

CISTERCIAN STUDIES SERIES: NUMBER TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-SIX

Claudio Stercal

Stephen Harding

A Biographical Sketch and Texts

CISTERCIAN STUDIES SERIES: NUMBER TWO HUNDRED TWENTY-SIX

Stephen Harding

A Biographical Sketch and Texts

by

Claudio Stercal

Translated by Martha F. Krieg



Cistercian Publications
www.cistercianpublications.org

LITURGICAL PRESS
Collegeville, Minnesota
www.litpress.org

A Cistercian Publications title published by Liturgical Press

Cistercian Publications
Editorial Offices
Abbey of Gethsemani
3642 Monks Road
Trappist, Kentucky 40051
www.cistercianpublications.org

Originally published as *Stefano Harding. Elementi biografici e testi* by Jaca Book, Monastero S. Maria di Chiaravalle, Milan, 2001. Translation © Cistercian Publications, 2008. All rights reserved.

© 2008 by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegeville, Minnesota. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, microfilm, microfiche, mechanical recording, photocopying, translation, or by any other means, known or yet unknown, for any purpose except brief quotations in reviews, without the previous written permission of Liturgical Press, Saint John's Abbey, P.O. Box 7500, Collegeville, Minnesota 56321-7500. Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Stercal, Claudio, 1954–

[Stefano Harding. English]

Stephen Harding : a biographical sketch and texts / by Claudio Stercal ; translated by Martha F. Krieg.

p. cm. — (Cistercian studies series ; no. 226)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-87907-326-8 (pbk.)

1. Stephen Harding, Saint, d. 1134. 2. Theology. I. Stephen Harding, Saint, d. 1134. Works. English & Latin. 2008. II. Title. III. Series.

BX4700.S75S74 2008

271'.1202—dc22

[B]

2008028121

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Translator's Acknowledgements	6
A Biographical Sketch	7
TEXTS BY STEPHEN HARDING	37
1. The <i>Monitum</i> of Saint Stephen's Bible	39
2. The Letter on the Use of Hymns	56
3. The Letter to King Louis VI	68
4. The Letter to Pope Honorius II	78
5. The Letter to the Monks of Sherborne	86
6. Other Texts	96
Conclusions	102
<i>Sigla and Abbreviations</i>	115
<i>Bibliography</i>	117
Sources	117
Studies in Chronological Order	119
Studies in Alphabetical Order	137
<i>Index of Names</i>	155

Introduction

WE KNOW RELATIVELY LITTLE about the beginnings of the Cistercian Order or, at least, not as much as we would like. There are not many documents, their dating is often uncertain and, in every case, their final redaction was made several years after the foundation of the Order. The reconstruction of the intentions that inspired them and of the circumstances that accompanied them is rather complex and controversial.

Not only the documents, but also the circumstances that led to the foundation of the Cistercian Order are often obscure and uncertain. We need only mention here the disputed identification of the founder. It is known that at the origin of the cistercian experience, it was Robert¹, abbot of the monastery of Molesmes², who in 1098, with twenty-one monks of his monastery³, gave life to this new experience. We know, however, that already in the following year, for reasons in part still in need of clarification, he returned—with the consent of Pope Urban II, granted in April 1099⁴—to Molesmes, where he took up the function of abbot again and carried it out through to the end of his own life—that

1. For a first glance at the figure of Robert, see Oury (1983) 7:1868–1869; Mikkers (1988) 13:736–737.

2. Recently, at the request of the municipality, the spelling of the name of the french commune of *Molesme* has been modified to *Molesmes* (cfr. Veyssi re [1997] 45, n. 3).

3. See *Exordium Cistercii* (EC) 1.7; *Exordium parvum* (EP) 3.2.

4. See EP 6; Jaff  (1885²) 1:700–701, no. 5793 (4336). See also EP 5.7–8; EC 2.3.

is, until 1111. The rapid return of Robert to Molesmes must have given rise, above all in the first decades of the life of the Order, to a lively reaction; as Jean-A. Lefèvre concludes in his documented study on the view of the figure of Robert in the monastic world of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it is only after 1222, the year of Robert's canonization, that the title of first abbot—*primus abbas Cistercii*⁵—is accorded him in the official documents of the Order.⁶ Until then⁷, in fact, he had not been officially listed in the computation of the abbots, so that Alberic, his immediate successor at Cîteaux (1099–1008), had come to be considered the first abbot and Stephen the second (1108–1133)⁸. Even the

5. Canivez (1934) 2:15–16 [anno 1222, no. 13]: '*De beato Roberto primo abbate Cistercii fiat festum XV^o kalendas maii cum XII lectionibus, sicut de beato Hieronymo, et una missa sicut de beato Benedicto*'. The request for canonization was issued by the General Chapter at the request of the abbot of Molesmes, in 1220: '*Petitio abbatis Molismensis de scribendo Domino Papae pro canonizatione venerabilis Roberti abbatis exauditur*' (Canivez [1933] 1:527 [anno 1220, no. 53]). We should remember too that the martyrology of Cîteaux (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 378), written around 1224, at the date 29 April reads: '*S. Roberti, primi abbatis Cisterciensis*', yet the last three words are on an erasure; in the original version, certainly before the introduction of the feast of Saint Robert, it would have read simply *S. Roberti abbatis*.

6. Lefèvre (1956a) 82: '*En 1222, l'Ordre de Cîteaux promulgue, sous le rit-<e> de douze leçons, la fête du nouveau bienheureux. Dans le statut qui l'établit, on lui accorde, pour la première fois—et ceci est caractéristique—le titre de primus abbas Cistercii, que tous les documents officiels cisterciens lui ont refusé jusqu'alors—et depuis 1109—avec une unanimité si parfaite qu'elle marque nettement un préjugé défavorable*' [In 1222, the Order of Cîteaux promulgated, under the rite of twelve lessons, the feast of the new blessed. In the statute that established it, they granted him, for the first time—and this is distinctive—the title of the first cistercian abbot, which all the official cistercian documents had refused him to that time—and after 1109—with a unanimity so perfect that it plainly marked an unfavorable opinion'].

7. In fact, the usage continued, in some cases, up to the twentieth century; see, for example, Oursel (1962) 1.

8. Such usage can be documented thanks to:

—the *colophon*, written in the first hand, of *Saint Stephen's Bible*, datable to 1109: '*gubernante Stephano II^o abbate cenobium cisterciense*' (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 13, f. 150v); see Załuska (1991) 50; below, text number 2.

—the *colophon* of the manuscript of the *Moralia in Job* by Gregory the Great, produced in the scriptorium at Cîteaux in 1111, '*temporibus domni stephani Cisterciensis abbatis secundi*, (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 1709, f. 92v); see Załuska (1991) 59;

identification of the founder has been, therefore, difficult and controversial.

A similar fate has often befallen the name of the first monastery and of the Order. We know that in the beginning the term chosen to designate the new foundation was simply 'The New Monastery'—*Novum monasterium*—but that by 1115–1116, and then more commonly and officially from 1119 onwards, that name was replaced by the term *Cistercium*.⁹ For a long time, therefore, the monastery was indicated by a rather generic term, bound simply to the novelty of that experience. But the etymology of the name

—the foundation charter of the abbey of Val Sainte Marie (La Bussière), twelfth daughter-house of Cîteaux, drawn up 21 March 1131: '*per manum venerabilis Stephani cisterciensis abbatis secundi*' (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 1003, f. 136r-v); see *Gallia Christiana* 4.495 and *instrumenta*.89; Marilier (1961) 90, no. 85;

—the foundation charter of the abbey of Maizières, drawn up in 1132: '*precibus domni Stephani secundi abbatis ecclesiae Cisterciensis*' (*Gallia Christiana* 4.1029–1030 and *instrumenta*.239).

Indirectly it is also witnessed to by the title of some chapters of the EP: EP 9: '*De electione Alberici, primi abbatis Cisterciensis ecclesiae*'; EP 17: '*De morte primi abbatis et de promotione secundi, et de institutis et laetitia eorum*'.

There are various interpretations of this usage of the first cistercian generations. According to Othon Ducourneau, the monks of Cîteaux harbored against Robert 'such a rancor that they struck him from the list of their abbots, so that all the primitive documents attribute the title of first abbot of Cîteaux to Saint Alberic' (Ducourneau [1933] 19). According to H. E. J. Cowdrey, on the other hand, this usage 'may be better understood as a courteous and conciliatory gesture toward Molesmes' (Cowdrey [1991] 335, n. 24). According to Laurent Veyssièrre, the aversion to Robert would have still been veiled in the years from 1110–1130, as he claims to be able to see in EP and *Gesta Regum Anglorum* (GRA) 4.337; 582–584, but would have become more explicit in later generations, as the *Exordium magnum* (EM) seems to document. On the contrary, Bernard of Clairvaux and the atmosphere at Clairvaux would have maintained excellent relations with Molesmes (see Veyssièrre [1997] 52–72). Thus can be verified 'as concerning other arguments, an evident difference of viewpoint (*une différence évidente de vue*) between Stephen and Bernard. But, as in all the other cases, it is not in any way a matter of more or less open opposition between the two men, which could have introduced conflicts within the Cistercian Order. . . . The abbeys were free in their movements: Stephen chose withdrawal from Molesmes, Bernard instead maintained excellent relations; Stephen opted for a complete break with the customs of Molesmes, Bernard chose to continue the reform begun by Robert' (Veyssièrre [1997] 70).

9. See Marilier (1950); Marilier (1961) 23–26.

Cistercium also does not mask its 'ordinariness'. It seems to be linked, in fact, to the name of a place, a plant, or a stone:

It may be that it derives from the latin *cisterna*, which may signify 'swamp or marshy terrain', and therefore that it reflects the geographic nature of the place; or perhaps it may come from the old French *cistel* (*roseau* or *ajonc* in modern French, *giunco* or *ginestrone* in Italian), a type of reed or marsh rush which, according to the legend, grew in abundance in that area, to the point of giving it its name; or yet again it might refer to the fact that the place was situated 'on this side of the third mile stone' (*cis tertium lapidem miliarium*) of the old roman road which ran from Langres to Chalon-sur-Saone.¹⁰

So, even the circumstances linked to the names of the first abbey and of the Order manifest their uncertainty, their anonymity, and their ordinariness.

The elements referred to seem to converge: the documents relative to the origins are few, late, and not easy to interpret. The recognition of the founder is uncertain, or at least disputed; the name of the first abbey, from which is derived the name of the Order, appears only twenty years after the foundation and is linked to uncertain and, at the same time, ordinary elements.

The impression we get is that everything that has a singular correspondence with the life of the Cistercian Order in the twelfth century appears not to have been so much the clear and well-defined fruit of the intuition of a single founder as the result of a progressive quest by a group.¹¹

A progressive quest for an authentic and convincing form of the christian life: the zeal of the first cistercian monks seems to

10. Kinder (1998) 17.

11. For example, Martha G. Newman also appears to take this interpretive tack when, in her study on the figure of the abbot in the Cistercian Order and in the vision of Stephen Harding, she concludes: 'Stephen's insistence that all Cistercians, whether abbot or brothers, were subject to a uniform observance of the Benedictine Rule and the *discretio* embodied in it brought abbot and monks together into a community in which all could learn from one <an>other. Stephen's legalistic concerns and authoritarian voice had placed the Cistercian abbot within a community of brothers and provided the foundation for the later Cistercians' language of love' (Newman [1997] 329).

be best explained in this way. This is perhaps also one of the elements of their success: their experience is not the fruit of a genial and unique personality—an event which comes into play rarely in history and which is easily exposed to the dangers of subjectivity—so much as the success of a common search which, if well conducted, has a greater guarantee of objectivity and can better interpret the ‘spirit of an epoch’. This is what, probably, happened in the twelfth century. The quality of the christian interpretation of the life set out and followed by the Cistercians appeared convincing to their contemporaries, and to some degree fascinating. And so many of them were drawn to it.

It is also for this reason that it is worth taking the trouble today to trace the ‘origins’ of the Cistercian Order, to find again in those ‘origins’—anonymous, quotidian, and in some part still obscure—their ‘fascinating’ interpretation of the life of human beings and of the christian faith.

What we propose to do here is to gather together some data relative to Stephen Harding, one of the most significant figures of the first decades of cistercian history. He was part of the group of founders of the *Novum monasterium* and was later its third abbot, from 1108 to 1133. Let us gather together the elements known of his biography and put forward the texts that can be attributed to him, with the addition of a few notes that will help in reading and comprehending them. This is not a definitive study, however, but a collection of ‘working material’. It will be useful, we hope, for further studies and more profound research.

Translator's Acknowledgements

This translation owes much to the patience of my husband, Laurence Krieg, and to the support of Katy, Eric, Robbie, Ian, Megumi, and especially Elissa, who along with Miss Jean Curtiss was kind enough to read the entire manuscript. The prayers of the SPIRITUS and Conversi on-line contemplative communities made the journey much more pleasant.

Martha F. Krieg

Ypsilanti, Michigan
January, 2007

A Biographical Sketch

HARDINGUS

ONE OF THE QUESTIONS still to be clarified concerning the life of Stephen is that of the use of the 'double name', Stephen Harding.¹ According to one of the privileged sources on Stephen and the beginnings of the Cistercian Order, the *Deeds of the Kings of England* (*Gesta regum anglorum*, GRA) by the famous Benedictine William of Malmesbury (c. 1095–c. 1142)², *Hardingus* was the name *Stephanus* among the English: *Is fuit Hardingus nomine, apud Anglos*.³ The medieval cistercian texts, in fact, normally use only the name *Stephanus*. The current use of the double name is attested beginning in the seventeenth century at least. In 1614 it is used in the *Chronicon Cisterciensis Ordinis* of Aubertus Miraeus⁴ and in 1642 Angelus

1. See Cowdrey (1998a) 211, n. 9.

2. The GRA was finished in 1125 and offers precious information on the beginnings of the Cistercian Order. See Colombás (1992); Leclercq (1994). William of Malmesbury would have received his information directly from Stephen, in the course of a meeting which occurred at Cîteaux in 1120–1122: 'Some authors believe that William drew his information from the source, that is to say at Cîteaux, when he met Stephen around 1120–1122' (Veyssi re [1997] 56); see also Van Damme (1991) 124; Colombás (1992) 492.

3. GRA 4.334.2; 578; see also GRA 4.335; 580.

4. See Miraeus (1614) 38, 89.

Manrique, perhaps following Aubertus Miraeus, uses *Hardingus* as Stephen's 'nickname': *Hic, cognomento Hardingus, genere nobilis, natione Anglus*.⁵ The double name then came into common use;⁶ we need only mention the famous biography of Stephen written by John Dobrée Dalgairns and published in 1844 under the title *The Life of Stephen Harding*.⁷

ANGLUS

There are two sources—authoritative, but very concise—that offer some information on the first years of the life of Stephen: the GRA already cited; and the letter sent by Stephen in the last years of his own life to the monks of the monastery of Sherborne (EpSherb).⁸ Thus we know that he was born in England (*natione Anglus*), probably of noble origin (*non reconditis natalibus procreatus*), and, while still a boy (*puer*), he entered the monastery/cathedral of Sherburn—today Sherborne⁹—where, in all probability, he became a monk (*Scireburnie monachus . . . monachus uester fui*). Soon (*adulescens*), however, attracted by the 'things of the world' (*urtica seculi*) and perhaps tired of the monastic life (*pannos perousus*), he left that monastery in order to go first to Scotland¹⁰ and

5. Manrique (1642) 1:3 (*Introductio, caput 2, no. 4*).

6. The double name, for example, was used by Jean Mabillon and by Maurini.

7. Dalgairns (1844). The use of the name Stephen Harding appears, in the same year, also in the work of Samuel Roffey Maitland (1844) 356.

8. See below, text number 5.

9. The monastery of Sherborne was founded in 998, in the county of Dorset, on the border with the county of Somerset. For very basic information on the abbey of Sherborne, see *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1655); Calthrop (1908) 2:63; Waddell (1981) 15.

10. *Scottia* or *Scotia*, which William of Malmesbury speaks of, today has come to be identified with Scotland and not, as in past decades, with Ireland; see further: Oursel (1962) 6–8. Documentation on the use of the term *Scottia* or *Scotia*—in the twelfth century also in the cistercian context—to indicate Scotland is found in King (1941) 307–308; see also Van Damme (1963) 310–311. The same William of Malmesbury uses the term *Hibernia* to indicate Ireland in GRA 5.409; 738, and also in the *Historia novella* (William of Malmesbury [1889] 3.509; 2:588).

then, from there, to France (*primo Scottiam, mox Frantiam contendit; in baculo meo mare trasiui*).¹¹

In 1962 Charles Oursel, at a conference convened by the Friends of the Museum of Dijon,¹² formulated some new hypotheses on Stephen's birth and the first years of his life, basing his opinions on research conducted by G. M. Robertson—then a magistrate in the English Indies, later to become owner of Sherbourne Abbey—and of a group of inhabitants of Sherborne.

The date of Stephen's birth is usually placed a few years before 1066.¹³ Charles Oursel moved it back to 1059.¹⁴ In fact, the proposition does not appear at all convincing, as it is based only on a presumed and not documented indication by William of Malmesbury that 'in his *Gesta Regum*' he had indicated that 'the future abbot of Cîteaux . . . lived about 75 years, which moves his birth toward 1059, since he died in 1134'.¹⁵

HARDINGUS FILIUS ELNODI

Charles Oursel claimed, moreover, that he could identify in one of the entries in the *Domesday Book*¹⁶ the names of Stephen's father and grandfather. In particular, in the *Exon Domesday*—conserved in the library of Exeter Cathedral—the name 'Harding' appears

11. GRA 4.334.2; 578: '*Is fuit Hardingus nomine, apud Anglos, non ita reconditis natalibus procreatus, a puero Scireburniae monachus; sed cum adolescentem seculi urtica sollicitaret, pannos illos perosus, primo Scottiam, mox Frantiam contendit*'. EpSherb 3: '*Ego monachus uester fui, et in baculo meo mare transiui*'.

12. Oursel (1962).

13. See Standaert (1961) 1489; Dimier (1963) 1226.

14. Othon Ducourneau had proposed moving the date of Stephen's birth forward to 1056 and his departure from Sherborne would not have happened before he reached his sixteenth year, that is in 1072; see Ducourneau (1932); Ducourneau (1933).

15. Oursel (1962) 5.

16. The *Domesday Book* is the *descriptio* ordered in 1085 by William the Conqueror to register and institutionalize the feudal landholding system introduced by the Normans after the victory over the English in the battle of Hastings in 1066; see Morris (1972–1992).

several times, whether at Cranmore, which is located in Somerset about forty kilometers from Sherborne, or at Meriet, today Merriott, which is closer to Sherborne, about fifteen kilometers away. He therefore holds it to be 'probable that Saint Stephen Harding descended from the branch of *Meriet* rather than that of *Cranmore*. The *Exon Domesday*, folio 393, cites three of six properties of a Harding under William the Conqueror, probably the father of Saint Stephen, that is: *Mansus qui vocatur Brada;—idem Harding habet I mansum qui vocatur Capilandia;—idem harding habet I mansum qui vocatur Meriet*. . . . The *Domesday Book*, having already mentioned Harding, specifies *Hardingus filius Elnodi*'.¹⁷ The individualization of these 'Hardings' seemed to Charles Oursel enough to hypothesize that the first Harding, the owner of Meriet, was Stephen's father and Elnod his grandfather. Oursel pursued the hypothesis, identifying—although at some risk—Elnod with Ednoth on the basis of an older spelling. Ednoth was a great official (*stallarius*) at the court of King Harold, as recorded in the GRA¹⁸ and whom Oursel knows through the *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands* by Augustin Thierry.¹⁹ After the defeat of the English at the battle of Hastings in 1066, Ednoth (Elnod) went into the service of the invading Normans and was killed in 1069 in the course of a revolt organized against the invaders by the inhabitants of Somerset, Devon, and Dorset. If only on a purely hypothetical basis attested to by a rather weak correspondence of names, these suggestions of the context of Stephen's family also agree, according to Oursel, with the hint given in GRA of Stephen's noble origin.²⁰

17. Oursel (1962) 5–6.

18. GRA 3.254.2; 470: '*Vocabatur is Ednodus, domi belloque Anglorum temporibus iuxta insignis, pater Hardingi qui adhuc superest, magis consuetus linguam in lites acueri quam arma in bello concutere*'.

19. Charles Oursel (Oursel [1962] 6, n. 1) cites, in a note, the notice extracted from Thierry (1826) 2:78 as follows: "*Ednoth stallere (aulae praefectus.—Chronicum Saxonium, seu Annales rerum in Anglia praecipue gestarum a chr. r. ad 1154 deducte*" (ap. Lye-Manning, *Dictionarium saxonico et gothico-latinum*, Londini, 1772, in-f^o, app. IV)'.

20. Oursel (1962) 5: 'William of Malmesbury . . . did not fail to note that the future abbot of Cîteaux came from a distinguished family'. The allusion cited by

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE 'DEPARTURE' FROM SHERBORNE

In 1963, Jean-Baptiste Van Damme²¹ became a proponent of the view delineated by Charles Oursel. He too advanced an hypothesis on the elements (*éléments*) and the nature (*nature*) of Stephen's departure from the monastery of Sherborne. It is an aspect that, according to Van Damme, Oursel did not examine because he held that Stephen's departure from Sherborne fell within the 'changes' of monastery permitted in the tenth and eleventh centuries.²² Van Damme, however, intended to furnish some explanations to avoid the errors—or at least the confusion—which he claimed to have found in many authors.²³ His opinion was that, without a reason of *force majeure* or without the choice of a more austere form of life, Stephen's departure should be interpreted as 'apostasy pure and simple'.²⁴ The hypothesis he advanced is that, through force or through prudence (*soit contraint par la force, soit par prudence*), he was forced to abandon

Oursel from the works of William of Malmesbury is perhaps the same which we have already cited: '*Non ita reconditis natalibus procreatus*' (GRA 4.334.2; 578).

21. See Van Damme (1963).

22. Van Damme (1963) 308: '*Il nous faut étudier un fait très important dans la vie d'Etienne Harding, à savoir son départ de Sherborne. M. Oursel ne s'y arrête pas, et, supposant l'unanimité et le bien-fondé de son opinion, se contente de dire que "la pratique et la réglementation des changements de monastère étaient pour les moines des X^e e XI^e siècles normalement admises"* (p. 4)'. ['We should study a very important fact in Stephen Harding's life, that is, his departure from Sherborne. M. Oursel does not dwell on it and, assuming the unanimity and well-founded nature of his opinion, contents himself with saying that "the practice and the regulation of changes of monastery were normally allowed for the monks of the tenth and eleventh centuries."']

23. See Van Damme (1963) 308.

24. Van Damme (1963) 309: '*Soit qu'il fût entré à l'abbaye comme enfant, soit comme jeune homme disposant de sa liberté, dans les deux cas son départ de Sherborne serait à interpréter comme apostasie pure et simple, s'il n'y avait pas de raison de force majeure ou passage à une religion plus austère.*' ['Whether he entered the abbey as a child or as a young man making use of his own free will, in both cases his departure from Sherborne must be interpreted as apostasy, pure and simple, if there was no motivation of *force majeure* or passage to a more austere monastery.] He references Anselme Dimier, 'Saint Bernard et le Droit en matière de Transitus', *Revue Mabillon* 43 (1953) 48 ff; and J. Orlandis, 'La oblación de Niños a los Monasterios en la España Visigótica', *Yermo* 1 (El Paular 1963) 33 ff.

England in the years following the uprising known to have taken place in Somerset and the death of Elnod. In those years, in fact, many abbeys were exposed to uprisings and reprisals, and many people, especially those linked to men who had taken service under the Norman invaders—as in the case of the relatives of Elnod, were particularly exposed to hatred and personal revenge.²⁵ The entry of Elnod—according to Van Damme, Stephen’s grandfather or uncle²⁶—into the Normans’ service and his death would therefore have made Stephen’s remaining at Sherborne particularly dangerous.

Charles Oursel in 1959, taking a different perspective on the statement in the GRA (*cum seculi urtica sollicitaret, pannos illos perosus*), sought to present Stephen’s departure more kindly, as a consequence of his ‘desire for knowledge’ (*appétit de science*).²⁷ It was then interpreted by Van Damme as a ‘flight’ determined by *force majeure* and prudence. Van Damme’s interpretation also appears to contradict what is put forward in the GRA. He justifies that difference—to tell the truth, in a way that is not at all convincing—on the grounds of the changed historical context:

25. Van Damme (1963) 310: ‘Celle [the abbey] d’Etienne, Sherborne, sise dans une des régions où sévirent particulièrement les émeutes et les représailles, ne saurait avoir échappé à ce sort. Et sa personne, liée par des liens de famille au parjure Elnod, haï dans la contrée par son mauvais gouvernement (cf. G. de Malmesbury, l. c., PL 179:1236), avait bien des raisons que d’autres n’avaient pas, pour être prudent. Nous pensons donc qu’Etienne quitta Sherborne soit contraint par la force, soit par prudence, et qu’il espérait continuer la vie monastique dans une autre abbaye, sinon revenir à Sherborne un jour quand les circonstances auraient changé’. [That of Stephen, Sherborne, situated in one of the regions where the riots and reprisals particularly raged, would not have escaped that fate. And his person, linked by the bonds of kinship to the traitor Elnod, hated in the country for his bad government (see G. de Malmesbury, l. c., PL 179:1236), certainly had reasons which others did not have for being prudent. We think therefore that Stephen left Sherborne constrained either by force or by prudence, and that he hoped to continue monastic life in another abbey, if not to return to Sherborne someday when circumstances might have changed.] See also Van Damme (1991) 80–86.

26. See Van Damme (1963) 312. Many of the authors who accept the theses of Oursel and Van Damme are often uncertain of the exact degree of relationship between Stephen and Elnod; sometimes without any discussion they present Elnod as Stephen’s ‘father’, ‘uncle’, or ‘grandfather’.

27. Oursel (1959) 40.

'Placed in the known historical context of the contemporary readers, the testimony of William of Malmesbury, who affirms that Stephen abandoned the monastery because of his distaste for the monastic life, so in contrast yielding to the temptations of the world, means nothing else than . . . that he was obliged to flee to save his own life and his own religious life'.²⁸

Now seems the proper time to take note of the observation of Herbert Edward John Cowdrey, who in 1995 underscored that the hypothesis formulated by Van Damme (but, we should remember, also by Robertson and Oursel as well), which—although it may be very interesting,²⁹ does not enjoy adequate documentation. Above all this is true if we take into account that the name 'Harding' is rather frequent in this same Domesday Book³⁰ and

28. Van Damme (1963) 310.

29. Cowdrey (1995) 72, n. 29.

30. Cowdrey justly underscores that Jean-Baptiste Van Damme—and still earlier Charles Oursel—limited himself to the consideration of the Hardings who resided in the vicinity of Sherborne, while the name was also common in the counties of Leicester, Warwick, and Suffolk. In a note Cowdrey offers a complete list, at least so far as the localities near Sherborne are concerned, from which there immediately appears a wider horizon than that considered by Van Damme and still earlier by Robertson and by Oursel (Cowdrey [1995] 71, n. 29):

<i>Domesday Book folio</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Places</i>	<i>Form of name</i>	<i>TRE [tempore Regis Edwardi] or modo [now]</i>
67c	Wiltshire	Beechingstoke	Harding	TRE
68d	Wiltshire	Winterslow	Harding	TRE
69a	Wiltshire	Compton, Durrington, Winterslow, Ablington, Chitterne, Tytherington	Harding	TRE
74a	Wiltshire	Knighton, Figheldean, Ogbourne	Harding	TRE; <i>modo</i>
82c	Dorset	Bredy	Harding	TRE
90d	Somerset	Cranmore	Harding	TRE; <i>modo</i>
98d	Somerset	Lopen	Harding f. Alnod	<i>modo</i>
98d	Somerset	Bradon, Capland, Merriott, Buckland, Discove	Harding	<i>modo</i>

that the identification of Elnod with Ednoth the *stallarius* is rather uncertain.³¹

In 1981, Chrysogonus Waddell, while expressing some admiration for the hypothesis of Jean-Baptiste Van Damme, also asserted that he could not accept it because by itself it could not explain why, after having left Sherborne, Stephen did not immediately enter another monastery, but spent several years outside the monastic environment.³² Moreover, Waddell suggests, we should not undervalue the testimony of William of Malmesbury, who does not conceal, among Stephen's motives for leaving Sherborne, the attraction for the 'things of the world' (*urtica seculi*) and the boredom he encountered in monastic life (*pannos perosus*). And William certainly cannot be accused of 'anti-cistercian or anti-Stephen prejudice', since he clearly expresses his 'praise for his compatriot monastic reformer'.³³ Waddell proposes accepting the motivations specified by both GRA and by Jean-Baptiste Van Damme:

I would not have a problem in reconstructing the events in this fashion: a boy, raised from infancy in a monastery, and now, like every adolescent, somewhat unsatisfied, is forced to leave his own community because of difficulties stemming from his family connections. Since the problem would have presented itself for Stephen after 1066 in almost all the English monasteries, it was necessary for him to seek his new monastic home on the Continent. He chose the most usual path of exile: Scotland. But before finding a new monastic home, he did not resist the temptation to

31. Cowdrey (1995) 72, n. 29: 'It may, however, be pointed out that Harding was a fairly common Old English name, and it is far from certain that the *Alnod* of Domesday can be identified with Ednoth the Staller'.

32. Waddell (1981) 19: 'The hypothesis is fascinating. If I personally hesitate in accepting it, I do so because Stephen, upon leaving Sherborne for family and political reasons, did not head for another monastic community, but spent a number of years getting his education in a non-monastic milieu on the Continent'.

33. Waddell (1981) 19.

know a little bit more about the world outside the cloister.³⁴

In 1992 García M. Colombás suggested interpreting Stephen's departure from Sherborne not as a flight or an apostasy, but as one of the choices available to a young 'oblate' who, although living as part of the monastic community, was free, when he reached the appropriate age, to choose whether to continue to stay in the monastery or to leave it.³⁵

In an article published posthumously in 1994, Jean Leclercq, leaning on the studies of Helen Waddell and H. E. J. Cowdrey, advanced a new hypothesis: that this departure of Stephen was not a 'flight', but that he 'was—in the first place—a wandering student (*étudiant vagabond*), then a devoted pilgrim (*dévot pèlerin*)'.³⁶ Basing his opinion on the work of Helen Waddell dedicated to *The Wandering Scholars*,³⁷ Leclercq underscores the existence during the Middle Ages of 'wandering students' and takes that as a starting point in seeking to explain what Stephen experienced.

The representatives of that 'category' were a very diverse bunch, depending on whether they were more or less students and more or less wanderers. Many of them, after many years of wandering, settled down, sometimes in monasteries. Among the Cistercians as well many conversions of this sort were mentioned by Caesarius of Heisterbach, who, in the first half of the thirteenth century, was the historian of the Order. Many young english men came to the continent and

34. Waddell (1981) 20.

35. Colombás (1992) 487: '*Los oblatos, en efecto, eran considerados como monjes. Sin embargo, llegados a una edad apropiada, se les concedía la facultad de decidir por sí mismos si continuar en el monasterio o volver al mundo. En este momento crucial de su vida, Esteban optó por abandonar el monasterio*'. [The oblates, in effect, were considered to be monks. Nevertheless, having arrived at an appropriate age, they were granted the right to decide for themselves whether to continue in the monastery or to return to the world. In this crucial moment in his life, Stephen opted to abandon the monastery.]

36. Leclercq (1994) 18.

37. Waddell (1989).

some of them settled there. Often they dedicated themselves to song, which they studied and performed in public. We know also that Stephen Harding, after becoming abbot of Cîteaux, was very interested in all this.³⁸

From Cowdrey's study³⁹, Leclercq developed the hypothesis that Stephen, in choosing to leave Sherborne and then to undertake a pilgrimage to Rome with his friend Peter, could have been inspired by the *peregrinus* Egbert, one of the central figures in the *History of the English Church and Nation* (*Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*) of the Venerable Bede (672/3–735).⁴⁰ This was a text that Stephen could have read in the library of the monastery of Sherborne.⁴¹ In that case, Cowdrey observes, even if 'it is not possible to prove that Peter and Stephen were moved by the example of Egbert, still Bede's narration could have greatly influenced their life as *peregrini*.'⁴²

TOWARD MOLESMES

It is difficult to clarify definitively the motives for Stephen's departure from the monastery of Sherborne. Nevertheless, whatever the reason was, it allowed him to have contact in France with the most renowned schools of the age—Paris, Rheims, Laon, Bec, Chartres—where among other things he made an acquaintance who was important in his own life. Stephen—as the GRA bears witness⁴³—met a fellow countryman, the cleric and pilgrim Peter,

38. Leclercq (1994) 18.

39. Cowdrey (1991).

40. See Bede (1969) 3.4; 224. 3.27; 312–314. 4.3; 344. 5.9; 474–480. 5.20–24; 552–566.

41. See Cowdrey (1991) 330.

42. Cowdrey (1991) 330.

43. GRA 4.334.2; 578: '*Romam cum consorte studiorum clerico profectus est; nec illos continuatio et difficultas itineris et facultatum penuria unquam cohibere potuit quin cotidie totum psalterium et euntes et redeuntes cantitarent*'. The account given

who would later become the prior of Jully-les-Nonnains.⁴⁴ With Peter he enjoyed a deep friendship. In his company he made a pilgrimage to Rome, during which it was their custom to recite the entire psalter every day. Probably they would also have had opportunity to visit the great centers of monastic reform, Camaldoli and Vallombrosa.⁴⁵

Once returned to Burgundy, they visited the abbey of Molesmes, founded in 1075 by Abbot Robert. They arrived at a time when the abbey, as William of Malmesbury observes, was a monastery both *novum* and *magnum*⁴⁶—therefore not in all probability before 1085,⁴⁷ that is, after the ‘large territorial donations’ of 1084.⁴⁸

in the GRA of the voyage of Stephen and Peter to Rome was later used by Herbert of Clairvaux in his *De miraculis libri tres* (DM), completed in 1178 (as attested by the anonymous *Chronicon Claraevallense*, PL 185bis:1249B). DM 2.24, in PL 185bis:1333D: ‘*De beato autem viro legitur in Gestis Anglorum quod, dum adhuc esset in saeculo juvenis, profectus est aliquando Romam cum quodam socio suo causa orationis. Quandiu vero fuerunt in itinere illo, soliti erant diebus singulis sine intermissione Psalterium integrum decantare*’. EM, written probably between 1195 and 1206, finished at least in the first quarter of the thirteenth century (see Waddell [1999] 157), repeats Herbert’s information from DM: ‘*Hic beatus uir in adolescentia sua exiens de terra et de cognatione sua limina sanctorum apostolorum peregrinus adiit. In quo itinere non otiosis fabulis, sicut fieri solet, occupabatur, sed cum socio suo diuinis laudibus uacans psalterium ex integro cottidie decantabat*’ (EM, 1.21; 44).

44. See *Vita sancti Petri prioris Juliacensis puellarum monasterii et monachi Molis-mensis*, in PL 185bis:1255–1270, written between 1160 and 1185, that is about twenty-five years after Peter’s death, which occurred on 23 June 1136. See also: Gengler (1922); Mathon (1968); Cowdrey (1995).

45. See the full study by Roger Duvernay [1952] on the possible connections between Stephen and Vallombrosa and some doubts about it raised by Charles Oursel (see Oursel [1959] 42). One can nevertheless share the opinion of Laurent Veyssière ([1997] 50), who justly maintains that the direct acquaintance with celtic monasticism and the italian reform fostered Stephen’s personal enrichment, which bore fruit later in his monastic experience, first at Molesmes and later at Cîteaux .

46. See GRA 4.334.3; 578.

47. See Van Damme (1963) 313; Veyssière (1997) 46. According to Othon Du-courneau the pilgrimage to Rome would have taken place in 1088 (see Duvernay [1952] 462, n. 4). According to Thomas Merton (Merton [1998] 267), on the other hand, Stephen’s entry at Molesmes would have happened shortly after its foundation: ‘The most usual opinion is that Saint Stephen entered to become part of the community [of Molesme] in the period of the purity of its first fervor, that is shortly after the departure from Colan, which happened in 1075’.

48. See Laurent (1907) 1:148.

Drawn by that experience, they decided to remain there as monks. In 1097 Stephen is present with the abbot of Molesmes, Robert, and the prior, Alberic, at the juridical gathering (*conventio*) which defined the relationship of filiation between that monastery and that of Aulps—founded between 1090 and 1094 by two monks from Molesmes, Guy and Guérin—which by that act was raised to an abbey.⁴⁹

ABBOT OF THE *NOVUM MONASTERIUM*

In 1098 Stephen left Molesmes with the group led by Abbot Robert and Prior Alberic that founded the *Novum monasterium*.⁵⁰ the beginnings of the Cistercian Order. When in 1099 Abbot Robert returned to Molesmes and Prior Alberic became abbot,⁵¹ Stephen was named prior. When Alberic died on 26 January 1108,⁵² Stephen was elected abbot of Cîteaux and remained abbot until 1133, the year before his own death.

In the years from 1109 to 1112 the monastery of Cîteaux went through a period of difficulty due above all to poverty and the reduced number of monks, but in 1113, thanks to the entrance into the monastery of a closely-linked group of new vocations guided by Bernard of Fontaines-les-Dijons,⁵³ a first foundation at La Ferté (*Firmitas*) became possible.⁵⁴ The foundation charter of La Ferté records among the motives which had driven the founda-

49. See 'Conventio inter molismenses et alpenses monachos', in Waddell (1999) 508–509.

50. See Marilier (1950); Marilier (1961) 23–26.

51. See EP 9.

52. Sometimes the date of Alberic's death is indicated as 26 January 1109 (see for example Lekai [1989] 24). This uncertainty goes back to the studies of Jean Marilier who in 1948 proposed 1109 as the date of death (Marilier [1948] 55:2–5), but in 1961 he corrected himself, maintaining that it was preferable to place it in 1108 (Marilier [1961] 22–23). See below, text number 6.5.

53. See EC 2.8–10; EP 17.11; Vacandard (1895) 1.39 ff.; Gastaldelli (1987).

54. See Marilier (1961) 65–66, no. 42; *Gallia Christiana*, 4:1019–1020; Duby (1953) 41–42.

tion, the great number of brothers present at Cîteaux and the resulting lack of space and of means of sustenance,⁵⁵ but it also underscores that the separation would be only of the body and not of the spirit (*corpore non animo*), highlighting in this way the profound community spirit which bound the first Cistercians.⁵⁶ Other foundations quite quickly followed the first: Pontigny (*Pontiniacum*)⁵⁷ in 1114, Clairvaux (*Clara-vallis*)⁵⁸ and Morimond (*Morimundus*)⁵⁹ in 1115. These four abbeys, with Cîteaux, form the so-called 'mother abbeys of the Order'. Morimond became part of this group only in 1163 with the bull *Sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia* (15 October 1163) of Alexander III.

In those years, thanks to Stephen's administrative skills and to good relations with neighboring nobles, the first expansion of the property of Cîteaux occurred. Within the space of the first five or six years of his abbacy, on land donated for the most part by the family of the countess Elizabeth of Vergy, the first granges were founded: Gergueil,⁶⁰ Bretigny, and Gemigny.⁶¹ Donated by Aimon of Marigny, Gilly-les-Vougeot⁶² would later become the summer residence of the abbots. From 1115 on, the monks sought to add to it the famous vineyards known afterwards as Clos-de-Vougeot—which was to become probably the most precious piece of land in all of Burgundy.⁶³ That during those years, Stephen not

55. Marilier (1961) 66, no. 42: '*Tantus erat numerus fratrum apud Cistercium quod nec substantia quam habebant eis sufficere, nec locus in quo manebant eos convenienter poterat capere*'.

56. Marilier (1961) 66, no. 42: '*Placuit itaque abbati ejusdem loci Stephano nomine ceterisque fratribus ut locum alium quererent in quo pars ipsorum ab aliis corpore non animo separata, Deo devote et regulariter deserviret*'.

57. See Marilier (1961) 66, no. 43; Quantin (1854) 1, no. 122; Hümpfner (1932) 19–21; Garrigues (1981) 152–154.

58. See Marilier (1961) 66, no. 44; the foundation charter is not given there.

59. See Marilier (1961) 66, no. 45; Hümpfner (1932) 24–25; Grill (1953) 121–122.

60. See Marilier (1961) 57–58, no. 36 (the donation was made before May 1111).

61. See Marilier (1961) 68–70, no. 51 (the donation was made before 1117).

62. See Marilier (1961) 57, no. 33; 63–65, no. 41 (the donation was made before 1110); see also Marilier (1961) 57, no. 35.

63. See Lekai (1989) 25.

only received donations, but also did his best to expand and organize the possessions of Cîteaux, is exemplified by the creation in the years 1116–1119 of the granges of Mosey⁶⁴ and Crépey⁶⁵.

The expansion of the territory and the increase of agricultural production invites us to remember that the creation of the figure of the lay brother (*conversus*) also dates back to this time. Side by side and probably in many cases within the group of the paid workers who in all probability helped the monks in their agricultural labors, a group of men increasingly came together who, while remaining laymen, nevertheless shared in part the religious life of the monastery, but being freer [of the obligations of the monastic life] were able to see to the care of the fields farther from the abbey and to allow the monks to fulfill the precepts of the rule (*se plenarie die sive nocte praecepta Regule posse servare*)⁶⁶. The customs and norms that governed the life of the lay brothers changed so very little that their definitive codification can be dated to a period slightly before 1150.⁶⁷

THE EXORDIUM PARVUM

Chapter Seventeen of the *Exordium Parvum* (the ‘Little Beginning’; EP), composed ‘not long before 1147’,⁶⁸ offers us a brief synthesis

64. See Marilier (1961) 72–77, nos. 57–62.

65. See Marilier (1961) 79–80, no. 66. See the reference in GRA 4.337.3; 584: ‘*Beatum se computat terrae illius indigena, quisquis per illius manum pecunias suas transmittit ad Deum. Plura quidem ille accipit; sed paucis in suos suorumque usus expensis, cetera in egenos et monasteriorum aedificationem confestim dispertit.*’

66. EP 15.10: ‘*Per conversos agenda sunt exercitia apud grangias et per mercenarios. Quos utique conversos episcoporum licentia tanquam necessarios et coadiutores nostros sub cura nostra sicut et monachos suscipimus, fratres et participes nostrorum tam spiritualium quam temporalium bonorum aequae ut monachos habemus*’ (Instituta 8); see also Capitula 20: ‘*Tuncque definierunt se conversos laicos barbatos licentia episcopi sui suscepturos, eosque in vita et morte, excepto monachatu, ut semetipsos tractaturos, et homines etiam mercenarios; quia sine adminiculo istorum non intelligebant se plenarie die sive nocte praecepta Regule posse servare.*’ For basic information on lay brothers, see Ducourneau (1929); Donnelly (1949); Hallinger (1956); Mikkers (1962); Auburger (1986) 63–65, 148, 442–46.

67. See below, text number 6.4.

68. Waddell (1999) 231. The dating of EP is difficult. There is a brief review of the positions in Waddell (1999) 199–205. The trend prevalent today is to consider

of the events which characterized Stephen's abbacy in those first years, even if the text is, unfortunately, very brief and the chronological indications rather imprecise (*huius temporibus; illis diebus; istis temporibus*). The title of the chapter presents Stephen as the 'second' abbot of Cîteaux: *De morte primi abbatis et de promotione secundi, et de institutes et laetitia eorum*.⁶⁹ After a brief reference to the death of Alberic,⁷⁰ it records the English origin of Stephen, his arrival from Molesmes, and the quality of his monastic life: 'One of the brothers, Stephen by name, succeeded him [Alberic], who was of English origin (*anglicus natione*), who also had come with the others from Molesmes and was a lover of the rule and the place (*amator regulae et loci erat*)'.⁷¹ There seem to have been three fundamental elements of Stephen's abbacy that EP intended to highlight. First of all was his decision—certainly not easy and probably because of that stored in the memory as a decisive moment in the reform project—to prohibit the nobles of the place—perhaps above all the Duke of Burgundy—from using the monastery as a meeting place, a right recognized in the Middle Ages as belonging to founders of monasteries⁷² and still in force, for example, at Molesmes.⁷³ EP underscores that the decision was taken by the common accord of the entire community:

it a text composed at different periods. The oldest part would consist of the prologue and chapters 1–2 and 9–14, whose compilation would be 'datable around 1113' and 'whose probable author' would be 'Saint Stephen Harding, who wrote in the name of the founders of the New Monastery, to furnish to the new generation of monks an authoritative exposition of the origins, of the spirit, and of the monastic program of the brothers of the New Monastery' (Waddell [1999] 230–231). On the other hand 'chapter III and chapters XV–XVIII (and maybe a revision of chapter IX), as well as the index and the titles of the chapters, were added not long before 1147 . . . and their probable author would be the blessed Rainard, abbot of Cîteaux' (Waddell [1999] 231).

69. EP 17.1. As concerns the designation of Stephen as 'second' and not as 'third' abbot, see above, Introduction, note 8.

70. EP 17.2: '*Vir autem Domini Albericus, in schola Christi per novem annos et dimidium regulari disciplina feliciter exercitatus, migravit ad Dominum, fide et virtutibus gloriosus, et ideo in vita aeterna a Deo merito beandus*'.

71. EP 17.3.

72. Lesne (1910–1928) 2.2:387–404.

73. See Laurent (1907) 1.141–142.

In that period (*huius temporibus*)⁷⁴, the brothers, in accord with the abbot (*fratres una cum eodem abbate*), prohibited the lord of that region, and all other princes, from holding at any time the meetings of their court near that community, as at first they were accustomed to do on feast days.⁷⁵

The second element of Stephen's experience at Cîteaux which EP wished to record was the sobriety and the essential nature of the liturgy:

In order that in the house of God, in which they desired to serve God with devotion day and night, there should not remain anything which might reek of pride or superfluity (*superbiam aut superfluitatem redoleret*), or which might in some way corrupt poverty—custodian of virtue (*paupertatem, custodem virtutum*)—which they had freely chosen, deciding not to have croziers of gold or silver, but only of wood, nor thuribles save of brass or iron, nor chasubles unless they were of fustian or linen without silk, gold, and silver, nor shirts or amices unless of linen, equally without silk, gold, and silver. In addition, they completely renounced any type of mantles, copes, dalmatics, and tunics; they kept silver chalices, not gold, but gilded if possible, and a silver straw, gilded if possible, and also stoles and maniples only of silk, without gold or silver. They decided, with clarity, that the altarcloths

74. According to Jean-Baptiste Auberger, 1112 or shortly thereafter, is when 'the important acquisition of lands thanks to Elisabeth de Vergy and her family . . . undoubtedly gave the brothers more freedom in regards to the duke. One could therefore estimate that is about 1112, or a bit later, that such a decision was able to be taken' (Auberger [1986] 81); also: 'The period of silence in the relations between the duke and the monks of Cîteaux (shortly after 1113 to 1119) might seem to confirm this hypothesis' (Auberger [1986] 141).

75. EP 17.4.

should be made of undecorated linen and that the wine flasks should be without gold or silver.⁷⁶

The third element, finally, was his capacity for maintaining a wise balance between agricultural and economic development and the intensity of the religious life, conditions which favored the material and spiritual progress of the community:

In those days (*Illis diebus*), the community grew in the possession of lands, vineyards, fields, and rural possessions, but its religious life did not diminish (*nec religione decrevit*). At the same time (*istis temporibus*), God visited that place, pouring out the bowels of his mercy on those who, because of the almost total lack of followers, called upon him, shouted out to him, crying in his presence; day and night they emitted long and profound sighs and were by this time close to desperation. The grace of God, in fact, sent to that community, at one time, so many clerics, educated and noble, and also lay people, powerful in the world and equally noble, that thirty of them, with fervor, entered the novitiate together and carried to happy completion their course, struggling forcefully against their own vices and the incitements of the evil spirits. In diverse parts of the region, old men, youths, and men of all ages, moved by their example, seeing that in them was possible what first they feared to be impossible in the observance of the rule, began to run to that place, to submit their proud necks to the easy yoke of Christ (*superba colla iugo Christi suavi subdere*), to ardently love the hard and harsh precepts of the

76. EP 17.5–8. GRA recorded—in similar words—the diligence of Cîteaux in search of poverty and simplicity, and there the motive is also explained: the moral life, the mind, the conscience are all far superior to luxury and riches: '*At uero illi, ea quae prima mortales falso estimant in secundis habentes, omne studium in ornandis moribus ponunt, magisque amant splendidas mentes quam auratas uestes; scientes quod benefactorum retributio optima est munda frui conscientia*' (GRA 4.337.4; 584).

rule (*dura et aspera regulae praecepta ardentem amare*), to make joyful and reinforce that community in a marvelous way (*ecclesiamque illam mirabiliter laetificare et corroborare*).⁷⁷

BIBLE AND LITURGY

The years of the abbacy of Stephen at Cîteaux were marked as well by initiatives of great cultural value. One can think in particular of the revision of the text of the Vulgate, realized by the collation of the best manuscripts and with a verification, thanks to the help of ‘some Jews expert in their scripture (*iudeos quosdam in sua scriptura peritos*)’,⁷⁸ against the original texts of the Old Testament. Also to be remembered is his zeal for an ever more authentic observance of the rule of Saint Benedict (RB), lavished on research at Metz into the Gregorian chant of the times of Saint Gregory and at Milan into the hymns ‘composed by the blessed archbishop Ambrose (*quos beatum ambrosium archiepiscopum constat composuisse*)’.⁷⁹

Also to be considered is the production of the scriptorium at Cîteaux, particularly distinguished by the care and the beauty of the manuscripts produced in it. We need only think of the ‘miniatures of his Bible and of the book *Moralia in Job* (by Saint Gregory the Great), both written and illuminated during the first three years of his abbacy’ which ‘were the most original productions of the entire age and demonstrated that in those years Cîteaux gathered together some of the greatest artists of France’.⁸⁰

77. EP 17.9–12.

78. MonBibl, v. 7; see below, text number 1.

79. EpHymn, v. 2; see below, text number 2.

80. Lekai (1989) 26.

THE CARTA CARITATIS

In those years, too, the development of the abbey of Cîteaux progressed with other foundations: Preuilley (*Prulliacum*)⁸¹ in 1118, La Cour-Dieu (*Curia-Dei*)⁸² and Bonnevaux (*Bona-vallis*)⁸³ in 1119, L'Aumône (*Eleemosyna*)⁸⁴ and Le Loroux (*Oratorium*)⁸⁵ in 1121, La Bussière (*Buxeria*)⁸⁶, Le Miroir (*Miratorium*)⁸⁷ and Sant-Andrea di Sestri (*S. Andreas de Sexto*)⁸⁸ in 1131. The growing number of foundations favored the birth and development, during Stephen's abbacy, of a system of regulations on the relations between the foundations and the mother-abbey of Cîteaux, the basic criteria of which are formulated in the fundamental constitution of the Order, the *Carta caritatis*.⁸⁹

The meaning and value of the *Carta caritatis* are indicated by one of the 'official' documents of the Cistercian Order: the *Exordium Cistercii* (EC). Concerning Stephen, the EC, edited in the years immediately following his death,⁹⁰ records his english origin and eulogizes his zeal in the monastic life: ' . . . an englishman by origin, an ardent lover and utterly faithful disciple of the religious life, of poverty and the discipline of the rule (*homo natione Anglicus, religionis, paupertatis, disciplinaeque regularis*

81. See Marilier (1961) 78, no. 63; Catel-Lecomte (1927) no. 1.

82. See Marilier (1961) 78, no. 64.

83. See Marilier (1961) 78–79, no. 65; Chevalier (1889) no. 1; *Gallia Christiana*, 16: *instrumenta*: 31–32, 41.

84. See Marilier (1961) 83, no. 71.

85. See Marilier (1961) 83, no. 72.

86. See Marilier (1961) 90, no. 85; *Gallia Christiana*, 4:296.495 and *instrumenta*: 89.

87. See Marilier (1961) 90, no. 86.

88. See Marilier (1961) 90, no. 87.

89. See EC 2.12–13; below, text number 6.1.

90. The EC today is normally dated in the years immediately following the death of Stephen. There are good reasons to attribute it to a monk of Clairvaux, whose thought and expressions could be considered near to those of Bernard. According to Chrysogonus Waddell, the author might be identified as Raynard of Bar, monk of Clairvaux and Stephen's successor (see Waddell [1999] 159–161).

ardentissimus amator, fidelissimus aemulator'.⁹¹ It then underscores the intelligence and the balance with which he proceeded to the drafting of the *Carta caritatis*:

From the very beginning, when the new plant began to sprout new branches, the venerable father Stephen, with attentive perspicacity (*venerabilis pater Stephanus sagacitate pervigili*), provided for the drafting of a document of extraordinary discernment (*mirae providerat discretionis scriptum*), like pruning shears, to prune the shoots of separations which one day or another, if allowed to grow, might possibly have strangled the fruit born of mutual peace. Therefore, opportunely, he wanted that document to be called 'Charter of charity' (*Cartam caritatis*), because all its content is inspired only by charity (*quod ea tantum quae sunt caritatis tota eius series redoleat*), to the point that it seems to treat of almost nothing else: 'Do not have any debt with anyone except that of loving each other reciprocally' (see Rom 13:8).⁹²

Yet we do not know the *Carta caritatis* in its original form, as it was, presumably, edited during the time of the first foundations.⁹³ Instead we know a version reworked during the following years which received official approval on 23 December 1119 in

91. EC 2.7.

92. EC 2.12–13.

93. True, it is often affirmed that the first 'official' notice of the *Carta caritatis* (*et unanimitalis*) is found in the document of the foundation of Pontigny, a foundation that took place on 13 May 1114. '*Eo tempore, accensu et dono auctoritateque donni Humbaldi episcopi et totius capituli ecclesiae suae ac venerabilis sacerdotis Ansii, suscepit donnus Stephanus abbas Pontiniaci ecclesiam ad abbatiam in ibi ordinandam. Cartam vero caritatis et unanimitalis inter novum monasterium et abbatias ab eo propagatas compositam et corroboratam idem pontifex et canonicorum conventus ratam per omnia habuerunt*' (Garrigues [1981] 153); see above, n. 57. Still, we must note that this document could have been drawn up after the death of William, Count of Nevers, who in the document is remembered as *bonae famae* and who died in 1147.

the bull *Ad hoc in apostolicae* of Pope Callixtus II.⁹⁴ This version was discovered by Josip Turk in 1939, in ms 31 of the University Library of Ljubljana.⁹⁵ Turk called it *Carta caritatis prior*⁹⁶ (CC1), to distinguish it from the redaction already known, which was considered the original text of the *Carta caritatis*, but which is in reality the fruit of a series of modifications carried out on the *Carta caritatis* and which for that reason is now called the *Carta caritatis posterior* (CC2).⁹⁷ The last named is the text approved by Alexander III on 5 August 1165, by the bull *Sacrosanta Romana Ecclesia*—actually the fifth bull with the same name. Over the course of thirteen years, beginning 1 August 1152, the five pontifical bulls accompanied the approval of lightly modified texts of the *Carta caritatis*⁹⁸ and it is difficult today to reconstruct with precision the texts that were the subjects of the five pontifical approvals.

It is, however, possible to get an inkling of what influence the *Carta caritatis* had on the life not only of the Cistercian Order, but also on the other religious orders. In this regard it is customary to cite the twelfth constitution of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, in which the abbots 'of every kingdom or province' were instructed to hold a General Chapter every three years, on the model proposed by the cistercian *Carta caritatis*. Recognizing the consolidated cistercian experience, the conciliar constitution also

94. See Waddell (1999) 295, 451.

95. Ljubljana, Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica (National and University Library), ms 31. The manuscript, dated around 1147, comes from the monastery of Stična, which is in the diocese of Ljubljana and was founded in 1135 by the abbey of Reun (Rein), in the line of Morimond (see Waddell [1999] 52). For its publication see Turk (1942); Turk (1945) 1.53–56; Turk (1948) 4.32–35, 109–119; C. Noschitzka (1950) 6.6–124. For a first analysis see Kos (1931) 56; Turk (1942); Turk (1945) 1.11–61. Turk (1947); Turk (1948); Notschitzka (1950) 6.1–6; Lefèvre (1956b); Lefèvre (1964); Golob (1996) 190.

96. See Waddell (1999) 274–282, 442–450.

97. See Waddell (1999) 381–388, 500–505.

98. The five bulls were promulgated by Eugene III, *Sacrosanta Romana Ecclesia* (1 August 1152); Anastasius IV, *Sacrosanta Romana Ecclesia* (9 December 1153); Hadrian IV, *Sacrosanta Romana Ecclesia* (18 February 1157); Alexander III, *Sacrosanta Romana Ecclesia* (15 October 1163); Alexander III, *Sacrosanta Romana Ecclesia* (5 August 1165). See below, text number 6.1.

provided that two cistercian abbots from whatever monastery was nearby should be invited to every General Chapter; to them, supported by two of the other abbots, was entrusted the oversight of the works of the chapter.⁹⁹

THE YEARS OF MATURITY

From 1120–1125, Stephen also had an important part in the foundation of the female abbey of Tart (twelve km northeast of Cîteaux). The abbey adopted the constitutions and customs of Cîteaux and so became the first cistercian women's monastery.¹⁰⁰

In 1124 the first great crisis of the Order took place.¹⁰¹ Arnold, abbot of Morimond since its foundation (1115), decided to leave the monastery in an irregular way (*satis inordinate deseruit*¹⁰²), to make a new foundation in Palestine. He left with a group of monks from Morimond—among whom were Everard, Adam,¹⁰³

99. Concilio Lateranense IV (1991) 240–241: *'In singulis regnis sive provinciis fiat de triennio in triennium, salvo iure dioecesanorum pontificum, commune capitulum abbatum atque priorum abbates proprios non habentium, qui non consueverunt tale capitulum celebrare Advocent autem caritative in huius novitatis primordiis duos Cisterciensis ordinis abbates vicinos, ad praestandum sibi consilium et auxilium opportunum, cum sint in huiusmodi capitulis celebrandis ex longa consuetudine plenius informati. Qui absque contradictione duos sibi de ipsis associant, quos viderint expedire; ac ipsi quatuor praesint capitulo universo, ita quod ex hoc nullus eorum auctoritatem praelationis assumat, unde, cum expedierit, provida possint deliberatione mutari. Huiusmodi vero capitulum aliquot certis diebus continue iuxta morem Cisterciensium celebretur'.*

100. See *Diatriba de illustri genere S. Bernardi. Probationes et illustrationes. XII: Fundatio monasterii de Tart sanctimonialium diocesis Lingonensis, quae intra muros urbis Divionis ex anno Christi 1623 sunt deductae*, in PL 185bis:1409C–1411A. See also PL 185bis:1411B–1414B; Hene (1897) 8.48–57, 85–89, 110–118; Connor (1995), reprinted in Connor (1998).

101. For a concise presentation of the event, see Vacandard (1895) 162–169; OSB 6/1.48, n. 1.

102. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 6.1; SBOp 7:30.

103. See Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 5; SBOp 7:28–29; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 7; SBOp 7.31–46.

Conrad,¹⁰⁴ and Henry¹⁰⁵—, but without the consent of the other monks and without the permission of the abbot of Cîteaux or of the bishop of Langres¹⁰⁶, relying instead on a presumed authorization of Pope Callixtus II.¹⁰⁷ The motives for this decision, precipitous to say the least, are perhaps linked to some difficulty or to a crisis; possible hints as to the underlying reasons may be indirectly provided by Bernard of Clairvaux in a letter written in 1137: the difficulty of his relationships with the monks and their disobedience; the strain of guiding the lay brothers; the hostility of the neighbors; the lack of economic resources.¹⁰⁸ The exploit concluded with the return of all the monks to Morimond—with the exception of Arnold, who withdrew into Flanders, where

104. See Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 6.1; SBOp 7:30.

105. See Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 7.14; SBOp 7:42.

106. '*Absque consilio fratrum et coabbatum tuorum, absque Patris et Magistri tui licentia*' (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 4.3; SBOp 7:27). '*Nec coabbatum suorum in tam scrupuloso facto exspectavit consilium, nec ipsius, cui praecipuum debebat subiectionem, abbatis scilicet Cisterciensis, licentiam vel assensum*' (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 6.1; SBOp 7.30). '*Putantes illum episcopi Lingonensis et abbatis Cisterciensis,—nam utriusque debitor erat—, licentia proficisci*' (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 7.5; SBOp 7.35).

107. '*Romani Pontificis tamquam gravior auctoritas, cuius quippe vos aiunt praemunitos fuisse licentia*' (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 7.7; SBOp 7:36). '*Apostolicam, inquit, licentiam quaesivimus et impetravimus. Utinam non licentiam quaesissetis, sed consilium; id est non ut liceret, sed an liceret. Unde tamen quaerebatis licentiam? Ut liceret quod non licebat? Facere itaque volebatis quod non licebat. Sed quod non licebat malum erat. . . . Quod tamen summum fecisse Pontificem nequaquam crediderim, nisi aut circumventum mendacio, aut importunitate victum*' (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 7.9; SBOp 7:37–38). Also in the letter sent directly to Pope Callixtus II, Bernard affirms: '*Prius quidem, ut aiunt, circumspectionis vestrae prudentiam tentaturus, si quo modo a vobis suo possit errori extorquere licentiam. Qua in re si quem ei, quod absit, assensum praebueritis, ipse perpendite quantae possit nostro Ordini esse destructionis occasio*' (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 359; SBOp 8:305).

108. It also seems possible to extract from the letter sent in 1137 to Humbert, abbot of Igny, which records as an example not to be imitated that of Arnold: '*Miror quod te non terruit Arnaldi abbatis exemplum, cuius similis praesumptio digno, sed pavendo fine, ut bene meministi, in brevi est vindicata. Et quidem ille qualemcumque, ut bene novi ego, habuit causam, tu nullam. Numquid enim aut monachi tuis erant inobedientes imperiis, aut conversi segnes in operibus, aut vicini forte tibi tuisve rebus infesti, aut certe modica et non sufficiens substantia mundi, quatenus relinquere cogeres quos vel regere, vel pascere non sufficeres?*' (Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 141.1; SBOp 7:338–339).

he died on 3 January 1125.¹⁰⁹ Stephen then named as Arnold's successor at Morimond the prior of Clairvaux, Walter, who began a period of great flowering at the abbey and its foundations, above all in Germany, Bohemia, and Austria.

During the same period, in 1124, a new famine forced Stephen to go to Flanders to ask for help for the population of Burgundy.¹¹⁰ On the way back, he had occasion to stay in the abbey of Saint-Vaast at Arras; there he tightened the bonds of brotherhood between Cîteaux and that monastery.¹¹¹ He obtained from the monk Osbert of Saint-Vaast a copy of Saint Jerome's Commentary on Jeremiah.¹¹² A full-page miniature in that manuscript portrays Saint Stephen and Abbot Henry I of Saint-Vaast, each with a golden nimbus, offering their respective abbeys to the Virgin.¹¹³

Still other donations contributed to the growth of the property of Cîteaux. In 1125 some possessions were donated to Vernolle (Grosbois-en-Montagne) and to Civry,¹¹⁴ and in the following years, from 1130 to 1140, to Latrecey, Toutenant, Moisey, and Dambilly.¹¹⁵

In 1128 Stephen, together with Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux, and with Abbots Hugh of Pontigny and Guy of Trois-Fontaines, participated in the council of Troyes.¹¹⁶ In 1129–1130, again with Bernard and the other abbots, he intervened with the King of France, Louis VI 'the Fat', to defend the bishop of Paris, Stephen of Senlis. The bishop wanted to reform the secular canons according to the norms of the canons of Saint Victor, but the canons of the cathedral, headed by the archdeacon Theobald Notier, were

109. See Williams (1940); Grill (1953) 125–133.

110. See Manrique (1642) 1:160 (*ad annum* 1125, *caput* 2, no. 1).

111. See Marilier (1961) 83–84, nos. 74–75.

112. S. Hieronymus [Saint Jerome], *In Hieroniam prophetam libri VI*, currently: Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 130.

113. Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 130, f. 104; see Oursel (1926) table 51; Blanchon-Lasserve (1927–1931); Marilier (1961) 83–84, nos. 74–76; Samaran and Marichal (1968) 6.179; Zaluska (1991) 127–129. (See the cover of this book.)

114. See Marilier (1961) 85–86, no. 77.

115. See Marilier (1961) 87–91, 94–96, nos. 81, 84, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96.

116. See Manrique (1642) 1:182–185 (*ad annum* 1128, *caput* 1, nos. 1–11); Sacrorum Conciliorum (1961) 21:357.

fiercely opposed to the change and appealed to the king. The king went to the chapter of the cathedral and defended the secular canons. The bishop, with the support of the bishop of Chartres and of the archbishop of Sens, issued an interdict against the king, who in his turn confiscated the bishop's goods and took away the benefices the bishop held from the king. The bishop took refuge at Cîteaux, where the General Chapter of the Order was in progress. So it was that Stephen and the other cistercian abbots involved in the meeting wrote a letter to the king. This letter was later to become part of the letter collection of Bernard of Clairvaux.¹¹⁷ The affair concluded only in 1132, when Pope Innocent II declared in favor of the bishop of Paris and invited the canons of Notre-Dame, who agreed, to grant one of their prebends to the canons of Saint Victor.¹¹⁸

In 1129 Stephen intervened again, with Hugh of Pontigny and Bernard of Clairvaux, to defend the archbishop of Sens, Henry of Boisroques, against accusations by King Louis VI, and he wrote to Pope Honorius II to ask that he, rather than the king, judge the situation.¹¹⁹

In the years 1130–1132, Stephen, once again with Bernard, was made responsible by Pope Innocent II for intervening as mediator and judge in the contest between Abbot Herbert of Saint-Étienne in Dijon and Abbot Herbert of Saint-Seine over the possession of the churches of Estaule and Dairé and their tithes (*cum decimis possessio*¹²⁰). On 3 December 1130, Innocent II wrote to Bishop William of Langres to invite him to help Stephen of Cîteaux and Bernard of Clairvaux in seeking to put an end to the question.¹²¹

117. See Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 45; SBOP 7:133-134; below, text number 3.

118. See Manrique (1642) 1:172–174 (*ad annum* 1127, *caput* 1, nos. 1–8); De Warren (1953); Luchaire (1890) n. 424; Van Damme (1991) 145–146.

119. See Bernard of Clairvaux, *Epistola* 49; SBOP 7:140–141; Manrique (1642) 1:188–189 (*ad annum* 1128, *caput* 4, nos. 1–6); Van Damme (1991) 146; below, text number 4.

120. Innocentius II, *Epistolae et Privilegia*, LXXXVI: *Ad Herbertum abbatem S. Stephani Divionensis* (Anno 1132, Febr. 12.), PL 179:125C.

121. Innocentius II, *Epistolae et Privilegia*, XXI: *Ad Guillelmum Lingonensem episcopum* [Anno 1130, Dec. 3.]; PL 179:70D: 'Sicut praesentes tibi injunximus, ita per

On 4 November 1131, Innocent II wrote to Stephen to ask him to conclude that controversy. The pope obviously held Stephen in great esteem: he addressed him as 'a wise man, balanced, and religious'.¹²² On 30 December 1131, the pope informed the bishop of Langres of the charge given to Stephen and Bernard, and invited him to do his best to respect the decisions which would be taken.¹²³ On 12 February 1132, Innocent wrote to Abbot Herbert of Saint-Étienne to tell him that he had ratified, on his own authority, the judgment formulated by Stephen, who 'as a religious man and a lover of peace'¹²⁴ had listened to the parties in the dispute and, with the advice of Bernard and the other religious authorities, had established a just division of the property and of the tithes.¹²⁵ But the abbot and monks of Saint-Seine seem never to have accepted and respected the agreement. In fact, the following year, on 19 May 1133, Innocent II informed Duke Hugo of Burgundy that he had renewed the excommunication of that monastic community because they had not respected the agreement, and in addition—it even appears with the support of the

apostolica scripta fraternitati tuae praecipimus, quatenus, ascitis tecum dilectis filiis nostris [Stephano] Cisterciensi et [Bernardo] Claravallensi abbatibus, controversiam quae inter Ecclesiam S. Stephani et S. Sequani agitur, canonico fine decidas, aut concordiam et pacem componas'.

122. Innocentius II, *Epistolae et Privilegia*, LXIV: *Ad Stephanum Cisterciensem abbatem* [Anno 1131, Nov. 4.] (PL 179:112B), Jaffé (1885²) 1:852, no. 7505 (5380): 'Quia igitur te sapientem, discretum et religiosum virum esse cognovimus, dilectioni tuae mandamus quatenus, statuto utrique parti termino, causam audias canonicèque definias, et auditis utriusque partis rationibus, quod inter vos discretio tua statuerit, inviolabiliter servetur'.

123. See Innocentius II, *Epistolae et Privilegia*, LXXVII: *Ad Guillelencum Lingonensem episcopum* [Anno 1131, Dec. 30], in PL 179:118B–C; Jaffé (1885²) 1:853, no. 7524 (5393). [Guillelencum should probably be Guillelmum.]

124. Innocentius II, *Epistolae et Privilegia*, LXXXVI: *Ad Herbertum abbatem S. Stephani Divisionensis* [Anno 1132, Febr. 12.]; PL 179:125C–D: 'Ipse [dilectus filius noster Stephanus Cisterciensis abbas] vero tanquam vir religiosus, et pacis amator, auditis tam tuis quam alterius partis rationibus, et diligenter inspectis, consilio charissimi filii nostri Bernardi Clarae-Vallensis abbatis, et aliorum religiosorum virorum, praenominatam de duobus ecclesiis controversiam hoc modo per concordiam terminavit, ut videlicet ipsarum ecclesiarum, tam tu quam fratres tui dimidiam portionem et ecclesia Sancti Stephani reliquam medietatem obtineat'.

125. See PL 179:125A–D.

duke himself (*tuo favore perpetrata*)—they had attacked and plundered the abbey of Saint-Étienne. The pope presented Stephen as a ‘wise man’¹²⁶ and admonished the Duke, if he did not wish to be considered jointly responsible for the evils which he had chosen not to avoid, to cause the agreement, ‘reached thanks to a man so wise and zealous’, to be respected and to avoid causing Stephen to be ‘further annoyed’.¹²⁷

On 10 February 1132, Innocent II, consenting to the ‘just requests’ of Stephen, had sent to him at Cluny the bull *Habitantes in domo*, with which he confirmed the property of Cîteaux, regulated the modality of abbatial elections, removed the cistercian lay brothers (*conversi*) from episcopal jurisdiction, and granted his protection and exemption from the tithe to the Cistercian Order.¹²⁸

STEPHEN’S RESIGNATION

In 1133—not earlier than 19 May, the date of Innocent II’s letter to Duke Hugh of Burgundy¹²⁹—Stephen turned in his resignation

126. Innocentius II, *Epistolae et Privilegia*, CXXXIII: *Ad Hugonem Burgundiae ducem* [Anno 1133, Maii 19.]; PL 179:176B–C: ‘*Controversia quae inter filios nostros Herbertum Divionensem abbatem et monachos S. Sequani jam dudum agitata est, dilecti fratris nostri Stephani Cisterciensis abbatis, sapientis siquidem viri, cui eam per justitiam vel concordiam terminandam commisimus, exstat provida discretione decisa.*’

127. *Ibid.*; PL 179:176D: ‘*Nobilitati ergo tuae mandamus ut jam dictam concordiam quae per tam sapientem virum et industrium facta est, facias observari, et ne praedictus abbas propter hoc ulterius molestetur, studeas providere; alioquin timendum est ne tibi imputetur, si, cum possis malum prohibere, non prohibes.*’

128. See Innocentius II, *Epistolae et Privilegia*, LXXXIII: *Monasterii Cisterciensis possessiones confirmat* [Anno 1132, Febr. 18] (PL 179:122B–123D); Jaffé (1885²) 1:854, no. 7537 (5399); Marilier (1961) 92–93, no. 90; Brem-Altermatt (1998) 238–243. The privilege gave rise to the long controversy between the abbey of Le Miroir—eleventh foundation of Cîteaux founded in 1131 (see above, n. 87)—and the cluniac priory of Gigny, to which the Cistercians refused the tithes due. See the letters of the abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable, to the abbots of Cîteaux and Pontigny (*Epistola* 35, in Peter the Venerable (1967) 1:113–116; see also PL 189:170–174) and to all the abbots meeting in the General Chapter (*Epistola* 26, in Peter the Venerable [1967] 1:116–117; see also PL 189:174–176). See as well de la Croix Bouton (1953a).

129. See above, notes 126–127; Waddell (1999) 156–157.

of the charge of abbot, perhaps because of blindness.¹³⁰ Guy, abbot of Trois-Fontaines, the first daughter-house of Clairvaux, was named as his successor. Guy, for reasons unknown, proved to be unworthy of the charge, and after only a few months, was forced to step down.¹³¹ His name was never inserted in the list of the abbots of Cîteaux. In his place, a monk of Clairvaux, Raynard of Bar (1133/1134–16 December 1150), was chosen.¹³²

Stephen died on 28 March 1134. The Cistercian Order had by then around eighty monasteries, scattered through the most important countries of Europe: France, England, Germany, Italy, Spain. Stephen was buried in the first church at Cîteaux, next to Alberic. They were later transferred to the great cloister beside the new church, begun in 1140 and consecrated in 1193.¹³³ There the other abbots in their turn were also buried. However, the

130. *'Hic itaque longo senio confectus, cum jam caligassent oculi ejus, et videre non posset, curam pastorem deposuit, ut sibimet ipsi et soli Domino jam vacaret'* (DM 2.24 PL 185bis:1334A); *'Cum autem beatus pater Stephanus officium sibi commissum secundum ueram humilitatis Domini nostri Iesu Christi regulam strenue administrasset, longo confectus senio, ita ut caligarent oculi eius et videre non posset, curam pastorem deposuit soli Deo et sibi per sacrae contemplationis gustum uacare desiderans'* (see EM 1.31; 59). Angelo Manrique (Manrique [1642] 1:260 (*ad annum* 1133, *caput* 9, no. 1) puts the following words in Stephen's mouth, in the farewell speech delivered to the abbots in chapter: *'Mihi non tam affectus, quam vires desunt, et caligantibus oculis, ut cernitis, eo ad interiora mea propensius vocor, quot externis deseror. Liceat quiescere impotenti labore, et permittar mihi soli prouidere, cum nequeo aliis.'* See Van Damme (1991) 153.

131. DM 2.24; PL 185bis:1334A–B: *'Successit autem ei quidam indignus honore, nomine Guido, qui donis exterioribus instar sepulcri dealbati non mediocriter pollens, interius erat vitiorum putredine sordens. Cumque in ipso suae promotionis primordio, fratrum professiones de more susciperet, isdem Dei famulus Stephanus vidit immundum spiritum ad illum venientem, atque in os ejus ingredientem. Vix mensis praeterierat unus, et ecce, reuelante Domino, denudata est impuritas eius, et eradicata est mox de paradiso Dei plantatio spuria, quam Pater coelestis non plantauerat'*. EM 1.31; 60: *'Vix mensis praeterierat unus, et ecce reuelante Domino reuelata est impuritas eius et eradicata est mox de paradiso Dei plantatio spuria, quam pater caelestis non plantauerat'*. See Waddell (1999) 157–159.

132. See Brouette (1975–1977).

133. *'Abbatess de Firmitate, de Pontigniaco, de Claravalle et alii abbatess qui cum eis fuerunt in choro cum sanctimonialibus, in dedicatione Cisterciensis basilicae, . . .'* (Canivez [1933] 1:180 [*anno* 1194, no. 55]). See Canivez (1953).

remains of all the abbots were dispersed at the time of the French Revolution.¹³⁴

THE CULT OF STEPHEN

Very soon Stephen was venerated as a saint within the Order. In 1489, the abbot of Cîteaux, Jean de Cirey, inserted his name in the *Compendium sanctorum ordinis cisterciensis*.¹³⁵ In 1586 Caesar Baronius Soranus inserted him in the 1623 *Martyrologium Romanum* for April 17th.¹³⁶ The General Chapter of 1623 officially introduced the feast of Saint Stephen on 17 April throughout the Order as a feast of twelve readings [at Vigils].¹³⁷ In 1628 the feast was elevated to the rank of a major feast with homily, but without an octave.¹³⁸ The General Chapter of 1683 established that the feast should be raised to the rank of a solemnity with an octave and it was transferred from 17 April to 16 July,¹³⁹ perhaps to avoid being too frequently superseded by Easter.¹⁴⁰ The General Chapter

134. The last description of the abbey of Cîteaux before its sale (4 May 1791) and of its subsequent abandonment, is that of Constantin Haschke, abbot of Heinrichau, in Silesia, who went to Cîteaux in 1768 on the occasion of the General Chapter (see CistC [1931] 43:1 ff.). See also the other narratives of visits to the abbey of Cîteaux: in 1667, that of Laurent Scipio (see CistC [1896] 8:289); in 1667, that of Joseph Meglinger (see PL 185:1565-1622); in 1699, that of Joseph Jahn (see CistC 21 (1909) 33ff.); and that of Martène and Durand (1717).

135. de Cirey (1491) f.190.

136. See *Martyrologium* (1602) 216–217.

137. Canivez (1939) 7:353 (anno 1623, no. 34): ‘Mandat Capitulum ut per totum Ordinem ipsius festum in posterum cum XII lectionibus celebretur, eiusque officium adm R. D. abbatis Claraevallensis diligentia in Breviario nostro inseratur.’

138. Canivez (1939) 7:361 (anno 1628, no. 26): ‘Iniungitur ut festum sancti Stephani, tertii abbatis Cistercii per totum Ordinem fiat instar divi Bernardi, sed sine octavis.’

139. Canivez (1939) 7:550 (anno 1683, no. 87): ‘Praesens Capitulum generale attendens quantum debeat totus Ordo pietati et sapientiae S. Stephani tertii abbatis Cistercii et Ordinis nostri quasi fundatoris, et volens sancti huius cultum in Ordine promovere, statuit quot in posterum festum eius celebretur sub ritu festi sermonis maioris cum octava solemnii; et quod festum eius transferatur a die 17 aprilis ad diem 16 mensis iulii.’

140. See Presse (1934b) 107.

of 1783 instituted a votive Office of Saint Stephen to be recited on the free *feria secunda* (Monday) of every week.¹⁴¹ The General Chapter of 1786 specified that the Office of Saint Stephen not be recited on feasts with three readings, in Lent, and in Advent after December 17th.¹⁴² This votive office remained in force until the revision of the cistercian breviary in 1870.¹⁴³ From 1966 onwards, the feast of Saint Stephen has been celebrated on 26 January, together with those of Saint Robert and Saint Alberic.

141. *‘Ad ampliandam devotionem sacri Ordinis nostri erga . . . S. Stephanum . . . Feria secunda cujuslibet hebdomadae fiet Officium de S. Stephano . . . dummodo tamen praedictum Officium Festo occurrente non impediatur’*—cited by Presse (1934b) 107.

142. See Presse (1934b) 107.

143. Alexis Presse (Presse [1934b] 107) formulated a hypothesis on the motives for this change: *‘Les éditions du Bréviaire cistercien postérieures au Chapitre Général de 1786 avaient inséré dans les Rubriques générales les décisions prises en 1783 et 1786 relativement à l’Office votif de S. Etienne et aux autres. Or, lorsque le Bréviaire cistercien réformé par l’abbé général Claude Vaussin fut attaqué à Rome, ce fut l’édition de ce Bréviaire donnée par Claude Vaussin (ou peut-être une autre de son temps) qui fut soumise au jugement du S. Siège; l’édition ainsi présentée ne faisait point, et pour cause, mention de l’Office votif de S. Etienne. Ce fut cette édition examinée à Rome et déclarée légitime qui fut dès lors regardée comme faisant loi et qui fut reproduite dans les éditions postérieures avec les retouches nécessitées par la refonte du Calendrier; comme on constata qu’elle ne renfermait point la mention de l’Office votif de S. Etienne, on pensa que Rome l’avait purement et simplement supprimé et on cessa de la faire.’* [The editions of the cistercian Breviary after the General Chapter of 1786 had inserted in the general rubrics the decisions made in 1783 and 1786 relative to the votive office of Saint Stephen and others. Later, when the cistercian Breviary reformed by the abbot general Claude Vaussin was attacked in Rome, it was the edition of that Breviary given by Claude Vaussin (or perhaps another of his time) that was submitted to the judgment of the Holy See; the editions thus presented made no mention of the votive office of Saint Stephen, for very good reason. It was that edition examined in Rome and declared legitimate which was from that time on regarded as the standard and which was reproduced in the later editions with the tweaks necessitated by the reform of the Calendar; when it was noticed that it contained no mention of the votive office of Saint Stephen, people thought that Rome had suppressed it, pure and simple, and they ceased to recite it.]

Texts by Stephen Harding

ONLY FIVE VERY SHORT texts can be considered as having been written by Stephen Harding, even if with differing levels of certainty. We present them in the original language and in the textual form that at the present state of research seems to be the most reliable. We indicate the related manuscripts and the best-known printed editions; we also offer an english translation with a few brief introductory and explanatory notes. In ordering them for publication we follow the likely chronological order.

After the examination of these five texts, we will also provide a few pieces of information about other texts which, in the course of the centuries, have variously been attributed to Stephen (see the texts presented in number 6).

Our intention is to encourage a direct reading of these writings, a condition indispensable for a better understanding of Stephen's life and personality and for a more precise documentation of some significant aspects of medieval life and culture.

1. The *Monitum* of Saint Stephen's Bible

(MonBib1)

1109

THE FIRST TEXT that we shall take under consideration is the so-called *monitum* of the *Cîteaux Bible* or *Saint Stephen's Bible*. The manuscript of *Saint Stephen's Bible* reproduces the latin version of the Bible and was produced in the *scriptorium* of Cîteaux during the abbacy of Stephen Harding.¹ It belongs to a collection of manuscripts dating to the beginning of the twelfth century and coming from the abbey of Cîteaux. The common provenance of these manuscripts—now conserved in the library of Dijon²—is easily documented, thanks to the similarity of the script and—sometimes—of the decorations and in any case thanks to the notable quantity of common elements.³ The most celebrated of these manuscripts is, in fact, *Saint Stephen's Bible* (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, mss 12-15).

1. In 1937, Anselme Dimier had already excluded, on the basis of convincing paleographical criteria, the hypothesis that *Saint Stephen's Bible* had not been produced in the *scriptorium* of Cîteaux, but that it had simply been given to Stephen and afterwards merely corrected in his *scriptorium* (see Dimier [1937] 188–190). See also Oursel (1955) 162, n. 4; 167.

2. See Załuska (1989) 9–16.

3. For a first attempt at showing how these manuscripts 'form an ensemble, an indissociable *corpus*' coming from the *scriptorium* at Cîteaux, see Oursel (1955) 168. See also Auberger (1986) 202.

At the present time *Saint Stephen's Bible* is composed of four volumes, designated respectively: ms 12, 13, 14, 15. Originally there were only two volumes—not three as has sometimes been repeated, following the analyses of Charles Oursel.⁴ As becomes apparent from an attentive codicological analysis, the two original volumes were divided, perhaps already in the twelfth century,⁵ into two tomes: the first volume contained what are now mss 12 and 13, and the second mss 14 and 15. This division was probably made to render the work more manageable.⁶

The original first volume provides in the colophon, written in the same hand that copied the manuscript, the date 1109: '*Anno M^{mo} centesimo nono ab incarnatione domini / liber iste finem sumpsit scribendi gubernante Ste / phano II^o abbate cenobium cisterciense*'.⁷ The original second volume, on the other hand, does not have any chronological indication and from a stylistic point of view it is rather different from the first.⁸ Ms 14 would have had no reason

4. See, for example: Oursel (1960) 11; Auberger (1986) 21.

5. From the style of the leaf substituted at the beginning of ms 13 (f. 1), written with colored letters, it seems possible to deduce that the division of the first volume dates as well to the twelfth century (only the filigrees added in the second row seem to be from the thirteenth century). On the other hand, the dating of the division of the second volume (mss 14 and 15) is more difficult. In fact the part relating to the New Testament has undergone a series of manipulations that is difficult to reconstruct and the writing and the decoration of f. 2 of ms 15—text recopied after the division—seem attributable to a later phase, difficult to date; for this volume as well, however, we can consider the end of the twelfth century or the beginning of the thirteenth century. See Załuska (1991) 50, 55; Załuska (1989) 64–66.

6. For the objections advanced in the following decades concerning the unity of the work and its dating, see Bougenot and Moliner (1889) 5:5–6; Oursel (1960) 11; Samaran and Marichal (1968) 6:169.

7. Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 13, f. 150v; see *MonBibl*, v. 1.

8. For the description of the two manuscripts and their differences, see: Załuska (1991) 49–56; Auberger (1986) 190–191; and before that Oursel (1955) 165–167; Oursel (1959) 35. Jean-Baptiste Auberger (Auberger [1986] 191) summarized his description in this way: '*Bref, il apparaît très clairement d'une part qu'une rupture dans la décoration existe entre les mss. 14 et 15 et l'ensemble des mss. 12–13, et d'autre part que les mss. 14 et 15 présentent une telle richesse et variété décorative qu'ils manifestent l'expression d'une recherche de style*'. [In short, on one hand it appeared very clearly that a break in the decoration exists between mss 14 and 15 and the group of mss 12–13, and on the other hand that mss 14 and 15 present such a decorative

to provide a chronological indication, as originally it merely formed the first part of the second volume. Ms 15, on the other hand, has lost the last leaf, and it is therefore not possible to know whether there was a chronological indication at the end. We ought, however, to point out that on the penultimate leaf, the last one remaining today, there was space for possible annotations, including chronological ones. We may therefore suppose that ms 15, even in the original, lacked a date.⁹

For dating the second volume, the analysis of the manuscript conducted by Yolanta Załuska is useful. She agrees in recognizing the original first volume (mss 12–13) as the work of a single hand, while the second volume (mss 14–15) is the work of three copyists, one of whom is the same copyist who created the first volume.¹⁰ To that same hand can be attributed a part of the first three volumes of another work of the *scriptorium* of Cîteaux, the *Moralia in Iob* by Gregory the Great (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, mss 168, 169, 170)¹¹, that we know was finished on Christmas Eve in 1111.¹² The hypothesis proposed by Yolanta Załuska, therefore, is that the copyist had finished his work on *Saint Stephen's Bible* around the middle of 1111, that is, before beginning to work on the manuscript of the *Moralia in Iob*,¹³ and thus 1111 may reasonably be the year in which *Saint Stephen's Bible* was finished.

On the final leaf of ms 13, f. 150v, in the first column, after the colophon that we have cited and after a blank line, appears the

richness and variety that they display the expression of a pursuit of style.] In 1927, in the congress dedicated to Saint Bernard, convened at Dijon, the american archeologist Arthur Kingsley Porter pointed out the influence the anglo-saxon school had had on cistercian miniatures (see Porter [1927]). On the links between *Saint Stephen's Bible* and the Bayeux Tapestry, see Gras (1951); Van Damme (1991) 96.

9. See Załuska (1989) 66.

10. See Załuska (1991) 50; for information on the parts of mss 14–15 written by the three different copyists, see Załuska (1991) 55.

11. See Załuska (1991) 59.

12. As appears in the colophon of ms 170: 'Anno ab Incarnatione Domini / millesimo centesimo undecimo / in uigilia Natiuitatis eiusdem / Domini nostri Ihesu Christi, liber iste / finem sumpsit scribendi, tem / poribus domni stephani Cister / ciensis abbatis secundi' (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 170, f. 92v).

13. See Załuska (1989) 69.

text of Stephen's *monitum*. It is written in the same hand as the rest of the leaf, though heavily revised at a later time.¹⁴ The placement of the *monitum* on the verso of the last leaf is easily explained because at that time it was common to store manuscripts by laying them on the first page. The final leaf was, therefore, the first page that presented itself to the reader.¹⁵

It is not easy to clarify whether the date indicated in the colophon, 1109, refers to the conclusion of the writing of the manuscript or also indicates the end of the work of revision which—as the *monitum* attests—the biblical text was put through. In the first case—that is if it refers to the work of copying—we can surmise that the revision of the text was finished a short time later; in the second case—that is if it also takes into account the work of revision—we can hypothesize that the work of writing it had been completed a short time earlier.¹⁶ In either case, however, it is not necessary to think that the chronological gap between the two moments was particularly great. Nothing seems to have been said about the decoration of the manuscript. The formulas of the colophon seem to refer only to the work of writing the text (*scribendi*). It seems possible to distinguish the moments of writing and decorating because, even though the volumes are in part the work of the same copyist, they are decorated in different styles. The styles are also different from the style of the decoration of the first part of the *Moralia in Iob* (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, mss 168–170).

The *monitum*'s reference to the chaldean language—actually the aramaic language—in which part of the Old Testament is written (see below, MonBibl, vv. 6, 9, 10) allows us to understand that the work of revision to which it refers was performed not only on the first volume—at the end of which it is written—but on both volumes. In fact, in the biblical books contained in the first volume only a few words are written in aramaic (see Gn 31:47 and Jer 10:11), while in the second volume Dn 2:4b–7:28

14. See Załuska (1991) 50.

15. See Auburger (1986) 192.

16. See Załuska (1989) 71.

and 1 Esd 4:8–6:18; 7:12–26 are written in aramaic.¹⁷ Moreover, the annotations that appear in the margin of the second volume constantly make reference to the hebrew text and give witness to a work of revision according to the principles enunciated in the *monitum*.¹⁸ The marginal notes show that textual corrections were also made on the New Testament.¹⁹

Jean-Baptiste Auberger advances the attractive, although somewhat difficult to prove, hypothesis that the first copyist, the one who wrote mss 12–13 and who was involved, at least partially, in the preparation of the others, was Stephen Harding himself, and that he would have begun the work during the years when the *Novum monasterium* had few monks and did not yet have daughter-houses. Around 1112–1113 however, whether because of the obligations linked to the charge of abbot and to the first foundations, or because of the influx of new monks who were cultured and educated, he entrusted the work to a small group of monks who brought it to completion with greater speed

17. For a list of the books contained in the two volumes of the *Saint Stephen's Bible*, see Załuska (1989) 276–277 (appendix II). Ms 12 contains: Gn, Ex, Lv, Nm, Dt, Jos, Jgs, Ru; ms 13: 1–2 Sam, 3–4 Kgs, Is, Jer, Lam, Ez, Hos, Jl, Am, Ob [*Abdias qui interpretatur*], Jon, Mi, Na, Hb, Zep, Hg, Zec, Mal. [translator's note: in the original Italian, the books listed on page 276, column 2—that is, books from Is through Mi—were missing].

18. We cite a few taken from Załuska (1989) 72, n. 22. In the margin at 1 Par: '*In hebreo et latino inuenimus "fugauerunt"*' (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 14, f. 80r); in the margin at 2 Par 26:7: '*In hebreo Gazerbaal habetur, sed quia in latino non inuenimus idcirco non muauimus*' (*ibid.*, f. 103r); in the margin at 1 Ezr 5:10: '*In hebreo sic habetur "Commodauimus plurimis aurum et argentum" sed quia in multis latinis libris sic inuenimus [= "commodauimus plurimis pecuniam et frumentum"] ideo non mutauimus. "Aes alienum concedamus quod debetur nobis". Hoc non habetur in hebreo. Sed quia nullum latinum inueniebamus qui hoc non haberet idcirco non deleuimus*' (*ibid.*, f. 117r).

19. Still from Załuska (1989) 72, n. 23, we cite a few examples. In the margin at Acts 10:6 it reads: '*In duobus uetustissimis et multum ueracibus hystoriis non inuenimus hunc uersum "hic dicit tibi quid te oporteat facere"*' (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 15, f. 73v). In the margin at Lk 10:30: '*Sus[ci eraso]piens in ueracibus et antiquiis et in greco*' (*ibid.*, f. 47r), the intention of this correction, not finished, was as appears from the text, to substitute *suspiciens* for the word *suscipiens*. Some corrections to the manuscript were instead made toward the middle and toward the end of the twelfth century (see Załuska [1989] 73).

and ease. The theory might also explain the diverse and more elaborate styles of the later manuscripts.²⁰

The work of textual criticism declared in the *monitum* and executed by Stephen and the monks of Cîteaux, with the help from Jewish experts, today in large part remains still to be studied. Mattieu Cauwe has recently supplied a first analysis, relative to the Latin text of the books of Samuel and to the corrections successively made to it. It is a significant test, even if partial,²¹ because they are two of the books that, according to the information given in the *monitum* itself, contained the majority of the errors.²²

20. Auburger (1986) 195: '*Si, jusque vers 1110, un seul copiste a réalisé toute la copie du texte des mss. 12–13 et le début du ms. 14—comme l'analyse paléographique le révèle—il est probable, sans que la chose soit certaine, que l'enluminure des mss. 12–13 a été faite par ce même homme. Il aurait cédé alors à un autre le soin d'exécuter le travail de décoration des mss. 14 et 15, tandis qu'il aurait poursuivi la copie du ms. 14. La fin de cette copie pendant est l'œuvre d'un autre moine, soit en raison de la disparition du copiste primitif, soit par indisponibilité de temps—ce qui s'expliquerait forte bien si cet homme était Etienne Harding lui-même. En effet, dès 1112, il eut à se préoccuper des nouvelles fondations successives, et à composer la Charte de Charité et d'Unanimité primitive. Un petit atelier a pu se constituer dès ce moment-là grâce à l'entrée, autour de 1113, des lettrés capables d'assurer non seulement la copie mais aussi l'enluminure des manuscrits.*' [If, around 1110, a single copyist completed the entire copying of the text of mss 12-13 and the beginning of ms 14—as the paleographic analysis reveals—it is probable, without being a complete certainty, that the illumination of mss 12–13 was done by the same man. He would have delegated to another the task of executing the work of decorating mss 14 and 15, while he pursued the copying of ms 14. The final portion of that copy however is the work of another monk, whether because of the disappearance of the first copyist, or because of lack of time—which could very well be explained if that man were Stephen Harding himself. In effect, from 1112 on, he had to concern himself with successive new foundations, and to compose the early *Charter of Charity (and Unanimity)*. A small workshop could have formed at that time, thanks to the entry around 1113 of literate monks capable of assuring not only the copying but also the illumination of manuscripts.]

21. Cauwe (1993) 439: '*Nos conclusions, parce que s'appuyant sur une base étroite, ne sont pour l'heure qu'une série d'hypothèses balisant momentanément la recherche à poursuivre. Il reste que pour nous faire une meilleure idée de la science exégétique de l'abbé de Cîteaux, d'autres études devraient être menées.*' [Our conclusions, because they rest on a slender base, are for now no more than a series of hypotheses marking the way for the time being of the research to pursue. It remains the case that to give us a better idea of the exegetical skill of the abbot of Cîteaux, other studies must be conducted.]

22. See *MonBibl*, v. 10.

From his analysis, Mattieu Cauwe reaches the conviction that, so far as it is possible to understand it today, the work of critical revision was carried out coherently, based on the principles enunciated in the *monitum*.²³ Stephen and the monks of the *Novum monasterium* would have been aware of the need to provide the community with a Bible. According to the principles that inspired their foundation, they would have sought to locate a text that would respond to their desire for authenticity and truth. They therefore borrowed various texts of the Bible 'to seek the most authentic (*ut veraciorem sequeremur*)' (MonBibl, v. 3). How many? The *monitum* alludes to 'many books (*plurimos libros*)' (MonBibl, v. 3) and to 'many latin books (*multis libris latinis*)' (MonBibl, v. 10). Taking into account the value of a Bible at that time, we ought, however, to think that the number of copies collected on that occasion could not have been extensive.

Among the collected books there was one 'very different from almost all the others (*fere ab omnibus multum dissonantem*)', since it provided a 'more complete (*pleniorem*)' text (MonBibl, vv. 3–4). Perhaps precisely for that reason, they chose it as the base model to copy. The logic behind the choice is understandable. A 'more complete' text was better able to protect itself when confronted with possible omissions.

It was normal—as the *monitum* itself declares (MonBibl, v. 5)—that at that time one would make reference to the text of the *Vulgata* of Saint Jerome. The analysis undertaken by Cauwe concurs in advancing the reasonable hypothesis that the text contained in the manuscript was an 'alcuinian text', that is the text

23. Cauwe (1993) 441: 'Il y a bien eu révision de la Bible selon les modalités décrites par le monitum. Allant plus loin que la seule vérification, nous nous sommes efforcés d'apporter quelques éléments d'explication. Ainsi que nous le faisons remarquer, le monitum donne vraiment les grandes principes de l'oeuvre d'Étienne. À neuf siècles de distance, cependant, tout n'est plus aussi évident. Les motivations, la méthode et le détail de l'entreprise échappent en partie.' ['There truly was a revision of the Bible according to the methods described by the *monitum*. Going beyond mere verification, we have tried to contribute some elements of explanation. Thus as we have noted, the *monitum* truly gives the broad principles <governing> Stephen's work. Nine centuries later, however, not everything is totally evident. The motivations, the method, and the detail of the enterprise to some degree escape us.']

of the revision of Saint Jerome's Vulgate made by Alcuin of York (735–804).²⁴ At the end of the work Stephen and his monks realized, however, that the *plenior* text was not necessarily also the *veracior* text. They decided, therefore, to proceed to make a revision of the text. Stephen's preoccupation was not so much with creating a new translation from the original languages, as with establishing the *veracior* text of the latin version of Saint Jerome. This same preoccupation had already pushed Alcuin of York and Theodulph of Orleans to effect the revision of Jerome's *Vulgata* to purge the text of the progressive corruption of the manuscripts and the contaminations from the *Vetus Latina* version.

Since Saint Jerome had translated from the Hebrew and the Aramaic, and not merely from the greek version of the Septuagint, the encounter with the original texts was certainly helpful in choosing the latin version closest to that of Saint Jerome, even if the cistercian revisors were not able to take into account the fact that Saint Jerome worked not only with the hebrew text, but also with the jewish versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. Yet in order to deal with the hebrew and aramaic text, the monks of the *Novum monasterium* had recourse to jewish experts.

The notes in the margin of *Saint Stephen's Bible* sometimes concern justifications of the choices made. It is thus possible to reconstruct some of the criteria that were used in this work of revision. Some notes show that the choice was made through recourse to the hebrew text²⁵; others give witness that they were

24. Jean-Pierre Paulin Martin, towards the end of the nineteenth century, had instead advanced the hypothesis that the Bible used as a model for the *Saint Stephen's Bible* contained a 'theodulphian text' (see Martin [1886]), that is the revision of the *Vulgata* of Saint Jerome produced by Theodulph of Orleans (who died perhaps in 821). Berger (1893a); (1893b) and Blanchard (1919) also held the same opinion.

25. For example, in the margin at 2 Sam 15:23 we read: '*Ita habetur in hebreo*' (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 13, f. 27v); in the margin at Jer 44:24: '*Plus non habetur in hebreo*' (*ibid.*, f. 104r); in the margin at Hos 5:7: '*Ita habent hebrei*' (*ibid.*, f. 133v).

made based solely on the latin tradition²⁶; the majority agree with the opinion that more often a comparison was done between the latin text and the hebrew.²⁷ The hebrew text was not, then, the unique and exclusive point of reference. Stephen never lost sight of the latin tradition and sometimes, indeed, he preferred what the latin tradition proposed over the hebrew, arguing on the basis of the number (*multi*), on the authenticity (*veraces*) or on the antiquity (*antiqui, vetustissimi*) of the manuscripts that he decided to follow. It is thus clear that his intention was not to make a new translation from Hebrew or Aramaic, but to rediscover the original version of the latin translation of Saint Jerome, by having recourse to the original languages as well.²⁸

If the base text was 'alcuinian', Cauwe's study on the corrections successively applied allows one to hypothesize that the other Bibles at Stephen's disposition—and on the base of which he had made the corrections—contained an 'alcuinian' text as well, rather than (as has often been thought) a 'theodulfian text', even if these were older—and because of that perhaps in certain cases shorter—versions. Stephen's labor did not therefore succeed in returning to the more authentic text of Saint Jerome. On the other hand,

26. In the margin at Lk 2:16 we read: '*In omnibus fere antiquis latinis invenimus sic*' (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 15, f. 41r); in the margin at Mt 12:31: '*Ita in multis*' (*ibid.*, f. 17r); in the margin at Lk 10:30: '*Ita in antiquissimis et veracibus invenimus*' (*ibid.*, f. 46r); in the margin at Acts 10:16: '*In duobus vetustissimis et multum veracibus hystoriis non invenimus hunc versum*' (*ibid.*, f. 73v).

27. In the margin at Job 2:10 we read: '*In quibusdam latinis habentur . . . Sed in hebreo non habetur nec in quibusdam latinis*' (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 14, f. 2v); in the margin at Job 3:3: '*Plus invenimus in aliquibus latinis, sed hebreus non plus habet nec quidam latini*' (*ibid.*, f. 2v); in the margin at Neh 4:10: '*In hebreo sic habetur . . . Sed quia in multis latinis libris sic invenimus, ideo non mutavimus*' (*ibid.*, f. 117r); and again in the margin at Neh 5:10: '*Hoc non habetur in hebreo. Sed quia nullum latinum inveniebamus qui hoc non habet, iccirco non delevimus*' (*ibid.*, f. 117r).

28. Cauwe (1993) 442: '*Les moines de Cîteaux n'ont pas voulu refaire la traduction que Jérôme aurait dû proposer. Ils ont procédé à une toilette du texte latin issu de Jérôme on s'aidant des principes exposés par celui-ci et des diverses traditions latines se réclamant de lui*'. [The monks of Cîteaux did not want to redo the translation which Jerome must have put forward. They proceeded to a cleansing of the latin text stemming from Jerome, with the help of principles expounded by him and of diverse latin traditions identified with him.]

with the books of the Bible at his disposal, perhaps in rather limited number, that would hardly have been possible.²⁹

We should also point out that Stephen's work of revision was not complete and systematic, but was done only where 'his attention was concentrated and only on the problems whose difficulty appeared evident to him.'³⁰

Still, Cauwe recognizes, 'notwithstanding these limits from the point of view of modern textual criticism, we need to recognize in Stephen a certain *esprit de finesse*. His method seems to have been adequate to it, pertinent and painstaking. The way in which he refers either to the Hebrew or to the Latin, trusting in the last instance in the Latin, guarantees better results in the pursuit of the project to establish Jerome's text.'³¹

Stephen's work appears still more significant if we do not forget that his objective was not to 'prepare a critical edition—and naturally not according to our criteria—but to give the community a biblical text that would correspond to the ideals of the reform and to the necessity of monastic life, without drawing too

29. Cauwe (1993) 443: 'Il est apparu au cours de l'enquête qu'Étienne était parti d'un état relativement tardif du texte alcuinien pour aboutir à un état de ce même texte plus proche des recensions réalisées par Alcuin lui-même. Ce résultat suffirait à dénigrer l'œuvre d'Étienne puisqu'il n'y a pas d'adéquation entre version alcuinienne et version hiéronymienne. Ce serait faire un mauvais procès. Certes nous touchons ici à une sérieuse limite objective du travail d'Étienne, mais pouvait-il en être autrement? Ce résultat tient aux exemplaires bibliques réunis, sans doute en nombre plutôt restreint, et tous issus de la seule famille des Bibles de Tours. Le texte alcuinien était largement majoritaire en Gaule et les frères de Cîteaux ne pouvaient guère se procurer d'autres textes que celui-là. Même en Gaule, le type théodulfien est rare.' [It appeared during the inquiry that Stephen started from a relatively late state of the alcuinien text in order to arrive at a state of the same text which was closer to the recensions of Alcuin himself. That result would be sufficient to denigrate Stephen's work since there is no comparison between the alcuinien and the hieronymian versions. That would be a mistake. Certainly we reach here a serious objective limitation to Stephen's work, but could it be otherwise? That result depends on the copies of the Bible gathered together, doubtless in somewhat limited number, and all stemming only from the family of Bibles of Tours. The alcuinien text predominated in Gaul, and the brothers of Cîteaux could hardly procure texts other than that. Even in Gaul, the theodulfian type is rare.]

30. Cauwe (1993) 443.

31. Cauwe (1993) 443.

far away from the text that the liturgy and *lectio divina* had carved into the monks' memory'.³²

Concerning Stephen's final recommendation not to modify anything that had been eliminated or corrected, Cauwe underscores that this 'was respected',³³ even if we must note in the portion we examined we found at least one case in which an interpolation that Stephen eliminated was reinserted at a later time.³⁴ One can, however, agree with the judgment of Henri de Lubac, expressed in 1961 regarding Stephen's work, which he presented as 'a witness to the great and multiform intellectual development' of the Middle Ages (*un témoin du grand et multi-forme essor intellectuel de cet âge*)³⁵.

Thomas Merton, in a brief essay only recently republished, but earlier, in 1954, distributed internally within the Cistercian Order, had underscored the value, not merely cultural but also spiritual, of *Saint Stephen's Bible*:

This work of revision and correction, which has been praised as one of the most masterly pieces of Biblical scholarship of the Middle Ages, is an interesting revelation of Saint Stephen's spirituality. It indicates his concern to have his monks study and meditate on holy Scripture in its authentic and purest possible text, and proves that Saint Stephen was the enemy of vagueness and carelessness in spiritual things. Although scholarship as such was foreign to the Cistercian ideal, Saint Stephen did not hesitate to throw himself into this exceedingly intellectual task when there was question of the spiritual formation of his monks.³⁶

32. Cauwe (1993) 443.

33. Cauwe (1993) 443–444.

34. This concerns the expression in 1 Sam 4:1: '*Et factum est in diebus illis con-
venerunt philistinim in pugnam*'. After having been erased, probably in Stephen's
revision, it was written again, this time in the lower part of the leaf, at a later date
(see Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 13, f. 5r).

35. H. de Lubac (1961) 2/1:268. Italian translation: de Lubac (1996) 3:366.

36. Merton (1998) 268.

On the other hand, we ought also to note that the cistercian tradition has not always succeeded in maintaining itself with the same intensity and constancy on the path traced out by Stephen and the first monks of the *Novum monasterium*. On this point we may recall the episode experienced by the cistercian monk of Trois-Fontaines, Nicolas Maniacoria (who died toward the middle of the twelfth century) and cited by Beryl Smalley in her volume *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, precisely to document how, after the efforts of Stephen Harding, the work of correcting the biblical text among the Cistercians was conducted 'sometimes with more zeal than method':

Nicolas Maniacoria, the cultured monk of Trois-Fontaines, was horrified when he discovered, during the visit to a convent of his order, that a confrère in its scriptorium was copying over an old and good text of the Bible all the additions that he succeeded in finding in other copies, convinced that the most complete version must be the most accurate. Nicolas politely expressed his disappointment and conceived the idea, which he later put into practice, of fixing some rules to follow in textual criticism.³⁷

37. Smalley (1972) 125; see also Denifle (1888) 270–277, 601; Berger (1893b) 12–15; Wilmart (1921). The work to which Beryl Smalley alludes is, most likely, the *Libellus de corruptione et correptione psalmorum et aliarum quarundam scripturarum* (Montpellier, École de Médecine, ms 294, ff. 144r–159v, copied at Clairvaux at the end of the twelfth century).

Manuscript:

Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 13, f. 150v.

Printed Editions:

Sancti Bernardi abbatis primi Clarae-Vallensis Opera Omnia. 1690.
J. Mabillon, ed. Parisiis [Paris]: Sumptibus Petri de Launay.
3.XI.

In this edition of the works of Saint Bernard—the second edited by Jean Mabillon—the *monitum* of Saint Stephen's Bible was printed for the first time, with the title 'Censura de aliquot locis Bibliorum'. Jean Mabillon calls it the *monitum* or *enciclica* of Saint Stephen, probably because of the solemn and somewhat authoritarian tone of the writing;

Sancti Bernardi abbatis primi Clarae-Vallensis Opera Omnia. 1719. J. Mabillon, ed. Parisiis [Paris]: Apud Carolum Robustel. 1:xii; PL 166:1373D–1376B (reproduces the edition of J. Mabillon); Hümpfner (1917) 75, 78; De Visch (1927) 44; Oursel (1960) 7, n. 1; Marilier (1961) 56, no. 32; Auberger (1986) 327; Załuska (1989), 274–275 proposes a new transcription of the manuscript, with modernized punctuation, and uses the translation of Oursel [1926] 16–17); Cauwe (1993) 416–417 (proposes a new transcription and a new translation); Brem-Altermatt (1998) 210–213 (reproduces the edition of Marilier [1961]).

Italian Translation:

Viti (1988) 23–24.

We present here our own transcription, inserting the punctuation, and following the edition Brem-Altermatt (1998) 210–213 for the numeration of the verses. The english translation is by Martha F. Krieg.

[THE MONITUM OF THE BIBLE OF SAINT STEPHEN]

[1] Anno M^{mo} centesimo nono ab incarnatione domini, liber iste finem sumpsit scribendi, gubernante Stephano II^o abbate cenobium cisterciense.³⁸

[2] Frater Stephanus, noui monasterii Abbas, et presentibus et futuris seruis dei salutem.

[3] Hanc historiam scribere disponentes, inter plurimos libros quos de diuersis ecclesiis congregauimus, ut ueraciorem sequeremur, in quendam fere ab omnibus multum dissonantem impegimus.

[4] Et quia illum pleniorum ceteris repperimus, fidem ei accomodantes, hanc historiam secundum quod in eodem libro inueniebamus scripsimus.

[5] Qua digesta, non modice de dissonantia historiarum turbati sumus, quia hoc plena edocet ratio, ut quod ab uno interprete, uidelicet beato Iheronimo, quem ceteris interpretibus omissis, nostrates iamiamque susceperunt, de uno hebraice ueritatis fonte translatum est, unum debeat sonare.

[6] Sunt tamen quidam ueteris testamenti libri, qui non de hebraico sed chaldaico sermone ab eodem nostro interprete sunt translati, quia sic eos apud iudeos inuenit, sicut ipsemet in prologo super danihele scribit; nosque illos sicuti ceteros libros secundum eius translationem suscepimus.

38. We report also the colophon written at the end of the first volume (Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, ms 13, f. 150v), under which, after a line left blank, the *monitum* was written by the same hand.

[THE MONITUM OF SAINT STEPHEN'S BIBLE]

[1] The writing of this book was completed in the year 1109 after the incarnation of the Lord, during the reign of Stephen, the second⁴¹ abbot of the cistercian monastery.

[2] Brother Stephen, abbot of the New Monastery, to the present and the future servants of God, greetings.

[3] Being disposed to write this text, among many books which we gathered together from diverse churches, in order that we might follow the most authentic, we encountered one which was different from almost all the others.

[4] And because we found that text to be more complete than the others, we trusted it, and we wrote this text according to what was in that book.

[5] Having completed the book, we were more than a little disturbed by the disagreements between the texts, because reason plainly leads us to expect that what was translated from a single fount of hebraic⁴² truth by one translator, namely blessed Jerome, [and] chosen by our ancestors who had left aside other interpreters, ought to speak with one voice.

[6] However, there are certain books in the Old Testament which were translated by this same translator of ours not from the hebrew but from the chaldean⁴³ speech, because they are found that way among the Jews, as he himself writes in the prologue to Daniel⁴⁴; and we have accepted those as we have the other books according to his translation.

41. Jean-Pierre Paulin Martin advanced the hypothesis that in the manuscript 'II^o' was the fruit of a correction made over an original 'III^o' (see Martin [1886]). This is not sustainable, however, from the paleographical point of view. The reason that the copyist defines Stephen as 'second' abbot is, rather, to be attributed to the exclusion of Robert, in the first decades of the cistercian Order, from the computation of the abbots of Cîteaux (see above, Introduction, n. 8).

42. The reference is to one of the fundamental principles of the translation of the biblical texts carried out by Saint Jerome.

43. The 'chaldean' language means, in fact, the 'aramaic' language in which part of the Old Testament is written, see above, p. 46.

44. '*Sciendum quippe Danihelem maxime et Ezram hebraicis quidem litteris, sed chaldaico sermone conscriptos, et unam Hieremiae pericopen*' ('*Incipit prologus Hieronymi in Danihele propheta*' in *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam revisionem* [1975] 3:1341).

[7] Unde nos multum de discordia nostrorum librorum quos ab uno interprete suscepimus ammirantes, iudeos quosdam in sua scriptura peritos adiuimus, [8] ac diligentissime lingua romana ab eis inquisiimus de omnibus illis scripturarum locis, in quibus ille partes et uersus habebantur, quos in nostro predicto exemplari inueniebamus et iam in hoc nostro opere inserebamus, quosque in aliis multis historiis latinis non inueniebamus.

[9] Qui suos libros plures coram nobis reuoluentes et in locis illis ubi eos rogabamus, hebraicam siue chaldaicam scripturam romanis uerbis nobis ex[ponente]s, [parte]s³⁹ uel uersus pro quibus turbabamur minime reppererunt.

[10] Qua propter hebraice atque chaldaice ueritati et multis libris latinis qui illa non habebant, sed per omnia duabus illis linguis concordabant credentes, omnia illa superflua prorsus abrasimus ueluti in multis huius libri locis apparet, et precipue in libris regum ubi maior pars erroris inueniebatur.

[11] Nunc uero omnes qui hoc uolumen sunt lecturi rogamus, quatinus nullomodo predictas partes uel uersus superfluos huic operi amplius adiungant.

[12] Satis enim lucet in quibus locis erant, quia rasura parmagameni eadem loca non celat. Interdicimus etiam auctoritate dei⁴⁰ et nostre congregationis, ne quis hunc librum multo labore preparatum inhoneste tractare, uel ungula sua per scripturam uel marginem eius aliquid notare presumat.

39. The reading 'ex[ponente]s [parte]s' is conjectural because of a wrinkle or crease in the manuscript.

40. 'Dei' was added by the first hand between the lines.

[7] Therefore, being greatly amazed at the disharmony among our books which we received from a single translator, we resorted to certain Jews⁴⁵ expert in their Scripture, [8] and we interrogated them most diligently in romance speech⁴⁶ about all those places in the scriptures in which there were parts and verses which in our aforesaid copies we had found and already inserted in this our work, which we did not find in many other latin texts.

[9] Opening many of their books before us, they explained the hebrew or chaldean scripture to us in romance speech, and in those places where we asked them, the parts or verses about which we were disturbed were not found at all.

[10] Therefore, believing in the truth of the hebrew and chaldean and the many latin books which did not have these passages, but which agreed with these two languages in all the rest, we completely erased all those superfluous things, as appears in many places in this book, and especially in the books of Kings⁴⁷ where the majority of the errors was found.

[11] Now truly we request all who read this book in the future, never on any account to add back in to this work the aforesaid superfluous parts or verses.

[12] It is clear enough in which places they were, because the erasure of the parchment does not conceal them. We also forbid by the authority of God and of our congregation that anyone should presume to treat this book, prepared with great labor, disrespectfully or to make note of anything with his *ungula*⁴⁸ either in the text or the margin.

45. It is a witness to the care for the philological quality of the biblical text and to the good relations between Christians and Jews in the twelfth century, above all in northern France (see Smalley [1972] 215–246).

46. [Translator's note: Literally, romance words. In other words, the Jews and the monks communicated in French, not in Hebrew or Latin.]

47. In the old latin translation of the Vulgate there are four books of Kings. The usage of the Septuagint was kept which regrouped the two books of Samuel and the two books of Kings into four books of 'Reigns/Kingdoms' (βασιλειων), substituting however 'Kings' for 'Reigns'.

48. The *ungula* was a tool used by scribes to mark the lines or erase errors. [Translator's note: literally, *ungula* means 'nail' or 'claw']