of Columbanus* (Oxford, 2018), 267-8.

[55] Dominique Iogna-Prat, "La geste des origines dans l'historiographie clunisienne des XIe-XIIe siècles", *Revue bénédictine* 102 (1992): 135-91 and Franz Neiske, "Charismatischer Abt oder charismatische Gemeinschaft? Die frühen Äbte Clunys", in *Charisma und religiöse Gemeinschaften im Mittelalter*, ed. G Andenna, M. Breitenstein, and G. Melville (Münster, 2005), 55-72.

[56] Steven Vanderputten, "*I Would be Rather Pleased if the World Were to be Rid of Monks. Resistance to Cluniac Integration in Late Eleventh- and Early Twelfth-Century France*", *The Journal of Medieval History* 47 (2021): 22-41.

[57] Ernst Tremp, "Saint Colomban dans les manuscrits hagiographiques et liturgiques de l'abbaye de Saint-Gall", in *L'eredità di san Colombano. Memoria e culto attraverso il medioevo/L'héritage de saint Colomban. Mémoire et culte au Moyen Âge/Saint Columbanus' Legacy. Memory and Cult in the Middle Ages*, ed. E. Destefanis (Rennes, 2017), 217-28.

[58] Brussels, Royal Library Albert 1, 8158-8120.

[59] Steven Vanderputten, *Monastic Reform as Process: Realities and Representations in Medieval Flanders, 900-1100* (Ithaca, NY, 2013), 54-55.

[60] Mériaux, "*Multorum coenobiorum fundator"* (n. 6 above), 88.

[61] *Adso Dervensis Opera hagiographica*, ed. Goullet (n. 32 above), 88-89. The Luxeuil monks may have mistaken the Count Walbert who is mentioned in Saint-Bertin's

hagiographies for their third abbot Waldebert; Mériaux, "*Multorum coenobiorum fundator"*, 89

[62] Bishop Weginhar of Strasbourg (d. 1028) donated the already mentioned Luxeuil copy of the *Geometria* (n. 43 above) and a Saint-Bertin copy of the *Arathea* (a translation of a Greek treatise on the ancient constellations) to the cathedral of Strasbourg; Bern, Burgerbibliothek, Cod. 88. Although the Burgerbibliothek's catalogue suggests that Weginhar had acquired the latter manuscript from Saint-Bertin, it is just as likely that the codex had first ended up at Luxeuil as part of a trade between monastic centres before they were transferred into the bishop's hands (also n. 30 above); https://aratea-digital.acdh.oeaw.ac.at/pages/show.html?document=desc__bern_bb_88.xml&directory=descr iptions, accessed 7 October 2020.

[63] Mériaux, "*Multorum coenobiorum fundator"* (n. 6 above), 88.

[64] The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 7 H 50; "Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum bibliothecae regiae Hagensis", *Analecta Bollandiana* 6 (1887): 204-6 and *Adso Dervensis Opera hagiographica*, ed. Goullet (n. 32 above), 67-68.

[65] Mériaux, "*Multorum coenobiorum fundator*" (n. 6 above), 89.

[66] *Adso Dervensis Opera hagiographica*, ed. Goullet (n. 32 above), introduction and *Les moines du Der 673-1790. Actes du Colloque International d'Histoire Joinville-Montier-en-Der, 1er - 3 octobre 1998*, ed. P. Corbet (Langres, 2000).

[67] In Jean Vezin's opinion the manuscript was either copied by Metz scribes who worked locally or were sent to work at Luxeuil, or by Luxeuil monks who had been trained in the Metz style. Besides these palaeographical clues about a connection to Metz, the French scholar also pointed at a note on fol. 71v where a scribe named Stephanus identifies himself in a cipher message that is very similar to one we find in a manuscript (now Paris, BNF, Lat. 5294) by Constantin of Saint-Symphorien in Metz; "Manuscrits" (n. 40 above), 314-5. On

ciphers, Katherine Ellison and Susan Kim, "Introduction: Ciphers and the Material History of Literacy", in *A Material History of Medieval and Early Modern Ciphers: Cryptography and the History of Literacy*, ed. by the same (New York, 2018), online version without page numbers (accessed 7 October 2020).

[68] Paris, BNF, Nouvelles Acquisitions Latines 2196; Vezin, "Manuscrits" (n. 40 above), 314.

[69] *Das Verbrüderungsbuch der Abtei Reichenau*, ed. J. Autenrieth, D. Geuenich, and K. Schmid, MGH Libri memoriales et necrologia, nova series 1 (Hanover, 1979), 1-164.

[70] Josef Semmler, "Das Erbe der karolingischen Klosterreform im 10. Jahrhundert", in *Monastische Reformen im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, ed. R. Kottje and H. Maurer (Sigmaringen, 1989), 29-77.

[71] *Vita Deicoli*, 200-201: "Ibi quippe gymnasium inuenitur spiritale monachorum, atque inexpugnabile semper patens azylum miseris, atque post multa facinora mundo et concupiscentiis eius obrenuntiantibus, iugiter in palaestra paternae disciplinae sese ibidem exercitantes, et propter timores nocturnos semper armati incedentes, diabolicas acies viriliter cuneati infringunt: nec tamen, ut vulgo solet, post victoriam dimicare desistunt, verum dum hodie est, incessanter pugnant, incessanter triumphant".

[72] Margue and Schroeder, "Aspects" (n. 48 above); also Daniel Misonne and Michel Margue, "Aspects politiques de la réforme monastique en Lotharingie. Le cas des abbayes de Saint-Maximin de Trèves, de Stavelot-Malmédy et d'Echternach (934-973)", *Revue Bénédictine* 98 (1988): 31-61 and John Nightingale, *Monasteries and Patrons in the Gorze Reform. Lotharingia c. 850-1000* (Oxford, 2007), 169-260.

[73] *Vita Deicoli*, 201. The 970s *Life of John of Gorze* mentions a monk from Fulda named Gundlach who, prior to coming to Gorze, had spent time at Sankt Maximin "because of its famous religious observance" (*ob insignem religionis conversationem*); John of Saint-Arnoul, *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, ed. P.C. Jacobsen, *Die Geschichte vom Leben des*

Johannes von Gorze (Wiesbaden, 2016), 308. Sankt Maximin's reputation reached as far south as Alsace, as is shown by the comments in the *Vita Deicoli* and possibly also in the dissemination of hagiographic material relating to its patron St Maximin. In 1857 a ninth-century manuscript with tenth-century additions by scribes from Sankt Maximin (including a *Life* of St Maximin) was sold as part of an auction with multiple lots from the former library of Luxeuil; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz Ms. theol. lat. oct. 155 (http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/?xdbdtdn!%22obj%2031101612%22&dmode=doc#|4, accessed 7 October 2020). This may point at direct exchanges between the two institutions in the period that concerns us here.

[74] Hoffmann, "Theoderic" (n. 2 above).

[75] In Fleury's customary (which likely dates from the 1110s) Theoderic woud once again praise that abbey as an exemplar of monastic observance; *Consuetudines Floriacenses antiquiores*, ed. A. Davril and L. Donnat, *L'abbaye de Fleury en l'an Mil* (Paris, 2004), 172: "Generosus Floriacensis monasterii locus pro genere habeatur et cetera monasteria quasi eius species complectentur, ut eo facilius in capite membrorum valitudo pervestigetur".

[76] Semmler, "Das Erbe" (n. 70 above), 29-31 and Giles Constable, "Baume and Cluny in the Twelfth Century", in Giles Constable, *The Abbey of Cluny. A Collection of Essays to Mark the Eleven-Hundreth Anniversary of Its Foundation* (Berlin, 2010), 405-407 .

[77] de Vrégille, Locatelli, and Moyse, *Gallia Pontificia* (n. 1 above), 175.

[78] Steven Vanderputten, "The Emergence of the Ecclesia Cluniacensis", in *A Companion to the Abbey of Cluny*, ed. S. Bruce and S. Vanderputten (Leiden, 2021, forthcoming).

[79] *Vita Deicoli*, 202: "Et ad augendum gregem Domini plus cupidus, quam suae solius saluationi consulere contentus, veluti non eneruis miles Christi, ad construendum ouile Domini, in loco, qui Luxouium exin nomen ademit, succinctus cuculla, non cucullo, omnimodis nisum dedit".

[80] Kassius Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny. Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im hochmittelalter*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1950-1951), 2:702-15.

[81] Semmler, "Das Erbe" (n. 70 above), esp. 61-63 and Steven Vanderputten, "The Dignity of Our Bodies and the Salvation of Our Souls. Scandal, Purity, and the Pursuit of Unity in Late Tenth-Century Monasticism", in *Using and Not Using the Past after the Carolingian Empire, c. 900-c. 1050*, ed. A. Hicklin, S. Greer, and S. Esders (Abingdon, 2019), 262-81.

[82] Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny* (n. 80 above) and E. Hochholzer, "Die Lothringische ('Gorzer') Reform", in *Die Reformverbände und Kongregationen der Benediktiner im Deutschen Sprachraum*, ed. U. Faust and F. Quarthal (St. Ottilien, 1999), 43-87.

[83] Esp. Wagner, *Gorze* (n. 48 above).

[84] *Vita Deicoli*, 204, to be compared with the passage in *Vita beati Cadroe abbatis Valciodorensis*, in *Acta Sanctorum veteris et maioris Scotiae seu Hiberniae sanctorum Insulae*, ed. J. Colgan (Louvain, 1645), 1:499.

[85] Wagner, *Gorze* (n. 48 above), 487. On sunbeam miracles in early medieval hagiography, see among other studies Phillips Barry, "The Bridge of Sunbeams", *The Journal of American Folk-lore* 27 (1914): 79-89.

[86] *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, ed. Jacobsen (n. 73 above), 272-4; also Guilia Barone, "Gorze et Cluny a Roma", in *Retour aux sources: Textes, études et documents d'histoire médiévale offerts à Michel Parisse*, ed. Sylvain Gouguenheim (Paris, 2004), 583-90.

[87] In 891 King Arnulf of Lotharingia had apparently given Luxeuil abbey to the diocese of Metz; Moyse, "Origines" (2) (n. 1 above), 439.

[88] Semmler, "Das Erbe" (n. 70 above).

[89] Nightingale, *Monasteries* (n. 72 above), 71-72 and 77–86.

[90] *Vita Deicoli*, 209. We can only wonder if the *Vita*'s mention of tensions between Adalbero and the Alanesberg monks is a veiled reference to the bishop's troubled relationship with the community at Gorze.

[91] At one point the monks of Gorze, who were embroiled in a conflict with Bishop Adalbero of Metz, had threatened to leave for Sankt Maximin; *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, ed. Jacobsen (n. 73 above), 374 and *Miracula s. Gorgonii*, ed. P.C. Jacobsen, *Studien und Texte zur Gorgonius-Verehrung im 10. Jahrhundert* (Hanover, 2009), 116.

[92] Beginning respectively in c. 1003 and in 1006, Immo combined the abbacy of Gorze with those of Prüm and Reichenau; Wagner, *Gorze* (n. 48 above), 37-52.

[93] Authors from the period had different ways of conveying that message. For instance, the 1030s Italian *Life of the hermit Simeon* includes the story of Simeon who has a vision of a conversation with St Columbanus. Throughout the passage St Benedict literally stands between the two men, which Simeon explains by saying that Benedict's precepts take precedence over those by Columbanus; Paolo Golinelli, "La «Vita» di s. Simeone monaco", *Studi medievali* III/20 (1979): 745-88, at 782-83.

[94] *Vita Deicoli*, 201. Theoderic used the same rare expression in his *Illatio Sancti Benedicti*, ed. Dümmler (n. 8 above), 24 and 26.

[95] *Vita Deicoli*, 207.

[96] Ibid., 206: "sacer locus diatim saecularibus esset occupatus sordibus".

[97] Ibid., 204.

[98] Ibid., respectively 208: "...quia monachi feminarum consortia declinare solent, quod perfectus pater in vita sua custodire studuit, hoc et post mortem violare noluit".

[99] Ibid., 200 and 210.

[100] Ibid., 205 ("paradisus monachorum... divini schola servitii") and 206.

[101] Ibid., 205-206: "...ad secretiorem atque actiorem vitam anhelans".

[102] Ibid., 203: "peregrinus sum et monachicum proposito gero". The descriptor *peregrinus* ("ascetic wanderer") is also used in a second passage on 203-204.

[103] Ibid., 209.

[104] Ibid., 207: "...sacramento iusiurandi super tanti Patris sepulchrum se vnanimiter tricauerunt, quatenus eorum nullus se subtraheret, quin in proximo, saeculo funditus abrenuntiaret, ac beatissimi Patris Benedicti regulae, tonsura, habitu, professione, obedientialiter se subderet, et eiusdem loci stabilitatem fine tenus custodiret".

[105] Marie-Christine Chartier, *La regula solitariorum de Grimlaïc. Edition et commentaire*, 2 vols. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université de Paris X-Nanterre, 1980); Karl S. Frank, "Grimlaicus, "Regula solitariorum"", in *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. S. Haarländer, F.J. Felten, and N. Jaspert (Berlin, 1999), 21-36; and Andrew Thornton, "Rule Within Rule, Cell Within Cloister: Grimlaicus's Regula Solitariorum", in *Medieval Anchorites in their Communities*, ed. C. Gunn and L.H. McAvoy (Woodbridge, 2017), 68-83. Although the text might date back as far as the second quarter of the ninth century, the oldest-known copy was made at late tenth-century Sankt Maximin; Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Theol. lat. fol. 726.

[106] *Vita sancti Arnulphi*, ed. *AS Julii* 4 (Antwerp, 1725), 444: "monachi habitum in eremo suscepit".

[107] *Vita Basoli*, ed. M. Goullet, *Adso Dervensis Opera hagiographica* (n. 32 above), 257-69.

[108] Julia Barone, "Jean de Gorze: Moine de la réforme et saint original", in *Religion et culture autour de l'an Mil. Royaume capétien et Lotharingie. Actes du colloque Hugues Capet 987-1987. La France de l'an Mil, Auxerre, 26 et 27 juin 1987 - Metz, 11 et 12 septembre 1987*, ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat and J.-C. Picard (Paris, 1990), 31-8; Ead., "Jean de Gorze, moine bénédictin", in *L'abbaye de Gorze au XIe siècle*, ed. M. Parisse and O.G. Oexle (Nancy,

1993), 141-58; and *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, ed. Jacobsen (n. 73 above), introduction at 1-105.

[109] Refer to the discussions in Semmler, "Das Erbe" (n. 70 above) and Wagner, *Gorze* (n. 48 above), esp. 28.

[110] *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, ed. Jacobsen (n. 73 above), 234 (on pollution of sacred space), 190 (on the hermit Berner who refuses to sit where he had earlier seen a woman take a place), and 398 (John expresses no fear of castration and states that this would liberate him from great worry). Legitimate interactions with (mostly veiled) women are discussed in passages edited ibid., 185-6 and 192-6.

[111] Ibid.*,* 234, 238, 292, 326-8, 378, and 456.

[112] Ibid., 202-208, 224-6, and 253-4. Of particular note is a passage about a hermit who declined to follow any kind of rule and as a result of this led a dissolute lifestyle; Ibid., 204-206. According to his biographer Ruotger, Archbishop Bruno of Cologne (d. 965) imposed regulations and supervision by religious communities on all the hermits in his archdiocese; *Vita Brunonis archiepiscopi Coloniensis*, ed. I. Ott, *MGH Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum ns 10* (Weimar, 1951), 34. Also the referenced cited above, n. 106.

[113] *Vita Johannis Gorziensis*, ed. Jacobsen (n. 73 above), 290-2.

[114] Ibid., 218-20, 228-32, 248, 252, and 256-8. On this point, Otto G. Oexle, "Individuen und Gruppen in der lothringischen Gesellschaft des 10. Jahrhunderts", in *L'abbaye de Gorze au XIe siècle*, ed. M. Parisse and O.G. Oexle (Nancy, 1993), 105-39.

[115] An interesting point of comparison is offered by Theoderic's *Commentary on the Catholic Letters*, which he wrote some time in or shortly after 1018 at the request of Abbot Theoderic of Amorbach. In that text, he provides a long and detailed argument on monastic spirituality and offers a trenchant critique of (among other things) simoniac clerics. Unfortunately the few published extracts are insufficient to extend our understanding of the author's views and to

precisely establish how these had changed since he had left Lure in the 980s; Dümmler, "Über Leben" (n. 8 above), 28-38. Tina Orth-Müller is currently preparing the first edition of the complete text for the CCCM series. Some preliminary remarks on that project and on the commentary itself are in Ead., "Si ad plenum apostolica verba nequaquam valeam explanare: Theoderich von Fleury (Theoderich von Amorbach) und sein Kommentar zu den Katholischen Briefen", in *Medialatinitas. Ausgewählte Beiträge zum 8. Internationalen Mittellateinerkongress, Wien 17.–21.9.2017*, ed. C. Ratkowitsch (Vienna, 2020), 75-90.