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ABSTRACT

The Caulites—sometimes called Valliscaulians, from their Latin name *vallis caulium*—were one of the last of the so-called “reform orders” of the twelfth century, a time of great religious ferment. This dissertation examines the foundation of their order in 1193, and its expansion in France, Scotland, and the Holy Roman Empire during the thirteenth century. It places the Caulite Order in the context of contemporary social, political, economic, and religious trends, and contrasts the historical role of the Caulites with that of the larger, better-known, monastic orders, e.g., the Cistercians and Carthusians.

The dissertation is based largely on unpublished documentary and visual sources. It begins by examining the Caulite foundation, reconciling a legend of that foundation with the documentary evidence. It addresses the Caulite ideal to live from rents, i.e., regular payments of grain or money, as an expression of monastic poverty. It shows how the Caulites eventually abandoned that ideal by acquiring land and other properties. It looks at Caulite expansion—in France, the Holy Roman Empire, and Scotland—and identifies more filial monasteries than has any earlier study. It revises the findings of earlier scholars concerning the origins of the Caulite customary (their “rule book”), showing that the Caulites borrowed practices from the Cistercians and Carthusians, but adapted those practices to fit their particular monastic vision. It examines Caulite organization, within a single monastery and throughout the entire order, concluding that the Caulites borrowed much of their organization from the Cistercians. Finally, it looks at daily life in a Caulite
monastery, moving beyond the monastic site as object of architectural or art historical study, and entering the Caulite monastery imaginatively, viewing its buildings as part of a human experience of the past.

Many earlier scholars have left the impression that the Caulites were simply a brand of Cistercians. While the Caulites did borrow from earlier orders, they did so critically. They were not simply carbon copies of those monks from whom they borrowed, but were "new monks in old habits."
For Karen.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The history of a town, a village, even of a hamlet, is sometimes the history of an entire nation.

— French historian Ernest Petit

The goal

The quotation above is from Petit's introduction to his brief history of the priory of Vausse, one of the oldest monasteries of the Caulite Order. Ever since I first read the line, I have liked the idea that the history of a small thing can tell us something about the history of bigger things. Blake's "world in a grain of sand"! It is in this spirit that I offer the following history on the origins and expansion of the Caulites—by any comparison to other monastic orders, a small thing. I believe that a knowledge of this relatively small monastic order can deepen our understanding of larger topics, including the history of monasticism, the history of France, and the history of Europe in the thirteenth century.


The context

At the most abstract level, the study of medieval monasticism is the study of how groups of people governed themselves in religious response to the exigencies of their day. In this sense, the study of monasticism contributes directly to our knowledge of group dynamics and political organization, as well as to the history of spirituality. Aside from religious motivations, medieval monasticism was also a movement responding to societal pressures, in an ebb and flow that created waves of monastic renewal. One such wave, for example, occurred in response to the chaos following the "decline" of the Roman Empire, when Christians fled to the deserts of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt in search of spiritual fulfillment.

More such waves occurred from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries, a time of great religious ferment. A driving force behind this ferment was the Gregorian Reform, which began as a movement against clerical marriage and simony (the purchase of church offices). The papal campaign against simony led to a struggle over lay investiture, in which emperor and pope clashed over the right to install bishops and abbots. The pope won, more or less, and his prestige increased. In fact, during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the prestige of the papacy increased so dramatically that one might easily have confused the pope for a secular monarch; while real secular monarchs and their armies fought to

---


fulfill—if only for a moment—the pope’s call to wrest Jerusalem from the Muslims. The reform-minded papacy also revived the parochial mission, and people began to actively renew the spiritual aspect of their lives. The quest for the spiritual could occasionally lead to heresy. When that happened, the pope and his secular lords shifted the focus of their crusades away from Islam and toward the heretical threat within Christendom itself. We should keep in mind, however, that the Church defined heresy, and those whom it labeled “heretics” did not view themselves as such.5 The eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries also witnessed a resurgence of towns and the advent of the universities.6 With towns and universities, the study of theology reached new heights, producing such noteworthy practitioners as Abelard and Anselm and Aquinas. All of this is to say that the first three centuries of the second millennium offered a variety of ways in which one might pursue a spiritual life: as a priest, as a crusader, as a “heretic,” as a scholar.

Many people in search of a spiritual life turned to monasticism. Some became monks in traditional Benedictine monasteries like those under the still-flourishing Cluniacs. Others, by way of criticizing what they saw as Cluniac extravagance, attempted to reform monastic practice, making it more ascetic, more “true” to the Rule of Benedict, the most influential rule for monks in the West. These reform movements included (in no particular order) the Grandmontines, the monks of Fontevraud, the Arrouaise canons, the Victorines,


the Trinitarians, the Williamites, the Gilbertines, the Premonstratensians, and the Carthusians, to name only a few. The Cistercians were arguably the largest, most successful, most wide spread, and certainly have become the most studied of these reform movements. In fact, as the Cistercians gained prominence on the medieval landscape, they themselves became the object of criticism, setting off further waves of monastic renewal.

Another great wave in the history of medieval religious movements came in the early thirteenth century with the Friars, i.e., the Franciscans and Dominicans. Many historians see the Friars as a watershed in the history of religious life. Rather than "leaving the world" to pursue their own salvation in remote locations, as traditional monks did, the Friars chose to live in towns, actively pursuing the salvation of others by preaching and hearing confessions. Rather than live in individual poverty while at the same time enjoying

---


8 The bibliography on the Cistercians is truly thick enough to stun an ox. For the sake of space, I refer the reader to the now-classic study, L. Lekai, *The Cistercians: Ideals and Reality* (Kent, Ohio, 1977). Pages 400-441 of this work contain an annotated bibliography on the Cistercians.

9 The bibliography on the Friars is also quite large. A good introduction is C. Lawrence, *The Friars: the Impact of the early Mendicant Movement on Western Society* (London and New York, 1994). Pages 229-236 of this work contain an annotated bibliography on the Franciscans.
a monastery’s corporate wealth, as traditional monks did, the Friars chose a life of individual and corporate poverty. In the parlance of the day, their ideal was “naked to follow the naked Christ.” When Francis of Assisi was only eleven years old living in Italy—before the foundation of the Franciscan Order had even entered his mind—medieval monasticism in Burgundy experienced another wave, though perhaps swell or ripple might be more precise. This was the Caulite Order.

The Caulites founded their first monastery in 1193. The order was named for the site of this first monastery in a “valley of cabbages,” located in the Châtillon forest, some twelve kilometers southeast of the town of Châtillon-sur-Seine in northwest Burgundy. The most important benefactor of the order, its temporal founder, was the duke of Burgundy, Odo III. The order’s spiritual founder was a certain Viard, sometimes called Guy or Guido, who, according to eighteenth-century mémoires of the order, was a former Carthusian lay brother. The Caulite Order received papal approval in 1205. It expanded in the first half of the thirteenth century, growing to some seventeen houses in France (mostly Burgundy), three in Scotland, one in what is today Germany—some have even suggested Spain and Portugal—founding its last monastery around 1260. The order lasted almost six centuries, but reduced numbers (both of monks and properties) forced the Caulites in 1764 to unite with, and be governed by, the Cistercian abbey of Sept-Fons. They experienced a

---


11 Francis was born in 1181. It was not until Francis was twenty-four years old that he heard the call of Christ in a dream. He won papal approval for his newly-founded Order of Friars Minor—also known as the Franciscans—in 1209. See Lawrence, *The Friars*, 29-30.

12 The French name for the site was “Val-des-Choux,” in Latin *vallis caulium*, whence “Caulite.” See the section “On naming the subject of this work,” below, for more on the naming of the first monastery and the order.
brief revival in the late eighteenth century, but disappeared, nonetheless, in the wake of the French Revolution. This is the history of the Caulites in its most abbreviated form. But there is much more to it than that.

The foundation of the first Caulite monastery took place roughly a century after the advent of the Cistercians, barely two decades before the advent of the Franciscans.13 Having said this, I must now invoke the reader to caution. There is no need to engage in what Giles Constable has called “the seductive game of precursorism.”14 While I do intend to argue that the Caulite movement was a conscious reform of the Cistercians, I do not believe that their form of monasticism inevitably led to the Franciscans. The Caulites in no way anticipated the Friars, and the Friars certainly did not grow out of the Caulites.

It is important to understand the Caulites in the context of an evolving religious discourse. Part of this discourse concerned how monks should live: in “deserts” or in towns? alone or with others? through endowments or hand to mouth? The last of these was perhaps the most difficult to resolve, as medieval society itself was undergoing major changes. One current in the religious thought of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was that monks should live a life of poverty, imitating the poverty of Christ. As Lester Little has illustrated, this belief conflicted with the rise of a profit economy especially in medieval towns, centers of trade and money lending that drew criticism for promoting dubious moral values.15 Since many of these towns had grown up around monasteries, one response of monastic reformers was to flee from towns. The Cistercians tried this, withdrawing to the most desolate corners of the world to live in poverty, but, as Constance Bouchard has

13 Robert of Molesme founded the “new monastery” of Cîteaux in 1098.


demonstrated, soon became re-integrated into the profit economy, especially because of their creative land management and labor initiatives. The Franciscans attempted to operate at the other end of that spectrum, rejecting wealth while begging for their daily bread in the centers of commerce. As this work will show, the Caulites, too, were part of this discourse. Like the Cistercians, they chose to live in “desert” settings, away from towns. Like the Carthusians—the order that produced the Caulites’ founder—they stressed the hermit’s life, but lived this in small communities. To avoid worldly entanglements that inevitably came with owning property, and as an expression of their monastic poverty, they attempted to live entirely from rents, i.e., regular donations of grain, wine, or money that came from their lay supporters. As we shall see, this economic experiment did not last.

The plan

In the preface to his edition of the Caulite customary (the “rules” by which the Caulites lived), Walter De Gray Birch lamented that it was “remarkable that so little is known about the ... Val-des-Choux.” Sixty years later, the French historian Robert Folz commented that “the monastery of Val-des-Choux has not ceased to arouse the curiosity of its visitors, and of historians.” Yet, in the past hundred years only a handful of brief studies has appeared to satisfy that curiosity. The best of these without doubt has been Folz’s own article, which dealt with the first one-hundred years of Caulite history (roughly the thirteenth century), but which focused primarily on the motherhouse rather than on the order as a whole. The present work is in some ways an expansion of Folz’s article, though it is my hope that it is much more. For no previous scholar has attempted to write a comprehensive


history of the formation and expansion of the entire Caulite monastic order. Although the number of previous works on the Caulites is scant, there have been some. Chapter 2 assesses these in its discussion of Caulite historiography.

In addition to Birch’s edition of the Caulite customary, mentioned above, the Caulites have left us numerous other records, from charters of economic activity to church ruins to funerary reliefs. Chapter 3 discusses the many and varied sources used in this work.

It seems that no history of a monastic order would be complete without a legend to explain the order’s origins. The Caulites are no different, having cast their founder as a simple lay brother from a nearby Carthusian monastery. Unfortunately, the earliest documents recording this legend come from the eighteenth century, when the later Caulites might have had any number of reasons for constructing such a legend to reify their own past. Chapter 4 looks at the Caulite foundation legend and attempts to reconcile it with the historical sources.

The Caulites founded their order on the ideal of living from rents—rather than owning property—to avoid worldly entanglements. Over the course of the thirteenth century, that ideal proved unrealistic, and the Caulites transformed it into an economic policy that supported the acquisition of land and other properties. Chapter 5 addresses the Caulite economy as expressed at the motherhouse of Val-des-Choux.

Soon after the foundation of its first monastery, the Caulites attracted benefactors to the new order, which allowed it—at least during the thirteenth century—to flourish and expand. The Caulites founded monasteries throughout Burgundy, in Champagne and Normandy, and even expanded into the Holy Roman Empire and Scotland. Chapter 6 looks at the extent of Caulite expansion.

We have already mentioned the Caulite customary and Birch’s edition of it. Birch and other earlier scholars suggested that the Caulites copied the greater part of their
monastic practices verbatim from the Cistercians. This was not entirely true. Chapter 7 examines the origins of the Caulite customary. It shows how the Caulites adapted some Cistercian practices but rejected others to fit their particular monastic vision. Since the Caulite founder originally came from a Carthusian monastery, it should come as no surprise that the Caulites also borrowed some of their practices from the Carthusians. Chapter 7 takes Carthusian borrowings and adaptations into account, as well as going back to the source of most monastic practice in the West, the Rule of Saint Benedict. It was this borrowing and adapting of earlier monastic customs that inspired the title of this work: the Caulites were new monks who revived and reformed old habits.

If the Caulites were indebted to the Cistercians for anything it was the governmental organization of their order. Cistercian innovations in this aspect of monastic life were becoming standard practice by the thirteenth century. These innovations included the practices of filiation and visitation, by which motherhouses monitored, through on-site inspections, the practice of the daughter monasteries they had founded. It also included the practice of holding a general chapter, an annual meeting of the heads of all the monasteries of the order. Chapter 8 examines Caulite organization, both within a single monastery and throughout the entire order.

The first eight chapters of this work are concerned with “taking apart” and analyzing all that I have discovered in my research on the Caulites. Chapter 9 puts it all back together in an attempt to understand what daily life in a Caulite monastery might have been like. It is my hope in this chapter to move beyond seeing a Caulite monastic site as the object of architectural or art historical study, and to enter a Caulite monastery imaginatively, viewing its buildings as part of a human experience of the past.

---

18 See Birch. xii; Folz. 100-104, to name only two prominent examples.
Although the focus of this study concerns the origins and expansion of the Caulite order in the late twelfth through the thirteenth centuries, I have also included a Postscript that provides a brief synopsis on the “decline and fall” of the Caulite Order. It is not my intention with this synopsis to give the impression that this work is an exhaustive history of the Caulite Order. Caulite documents from the fourteenth to the eighteenth centuries are plentiful, and they deserve a thorough study of their own. For the moment, however, such study must remain the task of another day, perhaps of another scholar. I offer this Postscript in the hope of providing the reader with some small sense of closure, to satisfy the desire to know “what happened next?”

On naming the subject of this work

As mentioned above, the monastic order that is the object of this study takes its name from the site where its first monastery was located. The earliest extant document called this site \textit{vallis olerum}, or the “valley of vegetables.” This soon was changed in its Latin form to \textit{vallis caulium}, French “Val-des-Choux,” which in English means the “valley of cabbages.” Since modern times, the name “Val-des-Choux” has been transformed into “Val des Choues,” or the “valley of owls,” from an Old French form for “chouette.” Modern maps identify the first Caulite monastery as “Val des Choues,” as did publicity materials for the 900th anniversary of the monastery of Citeaux, with which Val-des-Choues

---

\textsuperscript{19} See Peincedé, vol. 28.2, pg. 1157, #24, for reference to a document dated 1195; or AD de la Côte d’Or. B 10470, for an original charter dated 1200: “valle holerun.”

\textsuperscript{20} The Latin is first attested in an original charter in 1205. see AD de l’ Allier. H 273: “valle caulium,” though Peincedé, vol. 28.2, pg. 1175, #117, refers to a document using this form as early as 1200. By contrast, the French form “Valle des Choz” is attested in an original charter dated 1196; see AD de la Côte d’Or. 16 H 230.
became associated during the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{21} This change of name probably reflects the sensibilities of the hunters who now use the remaining buildings of the monastery as a lodge—"valley of owls" no doubt sounds more hunterly than "valley of cabbages."

Regardless, "valley of owls" has no historical basis. The Latin form \textit{vallis caulium} bears this out: the French name of our subject is Val-des-Choux, never Val-des-Choues. Yet for an historian writing in English, the question remains of how to proceed without having to refer to his subject as "the cabbage valley monks."\textsuperscript{22} Most French scholars call both the motherhouse and the monastic order the "Val-des-Choux", but this is difficult to transform into an English adjectival form (Val-des-Chouvian?). Some Scottish scholars have dubbed them the "Kale Glen" monks, but this seems too radical a translation, and the same problem exists with an adjectival form (Kale Glennian?). Some twentieth-century scholars have opted for "Valliscaulian." This term is precise, and works as both noun and adjective, but it is quite a mouthful—exceeded only by "Premonstratensian" in difficulty of pronunciation.\textsuperscript{23} After much consideration, I have opted for "Caulite," which evokes the "cabbage" portion of the Latin form, which serves equally as noun and adjective, and which I hope is easy on the ears as well as the tongue.\textsuperscript{24}


\textsuperscript{22} One colleague jokingly suggested "cabbage patch monks." after the popular children's doll of the 1980s.

\textsuperscript{23} Premonstratensian is the most common adjectival form used for the French order of regular canons founded at Prémontré in 1121. See note 6. above.

\textsuperscript{24} "Caulite" is attested in the 15th to 16th-century writings of Henry Calcar, see A. Potthast. \textit{Repertorium fontium historiae mediæ aevi} 3 (Rome, 1962), 305, which cited Henricus de Calcar, who was also called Henricus von der Heiden, as the continuator of Guillelmus de Reno's "Chronicon monasterii Campensis," which H. Keussen edited in \textit{Annalen des historischen Vereins für den Niederrhein} 20 (Bonn, 1869), 261-360. The term "Caulite" is also cognate with the German form Kauliten, used by German scholars of the order.
Let it be “Caulite,” then, for the name of the monastic order, but to avoid confusion, “Val-des-Choux,” for the name of the order’s first monastery. Hence, the monastery at Val-des-Choux is the motherhouse of the Caulite Order.

***

It is my hope that this history will provide an end to Birch’s lament that “so little is known” about the Caulites. I also hope that Folz’s comment might continue to resonate, that this history of the Caulites might “arouse the curiosity” of its readers, be they historians, be they visitors.
CHAPTER 2

HISTORIOGRAPHY

That learned man [St. Jerome] knew ... how obscure truth is, how deep it lies buried ... by how much work it is reached, how practically no one ever succeeds, how it is dug out with difficulty and then only bit by bit.

—Andrew of St. Victor, c. 1170

Introduction

Over the past four centuries, historians have pursued the truth about the Caulite Order with varying degrees of success. Some of these historians have operated in a closed system, content to repeat and/or copy the work of their predecessors. Others, because of their uncritical approach, have perpetuated misconceptions about the Caulites, many of which have lasted to the present day. Still others have just been downright sloppy. And yet, a few historians have managed to unearth some truth about the Caulites, though with difficulty, and only bit by bit. This chapter discusses all of them. It begins with a discussion of the main questions earlier historians have asked concerning the Caulite Order. It then turns to works that deal specifically with the historiography of the Caulites. Next, it examines in chronological order those works that have dealt with the Caulite Order in general or the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux in particular. Finally, it examines the two most important articles concerning the Caulites that have appeared to date, and discusses where the study of the Caulite Order must go from here.
The main questions to date

Earlier scholars of the Caulite Order have focused, for the most part, on only three questions. The first of these concerns when and how the order was founded. The second concerns the nature of the rule by which they lived. And the third concerns the spread of the order throughout France and beyond. I provide this brief treatment of these questions so that we may deal more swiftly with the many “answers” of earlier scholars, proffered below.

A standard narrative has evolved around the foundation of the order, which I am calling the Caulite foundation legend. The basic structure of its narrative is as follows. Viard (sometimes Guiard, or Guy, or Guido), a conversus or lay brother, left the nearby Carthusian monastery at Lugny to lead a “stricter life” in what came to be known as the “valley of cabbages” in the Châtillon forest. He attracted followers and patrons, among them the duke of Burgundy, Odo III, who promised to build Viard a monastery upon his successful return from an unnamed military campaign. This legend is not preserved in any of the early, extant documents of the order. Nonetheless, it became part of the Caulite “tradition”, and scholars writing on the order repeated and embellished upon this legend, at times with great poetic license. Chapter 4 discusses the foundation legend in greater detail.

The second question, concerning the nature of the Caulite rule, is an attempt to determine the degree to which the Caulites borrowed from the practices of other religious orders in creating their own customary, and from which orders they borrowed. The monastic sources for the Caulite customary most suggested by the scholars below include the practices of the Benedictines, the Carthusians, and the Cistercians—though each scholar who tackled this question had his own ideas about the combination and degree of influence

---

1 A monastic customary was a set of written rules or customs, both spiritual and practical, upon which the monks framed their lives.
of each of these practices. This is admittedly not an easy question to answer, but Chapter 7 attempts to unravel the lineage of the Caulite customary in greater detail.

The third question, concerning the spread of the Caulite Order in France and beyond, is an attempt to identify and locate as many Caulite-affiliated priories as possible. The highest number suggested so far has been thirty, though earlier scholars have identified only eighteen with any certainty. Chapter 6 deals with this question in more detail.

Historiographic works

Three works, composed in the first half of the twentieth century, provide useful reference tools concerning the historiography of the Caulite Order. The first author to attempt to catalog Caulite documents was Hubert Gautier, who not only described the Caulite collection at the Departmental Archives of l’Allier, then located in Moulins-sur-Allier, but also offered his own brief treatment concerning the origins of the Caulite Order. Gautier’s article appeared in two installments. The first installment began by explaining the presence of this Caulite collection in the department of l’Allier, which is located roughly 250 kilometers south of Paris, in the Bourbon region of France. After the union of the Caulite Order with the Cistercian abbey of Sept-Fons in 1764, its documents were transferred to Sept-Fons, which is located in l’Allier. In the wake of the French Revolution, monastic records were transferred to the nearest departmental archives. For Sept-Fons this meant the department of the Allier. It is thus that so many of the documents of a monastic order from Burgundy found their way into the archives of a territory in which none of its

---

houses were located. Gautier next provided a brief description of the Grand Cartulary, and published descriptions of the Caulite customary. He then listed 56 cartons of documents concerning the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux, and 37 cartons of documents concerning filial priories, with a brief descriptions of each carton, e.g. "Essarois (1218-XVIIIe)." Gautier’s treatment seems to have been the basis for current descriptions employed in the archival catalog of the Allier. Gautier noted that Mignard had analyzed the most important aspects of these documents, in a work which Gautier called “erudite and conscientious.”

Next, Gautier treated what he called the “legendary origins” of the Caulite Order, essentially the foundation legend, discussed above. Gautier was not the first to cite the legend, but he did not cite it from the archival sources he had just described. Instead, he relied on the works of earlier érudit historians: Courtépée, Vignier, Mathieu, Lapérouse, and Mignard (see below).

Gautier’s work then detailed some of the aspects of Innocent III’s 1205 approval of the Caulite Order, as well as Honorius III’s 1224 mitigation of Caulite practice. Gautier also provided a description of Birch’s edition of the *Ordinale conventus vallis caulium*. Gautier falsely claimed that the *Ordinale* was based on a manuscript at Paris, apparently not

---

3 Gautier, “Les documents.” 22-24 describes the Grand Cartulary at Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215-221. A cartulary was essentially a collection of charters, or documents, that had been recopied into another book or register.


5 See Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 267.


realizing that Birch’s edition of the Caulite customary was drawn from two manuscripts, the one at Paris, and another at Moulins. Gautier concluded this section with a brief analysis of what he considered some of the most important early donations to the Caulite Order.9

In his second installment, Gautier listed the priories in France and Scotland, and the priors of the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux (from the 13th to the 18th century). He also briefly treated the decline of the Caulites and their union with Sept-Fons. As a final word on Gautier’s study of the Caulites, we should note that, following Mignard, he falsely labeled them Trappists.10 The Trappist reforms of the Cistercian Order, named for the Swiss monastery of La Trappe, were not instituted until 1664. The Cistercian abbey of Sept-Fons—to which the Caulite Order was joined in 1764—did not adopt Trappist reforms until 1845, after the Caulites had been dissolved. Hence, at no time during the history of the Caulite Order were they ever associated with the Trappist reforms, and the application of this term to the Caulites is wholly anachronistic.

Dom Laurent Cottineau provided the next useful reference concerning Caulite historiography. His Répertoire topo-bibliographique is well known to students of both monasticism and art history. It contains entries for the Caulite motherhouse at Val-des-Choux, as well as the French filial priories of Beaupré, Clairlieu, Genevroye, Rémonvaux, Royal-Pré, Val-Saint-Benoît, Val-Dieu, Val-Duc, Vauclair, Vausse, and the Scottish priories of Beauly, and Pluscarden.11 Some of the foundation dates provided in Cottineau’s work

---


11 L. Cottineau. Repertoire Topo-Bibliographique des Abbayes et Prieurés, 3 vols. (Mâcon, 1939-1970). For Val-des-Choux, see Cottineau 2: 3257. For Beaupré, see Cottineau. 1: 310. For Clairlieu, see Cottineau. 1: 797. For Genevroye, see Cottineau. 1: 1270. For Remonvaux, see Cottineau, 2: 2443. For Royal Pré, see Cottineau, 2: 2557. For Val-Saint-Benoît, see Cottineau, 2: 3255, 3265, which listed the priory once simply as Val-Benoît, but these are the same place, not two separate priories. For Val-Dieu, see Cottineau, 2: 3260. For Val-Duc, see Cottineau, 2: 2442. For Vauclair, see Cottineau. 2: 3302. For
are questionable, and Cottineau identified the Caulites at times as Cistercians, at times as Trappists, and at times simply as their own independent order.

The most complete historiographic study of the Caulite Order to date was that of Jacques Laurent and Ferdinand Claudon, though it is not without its flaws. Their work contains entries for the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux, as well as the filial priories of Genevroye, Val-Duc, Val-Saint-Lieu, Vauclair, and Vausse.\(^{12}\) We should note that their treatment of the filial priories is not as thorough as that of the motherhouse. Their work lists archival holdings, secondary works, including studies of non-documentary sources such as seals and architecture. The authors attempted a brief treatment of the foundation of the order, largely repeating the foundation legend. They made some claims that do not seem to be based in the documentary evidence, e.g., that the Caulites always lived in community, and never in isolation—Chapter 9 discusses this question in more detail. They also maintained that the Caulites had monasteries in Spain and Portugal—a question addressed in Chapter 6. Though it is not the focus of our study, their treatment of the decline and final years of the Caulite Order is detailed and well presented.

Works concerning the order and the motherhouse

The first author to write about the Caulite Order was James of Vitry (c. 1170-1240), bishop of Acre, well-traveled preacher, and keen observer of his own times. Most importantly for our purposes, James was a contemporary of the first Caulites, and visited Val-des-Choux in the first quarter of the thirteenth century. In his *Historia occidentalis*,

\[^{12}\text{J. Laurent and F. Claudon,}\text{ Abbayes et prieurés de l'ancienne France 12, in Archives de la France monastique 45 (Paris and Ligue, 1941).}\text{ For Val-des-Choux, see Laurent, 425-429.}\text{ For Genevroye, see Laurent, 463.}\text{ For Val-Duc, see Laurent, 595.}\text{ For Val-Saint-Lieu, 598.}\text{ For Vauclair and Vausse, see Laurent, 464.}\]
written between 1219 and 1225, James recorded his observations on Caulite practices. He was the first to claim that the Caulites borrowed from the Cistercians, yet he seems also to have associated them with Carthusian practices, and in a sermon he even listed them among the Augustinian canons. In spite of this confusion, we can nonetheless be grateful to James for his description of early Caulite economic life.

After James of Vitry, we have no record of any scholarly treatment of the Caulite Order for more than three centuries. Writing in 1579 on the Cistercian Order, Chasseneuz included a brief paragraph on the monks of “Vallis collium,” according to which they lived “under the rule of the blessed Benedict” (*sub regula beati Benedicti*), as well as “under the customs of the Cistercians” (*sub habitu Cisterciensium*).

The next time scholars turned their attention to the Caulite Order was in the seventeenth century. In his chronicle of the Cistercian Order, published in 1614, Le Mire simply re-published James of Vitry’s chapter on the Caulites from the *Historia occidentalis*. In 1656, the second edition of *Gallia christiana* also claimed that the Caulites lived “under the Rule of Benedict” (*sub Regulâ Benedictinâ*), and gave 1197 as date for Viard’s foundation of the order. The third edition of *Gallia christiana*, published

---


15 B. Chasseneuz, *Catalogus gloriae mundi* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1579), bk. 4, p. 119, consid. 58. Chasseneuz’s phrase *sub habitu Cisterciensium* could mean that the Caulites wore the habit of the Cistercians, but I think this would have been unlikely at the time of Chasseneuz’s writing, in the sixteenth century. The Caulites did not join the Cistercians at Sept-Fons until the eighteenth century. Hence I have translated *sub habitu Cisterciensium* as “under the customs of the Cistercians,” according to a definition of “habitus” in Niermeyer, 478.

16 A. Le Mire, *Chronicon cisterciensis ordinis* (Cologne, 1614), 249-252.
by the Maurists in the eighteenth century, stated that the Caulites lived "under the rule ... of Saint Benedict and the constitutions of the Cistercians, to which they added many provisions of the Carthusians" (sub regula ... sancti Benedicti et constitutionibus Cistercii, quibus multa ex Carthusianorum instituto petita accesserunt). Neither edition of Gallia Christiana offered any evidence for its assertions. The third edition added to the current knowledge of the Caulites by providing a brief version of the foundation legend, listing three of thirty filial priories, and listing twenty-six priors of the motherhouse. Writing in 1662, Chopin contrasted the origins of the Caulite Order in Burgundy with the origins of the Val-des-Écoliers in Champagne, but seems to have been more concerned with the latter. He nonetheless listed some of the Caulite filial priories. Writing in the late seventeenth century, Vignier claimed 1188 as the foundation for Val-des-Choux. There are problems with this date, which I will take up in Chapter 4.

The first scholars to treat the Caulite Order in the eighteenth century were the Benedictine érudits, Martène and Durand. In 1717, they published what they referred to as the Caulite Constitutiones, with a brief expository footnote, including a version of the Caulite foundation legend. They, too, argued for the influence of Carthusian practices on the Caulites. In that same year, they published a memoir of their travels to Val-des-Choux.


18 R. Chopin, Traite des droits des religieux et monastères (Paris, 1662), 188-189, as well as the entry "Val-des-Choux" in the table of contents.

19 J. Vignier made this claim in two different works: Chronicon lingonense, ex probationibus decadis historiae contextum (Langres, 1665), 120; and, Décade historique du diocèse de Langres, published for the first time by the Société historique et archéologique de Langres (Langres, 1894), 2: 107.

and other monasteries in France. This included a rendition of the foundation legend, which Martène and Durand took to task based on inscriptions they had seen in the church at Val-des-Choux. It also included an engraving of a tomb, the side of which depicted a funeral procession with Caulite monks. In 1724, seven years after their publication of the Caulite constitutions, Martène and Durand published a brief history of the Carthusian Order by an anonymous author, which seems to contain references to the Caulites “living almost as Carthusians” (viventes quasi sint Carthusienses). Hélyot, writing his history of the monastic orders in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, offered a brief treatment of the Caulites. He began his entry with the assertion that “most historians who spoke of the [Caulite Order] had been mistaken” when they claimed that Viard, its founder, had been a Benedictine—though Hélyot never identified these earlier, “wrong-thinking” historians. He then offered up the standard Caulite foundation legend, finding greater Carthusian than Cistercian influence in their practice, and taking James of Vitry to task for claiming otherwise. Fleury’s mention of the Caulite Order in the seventy-fourth book of his church history, completed in 1738, is basically a re-hashing of Hélyot. Fleury falsely asserted that Honorius III had approved Viard’s Carthusian-based rules for the Caulites (it was actually Innocent III who had done this). He also dismissed James of Vitry’s observations, essentially reiterating Hélyot’s objections. Plancher, writing in 1739, also took the Caulite foundation legend to task. Arguing from the existing

21 Martène and Durand, *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux Benedictins de la congregation de Saint Maur* (Paris, 1717), 112-113, figure.


evidence—inscriptions once found in the church at Val-des-Choux, entries in the Caulite customary, and his own knowledge of the historical record—Plancher made a logical (though ultimately false) argument for denying Odo III the title of “founder” of the Caulite Order.25

Scholars’ interest in the Caulite Order continued into the second half of the eighteenth century. In 1758, Courtépée published a description of his travels to several Burgundian monasteries, including Fontenay, Oigny, Lugny, and Val-des-Choux. His description of the Caulite motherhouse still inspires a sense of awe at the extreme isolation of the site. Courtépée listed several of the Caulite filial priories, though some of these were falsely attributed.26 In 1775, Courtépée published the same list of Caulite priories as part of his four-volume description of the duchy of Burgundy. This time he also mentioned the Caulite priories in Scotland, but his claim of Caulite priories in Spain and Portugal remains as yet, unsubstantiated.27 In 1777, in his abridged history of Burgundy, Courtépée amended the Caulite foundation legend. According to this new version, Odo III built the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux upon his return, not from some generic military campaign, but from “the Orient”, i.e., the crusades.28 Also writing in 1759, Brockie (following Hélyot) maintained that only Benedictine and Carthusian customs had contributed to the Caulite practices. Brockie began the critical observations to his edition of the Caulite constitutions (which he copied from Martène and Durand’s edition) by embellishing the


Caulite foundation legend. He concluded his argument by rebutting James of Vitry, claiming that the Caulites did not embrace Cistercian practices, “as much as ... estimated in [the Historia],” for “nowhere can one discover such a familiar relationship between the Caulites and Cistercians as one can between the Caulites and Carthusians.”

Du Terns, writing in 1774, claimed that Odo, duke of Burgundy, had founded the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux some time after 1192. Based on his reading of an inscription in the church at Val-des-Choux, he denied Viard any role in the Caulite foundation.

Not surprisingly, most knowledge concerning the Caulites generated during the nineteenth century—i.e., after the French Revolution—dealt with the decline of the order, or the contemporary ruinous state of its monasteries. These often appeared in romanticized travelogues. In 1833, Maillard de Chambure described the “picturesque ruins of the grand priory of Val-des-Choux.” He maintained that the Caulites followed the Rule of Benedict, with Cistercian constitutions and certain observances borrowed from the Carthusians. He listed some of the filial priories of the Caulite Order—though he misidentified some—and repeated the claim of Caulite priories in Spain and Portugal. Two engravings of Val-des-Choux, as it appeared in 1833, supplemented his treatment. Although the site was falsely labeled a “monastère de Trappistes,” the engravings by Jobard do provide a romantic interpretation of the motherhouse, set in a cloudy valley with sunlight miraculously streaming down on the monastery's ruins.

29 L. Holste. [Holstenius], Codex regularum monasticorum et canoniarum, revised edition by M. Brockie (Augsburg, 1759, reprint Graz, 1958), hereafter, Holste-Brockie. 3: 12: “Non igitur patres Caulitae amplexi sunt Instituta Cisterciensia, quemadmodum existimavit Jacobus a Vitriaco in Historia occidentali; nullibi enim reperimus tantam familiaratem societatem inter illos et cistercienses, quals erat cum cartusianis.”


of the motherhouse. In 1860, Nesle, a painter and "membre de plusiers Académies," offered a visual description of the ruins at Val-des-Choux, which even included the flora one might witness there. He, too, invoked the Caulite foundation legend, and repeated Courtépée's unsupported claim of Caulite monasteries on the Iberian peninsula. One useful addition to Nesle's work was his publication of an engraving of a bas-relief on the side of a tomb that depicted a funeral procession of Caulite monks.

Another popular product of the French learned societies during the nineteenth century was the erudite "encyclopédie" or "dictionnaire." In 1837, the Caulites earned a lengthy footnote in Lapérouse's history of Châtillon. His treatment began with a lavish retelling of the Caulite foundation legend, followed by a count of Caulite monasteries—not just in France, but also Scotland, and, yes, Spain and Portugal—and closed with a description of the motherhouse, and of the monastery's closing during the Revolution. In 1844, Mathieu dated the foundation of Val-des-Choux in 1193, with "Wiart" as its founder. In 1856, Montrond's monastic dictionary re-hashed Fluery's treatment of the Caulites. This included Viard giving his disciples the rules of the Carthusians, and Honorius III's (falsely attributed) approval of the order. In 1865, the commission of antiquities in the Côte d'Or reported that one of its members had examined a cracked bell.

---


35 Abbé Mathieu, *Abrégé chronologique de l'histoire des évêques de Langres* (Langres, 1844), 78.

coming from Val-des-Choux, though the account offered no great detail.\textsuperscript{37} In 1866, in his unpublished encyclopedia concerning the Côte d'Or, Denizot offered a treatment of the Caulite Order which seemed largely copied from other sources: the standard foundation legend; Viard's adoption of the Benedictine, Cistercian and Carthusian rules; confirmation by Innocent III in 1205. Like Mignard and others, Denizot also mistakenly called the Caulites Trappists. He claimed that they gave hospice to travelers, though pointing out that women were not allowed to sleep inside monastery. He also discussed several gifts made to the order.\textsuperscript{38} Writing in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Roussel tells us that the diocese of Langres—in which Val-des-Choux is located—marked the first of June as a holy day in honor of Viard, founder of Val-des-Choux. Roussel followed Vignier in his retelling of the foundation legend, and posited that Hugh III (Odo III's father) founded the Caulite Order in 1188. A positive aspect of Roussel's work was his list of the priors of Val-des-Choux, which greatly improved the list in the \textit{Gallia christiana}.\textsuperscript{39} Finally, Roussel discussed five Caulite filial priories located in the diocese of Langres—Petit-Saint-Lieu, Rémonvaux, Val-Duc, Vauclair, and Vausse, but falsely listed Vassy-les-Pizy among them.\textsuperscript{40} In 1877, Janauschek's study on the origins of the Cistercians named the Caulites as a "Cistercian coenobium," with houses in Scotland and France.\textsuperscript{41} Janauschek correctly asserted that the Caulites, like the Cistercians, were subject to the general chapter.\textsuperscript{42} but—in


\textsuperscript{38} J. Denizot, "Encyclopédie du département de la Côte d'Or". Dijon. BM. ms. 1732. fol. 215r - 217v.

\textsuperscript{39} Roussel. \textit{Le diocèse de Langres} (1878). 3: 62-64.

\textsuperscript{40} Roussel. \textit{Le diocèse de Langres} (1878). 3: 284.

\textsuperscript{41} L. Janauschek, \textit{Originum Cisterciensum}. (Vienna. 1877). 1: liv.

\textsuperscript{42} Janauschek. \textit{Originum}. 1: lxvii.
discussing their union with Sept-Fons in the eighteenth century—once again falsely labeled them Trappists.\(^{43}\)

The twentieth-century historiography of the Caulite Order began with Walter De Gray Birch's publication of its customary. In an introduction to the edition, Birch offered a brief history of the order and the motherhouse, and listed its dependent priories and its priors. Birch used Mignard (see below) as his main secondary source, but with caution.\(^{44}\) In 1902, Kleinclausz re-published the engraving from Martène and Durand of a funerary relief depicting Caulite monks, this time for purposes of comparison to other Burgundian funerary art. The historical background Kleinclausz offered came largely from Martène and Durand, Courtépée, and Mignard.\(^{45}\) In 1905, Joanne gave the briefest of geographical descriptions for several Caulite houses. Included in his treatment of the motherhouse was the undocumented claim that Louis XIII and Louis XIV both made religious retreats at Val-des-Choux.\(^{46}\) In 1912, Coulon published descriptions and reproductions of Caulite prioral seals from Val-des-Choux, Vausse, and Petit-Saint-Lieu.\(^{47}\) In that same year, Hunter-Blair provided a brief, but well-documented encyclopedia entry on the Caulite Order—including the foundation legend—as well as entries on the Caulite filial priories of Ardc chattan and Pluscarden in Scotland.\(^{48}\) In 1914, Villiers offered another brief article on Val-des-Choux, drawn largely from the work of others. Following Nesle, Villiers included a description of

\(^{43}\) Janauschek, \textit{Originum}, 1: lxxiii.

\(^{44}\) Birch, especially xi-xxvii.


the native flora surrounding the site.\textsuperscript{49} In 1915, the Carthusians of Saint-Hugues, in a study of the houses of their order, proposed some interesting, if unsubstantiated, ideas concerning the Caulites. They maintained that Viard left the Carthusian house of Lugny to found the Caulite Order in 1193, and died at Val-des-Choux circa 1210, having imposed the Carthusian statutes on his followers. The Caulites then adopted Cistercian customs, and in 1262 began to follow the Rule of Benedict. Finally, according to this study, the prior of Lugny presided over the Caulite general chapter.\textsuperscript{50} The foundation date of 1193 is reasonable, but there is no evidence to point to 1210 as the date of Viard's death.\textsuperscript{51} The date of 1262 for the adoption of the Benedictine Rule seems far too late.\textsuperscript{52} The most provocative claim is that the prior of Lugny had authority over the general chapter at Val-des-Choux, a point that Chapter 4 addresses in more detail. In 1920, five years before publishing his study of Caulite documents at the archives of the Allier (see above), Gautier published a brief article concerning the foundation at Val-des-Choux. This contains Gautier's own version of the foundation legend, including the erroneous suggestion that Odo III built the monastery at Val-des-Choux upon his return from the Fourth Crusade.\textsuperscript{53} In 1948, Mann offered a brief sketch on the foundation of the Caulite Order, written to celebrate the "re-colonization" of the Caulite filial priory of Pluscarden in Scotland. The


\textsuperscript{50} Carthusians of Saint-Hugues. \textit{Maisons de l'ordre de Chartreux} (Parkminster, Sussex, 1915), 2: 9-10.

\textsuperscript{51} Chapter 4 discusses Viard's life in more detail.

\textsuperscript{52} The Caulites did adopt the Benedictine Rule, but see Chapter 7 for a more precise date.

article is largely drawn from the work of others, and its introduction and conclusion are
almost panegyric, yet Mann’s translations of some early charters are useful.54

It was not until 1954 that a scholar challenged the assumption that the Caulites
derived their customary equally from Benedictine, Carthusian, and Cistercian sources. This
was Pascalis Vermeer, who found that Cistercian documents had a greater influence on the
Caulites than Carthusian. Vermeer offered more evidence for his claims than any of his
predecessors, yet there are several flaws in his argument, which Chapter 7 will take up in
more detail.55 Also in 1954, Jean Richard, the dean of Burgundian medievalists, offered
little more than footnotes on the “Caulites’ new foundation;” though in his history of
Burgundy, published in 1978, the Caulites earned an entire paragraph, which unfortunately
repeated Courtépée’s claim of Caulite filial houses in Spain and Portugal.56 In 1961, Bazin
derived his article largely from secondary sources (Vignier, Courtépée, Nesle, Roussel,
Mignard, Gautier, and Folz), and hence repeated several of their errors. For example, he
adopted Gautier’s misguided version of the foundation legend. In spite of these flaws,
Bazin’s article offered decent reproductions of engravings and floor plans from the works
of Maillard de Chambure and Mignard.57 Also in the 1961, Wolter covered all three of the
main questions (foundation, customary nature, and expansion) in an encyclopedia entry of

54 H. Mann, “Notes on the Valliscaulian Order.” Pax. Winter (1948): 172-181. Concerning the re-
colonization at Pluscarden, Mann wrote: “Just as a grain placed in an ancient Egyptian mummy case has
been known to sprout when sown centuries afterward, so at Pluscarden priory we may believe that God’s
restoring hand will quicken the ancient fabric again.”

55 P. Vermeer, “Citeaux-Val des Choux.” Collecteana ordinis cisterciensum reformatorum 16 (1954): 35-
44. Chapter 7 discusses Vermeer’s article in more detail.


452-53.
one paragraph, drawn from the work of Barret, Vermeer, and Folz. In 1964, Evans' architectural study of French monasteries included photos of some mid-seventeenth century additions to Val-des-Choux, but little else of the Caulites' roughly twenty French monasteries. In 1965, Heimbucher dismissed the Caulites in two sentences as a "vorübergehende Trennung" (temporary separation) from the Carthusian tradition. In 1975, Legendre's study of the Carthusian house at Lugny—from which Viard left to found the Caulite Order—uncovered a document that identified Viard as a priest rather than a conversus, a matter that Chapter 4 takes up in more detail. In 1977, Lekai briefly mentioned the Caulites in his synthesis of Cistercian history. While he correctly asserted the influence of Cistercian practices on the Caulite customary, he was incorrect when he claimed that the Caulites introduced annual chapter meetings under the personal influence of Bernard of Clairvaux in the first half of the twelfth century. The Caulites did not even come into existence until the end of the twelfth century. In 1981, Maignier's history of Villiers-le-Duc, a village northwest of Val-des-Choux, offered little more than a brief version of the foundation legend. Yet Maignier also showed how anti-clerical bias could last well beyond the French Revolution, when he wrote that "it was easy to imagine the unpopularity of Val-des-Choux at Villiers, and the perpetual conflicts that resulted there [on account of


the tithes Villiers owed]. In fact, the Caulite charters show many donations and sales concerning Villiers-le-Duc, but no conflicts—at least not during the thirteenth century.

Several authors have produced works concerning filial priories of the Caulite Order. These usually begin with some description concerning the origins of the Caulite Order, e.g., the foundation legend, the nature of the customary, etc., which the authors intended as background for their discussion of particular filial houses. Most of these authors simply borrowed from works discussed above—which at best did not generate any new knowledge, and at worst repeated earlier mistakes. Hence, their various treatments of the Caulite Order in general would not be of much use to us. At the same time, to discuss the thrust of their work (the study of filial priories themselves) at this juncture would add a level of detail so unconnected to the narrative as to merely create confusion. For this reason, I will hold any discussion of works on filial priories until Chapter 6, and turn instead to a discussion of the two most significant works concerning the Caulite Order written to date.

The two most significant works to date

The works concerning the Caulite Order that I have mentioned thus far have all addressed similar questions, and arrived at similar conclusions. There are two more studies of the Caulite Order that deserve special attention. The first of these, by Prosper Mignard, exercised great influence (for better and worse) on Caulite scholarship since the late nineteenth century. The other, by Robert Folz, was the first study to adopt a more critical approach, in the grand style of the French annalistes.

In 1864, Mignard published a short history of the Caulites, whom he erroneously called the “Trappistes du Val-des-Choux.” Sixty pages in length, it was the first in-depth

examination of the order. Mignard began studying the Caulites a decade earlier, in 1854, when the archivist at the departmental archives in Moulins sent him "a whole crate of folders containing the documents necessary for a history of the [Caulites]."65 One gets the sense that Mignard may have been the first scholar to study these documents since their transfer to the archives after the Revolution—or perhaps the first scholar ever.66 Following its publication, Mignard’s article became a standard reference, whether as background for histories of filial priories, or as the basis for re-telling the history of the motherhouse. Of the roughly forty authors who have written on any aspect of Caulite history since 1864, ten cited Mignard.67 Although Mignard’s work signaled a shift in Caulite historiography, it is nonetheless fraught with shortcomings.

Mignard began his article with a description of the motherhouse at the time of his writing, including a detailed ground plan, drawn from his visits to Val-des-Choux. He followed this with a discussion of the monastery’s founders, supporting this with quotations from the martyrology found in the Caulite customary.68

---


66 No work published between 1789 and 1864 based its findings on the documents used by Mignard.

67 See MacPhail (1881); Pfülf (1900); Kleinclauss (1902); Hunter-Blair (1912); Gautier (1920, 1925); Cottineau (1939); Laurent (1941); Mann (1948); Vermeer (1954); and Bazin (1961-62).

68 A martyrology was a kind of calendar of Christian martyrs, one for each day of the year, by which the church kept track of feasts. Monks often recorded the deaths of their patrons or other important people in the margins. The martyrology Mignard cited is now catalogued as Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 232. Chapter 2 discusses the martyrology as a source in more detail, while Chapter 4 specifically discusses its entries on Viard and Odo III.
Mignard next discussed the "mixed rule" of the Caulites, and it is here that the failings in his scholarship become most apparent. In discussing the Caulite adoption of Cistercian practices, Mignard cited the work of Le Mire, not realizing (or at least not acknowledging) that Le Mire had simply re-published James of Vitry's chapter on the Caulites.\(^{69}\) Matters become worse when Mignard published a large section of what he called "the principal provisions of the rule adopted by the first founders."\(^{70}\) There follow four pages of text, translated from Latin into French,\(^{71}\) in quotation marks, but without a single specific citation. As an example, I offer here the first line of Mignard's translation:

Pour quiconque, renonçant au monde, veut militer sous Christ, qui est le vrai roi, c'est le moment de sortir de léthargie et de courir ver la lumière pour ne pas être enveloplée des ténèbres de la mort. [If anyone, renouncing the world, wishes to fight under Christ, who is the true king, it is the moment to abandon lethargy, and to run toward the light, so as not to be enveloped by the shadows of death.]\(^{72}\)

Confusion sets in when one tries to trace this passage to the Caulite customary. One assumes that Mignard used the copy of the customary he had received from the archivist at Moulins, but this copy does not contain anything resembling Mignard's translation. The customary does contain a copy of the Rule of Benedict, the prologue of which expresses similar ideas:

Ad te ergo nunc mihi sermo dirigitur, quisquis abrenuntians propriis voluntatibus, domino Christo vero regi militaturus, oboedientiae fortissima atque præclara arma sumis. [This message of mine is for you, then, if you are ready to give up your own will, once and for all, and armed with the strong and noble weapons of obedience to do battle for the true king, Christ the Lord.]\(^{73}\)

\(^{69}\) Mignard, 419, note 2. Le Mire, *Chronicon*. 249, indicated in the marginalia that his work was "Ex Vitriaco cap. 17, histor. Occid."

\(^{70}\) Mignard, 421: "les principales dispositions de la règle adoptée par les premiers fondateurs."

\(^{71}\) Mignard, 423, notes 1, 2; and 425, note 1, offer the only Latin text.

\(^{72}\) Mignard, 421.

\(^{73}\) RB, prologue. The translation is from T. Fry, ed., *The Rule of Saint Benedict in English* (Collegeville, Minnesota, 1982), 15.
But this is clearly not the passage Mignard translated. It is possible that Mignard consulted a copy of the customary no longer extant, but any attempt to prove this seems convoluted. Based on his description of the martyrology, and knowing that he used documents from the archives in Moulins, the most elegant conclusion we might draw is that Mignard consulted the copy of the customary still found in the departmental archives at Yzeure. The segment of Mignard's article concerning "the principal provisions of [their] rule" continues with a few more lines that seem to derive from the Rule of Benedict, then several lines of text excerpted, in no discernable order, from the Caulite customary itself. It is only with great difficulty that readers might locate these snippets in the customary; but if one had access to the customary anyway, such an exercise seems hardly worth the effort. I honestly have no idea what Mignard's intentions may have been. My best guess is that he meant his translated synopsis as a service to his readers, but in fact he only created confusion. He did provide a great service, however, when he published, in toto, transcriptions of two important papal bulls concerning the Caulites.

Mignard continued his article with a discussion of the principal donors to the order. Of all the documents we suppose Mignard had at his disposal, he largely ignored the donations of lesser knights and lords, focusing instead on gifts made by Duke Odo III of Burgundy and his heirs. Among these, Mignard provided a transcription of the chronicler Joinville's donation. It seems Joinville's fame was enough to warrant this entry, for Mignard offered no analysis concerning the reasons behind the donation, nor any attempts

---

74 Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 232.

75 Mignard published Innocent III (1205) and Honorius III (1224), both of which can be found at Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 222. and neither of which had been previously published. For the bull of Innocent III, see O. Hageneder, Die Register Innocenz' III (Vienna, 1997) 7: 218; A. Potthast, Regesta Pontificum Romanorum (Berlin, 1874), 1: 2410; or PL. 215: 532. For the bull of Honorius III, see P. Pressutti, ed., Regesta Honorii papae III (Rome. 1888-95), no. 4936.
to connect it with donations of the dukes of Burgundy. Mignard transcribed several documents that reveal the Caulites’ centuries-long, litigious attitude toward their debtors, i.e., those donors (or heirs of donors) who were unable or unwilling to continue payment on tithes given “in perpetuity.” Next, Mignard supplied a list of the priors of Val-des-Choux, including brief biographies of each, drawn largely from *Gallia christiana*. Then came a list of the Caulite filial priories, which seems to be copied verbatim from the Grand Cartulary of Val-des-Choux. Mignard’s article ended with an account of the decline of the order, its eventual union with the Cistercian abbey of Sept-Fons, and its demise in the wake of the French Revolution.

The most disappointing aspect of Mignard’s work, at least to a historian writing at the end of the twentieth century, is that he offered so little interpretation. One senses throughout the work that his concerns are more antiquarian than analytical. Regardless of our disappointment, however, we ought not fault him for pursuing the historical concerns of his day. In spite of what we consider shortcomings, Mignard’s article is important. As the first history of the Caulite Order, it sets the standard and points the way for all Caulite histories to follow.

Writing roughly a century after Mignard, Folz offered a more analytical treatment of the Caulites. The focus of his article was the history of the Val-des-Choux during its first century, though the article also treated some aspects of Caulite filial priories. Folz began by posing two questions. First, what was Val-des-Choux before its union in 1764 with Sept

---


78 Mignard. 464-475.

Fons? Second, who founded it, and to what monastic family did it belong? According to Folz, “On these two points, the answer has remained uncertain for a long time, the old historical literature presenting little more than a veil of contradictions on one or the other of these questions.”* Amen to that! Yet Folz did not blame the historians of the eighteenth century, nor even Mignard in the nineteenth century, because he recognized that they had been confronted with various traditions, which in the end they were unable to reconcile. Folz hoped to overcome the missteps of his predecessors by placing these traditions in their historical context, and by basing his study on what he called the “très riches archives du [Val-des-Choux].” He divided his work into three parts: foundation, organization, and endowment.

Concerning the foundation, Folz followed Mignard in using the Caulite martyrology as his main source of evidence. He rejected the foundation legend, suggesting that its use of Viard was most likely a fictive construct, based on the many hermits who had occupied the Valley of Cabbages before the monastery’s inception.*

Folz divided his discussion of Caulite organization into three parts. First, he theorized on the Caulites’ original rule.* Second, he touched on the expansion of the order, which he displayed in tabular form, listing monasteries, foundation dates, and founders.* Finally, he analyzed the process by which the Caulites moved from their original rule to the more complex customary that eventually guided their practices. Like many others before him, Folz saw Caulite practices as a mixture of Benedictine, Cistercian

---

* Folz, 91: “Or, sur ces deux points, la réponse est demeurée longtemps très incertaine. l’ancienne littérature historique ne présentant guère qu’un tissu de contradictions sur l’un et l’autre question.”

* Folz, 94.

* Folz, 95-96.

* Folz, 98-100.
and Carthusian customs. In an appendix to his article, Folz displayed, in tabular form, those statutes of the Caulite constitutions for which he was able to find a source. The appendix is useful, but Folz’s cursory study of the customary rendered the information he provided incomplete.

Thus far, Folz has addressed the three standard questions concerning the Caulite Order: its foundation, the nature of its rule, and its expansion. In the final section of his article, Folz broke new ground by analyzing the monastery’s endowment. Mignard had reported on this endowment in part, but in a haphazard fashion that lacked synthesis. For example, he published a document by which the Caulites received permission to pasture 20 cows in the woods surrounding their monastery, but his only commentary was that the document was “curious enough to be reproduced textually.” By contrast, Folz looked at the document published by Mignard and concluded that the Caulites eventually took up animal husbandry, in spite of earlier prohibitions concerning this practice, and evidence from James of Vitry concerning the Caulites’ early refusal of animal husbandry. This is just one example from a structural model Folz created for the purpose of examining the Caulite economy. Dividing Caulite goods into four categories (forest, tithes, rents, and lands), Folz’s careful study of the documents led him to many interesting conclusions.

---

84 Folz. 100-104.

85 Chapter 7 discusses the customary in detail, and explains the shortcomings of Folz’s table.

86 Mignard. 430.

87 Folz. 105. Cf. Innocent III (1205): “Vivetis de redditibus;” Vitry, Historia. 120: “... nec greges nec armenta ... habent.” But see also Honorius III (1224) “… Ad hec presentium auctoritate districtius inhibemus ne quibuslibet exactionibus insolitis et indebitis vos aggravare presumat, vel a vobis de ortis et vigultis vestris aut vestrorum animalium nutimentis decimas extorquere” (italics mine).

88 Folz. 104-112. Chapter 5 analyzes Folz’s model in more detail, and discusses how I have adapted his model for use in this study.
Although Folz’s work is a great improvement over that of Mignard, it nonetheless presents its own set of shortcomings. One of these concerns his use of primary sources. Although Folz had access to the “très riches archives du Val-des-Choux,” he cited most of his primary evidence from the Grand Cartulary, which is essentially a collection of earlier documents re-copied in the mid-eighteenth century. One problem with this approach is that the Grand Cartulary does not contain all of the documents from Val-des-Choux, hence Folz’s analysis may not be as thorough as it could have been. Another shortcoming concerns his use of secondary works. Although Folz cited the extensive work of Laurent and Claudon, he did not seem to take full advantage of earlier works in his own study. There are other minor flaws in Folz’s article, and specific points with which I simply do not agree, but it seems more appropriate to address these in the following chapters, as they arise. The ultimate drawback to Folz’s work may be its brevity. One cannot properly execute a study of the Caulites, even one confined to the first century of their existence, within the constraints placed on articles. In spite of its shortcomings, Folz’s article is both an inspiration and a starting point for further work on the Caulites—and there is certainly more work to do.

Conclusion

Such is the state of Caulite historiography. It ranges from the simple repetition of obscure, unattested traditions to the thoughtful analysis and conscientious citation of the primary sources, from scattered entries in encyclopedias to a handful of scholarly articles. For the most part, it has tried to answer three questions: on the order’s foundation, on the nature of its rule, on the extent of its expansion. Folz, a rare exception, has expanded the discourse to inquire into the Caulite economy. No author has yet attempted to write a
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comprehensive history—based in the primary sources—of the foundation and expansion of the entire Caulite Order. This is one of my goals in this work, to clear the ground and return to the sources. If St. Jerome (via Andrew of St. Victor) was right, that “practically no one ever succeeds,” it nonetheless seems worth the effort to dig into the sources and see what we may find. The following chapter discusses where that digging will take place.
CHAPTER 3

SOURCES

Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

—Hebrews. 11:1

Introduction

Like all medieval historians, I have based this study, to a degree, on "the evidence of things not seen." It uses archival and non-archival sources. Interpreting such evidence can often seem like an act of faith. In an attempt to navigate the advantages and pitfalls attendant in the sources, it seems appropriate near the outset to discuss their nature and kind, their adherent plusses and minuses.

This study employs eight types of sources: 1) the customary; 2) the charter; 3) the vidimus; 4) the cartulary; 5) the documentary inventory; 6) the wax seal; 7) the funerary relief; and 8) architecture. The first of these, as its name implies, can offer a view into Caulite customs, both in terms of religious rites, as well as the daily practice of living in a monastery. Numbers two through five are largely records of legal transactions, such as transfers of land and payments of tithes, which can help to track the economic life of the Caulite Order, as well as illuminate its interactions with the world outside the monastery. The last three, wax seals, funerary reliefs, and architecture, because they are visual sources, may shed light on the mentalité of our subject in ways that written sources cannot. Yet in
using visual sources, my interpretation has been less concerned with form than with content, and in this sense I have used these sources as “texts” rather than, for example, as the object of an art-historical study. I hope my intention with regard to each type of evidence is adequately explained in the course of this chapter. Before entering into a discussion of the documentary sources, I will first offer a word on the archives in which they are housed. After describing the various kinds of evidence, with specific examples for each, I will discuss two kinds of documentary sources we do not have, namely the chronicle and the *vita*. This chapter then closes with a brief thought on the serendipity of manuscript preservation.

*The archives*

This study cites all unpublished documents according to a method advocated by Coulson,1 i.e., with the city in which the archives/library is located first; then the name of the archives/library; then the fond (if applicable); then the shelfmark. City and library names appear in the language of the country. The shelfmark “Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 232” indicates that in the town of Yzeure, the departmental archives (French: *archives départementales*, hence AD) of the Allier hold the manuscript H 232. It often occurs, particularly at Yzeure, that several documents share the same shelfmark, bundled together in what the French call a *liasse*. The document’s date is then the next best identifier. Where no country is given, assume France. Documents in departmental archives in France are all catalogued according to the same system. The letter H is the catalogue designation for documents concerning regular clergy, i.e., clergy that live according to a rule (Latin: *regula*), as opposed to secular clergy, e.g., priests and bishops, who live in the world rather than in

monasteries. Documents concerning secular clergy in French departmental archives are catalogued under the letter G. I offer this explanation partially for the sake of future scholars, so that they might more easily locate the documents used in this study. At the same time, such catalogue designations also help to tell part of the story. For example, the Caulite monastery of Val-Saint-Benoît began as a house for regular clergy, as did all Caulite monasteries. One would expect to find documents for Val-Saint-Benoît listed under H in archival catalogues. But in 1697, Val-Saint-Benoît was joined to a (secular) seminary in the diocese of Autun. Documents bearing the shelfmark Mâcon, AD de Saône-et-Loire, 9 G 23, suggest as much. Once this union took place, all of the monastery’s previous, “regular” documents became part and parcel of the seminary’s property. Rather than separate these earlier documents according to kind (regular clergy = H), the archivists chose to group them with other documents of the seminary according to their common geographic location (Val-Saint-Benoît), and catalogued all of them under the letter G.

Documents may change locations not only when monasteries change hands, but also when archives change buildings. This happened in the mid-1960s when the AD de l’Allier—which houses by far the greatest number of Caulite documents—moved from Moulins-sur-Allier to a more modern building in the nearby suburb of Yzeure. This move precipitated a re-cataloguing of many documents, including those of the Caulite Order. This study uses the current shelfmarks, but scholars who wrote before the move will have used the older shelfmarks. This is true, for example, of Gautier’s article, mentioned in Chapter 2, the very purpose of which was to describe the Caulite documents at the AD de l’Allier. To avoid confusing scholars who may wish to refer to Gautier and/or other earlier works, Appendix A provides a concordance of the new and old shelfmarks for Caulite documents at Yzeure, AD de l’Allier.
The customary

Medieval monastic communities are often defined by the fact that they lived by a rule. In the West, the Rule of Benedict eventually became the most widely used rule for traditional monastic communities. At a certain point in its history, the Caulite community also adopted this rule—Chapter 7 discusses when and why they did this. But the Rule of Benedict, written in Italy in the sixth century, could not possibly account for every exigency in every situation in every locale in which people attempted to practice monasticism. For this reason, monastic communities created what is known as a customary: a set of rules, if you will, for following the Rule. The purpose of a customary was to meet the needs of a particular monastic community, and to address the issues of the time and place in which it was situated. Such adaptation seems to have been in keeping with Benedict’s intention, for he suggested as much at various points in his Rule. For example, he wrote that kitchen servers should receive help “as the size of the community or local conditions warrant;” and concerning clothing, he wrote that it should be issued “according to local conditions” and “what is available in the vicinity.”

The Caulite customary survives in two manuscript copies. The first of these manuscripts, Paris, BN, lat. 18047 (henceforth manuscript P), is written in Latin on parchment, in two hands of the thirteenth century, in French Gothic script. It contains a single text: the Caulite customary, which consists of 161 discrete chapters: a set of 64 brief, untitled, miscellaneous rules; statutes from the general chapters of 1238; two undated

---

2 For more on customaries, their history, form, and use as historical sources, as well as a thorough bibliography on the subject, see K. Hallinger, “Consuetudo. Begriff, Formen, Forschungsgeschichte. Inhalt,” in Untersuchungen zu Kloster und Stift, Studien zur Germania Sacra 14 (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980), 140-166. Hallinger has also edited numerous monastic customaries in the series Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum.

3 RB. ch. 35.

4 RB. ch. 55.
statutes, probably from the late thirteenth century; statutes from the years 1287 and 1289; and undated statutes from the fourteenth century. This manuscript belonged to the Caulite priory of Val-Croissant (Vallis crescents), whose name appears in the novice's oath of profession, folio 35v: “Ego frater .... in hoc loco qui vocatur Vallis crescents.” (I, brother ... in this place that is called Val-Croissant.) Folio 50v also bears witness to this fact with the following note in sixteenth-century script: “Ce p[resent] livre est à Notre Dame du Vault Croissant; qui le prandra daumnpé sera et en enfer ira.” (This present book belongs to Our Lady of Val-Croissant, whoever takes it will be damned and go to hell.)

The second manuscript, which is significantly different from manuscript P, is Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 232. Because the archives which hold it were once located in Moulins, scholars have traditionally called this manuscript M. It is written in Latin on parchment, in several hands of the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, in French Gothic script. It contains four sets of texts. The first of these is a copy of the martyrology of Usuard. Charles the Bald, Charlemagne's grandson, asked the Parisian monk Usuard († 877) to create this calendar of Christian martyrs with brief synopses of their lives, one for each day of the year. The original purpose of the martyrology was to help Christians keep track of when they should celebrate the feasts of the saints. The Caulite monks chose to record other important dates in the margins of their copy of the martyrology, for example, the days on which they commemorated the anniversary of their founders and other donors. Some scholars describing this portion of manuscript M have used the term “necrology.”
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Technically, a necrology is a list of persons who have died, as opposed to a martyrology, which is a list of martyrs, and/or the history of those martyrs’ lives. To be precise, the Caulite customary is a kind of hybrid of the two: the martyrology of Usuard, with the names of some Caulite monks and benefactors entered into its margins. Yet the list of names in the margins hardly seems complete enough to warrant calling this a necrology. For simplicity’s sake, I will use the term martyrology throughout. Chapter 4 discusses specific notations in the martyrology in more detail. The second text in manuscript M is the Rule of Benedict, which is followed by a list of Latin adverbs and prepositions, e.g., “Usquemodo. Alio modo. Quonammodo.” This latter is perhaps a mnemonic exercise, or short grammar lesson, which was appended to the Rule of Benedict for no other apparent reason than that there happened to be a blank sheet of parchment available. Following this word list is another page of penmanship practice with short notices such as “ego frater Lucas” (I, brother Luke). These are in different hands and have clearly been done over the centuries. Two papal bulls comprise the third set of texts in manuscript M. One is a copy of Innocent III’s bull of 1205, approving the Caulite Order, and then the first three lines of Honorius III’s bull of 1224, which mitigated the severity of the Caulite rule. Chapter 4 discusses the first of these in more detail; Chapter 7 discusses the second. The fourth text in manuscript M is the Caulite customary itself—though in a certain sense the entire volume is the Caulite customary. The customary includes 135 chapters found in manuscript P, though not entirely in the same order; two of the 64 untitled, miscellaneous rules found in manuscript P; statutes of the general chapters of 1262, 1263, 1260, 1266, 1269, 1268; a section which concerns Caulite conversi, or lay brothers; instructions for celebrating mass; instructions for calculating Easter; statutes of the general chapter of 1485; an illegible note written in a cursive hand; and finally more penmanship practice. Manuscript M belonged to the Caulite priory of Petit-Saint-Lieu (Sanctus Locus), whose
name appears in the novice’s oath of profession, folio 118r: “Ego frater .... in hoc loco qui vocatur Sancti loci” (I, brother .... in this place which is called Saint Lieu).

For a more detailed, archival description of each of these manuscripts, including foliation, collation, binding, decoration, bibliography, and history, see Appendix B. The Caulite customary also exists in three printed editions, which I will describe briefly, while at the same time referring the reader to Appendix C, which shows the relationship of the extant manuscripts to the various editions, and indicates sources which influenced the Caulite customary.

Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand published the first edition of the Caulite customary under the title "Antiquae constitutiones et quaedem decreta capitulorum generalium ordinis vallis caulis,” based on a manuscript that the editors had seen at the motherhouse of Val-des-Choux. For this reason, we might rightly consider Martène and Durand’s edition to be a third witness of the Caulite customary, a manuscript which is no longer extant, but which bears significant differences from manuscripts P and M (see Appendix C). Marian Brockie published the second edition of the customary under the title "Antiquae constitutiones ordinis vallis caulis.” Based on Martène and Durand’s edition, Brockie’s work has nothing significant to offer our inquiry. The best edition of the Caulite customary is Walter De Gray Birch’s *Ordinale convenais vallis caulium: The Rule of the Monastic Order of the Val des Choux*. Birch used manuscript P as the base document for his edition, and manuscript M as a supplementary document—to fill in the

---


9 Holste-Brockie, 3: 11-18. Holste died in 1661. His 1663 edition did not include any reference to the Caulite customary. In the marginalia on page 13. Brockie indicated that the “old codex” he was publishing was “apud Martène, Thes. anedc. Tomo. IV.” i.e., according to Martène’s edition. My thanks to Thomas Osterfield, Librarian of the Nashota House Library at the Episcopal Seminary in Nashota, Wisconsin, who tracked down this information from Holste’s rare edition.
blanks not accounted for in manuscript P (again, see Appendix C). Birch’s edition provides a useful reference tool, but it is not exhaustive. For although he was aware of Martène and Durand’s edition, Birch did not recognize it as a third witness to the customary. We can only conduct a thorough study of the Caulite customary when we use manuscripts P and M, in concert with Martène and Durand’s edition.

The charters

Evidence gleaned from charters comprises a good portion of this study. A charter, from the Latin *carta*, is a written record of a transaction. Hence the famous *Magna Carta* (Great Charter) is a record of the transaction in 1215 between King John and his English barons. The charters used in this study date from 1187 to 1305. This means they were written at a time when parchment was the standard medium for preserving written documents. Parchment is essentially processed animal skin, usually from sheep. Since one can only render so many sheets of parchment from any one sheep, it is costly material. For this reason, parchment users avoided waste whenever possible, i.e., a brief document was most often written on a small piece of parchment. The size of the charters used in this study ranged from as small as 4 x 10 cm to as large as 60 x 80 cm. Parchment is durable, and most of the charters concerning the Caulite Order remain in remarkably good condition, especially when one considers that they are between 700 and 800 years old. Some of the Caulite charters have water stains, which have caused the ink to fade; some are torn or have wormholes; flaws render their reading more difficult, and occasionally impossible. The bottom edge of almost all of the Caulite charters has been folded over, to form a sturdy flap. A slit has been cut in this flap, through which was once threaded a strip of parchment or silk thread, intended to carry a seal authenticating the charter (see the discussion on wax seals below). Very few Caulite charters still have seals attached, and this slit flap is the sole
remaining evidence of a once authenticated document. Obviously, many different scribes
did the actual writing of the Caulite charters, but in the late-twelfth and early thirteenth
centuries they all used variations of protogothic documentary script. From the mid- to late-
thirteenth century, charters begin to appear in variations of *cursiva anglica.* The earliest
charters used in this study were written in medieval Latin, but as the thirteenth century
progressed the vernacular Old French (*ancienne française*) came to be used more and more
in legal documents. Even as late as 1300, however, Latin was still in prominent use in
Caulite charters. This, then, is the physical description of the Caulite charters, the elements
of which may be used in concert to establish their authenticity. Now to describe the content
of those charters.

Charters are records of legal transactions. For the Caulite charters such transactions
included the gift, sale, trade, transfer of goods both movable (e.g., grain or money), and
immovable (e.g., land or houses). Charters might also record dispute resolutions
concerning those same goods. Often, presumably impartial third parties issued these
charters in the name of the authority of their office, for example, “I, Manasses, by the grace
of God, bishop of Langres, make known that [certain parties gathered before me agreed to
certain transactions].” Sometimes, though, the active participants in a transaction issued the
charter on their own authority. Either type of charter, i.e., those issued by third parties or by
active participants, were usually witnessed by interested parties, and bore such language as
“with the consent of my wife” or “my children approving.” Because charters often
named such witnesses and identified their relationship to the active participant, one by-
product of charters is their genealogical value—though the charters’ creators did not
provide this information for that purpose. Charters are useful as historical sources because
they were not intended for any audience other than those actively participating in the
transaction. This might include the heirs of those originally conducting the transaction, who
would have a legitimate future interest in the authenticity of the charter. For this reason, in
as far as we can trust their authenticity, charters are relatively free of bias. They used a precise, formulaic, and legalistic language, at times difficult to penetrate, but rarely intended to deceive. This is not to say that charters could not be forgeries. An interesting example of this is when Gauthier of Aignay, called “the Rich,” produced false letters claiming that he did not owe the Caulite monks what they claimed he owed them. When the duchess of Burgundy stepped in to resolve the dispute, Gauthier refused to produce these false letters. Yet even Gauthier’s forgery said what it meant to say, and could hardly be interpreted in more than one way, even if it was a lie. Contrast this with the bias one finds, for example, in a medieval (or even modern) biography, whose author might, consciously or unconsciously, change the story to make his subject look better in the eyes of history.

The vidimus

The third type of documentary source used in this study is the vidimus. The Latin term vidimus literally means, “we have seen.” A vidimus was a document in which a recognized authority attested, under his seal, that he had seen an earlier charter, i.e., the written record of an earlier transaction. That same authority then reproduced the text of the earlier charter in full, inserting it into a newer, sealed document, thus giving as much validity to the copy as to the original charter, and hence authenticating the earlier transaction. Since hand-writing styles have changed over the centuries, one advantage of the vidimus for its users was that it rendered the records of earlier transactions more accessible by copying those records into contemporary manuscript hands. One common reason for creating a vidimus was to provide documentary evidence in a dispute resolution. When such a dispute was to be resolved in some location other than the monastery, the monks likely felt more at ease sending an authenticated copy, the vidimus, rather than the original document. The

10 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245. Chapter 5 offers a more thorough treatment of this dispute.
very reason for the creation of the *vidimus*—to convince a third-party arbiter of the monastery’s case in the resolution of some dispute—makes it suspect as evidence.

Knowing the reputation of the party issuing the *vidimus*, and his or her relationship to the monastery, are our best hope of determining any bias, but these are often difficult to assess.

The best *vidimus* documents, as far as limiting bias, are those in which all parties in a dispute agree to the contents of the original charter, and attest to that fact in the *vidimus*.

Despite these limitations, the *vidimus* is indispensable to historians because many charters that are no longer extant in their original form have been preserved in the form of a *vidimus*.

From 431 recorded transactions used in this study, 11 are recorded in the form of a *vidimus*, and are not attested in any other form. Though the basic form of the *vidimus* remains the same, there can also be wide variation. A few examples may best illustrate this point.

A *vidimus* may record a transaction from the relatively recent past. For example, Joinville confirmed a transaction concerning the Caulite house of Remonvaux in January of 1256. But we only know about this transaction because he had issued a *vidimus* of that charter in October of 1294—a portion of which Joinville wrote in his own hand.\(^{11}\) In contrast, a *vidimus* may record a charter from the relatively distant past. Thus, in 1481, when John of Chateauvillain, lord of Thil, refused to make his rent payment in grain to the Caulite monastery at Val-Croissant, the prior of that monastery resolved the issue by reminding John that his ancestors, the lords of Thil, had been co-founders of Val-Croissant, and to prove his point, provided a *vidimus* of a charter dated 1254—the original promise for the grain payment.\(^{12}\) This is also an example of a *vidimus* in which both parties, i.e., the prior of Val-Croissant as well as the lord of Thil, agreed to the authenticity of the original charter. A *vidimus* might record a single transaction, as above, or it might record several.

---

\(^{11}\) Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 308: “ce fut escrit de ma mein.”

\(^{12}\) Dijon, BM, ms. 1891, fol. 139.
One example, an undated Caulite *vidimus*,\(^{13}\) contains copies of charters dated 1242 and 1254. Another *vidimus* lists ten transactions, dating from 1229 to 1280, and also provides an extreme example of the historical value of the *vidimus*. We know of these ten transactions from the thirteenth century only because of a document dated 24 October 1502,\(^ {14}\) which is a *vidimus* of a document dated September 1373, which is itself a *vidimus* of the ten original charters.

The language of a *vidimus* might also reveal aspects of medieval society that may have otherwise remained hidden. For example, in 1209, Odo III, the duke of Burgundy, granted to the Caulite monks the use of a certain portion of the forest surrounding their monastery at Val-des-Choux. In 1269, Odo’s son Hugh, who had become duke of Burgundy, wanted to re-confirm his father’s donation. He did this by issuing a *vidimus*, in which he stated that “We [i.e., Hugh] have seen and made to be read in our presence the letter of our lord and father Odo.”\(^ {15}\) This sentence from the *vidimus* could reveal something of the ducal court’s bureaucratic ritual. When certain documents were “made to be read” in a public setting, it emphasized their importance.

Sometimes monks transcribed their charters, not necessarily in the form of a *vidimus*, but simply to have back-up copies—and possibly for other reasons which we can never know. Based on the manuscript hands, some of these transcriptions of Caulite charters were done as late as the eighteenth century. We may therefore assume that these transcriptions, like the *vidimus*, were at the least intended to make the contents of earlier charters accessible to contemporaries, without forcing all of them to become experts in paleography. And, as with the *vidimus*, some of these transcriptions provide the only extant

---

\(^{13}\) Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 326: though undated, the manuscript hand is from the thirteenth century.

\(^{14}\) Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H 1002/2.

\(^{15}\) Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 273: “nos vidimus et legi fecimus coram nobis litteras domini et patris nostri Odonis.”
copy of a thirteenth-century charter. Unfortunately, without knowing their intended purpose, it is difficult to know how far we should trust such documents.

The cartularies

When transcriptions of original charters were collated in one place it is called a cartulary, i.e., a collection of *cartae*.\(^{16}\) Accessibility was the hallmark of the cartulary. It collected documents into a single codex, or sometimes into several codices, rendered in a contemporary manuscript hand. Monks created cartularies for a variety of reasons, and organized them according to various schemas. Robert Berkhofer has suggested that a cartulary’s organization can reveal something of the *mentalité* of its creators. His research has shown that monks organized their cartularies based on three distinct patterns: chronologically, by grantor, and by land. Chronologically-based cartularies organized charters according to when they were composed, or perhaps grouped charters together based on the reign of an abbot. Such cartularies would be useful in writing the history of a monastery, or the *gesta* of an abbot. Grantor-based cartularies organized charters according to the rank of their donors, i.e., papal charters came first, then royal, then episcopal, then ducal, etc. Such cartularies offered protection to the monastery’s patrimony, and were useful tools when monks had to travel to court to defend challenges to their ownership. Land-based cartularies organized charters according to the lands that they concerned, for example, grouping together the lands surrounding a certain estate or village. According to Berkhofer, land-based cartularies became more common in the twelfth and thirteenth

centuries, and reveal economic thinking on the part of the monks who created them.\textsuperscript{17} The Caulite cartularies discussed below are all land-based cartularies.

Sometimes the marginalia of cartularies contained synopses of the charters' contents, and even physical descriptions of the charters, e.g., "the hanging lead seal is attached with yellow silk."\textsuperscript{18} Such descriptions can be especially useful in helping to authenticate charters from which the seals have been removed. Like the \textit{vidimus}, the cartulary sometimes provides our only witness to a no-longer-extant original charter. Unlike the \textit{vidimus}, the cartulary was not prepared as evidence for the resolution of a specific dispute, but with all possible future contingencies in mind. For this reason cartularies are somewhat more reliable as documentary evidence, though they may also contain forgeries—made that much more difficult to detect because we cannot rely on paleographic methods, but must depend on contradictory internal evidence.

This study relied on five Caulite cartularies. The first of these, Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 215-221, is the so-called Grand Cartulary, mentioned in Chapter 2, which consists of seven volumes, written in a clear and easily-legible manuscript hand of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{19} By the 1750s, the Caulite Order was in serious decline, and in order to save whatever could be saved, it was joined in 1764 to the Cistercian house of Sept-Fons, located just east of Moulins-sur-Alliers. The Grand Cartulary was created after this union, between 1776 and 1780, "at the request of the palace counselors of the king in his court of parliament, to renew or confirm the lands, to collate the old and new titles."\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{17} R. Berkhofer. "From Sacred to Managed Patrimony." paper presented at the 35th International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 4 May 2000, cited here with permission.
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 215, p. 9.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} See Stein. \textit{Cartulaires français}, 286. nos. 2076-77.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 215, p. 1.
\end{itemize}
\end{flushleft}
Grand Cartulary, all the extant documents at the motherhouse of Val-des-Choux, as well as the filial priories of Vauclair, Beaupré, and Remonvaux (the only Caulite houses still affiliated with the motherhouse in 1764) were moved to the abbey at Sept-Fons, where they would be copied. Two notaries, François Bouillier de Dompierre and François Alamartine de Pierrefitte, directed the copying, and approved every page of the cartulary by their signatures. The Grand Cartulary contains transcriptions of documents that date from the early thirteenth century up to 1776, with several documents that specifically concern the union of the Caulite Order with the monastery of Sept-Fons. For our purposes, there are 85 transcriptions of charters from the thirteenth century, 70 of which also survive in original charters. This means that we can verify the authenticity of 82% of the thirteenth-century charters found in the Grand Cartulary, and make an argument for the accuracy of those transcriptions. This is important because 15 of the thirteenth-century charters transcribed in the Grand Cartulary (18%) have no other witness, i.e., the original is no longer extant. All things being equal, we assume that Bouillier and Alamartine were as diligent with their transcriptions of these unattested documents as they were with the others.

Two adaptations of the Grand Cartulary exist. The first of these is at Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 32 H 5; the second is at Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H cart 235 bis. Both of these cartularies were created under the supervision of Bouillier and Alamartine. They appear to be condensed versions of the first two volumes of the Grand Cartulary (AD de l'Allier, H 215-216), for they do not contain transcriptions of each and every document contained in those codices. The pages of these two cartularies are numbered consecutively in the upper, outer corner of every page, but there are also page numbers on the upper, inner corners of each page (near the binding). These inner-numbers are not consecutive, but they seem to correspond to page numbers in the Grand Cartulary. Because these cartularies are located in three different archives, a more detailed comparative analysis was not possible. It seems likely, however, that these two cartularies are merely
abbreviated versions of the first two volumes of the Grand Cartulary. Just looking at the difference in size one can guess that our eighteenth-century scribes could not possibly have fit every charter in the two larger volumes at Yzeure into the single volumes at Chaumont and Dijon. They must have copied select documents into the Chaumont and Dijon exemplars, though why such an abbreviated format was necessary needs further investigation. Thankfully, the intent of these eighteenth-century scribes is not our purpose here. We can note, however, that all of the thirteenth-century charters transcribed into these condensed cartularies are also transcribed in the Grand Cartulary. In other words, there is no news here.

One of the Caulite filial priories, the monastery of La Genevroye, produced a small cartulary, Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or. 66 H 1002/1. It was composed on paper, bound in parchment, written in brown ink in a seventeenth-century cursive hand. It records 16 transactions from the thirteenth century, dating from 1216 to 1266. Its pages are foliated in the upper right hand corner, from 1 to 42, but the folios 11, 18, 19, 20, 21, 32, 33, and 34 are missing. The cartulary of La Genevroye provides the only witness to the transactions it records.

The last of the five Caulite cartularies might have been the most interesting for our purposes, but, alas, it is lost to us. What we have is an unpublished analysis of this cartulary by an érudit of the eighteenth century, Jean-Baptiste Peincedé (d. 1820). According to the title page of his thirty-six-volume Inventaire de la chambre des comptes de Bourgogne, Peincedé was a counselor to the king, a “garde-honoraire” of the books, titles, and papers of the chamber of accounts of the Duchy of Burgundy, and of the territories of Bresse, Bugey, Gex and Dombes.21 Two years before the Revolution, in April of 1787, Peincedé bought a cartulary from a bookseller in Dijon named Duberney, who

---

21 Peincedé. 1: 1.
claimed to have bought the cartulary along with other old books from the library of a certain Monsieur de Clugny de Thenissey. According to Peincédé’s description, the cartulary consisted of 130 documents, dating from 1195 to 1271; it was written on vellum (a type of parchment), around the year 1290, and came from “la maison du Val-des-Choux.” A man of honor, Peincédé intended to return the cartulary to its rightful owner. He passed the cartulary on to a lawyer named Bonnard—who was legal counsel to the abbey of Sept-Fons—and charged Bonnard with returning the cartulary to that same abbey, which by 1787 had been the “guardian” of the Caulite Order for over a decade. For the cause of historiography, this turned out to be a bad decision. We have no reason to doubt that Bonnard fulfilled his task, but since the Revolution, the cartulary has disappeared. Bouillier and Alamartine had already completed their “Grand Cartulary” by 1780, so the charters in Peincédé’s cartulary find were not copied in those volumes. Our one stroke of good fortune in this tale is that, before attempting to return the cartulary to Sept-Fons, Peincédé’s curiosity as a man of letters caused him to analyze the cartulary’s contents.

Peincédé did not transcribe the documents verbatim, but offered synopses of each charter’s content, citing the dates, the names of the main agents involved, and the gist of the transactions, e.g., the amount of grain given, and when it should be collected. This is all useful information, but it is obviously dependent on which information Peincédé deemed important at that moment in time. Without the original cartulary, we cannot know what Peincédé deemed unimportant, i.e., what he may have left out. And for better or worse, such value judgments for the writing of history are constantly in flux. Nonetheless, we know that 55 of the 130 documents described in Peincédé’s analysis (roughly 42%), are attested either by originals or by copies. Peincédé also listed 7 of 14 donors and their gifts cited in a bull of Innocent III, dated 10 May 1210, which was intended to confirm those gifts. Comparing

---

22 Peincédé, 28.2: 1151.
original charters to Peincedé’s analysis of them allows us to assess the usefulness of Peincedé’s work for the purpose of this study. In my estimation, Peincedé seems to have been a conscientious scholar, and there seems to be no reason not to accept his analysis of the 75 charters in his *Inventaire* for which there exists no other witness. Many of the otherwise unattested charters in Peincedé happen to be those concerning the earliest days of the Caulite Order. Of the seventeen charters used in this study dating between 1195 and 1205, we know of eight based on Peincedé’s analysis—thus making it an invaluable primary source.

Though I have included Peincedé’s analysis in this discussion of Caulite cartularies, it might more accurately be considered an inventory of documents, which offer synopses of charters, rather than verbatim transcriptions. This brings us to a discussion of the fourth type of documentary source used in this study.

*The documentary inventories*

For some charters, the only trace of their existence comes to us in the form of a documentary inventory. These are not complete transcriptions of original charters, but consist of synopses of a charter’s content. In a certain sense, such inventories are a kind of *vidimus* once removed: we trust the authenticity of the document described in the inventory in direct proportion to the authority we give the creator of that inventory.

The Caulites created one such inventory at Val-des-Choux in the year 1738—i.e., before the Caulite Order was joined to Sept-Fons in 1764, hence before the Caulite archives were moved to that monastery. A comparison of this inventory with the Grand Cartulary

---

23 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40. The foliation in this inventory is as follows: fol. 1-37 are numbered in the upper right hand corner in blue ink, though not all folios are numbered; then come ten folios numbered with Roman numerals, i- x. also in blue ink. The foliation in blue ink is a modern addition and will be identified as such if used in later citations. The remainder of the inventory was foliated at the time of production (1738), in brown ink in the upper right-hand corner, starting again at the number 1 and continuing through number 444.
created for Sept-Fons shows that several documents must have been lost in the move, or at least before the move took place. While the inventory only provides synopses of transactions, at least half of these synopses are attested by original charters. The high percentage of accuracy in these synopses lends credibility to the inventory. The inventory also attests to some of the documents listed in Peincedé, for which there is no other original, hence lending more credence to Peincedé’s analysis. A second inventory, created specifically for the union with Sept-Fons, is not nearly as thorough in its treatment of documents from the thirteenth century.²⁴

*Seals, funerary reliefs, and churches*

The creators of medieval charters authenticated those charters by attaching to the document the seal of some authority or authorities—e.g., the duke or bishop. These seals, distinct in design for each authority, were cast in wax or lead, and were attached to the original document by means of a separate strip of parchment, or at times by colorful silk threads. Signatures might be forged, but a seal was not as easily duplicated. Also, a seal offered recognizable, visual representations that no doubt were more accessible to a society still largely illiterate. Time has not been so kind to the seals once attached to the Caulite charters. Of the hundreds of charters I examined for this study, a pitiful few still had seals attached. These included exemplars of seals for the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux, as well as for the filial priories of Clairlieu, Petit-Saint-Lieu, Val-Croissant, and Vausse.²⁵ It seems apparent that many of those seals struck in wax became brittle and crumbled away; but many more fell prey to antiquaries and collectors. One can appreciate the collectors’

²⁴ Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H Inv 218.

²⁵ These are reproduced in A. Coulon. *Inventaire des sceaux de la Bourgogne* (Paris, 1912), plates 57, 59.
attraction (while at the same time deploring their practice), for those few seals that remain are both interesting and beautiful. These seals can provide insight into the mentalité of the Caulite monks, since the symbols used to represent the authority of the prior of each house reflected a particular system of beliefs. The analysis of such objects as seals is more often the province of art historians, yet seals might also serve purely historical purposes. As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, I am not so much interested in the artistic form of seals, but in what their content can provide.

Another Caulite objet d'art, the funerary relief, can also contribute to our study. This study uses two funerary reliefs, which probably offer the only extant representations of Caulite monks. The first of these once adorned the side of the tomb of two of Odo III's children. The second was a bas-relief depicting the funeral of Gauthier of Sully, founder of the filial priory of Val-Saint-Benoît.

Finally, this study uses the architecture of Caulite churches as a visual source. Again, my purpose is not art historical. In using architecture as a text, I hope to gain an understanding of the inner workings of the Caulite Order: from the relationship of regional benefactors to the Order as a whole, to the Caulites conception of piety as reflected in architectural styles. The rapid growth and expansion of the Order throughout France and into other countries—over 20 monasteries in 50 years—might lead one to believe that the design of Caulite churches followed a certain, uniform style. In fact, there is a range of variation that is surprising, and most certainly meaningful. Some of the discussion of

26 To the best of my knowledge, no Caulite seals are preserved in public or private collections, but this issue deserves further research.

27 This funeral relief, once at the motherhouse of Val-des-Choux, is now lost to us. A rendering of it is published in A. Kleinclausz, "L'art funéraire de la Bourgogne au Moyen Âge." Gazette des Beaux-Arts 27 (1902): 309-311.

28 This bas-relief, once in the chapel at Val-Saint-Benoît, was moved to the Chateau de Sully in nearby Sully. It is published in P. Muguet, "Le prieuré du Val-Saint-Benoît," Mémo. soc. ed. 35 (1907): 208-209.
Caulite architecture relies on descriptions and illustrations of churches no longer extant. Whenever possible, I have taken photographs during on-site visits to the ruins of Caulite monasteries, including Clairlieu, Épeau, Genevroye, Uchon, Val-Croissant, Val-Dieu, Val-des-Choux, Val-Saint-Benoît, and Vausse.

**Lacunae**

There are certain types of sources we might like to have, but do not. We do not have, nor is there any indication that the Caulite monks ever created, a chronicle. It is still possible, even relatively easy, to discuss the Caulites in a chronological context, but without a chronicle it is difficult to assess the Caulites' own sense of their place in history. For example, one of the great events of the early thirteenth century was the Battle of Bouvigne in 1214, in which the French king Philip-Auguste defeated King John of England, significantly diminishing English influence in France. Odo III, duke of Burgundy, who was the temporal founder of the first Caulite monastery and who kept close ties to it, played an important part in the battle of Bouvigne. Without a Caulite chronicle, we cannot say whether the Caulites had any knowledge of this important moment in history, or whether their isolation, their withdrawal from the world, was so successful and complete that they were oblivious to the fact. We also do not have, nor is there any indication that there ever existed, a *Vita*, or life, of the spiritual founder of the Caulite Order—as we do for Gilbert of Sempringham, founder of the Gilbertines, or with Francis of Assisi, founder of the Friars Minor, both of whom were roughly contemporary with the Caulite founder. Rather than pretending to any sense of objectivity or biographical truth, such *vitae* are most often hagiographic, laudatory, and full of bias. They can, nonetheless, offer insight into the mentality of a religious community's earliest members, usually that generation just after an
order's foundation. Lack of a chronicle or a *vita* does not make our task impossible, but it does make it more challenging.

*Manuscript preservation or fruit preserves?*

Charters from the Caulite filial monasteries of Vausse provide a charming anecdote on how one of France's most prolific historians started his career. Shortly after the French Revolution, Vausse became the home of the Petit family, whose most famous son, Ernest (1835-1918), would grow up to write a nine volume history of the dukes of Burgundy.29 As a young boy visiting his grandfather for the summer, Ernest discovered that the family servant had used scraps of parchment covered with curious handwriting as lids for her fruit preserves. Petit was intrigued by these strange pieces, and committed himself then and there to learn to read them.30 And the rest, as they say, is history. Petit had an upper level built in the chapel at Vausse, which became his study (see Figure 3.1), where, according to one fellow historian, Petit had "placed a billiard table, and all visitors could come there to visit and work."31 From this study, Petit wrote passionately about the history of his family home—he even adopted the design from the seal of Vausse’s prior as a kind of professional emblem.32 He catalogued and synopsized charters from his archives at Vausse in an inventory that for some of these charters remains our only trace. For example, Petit cited a cartulary of Vausse containing charters from 1204 up to the sixteenth

---


32 This design appears on the title page of each volume of Petit's *Histoire*. 
century, which he intended to publish but apparently never did. I have been unable to locate this cartulary, but the entry in Petit's inventory at least suggests a foundation date for Vausse, or at least a very early transaction, dated 1204. In an article concerning Vausse, Petit published several charters from the thirteenth century—rescued from the servant's unwitting designs—including a confirmation of Vausse's foundation charter.

---

33 Petit, Chartes, manuscrits, autographes, documents historiques sur la Bourgogne faisant partie d'un collection particuliere (Dijon 1886). The missing cartulary is described on p. 104: "1204-1600—Cartulaire du prieuré de Vausse, ordre du Val-des-Choux, extrait de divers fonds (sera publié). Chartres de 1204 jusqu'au XVIème siècle: liste des prieurs et notices; tables des noms; 8 photographies et vue; plans; 8 dessins de pierres tombal; recouvert de velours bleu semé de fleur de lys d'argent, fermoirs; doré en tete, non rogné."

34 Petit, "Vausse," 82-88. The foundation charter of Vausse is also edited in H. de Chastellux, Histoire Généalogique de la Maison de Chastellux (Auxerre, 1869), 327-328; and is cited in M. Quantin, Cartulaire Général de l'Yonne, Receuil de pièces pour faire suite au cartulaire général de l'Yonne, XIIIe s. (Auxerre and Paris, 1873), 3: 428.
These, then, are the sources, documentary and visual, which I will use in this study. Many of the charters mentioned above contain numbers, e.g., the number of measures of wine donated or the number of parts of a tithe. The available charters themselves are relatively numerous. This quantity of data might lead one to attempt a quantitative study, but I have chosen not to do so. The very accident of these documents’ survival—at eight hundred years of religious wars and revolutions and just plain moving about—implies that the results of any quantitative analysis would be skewed. Where possible, and useful, I will use what numbers exist. For the most part, though, the conclusions drawn in the following chapters are purely qualitative, my own impressions after spending some time with the sources.
CHAPTER 4

THE TWO FOUNDERS OF VAL-DES-CHOUX

Novice: What is a monk?
Master: A monk is someone who rises every day and asks, ‘What is a monk?’

—Anonymous

Introduction

The history of Christian monasticism is a history of contrasting visions, which struggled (among other things) to answer the question, “what is a monk?” Rather than jump in and attempt to nail down such details as who founded Val-des-Choux and when, it seems more prudent to approach these questions from the long range. As this chapter will reveal, the foundation of the Caulite Order was not so much a fixed historical event as it was a process—one that transpired within a greater historical context. Thus, to appreciate the Caulite response to the question “what is a monk?”, i.e., to understand the motives of the Caulite founders, we must start by reviewing how others, over time, have answered that same question.

Following this brief historical survey, I will unravel the question of the foundation at Val-des-Choux. This will include a discussion of the monastery’s legendary origins, the extent to which the historical evidence supports those origins, and an alternative foundation theory. The chapter ends with a discussion of Val-des-Choux’s two founders: the one spiritual, the other temporal.
A quick history of medieval monasticism

Some argue that the beginnings of monasticism in the West came when Christians, fearing Roman persecution, e.g., under Diocletian, fled to the desert in order to more safely practice their faith. Others maintain that the first monks sought to flee from the lax practices and careerism that developed after Christianity had become the official religion of the Roman Empire under Constantine.¹ The core of monastic life is asceticism: a denial of the flesh and the worldly in order to achieve spiritual perfection. Hence, whatever secular pressures the earliest Christian monks may have been responding to, the inspiration for that response came from the Scriptures: John the Baptist in the wilderness, Christ in the desert. The Greek word for desert, “eremos,” gives us eremitic, whence the English word hermit.² The Greek “monos,” meaning solitary, gives us the word monk (Latin: monachus).³

Which brings us to the first of several contrasting visions of monastic life, namely, just how alone a monk in the desert should be: completely alone, living in solitude as a hermit? Or alone with others, living in a community apart from the rest of the world?

¹ Saint Jerome (c. 331-420) was one advocate of the idea that the earliest monks were refugees from Roman persecution; see Lawrence. 1-2.


The earliest answers to this question came from the 'founders' of Christian monasticism, who are appropriately called the 'Desert Fathers'. The first of these was Anthony (c. 251-356), who began his monastic vocation in Egypt in the last quarter of the third century, living as a hermit in a tomb. Anthony, like most hermits, learned the eremitic life from a spiritual master. This shows that even in Anthony's day the eremitic life was not lived entirely alone. Hermits often created loosely formed communities called lauræ, from a Greek word meaning 'pathway', in which individuals apparently walked a path from their hermits' caves to gather in a common place for weekly prayer. Yet the essence of Anthony's monasticism was isolation, even from other members of the laura. Though there were many hermits in Anthony's time, the more common form of monasticism was life in community. Pachomius (c. 292-346), Anthony's contemporary, was the most influential advocate of the communal life. Pachomius had also started out as a hermit, but his laura soon attracted so many followers that he was forced to develop a different form of monastic life. He had been a conscript in the Roman army before his conversion to Christianity, and it was this experience which likely led Pachomius to structure his monastic community in a quasi-military fashion. Unlike Anthony, Pachomius wrote a rule for his monks. The large Pachomian community was sub-divided into houses of twenty monks, each with its own spiritual leader, while Pachomius remained the leader of the community as a whole. Obedience to the leader, which entailed surrender of the will, became an important element of Pachomian monasticism, as did regular, daily communal prayer, which contrasted with the isolated prayer and meditation of Antonian monasticism. Work also took on greater significance, both as a means of salvation and as a way of supporting the monastery. This communal form of monasticism came to be known as coenobitic, from the Greek

---

“koinos bios”, meaning common life. After visiting Pachomius’ monastery, Basil founded his own community circa 357 at Caesarea, in Asia Minor. Basil based his community on a much smaller scale of the coenobitic model. He saw the monastic community as one family under one roof, under the authority of one spiritual father. While recognizing the value of eremiticism, Basil preferred the community life. According to Basil, if a monk lived alone, as a hermit, he would never have the opportunity to practice Christian charity and mercy, since he would never be confronted with the shortcomings of his fellow humans. Basil’s community became an example to others, and he preserved the regulations of his community in two rules, one longer, one shorter. While the hermit continued to play an important role in the Eastern Orthodox Church, in Europe, Basil’s model became the norm.5

When monasticism arrived on the European continent, the discourse concerning its eremitic and coenobitic strains continued. The writings about the Desert Fathers played an important role in the transmission of monastic ideals to Europe. Athanasius’s *The Life of Anthony* popularized the eremitic life, as did the “sayings of the fathers” collected in such works as the *Apophthegmata*6 or John Cassian’s *Conferences*. Not only writings from the East, but monks themselves came to the West and began to establish monasteries. Hilary of Poitiers (c. 315-367) founded the first of these in Gaul, after fleeing the Eastern Empire during the rise of the Arian heresy. Hilary became the patron of Martin of Tours (d. 397).

---

5 Note, however, that eremiticism never entirely disappeared in the West, and often existed within coenobitic communities. For example, monks might take eremitic retreats after long periods of living in a coenobitic setting; or hermits might be permanent residents of coenobitic communities, living perhaps on the outskirts of the monastery, but under the abbot’s authority. See G. Constable, “The Study of Monastic History Today,” in V. Mudroch and G. Couse, eds., *Essays on the Reconstruction of Medieval History* (Montreal and London, 1974), 31.

Sulpicius Severus’s popular Life of Martin gave the West its first cynosure of the monastic ideal. Even after Martin became Bishop of Tours, he insisted on living as a hermit. Sometime after 372, he established a community of hermits that in many aspects resembled an eastern laura. John Cassian also became a transplant to the West. He saw eremiticism as a higher form of monastic life, though he did not believe one should enter that life without sufficient training. Hence circa 410, when Cassian established twin monasteries in Gaul (one for men, one for women), he based them on the coenobitic model. About a century after Cassian’s foundations in Gaul, there appeared in Italy a man whose writing would exercise the greatest influence on Western monasticism—though not during his own lifetime. This was Benedict of Nursia (c. 480-550). Benedict was like the monastic leaders mentioned above, as well as many others drawn to the monastic life in the early Middle Ages. He began his vocation as a hermit, attracted followers, and at some point found it necessary or useful to set down the guidelines for his monastic community in the form of a rule. He began the first chapter of his Rule by entering the discourse concerning coenobitic and eremitic monasticism. Benedict admired the eremitic life, but described it as one that should only be entered into “after a long testing time in the monastery.”

Benedict tells us that he wrote his Rule for coenobites, whom he described as “the strongest kind [of monk].”

Benedict and his Rule might have fallen into obscurity had it not been for his biography, written roughly half a century after his death by Pope Gregory I, the Great (590-

---


8 RB, ch. 1: “… monasterii probatione diuturna.”

9 RB, ch.1: “… ad coenobitarum fortissimum genus.”
604). Gregory had himself been a monk, and was a tireless promoter of monasticism. The popularity of his *Vita Benedicti* influenced many monastic founders to adopt Benedict’s Rule.\textsuperscript{10} Years of scholarship now render it a practical certainty that Benedict based his Rule on the so-called Rule of the Master.\textsuperscript{11} Yet where the Master’s Rule was verbose and strict, Benedict adapted it with elegance, practicality, and humanity. The core of Benedictine life consisted of a balance between prayer and work (*ora et labora*). Benedict’s Rule eventually became the standard in the West, but not solely on account of its merits; which leads us to the next set of contrasting visions on monasticism: the role of the monk in the world.

Benedict’s Rule was not unique or widely used during his own lifetime. Even after its endorsement by Gregory I, other monastic rules continued to exercise just as much influence, for example the mixed rules in Gaul and Spain. The turning point for the role of Benedict’s Rule in Western monasticism came with the Carolingian Dynasty. In his attempt (in a sense) to recreate the Roman Empire, Charlemagne (768-814) had consolidated vast territories in the West, but he needed some way to control them. For this reason, and also because of his personal piety, Charlemagne hoped to reform the church and use it as an instrument of government. Part of his plan included standardizing monastic practice throughout the empire. Charlemagne’s father, Pepin (752-68), had already ordered all Carolingian monasteries to adopt the Rule of Benedict, but older traditions were slow to change. It was up to Charlemagne’s son, Louis the Pious (814-840), to fulfill this plan. He did so thanks in large part to the work of a Gothic monk named Witiza (751-821), whose admiration for Benedict’s Rule led him to adopt the name Benedict of Aniane. Under this second Benedict’s leadership, Carolingian synods imposed the Rule of the first Benedict on


all Carolingian monasteries—to the exclusion of all other rules. In spite of their zeal for
Benedict’s Rule, the success of the emperor and his monk at imposing the Rule also had the
effect of altering its essence. No longer were monasteries autonomous, as they had been in
the days of the original Benedict. Carolingian monasteries became subject to the power of
an abbot-general, who was backed by the secular emperor. Since Gallic monasticism had
exercised great influence on Benedict of Aniane, the monastic liturgy itself began to change.
No longer was there a balance between prayer and work, as the original Benedict had
prescribed. Carolingian monasteries spent more time in prayer, and considerably less time
working. Lay lords had long founded monasteries with the expectation that the monks of
the new foundation would pray for their eternal souls. Medieval theologians had
constructed an economy of salvation, in which sinners—e.g., a monastery’s
founders—could apply the vicarious merit of the monks to themselves. Louis the Pious
was not the first to found monasteries for this reason, but he was the first to attempt it on an
imperial scale. If all the monks of the empire were to pray for the salvation of that empire,
then it was important that they pray in the appropriate fashion. For Louis, this meant
Benedict’s Rule.

During the 840s, the Carolingian Empire went into decline. After the death of Louis
the Pious, his three sons battled for control of the empire—which eventually led to its
division into three parts. Around the same time, new invaders struck the empire: Vikings
from the north, Muslims from the south, Magyars from the east. The fragile economic and
political base upon which the Carolingians had built their empire began to crumble. Its
monastic network also collapsed. Monasteries fell under the control of local strongmen,
who exploited the monasteries’ economic resources but did little to support their spiritual
mission. A few monasteries of the Carolingian Renaissance thrived—Fulda, Saint Gall,
Reichenau—but for the most part it seemed as if Western monasticism might be seriously threatened. The founding of Cluny changed that.

Duke William of Aquitaine founded the monastery of Cluny in 909. In contrast to Carolingian practice, the founder relinquished all rights to the monastery for himself and his heirs. Instead, Cluny was put under the authority of Peter and Paul, i.e., the apostolic see, the Pope. During the tenth and eleventh centuries, Cluny would become the head of a monastic dynasty, with hundreds of houses throughout Western Europe, all answering to the abbot of Cluny. In many ways, Cluny was also the spiritual center of Western Christendom in the eleventh century. The Cluniacs believed that humanity could not be cured of its sinful tendencies, and that the only path to salvation was to become a monk. This idea attracted numerous wealthy benefactors, who—based on their understanding of the economy of salvation—wanted the Cluniacs to pray for them, the more the better. This led to the development of an elaborate liturgy, which eventually dominated Cluniac practice. In spite of the Cluniacs’ intention to restore the Benedictine life, oratio became more important than labor. Thanks to the popularity of their prayer, the Cluniacs attracted many benefactors throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries. They became wealthy and powerful, integrated into the secular world, even, as some have argued, to the point of becoming “feudal” lords.¹²

During the last half of the eleventh century and the first half of the twelfth, several concerned observers wondered whether Cluniac monasticism was the best path to salvation, leading them once again to ask, “what is a monk?” The response to this question between 1050 and 1150 led to what some scholars have labeled the “crisis of coenobitism” or the

According to the “crisis” argument, wealth and power had corrupted Cluniac monasticism, and the only response to this—the only way to “fix” monastic life—was to return to the simplicity and poverty of the desert. This “return to the desert” took many forms. Some found inspiration in the Desert Fathers, such as the foundation of hermits at Camaldoli, which was organized along the lines of the ancient lauras. Others, such as the monks at Vallombrosa, rediscovered asceticism through their strict adherence to Benedict’s Rule. Still others based their new forms of monasticism on a model from the early church that came to be known as the vida apostolica, the life of the apostles. The forms of this life were varied, but its essence came from a description of the apostolic community in Acts, 2:42-45:

They devoted themselves to the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers ... All who believed were together and had all things in common; they would sell their possessions and goods and distribute the proceeds to all, as any had need.

Following this, the practitioners of the vida apostolica devoted themselves to poverty and itinerant preaching. The religious ferment of the eleventh and twelfth centuries provides many such examples, more than so brief a survey of monastic history can afford. Hence, let me focus on the two most successful of these new movements, the Cistercians and the

Carthusians, whose more direct roles in the foundation of the Caulite Order deserve special attention.

The impulse toward a simpler life led Robert of Molesme and a small group of his followers, in 1098, to found a new monastery at Citeaux—dedicated to poverty and isolation from the world—which would grow into the Cistercian Order. The Cistercians sought out the most desolate sites they could find, in hopes of recreating a desert existence, one that rejected corporate wealth and secular entanglements. They longed to return to a "purer" interpretation of Benedict's rule, which they imagined had been practiced in some indistinct, earlier time. This "new monastery" struggled at first, but the charismatic leadership of Bernard of Clairvaux revitalized the Cistercian movement, and recruitment became phenomenal. With such rapid growth, however, came the need for greater organization. The Cistercians developed a framework for supervising their monasteries, by which each abbey was responsible for the others. This was a kind of confederation, as opposed to the direct hierarchy of the Cluniacs, with the abbot of Cluny at the head. Supervision of Cistercian filial houses was accomplished through regular annual meetings called general chapters, which were held at Citeaux. Initially, the Cistercians required all of their abbots to attend the general chapter, but with the expansion of the order, greater and greater distances from Citeaux made this difficult to realize. As the Cistercian Order grew, it became the main challenger to the once prominent Cluniacs, and the discourse of "what is a monk?" took fire in an exchange of letters between Bernard of Clairvaux, on behalf of Citeaux, and Peter the Venerable, on behalf of Cluny. Although their correspondence points to the differences between the two orders, they shared many similarities. For example, while both claimed strict adherence to the Rule of Benedict, both nonetheless altered the Rule to suit

---

their needs, e.g., the Cluniacs by altering the liturgy, the Cistercians by introducing lay brothers, known as *conversi*, into their workforce. In the end, the very popularity of Cistercians made them susceptible to the same criticism that had befallen the Cluniacs. Lay lords, pleased with the Cistercians’ civilizing influence in their most forsaken territories, granted them special privileges and exemptions from certain tithes. The Cistercians turned these advantages into economic success, especially through their employment of *conversi*, who at some monasteries numbered in the hundreds, and whose effective land reclamation led to an increase in Cistercian properties. The short version of the story is that Cistercian success economically soon made them seem not aspure spiritually, and the Cistercians soon found critics who compared them to the old Benedictines, i.e., the Cluniacs. At a certain point in their history, the Caulites would adopt Cistercian practices—e.g., general chapters and *conversi*—but not without exercising their own critique of the Cistercians by adapting these practices.

If the Cistercians were the most prominent coenobitic revival of the twelfth century, then their eremitic equivalent in that period was surely the Carthusians.¹⁵ The patriarch of the Carthusians was Bruno of Cologne, who left his post at the cathedral school at Reims circa 1080 to join a group of hermits living in the forest of Colan. A few years later, Bruno moved the community of hermits to a more isolated spot, high in a valley in the Alps, which he had received from the Bishop of Grenoble. Destiny had other plans for Bruno, who was called to the Roman Curia in 1090 by Pope Urban II, Bruno’s former student. In Bruno’s absence, it looked as if the alpine hermitage might die out, but a new arrival named Guigues du Pin, more commonly called Guigo, kept this from happening. While Bruno was the

---

patriarch of the Carthusian Order, Guigo was more rightly its founder. Guigo corresponded with many religious leaders, including Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable. In 1132, a great avalanche killed several of the brothers at the hermitage, and the community moved to a site known as the Grande Chartreuse, whence the order's name. Even before this move, the community attracted followers and began to grow. Soon the need to set down their practice in writing became evident, and Guigo set his hand to the task in 1128. The Carthusians drew their customs from many sources, including the Benedictine liturgy, the Camaldolese eremitic practices, and the Cistercian general chapter. The essence of Carthusian life was a unique combination of the eremitic and coenobitic forms. In the beginning, Carthusian hermits lived in separate huts, but over the course of the twelfth century they settled on a monastery design that essentially remained unchanged throughout the history of their order. Carthusian monasteries were comprised of individual hermit cells, each with its own small garden plot and latrine. These cells were separated by a high stone wall, and arranged side-by-side around a common cloister, next to the church. Every evening, the community would come together for Vespers. On Sundays and high feasts they would gather for mass and a chapter meeting, and then dine together in the refectory. Other than this, the rule was solitude. The focus was the contemplative life, or vita contemplativa. The Carthusians adopted the use of conversi to run the monastery and handle relations with the outside world. Hoping to avoid the necessity of large endowments, they limited the size of their communities to thirteen monks (in imitation of Christ and the twelve apostles) and sixteen lay brothers.

The expansion of the Cistercian and Carthusian Orders reveals something about their relative popularity. By the end of the twelfth century, the Cistercian Order had grown to over 500 monasteries, while the Carthusians had fewer than 40. That Cistercian foundations were especially strong in Burgundy should not be surprising, since Cîteaux itself was founded in Burgundy, as were its "oldest daughters": La Ferté, Pontigny,
Clairvaux, and Morimond. The Carthusians, on the other hand, were relative newcomers to Burgundy. One of their foundations from this period of expansion in the last half of the twelfth century warrants special notice for our purposes: the Charterhouse at Lugny.

Located twenty-seven kilometers east of Châtillon-sur-Seine, in a forest north of the river Oure, Lugny was founded in 1172 by Gautier of Burgundy, bishop of Langres.\footnote{For the following, I am indebted to J. Legendre, “La chartreuse de Lugny des origines au début du 14e siècle: 1172-1332.” Analecctia Cartusiana 27 (Salzburg, 1975).} Gautier apparently went to some pains to establish Lugny’s initial endowment, constructing it piecemeal, as it were, from properties controlled by the canons of Saint-Étienne at Dijon, the Templars at Bure, and the Cistercians of Longuy. That he went to such trouble shows the importance for Gautier of founding a Charterhouse in his diocese. Gautier was the grandson of Odo I, and the sixth son of Hugh II, dukes of Burgundy from 1078 to 1102 and 1102 to 1143, respectively. Gautier’s brother Odo II had also been duke, from 1143 to 1162. Gautier became bishop of Langres in 1164. A year later his nephew, Hugh III became duke, and ruled until 1192. Gautier’s family ties are significant because the trend of the ducal family of Burgundy up to that point had been to support Cistercian monasteries.\footnote{According to Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 123: “Even the dukes of Burgundy, wealthy enough to found their own monasteries had they wished, cooperated with the lesser nobility in founding Cistercian houses.”} For example, Odo I made a significant donation to Cîteaux in 1101, the year he left for the Holy Land. His son, Hugh II also saw to it that Cîteaux received support, while the Burgundian dukes of following generations supported the Cistercian monasteries of Auberive, Clairvaux, Longuy, Mazière, and Theuly.\footnote{See Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 150-152.} Yet while some mixture of spiritual and temporal concerns must surely have informed the ducal choice to support the Cistercians over other orders, Bishop Gautier’s preference seems to have been based on his
personal spiritual vision. We can see his admiration and preference for the Carthusians demonstrated in his retiring to Lugny in 1179, and taking the Carthusian habit. He died shortly thereafter, and was buried in the church at Lugny. Fourteen years later, Gautier's great-nephew would become duke of Burgundy, and would play a critical role in the foundation of a new monastery, sprung from the germ at Lugny. This was Val-des-Choux.

The legendary origins of Val-des-Choux

According to an eighteenth-century mémoire, the founder of the Caulite Order was a certain Viard, a simple conversus from the Carthusian house of Lugny. The mémoire went on to report that some time in the last quarter of the twelfth century—an exact date will be suggested below—Viard desired to leave his monastery so that he might seek out a more isolated, more austere existence. In the parlance of his day, Viard hoped to lead an arctior vita, a stricter life. With the permission of his superiors, Viard left Lugny. Heading southwest, crossing the river Ource, he found refuge in an isolated valley in the Châtillon Forest, just twelve kilometers from Lugny, in a valley that came to be known—or was perhaps already known—as the Valley of Cabbages, or Val-des-Choux. Viard lived alone there for some time, in a cave or some other makeshift quarters, but soon his reputation as a holy man grew, and he attracted disciples and admirers from the surrounding area. Viard's hermitage at Val-des-Choux was located in woods belonging to Odo III, duke of Burgundy. Odo paid frequent visits to these woods for the good hunting there. Upon hearing news of the hermit living in his forest, the duke sought him out. So impressed was he by Viard's piety, that Odo promised, upon his safe and victorious return from an impending military campaign, to found a monastery at Val-des-Choux. This is the foundation legend that has entered, almost entirely uncritically, into the historiography concerning the Caulite Order.

Before entering into the discourse concerning the historicity of this legend, let me first present some evidence that will play a role in that discourse.

Reconciling the legend with the historical evidence

In discussing the historical evidence concerning the foundation legend of the Caulite Order, I will examine three sources: 1) the Caulite customary; 2) inscriptions once found at the church at Val-des-Choux; 3) a papal bull confirming some of the new order's earliest donations, and 4) the Grand Cartulary. Earlier scholars have attempted some analysis of this evidence, and I will address their findings in turn.

Some of the evidence concerning the foundation of the Caulite Order comes to us from the Caulite customary. One of its oldest statutes, which we can date between 1205 and 1238, required the Caulites to dedicate all of their churches to the memory of the Virgin Mary and John the Baptist.20 The reason the statute gave for this was that "the first father and founder of our order originally came to the place of Val-des-Choux from the church of Lugny—which also dedicated its churches to the Virgin Mary and John the Baptist—whence we arose."21 Hence, the customary provides evidence that the founder of the Caulite Order came from Lugny. The Caulite customary also names the first prior of Val-des-Choux, as well as its founder. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the manuscript M version of the customary contains the martyrology of Usuard,22 with entries in the margin recording dates important to the Caulite Order. Two of these entries (the reliability of which will be discussed below) are especially pertinent to our inquiry. The first of these, dated "XVIII kalends of February" (i.e., 15 January), states that Viard was the first prior of Val-des-

20 See Chapter 7 for a discussion on dating the different elements of the customary.

21 See Birch, 94: "quia primus pater et constitutor ordinis nostri de ecclesia Luviniacensi que in honore est beate Marie et sancti Johannes baptiste ad locum Vallis caulisium unde et nos exorti sumus primitus venit."

22 Yzeure. AD de l'Allier, H 232, fols. 1-49.
Choux. We have no dates for Viard’s life, but as first prior he must have been active at the time of the monastery’s foundation. The second entry, dated the “nones of July” (i.e., 7 July) states that Odo was the founder of the order. Odo III lived from 1166-1218, and was duke of Burgundy from 1192. If we accept this entry in the martyrology and assume that Odo had to have been duke before he could found a monastery, then the earliest date for the foundation at Val-des-Choux becomes 1192.

Two inscriptions that at one time adorned the church of the monastery at Val-des-Choux also provide evidence about the foundation. These inscriptions, along with the church at Val-des-Choux, no longer exist, and we are forced to rely on the reports of earlier historians for our information. The first of these inscriptions, an epitaph written in verse on the side of a tomb located near the altar, confirmed Viard as the “first father” or spiritual founder of the monastery. According to this inscription:

Hic duo sunt fratres caput ordinis et protopatres.
Guido ac Humbertus, sit Christus utrisque misertus.27
(Here are two brothers, the head of our order and first fathers,
Guy [Viard] and Humbert, may Christ be merciful to them both.)


24 Folz, 92. said 3 July.


26 For Odo III’s dates, see Bouchard. Sword, Miter, and Cloister. 256, 261.

27 See Martène and Durand. Voyage littéraire. 112: Gallia christiana. 4: 742: MacPhail. History of Plascardyn. 12; or Birch, xxiv. Concerning the inscription’s poetics. Martène and Durand called it simply “deux Vers.” while Birch labeled it a “hexameter distich.”

28 Humbert was the second prior of Val-des-Choux.
The variant spellings of Viard’s name can be a source of confusion. The Latinized versions include Viardus, Wiardus, Guyardus, and the above Guido. Courtépée misread the above inscription as “Hugo et Guillelmus,” and concluded that “other monks must have been there before [Viard].”

A second inscription offered a precise date upon which Viard entered the church at Val-des-Choux, but the alleged date varies from one historian to the next. According to Folz:

An inscription read on the walls of the church, and which has been transmitted to us by the old historians, maintains that in 1293, 4 November, *intravit frater Wiardus in chorum Vallis caulium* [brother Viard entered the choir of Val-des-Choux]. We correct this date by a century and we arrive at 1193, which corresponds to the date of the advent of Odo III.

Folz cited this inscription from the work of Plancher, who (according to Folz) had corrected the date from 1293 to 1193. Yet Plancher’s work clearly gives that date as 2 November 1193, without suggesting that he had made any correction. It is puzzling where Folz got his information, because Plancher neither corrected the date of the inscription in the work Folz cited, nor did he quote the inscription in Latin. Concerning that same inscription, Petit claimed that:

An old inscription of the church maintains that Viard entered there 11 November 1198. This is at least the origin attributed to this order by Abbot Fleury, in spite of the opinion of Dom Plancher.

Yet again, a twentieth-century historian seems to have misread the work of his predecessor, for Fleury also dated the inscription at “the second day of November 1193.”

---

29 Courtépée, “Remarques d’un voyageur curieux.” 100.


Since this inscription was once part of a church that is no more, it seems to me that
the most reliable source for what the inscription once said are those historians who were
contemporary with the church's existence. Fleury and Plancher both wrote in the early
1700s, while the church at Val-des-Choux still stood. They both offered the same date,
1193, as did Hélyot, their contemporary.34 So far, so good. Yet two other eighteenth-
century authors, Martène and Durand, whom we know to have visited Val-des-Choux,
recorded this date as "MCCXCIII" (1293). They even claimed that this date, along with
Viard's name appearing as "Guido" in the earlier inscription, "entirely destroyed the false
tradition of the foundation of Val-des-Choux by the brother Wiard."35 Du Tems sided
with Martène and Durand, proclaiming, "There is nothing to the legend that Viard, a
conversus from Lugny was the founder, because he entered the monastery a century later
[i.e., a century later than 1193], according to the inscription still visible at the church."36 I
would like to believe that Du Tems, in the midst of writing his four-volume history of the
French clergy, simply read Martène and Durand, and adopted their views. Yet the phrase
"still visible at the church," published in 1774-75, while the church yet stood, sounds so
authoritative, as if Du Tems must have seen the inscription himself. Simply tallying the
readings of our contemporary observers yields a stalemate: three for 1193 (Fleury, Plancher,
and Hélyot), three for 1293 (Martène, Durand, and Du Tems). It is a confounding situation.
One possible solution is simply to throw the inscription out. Without a consensus on what
it said, its probative value is limited. Another would be to correct the date to 1193 ex post

35 Martène and Durand. Voyage littéraire. 112-113.
36 Du Tems. Le Clergé de France. 4: 537.
facto, as Folz did in Plancher’s name. Since we have other evidence that will allow us to do so, this seems the better choice.

To correct the date of Viard’s entry into the choir requires three steps. First, recall the entries in the martyrology that noted Viard as the first prior and Odo III as the founder. Second, recall that Odo was duke from 1192 to 1218. This gives us a range of years during which Viard would have been prior. Finally, we consult evidence that puts a terminus on the foundation date. A bull of Innocent III, dated 10 May 1210, confirmed several of the earliest donations to the Caulite Order. Among the donors listed was Garnier of Rochefort, who served as bishop of Langres from 1193 until his death in 1200—hence his gift was made before 1200. Peincedé dated Garnier’s gift more precisely at 1195. In order to have received the gifts approved by Innocent III, the house of Val-des-Choux had to have been founded before 1195. Odo III must have founded Val-des-Choux between 1192 and 1195. We can discount 1293 as the correct inscription reading. Viard, first prior of Val-des-Choux, entered its choir in 1193.

A tidy picture of the Caulite foundation is evolving from the evidence. In 1172, the Carthusian house of Lugny was founded. Some time after this, Viard, who according to the legend was a conversus, left Lugny to seek out his “stricter life.” He met Odo III, who, having become duke in 1192, built a church for the new foundation, the choir of which Viard entered in the following year. In 1195, Garnier, bishop of Langres, made one of the first gifts to the new foundation.

---

37 Innocent III (1210): “ex dono venereabilis fratris nostri Garnerii, episcopi quondam Lingonensis, de assensu capituli Lingonensis, unum modium frumenti in terciis de Castellione, et sex modios vini in decimis de Musseio annuatim.” Appendix D contains the complete text of this bull.

38 For Garnier’s dates, see Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 397.

Unfortunately, there is also evidence that disrupts this picture. An entry in the grand cartulary of Val-des-Choux claims that "[the Caulite Order] was instituted in the year 1188 under its own particular constitutions, and later under the rule of Saint Benedict."\(^{40}\) Recall that the grand cartulary was not composed until 1776, almost six centuries after the proposed foundation date. Whatever doubts the lateness of this entry might cause regarding an 1188 foundation, we can at least state with certainty that a foundation date of 1188 had become a part of the Caulite tradition. Yet writing a century before the creation of the grand cartulary, Vignier seems also to have accepted this date when he wrote that:

In the year 1188, in the solitude of the Val-des-Choux, a new community of hermits, and the foundation of a new order and a new monastery would be laid, by the religious man Viard.\(^{41}\)

Vignier also claimed that Manasses of Bar, who was bishop of Langres from 1179 to 1193, had approved the new foundation at Val-des-Choux.\(^{42}\) I have tried to find a charter among the episcopal documents that might support Vignier's claim, but without success.\(^{43}\)

Having presented this evidence, we now turn to the discourse concerning the Caulite foundation. As mentioned in Chapter 2, most historians of the Caulite Order have accepted the foundation legend uncritically.\(^{44}\) There have been a few notable exceptions. Plancher was one of the first to take the Caulite foundation legend to task.\(^{45}\) He began his argument by citing the inscription in the church that reported Viard's entry into the choir on 2

\(^{40}\) Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 215, p. 12.

\(^{41}\) Vignier. Chronicon lingonense. 120: "anno 1188. in vallis caulium solitudine. novi coenobii. novique ordinis iacta fundamenta. per virum religiosissimum Viardum."


\(^{43}\) Folz, 93, note 1, also admitted to searching in vain for such proof.

\(^{44}\) See for example Mignard, 417 ff.; MacPhail, History of Plucardyn. 11 ff.; Birch, xiii ff.

November 1193. Plancher argued that this must have been the date on which the monastery became habitable. According to Plancher, the inscription said that the entire monastery was finished in the same year (1193) in which Odo was recognized as duke. Plancher saw this as proof that Odo could not have been the founder, for how could he have had a monastery started, completed, and occupied all within the first year of his reign? More recent research dates Odo III's assumption of ducal power in 1192. But even if the date were 1193, it does not seem so far-fetched to imagine enough of a church at Val-des-Choux in 1193 to allow worship in one section, while other sections were still under construction. Think of Notre-Dame in Paris, which is obviously much more elaborate than anything that would have stood at Val-des-Choux, yet it serves as a fine example of how worship was not hindered by on-going construction—in the case of Notre Dame, over several centuries. Plancher maintained, however, that Odo had too many other "good works" to attend to, having been charged with the repair of damages done to other churches and monasteries during the reign of his father, Hugh III. He also argued that the "dangerous combat" from which Odo was supposed to have returned was pure fiction, that Odo III enjoyed a "profound peace" in the first years of his reign. Finally, Plancher challenged the entry in the martyrology that recorded Odo as the founder of Val-des-Choux. Plancher claimed to have:

seen and taken a copy of the [martyrology] which recorded nothing except "in memory of Odo, duke of Burgundy:" the addition of "founder of Val-des-Choux" was not there, and if it was there it would not be sufficient to establish an act so contrary to the history of the times and so little conforming to custom.

---

46 Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 256, 261.

47 Plancher, Histoire, 1: 448, note 6: "On a vu & pris copie de ce Nécrologe, qui ne porte autre chose, sinon: Mémoire d'Odo Duc de Bourgogne; l'addition de Fondateur du Val des Choux n'y est point, & quand elle y seroit, elle ne seroit suffisante pour établir un fait si contraire à l'Histoire du temps & si peu conforme à l'usage ordinaire." To avoid confusion, I have translated Plancher's term "necrology" as "martyrology." Refer to Chapter 3 regarding the differences between the two.
The martyrology to which Plancher referred was “from [the monastery] of Saint-Lieu at Dijon, at one time a dependant house of the Val-des-Choux.” i.e., the same as the Caulite customary in Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 232, which is cited throughout this study. Plancher concluded his argument by stating that it was unreasonable to claim Odo as the founder of the monastery, “based solely on this fabulous legend, and false or contrary authorities.”

Folz took a different approach to the Caulite foundation legend, believing that “one could have no doubt” about the identity of the temporal founder of Val-des-Choux. He too quoted the martyrology, which according to Folz read, “3 July: in commemoration of Odo, duke of Burgundy, of good memory, founder of the Val-des-Choux.” This is obviously different from the entry recorded by Plancher, and I will discuss that discrepancy below.

For the moment, let us continue with Folz’s argument. Based on his reading of the martyrology, Folz maintained that the foundation date for Val-des-Choux had to fall between 1193 (the date then current for Odo becoming duke), and 1195 (the date of Bishop Garnier’s donation). Based on the statute in the customary—that claimed the founder had come from the Carthusian monastery at Lugny—Folz saw Lugny as the motherhouse of Val-des-Choux. Based on the inscriptions at the church and Viard’s entry in the martyrology, Folz admitted that Viard must have been the first Caulite prior. He took issue, however, with the notion that Viard had been a “simple conversus,” finding it difficult to imagine that a conversus could become the prior of a new monastery. In addressing the legendary encounter between Odo and Viard, and the promise that the former, upon his victorious return from battle, would build a monastery for the latter, Folz did not believe it was necessary to entirely reject this interpretation of the foundation. He suggested.

---


49 Folz. 92: “3 juillet: commémoration d’Odo, duc de Bourgogne, de bonne mémoire, fondateur du Val des Choux.”
however, that the foundation legend had simplified the historical reality. Folz suggested that the hermit called Viard in the legend was simply the “crystallization into a single person of the memory that had been preserved of a group of hermits living in the forest of Villiers-le-Duc.” He cited several studies concerning the persistence of hermit movements in forest areas, as well as several examples of hermit colonies that had evolved into monastic communities. He then hypothesized that the Caulite Order was perhaps a late witness to the hermit movements that had begun in the mid-eleventh century, but which seemed to have disappeared since 1150. Finally, he suggested that Odo’s role in the foundation of Val-des-Choux had been to regroup the hermits living in his forest into a monastery. Only then, according to Folz, did a Carthusian from Lugny, Viard, come into the picture to give the monastery its first constitutions.

Folz tried to locate Viard in the documents concerning Lugny, but without success. He did find reference to a certain Wiardus Camberlanus, but did not dare identify him with the spiritual founder of the Caulite Order. One of Folz’s students, Jacqueline Legendre, had better luck finding Viard. Legendre discovered a charter of 1195 recording a sale, which described the Caulite father, among other witnesses to the transaction, as follows:

I, Garnier ... bishop of Langres ... make known ... that in my presence were called to witness: Martin, priest and monk of Lugny, and brother Guido, priest and hermit of the duke’s forest, and brother Girard, conversus ... (Italics mine.)


51 The documents for the Carthusian monastery at Lugny are housed at Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 48 H. Folz, 94, note 1, cited Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, cartulary H 220, no. 20 for the reference to Viardus Camberlanus, dated 1186: but see Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 48 H 892 for the original charter, dated 1187.

52 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 48 H 888: “Ego Garnerius ... episcopus Lingonensis ... notum facio ... quod in presentia mea testificati fuerunt Martinus, sacerdos et monachi Luvenilei, et frater Guido, sacerdos et
Not only does this seem to be an irrefutable reference to Viard, but it also confirms Folz’s hypothesis of hermits living in the ducal forest in the late twelfth century. For our purposes, it resolves Folz’s puzzlement over a simple *conversus* becoming the head of a new monastery: Viard had not been a *conversus* at all, but a priest. Legendre also believed that Viard had not been the only hermit living in the duke’s forest, and that Viard’s encounter with other hermits had lead to the idea of founding a new community. Regarding the foundation date of Val-des-Choux, Legendre felt it should be moved up to 1195, since at that point Viard still maintained significant connections to Lugny, “to the point of appearing as a witness ranked with the monks and *conversi* of that house.”^53 Legendre made this argument without addressing the contradictory evidence of the inscription at the church—recording Viard’s entry into the choir in 1193—which Legendre surely must have known from Folz’s article, which she cited. Nonetheless, Legendre posed several interesting questions concerning Viard’s intentions for the new foundation, to wit: why would Viard leave Lugny to take up a solitary life? Was the eremitic existence of the Carthusians not strict enough for him? Could Viard have been rejecting the material security provided by the Carthusian community? If Viard were rejecting Carthusian security, why would he bring so many Carthusian practices to his new foundation? Legendre did not address any of these questions, but ended her article with the regret that it is “difficult to grasp the thoughts of people in the past.” In fairness, the purpose of Legendre’s article was an examination of the foundation at Lugny, not Val-des-Choux. But there remains one question she might have raised, which, as I hope to show below, concerns the history of both of those monasteries. That is, why would Viard leave the community at

---

Lugny, according to the legend to lead the “stricter life” of a hermit, only to turn around and found another community, with more or less similar constitutions?

Before addressing that question, let me present one last interpretation of the Caulite foundation legend. It comes to us from Gautier’s article of 1920, which was apparently unknown to Folz and Legendre. According to Gautier:

A conversus from this Carthusian house [of Lugny], Gui (Guido) or Wiart, who took his favorite walk ... in the countryside inhabited by hermits, resolved, with the assent of his superiors, to group these pious solitaries, and to join with them to practice in common a more regular observance.54 (Italics mine.)

Forget that Gautier still followed the tradition of Viard as a conversus. What is interesting is his assertion that Viard—not Odo III, as Folz suggested55—had grouped these hermits into a regular community with Lugny’s approval. It was this assertion, in concert with my own understanding of the remaining evidence, that led me to my own theory concerning the foundation of Val-des-Choux.

An alternative foundation theory

My goal is to test the foundation legend against the historical evidence, in hopes of arriving at some more satisfying narrative of Caulite origins. To achieve this, I will not only draw on what is most useful in the theories of my predecessors, but will also introduce evidence of which they seem to have been unaware, or at the least chose not to address.

The Caulite foundation is best viewed as a process, rather than as a single historical event. Now, to describe that process. First, we know that the Carthusian monastery of

54 Gautier. “Notes sur la fondation.” 124. Gautier cited G. Lapérouse. Histoire de Châtillon (Châtillon-sur-Seine. 1837), the footnote running from pp. 145-47, but Gautier did not suggest that it was Viard who had grouped the hermits into a community.

55 Folz, 95: “Le rôle d’Odo III semblerait avoir été celui de regrouper les ermites vivant dans sa forêt en un monastère.”
Lugny was founded in 1172. Thanks to Legendre, we know that Viard had been a priest, not a conversus. We know that at some point he left Lugny, according to the legend to lead a “stricter life.” But suppose that Gautier’s theory is correct: that Viard was aware of the hermits living in the duke’s forest, and that he left, with the assent of his superiors, to group those hermits into a regular community. Suppose further that the “stricter life” Viard envisioned for this new community was to be based on Lugny’s practice, rather than the irregular practice of hermits surviving in the woods. Suppose further that his superiors at Lugny were fully aware of Viard’s intentions, and considered his new foundation as a kind of experimental branch of their own monastery—Lugny West, if you will—the progress of which they fully intended to monitor. Three statutes of the Caulite customary lend support to these suppositions.

We have already mentioned the custom that required Caulite monasteries to dedicate their churches to the virgin Mary and John the Baptist, which the Caulites explained by referring to the practice at Lugny, whence their founder had come. This could be interpreted simply as a way for the Caulite monks to pay homage to the church from which their founder came, i.e., by imitating its practice. Nothing in the statutes says that the Caulites should name their churches thus because Lugny required them to do so. It is interesting, nonetheless, that the reason the Caulites gave for this practice was their provenance from Lugny.

A second custom shows that the prior of Lugny had certain authority at Val-des-Choux. This statute, which concerns the monastery’s infirmary, states that:

[The infirmarian] cannot speak with the sick lying in bed, unless he will have been alone, or in the presence of the prior or sub-prior [of Val-des-Choux] or the prior of Lugny.

---

56 Birch, 94.

57 Birch. 67: “Cum infirmo jacenti in lecto non potest loqui nisi solus fuerit nisi in presentia prioris, vel sub prioris, vel prioris Luviniaci.”
Silence reigned in the daily lives of the Caulite monks, and the infirmary was not to be a place where slackers could go to partake in idle conversation. The infirmarian, too, was forbidden from speaking to the sick, except when alone, or in the presence of his superiors, among whom was the prior of Lugny, who apparently had the same authority as his Caulite counterparts to suspend the vow of silence at Val-des-Choux. It seems significant that the statute did not extend this authority to the prior of other monasteries in general, but was specific about the prior of Lugny. One can assume that the prior of Lugny must have visited the infirm at Val-des-Choux rather frequently for this contingency to be regulated in the Caulite customary.

A third custom demonstrates an even stronger tie between the Caulites and the Carthusian monastery of Lugny. According to this statute:

Novitius in Valle Caulium non debet ire, nisi congregentur Monachi Luniaci et Monachi Vallis Caulium, nec domum ipsam intrare potest.58

Which may be translated as follows:

A novice ought not to not go into Val-des-Choux [i.e., be admitted to the novitiate], unless the monks of Lugny and the monks of Val-des-Choux are come together [to approve his entry], he cannot enter that same house.

I have provided the Latin text here because two editions have offered different readings of this passage, and my choice of reading requires some explanation. The passage I have quoted is from Martène and Durand's edition, based on a manuscript they saw at Val-des-Choux. This rendition is also consistent with the copy of the customary found at Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 232. But Birch, in his edition of the Caulite customary, offered a somewhat different transcription, and hence interpretation, of that same passage:

Novitius in Valle Caulium non debet ire ubi congregantur monachi Luviniaci, et monachi Vallis Caulium nec domum ipsam intrare potest.\(^{59}\)

Which Birch, according to the index of his edition, translated as follows:

A novice in the Val-des-Choux ought not to go where monks of Lugny are congregated, and monks of Val-des-Choux cannot go in that house [at Lugny].\(^{60}\)

Two things will be apparent to the reader. First, the Latin *nisi* in Martène and Durand’s edition is replaced by the Latin *ubi* in Birch’s edition. Second, Birch’s translation suffers from a grammatical error. I will discuss each of these in turn.

The key to understanding how two quite different renditions could come about lies in two abbreviations common to French manuscripts of the thirteenth century. The first of these is the letter *n* with a superscript *i*, representing the Latin *nisi* (English: “unless, except”). The second of these is the letter *u* with a superscript *i*, representing the Latin *ubi* (English: “where, when”). Because of the nature of minims, which are the downward strokes used in the creation of Gothic script, letters like *u* and *n* can often be hard to differentiate. Whichever abbreviation the manuscript at Val-des-Choux used, Martène and Durand transcribed it in their edition as *nisi*. For his edition of the Caulite customary, Birch used Paris, BN, ms. lat. 18047 (manuscript P) for the base manuscript, and Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 232 (manuscript M) as a supplemental manuscript. The abbreviation in manuscript P easily looks like the letter *u*, hence *ubi*, which is exactly what Birch transcribed. But in manuscript M the abbreviation looks like the letter *n*, which would have rendered *nisi*. Although Birch was a thorough editor who usually noted any discrepancies from one manuscript to the other, this one slipped past him. Depending on how each of our editors deciphered the abbreviation, as *nisi* or as *ubi*, they then placed commas in the sentence to try to render some meaning. Martène and Durand chose *nisi*, and rendered a

\(^{59}\) Birch, 103: cf. Paris, BN, ms. lat. 18047, fol. 47r.

\(^{60}\) Birch, 133. The exact index entry reads as follows: “Lugny. Val-des-Choux Monks not to enter the house of. 103; ———. Novices of the Val-des-Choux not to frequent the Monks of. 103.”
sentence that makes sense grammatically. Manuscript M supports their choice. Birch chose *ubi*, and rendered a very different sentence, and alas, one that is grammatically incorrect: the only possible subject for the third person singular verb *potest* is the nominative singular *novitius*, not the plural *monachi*. Since Birch’s rendition is grammatically incorrect, and since both Martène and Durand’s edition and manuscript M support a rendition using *nisi*, let it be *nisi*. As a consequence of this reading, I would argue that the monks of Lugny held an extraordinary power over the Caulites at Val-des-Choux, since they could not receive novices into their house *except* with the approval of the monks of Lugny.

Folz may have been more correct than he realized when he called Lugny “the motherhouse of Val-des-Choux.”⁶¹ Certain authors have even maintained that the prior of Lugny presided over the general chapter at Val-des-Choux⁶²—though I have been unable to find a source supporting this claim. Whether this last can be supported or not, it seems we must view the Caulite foundation as a process, one by which the Caulites slowly liberated themselves from Lugny’s control. The fact that the Caulites eventually scored through this statute in the customary in ink—to indicate that the practice of seeking Lugny’s approval of novices no longer held—is proof of this slow liberation. It is proof that the monastery at Val-des-Choux underwent a transformation, from an experimental, subordinate, filial house of Lugny, to become the independent motherhouse of its own monastic order.

Having established—what I hope is—a reasonable theory of the Caulite foundation, let me now attempt a more detailed study of its founders. The tendency of most Caulite scholars has been to assign the role of founder either to Viard or to Odo III, but not to both.

---

⁶¹ Folz, 94.

Their choice inevitably depended on their definition of the term “founder.” If they defined “founder” as that person who brought the spiritual impulse to the new monastery, then they named Viard founder. If a founder was that person who supplied the economic endowment for the new monastery, then they named Odo III. As Mignard, my esteemed colleague of the nineteenth century, so eloquently phrased it, “What could a poor religious do without the munificence of [Odo III]?” He might just as well have said, “No money, no monks!” Indeed, organized monastic communities in the Middle Ages would find it difficult to survive without the economic support of secular rulers and other patrons. But one might equally argue that medieval secular lords would have no pious purpose for their money if it were not for organized monastic communities. Each fulfilled a need in the other. Hence, I have entitled this chapter “The Two Founders of Val-des-Choux,” dividing the role of founder into spiritual and temporal, casting Viard as the former, and Odo III as the latter.

The spiritual founder

We have very little direct evidence about the life and activities of Viard. The Caulite sources have not preserved a vita for their spiritual founder, if indeed one ever existed. Except for his role in the Caulite foundation legend, Viard appears only three times in the extant sources. We have already mentioned his appearance as “priest and hermit” in the charter of 1195, and the entry in the martyrology concerning the day of his commemoration, though the latter is an entry that was likely made well after Viard’s death. We add to this his appearance as a witness in a charter dated 1200, in which he is called

63 Mignard, 418: “Qu’aurait pu faire un pauvre religieux, sans la munificence d’Odo III...?”

64 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 48 H 888.

65 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 232, fol. 4r.
“brother Guyard.” The charter records Peter of Plancey’s swearing homage and fealty to the duke of Burgundy, a ceremony which the bishop of Autun and the abbot of Cîteaux also witnessed.\(^66\) We may assume from this charter that Odo considered Viard to be an important holy man, since the charter shows him ranking with other high clergy. Birch maintained that Viard appeared in a charter dated 1204, in which Guy, archbishop of Reims, confirmed the foundation at Val-des-Choux; and again in a charter of 1213.\(^67\) Birch did not cite specific charters, and it seems as if he was merely repeating references made by the authors of *Gallia christiana*, which discussed the charter of 1204, and claimed that Viard “presided [as prior] until 1213.”\(^68\) I could not locate the archbishop’s charter of 1204, and the description of same in the cartulary of 1738 states little more than that Guy took Val-des-Choux under his protection; no mention of Viard.\(^69\) Yet it seems reasonable to assume that if the archbishop encountered the Caulites circa 1204, he might very well have met their founder, only four years after Viard’s last known appearance in the charters. As for Viard presiding as prior of Val-des-Choux until 1213, this contradicts charters dated from 1210 to 1236, which show Viard’s successor Humbert appearing in that role.\(^70\)

One tradition maintains that Viard founded a second Caulite monastery in 1197, named Clairlieu,\(^71\) located in Champagne, west of Troyes, between the small towns of Pâlis.

---

\(^66\) Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. B 10470: “... fratris Guyardi. de Valle holerun [olerum].”

\(^67\) Birch. xxiii.

\(^68\) *Gallia christiana*, 4: 742: “Guido I. seu Viardus ... nominatur in charta Guidonis archiep. Remensis fundationem Vallis-Caulium confirmantis anno 1204. Praeerat adhuc 1213.”

\(^69\) Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H Inv. 40, fol. 79v: “Guy. archêveque de Reims. legat du St. Siege prend sous sa protection le prieuré du Val-des-Choux.”

\(^70\) Chapter 8 discusses Humbert and the other Caulite priors in greater detail.

\(^71\) Chapter 6 discusses Clairlieu, and the historical tradition concerning its foundation.
and Planty. Such an early foundation date would make Clairlieu the first filial priory of the Caulite Order. We know from Innocent III's bull, dated 10 May of 1210, that the Caulites had supporters in Champagne. For example, Blanche of Navarre, the countess of Champagne, donated the rights she had in the mill at Chaumont (Calvus mons), as well as a yearly rent of six livres from the fair at Bar-sur-Aube (Barri). Unfortunately, the donations contained in Innocent's bull range from 1195 to 1210, providing no specific date for Blanche's donation. And support to Val-des-Choux from the comital house of Champagne, even as early as 1195, is hardly evidence for Viard founding a priory in Champagne in 1197. While Chapter 6 contains a more thorough discussion of the foundation at Clairlieu, for the moment, suffice it to say that I have not found any documentary evidence to support the claim that Viard founded that monastery.

A late foundation legend, three brief mentions in the documentary evidence, and an unsubstantiated claim of further foundations: not much raw material from which to create the life of Val-des-Choux's spiritual founder. Yet other indirect evidence exists, from which we might glean some sense of Viard's spiritual motivation, of his vision for what would become a new monastic order. Two sources in particular serve this purpose: Innocent III's bull of 1205, which approved the foundation of the Caulite Order, and James of Vitry's account of Caulite practice in his Historia occidentalis.

Guy, Archbishop of Reims, took the Caulites under his protection in 1204. Whether the charter by which he did this mentioned Viard or not, we know that it was also Guy who presented the case for the new foundation to the papal curia. Innocent III's bull of 1205 states that:

---

72 Innocent III (1210): "...ex dono etiam nobilis mulieris B[lanche], comitisse Campanie, jus quod habetis in molendino apud Calvum-Montern, et sex libras in nundinis Barri annuatim." Peineédé, 28.2: 1165, no. 62, also records a donation from Champagne territory, this one from Lambert of Bar (de Barro), Blanche of Champagne's chamberlain (camerarius), who in October of 1205 donated 40 sols in annual rent to the Caulite monks.
From the letter of our very venerable brother G[uy], the bishop-elect of Reims, we heard that when he was travelling through the diocese of Langres, he discovered that you have taken up the new institution of an order; diligently inquiring about the order’s merits, he found nothing in it that was not religious and virtuous.73

Innocent’s bull described the monastic life found at Val-des-Choux on the basis of Guy’s letter. Thus we see that Innocent’s bull represents not a papal mandate for how the Caulites should live, but papal approval for how the Caulite form of monastic life had been presented to the pope via the archbishop’s letter. In effect, the Caulites were saying, “This is what we do,” to which the pope granted his confirmation. As such, Innocent’s bull becomes our earliest witness to the organizational skills and spiritual impulse of the Caulite founder.

Several themes in Viard’s vision for his new monastery were common to ascetic practices elsewhere. His monks were to have no private property.74 They would eat in common, and would allow no meat or animal fat in their diet.75 Women were not allowed entry into the monastery, and neither were the monks to leave, except the prior or someone he had assigned to some urgent task.76 The monks were to wear hair shirts, but those unable to perform this penance were not forced to do so. They were denied the comfort of linen and flaxen clothes. Over their hair shirts, the monks were to wear habits of thick, undyed wool and furs (pellicias). When sleeping, they were to lie in their tunics, girt at the waist, wearing hose, and they were never to sleep in their cowls, or lie down in their beds to

---

73 Innocent III (1205): “…Ex litteris sane venerabilis fratris nostri G.. electi Remensis, accepimus quod dum transiret per diocesim Lingonensem vos invenit in Valle Caulium novellam institutionem ordinis assumpsisse, de cujus meritis diligenter inquirens nil in eo nisi religiosum comperit et honestum.”

74 Innocent III (1205): “…Nullus vestrum proprium possidebit.”

75 Innocent III (1205): “…in refectorio comeditis, carnibus et sagimine non utentes.”

76 Innocent III (1205): “…Femine interiores terminos non intrabunt, nec vos exteriores, excepto priore, nisi causa ordinis transcendetis. Prior tamen, si occupatus fuerit vel ergotans et urgens necessitas vel evidens utilitas postularit, poterit unum quem voluerit destinare.”
rest. From Easter to the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (14 September), they were to eat twice a day; the rest of the year they fasted every Friday in penitence, content with bread, water, and one cooked dish daily. They were not to fast on Christmas Day, or on Fridays during the summer on feasts of twelve lessons. To be properly initiated into this life, novices were to have a one-year probation.

Surprisingly, Viard’s vision of Caulite life included many coenobitic features—in contrast to the eremitic life that he had left behind at Lugny. Viard’s Caulite monks were to labor together, and to dine together in a common refectory. The prior was to eat with and dress as the rest of the community. The community was to celebrate mass and sing the canonical hours daily, with private masses for those so desiring. They were to hold chapter every day, and the feast of twelve lessons at constituted times. Recall that the Carthusians only came together at Vespers, one of eight canonical hours. The Carthusians celebrated Mass, held chapter, and dined together only on Sundays and high feasts.

77 Innocent III (1205): “...Cilicia induetis ad carnem. eos qui ferre non poterunt non cogentes: lineas et cannabinas vestes nullatenus induetes. grossae lanae vestes, non tinctas et pellitias habituri ... Cum tunicis, cingulo et caligis omnes jacebitis. et praeter haec. vos. filii monachi. cum cuculla nusquam. et nunquam super calcitris quiescentes.”

78 Innocent III (1205): “...A festo resurrectionis dominice usque ad exaltationem sancte crucis. bis comeditis in die: residuum temporis sub jejuniorum abstinentia transcursuri. pane. aqua et uno pulimento contenti sexta feria existentes.”

79 Innocent III (1205): “... In die nativitatis dominice non jejunabitis nec sexta feria in estate. ubi f estum intervenerit duodecim lectionum.”

80 Innocent III (1205): “... Erunt novitii vestri in probatione per annum.”

81 Innocent III (1205): “... Simul laborabitis et simul in refectorio comeditis.”

82 Innocent III (1205): “... Prior vobiscum in eodem refectorio comedit, simili cibo et vesti contentus.”

83 Innocent III (1205): “... In conventu singulis diebus missa et horae canonicae cantabuntur; privat as quoque missas. qui voluerit celebrabunt. Capitulum tenebitis omni die. facturi duodecim lectiones temporibus constitutis.”

84 The canonical or liturgical hours are Matins, Lauds, Prime, Terce, Sext, Nones, Vespers, and Compline.
We can nonetheless see some influences from Lugny. For example, Viard put restrictions on the size of his new community. The number of members, both of monks and conversi, was not to exceed twenty.\textsuperscript{85} With twenty members (monks and conversi combined), the Caulites had nine less than the Carthusians (with thirteen monks and sixteen conversi). We can only speculate on Viard's reasons for “down-sizing” this model of an already small community. Fewer members would mean fewer mouths to feed, but also fewer hands to produce food. Viard solved this problem by insisting that his community live from rents, i.e., donations of grain, wine, or money, paid annually from benefactors, rather than owning property.\textsuperscript{86} He also mandated that they elect a prior, rather than an abbot.\textsuperscript{87} Priors were equivalent to the abbot's first officer in a large monastery.\textsuperscript{88} By opting for priors over abbots, Viard was symbolically expressing his desire to keep the Caulite community small. Viard adopted these innovations so that his monks might maintain their strict silence,\textsuperscript{89} i.e., not be distracted from their spiritual pursuits.

In Innocent’s bull, we can already see Viard’s critique of established monastic practices, his picking and choosing from customs with which he must have been familiar in order to create a form of monastic life that spoke to his own spiritual yearnings. It is interesting to note that the bull makes no mention of the eremitic strain in Caulite practice, e.g., there is no mention of individual hermits’ cells. This omission may have resulted from the way in which the bishop of Reims presented the case for the new order to the pope.

\textsuperscript{85} Innocent III (1205): “… monachi videlicet et conversi, quorum societas vicesimum numerum non transcendet.”

\textsuperscript{86} Innocent III (1205): “Vivetis de redditibus.”

\textsuperscript{87} Innocent III (1205): “… Inter vos unus monachorum, quem vos. filii monachi. eligetis debeat esse prior, cui omnes … tanquam spirituali patri reverentiam et obedientiam curabiliti exhibere.”

\textsuperscript{88} For more on the role of the prior, see RB. ch. 65.

\textsuperscript{89} Innocent III (1205): “… silentium servaturi.”
Folz argued that Innocent III was "preoccupied throughout his papacy" with a policy of incorporating new religious communities into already established forms, rather than allowing new forms of religious life to be created. This policy found expression in Canon 13 of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. Canon 13 mandated that anyone desiring to become a religious would have to join one of the already established orders, and anyone wishing to found a new religious house would have to adopt one of the already accepted rules. The one notable exception to this canon was the creation of the Friars Minor under Francis of Assisi, which Innocent III approved. Folz hypothesized that the archbishop of Reims, aware of the pope's leanings, might have put a certain spin on his presentation of the Caulite Order. For instance, he might have claimed that on the whole the Caulites belonged to the greater family of Benedictines, even if they did have a few practices borrowed from the Carthusians.

A source that does address Caulite eremiticism, and one that can further aid us in "reconstructing" Viard's character, is James of Vitry's Historia occidentalis. According to James:

There are other brothers in the bishopric of Langres, monks beloved to God and very religious, who are called the [Caulites]. These observe strictly and diligently the Cistercian rule in diet, and clothing, and the Divine Offices, and all the rest, except that they construct modest little cells for greater tranquillity and peace, so that in the cells, in time of meditation, of reading, of prayer, that much more devoted the more secluded, the door of sensuality closed, alone in their cubicle they are able to give themselves over to God.

---


91 Folz, 96.

92 See Niermeyer, 906, religio, definition 6: "rule observed by a religious order."

93 Vitry, Historia, 120: "Sunt alii fratres in episcopatu lingonensi monachi deo amabiles et ualde religiosi. qui de Valle Caulium nominantur. Hii religionem cysterciensis ordinis in uictu et uestitu et diuinis officiis et in omnibus alis districte et diligenter obseruant, excepto quod cellularas modicas causa maioris tranquillitatis et pacis sibi construxerunt, ut in eis tempore meditationis, lectionis, orationis, tanto deuotius quanto secretius, clauso sensualitatis ostio, intra cubiculum suum soli deo uacare queant."
James followed this with a description of Caulite economic life: each brother maintained his own little garden; they maintained no flocks of animals; they collected rents rather than own lands; and they kept their numbers small, taking in only as many brothers as the rents would support. Even James recognized such economic decisions as part of a spiritual plan. In his words, the Caulites did these things so that that would not be "occupied by temporal concerns and the cares of this world, lest they be kept from concentration on spiritual things."\textsuperscript{94} James’s reference to the "modest little cells" and the maintenance of individual gardens—absent in Innocent III’s bull—are clearly eremitic practices that Viard brought with him from Lugny.

James of Vitry wrote the \textit{Historia} sometime between 1219 and 1225. We cannot say with certainty that Viard was still alive during James’s visit. It seems reasonable, though, to suppose that the first or second generation of Caulites that James observed was still under the influence of Viard’s vision. As subsequent chapters will show, several aspects of Viard’s plan for Val-des-Choux changed soon after James’ visit: the Caulites found their practice to be too severe, and rendered it less so; they became land-holders (as opposed to living solely from rents); and they began to raise livestock. The transformation of religious communities—from the fervent first generation following the ideas of a visionary spiritual founder, to the later generations living by standards we might call “less strict”—is a common theme in the history of monasticism. One need only think of the Cistercians under Stephen Harding and Bernard of Clairvaux as opposed to following Cistercian generations; or the first Friars Minor under Francis, as opposed to the Conventual Franciscans after the founder’s death.

\textsuperscript{94} Vitry, \textit{Historia}, 120: “temporalibus occupati sollicitudinibus et curis huius seculi, ab intentione spiritualium retardentur.”
We are in the dark about Viard’s age and the year of his death. Since the Carthusians never accepted children in their monasteries, we might assume that Viard was a young man when he entered Lugny, say twenty years old. If he joined in 1172, the year of Lugny’s founding, then he would have been around forty years old when he entered the choir at Val-des-Choux in 1193. This would have given him plenty of time in the intervening years to have become a priest at Lugny (not just a conversus, if ever he was one). He also would have had time to earn the confidence of his superiors, who approved his experimental mission of uniting the hermits in the valley of cabbages under a new fusion of monastic practices. Some historians put Viard’s death at Val-des-Choux circa 1210. Others have found traces of his activity as late as 1213. I cannot confirm these assertions from evidence, but if the latter date has any merit it would mark twenty years since the founding of Val-des-Choux in 1193. By this speculative reckoning, Viard could have lived at least into his early sixties.

The temporal founder

Let us return now to identifying the temporal founder.

Recall that both Plancher and Folz offered different readings of the same entry in the martyrology: the one concerning the “commemoration of Odo, duke of Burgundy.” To reconcile their two different readings, we must first remember that any monastic customary was a living document, and we must not assume that all of the marginal notes in the martyrology or elsewhere were necessarily entered at the same time. The entry concerning Odo is in fact written in two different hands, in two different shades of brown ink. The first part of the marginal entry, “the commemoration of Odo, duke of Burgundy”

95 Chartreuse, Maisons de l’ordre de Chartreux, 2: 9-10.

96 Birch, xxiii; Gallia christiana, 4: 742.
(Commemoratio Odonis ducis Burgundie) is done in a hand consistent with that used for the body of the text. It is done in the same dark brown shade of ink, and is framed in red ink, consistent with that used for the rubricated initials in the body of the text. This is what Plancher saw when he insisted that "the addition of 'founder of Val-des-Choux' [in the martyrology] was not there." The second part of the marginal entry, "of good memory, founder of Val-des-Choux" (bone memorie, fundator Vallis caulium), is done in a different hand, in a lighter shade of brown ink. The scribe who made this entry even rendered a little hand pointing to a scroll which frames the words fundator Vallis caulium, also done in the lighter shade of brown ink. The hand and ink used in the second part of this entry are consistent with those used in later marginal entries of the martyrology; for example, when the Julian dating system—which recorded Odo's commemoration date as nones iulii—was translated into the Gregorian system—which rendered that date as 7 July.97 Based on Plancher's description, and on the paleographic evidence just presented, it now seems more likely that the second part of this entry, "of good memory, founder of Val-des-Choux," was not made until after 1739 (the publication date of Plancher's work). It was the second part of this entry, appended to the first, which Folz read, and about which he "could have no doubt." It is what we still read in the customary two centuries after Plancher. For our purposes, the important difference is as follows. It was a scribe from the eighteenth-century who described Odo, duke of Burgundy, as the fundator of Val-des-Choux. The scribe from the thirteenth century merely entered a date on which Odo should be remembered, though not explicitly as the monastery's temporal founder.

We should note that nowhere in any of the charters recording his gifts to the Caulite Order did Odo specifically identify himself as the founder of that order. MacPhail related a charter of Margaret of Flanders, who:

97 Not 3 July, as per Folz.
in the absence of her lord and master, Philip the Bold, enjoins the payment to the monks of Val-des-Choux of what the duke had guaranteed. [Margaret’s] charter runs thus: “The late duke Odo of Burgundy, of good memory, founder (fondateur) of the said church, has given and granted to the said suppliants (the monks of Val-des-Choux) in charity for the good of his soul,” etc.98

Philip the Bold was duke of Burgundy from 1363 to 1404. He married Margaret of Flanders in 1369. If MacPhail’s account of this charter is trustworthy, then at the very least we can state that by some date after 1369, the tradition of Odo III as founder of Val-des-Choux had taken hold—176 years after the foundation.

Having expressed so much skepticism, it seems ridiculous to attribute the title of “founder” to anyone but Odo III. Hugh III, Odo’s father, is the only other possible candidate, but if there is evidence linking him to Val-des-Choux, I have been unable to locate it. We know that Hugh founded other monasteries, e.g., the priory at Epoisses of the Order of Grandmont,99 which was indicative of a shift in Burgundian ducal support away from the Cistercians.100 We also know that Hugh participated in the Third Crusade, the dates of which (1187-92) provide a nice frame within which we might try to fit the foundation date of 1188. The Caulite foundation legend stated that the duke of Burgundy would build Viard a monastery upon his victorious return from battle. Unfortunately—not so much for our narrative as for the duke of Burgundy himself—Hugh III did not return from the crusade to build a monastery, but instead died in the Holy Land. In Chapter 6, we will see not one, but two examples of sons fulfilling their deceased fathers’ promises regarding the

98 MacPhail, History of Plascadyn, 13. Though MacPhail did not say as much, the payment due the Caulites was most likely 20 muids of wine that Odo had promised them in 1209, to be paid yearly in perpetuity. This was one of the most contested payments owed to Val-des-Choux, and its later records indicate numerous disputes on this matter. See Dijon, BM, Factums recueil, no. 4, “Mémoire ... à cause du Grand- prieuré de Notre-Dame du Val-des-Choux” (Dijon, 1777), 3.

99 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, B 11658.

100 See Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 152.
foundation of Caulite monasteries. Perhaps the same thing had happened with the duke of Burgundy. I searched for Hugh III’s last will and testament—hoping to pin down at least a promise by Hugh for a Caulite foundation in 1188, which Odo could then fulfill by 1193—but with no result. Not surprising, though, since such accidents of history can hardly be considered evidence of a pattern. Since we cannot have Hugh, let us be satisfied with Odo. The discrepancies in the documents notwithstanding, Odo played a critical role in the history of the Caulite Order, and if the Caulites wanted to think of him as their founder, it is easy to understand why.

Odo III was the most important donor in the early years of the Caulite Order. He came from a great family, which boasted members of both the warrior nobility and the high clergy. His great, great, great, great, great, great grandfather was Hugh Capet (r. 987-996), patriarch of the Capetian dynasty of French kings. Odo’s great, great-grandfather and namesake, Odo I (r. 1078-1102) died in the Holy Land following the First Crusade. Odo III also had many relatives in high clerical offices. Among these were two of his great-uncles, Robert (d. 1140) and Henry (1148-1170), each of whom served as bishop of Autun, and of course his great-uncle Gautier who, as already mentioned, was bishop of Langres and founder of the Charterhouse at Lugny.

Odo III was born in 1166 and became duke in 1192. As duke of Burgundy, he ruled a territory at the crossroads of medieval Europe. The borders of Burgundy in the Middle Ages were anything but stable, but the following might serve as a fair description. The duchy was located in what today is eastern France. It stretched approximately from the Loire Valley in the west to the Sâone and Marne Valleys in the east, from just south of the

---

101 Thibaud V, Count of Champagne, fulfilled his father Thibaud IV’s last will by founding the Caulite monastery of Val-Dieu in 1267. Gautier II, lord of Vignory, fulfilled the promise of his father Gauthier I by completing the Caulite monastery of Genevroye in 1230. See Chapter 6.

102 The information on Odo III’s lineage is from Bouchard, Sword, Miter, and Cloister, 256-261.
towns of Sens and Troyes in the north to the town of Mâcon in the south. An old and worn-down mountain range called the Morvan, roughly 1000 meters high, cuts through the center of Burgundy, which in medieval times slowed communications considerably. To the north and west, the duchy of Burgundy bordered territory controlled by the French king. To the east, it bordered the Holy Roman Empire. It was comprised of six dioceses: Autun, Auxerre, Chalon-sur-Sâone, Langres, Mâcon, and Nevers. Burgundy also boasted numerous monasteries, which is not surprising since, as mentioned above, it was the birthplace of both the Cluniac and Cistercian movements. Odo III supported many of these monasteries, either through his own gifts, or by approving the gifts of his vassals.

In the same year that he became duke, Odo married Mahaut of Portugal, but this union ended in divorce in 1195. Odo became involved in a long struggle with Hugh of Vergy, a vassal to the duke who was trying to break free of his feudal obligations. The duke won. The most significant outcome of this conflict was that part of the peace treaty by which Odo married Hugh's eldest daughter, Alix of Vergy, in 1199. Odo and Alix may have had children who died young. According to earlier historians, a tomb that once stood at Val-des-Choux, held two children of Odo and Alix. The prone figure on top of the tomb is clearly a child, but it is difficult to make out a second child (if there was one). A winged angel, above the child, transports the child's soul (which looks like an infant) to heaven. The bas-relief on the side of the tomb depicts the funeral procession. The first panel.

---

103 After the French Revolution, Auxerre, Chalon, and Mâcon were suppressed. Dijon split off from the diocese of Langres and became its own diocese in the early eighteenth century.


106 The following information on Odo III's life is from Petit. *Histoire*. 3: 87-251.
Figure 4.1: Tomb of Odo III's children (?), with Caulite monks in procession.

reading from left to right, depicts an acolyte carrying holy water, followed by a cross-bearer. The second panel depicts two other figures holding books, perhaps priests. The third panel depicts the bishop, wearing a miter and carrying his crozier. Next to him is perhaps the prior of Val-des-Choux. The last three panels depict Caulite monks carrying prayer books in the procession, their heads covered with their cowl s.107 (See Figure 4.1.)

107 See MacPhail, History of Pluscardyn, 13; Martène and Durand, Voyage littéraire, 113; Courtépée, Description générale et particulière, 4: 236; or A. Kleinclausz. “L’art funéraire de la Bourgogne au Moyen Âge.” Gazette des Beaux-Arts 27 (1902): 309-311. Macphail and the team of Martène and Durand both published engravings of the tomb (the latter of which Kleinclausz reproduced). Oddly enough, the image in each is reversed, i.e., in MacPhail the procession moves from right to left (as in Figure 4.1. above), while in Martène and Durand it moves from left to right. With no remaining tomb to examine, it is impossible to say which image is correct: whether the tomb depicted exactly the same figures on both sides (which I think is less likely); or if the conflicting images are just the result of a production error during publication. The issue becomes more complicated, however, when one tries to date the tomb based on art historical evidence. If the tomb really contained the young children of Odo III, then one assumes
The depiction of Caulites in these panels creates an interesting problem. The monks appear to wear Carthusian scapulars, that part of the habit that fits over the tunic. Notice the wide bands of fabric that connect the front flap of the scapular to the back, the mark of a Carthusian habit. (See the Frontispiece for an enlarged detail of these panels.) This depiction contradicts James of Vitry's assertion, above, that the Caulites followed the Cistercians "in dress," though perhaps James was referring to the un-dyed wool of the Caulite habit, mentioned in the bull of Innocent III.

To return to the chronology of Odo III's life, in 1213, the duke finally had a son, Hugh IV, who inherited the duchy from his father in 1218. As one of the major players in late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century France, Odo was involved in both papal and royal campaigns. For example, he participated in the Albigensian crusade, fighting the Cathar heretics in 1209 at the sacking of Béziers and Carcassonne. Five years later, in 1214, he led the right flank for the French King Philip-Auguste at the Battle of Bouvines, helping to drive Prince John back to England. Odo died suddenly in 1218 in Lyon, apparently of a heart attack, on his way to join the Fifth Crusade. He was fifty-two years old.

they would have died during the duke's lifetime, sometime before 1218. Yet architectural features on the tomb (e.g., the slender columns and trefoil arches) suggest a date nearer the end of the thirteenth century. Tombs were sometimes created long after the death of important figures, but rarely for children. It is possible that the children in the tomb were from some later duke of Burgundy, Odo's son Hugh IV, for example, or Hugh IV's son Robert. Further research may yield more satisfying answers, but for the moment this remains a mystery. For more on the study of medieval funerary art, see A. Morganstern, Gothic Tombs of Kinship in France, the Low Countries, and England (University Park, Pennsylvania, 2000).

108 For comparison, see the depiction of the Carthusian monk in Claus Sluter's sculpture for the tomb of Philip the Bold, Dijon, Musée des Beaux-Arts, published in K. Morand, Claus Sluter: Artist at the Court of Burgundy (Austin, Texas, 1991), plate 105.

109 Hugh IV was five when his father died. His mother Alix served as regent from 1218-1229, after which Hugh assumed leadership of the duchy.
Several Caulite historians have erroneously sent Odo III on the Fourth Crusade. Here we see the influence of the foundation legend, according to which Odo promised to build the monastery at Val-des-Choux following his safe return from battle. But Villehardouin’s chronicle of the Fourth Crusade tells a different story. It relates how Count Thibaud of Champagne was scheduled to lead the Fourth Crusade, but became ill and died at home in Troyes. The remaining crusaders, looking for a leader to replace Thibaud, approached Odo III. According to Villehardouin:

After the count was buried, Mathieu de Montmorency, Simon de Montfort, Geoffroy de Joinville, [who was] seneschal of Champagne, and Geoffroy the Marshal approached the Duc [Odo] de Bourgogne, and said to him: ‘My lord, you realize what a great loss the land oversea has suffered by the Comte Thibaut’s death. We therefore beg you, in God’s name, to take the cross and come to the aid of that land in his place. We will undertake to have all his money handed over to you, and will swear to you, on the Holy Gospels, while making others do the same, that we will serve you loyally, just as we would have served him.’ The duke, however, was unwilling to accept their offer. (In my opinion he might have shown more wisdom.)

Petit noted that the duke of Burgundy had promised to manage Thibaud’s affairs during the count’s absence. Petit also countered Villehardouin’s editorial comments that the duke “might have shown more wisdom,” arguing that Odo had good reasons for turning down the offer to replace Thibaud. Philip-Auguste had called for Odo’s help in a conflict he was having with the Holy See; and the duke’s financial situation at home was too precarious to undertake such a costly expedition—even with Thibaud’s funds.

The foundation legend insisted that the duke of Burgundy built the monastery at Val-des-Choux upon his successful return from battle. I have cogitated for some time on

---

107


what battle this might have been, but must conclude that there was no battle—at least not one that would coincide with our foundation date of 1193. Odo III had only become duke in 1192. Recall Plancher's assertion that Odo III enjoyed a "profound peace" in the first years of his reign. There was a minor incident in the first year of Odo's reign, when one of his vassals, Othe, count palatine of Mâcon, refused to pay him homage. Othe was the third son of Frederick Barbarossa. Othe's brother, Henry VI, had become Holy Roman Emperor in 1190, after their father's death by drowning on the Third Crusade. Odo III appealed the case of his resistant vassal to Henry VI, and the matter was resolved without battle. Odo's next major conflict was with Hugh of Vergy, mentioned above. This did lead to battle in 1196, but that was three years after Viard's entry into the choir of the church. The only reasonable conclusion is that Odo's promise to build the monastery "upon his return from battle" was a literary trope, designed to make the construction of the monastery more dramatic or more meaningful for later Caulite generations.

I have attempted to construct a logical argument, by which Odo III had the church at Val-des-Choux built by 1193. The first time he appeared in the Caulite charters, however, was in 1196. In that year, at "Valle des Choz," Odo approved donations made to the Cistercian monastery at Mazière. A charter dated 1200, mentioned above, shows that

---


114 Barbarossa was drowned crossing a river in Asia Minor, while leading the Third Crusade.

115 Petit, Histoire, 3: 90.


117 Such tropes are not without their precedents. For a good treatment of monastic foundation legends, see A. Remensnyder, Remembering kings past: monastic foundation legends in medieval southern France (Ithaca, 1995).

118 Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 16 H 230.
Odo must have regarded Viard as an important holy man, since he called on Viard to witness a ceremony of homage and fealty, for which other witnesses included the bishop of Autun and the abbot of Cîteaux. Before we see Odo himself making donations to the Caulites, we see him approving the donations of his vassals, such as the knight Mile of Breban’s donation (1202), or Josselin of Ravière’s donation (1204).

Odo III’s first gifts to Val-des-Choux came in 1205. The first was a serf named Vorle. The second was a certain portion of the forest surrounding Val-des-Choux. The author of a legal memorandum written in the eighteenth century claimed that Odo’s donation of the forest was not an outright gift, but should be viewed as amortized property, or land held in fief, with all of the legal restrictions that implied. This author further claimed that the dukes of Burgundy would never have had any intention of completely alienating the forest, and in fact often visited Val-des-Choux for the fine hunting that the forest offered. The language of the charter from 1205, however, seems undeniably clear. Odo made known that he gave, and in perpetual alms conceded (me dedisse ... et in perpetuum elemosinam ... concessisse) this property “to God and the brothers of Val-des-Choux serving God.” In 1207, Odo granted the Caulites twenty muids of wine, to be paid at the time of the wine harvest, from his tithe at Pommard, a gift that Innocent III approved in 1210.

---

119 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, B 10470; recall that this charter recorded Peter of Plancey’s swearing homage and fealty to the duke of Burgundy.

120 See Peinecédé, 28.2: 1154, no. 12 for Mile of Breban’s gift; and Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv. 40, fol. 73r. for Josselin of Ravière’s gift. Both of these donations receive further treatment in Chapter 5.

121 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv. 40, fol. 192r.

122 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 273 (1205): “... omne nemus circa domum ipsorum quod continentur infra metas ad illud determinandum positas et assignatas.”

123 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/1.

124 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 217, p. 385. A “muid,” from the Latin “modius,” was a measure used for wine, and sometimes for grain.
charter confirming this donation, Odo called the Caulite monks his “most dear religious”
(religiosis meis karissimis), but this did not mean that his donations of wine were limited to
the Caulite Order. In fact, Odo also donated a “clos de vigne” (enclosed vineyard) to the
abbey of Citeaux in 1207, which gift his brother, Andrew, count of Albon, approved in
1210.126 Odo continued to approve the gifts of his vassals. In 1208, he approved a
donation from Barthelmy, provost of Villiers.127 In 1209, he approved the gifts of Geoffrey
of Aignay,128 and Peter of Ravière;129 in 1215, the donation of Felicity of Arnet.130 In 1209,
the Caulites received rights to the full and free use (plenarium et liberum usuarium) of the
remaining forest around their monastery, except that Odo did not allow them to sell or
alienate any part of it. He also forbade them from pasturing their animals there.131

Innocent III confirmed Odo’s many gifts to the Caulite monks. These included the
two donations concerning the forest; the twenty muids of wine from Pommard; and, a
donation not yet mentioned: a house and land in the township of Louesme, including one
serf to work that land.132 The donation at Louesme became the source of a lengthy
litigation for the Caulites, and deserves further attention. The Caulites had requested papal
approval of these gifts (along with many others) some time before 10 May 1210, the date of

125 Innocent (1210): “… quam nobilis vir Oddo, dux Burgundie. domui vestre concessit … viginti modios
vini in decimis suis de Pomarz percipiendos annuatim.”

126 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 11 H 1016.


128 Peincédé. 28.2: 1154, no. 13.

129 Peincédé. 28.2: 1158, no. 33.


131 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 273. The legal memo, mentioned above, makes more sense in reference to
this charter, but it was the charter of 1205 to which it referred.

132 Innocent III (1210): “…domum et terram hospitalis de Leesme cum pertinentiis suis et unum hominem
cum rebus ipsius ad excolendam terram in usus vestros.”
Innocent III’s confirmation bull. But travel and communication in the Middle Ages were slow. By the time the papal curia had received the request from Val-des-Choux to confirm the gifts at Louesme, Odo III had withdrawn them and re-donated them to the Cistercian monastery of Longuay. In a charter of circa 1210, the Caulite prior Humbert officially conceded the duke’s donations at Louesme to the monks at Longuay. These included whatever the Caulites had in Louesme (Leesman), and in its entire township, in all advantages and enjoyment; any rights to the mill at Vanvey (Vanvex); and Gautier of Vanvey—the serf is finally given a name—together with all his possessions. It is difficult to judge why Odo would order the transfer of these donations from one monastic order to another. (Perhaps the transfer was at the request of the Caulites, who preferred rents to property and serfs?) The reasons do not seem to have indicated a shift in his spiritual preferences. In a charter dated 1211, the duke tried to soothe any ill feelings the transfer may have caused. First, he absolved the Cistercians at Longuay from an annual payment of wine that they owed him, but in exchange Odo required them to pay the Caulites four muids of wheat, once a year, for what they had given up at Louesme and Vanvey. In addition, the Cistercians were to deliver this wheat to Val-des-Choux in their own wagons (suis propriis vehiculis). It seems clear that Odo was searching for a way to appease the Caulites, who had lost revenues from Louesme and Vanvey. To compensate for their losses, the Caulites would receive four muids of wheat in annual rent, and to make the deal

---

133 Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 6 H 2, fol. 133r-v: “Ego Humbertus, prior, et fratres de Valle cauillum, dedimus et concessimus fratribus Longivadi quicquid habebamus apud Leesman, et in toto finagio eiusdem ville in omnibus utilitatisibus et usibus et in molendino de Vanvex ... etiam eis dedimus et concessimus Galterum de Vanvex, communibus rebus et possessionibus ipsius Galteri, sicut ea omnia prius ex dono illustris principis Odonis, ducis Burgundie possebamus.” The charter, preserved in a cartulary of Longuay, was undated, but other charters in the cartulary—on the same subject, and bearing dates of 1210 and 1211—suggest a date of 1210 for this charter.

134 Chaumont, AD de la Haute Marne, 6 H 2, fol. 172v.
especially sweet, that wheat would even be delivered to their front door, at no expense to them.

The story did not end there, however, for in August of 1221, the Cistercians at Longuay transferred the properties at Louesme (Loysme) to the Knights Templar—though the charter is not clear concerning their reasons for doing so. This new transfer included our poor serf, Gautier of Vanvey, who seems to have been still hard at work after eleven years with the Cistercians. Even though the Templars now held the properties at Louesme, the Caulites still expected their yearly wheat payment, delivered so conveniently in the wagons of their debtors. The Templars assumed this debt with their acquisition of the properties at Louesme.\(^{135}\) With assurances that the Templars would pay, Humbert, still prior at Val-des-Choux, then absolved the Cistercians at Longuay from this obligation.\(^{136}\) The Templars, for their part, would do whatever necessary to acquire the properties at Louesme. Andreas Coleor, preceptor\(^{137}\) of the Templars in France, made it clear that his order would make the wheat payment to the Caulites once a year—between the feast of Saint Remy and Christmas—and guaranteed that if the payment could not be made that the Templars would concede to the duchess of Burgundy their granges at Espailly (Espallei), Bissey, and Louesme, until satisfaction had been made. The Templars had no intention, however, of allowing the Caulites to take advantage of them. They agreed to deliver the wheat in their own wagons (as per the arrangement with the Cistercians), but asserted that

\(^{135}\) Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 6 H 2, fol. 18r-v. Folz, 110, believed that this was merely an exchange between the Caulites and the Templars, and did not see the evolution of this exchange involving the Cistercians at Longuay. But the only reason the Templars agreed to deliver the grain to Val-des-Choux was because they were obliged to do so when they acquired the properties at Louesme from the Cistercians.

\(^{136}\) Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 6 H 2, fol. 18v.

\(^{137}\) A “praeceptor” in the Knights Templar was the head of a province, in this case France. See Niermeyer, 828, definition 4.
"their men or horses, having delivered the wheat, should not be held to go out on any other errand or mission."\textsuperscript{138}

It is not surprising that so powerful a lord as the duke of Burgundy would be a benefactor to many religious establishments. One can reasonably expect, however, that such generosity would eventually lead to bookkeeping errors. Such was the case in 1215, when Odo altered an earlier donation he had made to the Caulites. A charter dated July of that year tells us that, at some earlier point in time, Odo had donated to the Caulites—for the remedy of his soul—twenty \textit{livres dijonnais} in annual rent from the toll of Châtillon, but then changed this donation to two \textit{muids} of grain (one of wheat and one of rye), to be paid from the tithe at Aignay.\textsuperscript{139} Unfortunately, Odo had already promised this grain to the monks at Puis d’Orbe. Thus in 1222, four years after Odo’s death, it was left to his widow Alix to reconcile this double payment. Under the mediation of William, archbishop of Reims, and Robert, bishop of Clermont, who were executors of Odo’s last will and testament, the monks at Puis d’Orbe agreed to keep the two \textit{muids} of grain, but in exchange ceded to the Caulite monks their portion of the tierce of Aignay.\textsuperscript{140}

From his construction of the church in 1193 to his death in 1218, the duke of Burgundy made several significant contributions to the monks at Val-des-Choux. From the

\textsuperscript{138} Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 262: "...pro qua vecturatione fratres de Valle caullium hominibus vel equitaturis nostris, dictum frumentum adducentibus, nullam omnino procurationem aut missionem tenentur exibere." The shelf-mark H 262 also contains charters approving this transaction from Alix, duchess of Burgundy, and Hugh, bishop of Langres (both dated 1221); a bull from pope Honorius III (dated "nonis februarii pontificatus nostri anno octavo," i.e., 5 February 1224); and a charter from Hugh, duke of Burgundy (dated 1242), reconfirming this arrangement, issued at the request of Renaud, then preceptor of the Templars in France.

\textsuperscript{139} Peinecéde. 28.2: 1153, no. 10.

\textsuperscript{140} Peinecéde. 28.2: 1164, no. 56. The tierce was a customary rent paid to a lay lord, which, as its name implies, amounted to about one-third of the crop. This differed from the tithe, which in theory amounted to one-tenth of the crop, and was traditionally paid the church. See Chapter 5. The medieval economy was a complex beast, however, and we will see examples of lay lords acquiring tithes, and monasteries acquiring tierces.
forest around Val-des-Choux to regular rents of wheat and wine to the approval of his vassals' donations. Odo III proved himself a conscientious founder. He established the basic material maintenance the Caulites would need, in exchange for which they would pray for him. Odo's last gift to the Caulites came in the year of his death, when he granted them the fishing rights in a brook, from its source near the monastery at Val-des-Choux up to the Ource River.\footnote{Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 352: “rivulum Vallis Caullum ad piscandum a fonte ipsius usque ad riveriam de Ousse.” In the text above, I have used the modern spelling, i.e., Ource.}

Conclusion

This chapter began with the question “what is a monk?” After a brief survey of how earlier monastic leaders had attempted to answer this question, we saw how the question persisted into the late twelfth century. Some time before 1193, Viard, a priest from the Charterhouse at Lugny, desired to answer this question for himself. He left Lugny to unite a group of hermits living in the “valley of cabbages.” Viard gave his monks at Val-des-Choux a set of practices, adapted from the eremitic Carthusians, but with some coenobitic influences, perhaps borrowed from the Cistercians. The Carthusians at Lugny monitored this new monastic experiment through regular visits to Val-des-Choux. Viard and his new monks attracted the attention of the duke of Burgundy, Odo III, who by 1193 had a church built for them, the choir of which Viard entered in that year. Odo followed the construction of the church with other important donations, and by approving the donations of his vassals.

The impact of donations by Odo’s vassals and other benefactors is our next topic. Chapter 5 examines how these donations created the economic basis for a monastic estate at Val-des-Choux, which the Caulites would supplement by targeted acquisitions, and defend against all comers in the seignorial and episcopal courts.
CHAPTER 5

THE ECONOMY AT VAL-DES-CHOUX

To God, the Blessed Mary, and the brothers of Val-des-Choux, in perpetual alms, for the salvation of my soul.

—from the donation formula used in Caulite charters

Introduction: a structural model

It is impossible to say whether the Caulites viewed themselves as living in an “economy,” in the modern sense of the word. They clearly understood that benefactors made donations to Val-des-Choux with the expectation of garnering some spiritual rewards in return. When Odo III granted the Caulites all the forest surrounding their monastery, as discussed in Chapter 4, he did so “for the salvation of [his] soul, and the soul of [his] father, and of all [his] ancestors.” Like all medieval monks, the Caulites’ mission was to leave the material world to focus on the spiritual. Yet, like all medieval monks, the Caulites had no illusions that they could do so without considerable support from the material world. The forest is just one example of a donation that would provide them with many, very real, material benefits. And although Odo made several other generous donations to Val-des-Choux, the Caulites would need even more support for their new community to thrive. Innocent III informed us, in the business-like prose of the Papal Curia, that the Caulites

---

1 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 273: “... pro remedio anime mei et patris mei, predecessorum meorum.”
were to live “from rents, in order to keep strict silence.” In a more poetic vein, James of Vitry proclaimed that the Caulites, in order to “circumcise the foreskin of their hearts from all external care ... had neither flocks, nor herds nor arable lands, nor other possessions, lest occupied by temporal cares, and the cares of this world, they be kept from concentration on spiritual things.” Instead, James continued, “they possess[ed] fixed revenues, which without great work they receiv[ed] yearly for their needs.”

This chapter shows that the Caulites did not continue to live from rents alone. From the earliest years of their history, the Caulites received small parcels of land and other properties side by side with tithes and other rents in kind and money. They also seem to have understood, early on, the benefits of supplementing donations through the active acquisition of further properties. This chapter begins by adapting a structural model, suggested by Folz, for the purpose of examining the Caulite economy. It then analyzes donations and acquisitions through the lens of that model.

Folz was the first scholar to suspect the unlikelihood that the Caulites could actually survive from rents alone, and to subject that claim to the test of documentary evidence. He was also the first to establish a model for studying Caulite economic development. He divided Caulite goods into four categories—forest, tithes, rents, and lands—from which he drew interesting conclusions. For example, Folz saw Odo III’s gift of the forest around Val-des-Choux as the cornerstone of their economic success, a donation upon which their

---

2 Innocent III (1205): “Vivetis de redditibus. silentium servaturi.”

3 Vitry, Historia. 120-121: “Adeo autem ab omni exterioris cure preputio corda sua circumcidere studuerunt, quod nec granges nec armenta nec terras arabiles nec alias habent possessiones, nec temporalibus occupati sollicitudinibus et curis huius seculi, ab intentione spiritualium retardentur .... Sed et certos possident redditus, quos absque magno labore ad usus necessarios annuatim recipiunt.”

4 Folz. 104-105.
monastic seignory would grow.\(^5\) I have adapted Folz’s model as follows. Having already discussed the forest and other gifts of the duke of Burgundy in the previous chapter, I will return to those gifts only as needed. Concerning the alms of other donors, I have divided these into five categories, and will discuss them in this order: first, tithes; second, rents in kind and money; and third, immovable property—not just lands, as per Folz, but also mills, houses, etc. As a fourth category, I will discuss movable property (e.g., livestock). I have chosen to discuss the acquisition of property through trade or purchase as a separate, fifth category, since such acquisition seems disconnected from the spiritual motivation of donors giving alms, and should more appropriately be viewed as a reflection of Caulite economic policy. This discussion of acquisition will include two case studies: one on consolidation of lands around a single village, Vanvey; and one on the gradual control of a single property, the mill at Aignay, also called “the mill of the leper house.” In each of the sections for the categories above, I have included the raw data in tabular form. Tables 5.1 to 5.5. For considerations of space, these tables reduce information in the charters to its most basic form: date of donation, donor, nature of donation, and documentary citation.\(^6\) The tables do not include much of the most interesting information from the charters. For example, they do not include the names of officials who witnessed the charters, or of family members and lords who witnessed and approved them. The tables also do not include a donor’s reasons for making the gift, such as the request for an anniversary mass. In spite of the absence of such matters in the tables, I will address these more specifically in the course of this chapter.

Throughout the discussion of the Caulite economy, I will examine the role of kinship, fealty, 

\(^5\) Folz, 104-112.

\(^6\) Since the tables contain the citation for the charters discussed in each section, I will not cite them again in the footnotes unless there is some clear necessity for doing so.
Figure 5.1: The seignorial zone of Val-des-Choux.
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and gender, though I will also synthesize the importance of these categories in the conclusion to this chapter. Figure 5.1 provides a map of what Folz called the "zone of the monastic seigniory" of Val-des-Choux.7

Tithes

One of the main sources of revenue for the Caulites, and indeed for most medieval monasteries, was the tithe.8 The concept of tithing—donating one-tenth of one’s crops or other goods to God’s priests—came from the Bible, which had numerous references to the practice in both the Old and New Testaments. For example, Genesis says that:

Abram gave him [God’s priest Melchizedek] one tenth of everything.9

And Leviticus says that:

All tithes from the land, whether the seed from the ground or the fruit from the tree, are the Lord’s … All tithes of herd and flock, every tenth one that passes under the shepherd’s staff, shall be holy to the Lord.10

But as Constable pointed out, “The Bible does not clearly indicate … to whom the tithe must be paid and how they should be used. Most references in the Old Testament treated tithes as the special property of God and as the perquisite of his ministers.”11 Medieval commentators struggled with interpreting the various biblical passages concerning tithes.

---

7 Folz, 107. In the map on the previous page, I have attempted, as much as possible, to locate the towns from which the various donations to Val-des-Choux came. For the sake of avoiding clutter, I have not labeled every forest on the map. The Châtillon forest, in which Val-des-Choux was located, is bounded by four rivers: the Seine to the west, the Ource to the north, the Digeanne to the east, and the Brévon to the south. The Carthusian monastery of Lugny held the forest to the west of the Châtillon forest, between the Digeanne and Ource rivers.

8 For the following material on the history of the tithing, I am indebted to G. Constable, Monastic Tithes, from Their Origins to the Twelfth Century (Cambridge, 1964).

9 Genesis. 14:20 (NRSV).

10 Leviticus. 27:30 (NRSV).

11 Constable, Monastic Tithes. 10.
Their approaches to interpretation ranged from the literal (Bede, Thomas Aquinas) to the allegorical (Rupert of Deutz). Based on their interpretation, medieval canonists taught that the tithe was a divine institution. Starting in the sixth century, the payment of the tithe became a religious obligation, and failure to meet that obligation could lead to excommunication. In 765, Pepin the Short ordered that “Everyone, willy-nilly, must pay his tithe.” Under Charlemagne, the enforcement of the tithe became a civil obligation, with the express purpose of assuring the church the means necessary for the maintenance of priests, the upkeep of church buildings, and the assistance of the poor. During the Carolingian period most monasteries also paid tithes, but did not possess tithes themselves. Over the course of the following three centuries, monasteries came to possess their own tithes, which came either “from the labor of other men” (decimas alieni laboris or aliorum hominum), or from the lands of their own demesne, cultivated by their own hands (decimas proprias). Monasteries that possessed their own tithes would often pay that tithe to themselves, effectively freeing them from paying the tithe to someone else. By the thirteenth century, many monasteries had become exempt from paying tithes at all. The tithes themselves were no longer exclusively a source of revenue for the church to exploit.

---

12 Constable, Monastic Tithes. 11-13.

13 In A.D. 585, the Council of Macon decreed that “anyone who scornt these most beneficial statutes [concerning the payment of tithes] be severed forever from the limbs of the Church.” See MGH, Leges III: Concilia, ed. F. Maassen and A. Werminhoff (Hanover. 1893-1924). 1: 67; cited in Constable, Monastic Tithes, 21.

14 See MGH, Leges II: Capitularia regum francorum, ed. A. Boretius and V. Krause (Hanover. 1883-97), 1: 42, no. 17; cited in Constable, Monastic Tithes. 28.

15 See Charlemagne’s capitulary of Herestal from the year 779, in MGH, Leges II: Capitularia regum francorum. 1: 28, no. 20.7; cited in Constable, Monastic Tithes. 28.

16 Constable, Monastic Tithes. 57.
but rather properties possessed by laymen and clerics alike. Thus in the following
discussion of donations to the Caulites, we see lay lords giving all or part of the tithes they
possessed in the towns surrounding Val-des-Choux. We also see the Caulites fighting to
keep those tithes against the pretensions of other claimants.

The Latin word for tithe was \textit{decima} (Fr.: \textit{dîmes}), which literally means one-tenth. Although in theory the tithe was supposed to amount to one-tenth of a community’s crop, it was rarely that high. The actual amount varied from one locality to the next, but was more often somewhere between one-eleventh and one-thirteenth. The four major grains—wheat, barley, rye, and oats—as well as the wine harvest, comprised the “grand tithe” (\textit{grossa decima}). The “lesser tithe” (\textit{minuta decima}) came from the produce of orchards or gardens. Newly cleared lands that came into cultivation often became a point of contention, because those who collected tithes, the decimators, also wanted to collect tithes from these newly cleared and cultivated lands. Not surprisingly, such tithes were called “new tithes” (\textit{decimae novales}), as opposed to old tithes that had been customary for as long as the contemporary, collective memory could recall. By the end of the thirteenth century, the monastery at Val-des-Choux held all or part of the tithes from eight localities: Saint-Phal, Saint-Germain-le-Rocheux, Brion, Villers, Vannaire, Mosson, Puisset, and Ampilly-le-Sec.

Table 5.1 lists the tithe donations given to the Caulites during the course of the thirteenth century. The first recorded tithe came from the provost Barthelmy of Villers in 1208, who gave the sixth part of the tithe of Saint-Phal (\textit{Sancti Fidoli}), a town east of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\footnum17 Constable. \textit{Monastic Tithes}. 3.
\item\footnum18 P. Viard, \textit{Histoire de la dîme ecclésiastique, principalement en France, jusqu’au décret de Gratien} (Dijon. 1909). 158-160.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Tithe Donation(s)</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td>Provost Barthelmy of Villers</td>
<td>1/6 tithe of Saint-Phal, held in fief from Duke of Burgundy; shared with the knight Jeremy</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1154, no. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>Peter of Ravières</td>
<td>tithes in Saint-Germain, held in fief from Simon of Rochefort</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1158, no. 33; 1159, no. 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>Thomas of Agentes, knight, and wife Dagnia of Bissey</td>
<td>1/6 tithe of Saint-Phal; 1/2 of tithe at Brion; rights to tithes in Villers.</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 251.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>William of Vergy</td>
<td>tithes he held in Brion</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 251.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Heminon of Rochefort</td>
<td>part of the tithe at Brion</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 216, p. 148.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Felicity of Arnay</td>
<td>1/2 tithe at Vannaire; 1/8 of her tithe at Mosson</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>John of Larrey</td>
<td>his part of the tithe at Mosson, held in fief from Felicity of Arnay</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 216, pp. 147-48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>Hugh of Bissey and his brother Odo</td>
<td>part of the tithe held at Saint-Germain</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1162, no. 48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1222</td>
<td>Knights Templar at Voulaines</td>
<td>EXCHANGE: Caulites gave Templars the rights to the tithe in Brion in exchange for 2 sextiers of grain annually</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1156, no. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1224</td>
<td>Simon of Rochefort</td>
<td>4/5 tithe at Puisset</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1159, no. 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>Ponce of Jou, squire</td>
<td>1/2 tithe at Ampilly, held in fief from Guy of Darcy</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 262.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>The abbey of Notre-Dame-de-Châtillon</td>
<td>its portion of the tithe at Ampilly</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 155r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1227</td>
<td>The abbey of Sainte-Marie-de-Châtillon</td>
<td>EXCHANGE: Caulites gave the abbey the wine tithe of Mosson in exchange for the wheat tithe of Mosson</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 270.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Donations of tithes to Val-des-Choux. (Continued.)
Châtillon near Villiers-le-Duc. Barthelmy shared this part of the tithe with a knight named Jeremy, and held it in fief from the duke of Burgundy. It is difficult (if not impossible) to assign an absolute value to Barthelmy’s tithe donation, i.e., to know how much grain was really involved, even on average. Since we do not know the size of the entire tithe in Saint-Phal, we cannot know the size of one-sixth of that tithe. This uncertainty holds true in discussing the other tithes as well, whether it is the half a tithe from Brion given in 1212 by the knight Thomas of Agentes or the four-fifths tithe from Puiset given in 1224 by Simon of Rochefort. Matters get even murkier when charters include phrases such as “whatever he had in the tithe” (quicquid liabebat in decimus), found in the tithe donation from Mosson made in 1216 by John of Larrey. Most of the tithe donations to Val-des-Choux occurred between 1208 and 1225, during the first three decades of the monastery’s existence. The only tithe donation after 1225 came in 1270 from Hugh li Quanus, who donated one-half the tithe of Vannaire. Hugh was probably the son of Felicity of Arnay, who in 1215 had already given the Caulites the other half of Vannaire’s tithe. But for this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Tithe Donation(s)</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>Hugh li Quanus (son of Felicity of Arnay ?)</td>
<td>1/2 tithe at Vannaire, plus all he held in Brion and Mosson</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 163v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1285</td>
<td>Robert, duke of Burgundy</td>
<td>EXCHANGE: Caulites gave Robert the rights to eight families of serfs in exchange for the tithe of Vannaire and other grain rents</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


20 My hesitation in identifying Hugh as Felicity’s son comes from the poor transcriptions of the charters. Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285—an original charter—identifies Hugh as “li Chamus” (?) in 1215 approving the gift of Felicity, “mater eius.” Cote d’Or. 66 H Inv 40, fol. 163v—an inventory composed in 1738 with only synopses of transactions—identifies Hugh as “li Quanus” (?) in 1270 donating the other half of the
one exception, tithes did not seem to be the donation of choice after 1225—though we do see two tithe exchanges in that period, one in 1257 and one in 1285. As I will show later in this chapter, 1225 seems to signal a kind of turning point in the Caulite economy. While the number of tithe donations dropped significantly after 1225, the number of money rents donated during the thirteenth century increased slightly after that date. The number of rents in kind (other than tithes) remained relatively stable during the entire thirteenth century. It could be that donors wanted to give specific, smaller amounts of grain because it was economically more feasible. By giving the tithe, they were potentially giving away large amounts of grain: one-tenth of the crop could be one bushel of wheat or a hundred bushels. In the inflation-ridden thirteenth century, it may have made more sense to them to keep surplus from good crop years, rather than give it away.21 I will give more specific numbers and analysis after I have had the chance to introduce more evidence. For now, let me simply alert the reader to this point and return to the discussion of tithes.

The textual formulae used in charters recording tithe donations reveal that the intentions of tithe donors were spiritual in nature. Most donors made their gifts “in alms” (in elimosinam), or more often, “in perpetual alms” (in elimosinam in perpetuum). The charters recording donations of Peter of Ravières, Thomas of Agentes, William of Vergy, Heminon of Rochefort, Felicity of Arnay, John of Larrey, and Ponce of Jou each contain such a formula. Donors did not make their donations to the monks, per se, but rather to God, using the monks as intermediaries. Hence Peter of Ravières, Thomas of Agentes, and John of Larrey, all made their donations “to God and the brothers of Val-des-Choux”

---

21 On changes in the thirteenth-century economy, including a greater use of money from roughly 1180 onward, see G. Duby, *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West*, translated by C. Postan. (Columbia, 1968), 232-278.
Heminon of Rochefort, Felicity of Arnay, and Ponce of Jou added "the Blessed Mary" to this formula \textit{(Deo et beate Marie et fratribus de Vallecaulium)}. The records of tithe donations that survive only in later synopses—e.g., those recorded by Peincedé, or in the inventory of 1738—do not do not always preserve such formulae. Peincedé, a scholar during the Enlightenment, may not always have found it important enough to record such things as a patrons spiritual impulse (though he did at times). The monks who compiled the inventory of 1738, more interested in recording the monastery's economic holdings, may have found the donors' spiritual impulse too apparent to warrant setting down in pen and paper. I assume that many of the original charters contained similar formulae, even though the synopses of these charters retain no trace of them. In spite of their seemingly formulaic nature, such phrases as those recording donations "to God and the blessed Mary and the brothers of Val-des-Choux" do reveal the spiritual impulse of the donors. The cult of the Virgin Mary was particularly prevalent during the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{22} Recall that the Caulites dedicated their churches to Mary and John the Baptist. Yet no tithe donations, and very few other kinds of gifts, mentioned John the Baptist in this opening formula.

Tithe donors also had specific ideas about the spiritual benefits they should receive in return for their gifts, or about the spiritual purposes to which the Caulites should apply their gifts. Donors gave tithes for "[their] soul" \textit{(pro anima mea)}, as we see in the charters recording the gifts of William of Vergy, Felicity of Arnay, and Hugh of Bissey and his brother Odo. Simon of Rochefort intended his tithe donation to augment the alms given for

\textsuperscript{22} Popular perceptions of the Virgin began to change in the eleventh century, for example, when statues of Mary slowly changed from depictions of a majestic yet rather unemotional queen to depictions of a loving mother interacting with her child. In the thirteenth century, Saint Francis’s depiction of the manger scene further contributed to the devotion to Mary. See M. Carroll, \textit{The Cult of the Virgin Mary: Psychological Origins} (Princeton, 1986); M. Warner, \textit{Alone of All Her Sex: the Myth and the Cult of the Virgin Mary} (New York: 1976).
the soul of his brother Odon of Apremont (*de Aspero monte*). Peter of Ravières donated his tithe in Saint Germain for the purpose of establishing a prebend for one monk.\(^{23}\)

Donors intended the annual payments of grain or wine contained in their tithe donations to continue well beyond their own death. Since a common purpose of the donation was to have the monks pray for the donor’s soul, which was eternal, it made sense that they would make these gifts “in perpetuity.” But guarantees were needed so that donations made during one lifetime would not become invalid after that life had passed—and the worldly goods of the donor had passed to the donor’s heirs. Hence most tithe donations include clauses in which the donor’s apparent heirs gave approval (*laus*) to the donor’s gifts. For example, Simon of Rochefort’s tithe donation was approved by Marguerite, his mother, and Beatrix, his wife. William of Vergy’s tithe donation was approved by Clemente, his wife, Baudoin, his squire (*armiger*), and Huo of Vergy, his brother.\(^{24}\) The donation of Thomas of Agentes and his wife Dagnia required the approval of Dagnia’s family: Gonthier, a knight of Brion-sur-Ours, Gonthier’s wife, Helvit, and their children William, Machar, Hugh, Herbert, Anueta, Dannieta, and Gileta.\(^{25}\) By approving these gifts, family members and lords were not only avoiding future conflict over the tithe, but also connecting themselves to the spiritual benefits of the monastery. They were in one sense giving the gift as well.\(^{26}\) Often tithes were attached to fiefs that the

---

\(^{23}\) A prebend was equivalent to a stipend or endowment.  

\(^{24}\) For Hugh of Vergy’s approval of the donation, see Peinecé, 28.2: 1166, no. 68. Concerning Baudoin as a squire, Niermeyer, 61, defines “*armiger*” either as a “*weapon-bearer, warrior’s assistant*” or as an “*esquire (in the technical sense)*.” I have opted for the latter definition in my translation, since this seems to be the more common usage after the eleventh century.  

\(^{25}\) For the approval of Dagnia’s family, see Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 216, p. 144; or Peinecé, 28.2: 1167, no. 69.  

\(^{26}\) Medievalists have labeled this approval of gifts by relatives the *laudatio parentum*. For a detailed discussion of this practice, see S. White, *Custom, Kinship, and Gifts to the Saints: The Laudatio Parentum*
donors held from other lords. For example, John of Larrey donated his tithe from a fief he held from Felicity of Arnay (\textit{de cujus feodo jam dictus Johannes predictas decimas tenebat}). Donations of tithes attached to fiefs needed the approval of the lord “from whose fief it moved” (\textit{de cujus feodo movet}). Thus we see Odo III, duke of Burgundy, approving the donations of Barthelmy of Villiers, and Felicity of Arnay. For her part, Felicity of Arnay approved the donation of John of Larrey. Simon of Rochefort approved the donations of his vassal Peter of Ravières, which included the stipulation that the Caulites should have the right, at some future date, to acquire the rest of that same fief. To make up for lost revenue Simon expected Peter to pay him a \textit{muid} of wheat at Belnotte. This transaction also needed the approval of the duke of Burgundy, from whom Simon originally held the fief at Saint-Germain.\textsuperscript{27} To make a charter “official,” donors called upon witnesses, often from the high clergy. Thus both Simon of Rochefort and William of Vergy called upon the bishop of Langres to approve their tithe donations.\textsuperscript{28} Keep in mind, however, that the charter was not the same as the transaction of the gift, but rather, a record of that transaction.

Although most donors gave tithes “in perpetuity,” this did not necessarily restrict the Caulites from alienating those tithes, if they thought it might be to their advantage. Thus we learn that in July of 1222 the Caulites abandoned all rights to the tithe they held from Simon of Brion—except the water rights—and in exchange for these rights received one

\footnotesize{in Western France, 1050-1150} (Chapel Hill and London, 1988). White, 177-209, believed that the practice of \textit{laudatio parentum} declined after 1200, but there seem to be numerous instances in the Caulite documents.

\textsuperscript{27} Peincédé. 28.2: 1158, no. 33.

\textsuperscript{28} For the bishop’s approval of Simon’s gift, see Peincédé. 28.2: 1159, no. 36. For the bishop’s approval of William’s gift, see Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 251.
sextier of rye and one of oats from the Knights Templar at Voulaines (Voleines). In 1257, the tithe at Brion seems to have returned to the Caulites. A charter dated September of that year shows Simon of Brion confirming that the Caulites held the wheat tithe that Simon and his heirs might have in Brion. This donation was payable in the field, and Simon was obliged to make his men pay it from all of their profits (in omni gaunnagio). The Caulites undertook another exchange of tithes in March of 1257. The abbot and convent of Saint-Marie-de-Châtillon-sur-Seine granted to the monks at Val-des-Choux their portion of the wheat tithe at Mosson (Mouchon). In exchange for this the Caulites agreed to relinquish their rights to the wine tithe at Mosson, and to pay an annual rent of two sextiers of wheat from the mill at Epoisse. A third tithe exchange, in 1285, involved Robert, duke of Burgundy. Robert granted the Caulites half of his tithe at Vannaire in exchange for the rights to eight families of men (octo familias hominum, i.e., serfs) in the Seine valley, specifically in the towns of Balenou, Cumigney and Cumignerot. As part of this same exchange, the Caulites also ceded their rights to two sextiers of grain (one wheat, one barley), that they received from the town of Meursauges (Mercauges).

29 Peinecé, 28.2: 1156. no. 20. Peinecé did not record the location of those tithes given by Simon of Brion. Voulaines is also called Voulaines-les-Tempriers, i.e., Voulaines of the Templars.

30 Peinecé, 28.2: 1168. no. 75.

31 Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 270.

32 Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 285. This grain rent had been the gift of the noblewoman Nicholette of Magny in 1232, which her daughter Gille and daughter-in-law Marguerite had approved; see Peinecé, 28.2: 1170, no. 83. Gille (Egidia) also donated directly to the Caulites in 1232: four sextiers of grain, to be paid once a year after her death from the tierce she received at Duesme: see Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 216, p. 458. The charters recording these donations reveal the intricate family links of the Caulite donors. Gille was the wife of Andrew of Montréal, the brother of Anseric, who had founded the Caulite priory of Vausse (see Chapter 6). Nicholette of Magny was the widow of Peter of Ravières, mentioned above in connection with the tithe at Saint-Germain-le-Rocheux. She had also been married to John of Montréal, yet another brother of Anseric and Andrew—making Nicholette at once Gille’s mother and sister-in-law: see Petit. Histoire, 5: 496, appendix 10, “Sires de Montréal-en-Auxois.” Nicholette’s donation of 1232 seems to have come near the time of her death, for in that year she made her will, which was witnessed by Humbert (frater H.), prior of Val-des-Choux; see Dijon, AD de la Cote d’Or. 112 H 1206; cf. Petit. Histoire. 4:
The Caulites hoped to live from rents such as tithes so that, in Jaques of Vitry’s words, they might be less “occupied by temporal cares, and the cares of this world.” Yet eventually, other claimants on their tithes led the Caulites into conflict, and into the episcopal courts. For example, in June of 1248, Horry, the curate of Ampilly, came into conflict with the monastery at Val-des-Choux over new tithes (super decimis novalium) at Ampilly. In the end, Horry—perhaps as a way of saving face—decided that it was in his power to cede these tithes to the Caulite monks, which cession the bishop of Langres approved. Another case, in April of 1271, saw the monks of Val-des-Choux and those of the abbey of Châtillon-sur-Seine contesting the claims of Vincent, the curate of Saint-Germain, over new tithes in that village. They resolved the conflict by allowing the curate to receive the entire grain tithe of Saint-Germain-le-Rocheux, except for one sextier of rye and four sextiers of oats, which the Caulites and the abbey of Châtillon would divide between them. Concerning the new tithe, however, the curate had no claim, and the three parties would have to divide this. The Caulites received two-fifths of the new tithe, while the abbey of Châtillon and Father Vincent split the remaining three-fifths between them. 

In February of 1264, it was the curate of Brion who challenged the rights of the Caulites to several important tithes in Brion and Mosson. Both parties called upon the bishop of Langres and the archdeacon of Tonnere to mediate. By the end of this dispute, the Caulites had won, and found themselves possessors of several important tithes at Brion and Mosson, to wit:

new tithes (decimas novalium) and tithes of free men (decimas liberorum), that is of knights, of arms-bearers, of priests and clerics, in the entire townships of Brion and of Mosson, with their anticipated fruits; next, the tithe of wine in the entire township

262. Nicholette seems to have married a third time, for her will identifies her as the wife of William of Tanlay.

33 Peinecé. 28.2: 1165, no. 58.

34 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or. 18 H, cart. 205, fol. 75r-v.
and within the limits of Brion; next, the tithe of orchards and of lands that the said religious exploited or had exploited within the limits of the curate’s church at Brion and Mosson; next, the grand tithe of Brion and of Mosson ... next ... the tithe of wool at Mosson; next, the entire tithe of hemp at Brion and Mosson.\(^{35}\)

In exchange for all of this, the Caulite monks were expected to pay the curate and his successors, in perpetuity, half a *muid* of grain, (two *sextiere* of wheat, two *sextiers* of barley, and two *sextiers* of oats), according to the measure of Châtillon, from the grain tithe in their grange near Brion.\(^{36}\) But the inhabitants of Brion were dissatisfied with this judgement against their curate, and apparently withheld payment. Thus, in September of 1264, the duchess of Burgundy was forced to send an officer to Brion to demand payment of the tithe that the townspeople owed to Val-des-Choux.\(^{37}\)

Thirty years later, in November of 1294, the tithe at Brion would again become a source of discord, this time with the Templars. It seems the Caulites demanded payment of the tithe from lands that the Templars had come to hold in Brion. To resolve this conflict, the Templars agreed to pay the Caulites a yearly rent of twelve *sextiers* of grain from their granary at Espaille in exchange for exemption from the tithe, but the exact form of payment would be linked to the actual production of the land in dispute:

Let it be known, that when the said land will yield wheat, the said brothers of Val-des-Choux will have from the said granary twelve *sextiers* of wheat; and when the said land will yield *tresmois* ["three month" grain], the said brothers will have twelve *sextiers* of *tresmois*; and when the said land shall be in darkness [i.e., lying fallow], the said brothers will not be paid anything from the grain above said.\(^{38}\)

---

\(^{35}\) Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 251.

\(^{36}\) Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 251.

\(^{37}\) Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 134r.

\(^{38}\) Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 111 H 1185: “Ce est a savoir que quant la dite terre sera gaigne de fromant, li dit frere dou Vaul des Chous auront ou dit grenier de Espaille dous setierce de frommant; et quant la dite terre sera gaigne de tremois, li dit frere auront dous setierge de tremois a la mesure desus dite; et quant la dite terre sera a sombre, li dit frere ne panront riens de blefs desus dite.”
The land in question was apparently part of a three-field crop rotation system, one of several agricultural innovations in the Middle Ages designed to increase production while at the same time decreasing the amount of labor input. Three-field crop rotation also allowed the land time to replenish its nutrients, because one field in a three-field system always lay fallow, here so colorfully expressed as being “in darkness.”

Finally, on the subject of tithes, I should discuss the town of Bissey-la-Pierre, whose tithes eventually became part of the Caulite patrimony. The reason for saving this till last is my uncertainty about when the Caulites came to possess these tithes—if it was after the thirteenth century, then it is beyond the scope of this work.39 Nowhere in the thirteenth-century charters concerning the tithes of Bissey are the Caulite monks mentioned by name, though they obviously possessed those charters and, one assumes, their inherent rights. For example, in March of 1217, Ponce of Jou—known to us for his tithe donation at Ampilly—donated whatever he had in the tithe of Bissey “to God and the church of blessed Mary of Bissey” (de Byssé).40 The Caulites did name their churches in honor of the Virgin Mary, but this charter seems to indicate that the church was in Bissey, some twenty-five kilometers from Val-des-Choux. In another charter, dated 1219, Andrew, knight and lord of Marcenay, and his wife Heylisabeth donated one bushel (bichetum) of wheat in annual rent to be paid from their part in the tithe of Bissey “to the church of Bissey and to the brothers in that same place.”41 This charter indicates that there were monks at Bissey—or perhaps canons regular (?)—but it does not specifically identify them as

39 Folz, 109, seems to have accepted uncritically the tithes at Bissey as part of the Caulites’ thirteenth-century possessions.

40 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 249: the date was 1217, not 1215, as per Folz, 109.

41 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 249.
Caulites. Four more charters enumerated donations from the tithe at Bissey, without specifically naming the Caulite monks as the recipients.\(^{42}\)

The first mention of the Caulites by name in connection with the tithe of Bissey came in a charter dated October of 1300, by which John and Jehanette, the children of Gauthier of Bissey, acknowledged that when their father was alive he donated to “God and the church of Blessed Mary of Val-des-Choux” one sextier of good wheat from his tithe at Bissey.\(^{43}\) A *vidimus* dated 1396 records a donation, dated 1219, in which Hugh of Bissey and his brothers, Huguenin and Oudot—familiar to us from their donation of the tithe at Saint-Germain-le-Rocheux—also donated to the Caulites a portion of the tithe at Bissey.\(^{44}\) This *vidimus* also confirmed that the Caulites indeed held the other donations here mentioned concerning the tithe of Bissey, but it did not suggest how the Caulites came into their possession, or why these earlier charters never mentioned the Caulites by name.

A series of charters regarding the tithe at Bissey, dated 1692 to 1693, offers a solution to this riddle. These charters show Philip Lenet, then prior at Val-des-Choux, and Laurent Finet, a priest and monk acting in the name of the prior of the Royal Abbey of Molesme, attempting to reach an accord concerning their respective interests at Bissey. As part of their arrangement, the Caulites agreed to relinquish to the monks at Molesme a church located in Bissey. The French term used to describe this church is *église succursale*, i.e., a church

---

\(^{42}\) Andrew and Heylisabeth increased their earlier donation of 1219 from a bushel of wheat to whatever they held in the tithe of Bissey: also in 1219, the knight Guy d’Aysi gave whatever he held in the tithe at Bissey: and in 1221, Guiot of Cours did the same; see Yzeure. AD de l’Allier, H 249. A charter dated 1228 tells us that a noblewoman named Guie, widow of the knight Andrew of Molesme, sold the sixth part of the tithe at Ampilly for 40 *livres dijonnais* to “dom Peter, a monk of Bissey [OF: Bisseot] and to the brothers living in the place Peter built east of Bissey;” see Peincede, 28.2: 1164, no. 57.

\(^{43}\) Yzeure. AD de l’Allier, H 249.

\(^{44}\) Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 216, p. 238: “Hugue de Bissey et ses freres, c’est a savoir Huguenin et Oudot, donnarent auxdiz religieux ce que ilz avoient oudit disme.”
dependent on a motherhouse, in this case the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux. It seems, then, that from some time after the thirteenth century the Caulites had been possessors of a proprietary church, at which they may have stationed some of their own monks. Proprietary churches had a long tradition in the West. Since the eighth century, both lay and monastic landlords had built small churches for their dependent peasants, and manned them with priests. Though the priests were often poorly trained, these proprietary churches helped to spread Christianity in the countryside, where the resources of the bishop often could not reach. The landlords, for their part, could enjoy a share of the profits from tithes, etc. This seems to have been the nature of the Caulite involvement at Bissey. Whether the Caulites possessed this church before 1300—the date of John and Jehanette of BIssey’s charter—is difficult to ascertain from the existing evidence.

Rents in kind

Charters recording the donations of rents in kind—as well other kinds of donations—followed roughly the same format as charters recording tithe donations. Donors gave rents in kind and other gifts “in perpetual alms,” “for the salvation of their souls and the souls of their ancestors.” Their family members and lords approved their donations, while important members of the clergy witnessed the transactions. This having been said, I will not approach these matters in the same level of detail for other kinds of gifts as I did in the section on tithe donations. I will address such matters when the charters provide new information on the motives of the Caulite donors, or when there seems to be some anomaly in need of explanation.

45 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 216, pp. 262-284. See especially pp. 281-284, the charter dated 12 March 1693, which shows Philip Lenet and the monks at Val-des-Choux “chargé de la desserte de l’église succursale de Bissey-le-pierres.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Rent(s) in Kind</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1195</td>
<td>Garnier, bishop of Langres</td>
<td>1 muid of wheat from his tierce at Châtillon, 6 muids of wine from his tithe at Mussey</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1157, no. 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td>Milon of Breban, knight</td>
<td>3 sextiers of wheat from his tierce at Beaunotte and Mosson</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1161, no. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Josselin of Ravières</td>
<td>1 sextiers of wheat from her tithe at Saint-Germain</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 73r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Robert, bishop of Langres</td>
<td>4 muids of wine from his tithe at Mussey</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1157, no. 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Guy of Chappes</td>
<td>5 sextiers of oats and 1 of wheat from Bissey-la-Côte</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 111 H 1184.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Odo III, duke of Burgundy</td>
<td>20 muids of wine</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 217, p. 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Bernard of Montbard</td>
<td>6 sextiers of wheat from Epoisse, 3 muids of wine from Corcilliens</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1173, no. 100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>Geoffrey of Aignay</td>
<td>2 quartaux of wheat from Beaunotte</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1154, no. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1209</td>
<td>Guy Bofeurreille, knight of Montmoyen</td>
<td>1 sextier of grain from his grange at Meursauge, held in fief from Peter of Ravières</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 242.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1210</td>
<td>Gauthier, a canon of Langres</td>
<td>3 muids of wine from his vineyards in Mussey</td>
<td>Innocent III (1210).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1210</td>
<td>William, a knight of Warach</td>
<td>1 muid from his house in Dijon</td>
<td>Innocent III (1210).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Two unnamed benefactors</td>
<td>1 muid of wine from their vineyards at Bois</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1176, no. 126.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Simon of Rochefort, knight and lord</td>
<td>6 sextiers of grain from his tithe at Puiset</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1159, no. 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>Hugh of Colombey</td>
<td>1 sextier of wheat from his tithe at Prengey</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1159, no. 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Ponce of Grancey</td>
<td>3 sextiers of wheat from his mill at Frôlois, 3 muids of wine from Frôlois</td>
<td>Peinecévé, 28.2: 1161, no. 43.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: Donations of rents in kind to Val-des-Choux. (Continued.)
Table 5.2, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Rent(s) in Kind</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>John of Quintiny, procurator of Saint-Esprit de Dijon</td>
<td>1 <em>sextier</em> of wheat from his house at Ampilly</td>
<td>Peincède, 28.2: 1169, no. 81.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Erard II, lord of Chacenay</td>
<td>7 <em>muids</em> of wine from his vineyards at Viviers called Nuisement</td>
<td>Peincède, 28.2: 1165, no. 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>Anselm of Duesme</td>
<td>1 <em>sextier</em> of wheat from his tierce at Villiers</td>
<td>Peincède, 28.2: 1175, no. 118.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>Andrew of Montbard</td>
<td>1 <em>muid</em> of ground wheat from Bovoilly</td>
<td>Peincède, 28.2: 1173, no. 101.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1225</td>
<td>Richard of Ocey</td>
<td>2 <em>sextiers</em> of grain from the tithe at Essarois</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 267.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>Odo of Grancey (Ponce’s son)</td>
<td>2 <em>sextiers</em> of grain from his tithe at Saint-Colombe</td>
<td>Peincède, 28.2: 1177, no. 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1229</td>
<td>Fauque of Minot and his wife Flora</td>
<td>4 <em>sextiers</em> of wheat from their tithe at Minot</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 269.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>Simon of Rochefort</td>
<td>1 <em>muid</em> of grain from his tithe in Essarois</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 267.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>Huguette, wife of Robelin of Châtillon</td>
<td>1/2 <em>muid</em> of grain from her tithe at Montigny</td>
<td>Peincède, 28.2: 1171, no. 89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Guy Boguerelle, knight of Montmoyen</td>
<td>2 <em>sextiers</em> of wheat and 2 of oats from Montmoyen, held in fief from Simon of Rochefort</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 267.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>Ricardis, a noblewoman</td>
<td>2 <em>sextiers</em> of grain from her tithe at Essarois</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 267.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>Simon, knight and lord of Brion</td>
<td>1/4 <em>sextier</em> of wheat in 1249, and 1 <em>sextier</em> of wheat after his death</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1001/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>Peter of Aisey</td>
<td>1 <em>sextier</em> of oats from his mill at Aisey</td>
<td>Peincède, 28.2: 1169, no. 80.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>Simon of Menicules</td>
<td>His proceeds from the mill of the leper-house at Aignay</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Rent(s) in Kind</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>John, count of Burgundy</td>
<td>17 charges (loads) of salt from his salt mines at Salin</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 406.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>Philip of Montmoyen, knight</td>
<td>3 sextiers of wheat from various lands and his tierce at Visernay</td>
<td>Peinecéde, 28.2: 1177, no. 129.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Hugh, duke of Burgundy</td>
<td>1 muid of wine from his vineyards at Darcy, for confraternity</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>William of Recey, knight</td>
<td>1 sextier of wheat from his tithe at Recey</td>
<td>Peinecéde, 28.2: 1176, no. 124.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Boyn of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>Bread and grain from the forest (?) of Castelnovet</td>
<td>Peinecéde, 28.2: 1176, no. 123.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>William of Pruley</td>
<td>1 muid of oats from his holdings in Pruley</td>
<td>Peinecéde, 28.2: 1177, no. 128.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>Hugh of Blaisei</td>
<td>2 muids of grain from his tierce at Eschigey, and other lands</td>
<td>Peinecéde, 28.2: 1156, no. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277</td>
<td>Denis and Renaud, prior and chaplain of Larrey</td>
<td>2 sextiers of grain from their tithe at Saint-Colombe</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 302r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1289</td>
<td>Peter of Aisey</td>
<td>1 sextier of barley from his mill at Aisey</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 285r.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 shows the donations of rents in kind made to the monks at Val-des-Choux during the course of the thirteenth century. The first of these came in 1195, two years after the monastery’s foundation, from Gamier, bishop of Langres, and amounted to one muid of wheat, paid annually from his tierce at Châtillon, and six muids of wine from the bishop’s tithe at Mussey. Note that Garnier did not donate the tithe of Mussey in toto, but rather a

---

A muid, from the Latin “modius,” was a unit of measure used for grain or wine.
specific amount of wine to be taken from that tithe. This is the defining difference between rents in kind and tithe donations. A tithe, of course, was a rent in kind. But the Caulites also received other annual rents in the form of grain or wine that did not come from tithes. These are the topic of this section. As mentioned above, the number of donations of rents in kind remained relatively stable during the thirteenth century. During each of the first two decades of the century, the Caulites received nine donations of rents in kind. The number of donations dropped to four during the 1220s, then remained at three donations per decade from the 1230s to the 1270s. The 1280s saw only one donation of a rent in kind, and this seems to have been the end of such donations for the remainder of the thirteenth century. The higher numbers at the beginning of the century correspond to the early years of the monastery's existence, when enthusiasm for the new order was likely still high. The drop after the 1220s may correspond to the drop in tithe donations after 1225, mentioned above, but rather than disappearing entirely, rent-in-kind donations seem to have stabilized after this date. Of course, such numbers do not speak to the quality of the gifts. A rent-in-kind donation comprised of six sextiers of wheat and three muids of wine (donated in 1207 by Bernard of Montbard) was certainly different than a rent-in-kind donation of one-quarter sextier of wheat (donated in 1249 by Simon of Brion). Yet by tracking the number of donations by decade, we can at least see that this remained a feasible way for lay donors to support the Caulites throughout the century.

As with tithe donations, Caulite benefactors gave rents-in-kind hoping to gain some spiritual benefit from the Caulite monks in return. Some of these donations followed a formula we have already seen. The donor made them for the salvation of their own souls, as well as the souls of others. These others could include family members, as in 1249, when Peter of Aisey gave one sextier of oats for his soul and for the soul of his deceased wife Emengarde. They could also be the souls of non-family members. For example, when the knight Milon of Breban, a vassal of the duke of Burgundy, donated three sextiers of grain to
the Caulites in 1202, he did so not only for his soul and the souls of his father and mother, but also for the soul of the duke himself. When Robert, bishop of Langres, donated four *muids* of wine in 1206, he did so for the salvation of his soul and those of his predecessors, i.e., the previous bishops of Langres.

Some benefactors made donations so that the monks at Val-des-Choux might perform specific liturgical duties for them. For example, in 1206, Guy of Chappes gave to God and to the priory at Val-des-Choux an annual grain payment from all grain he had at Bissey-la-Côte. In exchange for this, the Caulite monks were to maintain a lamp at the main altar of their church. In 1213, Ponce of Grancey donated wheat and wine from his holdings in Frôlois for the support of one monk. In 1217, the output of Ponce's mill and vineyards at Frôlois did not suffice to meet the payment of these alms. Ponce promised that he would meet his obligations by drawing from other sources, and hoped that the monks at Val-des-Choux would continue to celebrate a yearly mass for him, as well as for his wife.

By 1226, Ponce's son Odo, who had become the lord of Grancey, donated two *sextiers* of grain from his tithe at Saint-Colombe. In return for this gift, the monks at Val-des-Choux were to keep a lamp lit before the altar of the Virgin, and Odo insisted that the alms be used for no other purpose. Many donors wanted the Caulites to celebrate masses on the anniversary of their deaths. For example, in 1249, the knight Simon, lord of Brion, donated one-quarter of a *sextier* of wheat (*unum quartellum frumenti*), and a money payment of 30 florins (*triginta florinos*) both to be paid annually, so that the Caulite brothers might celebrate a mass once a year for the salvation of Simon's soul. In 1251, John, count of

---

47 Ponce's donation also included a money rent of 60 *sols* per year, see below.

48 Peincédé. 28.2: 1165, no. 61. Peincédé dated this entry 1207, but the date makes no sense when compared against Ponce of Grancey’s donation of 1213 (Peincédé. 28.2: 1161. no. 43), a gift to which this document obviously refers. I have given the date of this entry as 1217, based on the fact that it must be later than the first gift, and on the fact that by 1226, Ponce’s son Odo had become lord of Grancey.
Burgundy and lord of Salin, donated seventeen loads (Fr.: charges) of salt, to be delivered once a year from his salt mines at Salin. He did so for the salvation of his own soul, the souls of his parents, and of his wife, Heleyne Yzabelle, and in anticipation of an annual mass the Caulite monks would celebrate in their church. When the knight Philip of Montmoyen donated three sextiers of wheat to the Caulites in 1252, he did so that they might celebrate a mass on the anniversary of his mother, Lady Adeline. The knights William of Recey and Hugh of Blaisei also made their gifts of annual grain rents (in 1263 and 1271, respectively) so that the Caulites would celebrate anniversary masses for them.

Some benefactors made donations in order to establish more profound and long-lasting ties to the monastery. One such relationship was "confraternity" (Latin: confratermitas, OF: confrérie), i.e., "brotherhood." Confraternity was a special association to monastic communities that began with the Cluniacs. It was often an association between monks from different monasteries, so that they might pray for each other. Confraternity was also available to lay persons, and afforded them the full spiritual benefits of a monastic community, without the necessity of actually taking the monastic habit. For example, on the death of a "confrère," a monastic community would celebrate the full Office for the Dead, just as it would for one of its monks. An example of confraternity with the Caulites happened in 1262, when Hugh, duke of Burgundy (Odo III’s son), donated to the "confrères" and to the "confrérie" of Val-des-Choux, one muid of wine, to be paid once a year from his vineyards at Darcy. In exchange for this muid of wine, Hugh entered into confraternity with the Caulite monks. On a purely economic level, Hugh’s charter tells us that the status of "confrère" made him free and clear of all debts that he might owe the

---

monastery—though it is not specific about what those debts might have been. We see another example of confraternity at the Caulite filial priory of Val-Saint-Benoît. There, in 1280, Guy, prior of Val-Saint-Benoît, and Odet, lord of Repas entered into an association (associamus in perpetuum), for the greatest utility of the monastery, and to reestablish the connection of friendship that had previously existed between the monks and lords of Repas. In future, the monks of Val-Saint-Benoît and lords of Repas would enjoy in common the territories between the village of Repas, and Les Chaumes des Loges, territories comprised of meadows, forests, and pastures. To commemorate this new association, the lord of Repas decided to give the monks an annual rent of six sextiers of grain.

As with tithe donations, the Caulites also exchanged rents in kind if it worked to their advantage. Thus in April of 1283, they ceded to the abbot of Notre-Dame-de-Châtillon a rent of one quartaux of wheat, in exchange for a rent of oats, consisting of three muids from Vanvey, and one bushel from Villiers-le-Duc. In a charter dated 1295, the Caulites, under prior Laurent, relinquished all the tierce they held in the township of Aignay to Byetriz, duchess of Burgundy, and to her daughter Ysabauls, who had become lords of Aignay. This transaction took the form of a perpetual lease (OF: baillie ... a tozjorz mais). in exchange for which the Caulites received one muid of ground wheat and rye and two

50 Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 258: “Et por ce mui de vin nos sumes confreeers de li dite confrerie, et sumes quitte et franc des establissementz, et de totes les doces que nos deviens por rasom de cele confrerie.”

51 Mâcon, AD de Saône-et-Loire, 9 G 23: “Nos frater Guido, prior humilis Vallis Sancti Benedicti et Odetus de Repast, armiger, filius quondam Renaudi de Repast, domicelli defuncti, notum facimus quod nos dicti prior et conventus, considerata et pensata utilitate nostra et commodo nostro ecclesie et ad majus vinculum connexionis et unionis habendum inter nos et ipsum eumdem Odetum et suos in his omnibus que habemus et habere possimus et debemus quoquomodo et quacumque de causa in loco illo qui vocatur “les Loiges”, qui situs est inter villam de Repast et les Chaumes de Loiges. terris, videlicet pratis. memoribus, virgultis et rebus aliis universis quibuscumque. associamus in perpetuum pro duobus sextariis bladii. medietate siliginis et medietate avene ad mensuram Nolay reddendis ab ipso Odeto et suis in perpetuum infra nativitatem Domini annuatom.” This charter is also published in P. Muguet. “Le prieuré du Val-Saint-Benoit,” Mém. soc. ed. 38 (1909): 175.

52 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H Inv. 40. fol. 96r-v.
muids of oats in perpetual rent. The Caulites kept the property they had already acquired at Aignay, however, which amounted to forty-four journals of arable land distributed over nine different locations in Aignay, two hemp fields (OF: cheneveri), and one section of meadow. To avoid having to pay the tierce or other customary rents on these lands, the Caulites agreed to pay one bushel of oats annually to the duchess and her daughter. Robert, duke of Burgundy, approved this transaction in 1295, on the Monday after the feast of All Saints.

Again, as with tithe donations, the Caulites could come into conflict over rents in kind. For example, we know that in 1206 Guy of Chappes donated five sextiers of oats and one of wheat from Bissey-la-Côte to the monks at Val-des-Choux. But Guy's generosity was not limited to the Caulites. In 1210 he donated to the Templars at Bissey-la-Côte whatever he had in the township (finagium) of Bissey and Courban, both in men and in lands, except what he had already given to the brothers at Val-des-Choux. This charter of 1210 seems to imply that Guy's generosity was funded by wealth he had married into, for his donation once again needed the approval and assent of his wife, the lady Petronille, "from whom all of this moves" (de quam movent hec omnia). In spite of Guy's attempt to protect the alms he had given to the Caulites in 1206, in May of 1213, the Templars at Bissey-la-Côte were in possession of these alms. In exchange, they agreed to pay the

---

53 A "journal", jorna at in medieval Latin, was a measure of land equal to the amount of land that one could plow in one day. See Niermeyer. 561.

54 Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 245.

55 Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, B 11665.

56 Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 111 H 1184. Petit, Histoire. 3: 484, claimed that Guy gave the Templars goods which he had previously given to the Caulites ("biens qu'il avait precedent donnés aux Chartreux du Val-des-Choux"), but the charter clearly states: "... exceptis pratis et bladiis ... de Byceio que michi debebant annuatim et ... dederam ea fratribus de Val des Chous."
Caulites nine sextiers of grain (two of wheat, seven of oats), to be paid annually at Châtillon on the feast of Saint Rémy.\textsuperscript{57}

Nowadays, in the age of electricity, messengers of salvation have a number of outlets with which to reach their audiences and raise funds: radio and television, computerized mailings, the Internet. Monks in the Middle Ages had no such tools—whether they would have used them is a topic for debate—hence word of mouth was their only means of attracting benefactors. Two of the most obvious channels for spreading news of the Caulites were ties of family, and ties of fealty.

For example, the Montbards were one family whose ties connected them to the Caulites across generations. In 1207, Bernard of Montbard, lord of Epoisse—with the approval of his wife, Aremburge of Villehardouin, and his two sons Andrew and John—donated six sextiers of wheat, payable annually at his granary at Epoisse, as well as three muids of wine from his vineyards called Corcilliens. Bernard's son, Andrew, was lord of Epoisse from his father's death in 1212 until his own death in 1233. During his lifetime, Andrew had various dealings with the Caulite Order. For example, in 1208, he confirmed gifts made to the Caulite priory of Val-Croissant, and in 1219 he had dealings with the Caulite priory of Vausse.\textsuperscript{58} In a charter dated May of 1233, Robert of Turotte, bishop of Langres, tells us that Andrew—as part of his last will and testament—bequeathed one muid of ground wheat per year, from his mill at Bouboilly, to the monks at Val-des-Choux. The Montbard family provides a prime example of the Burgundian upper classes occupying both the fighting and praying orders. Bernard's brother John was a monk at the Cistercian house of Fontenay. His uncle, also named Bernard, was abbot of Fontenay from 1169-

\textsuperscript{57} Dijon. AD de la Côte d'Or, 111 H 1184.

\textsuperscript{58} For Andrew's dealings with Val-Croissant, see Petit, Histoire, 4: 469. For his dealings with Vausse, see Petit, Histoire, 4: 174. For more on Val-Croissant and Vausse, see Chapter 6.
Andrew’s great-great uncle, also named Andrew (d. 1155), was grand master of the Templars in the early twelfth century. The lords of Montbard extend back four generations to Bernard I, who died circa 1104.

Another example of family ties connecting benefactors to the Caulites is that of Erard II, lord of Chacenay. In 1216, Erard, with the consent of his wife, Emeline, donated seven muids of wine, payable each year during the wine harvest at his vineyard in Viviers (ad Vivarium), called Nuisement. Erard was cousin to the lords of Montréal, founders of the Caulite priory of Vausse. It is interesting to note that Erard made his donation in 1216, the same year in which he was excommunicated. Whether the former was intended as a remedy for the latter, it is difficult to say.

Of course, any attempt to prove that family links influenced donations to the Caulites is purely speculative. For example, just because Garnier, bishop of Langres, and his uncle, Simon of Rochefort, both gave to the Caulites, this does not mean that Simon ran right out and became a benefactor after hearing of the Caulites at his nephew’s table. There was a lag time of fifteen years between Garnier’s gift in 1195 and Simon’s first gift in 1210, hence Simon could just as well have found out about the Caulites from numerous others.

Evidence in the charters also suggests that ties of fealty helped to spread the word about the Caulites. We see lords approving their vassals’ donations to the Caulites, who themselves had made, or would make, donations to the Caulites. For example, in 1209, Guy Boguerelle donated to God and the brothers at Val-des-Choux one sextier of grain, to be paid once a year from a grange at Meursauge (Marcauges). Guy held this grange in fief from Peter of Ravières, who approved the donation. A charter of 1237 tells us that Guy

---

59 Peinedé, 28.2: 1165, no. 59.

donated, to the monks at Val-des-Choux, two sextiers of wheat and two of oats from of the
tithe of Montmoyen (Montemodio). Guy was a vassal of Simon of Rochefort, from whom
he held the tithe of Montmoyen in fief. We know both Peter of Ravières and Simon of
Rochefort from their tithe donations in 1209 and 1224, respectively.61

In 1210, Simon of Rochefort followed the example of his vassal Guy Boguerelle by
donating six sextiers of grain to be paid annually from his tithe at Puiset. This was before
Simon converted the donation to four-fifths of the tithe of Puiset. Simon would increase his
alms to the Caulite Order in 1218—with the approval of his wife Beatrix—by donating the
fishing rights at Essarois, just southeast of the monastery.62 In 1235, Simon donated
another muid of grain from his tithe in Essarois, this time not just for the remedy of his and
his wife’s souls, but also for the soul of his deceased son, Hugh.63 Finally, in 1248, Simon
approved the alms of two sextiers of grain that the noblewoman Ricardis had given—to
God, the blessed Mary, and the brothers of Val-des-Choux—to be paid once a year from
her portion of the tithe at Essarois.64

Money rents

Table 5.3 shows the donations of rents in kind made to the monks at Val-des-Choux
during the course of the thirteenth century. The term “money rents” might confuse readers
at the dawn of the twenty-first century. I do not mean rents collected in exchange for the
use of property, the way one pays rent to live in a furnished apartment—though there are
two examples similar to this which I will discuss at the end of this section. In the context of

61 See Table 5.1, above.


the thirteenth century, "money rents" meant monetary donations paid in installments, most often, though not always, on a yearly basis, from a variety of revenues held by the donors, made specifically for spiritual reasons, e.g., for the celebration of anniversary masses. In this way, the purpose of money rents was essentially the same as that of rents in kind; only the form of payment was different. Many of the charters did not use a specific terminology in describing these rents. For example, the charter recording Hugh d'Étang's donation called it simply "thirty sols viennois" (triginta solidos viennensisibus). Innocent III's bull of 1210—which recorded several donations to the Caulites—called Milon of Nucery's donation "one-hundred sols dijonnais in money" (centum annuos solidos Divionensis monete). Yet that same bull called Lambert of Bar's donation "forty sols in rent" (quadraginta solidos censuales). The term "censualis" applied to rents, but not exclusively to money rents. The charter recording Obert of Brion's donation of five sols dijonnais described this money rent as emanating "from the fief of rents of Pruley" (de feodo de censibus de Pruilleio). Synopses of charters in the inventory of 1738 consistently used the term "cens" to describe money rents. Peincédé was not always precise in his synopses of charters concerning money rents, sometimes using "cens" to describe these transactions, but more often simply translating to the French "rente."

The greatest number of money rents came in the second decade of the thirteenth century, which witnessed the monks at Val-des-Choux receiving six money rent donations. This number dropped to one or two money rents per decade from the 1230s to the 1270s, the minor exception being three money rents during the course of the 1260s.

---

65 See Niermeyer, 166. Innocent III (1210) also used "censualis" when referring to wine rents: "... ex dono Willelmi. militis de Warach. unum modio vini censualem ... Gualteri. canonici Lingtonensis. tres modios vini censuales."

66 Again, as in my analysis of tithe and rent-in-kind donations, I am not so interested in the quality of the donations, but believe that calculating the number of overall donations can suggest something to us about the viability of that form of donation to benefactors in the thirteenth century.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Rent(s) in Money</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td>Lambert of Bar, chamberlain of Blanche of Castille</td>
<td>40 sols from a house in Ruelle</td>
<td>Peincéde, 28.2: 1162, no. 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1210</td>
<td>Blanche of Castille, countess of Champagne</td>
<td>6 livres from the revenues of the fair in Bar-sur-Aube</td>
<td>Innocent III (1210).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1210</td>
<td>Milon, lord of Nucery</td>
<td>100 sols dijonnais</td>
<td>Innocent III (1210).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Ponce of Grancey</td>
<td>60 sols from his revenues in Frôlois</td>
<td>Peincéde, 28.2: 1161, no. 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Felicity of Armay</td>
<td>5 sols from her revenues in Brion</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>Obert of Brion</td>
<td>5 sols dijonnais from his revenues in Pruley</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 251.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1226</td>
<td>Mahaut, countess of Nevers</td>
<td>60 sols from revenues in Pothières</td>
<td>Peincéde, 28.2: 1172, no. 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Lambert of Châtillon, knight</td>
<td>2 sols dijonnais (payable each week) from his revenues in Châtillon</td>
<td>Peincéde, 28.2: 1161, no. 44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>John Trayer and his wife</td>
<td>2 sols from revenues from their vineyard in Bethy near Larrey</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 274r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>Simon, lord of Brion</td>
<td>30 florins (florinos)</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1001/2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Perrot of la Porte</td>
<td>7 sols dijonnais from his revenues in Mussy</td>
<td>Peincéde, 28.2: 1175, no. 114.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>Alix, lady of Châteauvillain</td>
<td>50 sols tournois from revenues in Beaunotte</td>
<td>Peincéde, 28.2: 1162, no. 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>William of Recey</td>
<td>5 sols from his revenues in Fraine</td>
<td>Peincéde, 28.2: 1176, no. 124.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Donations of rents in money to Val-des-Choux. (Continued.)
Table 5.3, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Rent(s) in Money</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Renaud, called Tirel, and his wife Petronille</td>
<td>40 <em>sols dijonnais</em> from their market stall near the castle of Saint-Michel in Châtillon</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1172, no. 92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>Viard, provost of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>the <em>cens</em> that he had purchased from Boyn, son of Aymon of Villiers</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1175, no. 120.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>William of Pruley</td>
<td>5 <em>sols viennois</em> from revenues in Pruley (to pay the debt of Obert of Brion, above)</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1175, no. 120.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>John of Courban, a canon of Langres</td>
<td>3 <em>livres</em> from his revenues on the banal oven in Courban</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 282r.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of money rents increased after our “turning point” date of 1225: seven money rents given before 1225 versus eleven given after that date. Of course, as the cliometricians say, it all depends on how one massages the data. It would be just as true to state that, on average, except for the 1210s, money rents over the course of the thirteenth century remained relatively stable. Over all we can note that the number of money rents recorded in the thirteenth at Val-des-Choux (18) was just under one-half the number of rents in kind given in the same period (39). Although we saw a real drop in the number of tithes donated to our monastery, especially after 1225, it does not seem that tithe donations were replaced entirely by money rents—a fact that seems to contradict the argument that the thirteenth century was largely based in a money economy. Instead, the Caulites’ benefactors shifted to donations that included smaller, more manageable rents in kind, in concert with money rents.

---

67 See note 21, above.
The first recorded money rent that the Caulites received came in October of 1205, Lambert of Bar’s forty solidos censuales, above. The expressed purpose of this donation was to buy twenty-five pounds of wax for candles to light the church. The rent was to be collected from the occupants of a house at Ruelle (de Ruella), who in 1205 were Gilbert of Bar, his nephew Almarric, and Lambert of Brena. Lambert of Bar was the chamberlain (camerarius) of Blanche of Castille, countess of Champagne. Innocent III’s confirmation of this gift in 1210 tells us that the countess of Champagne herself donated six livres to the monks at Val-des-Choux, which was to be paid annually from the revenues of the fair at Bar-sur-Aube (Barrum super Albam), one of the six celebrated fairs held in the territory of Champagne. The bull did not tell us what spiritual benefits the countess hoped to receive, though we assume that at the very least she made the donation for the salvation of her soul. For a good third of the money rents recorded, we have no record of the motives behind the donors’ gifts. This was true for the gifts of Milon of Nucery, Felicity of Arnay, John Trayer and his wife, Perrot of la Porte, and Viard, provost of Villiers-le-Duc. Likewise, Renaud, called Tirel, and his wife Petronille, who in 1263 donated forty sols dijonnais, do not tell us why. They do tell us, however, that the rent was to be paid annually from their market stall (stallum) located near the castle of Saint-Michel in Châtillon. This donation demonstrates that the Caulites were attracting a few donors from the merchant class.

Three of the money rents made to Val-des-Choux went to the celebration of anniversary masses. For example, in 1216, Henry d’Étang acknowledged a donation of thirty sols viennois, which his deceased father Hugh had made to the monks at Val-des-Choux. Hugh d’Étang, whose surname means “of the pond,” had once been the

---

68 Peincédé. 28.2: 1162, no. 46, and 1165, no. 62.

69 One reason for this lack of information is probably the poor synopses created in the eighteenth century.

70 Peincédé. 28.2: 1176, no. 127, incorrectly dated this transaction as 1270.
fisherman for the duke of Burgundy. He was very specific concerning whence this rent donation should come. Twenty *sols* were to be paid from the revenues of an oven, of which Hugh had been half owner, said oven being located in a village (*vicius*) called “water under the rock” (*aquam subtiis rocham*), i.e., Vic-sous-Thil. The other ten *sols* were to come from what had once been marshlands (*quondam launnam*) located in the territory of Ampilly, next to a mill which was called the “new mill.” This marshland had come into Hugh’s possession upon his marriage to a woman named Gondra. The entire donation was to go toward an annual, commemorative mass for both Hugh and Gondra. Another example of rents to support anniversary masses came in 1226. Mahaut, countess of Nevers, donated sixty *sols* of rent, so that the Caulites would celebrate a yearly mass for her soul and the soul of her deceased husband, Hervé, the former count of Nevers, both of whom had founded four Caulite priories in their county of Nevers.71 It was in 1226 that Mahaut remarried, four years after Hervé’s death, to Guy of Forez, who was count of Nevers from 1226 until his death in 1241. One possible motivation for Mahaut’s donation in the year of her remarriage—to the monastic order both she and her husband had so fervently supported—was to commemorate her continuing devotion to Hervé, in spite of her decision to remarry.

Just as with Hugh d’Étang, above, other donors of money rents could be very specific about whence their donation was to come, and for what purposes it was to be used. In 1274, John of Courban (*Cortivron*), a canon of Langres, donated three *livres*, payable each year on the feast of John the Baptist (24 June). This is perhaps connected to the Caulite custom of naming their churches in honor of John the Baptist, though the charter was not specific on this point. The rent was to come from John of Courban’s revenues at

---

71 For the Caulite monasteries founded by Hervé and Mathilde, and for more on the reasons behind those foundations, see Chapter 6.
the banal oven at Courban. In case these revenues did not suffice, the canon designated that the rent should be paid from other revenues he collected in Courban. In 1234, the knight Lambert of Châtillon donated two *sols dijonnais*, payable each week from rents he collected at Châtillon, to be used for the pittance of the monks at Val-des-Choux.

Sometimes donors had to pay money rents to cover the debts for which they had become responsible. For example, in 1259, Alix of Châteauvillain assigned a rent of fifty *sols tournois* from the revenues she collected in the village of Beaunotte. This was intended to account for a bequest that her deceased husband Simon, the former lord of Châteauvillain, and their daughter Agnes, the countess of Joigny, had left to the monks at Val-des-Choux.

Simon of Châteauvillain had also founded the Caulite priory of Vauclair. Another example came in 1270, when William of Pruley had somehow become responsible for the alms of five *sols viennois* donated to the Caulite monks by the knight Obert of Brion in 1219. Peincédé’s synopsis of this charter was unclear on the relationship between William and Obert. Nonetheless, to cover his debt, William assigned revenues held in Pruley and threw in a *muid* of oats for good measure. In a charter dated April of that same year, we learn that the manse to which William of Pruley had assigned the five *sols* of rent was attached to the house of Humbert “le Gras” (the Fat).

---

72 Banal rights were monopolies held by a manorial lord over his dependents. In this case, John of Courban owned the oven which his dependents were required to use, thus creating revenues for John. See Niermeyer, 80. “bannalis,” def. 4.

73 A pittance (an OF variant of *pietance*, piety or pity) was a monk’s extra allowance of food.

74 Peincédé, 28.2: 1162, no. 47.

75 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 326. For more on the foundation of Vauclair, see Chapter 6.

76 Peincédé, 28.2: 1177, no. 128. Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 251, claims that Obert’s gift consisted of 5 *sols dijonnais* (*solidos divionis*), not *viennois*.

77 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 277v.
In spite of the spiritual impulse that inspired them, money rents or rents in kind were debts, which donors, or their heirs, owed to the monastery. A family’s financial situation might change for the worse since the original donation of alms, but this did not necessarily keep the monastery from expecting its due. Neither wanting to forfeit the spiritual benefits that the earlier donation had brought, nor to be dragged into court by their creditors, the heirs of these debts were forced to find alternative forms of payment. Thus in March of 1281, when John of Frôlois became lord of Frôlois, he inherited the rent that Ponce of Grancey, his ancestor, had donated to the Caulites for the support of one monk.78 Ponce had already had difficulty paying this debt in 1217. John of Frôlois found himself in similar straits in 1281, and had to resolve the debt by donating several parcels of land to the Caulites, to wit: a field containing six journals of land, located above the leprosarium of Darcy; a section of meadow located at “Ves Mugnoix;” ten operatas in a vineyard below “Les Laiz de Rece;” another vineyard comprising almost seven operatas; and two journals of land located in a place called “au Beoissom.”79 March of 1281 must have presented hard times to some Burgundian landholders. In that same month and year, Claire of Villiers-le-Duc also found herself unable to pay the seventeen sols of rent she owed the Caulites, which Claire’s deceased husband, Viard, had donated to the Caulites so that they might celebrate a mass in his name. To settle this debt, Claire ceded to Peter, then prior at Val-des-Choux, various inheritances she held in trust (quos habeo in tutela) for her children Colin and John. These included whatever rights the children expected to have in two fields

---

78 This rent, discussed above, included three sextiers of wheat from the mill at Frôlois, three muids of wine, and 60 sols per year. See Peinecôde, 28.2: 1161, no. 43.

79 Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 242. An operata was a measure of land, specific to vineyards, which equaled one day’s work. See Niermeyer, 739.
located in Villiers-le-Duc; and one piece of arable land located in the township of Vannaire.  

Finally, though most of the money rents the Caulites collected were donations for spiritual purposes, two transactions seem to reveal to us that they collected rents of a purely financial nature. In 1208, we see them collecting five sols and one measure of wheat from a house and manse at Pruly which they had leased to Barthèlmy and Martin Maillot. A charter dated 1238 mentions rent collected on a house occupied by Laurent of Villiers-le-Duc. The nature of these transactions is ambiguous at best, on account of the poor detail found in the inventory of 1738 that records them. Taken at face value, they may indicate that the Caulites were moving away from their founder’s mandate that they should not own property.

**Immovable property**

Folz recognized the importance of land donations to the Caulite patrimony, but his view of immovable property was somewhat limited. The following discussion includes not only land donations, but also the gifts of other immovable properties not accounted for in Folz’s model, including vineyards, houses, mills, and market stalls. The earliest recorded donation of land to the Caulites that I was able to find came in 1200, when Borrins of Châtillon gave part of a meadow near a ford called “Val-du-menard.” Between 1200 and 1282, the Caulites received a total of twenty meadows, parts of meadows, or other sections

---


81 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 277r. The inventory of 1738 labeled this transaction a “baille a cens”. a lease for rent.

82 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 92r. The synopsis in the inventory of 1738 reads as follows: “mention d’une maison qui etoit occupée par Laurent de Villier le Duc, chargé d’un droit de cens envers les Val-des-Choux.”
The great number of meadows donated, especially after 1248, is probably connected to a shift toward animal husbandry. In addition to these meadows, over the course of the thirteenth century, the Caulites also received ten vineyards and ten "sections" (operatas) of vineyards; eight houses and three manses (mansus); two orchards; one winepress; two mills; and one market stall, located next to the pillory in Châtillon-sur-Seine. The distribution of immovable property donations over the decades of the thirteenth century is interesting. In the 1200s and 1210s, donations of immovable property numbered seven and five, respectively. As with other kinds of donations, these relatively high numbers in the early years of Val-des-Choux probably represent the early enthusiasm for the new order. It is perhaps ironic that so many donations of immovable property came in this period, when the ideal of living "from rents" must still have been fresh in the minds of Val-des-Choux's monks. From the 1220s to the 1250s, Val-des-Choux received only two donations of immovable property per decade (with none recorded for the 1230s). That number increased to four in the 1260s, then to three in the 1270s. The 1280s show four donations of immovable property to Val-des-Choux, though two of these were made in order to settle previous debts. Again, these figures do not speak to the quality of donations given, but to the raw quantity of donations, as a reflection of the kind of gifts donors were likely to make.

Of twenty-nine documents recording donations of immovable properties, only ten preserve any hint of the donors' religious motives. Peincedé's synopses of these

---

83 Vague language in the charters—such as "all the meadows he possessed" or "all his goods and inheritances"—complicated the task of calculating the number of immovable properties in this section. Therefore, when such language occurred that implied, for example, a plurality of meadows, I conservatively counted this as two meadows. This is not a perfect system, but it gives us some idea of the minimum number of immovable properties that the Caulites possessed.

84 See my discussion of movable property, below.

85 A mansus could be a dwelling or a homestead with the arable land attached to it. For several possible definitions, see Niermeyer, 643-645.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Immovable(s)</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>Borrins of Châtillon</td>
<td>part of a meadow near a ford called &quot;Val-du-menard&quot;</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1175, no. 117.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1203</td>
<td>Henry of Villetre</td>
<td>bought a vineyard in Fauverney from the Caulites (evidence that the Caulites already had it to sell)</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 264r-v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Foulque of Corterun</td>
<td>1 vineyard in Corterun</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1173, no. 103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1205</td>
<td>Humbaud of Nuiz, knight</td>
<td>1 house and mansus</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1173, no. 99.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206</td>
<td>Laure of Dijon</td>
<td>part of a vineyard in Bray</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 264v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>Ebrard, deacon of Langres</td>
<td>his half of an orchard in Bissey</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 248.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208</td>
<td>Robert, bishop of Langres</td>
<td>the other half of the orchard in Bissey, which he owned with Ebrard, deacon of Langres</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 248.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1210</td>
<td>Constant, magister of Avallon</td>
<td>all his vineyards near Tabulas et Domitiacum</td>
<td>Innocent III (1210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Humbert, a canon of Langres</td>
<td>vineyards he held in the township (finagium) of Dijon</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 264v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1216</td>
<td>Girard Pelipart and someone named Reverand</td>
<td>1 winepress</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 264v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>Obert of Brion, knight</td>
<td>3 meadows</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 251.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>Hugh of Bissey and his brother Odo</td>
<td>1 house called &quot;Bixeoth&quot;</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1162, no. 48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>Girard Pelipart</td>
<td>1 house near the &quot;porte bochet&quot;</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 264v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Donations of immovable property to Val-des-Choux. (Continued.)
Table 5.4, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Immovable(s)</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>Geoffrey of Aignay</td>
<td>1 mill in Beaunotte</td>
<td>Peinecedé, 28.2: 1154, no. 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>Peter Gaullarz</td>
<td>1 market stall, next to the pillory in Châtillon</td>
<td>Peinecedé, 28.2: 1175, no. 115.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>Peter of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>all the houses he held in Châtillon</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 180r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>Guy of Maisey, knight</td>
<td>1 meadow called “Bonet” near Vannaire</td>
<td>Peinecedé, 28.2: 1173, no. 98.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>Bounin, son of John Coutereau</td>
<td>all the vineyards he possessed in Darcy</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 259.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>Viard, provost of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>1 house and <em>mansus</em> near Vanvey (followed by entry into the monastery)</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 79v-80r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>Boyn of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>1 mill (the “Provost’s mill”) in Villiers-le-Duc; an orchard behind the mill; and the land in front of it</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 273.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Margareta, widow of William of Recey</td>
<td>1/2 a vineyard, which she had obtained from the Caulites in a dispute after her husband’s death</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 218, p. 636.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267</td>
<td>Renauz of Grancey, the lord of Larrey</td>
<td>all that he possessed in Mosson and its finagium, including men, lands, rivers, and all other things</td>
<td>Peinecedé, 28.2: 1176, no. 121.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>Boyn of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>all his lands, meadows and houses in the <em>finagium</em> of Villiers-le-Duc and of Ampilly</td>
<td>Peinecedé, 28.2: 1171, no. 88.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>Rainfred</td>
<td>1 meadow called “le Chu” and 2 corners (<em>angulas</em>) of meadow called “la Cuyche; 1 meadow, located between two bodies of water (<em>inter duas aquas</em>); 1 meadow called “Chau-morse”</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 286.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Immovable(s)</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1275</td>
<td>Simon of Maulyard and his wife Elysabeth</td>
<td>1 section of meadow under the bridge of Vanvey</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 81r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1276</td>
<td>Guilleimette d’Etaules</td>
<td>1 vineyard in a place called “Champolin”</td>
<td>Dijon, Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 180v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1280</td>
<td>The son of Girard le Roux of Aignay</td>
<td>his rights to 1 mansus in Aignay, adjoining a house called “Rousseau”</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 345v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>John of Frôlois</td>
<td>1 field with six journals of land next to the leprosarium of Darcy; 1 meadow called “Ves Mugnoix;” 10 operatas of vineyard (debt settlement)</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 242.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>Claire of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>2 fields Villiers-le-Duc; 1 in Vannaire (debt settlement)</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 273.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>John of Villiers-le-Duc and his wife Ameline</td>
<td>1 meadow called “le pré Brouche” in Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 81v.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents are surprisingly faithful—no pun intended. For example, Peincedé tells us that the knight Humbaud of Nuiz donated one house and mansus “in alms to Saint Mary of Val-des-Choux, for the salvation of the soul of Milon, and for his own.” In his synopses of six other transactions, Peincedé tells us that Hugh of Bissey, Geoffrey of Aignay, Peter Gaullarz, Guy of Maisey, Boyn of Villiers-le-Duc, and Renaud of Grancey, all donated immovable properties “in alms” and/or “for the salvation of their souls.” Of the eight original charters recording donations of immovable properties, only two tell us anything about the donors’ religious impulse. Obert of Brion made his donation “to God and the

---

brothers of Val-des-Choux (*Deo et fratribus Vallis caulis*), while Boyn of Villiers-le-Duc made his donation “for the salvation of his soul and the souls of his ancestors” (*por lou remede de s’arme et des armes a ses ancessours*). Noticeably absent from the records concerning immovable properties is any mention of anniversary masses, which were so prevalent in the records for money-rent donations.

The inventory of 1738 records but a single instance of immovable properties donated for religious motives—actually, two entries with variations. According to the first entry, in 1261, Viard, a “captain at Villiers-le-Duc,” gave the monks at Val-des-Choux a manse (French: *meix*) near Vanvey and “other things mentioned in the said donation.”

The second entry, immediately following the first, called Viard the “provost of Villiers-le-Duc,” and listed his donations as a house at Vanvey, and a place under the bridge at Vanvey. The second entry also reports that Viard, after making these gifts, “became a monk at Val-des-Choux.” Unfortunately, the compilers of the inventory then mistakenly claimed that the Viard of this donation was the same Viard mentioned in an inscription in the church at Val-des-Choux.

* Most scholars (myself included) associate the Viard in this inscription with Val-des-Choux’s spiritual founder, which the Viard of 1261 most certainly was not! In

---

87 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 79v: “... donation faite ... par un nommé Viard. Capitaine a Villiers le Duc. d’un meix situé proche Vanvey. et autre choses mentioné en ladite donation.”

88 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 79v: “Viard, prevot de Villiers le Duc a [donné] a perpetuité auxdits prieur et religieux, un maison située a Vanvey, et une place au meme lieu sous le pont.” Peinecé, dated this same transaction in 1269, but made no mention of Viard’s entry into Val-des-Choux: see Peinecé, 28.2: 1175, no.120: “Lettre ... par laquelle Wiard, prevot de Villers le Duc. du consentement d’Emengarde. sa femm e. a donné en aumone auxd. freres un meis situé a Vanver ... situé sous le pont de Vanveir.”

89 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 80r: “C’est ce même Viard dont il est tracé quelque mots d’ecriture dans le choeur du coté de l’evangile.”

90 For a discussion of this inscription, see Chapter 4.
spite of this error in the synopsis of this donation, the donation itself is still interesting. For one thing, it is one of only two records that I was able to find that speak of entry into a Caulite monastery. It also preserves one of the few names we have for Caulite monks in the thirteenth century. If Viard’s becoming a monk at Val-des-Choux was contingent upon his gift to the monastery, this could represent an example of simony, though it just as easily could be an “entry gift” to the monastery.

The Caulites do not seem to have experienced any discord over the immovable property they received, once the donors had given it. It is interesting to note that in 1266, Margareta, widow of William of Recey, gave half of a vineyard to the Caulites, only after having obtained the vineyard in some kind of judgment against them, following the death of her husband. The charter gives no indication about why Margareta would have donated her vineyard to the Caulites after having won judgment against them concerning her rights to the vineyard. William had been a Caulite benefactor in 1263 (see Tables 5.2 and 5.3, above). Perhaps William had promised the vineyard in some now-missing charter. Perhaps Margareta felt guilt or remorse at not supporting the order as her deceased husband had. In the end, Margareta’s children—Margareta, Thomas, Simon, Maltida, and Johanneta—approved her gift, and after this there is no record of any further discord surrounding this vineyard.

---

91 A charter discussed in Chapter 6 records a second case involving the Caulite priory of Vaucclair.

92 Simony was a practice by which a member of the laity “bought” entry into the monastery, in hopes of thus gaining the spiritual privileges that came with taking the habit. Concerning the difference between entry gifts and simony, see J. Lynch, Simoniacal Entry into Religious Life from 1000 to 1260 (Columbus, Ohio, 1976). According to Lynch, after the Fourth Lateran Council, in 1215, it became increasingly difficult to justify such gifts. In Lynch’s words, “a practice that had been normal and respectable before 1130, had become a crime by 1230.” See Lynch, 224.

93 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 218, p. 636: “...medietatem vinee que partitur cum predictis fratribus quam partem obtinuerat in jure contra ipsos post decessum mariti sui superius nominati.”
Some of the donations were very specific about how the Caulites should use the property. For example, in 1219, when Hugh of Bissey and his brother Odo gave the Caulites a house they own called "Bixeoth," they stipulated that the Caulites could not sell the house or give it to another religious order. In addition, the tenants of the house—at the time a certain Evrard and Garnier—were not to keep oxen, cows, pigs or sheep on the property.

Movable property

During the course of the thirteenth century, the Caulites received two kinds of movable property: livestock and the labor of humans.

The monks at Val-des-Choux had not always kept livestock. Recall James of Vitry’s observation, sometime in the 1220s, that the Caulites had “neither flocks, nor herds.”

According to James, this was all part of the Caulite plan to avoid involvement in worldly affairs, to eschew anything that might distract them from their spiritual pursuits. Animals needed caretakers, and the Caulites hoped to keep their communities small: twenty members, monks and conversi combined. Also, and above all, animals needed land on which to graze. This meant meadows. The number of meadows that the Caulites received in the thirteenth century, beginning in 1200 (see Table 5.3, above), suggests that Caulite practice regarding “flocks and herds” eventually shifted. According to a bull of Honorius III dated 1224—written soon after James of Vitry’s visit to Val-des-Choux—the Caulites did possess animals in that year.

In 1266, Hugh IV, duke of Burgundy, granted the

94 Vitry, Historia, 120: “nec greges, nec armenta.” James of Vitry wrote the Historia sometime between 1219 and 1225. For a discussion of the various arguments for dating James’s work, see Chapter 7.

95 Honorius (1224): “… Ad hec presentium auctoritate districtius inhibemus ne quis talis, collectis seu aliis quibuslibet exactionibus insolitis et indebitis vos aggravare presumat, vel a vobis de ortis et virgultis vestris aut vestrorum animalium nutrimentis decimas extorque” (italics mine).
Caulites the right of pasturage, in his forest of Villers, for twenty cows with their off-spring (OF: ensiganz) up to two years old, as well as eight plow oxen, from the Caulite properties at Saint-Germain-le-Rochoux. Folz saw this as evidence that the Caulites had entered into animal husbandry, signaling a shift from Innocent III's mandate of 1205 that they should live from rents. There is no record of how the Caulites acquired these cattle, whether they were given or purchased. If there was a shift to include animal husbandry in Caulite economic policy, it is surprising that this is the only mention of livestock at the motherhouse for the entire thirteenth century. Though we have no other specific numbers concerning the livestock at the motherhouse, Caulite filial houses also practiced animal husbandry, and on a much larger scale. For example, the knight Gaudry of Repas gave the filial priory of Val-Saint Benoit the right of pasturage for two plow-oxen, fifty sheep, twenty cows, and ten mares with their young. The only limitation on these pasturage rights was that the monks would be held responsible for any damage done by their animals. The founder of the filial priory of Val-Croissant gave the monks the use of enough meadows to graze 600 sheep and 20 cows. Monks at the filial priory of Genevroye kept pigs. All of this shows that within a generation or two of their order's founding, the Caulites practiced animal husbandry—in spite of the mandate against this.

Another form of movable property that the Caulites exploited was human labor. Traditionally, someone who owed labor obligations to a medieval lord was called a "serf."

---

97 Folz, 105, also discussed the bull of Honorius III and the observations of James of Vitry in this same context.
99 Courtépée. Description générale et particulière. 4: 156.
100 Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or. 66 H 1002/1. cartulary of Genevroye, fol. 9v.
but the use of this term has fallen out of favor with some historians, not the least because of its many and varied meanings throughout the Middle Ages.\(^{101}\) In fact, the Caulite documents do not use the term "serf" (*servus*) at all. Most charters use the term "men" (*hominis*). For example, in Innocent III’s bull confirming Odo III’s gifts to Val-des-Choux, it lists "a house and land ... and one man with his things to cultivate the land in their use."\(^{102}\) A charter dated 1221 refers to this same "man" by name, Gauthier of Vanvey. This second charter does not apply any identifying label to Gauthier, but merely states that the Caulites had rights to him, with all that he possessed.\(^{103}\) Gauthier of Vanvey passed from the Hospitallers to the Caulites to the Cistercians to Templars—a good example of how serfs could be tied to the land they worked.\(^{104}\) Even in its synopsis of Odo III’s donation of 1205, we can see the compilers of the inventory of 1738 translating the Latin *homo* into the French *homme*:

> Odo, duc de Bourgogne a donné aux Val-des-Choux son homme de Châtillon, nommé Vorle, pour la remede de son ame. (Odo [III] gave to the [Caulites] his man from Châtillon named Vorle. for the salvation of his soul.)\(^{105}\)

Yet, a charter dated 1208 applied the term *dominicus* to a man bound to obligatory labor. In this charter, Robert, bishop of Langres gave the Caulites an orchard in the town of Bissey, and threw in *dominicus* named Gauthier (*Galerius*) for good measure. Robert referred to

---


\(^{102}\) Innocent III (1210): "...domum et terram ... et unum hominem cum rebus ipsius ad excolendam terram in usus vestros."

\(^{103}\) Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 6 H 2, fol. 18r-v: "... quod fratres de Longovado dererunt et concesserunt nobis quicquid iuris habeabant et habere poterant .... [several things listed. then], et Galterius de Vanvex, cum omnibus quae possidebat."

\(^{104}\) For the full story of the transaction involving Gauthier, see Chapter 4.

\(^{105}\) Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 192r.
Gauthier as his “beast of burden” (somelarius). When the chapter at Langres confirmed Robert’s gift in 1210, they made it clear that the bishop had given Gauthier “for the purpose of caring for the aforesaid orchard” and “that both the orchard and the said dominicus, and his heirs, ought to be possessed by the [Caulite] brothers, by right, in perpetuity.”

Peincedé recorded another interesting transaction, dated 1269, which also concerned a man bound to obligatory labor. According to Peincedé’s analysis of this charter:

Arvier of Sottre, squire, declared, that having bought Milon of Moncon, called Poto ... from the brothers of Val-des-Choux, he does not assume any rights over Adeline, wife of the said Milon, and if there were any rights, he abandoned them to the [Caulites]. (Emphasis mine.)

In spite of Peincedé’s use of the phrase “having bought,” I assume that Arvier did not “buy” Milon, but rather the rights to his labor, which, as suggested above, did not include any rights to Milon’s wife Adeline. Other than these occasional mentions in the charters, the Caulites are silent on their “serfs.” We do not know how they were treated, where they lived, if or when they were ever manumitted. Chapter 6 offers several more examples of donors offering serfs to Caulite filial monasteries.

Active property acquisition

The generous donations of their benefactors—especially of lands and houses—may have whetted the Caulite appetite for property ownership. By the middle of the thirteenth

---


107 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 248: “... et unum hominem in ipsum villa Bassei, scilicet dominicum ad custodiendum viridarium ante dictum ... quod tam ipsum viridarium quam dictus dominicus et heredes sui a iam dictis fratribus iure perpetuo debeant possideri.”

108 Peincedé, 28.2: 1175. no. 119: “Lettre des abbé et prieur de Châtillon ... qui declarent qu’Arvier, dit de Sottre, ecuier, a declaré qu’ayant acheté des freres du Val-deds-Choux Milon de Moncon, dit Poto, il ne pretend aucun droit sur Adeline, femme dud. Milon, et s’il y a quelque droit il l’abandonné auxd. freres.” Cf. Cote d’Or. 66 H Inv 40. fol. 106v, which dated this transaction in 1260.
century, the Caulites certainly advanced from receiving property as gifts to acquiring property on their own initiative, apparently with an eye toward economic gain. Such phrases as "economic gain" can be loaded. It is not my intention here to render judgment on the Caulites, to find fault with them for passing from the "pure state" of their early days, when they lived from rents alone, to the "fallen state" of acquiring property for economic gain. Faced with the responsibilities of a growing monastic order, I can imagine that the Caulites saw no contradiction between their economic behavior and their spiritual ideals. In many ways, the experience of the Caulites echoes that of the Cistercians, who, to use Lekai's phrase, moved from ideals to reality.109

As Table 5.5 shows, the Caulites may have been acting for economic reasons as early as 1230, when they exchanged a house in Châtillon for a house in Langres. They certainly seem to have been acting economically in 1246, when they sought the permission of Thibaut, count of Champagne, to sell their mill in Chaumont to Stephen, the provost of Chaumont, for 400 *livres viennois*. In 1247 the Caulites made their first purchase: a vineyard called "de Ponce," which they bought from a priest named William for twenty-nine *livres dijonnais*. The Caulites made four more purchases in the 1250s. In the 1260's they made ten purchases, and eight more in the 1270s. They made eleven purchases and one land exchange in the 1280s. In the 1290s they made two purchases and one land exchange. In sum, during the last half of the thirteenth century, the Caulites made forty transactions involving the active acquisition of property. Contrast this with only thirty-two transactions involving gifts to the Caulites during that same period.110 By the end of the


110 From 1250 to 1290, the Caulites received three tithe donations; ten rent-in-kind donations; seven money-rent donations; and thirteen donations of immovable property; see Tables 5.1 to 5.4, above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property and Price</th>
<th>Purchased from</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1230</td>
<td>exchange of house in Châtillon for a house in Langres</td>
<td>Lambert and Hugh Pellipart</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 180r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246</td>
<td>mill at Chaumont for 400 <em>livres viennois</em></td>
<td>SOLD to Stephen, Chaumont’s provost. Thibaut, count of Champagne approved the sale</td>
<td>Paris, BN, ms lat 5993 A, fol. 414r-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1 vineyard called “de Ponce” for 29 <em>livres dijonnais</em></td>
<td>the priest William of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254</td>
<td>1 vineyard, no price given</td>
<td>Lambert of Châtillon, son of the deceased knight, John of Châtillon</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1170, no. 84.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1/4 sextiers of wheat, according to the measure of Aigny, for 40 <em>livres dijonnais</em> annually</td>
<td>Renaud of Dijon, called “li Qurs” (the Short)</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>market stall, located next to the pillory in Châtillon, for 17 <em>livres</em> 10 <em>sols dijonnais</em></td>
<td>William of Châtillon, and his wife Baunette</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1171, no. 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>an orchard, for twenty <em>livres dijonnais</em></td>
<td>Evrard of Mosson and his wife Emengard</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>several portions of meadow and several revenues (cens), no price given</td>
<td>Henry of Villiers-le-Duc, his wife Sibille, and his brother Guy</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1172, no. 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1 meadow, which owed rent to the church of Saint-Barthelmy-de-Vanvey</td>
<td>Henrioth of Belui</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>nine <em>journals</em> (jugera) of land next to the fields of Arnoul’s brother Liebaud, and seven <em>journals</em> next to land held by the Templars, in Vanvey, for 8 <em>livres dijonnais</em></td>
<td>Arnoul-Claude of Vanvey</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>1 house in Mussey (from the rents of which the Caulites had previously received a money-rent donation), no price given</td>
<td>Perrot of la Porte and his wife Isabelle</td>
<td>Peincédé, 28.2: 1174, no. 111.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: Active property acquisition at Val-des-Choux. (Continued.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property and Price</th>
<th>Purchased from</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1/4 part of a mill on the river of Beaunotte—below another mill that they already owned, for 20 livres viennois</td>
<td>Humbert of Melecon and his wife, Forniere</td>
<td>Peinecedé, 28.2: 1170, no. 85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1 meadow called &quot;Prez Bonot&quot; for 6 livres viennois</td>
<td>Milo of Maisey and his wife Bienvanient</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1/8 of the mill at Aignay, near the leper house for 20 livres viennois</td>
<td>Huot of Aignay and his wife Castellana</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1/2 of 1/3 of the mill at Aignay, near the leper house, formerly held by Simon of Menicules, for payment due on repairs</td>
<td>Marieta, Simon’s daughter, and her husband, the knight Henry of Beaumes</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>part of a meadow called &quot;Li lochere&quot;—which they shared with the Caulites and with a certain Guy Fabre, for 30 sols viennois</td>
<td>Sylvestre of Villiers-le-Duc, Julian, and Julian’s wife Olanette</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>1 grange, outside of an enclosure (extra clausuram), for twenty-five livres viennois</td>
<td>Gaudry, son of the deceased knight Renaud</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>3 parts of a haystack, in a meadow called “Grans fons,” located near Voulaines, which they shared with the seller, for 60 sols viennois. (a one-time purchase?)</td>
<td>Henry of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1/3 of one haystack, and 1/4 of another, located in the meadow of “Grans fons,” for 56 sols viennois (a one-time purchase?)</td>
<td>Donote of Villiers-le-Duc, widow of Viart</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>1 meadow, for 45 sols viennois</td>
<td>Melyne of Villiers-le-Duc, with the consent of her husband Thomas</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1273</td>
<td>section of meadow located in a place called “Laveine,” for 6 livres and 6 sols dijonnais</td>
<td>Henry of Villiers-le-Duc and his wife Marie</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property and Price</td>
<td>Purchased from</td>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1 grange called “dou Boschet,” and part of a field called “de la forest” for 38 livres tournois and one measure each of good wine and table wine <em>(unius modii boni et modii tabilis vini)</em></td>
<td>James of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1 meadow called “Thiery,” no price given</td>
<td>Michel and Henry Miiiot</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 84r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1 meadow in a place called “Au rue de Foncenelles,” for 30 sols dijonnais and one bushel of wheat</td>
<td>Arbert, called Metaul of Darcy</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1277</td>
<td>1 meadow called “by the fountain of Tue chiens” <em>(ad fontem de Tue chiens)</em>, for 6 livres and 10 sols dijonnais</td>
<td>Doiette, wife of Stephen of Mugnois, who shared it with the Caulites</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1 piece of arable land between Vanvey and Villiers, in a place called “Chanlart,” in front of a mill, next to the Caulites’ land, for 8 livres tournois</td>
<td>James of Villiers-le-Duc</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1 journal of land, for 6 livres and 10 sols tournois; 2 journals of land, price illegible</td>
<td>James de la Pierre of Vannaire and his wife Jasnette</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>a piece of land “containing close to a journal,” for 16 livres and 15 sols</td>
<td>Aubert and his sister Mengard</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1 field in Darcy, in a place called “by the cold fountain” <em>(OF: a froide fontene)</em> for 12 livres tournois</td>
<td>Robert of Aignay, priest</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>1 journal of land adjacent to an orchard <em>(bergeriam)</em> that the Caulites already owned, for 4 livres tournois</td>
<td>Bonette of Vannaire, with the approval of her husband Lambert</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>1 journal of land in Vanvey, no price given</td>
<td>Stephen of Vanvey</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 81v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>1 piece of arable land, for 40 sols tournois</td>
<td>Athenet of Vannaire</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property and Price</th>
<th>Purchased from</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1283</td>
<td>exchange of 1 journal land in Villiers-le-Duc for arable land in Vanvey</td>
<td>Henry of Villiers-le-Duc and his wife Catherine-Sabine</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 81v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>part of meadow called “Gelme,” in the finagium of Villiers-le-Duc, no price given</td>
<td>Guy Fabre and his wife Armengarde</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 81v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1 meadow located in a place called “au toz daure jautrui,” for 12 livres tournois and 3 bushels of wheat</td>
<td>Agnelia of Mignon, with the approval of her husband Benign</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1286</td>
<td>one-fourth of a house, shared by Perrino, called Regur, and Odico, called Vadet for 100 sols tournois</td>
<td>Benign, a cleric, and his wife Sybille</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288</td>
<td>1 manse in Aignay and one-third of the mill in Aignay, near the leper-house, held in fief by William of Fresne, for 20 livres tournois</td>
<td>the knight John of Duesme</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1291</td>
<td>exchange of two journals land for two other journals land in Vanvey</td>
<td>Marie, wife of Petitot of Vanvey</td>
<td>Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 82r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>1/2 of 3/4 interest in the mill at Aignay, near the leper-house, for payment due on repairs, as well as the cost of one horse</td>
<td>William of Fresne, who held this in fief from Val-des-Choux</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1293</td>
<td>the other 1/2 of 3/4 interest in the mill at Aignay, near the leper-house, for 50 livres tournois</td>
<td>William of Fresne, who held this in fief from Val-des-Choux</td>
<td>Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
thirteenth century, in addition to the properties their benefactors had donated, the Caulites had acquired numerous properties to create an impressive seigniory. Their acquisitions included twenty-two journals of land; twelve meadows; two pieces of arable land; two fields; two granges; an orchard; two vineyards; two and one-fourth houses; several parts of mills; and one market stall.

Occasionally, land purchases caused trouble for the monks at Val-des-Choux. For example, in March 1281, they bought a field (campus) from the priest Robert of Aignay for 12 livres tournois. One month later, in April 1281, the Caulites found themselves in court over this sale. It seems that Robert of Aignay’s brother, Jofrois, had sold the field in question to a third brother, Prenoire, knowing that Robert had already sold it to the Caulites. Jofrois admitted selling the field, but claimed he had every right to do so, and if Robert felt otherwise, he would have to prove it. Witnesses offered testimony before Renaud of Semur, cleric and bailli of Byetrix, duchess of Burgundy. In the end, Robert prevailed and the court upheld the sale to the Caulites. The real loser in this affair seems to have been Prenoire, but the charter recording this dispute was silent concerning any recompense he may have received.

Above all, a study of the charters reveals the Caulites consolidating their holdings through the purchase of select properties. I have not uncovered any expressed policy of Caulites concerning the consolidation of their properties. Yet their choices in purchasing lands and other properties seem to indicate that they were behaving in an economically astute manner. Two case studies may best illustrate my point.

---

111 Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 258.
Case Study No. 1: The lands surrounding Vanvey

Between 1261 and 1291, through gifts, purchases, and exchanges, the Caulites steadily increased their land holdings in Vanvey, a village northwest of Val-des-Choux, just south of Villiers-le-Duc (see map, Figure 5.1). In 1261, the Caulites received a house and manse in Vanvey from Viard, the provost of Villiers-le-Duc, which gift, as discussed above, was connected to Viard’s taking the habit at Val-des-Choux. In that same year, the Caulites made their first land purchase in Vanvey. Renaud, the prior at Val-des-Choux, bought a meadow from Henrioth of Belui. But the Caulites were evidently caught unawares when they discovered that the meadow owed rents (OF: *censie*) to the church of Saint-Barthelmy of Vanvey (l’*eglise Seim Bartholomies de Vanvex*). Nicholas, the prior at Saint-Barthelmy (prior de ce moimes lui), was not about to lose these rents just because the meadow had changed hands. To solve the problem, and not lose their investment, the Caulites agreed to pay five *deniers* yearly to the church of Saint-Barthelmy. A year later, in 1262, the Caulites purchased more land in Vanvey, this time from Arnoul-Claude of Vanvey. The sale amounted to nine *journs* of land next to the fields of Arnoul’s brother Liebaud, and seven *journs* next to land held by the Templars, all for 8 *livres dijonnois*. In 1275, Simon of Maulyard and his wife Elysabeth gave the Caulites another piece of land, a section of meadow under the bridge of Vanvey. In 1281, the Caulites began to more actively consolidate their holdings in Vanvey, purchasing one piece (*peciam*) of arable land between Vanvey and Villiers, in a place called “Chanlart,” next to land that the Caulites

---

112 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 79v-80r: see Table 5.4.

113 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285: see Table 5.5.

114 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 285: see Table 5.5.

115 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 81r, see Table 5.4.
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already owned (*iuxta terram dicti emptorum*). This was followed in 1282 by the purchase of one *journal* of land in Vanvey from Stephen of Vanvey. Further proof of active consolidation came in 1283, when the Caulites exchanged one *journal* of land they held in Villiers-le-Duc for arable land that Henry of Villiers-le-Duc held in Vanvey. If Henry really was from Villiers-le-Duc, this exchange made good sense for him as well. In 1291, the Caulites entered into an arrangement with Marie, the wife of Petitot of Vanvey, in which each party exchanged two *journals* of land in one part of Vanvey for two *journals* of land located elsewhere in that same township.

The donations of land in Vanvey were surely made for the spiritual benefits the donors hoped to gain. The inventory of 1738 tells us that Viard of Villiers-le-Duc gave the Caulites a house and manse as an entry gift to the monastery. The inventory of 1738 is not so generous in recording the spiritual motives behind the gift of Simon of Maulyard and his wife Elysabeth. Based on the expressed motivation of other donors, we can assume that they desired to be remembered in the prayers of the monks at Val-des-Choux.

The land purchases and land exchanges in Vanvey are another matter. I contend that these must be seen in economic terms. The purchases seem focused: land bought next to land that the Caulites already owned. The exchanges seem geared to consolidate: a *journal* in Villiers-le-Duc for arable in Vanvey; two *journals* in Vanvey for two others better located in Vanvey. In the course of thirty years, the Caulites increased their holdings in Vanvey from one house and manse to seventeen *journals* of land, one meadow, and one other piece of land, and that land seemed to be located according to some Caulite intention to work the

---

116 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 272; see Table 5.5.

117 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 81v; see Table 5.5.

118 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 81v; see Table 5.5.

119 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 82r; see Table 5.5.
land in the most efficient manner. Yet, thirty years is a long time. We can hardly call the Caulites acquisitions in Vanvey a fast-paced buying spree. I think it is more likely that the Caulites took opportunities when they arose, when land became available or when landholders found themselves in difficult economic positions. Such was the situation in the next case study.

Case Study No. 2: The mill at the leper house in Aignay

In May of 1251, Hugh, duke of Burgundy, made known that William of Duesme approved the alms made by his vassal, Simon of Menicules, to God and the brothers of Val-des-Choux. These alms were to be paid annually from Simon’s part in the mill of Aignay, located in front of the leper house at Aignay.120

Except for the rather colorful location of the mill—next to a house of lepers—there is nothing remarkable about these alms. The text of the donation follows a formula we have seen before. The agents in the charter appear according to what we might advisedly call a feudal hierarchy: Hugh, duke of Burgundy, had the transaction recorded in pen and parchment at the request of William of Duesme, “from whose fief” according to the language of the charter, “the said alms moved.” William’s vassal, Simon of Menicules gave his portion of the mill “to God and the brothers of Val-des-Choux.” What the Caulite brothers did with the mill after that, provides a good example of how the Caulites exploited the financial woes of property-owners in order to consolidate their own holdings.

The mill was located in Aignay, eleven kilometers south of Val-des-Choux, on the banks of the Coquille River, next to, as the charters tell us again and again, a leper house. This choice of location is quite enough to pique one’s curiosity. The mill obviously had to be next to the river, but one wonders whether the leper house came before or after the mill’s

120 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 245: see Table 5.2.
construction. This juxtaposition also raises questions about contemporary attitudes toward disease. One would think that bread baked from flour processed at the "mill of the leper house" might create a rather unappetizing image in the mind of consumers. Yet, mill and leper house co-existed on this site for some time.

As mentioned, the Caulites first began to enjoy the mill's profits in 1251, thanks to a gift from Simon of Menicules. According to the charter of 1251, Simon donated in alms pars sua of the mill's revenues, but this clearly did not mean a part of the mill itself. In December of 1264, the Caulites took the opportunity to buy their own part of this mill, namely, one-eighth, purchased from Huot of Aignay and his wife Castellana. The language in the charter recording this sale is quite different from the language in the donations discussed earlier, according to which, Huot of Aignay acknowledged that he had "sold, conceded and in perpetuity relinquished" his part of the mill to the Caulites. At this point, of course, the Caulites could no longer simply sit back as the donated revenues from the mill rolled in. With ownership came responsibility. By 1269, the mill was in need of repairs, but it was not clear who would take responsibility for those repairs. According to a charter dated March of 1269, Simon of Menicules's niece Marieta, and her husband, the knight Henry of Beaumes, had inherited Simon's interest in the mill—the revenues of which were being paid as alms to the Caulites. Marieta and Henry were either unable or unwilling to pay for repairs. But the fact that the mill was not producing did not keep the

---

121 Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 245: "molendini sit in riveria de Haignayo quod molendinum dicitur molendinum de leprosoria" (italics mine).


123 Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 245.

124 Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 245. Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H Inv 40, f. 345v, dated this sale in December of 1265.
Caulites from expecting the alms which Marieta’s father had promised them. The Caulites sued for late payment. To resolve this conflict, the Caulites agreed to repair the mill themselves, in exchange for which Marieta and Henry relinquished to the Caulites one-half of the third of the mill they had inherited from Simon, keeping the other half of one-third for themselves. Thanks to this dispute, we finally learn that Simon’s interest in the mill consisted of one-third part, which he had received in the dowry of his wife Aalidis. The addition of the sixth part of the mill (one-half of one-third) through this settlement brought the Caulites’ interest in the mill to roughly 25%. One-sixth, acquired from Marieta and Henry, plus one-eighth, purchased earlier from Huot of Aignay, equals just over 1/4 of the mill.

In January of 1288, the knight John of Duesme sold to the monks at Val-des-Choux his interest in one-third part of this mill, as well as a piece of land at Aignay. John’s vassal, a certain William of Fresne, held this third part of the mill in fief, and William’s rights and responsibilities vis-a-vis John were transferred to the Caulites with the sale, which brought the Caulite interest in the mill to just over one-half.

By June of 1292, the mill had again fallen into disrepair. A charter of that date reveals that Caulite control of the mill had somehow increased to 3/4—perhaps they had acquired the leftover 1/6 still controlled by Marieta and Henry. In any case, the charter of 1292 tells us that William of Fresne had come to hold three-fourths of the mill at the leper house in fief from the Caulites—up from the one-third he had held in fief from John of Duesme before the sale of 1288. But in the four intervening years, William had become indebted to the Caulites for his part in repairs to the mill, as well as for the cost of one bay-brown horse (bruni baardi) which the Caulites had sold to him. To reconcile this debt,

125 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 245.
William sold to the Caulites one-half of the fief he held from them, which according to the
charter meant one-half of three-fourths interest in the mill.¹²⁷ William’s financial straits
seem to have continued, for in April of 1293 he sold the Caulites the remainder of his fief in
the mill (the other half of three-fourths), as well as any land that was part of his fief, for the
price of 50 livres tournois.¹²⁸ In purchasing William’s fief in the mill back from him, the
Caulites were then free to exploit their interest in the mill as they saw fit. By 1293, then, the
Caulites found themselves three-fourth owners of the mill of the leper house.

If we can rely on information from the existing charters, the need to repair the mill at
the leper house was not incessant. Over a thirty-year period, from 1264, when the Caulites
first bought into the mill, to 1293, when they came to own three-fourths of it, the mill had
only been repaired twice. The fact that other owners in the mill had been unable to pay for
repairs created a situation that the Caulites exploited to their advantage, by increasing their
own interest in the mill. By 1295, just two years after its last recorded repairs, the mill at the
leper house underwent major renovations, which included the installation of a grain thresher.
A charter dated the Friday before Christmas of 1295, tells us that Renaud of Semur, a cleric
and canon of Saint-Étienne-de-Troyes, had re-built the mill at his own expense, and had
even added a grain thresher (old French: bateour) in front of the leper-house at Aignay.
The Caulites granted the rights and usufruct of this renovated mill to Renaud for the length
of his life. Upon Renaud’s death, however, these properties would return to the Caulites.¹²⁹
This seems to indicate that the Caulites had somehow become full owners of the mill, but we
have no existing charter to bear out this theory. After Renaud’s renovations, the history of

¹²⁸ Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 245.
the mill at the leper house moves beyond the thirteenth century, and hence beyond the scope of this work.

The lands around Vanvey and the mill of the leper house are not the only examples of Caulites attempting to consolidate their economic holdings. For example, in 1264, Henry, the prior of Val-des-Choux, bought from Milo of Maisey and his wife Bienvanient half of their interest in meadow called “Prez Bonot” for six livres viennois. Guy of Maisey, (Milo’s father?) had already donated part of this meadow to the Caulites in 1253. And forgive the pun if I suggest that the Caulites may have been attempting to "corner the market" when in 1259 they bought a second market stall (stallum) next to the pillory in Châtillon-sur-Seine—recall that they had already received one in 1241 from the gift of Peter Gaullarz. What these examples show us is not only the wide range of Caulite involvement in the thirteenth-century economy, but also something of their economic thinking.

**Conclusion**

Constance Bouchard, writing on monks and nobles in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Burgundy, lamented that any application of quantitative methods to monastic charters would yield nothing but “a specious air of numerical certainty unjustified by the randomness by which the documents have survived.” I think this problem applies just as well to the Caulite charters. Yet, even with the rudimentary tables I have constructed, I think we can glean some useful information from the Caulite charters concerning their

---

130 Peincédé. 28.2: 1173. no. 98; see Table 5.4.

131 Peincédé. 28.2: 1175. no. 115; see Table 5.4.

132 Bouchard. *Sword, Miter, and Cloister*, 42.
benefactors, first, with regard to their gender, second, with regard to what we might with due precautions label their "class," and finally, with regard to their motivation.

Of 141 transactions of any kind (donations or sales) made between 1195 and 1293, thirty-six named women in some capacity of agency. By this I mean that the women were not merely witnesses to a donation or sale, but were somehow the agent or co-agent of that transaction. Of these thirty-six transactions, sixteen named women as the main agents. At times, husbands or other male family members approved their transactions, for example, in the land sales made by Bonette of Vannaire and Agnella of Mignon. At times these women seem to have operated as sole agents, such as Blanche of Castille, Countess of Champagne, and Mahaut, Countess of Nevers. Note, however, that the women acting as sole agents were members of the higher nobility. Twenty of the transactions named women as secondary agents, after their husbands, fathers, or brothers. Their role in the donation or sale was still important, since their approval was critical to avoid potential future disputes over the nature of the transaction. Having reported on these numbers, I am hesitant to use them as the basis for any greater, sweeping claims. We note simply that women appear in the Caulite charters as early as 1200, and on a regular basis throughout the thirteenth century. They exhibited the legal power to make donations or sales of their own volition. The fact that their spouses at times approved these transactions was a reciprocal right (i.e., wives approved husbands' transactions as well), which had more to do with guaranteeing a contract's validity for generations to come, than with somehow limiting the power of women per se.

The category of "class" is one that medievalists should approach with caution, for fear of slipping into anachronism. Ideas such as "upper class" or especially "class

---

133 See Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 272 and H 258, respectively; also, see Table 5.5.

134 See Innocent III (1210) and Peinedé, 28.2: 1172, no. 95, respectively; also, see Table 5.3.
consciousness” are modern constructs, more appropriate to discussions of industrial labor struggles. And such modern constructs do not correspond to the contemporary medieval construct of three orders, i.e., those who fight, those who pray, and those who work. Even this “feudal construct” has come under fire recently, with historians claiming that it existed only as some desired reality, but in no way reflected the complexities of everyday existence.\textsuperscript{135} Acknowledging this debate—and my own inability at the moment to resolve it—I am nonetheless driven to create some order from the data, and find the easiest path in adopting the traditional “feudal” model. Even the critics of this model will readily see that the benefactors named in the Caulite charters often identified themselves as practitioners of some occupation, for example, knight or bishop, and that the occupations listed fall into one of the three traditional “feudal” categories. With this caveat against artificial constructs in mind, the charters can reveal something about the societal position of Caulite benefactors.

The overwhelming number of donations to Val-des-Choux came from “those who fight.” In addition to the term duke (\textit{dux}), documents recording donations to Val-des-Choux identify Caulite benefactors with the following terms from the fighting order: count (\textit{comes}), countess (\textit{comitissa}), lord (\textit{dominus}), lady (\textit{domina}), knight (\textit{miles}), squire (\textit{armiger}), and provost (\textit{praepositus}).\textsuperscript{136} Patterns of donation to Val-des-Choux reflect the intricate relationships of fealty as well as family, which helped to form a network of support


\textsuperscript{136} I hesitate to attach a number to each of these titles because the documents are truly deceptive in this matter. They do not always specifically identify donors as members of the knightly class, even though other indications seem to point to that conclusion. For example, Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245 (a charter concerning the mill at the leper house of Aignay) never specifically identifies Simon of Menicules as a knight, though we do know that he holds his part of the mill in fief from William of Duesme. Another problem is that the synopses in Peinecé and the inventory of 1738 are not always consistent in their recording of this information. The point is that there were probably more knights and lords donating to Val-des-Choux than the records so identify.
for the Caulites. We often find charters in which a lord approved the donation of his vassal, and then find that lord in another charter as a Caulite benefactor. For example, in 1209 Peter of Ravières approved the donation of his vassal Guy Boguerelle, and in the same year made his own donation to Val-des-Choux.\textsuperscript{137} Simon of Rochefort approved the donation that Peter of Ravières made to Val-des-Choux, then in 1210 we see Simon making his own gift to the Caulites.\textsuperscript{138} The best example of Caulite support across the generations is in the Burgundian ducal family. Throughout the thirteenth century, Odo III’s successors to the Duchy of Burgundy, Hugh IV and Robert I, supported the monastery at Val-des-Choux, as did Odo III’s wife Alix during her regency.\textsuperscript{139} Chapter 6 shows how ties of fealty and family spread Caulite support to her daughter monasteries. The instances are too high to reflect a simple coincidence of spiritual affinity, i.e., that all of these donors related through bonds of fealty and family just happened to enjoy supporting the same monastery. Their support of the Caulites must have spread through “feudal” and familial channels.

The clergy, “those who pray,” appeared numerous times throughout the charters. Bishops most often appeared as witnesses, or approving the donations of lay benefactors, or as arbiters of conflict between the Caulites and others, though they occasionally appeared making donations themselves. For example, Bishop Garnier’s gift in 1195 of wheat and wine; or Bishop Robert’s gift in 1208 of half an orchard, the other half of which the deacon Ebrard had already donated.\textsuperscript{140} Canons appeared three times making donations to Val-des-Choux.\textsuperscript{141} Abbots or religious communities most often appeared as complainants against

\textsuperscript{137} See Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 242; Peinecédè, 28.2: 1158, no. 33; Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

\textsuperscript{138} See Peinecédè, 28.2: 1158, no. 33: 1159, no. 35; Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

\textsuperscript{139} See, for example, Yzeure, AD de l’Allier H 273, H 258, H 285, and H 262.

\textsuperscript{140} Peinecédè, 28.2: 1157, no. 24; Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 248; Tables 4.2 and 4.4.

\textsuperscript{141} Innocent III (1210); Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 264\textsuperscript{v} and 282\textsuperscript{r}.
the Caulites, though occasionally they appeared as Caulite benefactors. For example, in 1225, the abbey of Notre-Dame-de-Châtillon gave the Caulites its portion of the tithe of Ampilly.\textsuperscript{142}

The Caulite charters also represented “those who work”—though the numbers for this group were smallest. For example, Hugh d’Étang, the duke’s fisherman, donated a money rent from his oven in Vic-sous-Thil.\textsuperscript{143} The merchant couple Renaud and Petronille donated a money rent from their market stall in Châtillon.\textsuperscript{144} These were obviously not agricultural workers—as per the traditional “feudal” model—and perhaps more rightly belong to the rising merchant class of the High Middle Ages. As far as we can tell from the charters, they are at least not members of the clergy or the warrior nobility. Charters concerning the filial priories of Val-Saint-Benoît and Vauclaire offer rather amusing examples of how the Caulites attracted donors from all walks of life. In 1262, Huguenin of Nollay, a juggler \textit{juglerius)}, gave the Caulites at Val-Saint-Benoît four \textit{sextiers} of wine annually so that they would celebrate an anniversary mass in his memory.\textsuperscript{145} In 1280, Perroz of Valbruant, another juggler (OF: \textit{juglers}), donated a piece of arable land to the Caulites at Vauclaire, so that they would celebrate an anniversary mass for Perroz and his wife Mariote.\textsuperscript{146}

The motivation of Caulite benefactors is as difficult to understand qualitatively as it would be to quantify. The language in the charters is certainly formulaic, but there is a range of variation in that language that may reveal the choices benefactors made in

\textsuperscript{142} Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H Inv. 40. fol. 155r; and Table 5.1.

\textsuperscript{143} Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 242; and Table 5.3.

\textsuperscript{144} Peincedé. 28.2: 1172, no. 92; and Table 5.3.

\textsuperscript{145} Mâcon. AD de Saône-et-Loire. 9 G 37. For more on Val-Saint-Benoît. see Chapter 6.

\textsuperscript{146} Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 326. For more on Vauclaire. see Chapter 6.
expressing the spirituality behind their gifts. Three categories emerge from the charters that can help us to understand the benefactors’ motives: 1) why they gave; 2) to whom they gave; and 3) what they expected in return.

Why benefactors gave is revealed in the formula “pro remedio animae,” i.e., for the remedy of the soul. The formula could be altered to account for the “health of the soul” (pro salute animae) or “anniversary of the soul” (pro anniversario suo animo). The soul in question was not limited to the benefactor’s, but might include the souls of the benefactor’s spouse, parents, children, or ancestors in general. Occasionally a vassal might make a donation for the soul of his lord, as the knight Milon of Breban did in 1202 for the duke of Burgundy.¹⁴⁷

To whom the benefactors gave may reveal something of their spirituality, or at least of their understanding of the monastery’s role in the church and society. Sometimes benefactors made donations simply “to the brothers of Val-des-Choux” or “to the prior and religious of Val-des-Choux.” Other times they made donations “to God and the brothers of Val-des-Choux.” Still other donations were addressed “to God and the Virgin Mary and the brothers of Val-des-Choux.” The last of these came in part because the Caulites named their churches in honor of the Virgin Mary, but also no doubt because of the increased popularity of the Virgin’s cult during the thirteenth century. Interestingly, although the Caulite dedicated their churches to the blessed Virgin and John the Baptist, very few donations included the name of the latter of these. When Hugh, duke of Burgundy, gave the Caulites the right to pasture twenty of their cows and their calves in his forest, he did so on “la vegile Saint Johan Baptiste” (23 June), but I hesitate to read any

¹⁴⁷ Peinecé, 28.2: 1161. no. 42. Peinecé’s synopsis tells us that Milon made this gift “pour la remède de l’âme du duc dequel il tient la presente aumône.” If we can trust the date that Peinecé has given, it would seem that Milon wished for the remedy of the duke’s soul while the duke was still very much alive. Odo III died in 1218.
deeper meaning into this date.\textsuperscript{148} The canon John of Courban’s money rent from his oven in Courban was due on the feast of John the Baptist (24 June).\textsuperscript{149} This is perhaps significant, since a money rent could have been paid at any time—as opposed to a crop rent which was more connected to the harvest. John’s choice of payment date could reveal his intent to honor the Caulite dedication to the John the Baptist.

What the benefactors expected in return, the action on the part of the Caulites that would ensure the remedy of the soul, was most often an anniversary mass, either for the benefactor or for the benefactor’s spouse, parents, children, or ancestors in general. Benefactors might also want candles lit in the church, as Lambert of Bar did when in 1205 he donated twenty-five pounds of wax expressly for this purpose.\textsuperscript{150} We have also seen an example of confraternity, a quasi-membership in the community, which Hugh IV enjoyed in exchange for one \textit{nuidel} of wine in 1262.\textsuperscript{151} Even full membership in the community was possible to benefactors, as witnessed by Viard, captain at Villiers-le-Duc, becoming a monk at Val-des-Choux after making an entry gift of properties in Vanvey.\textsuperscript{152}

One of the ironies of monastic history is that wealthy laymen, hoping to benefit from the prayers of the most pious monks, supported those monks by giving them property. When the very piety of those monks emanated from a life without material possessions, this created a dilemma. Viard had founded Val-des-Choux intending for his monks to live from rents alone. James of Vitry lauded this practice as a way of keeping the community’s focus on the spiritual. The Caulites’ choice to live from rents was not just a spiritual ideal, but an

\textsuperscript{148} Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 273.

\textsuperscript{149} Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 282r: and Table 5.3.

\textsuperscript{150} Peinecé, 28.2: 1165. no. 62; and Table 5.3.

\textsuperscript{151} Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258; and Table 5.2.

\textsuperscript{152} Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 79v-80r; and Table 5.4.
economic decision. In the twelfth century, benefactors of the early Cistercians donated huge tracts of lands, which the Cistercians exploited using their sizable corps of lay brothers. By the time the Caulites arrived on the scene, at the end of the twelfth century and into the thirteenth, benefactors did not have the same large tracts of land to give. Hence the Caulites planned for a patrimony consisting largely of grain tithes, rents in kind, and eventually even rents of money—all signs that the economy of the thirteenth century was different from the economy of the twelfth. In spite of their intention to live from rents, soon after their founding, it seems that the Caulites found themselves receiving real property from generous supporters. Recall the meadow that Borrins of Châtillon had donated to the Caulites in 1200, or the orchard given jointly in 1207-1208 by the bishop and deacon of Langres.\footnote{Peincédé, 28.2: 1175, no. 117; Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 248; and Table 5.4.}

By the middle of the thirteenth century, the Caulites shifted to active acquisition of immovable property, purchasing lands with an eye to consolidating their holdings. In one significant way, the Caulites were like the Cistercians, in that they integrated their spiritual ideals with the economic realities of the times in which they lived.

Chapter 6 offers more examples of the Caulites attempting to reconcile ideals with reality, as their order expanded from Val-des-Choux in the diocese of Langres to the far reaches of Burgundy, of France, and beyond.
CHAPTER 6

CAULITE FOUNDATIONS

For the glory of God ... he founded a new house of the order of Val-des-Choux in his land.

—from a bull of Innocent IV, 1249

Introduction

The life at Val-des-Choux soon spread. (See the map, Figure 6.1.) Several factors influenced the spread of the Caulite Order. The institutional limit on the size of any given community was likely one reason for expansion. As Val-des-Choux attracted more monks to its way of life, it would not take long for the community to reach twenty—thirteen monks and seven lay brothers—the number Viard believed could be supported from rents. Once the community achieved this critical mass, it must have searched for other locations and benefactors. The piety of the Caulites fulfilled a need in benefactors, who either were growing dissatisfied with other orders, or sought to cover all their options by having many different orders pray for their souls. Monastic benefactors of the thirteenth century did not enjoy the same economic flexibility as their predecessors of the twelfth century, who could and did endow monasteries with huge tracts of land. Hence benefactors in the thirteenth century must have appreciated the Caulite mandate to live from rents in kind or money, a donation more readily at their economic disposal. The “crusading spirit,” which began in the late eleventh century and continued into the late thirteenth, also played a role in the
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Figure 6.1: Filial monasteries of the Cauilte Order.
formation of the Caulite Order. Many of the Caulites’ benefactors made gifts in response to their departure to, return from, or pending death on the Crusades.

According to the Grand Cartulary, compiled between 1776 and 1780, the Caulite Order had seventeen filial priories in the territory we now know as France. The cartulary lists them (after Val-des-Choux), in French, in the following order: 1) Val-Croissant in the diocese of Autun; 2) Val-Dieu in the diocese of Troyes; 3) Vausse in the diocese of Langres; 4) Genevroye in the diocese of Langres; 5) Vauclair in the diocese of Langres; 6) Val-Duc in the diocese of Langres; 7) Petit-Saint-Lieu in Dijon; 8) Val-Saint-Benoît near Autun; 9) Uchon in the diocese of Autun; 10) Beaupré in the diocese of Sens; 11) Clairlieu in the diocese of Troyes; 12) Epeau in the diocese of Auxerre; 13) Sainte-Barbe-de-Plein-Marchais in the diocese of Auxerre; 14) Saint-Nicholas-de-Reveillon in the diocese of Auxerre; 15) Remonvaux in the diocese of Toul; 16) Royal-Pré in the diocese of Lisieux; and 17) another small priory in Lisieux, subordinate to Royal Pré. At the end of this list, the cartulary mentions, but does not name, four filial priories in Scotland, and states that some authors have attributed as many as “thirty or thirty-two houses” to the Caulite Order. While the cartulary makes some attempt to group these priories according to diocese, it also follows a perceived hierarchy of the Caulite Order. For example, it states that Val-Croissant was the first daughter of the order, and that Val-Dieu, although founded after other priories in the list, was considered the second daughter. One priory in France, which I will discuss in this chapter, receives no mention in the Grand Cartulary: Beaulieu, affiliated with Epeau. The cartulary also makes no mention of priories in the Holy Roman Empire or on the Iberian Peninsula, which I will discuss at the end of this chapter.

---

Rather than deal with the foundation of Caulite daughter-houses in a strictly chronological order, this chapter groups them according to "geo-political" regions, to wit: the duchy of Burgundy; the county of Champagne; the county of Nevers; the royal lands of the French king; Scotland; the Holy Roman Empire; and finally the Iberian Peninsula. I hope in this way to illustrate more clearly the relationships of these monasteries, one to the other, as well as their relationships to their temporal founders. The treatment of each priory will include a discussion of its foundation, and when applicable, its foundation legend. It will describe the location and site of the priory. It will discuss each priory's temporal goods, but only to the extent that this enhances our grasp of the Caulite economy as examined in Chapter 5. By this I mean that I do not intend to include every single transaction of every single priory, which would add considerable weight to this dissertation, but not necessarily deeper understanding. Instead, I will focus only on those transactions that significantly support or diverge from those trends already examined. Finally, the discussion of each priory will include a list of its known priors during the thirteenth century. The reader will quickly grasp that this chapter in no way offers a balanced or complete picture of the Caulite filial priories. This is because some of these priories have left us a fair amount of documentary evidence from which to reconstruct their stories, while others have left us little more than their names. Based on the evidence presented, the conclusion of this chapter will attempt to address such questions as how and why the Caulite Order expanded, and whence the impulse for that expansion came.

Caulite priories in the duchy of Burgundy

In addition to the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux, eight other Caulite priories existed in the duchy of Burgundy. Seven of these were founded by the duke of Burgundy's vassals; and one—the last Caulite foundation in Burgundy—was founded by the duke himself. Val-Croissant, which we have already mentioned as the "first daughter" of the
order, was also the first to have filial houses of its own: Val-Saint-Benoît and Notre-Dame-d’Uchon. Because of their special relationship, I will discuss these three as a group, even though Uchon was not founded until circa 1250. Returning to foundations at the beginning of the thirteenth century, I shall discuss Vausse and Genevroye, considered the third and fourth daughters of the order, respectively, followed by the priories of Vauclair and Petit-Saint-Lieu. Finally, I shall Val-Duc, also know as “le Quartier,” founded by Duke Hugh IV of Burgundy, son of Odo III.

Val-Croissant (*Vallis crescens*)

Maillard de Chambure claimed that the cap on community size at Val-des-Choux caused the Caulites to send a colony of monks to Val-Croissant.³ While his reasoning is sound, he did not attempt to reconcile why the Caulites necessarily sent this first colony of monks to Val-Croissant, and not elsewhere. In spite of the fact that the Caulites considered it the “first daughter” of their order,⁴ we have very little information regarding this monastery.

Guilleminot claimed that the Caulites began expanding circa 1210, and that it was in this year that they founded Val-Croissant, though he neither offered the name of the founder, nor any citation for his claim.⁵ According to Courtépée, the priory was founded in 1216 by William of Mont-Saint-Jean, with the consent of Gauthier, bishop of Autun. In 1226, William II, son of the founder, accorded to the monks the use of his meadows and

³ C. Maillard de Chambure, *Voyage pittoresque en Bourgogne, ou description historique, et vues des monuments antiques et du moyen âge, deuxième partie, département de Saône et Loire* (Dijon, 1835), 21-22.


woods for 600 sheep and 20 cows. Denizot also noted these donations by William, father and son, but added that the founder was "not satisfied to endow the new monastery with all the woods, meadows, lands and waters in the surrounding area, as well as high, medium, and low justice, [so he] added to this the tithes of La Motte, Thorey, Melin, Fleurey, La Comme, and Sonotte, and soon thereafter the fief of Merceuil." Denizot added that in 1286 the founder’s grandson Stephen, then knight and lord of La Motte, donated the perpetual right to fish in all the rivers, streams, and ponds located in his lands or fiefs. I have been unable to locate any original charters to support the claims of Courtépée and Denizot, and I offer their claims here with reserve. The fact that Denizot, writing roughly a century after Courtépée, provided more specific information concerning the foundation leads me to believe that this was a case of two scholars consulting the same documents, rather than one simply copying the other.

Val-Croissant was located in the diocese of Autun, less than two kilometers southwest of La Motte-Ternant, in a deep valley, shaded on all sides by dense forest. This was the monastery for which the Caulites created the Paris manuscript of their customary. The monastery itself formed a quadrangle, with a courtyard in the center, surrounded by cloisters. A small stream runs through the monastic property. Guilleminot claimed that "the only thing remaining at Val-Croissant is the house of the prior," but it seems that the high building with the rose window over three gothic windows (the latter now walled-in)

---

* Courtépée. *Description générale et particuliére*. 4: 156.

7 Dijon. BM. ms. 1732. fol. 213r.

8 Dijon. BM. ms. 1732. fol. 213r.

9 We know the manuscript came from Val-Croissant because that monastery's name appeared in the novice's oath of profession. See Paris. BN. ms. lat. 18047 (manuscript P). fol. 35 v: "Ego frater .... in hoc loco qui vocatur Vallis Crescens." Chapter 7 discusses of this manuscript more fully.

must surely have been part of the church. (See Figure 6.2.) According to Denizot, this was constructed in the fourteenth century in the Gothic style. Considering the foundation date and considerable endowment of the new monastery, both of which we will discuss forthwith, it seems odd that the brothers at Val-Croissant would have waited that long to build their church. Two stone crosses decorated with roses adorn the eastern and western sides of the old walls. Locals seem to believe that this was the “cross of the Templars,” but I tend to agree with Denizot that it was simply a case of “the profane replacing the sacred”—though
the crosses are nonetheless quite lovely. Denizot maintained that the courtyard of Val-Croissant once held the tomb of its founder.\footnote{Dijon. BM, ms. 1732, fol. 214r.}

Concerning Val-Croissant's temporal holdings, I was only able to locate the traces of a few transactions. The first of these puts into question the foundation date, as well as the founder of Val-Croissant. It survives in the collected notes taken by Courtépée for his history of the duchy of Burgundy.\footnote{Dijon. BM, ms. 1001, fol. 219v.} According to Courtépée, Andrew of Epoisses approved the donation of his vassal, Simon of Sincey—with the consent of Simon's wife and children—of half the tithe of Vieux-Chateau during Simon's lifetime, with the other half to follow after his death. Andrew approved Simon's donation in 1208, eight years before the "official" foundation claimed by Courtépée and Denizot. The one questionable aspect of this charter is that Courtépée was aware of it, but did not treat this discrepancy in his discussion of Val-Croissant's foundation. Yet we may find a link with Denizot's assertion of two later benefactors to Val-Croissant in 1256: Guyot and Simon of Sancy could reasonably be the sons of Simon of Sincey (a variant spelling of Sancy?). Denizot is not specific about what their donations entailed.\footnote{Dijon. BM, ms. 1732, fol. 213r.} We have seen before how children followed their parents' donation patterns, hence it would not be surprising to see this happening with Simon's sons. Further evidence of temporal holdings in the thirteenth century is equally limited. The monks at Val-Croissant received wine from the tithe of Pouilly (\textit{de Poliaco}),\footnote{Published in M. Quantin \textit{Cartulaire général de l'Yonne. Recueil de pièces pour faire suite au cartulaire général de l'Yonne, XIIIe s.}, (Auxerre and Paris, 1873), 3: 160, no. 358.} and grain from the tierce of Pressey.\footnote{Dijon. BM, ms. 1891, fol. 139. Pressey is located just west of Thil.} In 1257, Helisabeth of Thil...
left 100 sols to Val-Croissant in her last will and testament. None of the charters that I was able to find listed the names of priors.

Although the lack of confirmed documentary evidence is stifling, if the evidence we do have is true, then the foundation endowment for Val-Croissant was quite generous. The monks enjoyed all or part of the tithes from nine of the surrounding villages; rights of pasturage; fishing rights; as well as the right to administer high, medium, and low justice. The endowment also reveals the great range of variation in economic life from one Caulite priory to the next. Recall James of Vitry’s description that the Caulites had neither flocks nor herds. Granted, James was describing the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux, but he seemed to be speaking with an authority that reflected the order’s economic policy in general. Yet at Val-Croissant, within a decade of its foundation—not to mention within a decade of James’ description—we see the Caulites with a herd of 20 cows, and a flock of no less than 600 sheep.

Val-Croissant was not just the “first daughter” of the Caulite Order, but was also a motherhouse in its own right. As the next two sections will show, monks from Val-Croissant founded the Caulite priories of Val-Saint-Benoît and Uchon.

Val-Saint-Benoît (Vallis sancti benedicti)

The following foundation legend tells of the Caulite priory of Val-Saint-Benoît.

Gauthier, lord of Sully, Savigny and Repas, journeyed to the island of Rhodes, a base of the Order of Saint John (the Hospitallers), where he had taken his son Humbert to be knighted

---

16 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, H 571.

17 The legend is preserved in a manuscript held in an uncatalogued, private collection at Epinac, Archives of the Chateau de Sully. The current proprietor of this castle, the duke of Magenta, claims Gauthier of Sully as his ancestor. The legend is published in a modern French translation in J. Monard, “Process verbaux des séances des années 1888 et 1889,” Mém. soc. éd. 17 (1889): 504.
into that order. On the voyage home, Muslim pirates ("barbarous Turks") attacked Gauthier's ship and took him prisoner. Fearing a life of slavery, Gauthier took a vow to God and the Virgin Mary of Val-Croissant of the Order of Val-des-Choux. If the Virgin guarded Gauthier's life, and he was able to escape from the peril in which he found himself, he would found a monastery to her honor and glory, of which the prior of Val-Croissant, and no other, would be the master. Never doubting that his wish would be fulfilled, Gauthier was delivered, and when he had returned home he fulfilled his vow. He gathered craftsmen together to build a church in front of his castle at Repas, and dedicated its foundation to "our good lady of Val-Croissant," who had saved his life. According to the legend, however, this was not to be the final site of the new church. The morning after construction had started, and for several mornings thereafter, the workmen arrived at the site only to find the stones strewn about, their work on the foundation undone. Finally, on a Sunday morning, the stones seemed to lead the workers away from the castle of Repas, into the forest, to a site roughly half a league (four kilometers) north of the castle. Here they found that some invisible hand had laid out the outline of the church, the dimensions of which were exactly the same as those for the church planned at Repas. Furthermore, the masons discovered that their hammers had been placed in the form of a cross on that spot where the Virgin wanted the altar of her church to be. All of this took place, according to the legend, in the year 1236, "on the Sunday on which we chant Oculi," i.e., the third Sunday in Lent.

Two parts comprise the foundation legend of Val-Saint-Benoît: first, the founder's deliverance by divine providence, and second, the construction of the church by a divine and invisible hand. The first part is fraught with historical errors, most notably that the island of Rhodes in 1236 was held by Muslim pirates, and would not likely have been the location for a knighting ceremony of the Hospitallers. It was not until 1309 that Folques of Villaret
established Rhodes as a permanent base for the Hospitallers. The second part of the legend, the relocation and construction of the church by and according to divine will, is a trope common to many monastic foundation legends. Regardless of the lack of historicity, or the commonplace of its tropes, the legend nonetheless served to establish the site at Val-Saint-Benoît—in the minds of its founders and monks—as the product of divine providence and will. It acted as a reminder of the role that God and his intercessors, e.g., Our Lady of Val-Croissant, played in their daily lives.

Whether chosen by God's intercessors or by humans, the site of the monastery was in keeping with the monastic ideal of an isolated life. Val-Saint-Benoît is situated in the diocese of Autun, roughly fifteen kilometers east of Autun and three kilometers south of Epinac, in a valley that runs northwest through the small mountains of the Battées forest. These woods at one time completely encircled the monastery, but the work of de-forestation by the monks created a space in which they built their buildings and pastures. Fresh mountain springs provided water for the new community. Muguet argued that the church had to have been built rather quickly, for he found mention of the church in charters dating as early as 1242, while Monier maintained that the buildings of the priory "were painfully completed," because in 1259 the English burned them. This date seems to have been garnered from Courtépée, and is likely a misprint. A more likely date for an English

---


19 See Remensnyder, Remembering Kings Past, 66-69.


22 See Courtépée, Description générale et particulière. 2: 571, in which Courtépée also claims the burning of Val-Saint-Benoît in 1259.
attack would have been 1359, during the Hundred Years War. Devoucoux described the church at Val-Saint-Benoît as “offer[ing] one of the last examples of the transition between Romanesque and Gothic architecture ... composed of a single nave, with two transepts, and ending with a wall at a right angle, with no trace of an apse.” (See Figure 6.3.) Mercier described Val-Saint Benoît as “a magnificent chapel, lost in the forest ... which, in spite of the deterioration of most of the buildings, is worth being the goal of a tourist excursion.”

---


Several parts of the foundation legend were based in historical fact. In 1237, Gauthier, lord of Sully and Savigny, and his wife Oda, and William their son, did in fact found the priory by granting to the “brothers who came from Val-Croissant ... the place that is called Val-Saint-Benoît.” Thus we see that part of the foundation legend fulfilled in that the new monastery should be subordinate to the prior of Val-Croissant. Gauthier’s foundation gifts also included the full use of forests and waters, including fishing rights, and a place to make a meadow for up to ten cart-loads of hay (carratas feni) outside the said boundaries. They also granted the monks jurisdiction over the given territory, which included the right to administer justice. Finally, they donated one muid of grain from the customs and tierce of Sully, payable at the feast of Saint Remy.26

Gauthier of Sully died in March of 1240, just three years after founding the new priory, and was buried at Val-Saint-Benoît. The monastery once housed a bas-relief depicting Gauthier’s funeral procession. (See Figure 6.4.) Gauthier’s son, Hugh of Sully, a canon at the cathedral of Autun, commissioned the bas-relief to commemorate his father’s death. Two juxtaposed pieces of stone comprise this work, which measures 79 cm x 205 cm. Mercier believed that the idealized quality of the figures suggests the accomplishment of an artisan near the end of the thirteenth century, yet other authors have dated the piece from the mid-thirteenth century.27 The head of the funeral procession begins at the right

---

26 Epinac, Archives of the Chateau de Sully (uncatalogued); published in Mém. soc. éd. 38 (1909): 160.

side proper of the right-hand stone with two torch bearers; followed by a cross bearer; then a priest, who is shown plunging the *aspergillum* into a vase of holy water held by an acolyte. After the acolyte, in the center of the image, is Gauthier’s widow, Oda. Then comes Hugh, who commissioned the work. Based on his reading of Gauthier’s will, Devoucoux identified the remaining members of the procession: following Hugh came Gauthier’s youngest son, who became a monk in accordance with his father’s will; then two daughters of Gauthier, Huguette and Agnes. Two of Gauthier’s sons, William, who inherited the castle of Sully, and Guy, do not appear in the bas-relief. While earlier authors have noted that Gauthier’s youngest son became a monk at the request of his dying father, none considered that he took his vows at Val-Saint-Benoît. There is no documentary evidence to support this claim, yet nothing seems more natural than for the mourning and dutiful son to take the habit of the very priory his father had founded, the priory in which he might participate in the eternal prayer directed at his father’s sepulchre. Unfortunately, the depiction of the third figure from the left does not seem to show him wearing the Caulite

habit, as we have seen it depicted in the bas-relief thought to be from the tomb of Odo III's children. (See Chapter 4, Figure 4.1.) Hence it is difficult to make any such claim with certainty.

The foundation charter of Gauthier of Sully also included the donations of Humbert of Vevrey and his wife Helisabet, who provided the monks oats from their customs of Savigny.29 In a charter of 1238, the bishop of Autun confirmed the new foundation. The bishop's charter also mentioned the donations of Gaudry, a knight of Sully, who with the consent of his wife Agnes granted the monks grain from his tierce at Fleury, south of Mont-Saint-Jean.30 These latter two villages are in fact much closer to Val-Croissant than to Val-Saint Benoît—a fact that reveals the network of donors that was common to that priory and to its new daughter house. Devoucoux even claimed that William II of Mont-Saint-Jean, son of the founder of Val-Croissant, was in 1240 a prominent benefactor of Val-Saint-Benoît.31 In 1260, the foundation charter of Val-Saint-Benoît came under attack. Hugh of Couches, son of Gauthier of Sully, claimed that the original donation to the monks included properties which Gauthier was not entirely at liberty to give away. Hugh maintained that one-fifth of Gauthier's lands belonged to him, and he threatened to dispossess the monks of what, since 1236, they had thought was theirs.32 Hugh's repossess of the land did not happen thanks to the intervention of Hugh, duke of Burgundy. The duke required the monks to pay 100 livres viennois to the lord of Couches,33 in exchange for which Hugh of

29 Epinac, Archives of the Chateau de Sully; published in Mém. soc. éd. 38 (1909): 161.


31 See Devoucoux, "Le prieuré du Val St. Benoît," 151. I have neither been able to locate a charter mentioning William of Mont-Saint-Jean in connection with Val-Saint-Benoît, nor did I see his tomb at Val-Croissant.


Couches assured the monks the tranquil possession of the lands and forests conceded to
them by his father.34

Throughout the thirteenth century, Val-Saint-Benoît continued to draw the support
of local lords. Among its benefactors were the lords of Sully,35 Repas,36 Loges,37
Monestoy,38 Ivry,39 and many others.40 Some benefactors were buried in the church. In
addition to Gauthier of Sully, these include Renaud, lord of Repas, and his wife Elisabeth,
around 1262; Beatrix of Loges, around 1287; Marie of Couches, widow of Stephen of
Montagu, and her father John, in 1288 and 1301.41

The charters of Val-Saint-Benoît that I consulted list only two priors during the
thirteenth century. The first is Robert, who in 1262 acted as executor of the will of

36 Published in Mém. soc. éd. 37 (1909): 172.
37 Original charters concerning donations of the lords of Loges are at Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 323.
Seventeenth-century transcriptions of some wills are published in Mém. soc. éd. 38 (1909): 173, 177.
40 For a detailed description of the many donors in the thirteenth century, see Muguet, "Val Saint Benoît,"
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Elizabeth of Repas.\textsuperscript{42} The other prior mentioned in charters of the thirteenth century was Guy, who in May of 1281 purchased land at Cyrey from a certain Thibaut.\textsuperscript{43}

Uchon (sometimes Huchon)

I must sadly report my inability to unearth a single charter of the thirteenth century concerning the Caulite priory of Uchon. The Grand Cartulary described Uchon as having been under the direction of the prior of Val-Croissant.\textsuperscript{44} A charter dated 1738 called the priory “Saint-Jean d’Uchon,” while another, dated 1785, called it “Notre-Dame d’Uchon.”\textsuperscript{45} These two names were in keeping with the Caulite practice of naming their churches for John the Baptist or the Blessed Virgin. After this, we are at the mercy of earlier authors. Concerning Uchon’s origins, Courtépée offered little more than “an old priory of the [Caulite Order], founded in the woods by the lords of Uchon.”\textsuperscript{46} Monier reported that Uchon was founded first “by the lords of Huchon, then in 1300 by the lords of Chateauvillain.”\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{42} A seventeenth-century translation of Elizabeth’s will is published in Mém. soc. éd. 38 (1909): 172. Muguët, “Val Saint Benoît,” Mém. soc. éd. 35 (1907): 216. suggested that Robert might have been the first prior of Val-Saint-Benoit, meaning his tenure as prior would have lasted from the founding in 1236 until the execution of Elizabeth’s will in 1262—at least 26 years.

\textsuperscript{43} Mâcon, AD de Saône-et-Loire, 9 G 37. Devoucoux, “Le prieuré du Val Saint Benoît,” 157, claimed that Guy had been prior from 1280 to 1315.

\textsuperscript{44} Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 15. Cf. Dijon, BM. ms. 1732, fol. 213v. Denizot’s “Encyclopédie,” which also maintained that the prior of Val-Croissant was Uchon’s head.

\textsuperscript{45} Both the 1738 and 1785 charters are at Mâcon, AD de Saône-et-Loire, H suppl. Either of these names would have been in accordance with the Caulite practice of naming their churches after John the Baptist or the Virgin Mary. See Birch, 46.

\textsuperscript{46} Courtépée, Description générale et particulière. 3: 173.

\textsuperscript{47} M. Monier, Annuaire administratif, statistique et historique de Saône-et-Loire (Mâcon, 1859), 449.
According to Guilleminot, the foundation of Uchon took place circa 1260, when John of Chateauvillain founded the priory of Uchon as a sub-priory of Val-Croissant. John came into the baronies of Uchon and Luzy through his marriage to Jeanne of Semur in 1259. He went on the Eighth Crusade in 1270 in the company of Louis IX, who died in that same year at the siege of Tunis. John survived, but the Muslims took him prisoner, blinded him, and only released him in 1280 after his family paid a substantial ransom. He lived for another decade at home, before his death in 1290. John was familiar with the Caulite Order because his father, Simon of Chateauvillain, had founded the Caulite priory of Vauclair in 1219. John himself was an active benefactor of Vauclair, even after his marriage and the founding of Uchon. In January of 1269 he appears as “the lord of Chateauvillain and of Luzy” in a charter which recorded a land sale to the monks at Vauclair; and in May of 1280, after his return from Tunis, he appeared once again as such in a charter recording a land donation to Vauclair. It is interesting to ponder why John turned to Val-Croissant for assistance with his new foundation, rather than to Vauclair, with which he had a longer relationship. Distance may have been a factor: from Uchon to Vauclair is roughly twice as far (one-hundred-twenty-five kilometers) as from Uchon to Val-Croissant (sixty kilometers). Val-Saint-Benoît would be a logical choice in terms of proximity, but, as mentioned above, this priory was subordinate to the prior at Val-Croissant. It may have been Val-Croissant’s supervisory experience that influenced John’s choice, but this is purely conjecture.

---


50 See Yzeure. AD de l’Allier. H 326.

According to Guilleminot, the lord of Châteauvillain wanted to bring a new order into the region, which already had Benedictine houses at Mesvres and Perrecey.\textsuperscript{52} Guilleminot suggested that John's newly acquired territory of Uchon harbored remnants of Celtic cults, to wit, the Maison Dru and "chêne du Lot" (Oak of Fate). Although the Druids had long since vanished, Guilleminot maintained, these ancient cults still held sway with the common folk of this region, many of whom practiced Christianity in a superficial way, while finding more personal satisfaction in animistic beliefs and practices. According to Guilleminot, "one needed vigorous and holy monks to stifle these old beliefs."\textsuperscript{53}

Seeing that the Benedictines of Mesvres, founded sometime before 1100, and of Perrecey, founded in 880, had been unsuccessful in combating these Celtic cults, John turned to the young Caulite Order to colonize his new foundation. Guilleminot cleverly argued that the Caulites' naming their churches in honor of the Virgin or John the Baptist played into the Christianization of the region, since the feast day of John the Baptist is 24 June, which is approximately the date of the summer solstice. Though he did not flesh out his argument, Guilleminot was obviously implying that the monks at Uchon might have subtly transformed solstice festivities into a celebration of John the Baptist, thus easing the surrounding pagan populace into more Christian practices.\textsuperscript{54} Guilleminot's suggestion is interesting, but he offered no evidence or methodology to support it. For example, he provided no charter in which John of Châteauvillain announces the foundation of Uchon in order to rid the territory of pagans. Nor did he cite archeological evidence for the existence of pagan cults near Uchon past the mid-thirteenth century. This is not to say that such cults

\textsuperscript{52} Guilleminot, \textit{Histoire d'Uchon}, 40.

\textsuperscript{53} Guilleminot, \textit{Histoire d'Uchon}, 36.

\textsuperscript{54} Guilleminot, \textit{Histoire d'Uchon}, 42.
could not have existed in the area, especially on some subtle, difficult-to-retrieve level among the illiterate peasantry, but Guilleminot did not fulfill the scholarly burden of proof.\footnote{For successful reconstructions of popular belief in pre-industrial Europe, using methodologies ranging from anthropology and ethnography to art history, see K. Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England* (London, 1971); P. Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (London, 1978); or R. Kieckhefer, *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 1989).}

What little remains of the original priory at Uchon is still quite hidden away in the forest. It is located in the diocese of Autun, some eighteen kilometers due south of that same town, on the banks of a pond now called the “Étang du Prieuré.” According to Truchot, the monks at Uchon received a number of bequests in the thirteenth

\[\text{Figure 6.5: Remains of the “chapel” (?) at Uchon.}\]
century—though he did not specifically name the benefactors—allowing them to build monastic buildings covering more than half a hectare. Truchot described the site as follows:

Not much remains today. Nevertheless, the stable of the farm [which now occupies the site] is nothing less than the old chapel, possessing a gothic window, now half walled-in. On the inside, under the window and at the height of a man, a row of stones ... indicating the placement of the choir. In the right wall, one can still see a large, carved niche that must have served as a cupboard for plates. The stone at the base of this [cupboard] has two indentations in the form of dishes.\(^56\)

Truchot's description is accurate enough, though it hardly seems necessary that the building in question should have been the chapel, in spite of its small gothic window. The building has a relatively low ceiling, and is hardly big enough to park two tractors—the purpose for which the current proprietors use the building. (See Figure 6.5.)

With no documentary evidence for Uchon at our disposal, it is neither possible to discuss the monastery's temporal goods, nor to report the names of any of its priors.

La Genevroye-aux-Moines (\textit{Juniperia})

The Grand Cartulary calls Genevroye the "fourth daughter of the [Caulite] Order."\(^57\) Gauthier, lord of Vignory, founded this priory in 1216, but the monastery was not completed until 1230.\(^58\) Gauthier's original endowment included "the place called Genevroye, and the land around it, with the adjacent forest within specified boundaries."\(^59\) The donation of the forest is reminiscent of Odo III's endowment at Val-des-Choux. The


\(^{59}\) Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 66 H 1002/1, cartulary of Genevroye, fol. 8v: "locum qui dicitur Genevroy et terram cum nemore circa locum adiacentam usque ad metas illi loco deputatas."
foundation charter also included tithes, vineyards, mills, and rents of money, of which alms
Gauthier’s wife Elysabeth and their five children approved.  

In spite of this seemingly generous endowment, the first attempts at constructing the
new priory did not go well. The site given to the monks is roughly four kilometers west of
the village of Soncourt. Ancient forests covered the slopes of the mountains that surround
the site on three sides. A narrow valley of roughly one kilometer runs from north to
southwest at the foot of these mountains. It was at the narrowest point in this valley that the
monks decided to build their monastery, based on their assessment of the soil in that spot.
The stream that coursed through the property never ran dry. It not only supplied drinking
water for the community, but also allowed the monks to build two ponds, and to irrigate
their crops. Upon arriving, the monks constructed temporary buildings, and then set their
energies to widening and purifying the stream, which had been reduced to a muddy bog the
winter before. They cleared shrubs, and began cultivating the soil. Apparently, all the
resources that Gauthier had endowed to the monks went to clearing the land and making it
habitable.  

Even with additional resources from the tithes of Rouécourt (Riaucort) and
“Gracumcort,” after twelve years, the monks had made very little progress in the actual
construction of the monastery. To make matters worse, in 1229, Gauthier of Vignory fell ill

---

60 The charter by which William, bishop of Langres, approved Gauthier’s endowment, dated February 1217.
lists some gifts not mentioned in the charter of 1216. See Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/1. cartulary of Genevroye, fol. 8v-9r.

61 I have adapted the description of these early difficulties at Genevroye from C. Lorain. “Le Prieuré de la
Genevroye aux Moines ou abbaye de Soncourt,” Annales de la société d’histoire, d’archéologie, et des
beaux-arts, de Chaumont 3 (1910): 24-25. Lorain’s interpretation seems reasonable to me, but I should
point out that the extant charters make no mention of the hardships he described. nor of such environmental
features as the muddy bog of 1216. I am not aware of any chronicle that records these hardships, and Lorain
does not cite a source. It is possible that he could have drawn his conclusions from an archeological survey
of the site, but he did not say as much.

62 Gauthier donated the tithes at Rouécourt in 1222; see Lorain. “Genevroye.” 25. The knight Raoul of
Froncles donated two parts of the grand tithe of Gracumcort in 1228; see Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H
1002/1: cartulary of Genevroye. fol. 35r.
and died. It would be up to his son, Gauthier II, to ensure the completion of Genevroye. In September of 1230, Gauthier II donated an entire valley called the “Val Dom Richier” (vallis domini Richier) for the purpose of building a Caulite monastery (pro una domo ordinis vallis caulium edificanda). According to Lorain, this was the same valley in which the monks had already built their temporary lodgings. It contained 80 journals of land, which was more easily put into cultivation.

The layout of the monastery at Genevroye was somewhat different than that of other Caulite priories. Lorain provided a ground plan of the monastery as it might have looked in 1813, which he argued was essentially the same for the thirteenth century. Genevroye had no cloister. Walls six-foot-high enclosed a single courtyard, fifty by thirty meters in size. A gate on the north side of the courtyard led out to an orchard, beyond which lay vineyards. Lorain claimed that wine from these vineyards was intended for servants or guests, but not for the monks “who did not drink wine.” Yet the Caulite customary is replete with references to wine, particularly the loss of wine privileges as punishment. Just inside the north gate was a small fountain. Two outbuildings for farm tools formed part of the north wall. The monks’ lodgings lay along the east wall. The church measured twenty by eight meters, and lay in the southeast corner of the courtyard. (See Figure 6.6.) It had three doors: two leading into the courtyard and one small, side door on the south side of the church, through which visitors could enter. Lorain maintained that the current church—having been partially destroyed more than once—most likely dates from the

---

63 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/1: cartulary of Genevroye, fol. 9r.


65 The following description is based on Lorain, “Genevroye,” 29, as well as my own visit to La Genevroye.

seventeenth century. The building’s foundations, however, clearly date from the thirteenth century.\(^\text{67}\)

Gauthier II's donations helped re-infuse the life of Genevroye. In October 1238, he confirmed and expanded earlier donations he and his father had made to the priory. New donations included pasturage rights for all of the monks’ animals in the lands Gauthier had given them. Gauthier was explicit, however, that this did not mean the forest, and especially

\(^{67}\) Lorain. “Genevroye,” 29. Genevroye is now a farm, and the church is used as a hayloft.
not for the pasturage their pigs. This is proof once again that within a generation or two of their order’s founding, some Caulite priories practiced animal husbandry, in spite of the mandate against this. The new life at Genevroye attracted other donors. A charter dated August 1238 records that the arms-bearer Renaud of Viéville (Votibivilla) and his wife acknowledged the alms given by the wife’s mother to the monks at Genevroye. These alms consisted of part of the lesser tithe of Ambonville (Ambonvilla). That same charter recorded the donation of the knight William of Vouécort (Vehecort) of grain from his mill at Vouécort following his death. William also donated one falcata of meadow; i.e., a meadow, the size of which took one day to mow. In December 1248, a certain Galtera, daughter of the deceased knight Andrew de Castelione, acknowledged her father’s gift in alms of the tierce of Blaise (Blesia), which Andrew—and subsequently his daughter—held in fief from Gauthier of Vignory.

Throughout the thirteenth century, the tithes of four villages played an important part in the monastery’s economy. These villages were Provanchères (Provanegesiie), Froncles (Fironelis), and Buxières (Buxeiie)—all to the east of Genevroye along the Marne river—and Heu (Horris), also east of Genevroye, in the midst of the Heu Forest. Transactions concerning the tithes in these villages show that the monks at Genevroye were thinking in economic terms, buying tithes to enhance and consolidate their holdings. In 1232, the knight John of Bologne and his wife Margareta gave the monks whatever rights or possessions they had in these villages. By 1234, the monks purchased all the tithes in

---

64 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/1, cartulary of Genevroye, fol. 9v: “Item ... donavi siquidem super dictis fratribus ... usuagium suum in pasturis per totam terram meam ad omnium animalium suorum excepto passagio nemorum meorum quod non concessi eisdem pro porcis suis.”

65 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/1, cartulary of Genevroye, fol. 12v. The definition of “falcata” is from Niermeyer, 405.

70 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/1, cartulary of Genevroye, fol. 35r.

71 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/1, cartulary of Genevroye, fol. 23r.
these villages, both great and small, held by the knight Draco of Asseio and his wife Heluyse. In 1235, the monks purchased a portion of greater and lesser tithes in these villages held by one Domitella, identified in the charter as the “Queen of Bologne” (regina de Bolonia). In July 1242, the knight Haudouin approved the sale made by the squire (armiger), Girard de Montefario, of part of the tithe at Froncles, which Girard held in fief from Haudouin. In February 1258, there seems to have been discord concerning these tithes between the monks at Genevroye and the local curate of Buxières, which continued until at least 1266.

The charters record the names of four thirteenth-century priors. The first of these, G (Gauthier? Guillaume? Guy?), could be the monastery’s first prior, or at least the first prior after the “re-foundation” by Gauthier of Vignory’s son. A charter dated 28 April 1232 shows G—with a certain B, the prior of Vignory—witnessing a transaction by which the children of Thibaut of Lorn ceded to the lord of Vignory whatever they had in the tithes of Darmannes, Treix, and Bonmarchais, in exchange for other privileges. A charter dated 1264 shows a prior named Barthelmy relinquishing to the abbess of Poulangy all rights to the tithes he collected between the villages of Vraincourt (Aurincuriam) and Lamancine. In exchange for these tithes—which were commonly called “the tithes of Saint Peter of Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H 1002/1. cartulary of Genevroye. fol. 23v. In May 1240, Draco sold them the sixth part of the tithe of Cosancort. See Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H 1002/1. cartulary of Genevroye. fol. 37r.

73 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H 1002/1. cartulary of Genevroye. fol. 23v.

74 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H 1002/1. cartulary of Genevroye. fol. 23v.

75 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 66 H 1002/1. the cartulary of Genevroye, contains transcriptions of several charters concerning this dispute. The transcription in fol. 23v-24v marks the beginning of the dispute. The transcription in fol. 24v-25v shows that the dispute was still going on in January 1259. The transcription in fol. 25v-26r indicates that the discord was resolved by August 1266.

76 Published in D’Arbaumont, Cartulaire du ... Saint-Étienne. 231. Cf. Lorain, “Genevroye.” 38.
Luxeuil"—the abbess agreed to pay the monks at Genevroye a yearly grain rent. It is possibly this same Barthelmy who in 1266 appeared as a definitor of the Caulite general chapter, though the document recording the "minutes" of this meeting only lists the "prior de Juniperia," without naming Barthelmy. In 1281, a prior named Guiz entered into an exchange with William of Vilaincourt. The prior ceded all rights to the tithes at Signéville and Vignes, in exchange for which William exempted the monks at Genevroye from an annual rent they owed him, consisting of 20 bushels of wheat and 50 of oats. But the value of the items being exchanged was not entirely equal. To make up the difference, William threw in one ox valued at 40 sols, one cow valued at 30 sols, and thirty sols in cash. In 1284, brother Guiz (Guido) confirmed Barthelmy's transaction of 1263 with the abbey of Poulangy. In September 1288, William, the "prior de la Genevoie de l'ordre du Val des Chous," witnessed Gauthier of Viéville's donation of four journals of land and the right of pasturage near Viéville to the Praemonstratensian abbey of Septfontaines.

Vausse (Vaulcia, also Vaucia, Vaulx)

While most scholars agree that Anseric V of Montréal was the founder of Vausse, there is a range of opinion concerning the priory's foundation date. Some scholars have


78 The priors of two Caulite monasteries, Genevroye and Clairlieu, were both definitors of the general chapter in 1266. See Birch, 115-116; Martène, col. 1668; and Lorain, "Genevroie," 39. Lorain seemed certain that the prior named in this charter was the same Barthelmy.

79 Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 10 H 13; cf. Lorain, Genevroye, 39.

80 Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 12 H 13; Lorain, Genevroye, 39, did not date this document.

81 Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 10 H 1. 81; cf. Lorain, "Genevroie," 39.
posed a date as early as 1200, but without offering any documentary evidence.\textsuperscript{82} Courtépée dated the foundation rather vaguely "in the thirteenth century,"\textsuperscript{83} while Folz suggested "before 1235."\textsuperscript{84} Even Petit, who lived at Vausse and was interested in its history, only went as far as saying, "end of the twelfth century or beginning of the thirteenth."\textsuperscript{85} If Anseric V was the founder, then we can at least state with certainty that he founded Vausse before his death in 1223.\textsuperscript{86} Petit described a cartulary from Vausse with charters dated as early as 1204, which might push the foundation date back even further.\textsuperscript{87} Anseric had been married to Nicolette of Vergy, the sister of Alix, Duchess of Burgundy (Odo III's wife). Thus, we can see once again the links of kinship and fealty that helped the Caulite Order to spread.

The earliest mention of Vausse that I have been able to recover came in a charter issued at Damietta, Egypt, dated 1219—at the beginning of the Fifth Crusade—in which Andrew of Montbard, lord of Époisses, made a donation to the Hospitallers. The gift was to be regulated by the abbot of Fontenay, the archdeacon of Tonnerre, and the prior of Vausse, or by two of these parties. This charter at least establishes the priory's existence by 1219, and its prior's involvement in the world outside of Vausse.\textsuperscript{88} We have already encountered


\textsuperscript{83} Courtépée. Description générale et particulière. 4: 26.

\textsuperscript{84} Folz. 99.

\textsuperscript{85} Petit, "Vausse," 51.

\textsuperscript{86} See the genealogy of the lords of Montréal in Petit. Histoire. 5: 496–497.

\textsuperscript{87} The cartulary of Vausse is described in E. Petit. Chartes, manuscrits, autographes, documents historiques sur la Bourgogne faisant partie d'un collection particulière (Dijon 1886). 104. As mentioned in Chapter 3. I have as yet been unable to locate this cartulary.

\textsuperscript{88} This charter is described in Petit, Histoire. 4: 174, which cites l'Abbé Lalare. Cartulaire de Beauvoir. 187 as its source. To date, I have been unable to locate this volume.
Andrew of Montbard from his approval of gifts to the priory of Val-Croissant in 1208.\textsuperscript{89} According to Petit, Andrew was taken prisoner during the Fifth Crusade. When he returned from Egypt, he went to visit the monks at Vausse, accompanied by a member of the Teutonic Order of Knights. Andrew's companion was so moved by the piety of the monks at Vausse that he chose then and there to remain with them, and follow their practice.\textsuperscript{90} The lords of Montbard and Époisses were involved with several Caulite priories. Andrew's father, Bernard of Montbard, was an early benefactor of the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux.\textsuperscript{91} In 1231, Andrew's brother Bernard of Époisses, lord of Vic-de-Chassenay, donated a rent of wheat from his lands at Vic to the monks at Vausse.\textsuperscript{92}

In 1235, Anseric VI of Montréal approved the donations made to Vausse by his father. These included the house of "Vaulx" and full use of all the surrounding forest. Anseric allowed the monks at Vausse to enclose their monastery, but forbade them from turning it into a fortress without his consent.\textsuperscript{93} The monks received the grange near the village of les-Raneaux and everything that went with it. They also received grain rents from various vassals of Anseric V. A certain Sir Andrew gave them wheat and oats from his tithe. Wuillaume of Cisery gave them four septiers of grain, and as much hay as eight oxen could carry in their carts. They received two bushels of grain from Wuillaume, viscount of Avallon; six meadow cuttings from Renaud of Cherisy; and two parts of the tithe from the

\textsuperscript{89} Dijon, BM, ms. 1001, fol. 219v.

\textsuperscript{90} Petit, "Vausse," 60.

\textsuperscript{91} Peincedé, 28.2: 1173, no.100; cf. Petit, Histoire, 4: 469.

\textsuperscript{92} This charter is described in Petit, Histoire, 4: 472, which he cited from the Cartulaire de Vausse, fol. 69, mentioned above.

\textsuperscript{93} Petit, "Vausse," 82: "Les dits frères dessus dits peuvent cloure la dite maison et mettre leur place dedans leur clauture à leur volonté sans ce que lis dits ne doivent et ne peuvent dedans la dite clauture faire forteresse deffendable s'il en était de ma volonté [i.e., the volonté of Anseric]."
village of Marmeaux. Anseric VI also added to his father’s gift. He gave the monks at Vausse permission to collect all they could in tax (censives) up to 200 livres de terre, in exchange for which they would pay Anseric VI five pounds of wax per year. In a charter dated January 1287, Huguenin, “son of the noble Bertrand Hugh, once duke of Burgundy,” (i.e., Hugh IV) approved the original donations made to Vausse, and several others. The approved donations included the house at Vausse; the surrounding forest; and the restriction from turning the monastery into a fortress—though in this charter it was Huguenin who would need to give his consent to do so. Huguenin approved the donation of the grange at les-Raneaux, but in exchange for this the monks would have to pay Huguenin six pounds of wax per year. He approved the donations of several tithes of varying size, many from villages not mentioned in Anseric VI’s charter. Huguenin also ratified an earlier gift of three serfs, which he received from the monks at Vausse, and in exchange for which he would pay the monks the yield from three meadows in Châtel Gérard.

94 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, B 11665 (1235) is the original charter in medieval Latin. The charter must have been copied into Old French, which copy is published in Petit, “Vausse,” 82-83, and H. de Chastellux, Histoire généalogique de la Maison de Chastellux, (Auxerre. 1869). 327-328. Cf. Petit, Histoire, 4: 291, no. 2219; and Quantin, Cartulaire général, 3: 428, no. 1102.

95 Published in Petit, “Vausse,” 85-87; cf. Petit, Chartes, 103, no. 353. A transcription of the eighteenth century gave 1227 as the date of this charter; see Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 45 H 773.

96 Petit, “Vausse,” 85-86: “Lis freres dessus dites peuvent cloure la dite maison, et mettre leur place dedans leur clausure, a leur volonté, sans que lis ne doivent et ne peuvent dedans la dite claussure faire forteresse defendable. s’il en était de ma volonté [i.e., the volonté of Huguenin].”

97 Petit, “Vausse,” 86: “Huguenis ay volu louer, ottroyeret confirm er à la dite église ... oune grange que l’on dit les Raneuax ... Et pour ladite grange ... lis devand dits frères doivent rendre chacun an à moy où à mes hoirs six livres de cire a la feste de la Saint-Remy, lesquelles six livres de cire ils seulaient paier des leur tems audit Monseigneur Anseric, qui fut sire de Montreal.”

98 Petit, “Vausse,” 87: “Pour la rémunération des trois hommes que les dits frères ont donnés à moy. et à mes hoirs predurablement, c’est a savoir. Milon Chalissart; Mariette, sa soeur. et Obert le Menestrier de Sainte-Reine, et leurs hoirs ... je, Huguenin dessus nommé ay donné ... ez dits frères ... six fauchées de
The Grand Cartulary called Vausse the “third daughter of the [Caulite] order.”

The priory still stands, located near the community of Châtel Gérard, in the diocese of Langres, roughly sixteen kilometers due west of Montbard. According to Pignard-Péguet, Vausse gave its name to the surrounding forest—though it is known today as the forest of Saint-Jean. According to Petit, the church and cloister were rebuilt several times during the monastery’s history. For example, the current cloister was constructed between 1490...
and 1550. It nonetheless retains a sense of isolation and serenity that monks in the thirteenth century likely would have appreciated. The church, which is much larger than the cloister, has an *adjutorium* running along one side. (See Figure 6.7.) Petit claimed that it was here that “one found a chapel, where night and day there burned a lamp before the Blessed Sacrament.” Playful figurative sculptures support the rib vaulting in this chapel, for example, an angel reading a scroll, or a man in a hood who appears to be shrugging. Vausse’s founder, Anseric V, was among the many benefactors buried in the priory.

Few records survive that might relate the story of Vausse in the thirteenth century. A charter dated July 1248 tells us that Dreux of Mello and his wife Elvis donated a yearly rent of 100 *sols tournois*, from their revenues at Époisses, to establish an anniversary at Vausse after their deaths. In October 1257, Hugh, viscount of Tonnerre, in his last will and testament made several bequeathals to Fontenay and other monasteries, including 100 *sols* to the priory of Vausse. In May 1258, Hugh IV, duke of Burgundy, approved the alms of one-half *muith* of grain, given to the monks at Vausse by his vassal, Stephen of Trévilly. In 1276, the prior of Vausse reached an accord with Gibaut, the curate of Torcy.

---

103 I was unable to find Anseric’s tombstone at Vausse, but a drawing of it is published in Pet. *Histoire*, 3: the fourth plate in the front of the volume.
104 Courtépée described the charter in his collected papers; see Dijon, BM, ms. 1001, fol. 194r.
concerning the tithe of Torcy. In 1298, Miles, lord of Bierry, donated a mill to the monks at Vausse.

Petit recorded the names of seven priors for the thirteenth century: Thibaut (1231); Barthelmy (1235); Abraham (1239-42); Hugh (1258); William (1265); Thierry (1269); and William (1281-85). His sources for some of these names remain a mystery to me. In 1239, the abbot of Moutier-Saint-Jean called upon Abraham, prior of Vausse, to settle a dispute between Moutier-Saint-Jean and Andrew of Rochefort, concerning the mill at Saint-Jean. In 1242, Abraham negotiated a dispute attested by Martin, abbot of Fontenay, between Andrew, lord of Savoisy, and the monks of the abbey of Puits-d’Orbe concerning the woods of La-Bouchaille. In October 1265, William, “priors de Vauce,” appears in a charter arranging an anniversary mass for Mile of Noyers, his wife Elisent, and their ancestors, in exchange for sixty livres. In 1269, the monks of Moutier-Saint-Jean called upon Vausse’s prior Thierry to resolve a dispute they were having with John of Saulieu concerning non-payment of revenues. In 1285, Prior William mediated a dispute between Guy of Beauvoir and the monks of Moutier-Saint-Jean. In February 1287.

---

107 Published in Petit, “Vausse, 84-85; cf. Petit, Chartes, 103, no. 353, which described this charter as a vidimus.

108 Published in Petit, “Vausse, 87-88; cf. Petit, Chartes, 104, no. 357, which described this charter as a vidimus.

109 See Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 1 F 433. Petit also mentioned a list of priors in his description of the (as yet undiscovered) cartulary of Vausse; see Petit, Chartes, 105, no. 363.


111 See Petit, Chartes, 103, no. 351. Petit described this as a “très jolie pièce.”


114 See Chastellux, Histoire généalogique de ... Chastellux, 350.
when Huguenin confirmed the gifts of his father, Duke Hugh IV. William appears again as the “humblez priours de Vauces.” This charter still has William’s seal attached. The seal is cast in green wax, is mandorla-shaped, and measures 42 x 27 mm. It depicts a tonsured Caulite monk, standing and facing to the left, reading an open book that he holds in both hands. The book could be a symbol of monastic learning, or perhaps of regular life. (Saint Benedict is often depicted holding his Rule.) Before the monk are two stars, one above the book and one below; behind him is a crescent moon, perhaps locating the monk in the heavens. Below him are three pointed nails (the three nails used to nail Christ to the cross?). The inscription reads “S’ ECCLESIE . DE . VAUCIA,” i.e., the holy church of Vausse.

---

Figure 6.8: Seal of the prior of Vausse. Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, B 983.

---

Vauclair (Vallis clara)

Simon of Chateauvillain founded the priory of Vauclair in 1219. He did so with the assent of his wife Elysabeth, whose dowry Simon used as the basis of the foundation gift, which included one muid of wheat from Simon’s mill at Chateauvillain. Half of this (six sextaria) was to be paid at the feast of Saint Remy; the other half following Easter. If the value of the grain produced at the mill ever dropped, Simon made arrangements for 10 pounds in money (libras pecunii) to be paid to the monks at Vauclair every year, to account for the difference. Simon also gave twelve muids of wine from his vineyards at Valariot, to be paid each year at the Feast of All Saints; the cuttings from three meadows between Arc-en-Barrois (Arcum) and Giey-sur-Aujon (Gyensium); the use of all the fish in the waters between Giey and the mill of Mosterot; and all the woods within certain marked boundaries. Simon seemed to prefer supporting the Caulites over other orders, for the final lines of his foundation charter stipulated that if the monks occupying the priory of Vauclair transferred their holdings to another order, then Simon and his heirs would not consider

---

116 Courtepée, Description générale et particulière, 4: 271, believed that the founder was “J. de Chateauvillain,” i.e., John, Simon’s son, based on the fact that John’s tomb was once located in the church’s vault. Cf. Jolibois, La Haute-Marne ancienne et moderne, 537; and C. Roussel. Le diocèse de Langres: histoire et statistique (Langres, 1873), 2: 236; Cottineau, 2: 3302; Folz, 99.


118 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 326: “Dedi similiter eisdem fratribus decem [libras pecunii], singulis annis percipiendas in predictis molendinis in hunc modum quod si dicta molendina non essent [tanti] val[oris in molendinis de blajdo ipsorum molendinorum tamen vendi [te]neretur quo ad dicta pecunia dictis fratribus ex integro solveretur.”
themselves obliged to pay the alms listed above. In September of 1230, Simon donated fifty herring (alectia) per year and half a measure (summa) of olive oil to Vauclair, which he called “the house that I founded” (domus scilicet quam fundavi). In January 1252, Simon issued another charter reiterating the above donations, which his new wife Allis and their son, the knight John of Chateauvillain, approved. The charter also suggests that Simon may have founded Vauclair with his mother.

Vauclair was located near Giey-sur-Aujon, in the diocese of Langres, roughly twenty kilometers southwest of Chaumont. The church at Vauclair was destroyed in 1778, but Courtépée described it as having “a very delicate architecture.” Jolibois, no doubt reading Courtépée, called Vauclair a “beau gothique.” It is likely that many powerful lords had their own chapels in Caulite churches, and Vauclair was no exception. For example, we know that Baudouin, Provost of Arc, gave one-fourth of a certain meadow’s yield to light the candles in his chapel at Vauclair (pour le lumiyere de sa chapele de Val

119 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 326: “[Et sciendum] est quod dictum in hunc modum fundavi, quod si fratres ipsam [domum] inhabitantes ad alium ordinem [quam ad eamdem Vallis caulium, qui ne ibidem observatur] transferre voluerint predictas elemosinas ego vel heres meus eisdem fratribus reddere non [teneremur].”

120 See Niermeyer, 34.

121 A summa, derived from sagma, was a unit of measure for liquids. See Niermeyer, 929-930, def. 3.

122 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 326.

123 We have already encountered John of Chateauvillain as the founder of the Caulite priory of Uchon.


125 Courtépée, Description générale et particulière. 4: 271. By the time of Courtépée’s writing (1775), he tells us that the church had been destroyed for three years, but it seems apparent that Courtépée had seen the church in his lifetime.

126 Jolibois, La Haute-Marne ancienne et moderne. 537. Since Jolibois was writing seventy years after Vauclair’s destruction, and he himself admits that, at the time of his writing, Vauclair was nothing more than a mill, then he likely did not even see ruins. Therefore I take Jolibois’s description of Vauclair’s church to be his interpretation of Courtépée’s description.
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In May of 1295, John of Marac donated an annual grain payment in order to found an altar at Vauclair (fondei un auteiren l'eglise de Vaucler), at which the monks would celebrate masses for him and his family.¹²八

Simon of Chateauvillain continued to appear in charters concerning Vauclair until 1261—when his son John became lord of Chateauvillain—approving the gifts of dependents or vassals who held land from Simon in fief. For example, in 1230, Simon approved the gift of his mother Isabelle, who donated her part of the tithe at Blessonville.¹²九

In 1232, he approved sales to Vauclair made by Huoiz and William of Arc and by John, the chaplain of Arc.¹³° In 1240, he approved the sale made by the squire (armiger) John, known as Poeilly.¹³¹ In 1242, 1247, and 1250, Simon approved various alms donated by his vassal John “the dwarf” (Johannes nanus). John’s donations over the years included the tierce of Ligneruoles and of Gulis; all the meadows he had in Lignemoles; and twelve measures (moiteons) of grain and 20 sols in annual rent. Throughout his life, Simon of Chateauvillain approved donations of rents in kind and money given by a number of his different vassals.¹³²

In October 1243, Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254) took Vauclair’s holdings under his protection (sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus).¹³³ At the beginning of his

¹²七 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 326.

¹²八 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 326.

¹²九 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 328.

¹³° Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 326.

¹³¹ Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 326. For the use of “armiger,” see note 75, above.

¹³² Charters concerning Vauclair are at Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1001-1002; and Yzeure, AD de l’Allier H 220, pp. 326, 328-30, and 332-33.

¹³³ Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 324: “Innocentus, episcopus, servus servorum Dei ...dilectis filiis, priori et fratribus Vallis clare, ordinis Vallis caulium Lingonensis dioecesis, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.
pontificate, Innocent IV was also at the beginning of a long struggle with the Emperor Frederick II, who was trying to consolidate Italy under his authority. During this time, Innocent IV moved the papal curia across the Alps, excommunicated Frederick, and began raising funds for the continuing war in Italy. By placing their holdings under the pope's protection, the monks at Vauclair were perhaps showing support of the pope in this conflict. Frederick II died in 1250. In 1252, in a sweeping exchange with the monks at Vauclair, Simon took back many of Vauclair's holdings. In exchange, he offered the monks at Vauclair a comparatively small annual grain rent, which they seem to have accepted without any (recorded) dispute. Simon's son John approved the entire transaction. In 1255, Simon and his son John purchased from the monks at Vauclair the rest of these rents—including the 20 sols owed by John the dwarf—in exchange for the farm of Sautreuil (Sostruil), and all that went with it. The charter recording this exchange makes it clear that Vauclair would retain the rights to the use of Simon's forests, including the right to pasture twenty pigs in those woods. Recall that Simon had forbidden the Caulites at

134 Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 326: "[There is a long list of donations, after which Simon stated that] Je ai totes ces choses dessus dites prises en ma main a tenir a toujorz mes en heritaige de moi et de mes hoirs por lou grei et par la volentei des davant diz freres Vaucleir, et lor en ai donei en exchange [then follows a comparatively small grain rent in exchange for the other items]."

135 Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 326.
Vauclair from alienating their properties to any other monastic order, and threatened to repossess if they did so. There is no evidence that the monks were in violation of Simon’s wishes, but perhaps Simon feared that the pope, if he remained Vauclair’s protector, might install a different order in that priory. Then again, perhaps this exchange was just a way of consolidating all the donations the monastery would receive. In 1262, Pope Urban IV (1261-64) confirmed Vauclair’s holdings.136

We know several of the names of Vauclair’s priors during the thirteenth century, and even the name of one of its monks. Roussel listed Humbert as the first prior of Vauclair in 1233 and 1237, but I was not able to find charters with those dates, much less the name Humbert.137 A charter dated 1251, which concerned a conflict over the delivery of grain rents between Vauclair and the Cluniac monastery of Marmesse (Marmissa), named a certain Henry as prior of Vauclair.138 The authors of the Gallia christiana suggested that in 1262 the monks at Val-des-Choux elected this same Henry as their prior.139 Roussel listed four other priors, whom I have been unable to locate in any charter: John in 1255; Hugh in 1258; Henry again in 1262; then John again in 1265.140 In 1271, Elyes appears as prior of Vauclair, in a charter concerning the secular chapter of Châteauvillain.141 A charter of 1295,

136 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 324.

137 Roussel, Le diocèse de Langres, 2: 236.

138 Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 2 G 928. Roussel, Le diocèse de Langres, 2: 236, also listed Henry in charters dated 1254 and 1255, which charters I have been unable to locate.


140 Roussel, Le diocèse de Langres, 2: 236.

141 Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 2 G 928: “Nous frères Elyes, hummles priours de Vaulcler ...” Roussel, Le diocèse de Langres, 2: 236, claimed to have found Elyes in a charter dated 1273.
in which John of Marac dedicated an altar at Vauclair, reveals “frere Pierre, humble priour de Vauclair.”

In 1297, Marie, wife of Simon Aignay, the son of the lord of Chateauvillain, named “freires Luques [Luc], prioux de Vaulclair” as the executor of her will. Marie had at first asked a friar named Philip to perform this task, but when Philip “went from life to death,” she reassigned these duties to Luques. Finally, we know the names of one of Vauclair’s monks from a charter dated 1254, in which Simon of Chateauvillain donated to the monks at Vauclair the revenues from his winepresses (torcularibus) in Chateauvillain, freely and without tax. Simon also approved the donations of several vineyards given to Vauclair, among which was a vineyard donated by Rocelin of Chateauvillain and Brother Raoul, her son, a monk of Vauclair. Whether this vineyard was an entry gift for Raoul or some late form of simony is difficult to tell.

Petit-Saint-Lieu (Sanctus locus)

John of Montréal, lord of Tart, and his wife, Nicholette of Magny, founded Petit-Saint-Lieu in 1224. John was the brother of Andrew of Montréal, the founder of the Caulite priory of Vausse. Hugh of Montréal, the bishop of Langres and another of John’s

---

142 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 326.

143 Chaumont, AD de la Haute-Marne, 2 G 929. Roussel, Le diocèse de Langres, 2: 236. misread the name of the prior as Hugues (Hugh). The upper-case “H” and “L” in the charter are easy enough to confuse, but the lower-case “q” and “q” are easy to distinguish. “Luques” is correct.

144 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier. H 326: “Alia [vinea] sita est in Buxo, quam dederunt eis Rocelin de Castrovillano et frater Radulphus, filius suus, monachus Vallis clarae.” The date on the charter is difficult to read beyond 12-4. An archivist wrote the date 1254, which seems feasible.

145 On the difference between entry gifts and simony, see Chapter 5, note 92.

146 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 65 H 997. Cf. J. Vignier, Chronicon lingenense, ex probationibus decadis historiae contextum (Langres, 1665), 126 (Vignier dated the foundation in 1227); Chenevet, “Mémoire sur la maison de St Lieu” in l’Almanach de la province de Bourgogne et particulierment de la ville de Dijon (1781), 219; Abbé Mathieu, Abrégé chronologique de l’histoire des évêques de Langres (Langres, 1844), 93-93; Chastellux, Histoire généalogique de … Castellux, 42; Roussel, Le diocèse de Langres, 3: 95; Folz, 99; P. Gras and M. Garreta, “Le Petit Val-des-Choux”, MCACO 26 (1970): 133.
brothers, approved the foundation of Val-Saint-Lieu. Nicholette of Magny was the widow of Peter of Ravières. Both were benefactors of the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux.

In the foundation charter for Petit-Saint-Lieu, John and Nicolette gave “to God and the Blessed Mary and the [Caulite] brothers, a place that was called Molie [Moleix], for the purpose of building there a house of the [Caulite Order] that is called Oriens.” The name “Oriens” means “East.” This could have indicated the monastery’s eastward orientation toward Jerusalem; or, more simply, its location in relation to some landmark of which we no longer have knowledge. John and Nicholette’s original gift included full use of all the woods near the priory, and the waters that flowed between the priory and the woods. The monks were to have the right to fish in those waters from a place where the waters divided, up to the old site of the mill of Molene. John of Montréal also donated eighteen sextiers of wheat, according to the measure of Dijon; eighteen muids of wine from the castle vineyards of Tart; and eighteen livres dijonnais in money, to be paid once a year from the tax (de censibus) of the castle and town of Tart (tam de Tart castillo quam de Tart villa). It seems as if John and Nicholette had some affinity for the number eighteen, but their gift also included six sextiers of oats and eight cartloads of hay (carratas fenii). All tolled, John and Nicholette’s was the “perfect” Caulite endowment, comprised entirely of rents in kind and money. Even with such a rich endowment, the Caulites found the site at Molie ill suited for their purposes. According to Chenevet, John of Montreal had consulted his court more than the needs of the religious when he decided to give them Molie, but John died before he could remedy the situation.

---

147 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 65 H 997: “Deo et beate Marie et fratribus Valliscaulium locum quemdam qui appellebatur Moleix ad construendum ibidem quondam domum de ordine Vallis caulium qui Oriens vocatur.”

148 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. 65 H 997.
After John's death, in 1226, his wife Nicolette gave the Caulites a place called Saint-Lieu (Holy Place). The Caulites gave back the site at Molie, abandoning the name Oriens and adopting Saint-Lieu as the monastery's new name. They relinquished the right to gather wood in the forest of Molie, and eight muids of wine. In exchange Nicholette gave them the forest of Magny, the right to fish in its rivers, and six muids of wine from her vineyards at Marcennay. In 1236, Nicolette added other gifts to Vauclair's endowment, including all she had at Marcenay in men and lands, in rents and wine and justice. To this she added three cart-loads of hay, the entire forest of Magny next to their priory, the oven of Magny and the woods of Chevigny for use in firing that oven; and a house in Dijon. According to Chenevet, it was in this house in Dijon that the monks of Petit-Saint-Lieu "established themselves henceforth."

The original site of Petit-Saint-Lieu was near the community of Magny-sur-Tille, in the diocese of Langres (now the diocese of Dijon), just south of the city of Dijon. Since the monks moved their priory to Dijon during the fourteenth century, nothing remains of the original site at Magny-sur-Tille—not even a decent description from the usual eighteenth century erudites.

Very few charters from the thirteenth century remain for Petit-Saint-Lieu. From a charter dated 1252 we learn that John, count of Burgundy and lord of Salins, donated six charges of salt to the monks at Petit-Saint-Lieu. In recognition of these alms, the monks

---

149 In 1764, when the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux was joined to the Cistercian monastery of Sept-Fons, it eventually became known as Val-Saint-Lieu. It was likely after this that the filial priory of Saint-Lieu became Petit-Saint-Lieu, to differentiate it from the motherhouse. See Mignard, 467-473.

150 Chenevet, "Mémoire sur la maison de St. Lieu." 220. I have not been able to locate the charter of 1226, which Chenevet cited.

151 Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or. 65 H 997.

152 Chenevet, "Mémoire sur la maison de St Lieu." 220. Most authors do not have the monks at Petit-Saint-Lieu transferring to Dijon until 1363. See Folz. 99; and Gras and Garreta, "Le Petit Val-des-Choux", 133.
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were to perform a solemn anniversary for John and his wife Ysabel on the day after the
nativity of the Blessed Virgin (9 September), once a year while they lived, and on the day of
their death after they had died.\textsuperscript{153} A charter dated March 1283 records the sale of a
vineyard in Marcenay by the brothers of Petit-Saint-Lieu to the Grandmontine monastery of
Époisses (Spissie) for four livres viennois.\textsuperscript{154} None of the thirteenth-century charters that I
consulted preserve the names of a prior of Petit-Saint-Lieu.

Val-Duc (\textit{Vallis ducis}), a.k.a. Le-Quartier

Circa 1248 Hugh IV, duke of Burgundy, followed in his father's footsteps and
founded a Caulite monastery, the priory of Val-Duc (the duke's valley), which some
sources call Le-Quartier, after the name of the narrow valley in which the monastery was
located.\textsuperscript{155} The first document concerning Val-Duc is a bull dated 1249, in which Innocent
IV approved the foundation. According to this bull, Hugh:

by [his] zeal for the faith and the ardor of [his] piety, propose[d], both for the glory
of God as well as for the salvation of his soul and the souls of his successors.
found[ed] a new house of the order of Val-des-Choux, in [his] land, a place that is
called the forest of Salives, in the diocese of Langres.\textsuperscript{156}

\textsuperscript{153} Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 65 H 997.

\textsuperscript{154} Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, 31 H 735.

\textsuperscript{155} Courtéepeé, \textit{Description générale et particulière}, 4: 284; Roussel, \textit{Le diocèse de Langres}, 3: 123: A.
Roserot, \textit{Dictionnaire topographique du département de la Côte d'Or}, (Paris, 1924), 318; Folz, 100;
Centre de Valduc, \textit{Valduc, tranches d'histoire} (Arny-le-duc, 1997), 13-14. Folz dated the foundation
"before 1248." The authors of the CEA dated the foundation at 1245.

\textsuperscript{156} Dijon, AD de la Côte d'Or, H sup. 37, no. 1: "Cum zelo fidei et devotionis fervore succensus ad
honorem Dei et tuam tuorumque successorum animarem salutem quandam de novo domum in ordinis Vallis
caulium in terra tua loco videlicet qui foresta de Saliva [Salives] dicitur Lingonensis diocesis tuis propriis
fundatam."
Innocent exempted the monks at Val-Duc from any tithes or other temporal obligations, except that the bishop could demand a reasonable indemnity during visitations.\textsuperscript{157}

The forest of Salives is now called the Moloy Forest. Val-Duc was located four kilometers south of the community of Salives, roughly 30 kilometers northwest of Dijon. The church and other conventual buildings at Val-Duc have been gone for over two centuries. These did not fall victim to the French Revolution, as one might suspect, but to the whims of Canon Philibert Hemey, Vicar General of the bishop of Autun. In 1764, when the Cistercian monastery of Sept-Fons took control of the Caulite Order, the priory of Val-Duc went with it. Hemey became the commendatory prior of Val-Duc.\textsuperscript{158} The buildings at Val-Duc were badly in need of repair, but rather than undertake costly repairs, Hemey decided to raze them—this, without consulting with his superior, Dom Dorothée Jallontz, Abbot of Sept-Fons. Hemey, writing to the bishop of Dijon, declared that:

\begin{quote}
During times of snow, which are frequent in these awful mountains, when the paths are bad ... almost no one attends the mass at the priory ... the church of the priory is at the end of a long line of buildings in ruins, and without any defense against brigands.\textsuperscript{159}
\end{quote}

Jallontz responded on behalf of the Caulites, begging the bishop to intervene and spare Val-Duc from destruction because:

\begin{quote}
The church is very beautiful, and entirely whole, and of exactly the same construction as our church of Val-Saint-Lieu [i.e., Val-des-Choux, renamed after the union with Sept-Fons].\textsuperscript{160}
\end{quote}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{157} Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or. H sup. 37. no. 1: “Nos tue devotionis supplicationibus inclinati eidem domui auctoritate apostolica indulgenti ut nullus in eam vel fratres in ipsa degentes preter dioecesanum episcopum aut prorocurationem honestam in ipsa visitationis nomine tantummodo servamus exactionem in temporalibus valeat aliquam exercere.”
\bibitem{158} A commendatory prior was appointed by a higher authority, rather than elected by the convent of monks.
\bibitem{159} Letter of 28 June 1779 from Abbot Heney to the bishop of Dijon, quoted in CEA. Val-Duc. 17.
\end{thebibliography}
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Courtécéée, who visited the church between 1770 and 1775, described the church at Val-Duc as "fort bien." In spite of these positive descriptions of the church, Hemey won out and the monastery was demolished. Thankfully, when Hemey first took possession of the priory in 1778, he described the church in great detail. Hemey's purpose was to demonstrate the futility of initiating any repairs to the property. Yet from his description, and the few remaining stones on the property, Gras was able to reconstruct an image of the original church. According to Gras, the church was roughly seven meters wide. The nave of the church measured almost thirty meters, the choir roughly seven by six. On either side

---

161 See Courtécéée's collected papers at Dijon, BM, ms. 1005, fol. 122.
of the choir stood a chapel. A round capital—decorated with a bent ribbon design, and similar to capitals found in the neighboring church of Minot—was evidence that the church was big enough to have had columns, some of which were collateral. Two keystones for the vaulting remain. The workmanship of these suggests a construction date for the church earlier than 1250—though the foundation date in Innocent IV’s bull provides a more precise date. A square pillar, flanked by four smaller columns, was reminiscent of columns found at the nearby Cistercian abbey of Fontenay.\(^\text{162}\) (See Figure 6.9.)

The bull of Innocent IV is not generous in its detail; therefore we have no record of what the original foundation gifts included. However, we know that in 1270 Hugh gave the monks at Val-Duc an annual rent of 20 *livres viennois* from the fair at Chalon-sur-Saône. The monks were to use the money to buy religious vestments.\(^\text{163}\) Several historians report the gift of Hugh’s son Robert, then duke of Burgundy, who donated the forest around Val-Duc, and the use of the forest of Salives, though I have found no charter recording this donation.\(^\text{164}\) The monks at Val-Duc held vineyards near Darcy, which we know from a charter dated 1266 that records the sale of another vineyard, describing it as being next to that of the monks.\(^\text{165}\) At some point, the monks shared an enclosure (*excluse*), located between Crimolois and Neuilly, with the knight William of Sautrone, who was lord of Neuilly. In 1278, this enclosure became the object of a legal dispute between the monks at


\(^{163}\) See Peincedé, 25: 30.


\(^{165}\) Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or B 1376 (1266); cf. Peincedé, 1: 212.
Val-Duc and William on the one side, and the knights Hospitaller on the other. The Hospitallers won.166

We know the names of two of Val-Duc's priors from the thirteenth century. “Freres Bartholomiers, priour de Val-le-Duc,” served during a dispute in 1253 with the Cistercian abbey of Fontenay over the revenues from a house in Darcy.167 In 1276, Martin, “priour de la maison notre dame dou Quartier, dites vulgaremme lou Vaul lou Duc,” had more dealings with the monks at Fontenay, in which Val-Duc gave Fontenay part of its forest in exchange for some meadows.168

Caulite priories in the county of Champagne

The Caulites had four filial priories in the county of Champagne: Clairlieu, Val-Dieu, Remonvaux, and Beaupré.

Clairlieu (Clarus locus)

Chapter 4 mentioned an historiographic tradition by which Viard, founder of the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux, was also the founder of the filial priory known as Clairlieu. Most followers of this tradition placed the foundation in 1197.169 One author of the seventeenth century had Viard found Clairlieu in 1193—the same year as the foundation at

166 Dijon. AD de la Côte d'Or. 112 H 1206: cf. Petit, Histoire. 4: 263, no. 4369.

167 Dijon. AD de la Côte d'Or. 15 H 107; published in Petit. Histoire. 4: 411, no. 2781.

168 Dijon. AD de la Côte d'Or. 15 H 257; cf. Petit. Histoire. 4: 248, no. 4303.

169 See M. Courtalon-Delaistre, Topographie historique de la ville et du diocese de Troyes (Troyes. 1783-1784). 3: 167; T. Boutiot, Dictionnaire topographique du département de l'Aube (Paris 1874). 47; Maillard, “Notice historique sur le prieuré de Notre Dame de Clairlieu,” in Pâlis et le prieuré de Clairlieu (Troyes. 1884). 124 (Maillard was not certain of the date, but “knew” that Viard was the founder); J-M. Besse, Abbayes et prieurés de l'ancienne France, tome sixième: Province ecclésiastique de Sens, in Archives de la France monastique, (Ligué and Paris. 1913). 15: 158; Cottineau. 1: 797; and Folz. 97.
Val-des-Choux. We may dismiss 1193 as an almost absurd strain on our credibility. The "tradition" of 1197 as the foundation date is likely the product of so many erudites, one copying the other. We need not jettison the date just yet, though, as mentioned in Chapter 4, I have not found any documentary evidence to support Viard as Clairlieu’s founder.

In a charter dated 1222, the monks at Clairlieu received half a muid of wheat according to the measure of Saint-Florentin, and four muids of wine according to the measure of Auxerre, both to be paid once a year from lands in Avrolles (Avreuil?). (Ebrola). The donor was Thibaut IV (1201-1253), count of Champagne and Brie, who is perhaps best known as a courtly poet. Thibaut was the son of Blanche of Navarre, who in 1210 had donated a mill and money rent to the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux.

Thibaut’s donation to Clairlieu came in 1222, the year in which he reached majority. Aside from the formulaic reasons—“for the good of his soul and the souls of his ancestors”—it is unclear why Thibaut made this gift in this particular year. I suggest that Thibaut, now come of age, may have been trying to establish relations with the monasteries in the territory he would some day rule. I do not believe that the charter of 1222 marked Clairlieu’s foundation. Aside from the fact that the charter made no mention of a foundation, it seems that a foundation gift from a benefactor as important as the count of Champagne would have been more significant, i.e., it would have included lands, rights to a forest, fishing rights, etc.

---

170 Troyes, Episcopal archives, Chevre de Charmotte. *Recherches sur la Châtellenie de Villemaur* (17th-century manuscript), 528: “[Clairlieu] was founded in 1193 by frère Viard, conversus of the Charterhouse of Ligny (sic) of the diocese of Langres.”

171 Troyes. BM. ms 22, 192; Paris. BN. ms lat 5992, fol. 301.

172 For a good overview of Thibaut’s life, see Y. Bellenger and D. Queruel, eds., *Thibaut de Champagne, prince et poète au XIIIe siècle* (Lyon. 1987).

173 Thibaut became king of Navarre in 1234, after the death of his uncle, Sanche VII.
As it stands, “half a muid of wheat and four muids of wine” seems more the donation of a young count, perhaps one just testing the waters of monastic endowment. All of which means that Clairlieu must have been established before 1222, though we have no way of knowing how long before. The likely candidate for the founder then becomes Blanche of Navarre, who was already a Caulite benefactor.

The priory of Clairlieu was located roughly twenty-five kilometers west of Troyes, between the small villages of Pâlis and Planty. Joanne situated Clairlieu in “an untamed valley.”¹⁷⁴ Maillard described the site as “ravishing, nestled in the bottom of a narrow gorge, and surrounded by great, green forests … a well-chosen place of retreat.”¹⁷⁵ Clairlieu is currently a farm. Most of the woods that once surrounded the priory have been cleared for cultivation, but small patches of forest remain on the north and east sides of the property. A few of the monastic buildings still stand, which Maillard described as follows:

An entire aisle of the old monastery still exists in the current farm of Clairlieu. The walls are one meter thick, fifteen meters high and twenty-five meters long, with fourteen windows in the upper floor. The old refectory of the monks serves today as a stable. The chapel, of which the sanctuary was in the southwest, serves as a grange. It was sixteen meters deep, and was below ground level. The bell tower was above the choir. Daylight penetrated the interior through five gothic windows, of which we now see only the lower part.¹⁷⁶ (See Figure 6.10.)

Clairlieu was partially destroyed during the wars of religion in 1576, which destruction Maillard described as “a Huguenot act of vengeance.”¹⁷⁷ Even the most superficial inspection of the site reveals that it has been destroyed and rebuilt several times.


¹⁷⁵ Maillard, “Notice historique,” 123.


After Thibaut’s donation of 1222, there are few records for donations to Clairlieu in the thirteenth century. In 1230, Anseau of Trainel donated an annual rent of four and one-half sextiers of grain from his customs at Aix. In 1244, Clairlieu placed all the holdings (omnia bona) that it had or might acquire through donation or purchase in the protection (in custodia) of the count of Champagne—though the charter is not clear on why the monks took this action. These included portions of the tithes in Pâlis, Bourdenay, Hervy, and

---

178 Troyes, AD de l’Aube, G 511.
Lenario; granges in Pâlis and Paisy (*Pasiaco*); lands in Charmoi; part of the forest of Luissant; and other holdings in Montfeuil (*Monte folio*).

Though writers from the seventeenth to the twentieth century have listed Viard as Clairlieu’s first prior, no primary document attests this assertion. Only three priors of Clairlieu appear in the charters of the thirteenth century. A charter dated 1231 records a conflict between Anseau of Trainel, Clairlieu’s benefactor, and the Cistercian abbey of Valuissant, located seven kilometers west of Clairlieu. The prior of Clairlieu, identified only by the initial R, was one of many witnesses. His seal, still attached to the bottom of the charter, is badly damaged, but one can still make out a lamb in the foreground, with a crosier in the center, behind the lamb. The letters “CLAR-” along the left side of the seal indicate the first part of “CLARUS LOCUS.”

The second of Clairlieu’s priors to appear in the documents was Gauthier, who with John, prior of Val-des-Choux, placed Clairlieu’s holdings under the protection of the count of Champagne. The third prior of Clairlieu to appear in the charters was James, who in 1258 traded one-fourth of the tithe of Courgenay (*Corgenai*) to the abbey of Valuissant for 30 deniers of tax in the village of Bouy.

---


180 Auxerre, AD de l’Yonne, H 711. For further description of this seal, see Coulon, *Inventaire des sceaux*, 273, no. 1512.


182 Auxerre, AD de l’Yonne, H 710.
Val-Dieu (Vallis Dei)

Some earlier historians associated the foundation of Val-Dieu with the Queen Blanche of Castille, mother of Saint Louis, dating the foundation in 1215. They offered no evidence for this assertion, which could be the result of their confusing more than one monastery of the same name. For example, Cottineau posited a foundation date of 1215 for two priories named Val-Dieu. Both were in the diocese of Troyes, both in the community of Lachy. According to Cottineau, one of these was a Caulite priory, the other a priory of the regular canons known as the Val-des-Écoliers. Cottineau’s entry for the Val-Dieu of the regular canons cited Joanne, who described the site as containing a “gothic church, the vestiges of the priory of Val-Dieu and of the castle of Queen Blanche,” which suggests that Blanche was the founder.

Courtalon offered almost exactly the same description for the Caulite Val-Dieu:

Since the times of Saint Louis, the lordship of Lachy belonged to the crown. They had there a royal castle, of which there are still vestiges ... Queen Blanche, mother of Louis, founded there in one corner of the park, the priory of Val-Dieu ... of the Order of Carthusians of Val-des-Choux ... around the year 1215.

Two priories founded by the same person, in the same year, in the same place? This is either a remarkable coincidence—showing little imagination on the part of the founder—or earlier historians have not recognized that the two priories were actually one. Thankfully,

---

183 See Courtalon-Delaistre, Topographie historique. 3: 289; Besse. Archives de la France monastique. 15: 156; and Cottineau, 2: 3260 (who cited Courtalon-Delaistre, and Besse). Cottineau called Val-Dieu a “priory of the Trappists of Val-des-Choux.”


185 Cottineau, 2: 3260, cited Joanne. Dictionnaire géographique (Paris. 1905), but I was unable to locate any mention of Val-Dieu in this work.

186 Courtalon-Delaistre. Topographie historique. 3: 288-289. Courtalon also maintained that the Huguenots had destroyed the Caulite Val-Dieu in 1567, “so badly that no one could live there,” and that in 1784, nothing remained except a small chapel.
the charters offer some remedy for this confusion. The Caulite general chapter of 1266 stated that "Thibaut, by the grace of God king of Navarre ... had founded a house in Brie called Val-Dieu." Unfortunately, the general chapter did not indicate which Thibaut was meant: Thibaut IV, king of Navarre from 1234 to 1253, or his son Thibaut V, king of Navarre from 1253 to 1270. One might assume Thibaut V, since the general chapter of 1266 coincides with his regnal years. Yet both Birch and Folz seemed to believe that Thibaut IV was the founder, though without offering any further evidence. A charter dated May 1267, issued by Thibaut V, informs us in no uncertain terms that it was the son who:

to complete the last wish of [his] father, gave ... to the brothers of the [Caulite] Order ... a place that is called Val-Dieu, and everything belonging to it, which [was] near [his] house at Lachy.

In a certain sense, we might think of Thibaut père as the founder in spirit, and Thibaut fils as the founder in fact.

The priory of Val-Dieu was located roughly fifty kilometers north-northwest of Troyes, near the community of Lachy. Woods still stands on the east side of the current site, but these must have been much more dense in the thirteenth century. The castle vestiges of which Joanne and Courtalon spoke are no more, but one can still sense the

---

187 Birch, 115: "Theobaldo. Dei gratia illustri regi Navarrie ... quod prior domus quam fundavit in Bria, que dicitur Vallis Dei."

188 The father was so called because he was the fourth count of Champagne named Thibaut. But because he was the first king of Navarre with that name, from the Navarrese point of view, he was actually Thibaut I. This would make his son Thibaut V as count of Champagne, but Thibaut II as king of Navarre. Since having two Thibauts will make matters confusing enough, I have chosen to stick with the numbering used for the counts of Champagne, which the section on Clairlieu (above) already introduced. Henceforth, Thibaut IV was the father; Thibaut V was the son.

189 See Birch, 115, note 3; Folz, 100.

190 Chalons-en-Champagne, AD de la Marne, 36 H 2, no. 1: "... pour accomplir la dernier volonté de nostre pere, avons donné ... aux frères de l'ordre du Val des Choux ... un lieu qui est appelé le Val Dieu, et toutes les appartenances dudit lieu, qui est proche de nostre maison de Lachy."
Figure 6.11: Remains of the church at Val-Dieu.

outline of what must have been the church—now the home of the resident farmers. (See
Figure 6.11.) Since Thibaut’s foundation charter stated that he was giving the Caulites “a
place that is called Val-Dieu,” it is possible the site was so called when the Caulites got it.
If there were other monks or canons on this site they could have left for a variety of reasons.
This could explain the confusion of earlier historians who posited Blanche of Castille as the
founder. Perhaps Blanche did found a monastery of the same name, on the same site, but
one belonging to another monastic order. If the property at Val-Dieu had been connected
with Queen Blanche, perhaps it somehow passed from her into the hands of Thibaut
IV—who had composed so many songs of courtly love in her honor—then on to his son.
Thibaut V. The priory’s founder, the young count of Champagne and king of Navarre, was
an important benefactor of the Caulite Order. The statute from the general chapter of 1266,
demonstrates Thibaut’s importance to the Caulites, for it was there that they opted to raise
Val-Dieu to the status of “second daughter” of the order, even though so many other
Caulite priories had been founded before it.191 Even in 1265—before Val-Dieu’s
founding—the prior of Val-des-Choux and all the other Caulite priors, assembled in general
chapter, declared that Thibaut V could “participate in the merits of the order.” More
specifically, all Caulite houses promised to say a mass for the anniversaries of Thibaut, as
well as for his wife and his parents. During Thibaut’s lifetime, they would celebrate a
conventual mass of the Holy Spirit.192

Thibaut V’s foundation gifts of 1267 included an annual money rent of 40 livres de
provinsonis and 150 arpents of woods in his forest of Chapton.193 On Easter of 1269, he
donated the remaining woods in the forest of Chapton. In exchange for this, the Caulites at
Val-Dieu were to install three choir monks (fratres capellani), who were to celebrate three
daily masses for Thibaut: one mass of the Holy Spirit, one mass of the Blessed Virgin
Mary, and one mass of the Cross. After Thibaut’s death, the three monks were to celebrate
a daily mass for the dead in Thibaut’s memory—except on those solemn days when masses
for the dead were not performed. To insure that the Caulites would not forget this
obligation, “the names of the three choir monks [were to be] written into the weekly
schedule, just as the names of others who celebrated high masses [were written]”.194 This
was in addition to the mass of the Holy Spirit already celebrated for Thibaut’s family
throughout the Caulite Order. Thibaut had already seen to it that the monks at Val-Dieu

191 Birch, 115: “Vallis Dei, primum locum post dom[njum priorem Vallis Caulium.”
192 Paris, BN, ms. lat. 5993 A, fol. 414 v. Cf. Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 1 F 433, fol. 133.
193 Chalons-en-Champagne, AD de la Marne, 36 H 2, no. 1.
194 Chalons-en-Champagne, AD de la Marne, 36 H 1, no. 4: “nomina dictorum trium fratrum capellanorum
qualibus ebdomada die domenica erunt scripta in tabula sicud sunt nomina eorum qui qualibus ebdomada
tenetur magnorum missam celebrare.”
would be properly able to celebrate the mass. In April 1268, he secured for "[his] house of Val-Dieu near Lachy" a lectionary and an antiphonary, in four volumes, from the Cistercian monastery of Prouilly (Prulati). Such books comprised the basic necessities for conducting the Divine Office, so it makes sense that Thibaut would acquire them for his new priory soon after the its foundation.

In 1269, the Caulites seem to have been concerned about the number of monks that the revenues of Val-Dieu could support. In spite of Thibaut's donation of 40 livres per year in 1267 (see above), the prior of Val-des-Choux, meeting with the other priors in general chapter, declared that the Caulites would only establish as many monks at Val-Dieu as could be supported on 25 livres of rent. Perhaps Thibaut was not meeting the promised rent of 40 livres per year, and this capitular decision was a subtle warning that the number of monks at Val-Dieu might dwindle if he did not come up with the revenue.

The Caulites enjoyed support from the house of Champagne through three generations. Blanche of Navarre had donated to Val-des-Choux and was perhaps the founder of Clairlieu. Her son Thibaut IV was a benefactor of Clairlieu, and desired to found a Caulite monastery himself. Blanche's grandson, Thibaut V, would fulfill that desire after his father's death. Yet one curious aspect of Val-Dieu's foundation is why it took so long for Thibaut V to make it happen. One possible reason could be his age. Thibaut was born in 1235. When his father died in 1253, he was only eighteen years old. His mother

---

105 Chalons-en-Champagne, AD de la Marne, 36 H 1, no. 3. Patricia Stirnemann of the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes (IRHT) informed me that an antiphonary from the Caulite Order went on the open market c. 1991. The IRHT bid unsuccessfully on this volume, which is now in a private collection. For the moment, it is impossible to say whether that antiphonary corresponds to the one discussed above.
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Marguerite of Bourbon served as regent (1253-1256) until Thibaut turned twenty-one.\textsuperscript{197} Yet from 1256 to Thibaut's appearance in 1266-67 as the priory's founder still leaves a good decade unaccounted for.

The extant documents preserve the names of two priors of Val-Dieu. The first of these was a certain Guiz, who was likely the first of Val-Dieu's priors. In 1267, at the request of Thibaut, Guiz mediated a dispute between William, bishop of Metz, and Ferris, duke of Lorraine. Guiz's role was to safeguard letters of the two parties in conflict.\textsuperscript{198} Apparently, Guiz did not remain prior for very long, for the charter of 1269—the one concerning the limitation on monks at Val-Dieu because of insufficient revenues—lists a Brother James as the prior of Val-Dieu.\textsuperscript{199}

One transaction concerning Val-Dieu deserves special mention. It is recorded in a charter dated 1288, on the Saturday after the Feast of All Saints. Before tackling this charter, we should first clarify the count of Champagne's family history. In 1270, Thibaut V, count of Champagne, king of Navarre, and founder of Val-Dieu, died shortly after returning to France from the Eighth Crusade. His brother Henry succeeded him. When Henry died in 1274, his daughter Jeanne became countess of Champagne and Queen of Navarre. Jeanne married her fifth cousin, Philip IV the Fair, heir to the French throne.\textsuperscript{200} Upon their marriage, Philip also became king of Navarre. He ruled France and Navarre from 1285 until his death in 1314. Philip presided over the first Estates General in 1302, and is perhaps best known for his conflict with Boniface VIII, and his destruction of the Templars. Returning to the transaction in question, Philip made an agreement in 1288 with

\textsuperscript{197} See the chronology in Bellenger, \textit{Thibaut de Champagne}, 135-137.

\textsuperscript{198} Paris, BN. ms. lat. 5993 A. fol. 414v-415r.

\textsuperscript{199} Paris, BN. ms. lat. 5993 A. fol. 414v: "In cuius rei ... frater lacobus, prior dicte domus [Vallis-Dei]."

\textsuperscript{200} Eleanor of Aquitaine was the great, great, great grandmother of both Jeanne and Philip.
Edmund, Earl of Lancaster (son of the English king, Henry III), whom Philip identified as his "beloved and loyal cousin" (*dilectiis consanguineus ac fidelis*).²⁰¹ Philip had at one time given to Val-Dieu the relics of certain saints, namely: ten pieces of four jaws; four pieces of ribs; two small bones; two bigger bones; another bone, one tooth; more jaws; two ribs, and two other bones. For some reason, Philip asked the monks at Val-Dieu to relinquish these relics to Edmund, in exchange for which he released them from some, unnamed debt.²⁰² The charter does not attribute these relics to any particular saints, nor does it specify the reason for the relics' transfer from Val-Dieu to Edmund. The story of transferring relics from Val-Dieu was not unique. For example, in 1308, Philip had the bones of his own grandfather, Saint Louis, dug up and divided among important nobles for their reliquary value.²⁰³ For the moment, I have no explanation for the transaction at Val-Dieu, but I hope to research it further, and to write an article on the subject.

---

²⁰¹ Eleanor of Aquitaine was Edmund's great grandmother.

²⁰² Chaions-en-Champagne. AD de la Marne. 36 H 1, no. 6: "Philippus. Dei gratia francorum et Navarre rex, notum facimus quod cum nos dilecto consanguineo ac fidelis nostro Edmundo, filio clare memorie Henrici, regis Anglie quondam, donavimus quos reliquias quorumdam sanctorum inferius expressorum in ecclesia seu monasterio prioratus Vallis dei, situant in hereditate carissim e coniugis nostre Johanne. France et Navarre regine. In deposito consistentes quas quid reliquias de mandato nostro idem consanguineus nostre iam habuit et suscepit, videlicet decern pecias de quatuor fociis ([fau]ciis] [ ] cii; item quatuor pecias de costis; item duo parva ossa; item duo majora ossa; item unum os et unum dentem. Necnon de sociis [ ] [b]ereonis duas costas et duo ossa alia eorumdem. Nos pro nobis et prefata contingue nostra, prioratem et fratres monasterii memorati, qui de mandato et assensu nostris prout superius continetur eidem consanguineo nostro reliquias huiusmodi liberavunt et etiam tradiderunt ex nunc in perpetuum et ipsum monasterium penitus absolvimus et quittamus. In cuius rei testimonium ... [Jeanne. Philip's wife, then also assents to everything in the document]."
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Remonvaux

The opinions of earlier scholars have varied concerning the foundation of Remonvaux. Roussel posited Hugh II of LaFauche as the founder of the priory circa 1210. Roserot also named Hugh as the founder, but did not indicate whether this was father or son. He dated the foundation sometime in the thirteenth century. Folz posited Hugh of LaFauche as the founder, sometime before 1248. The closest that I have been able to come in dating the foundation is some time before 1229. The Grand Cartulary records a *vidimus* dated 1502, of a *vidimus* dated 1373, of several charters concerning Remonvaux in the thirteenth century. One of these charters, dated 1229, tells us that:

Sir Hugh, of good memory, lord of LaFauche, and lady Beatris, his wife, with the consent of their children, founded the house and church of Remonvaux for the remedy of their souls, the souls of the previous lords of LaFauche, and of their successors.

The charter goes on to confirm the original foundation gifts to Remonvaux, namely the valley of Antioch and its appendages, and the common oven (*four banal*) of Liffol-le-petit, a town just south of the monastery. The monks at Remonvaux were not to sell, alienate, nor put these things in the custody of anyone other than the lords of LaFauche. The same *vidimus* of 1502 records a second charter, dated 1233, which tells us that Hugh:

---

204 No Latin name is recorded in the charters.
205 Roussel, *Le diocèse de Langres*, 2: 188. Roussel did not cite a source.
206 A. Roserot, *Dictionnaire topographique du département de la Haute-Marne* (Paris, 1903), 143. The earliest charter Roserot listed was dated 1248.
207 Folz, 100.
208 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 221, pp. 455–464. The *vidimus* of 1502 is at Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/2. The *vidimus* of 1373 is at Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 315.
209 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/2: “Primo, messires Hues, de bonne memoire, sires de Lafauche et madame Bietris sa femme, par le consentement de leur affans, fondarent la maison et eccleise de Remonvaux pour le remeide de leurs ames, et des amez de leur daventiers signeurs de Lafauche, et de leur successeurs.”
with the consent of his said wife, and of Hugh his son, and of Isabel, wife of the said Hugh, and of Alain, Gauthier, and Aubrey, all his children, and of Aubrey his uncle, gave to the said church of Remonvaux and to the religious of that same place, the yield of two fields (charrues)\textsuperscript{210} between Parfondevaux and le Jarrenoy, and their usage for the pasturage of all animals, large and small, that the said religious shall have or could have in all the lands of LaFauche, without paying any amends, except only when their animals cause some damage, they shall render the said damage to those to whom it shall have been done, without other amends. And with this, the said Sir Hugh gave to the said religious, as it is said, their usage in all the woods of the land of LaFauche, for building, rebuilding, and making fires, except the woods behind the castle, and the woods of Chevillon.\textsuperscript{211}

The charter of 1229 described Hugh as “of good memory,” suggesting that he was dead by that time—though the charter of 1233 did not describe him as such. By 1248, Hugh’s son, also named Hugh, had clearly become lord of LaFauche. In that year, he confirmed the gifts his father had made “to the brothers of Remonval, who [were] of the order of Val des Chous.” He also confirmed the donation made by his brother Alain of four resaus of grain, to be paid each year at Val de Sirecort. Hugh added to these gifts the wood at Jarrenoy, of all kinds except chestnut (le chaisne)—to be used to light the oven at Liffol—and up to ten cuttings (faucies) from meadows in his territory.\textsuperscript{212}

Remonvaux was located roughly forty kilometers south-southwest of Toul.

According to the Grand Cartulary, it was “in the parish of Liffol-le-Petit ... in Champagne

\textsuperscript{210} Old French charrues—cognate with the medieval Latin carruca, literally “a wheeled plow”—was used to signify as much land as a wheeled plow could work in one season. See Niermeyer, 148. def. 3.

\textsuperscript{211} Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 221, pp. 455-456: “Item, lidis messires Huës do consentement de saditte femme [Bietris, de Hue, son fill, de Isabel, femme doudit Hue, de Alain, de Gauthier, de Aubrey, touz ses affanz, et de Aubrey son oncle, donna ... à ladite eccleise de Remonvaux et aux frères religieux de lëans le guaignage de deux charrues seant entre Parfondevaux et le Jarrenoy, et leur usaige pour paisture toutes les bestes, grosses et menuez que lidit religieul aueroient et pourroient avoir en toute la terre de Lafauche, sens paier amende aucun, fors seulement que se leur bestes faissoient aucun damaige, il renderoient ledit damaige aceux a cui il l’aueroient fait, sens autre amande. Et avec ce donna lidis messire Huës auxdiz religieux comme dit est, leur usaige en tous les boix de la terre de Lafauche, pour édifier, pour reédifier, et pour afouage, excepté leboix darrier le chaste! et le boiz de chevillon.”

\textsuperscript{212} Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 221. p. 445.
near Lorraine, in the diocese of Toul. As Folz intimated, in the Holy Roman Empire. Recall that a statute from the Caulite customary exempted priors de Alemania from attending the general chapter at Val-des-Choux. Folz argued that this statute was "without doubt" referring to Remonvaux. In the hope of identifying a Caulite priory in German-speaking lands, Folz was referring to Toul’s location in the Empire. It is true that during the thirteenth century, the city of Toul was part of the Holy Roman Empire. But dioceses—formed in the early days of the church and modeled on the administrative structure of the Roman Empire—included the rural districts around the city, and these did not always fit neatly within ever-changing political boundaries. In fact, the southwestern boundary of Toul’s diocese dipped across the county of Champagne and bordered the diocese of Langres, neither of which were part of the Empire. Hence, contrary to Folz, a monastery in the diocese of Toul did not necessarily have to be contained within the Empire’s borders. Moreover, as I will discuss forthwith, the feudal ties of Remonvaux’s founders pointed not toward the Empire, but to Champagne, and to France. When the Caulites exempted their filial priors from attending the general chapter at Val-des-Choux it was because of the great distances they would have to travel—especially those in Scotland and deep in Alemania. If distance from the motherhouse was the measure of exemption from attendance at the general chapter, then the Caulites were surely not thinking of Remonvaux. At a mere ninety kilometers from Val-des-Choux, the priory of Remonvaux

213 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 16.

214 Birch. 119.

215 See Folz. 103, note 7.


was actually closer to the motherhouse than Val-Dieu in Champagne, Epeau in Nevers, or Uchon in Burgundy. And the priors of all of those houses were, in theory, required to attend the general chapter. There was a Caulite monastery in Alemania—not Remonvaux—which I will discuss at the end of this chapter.

Perhaps the most famous benefactor to the Caulite Order was John, lord of Joinville and seneschal of Champagne—best know for his life of Saint Louis. Hugh of LaFauche, the younger, was a vassal to Joinville. He followed Joinville and Louis IX on the Seventh Crusade (1248-1254), and died in Egypt. A *vidimus* dated 1294 of a charter dated 1257 records his death:

Sir Hugh of LaFauche, who was killed in Egypt when the king was abroad, [i.e., on crusade]. *(Sires Hugh de la Faiche, que fut morz en Egypt quant li rois de France fuist outre mer.)*

One of Hugh’s last acts, recorded in the charter above, was to have Joinville confirm the foundation of Remonvaux, as well as Hugh’s gifts to the priory. Joinville did so, and added his own gift of “half *muid* of wine, according to the measure of Joinville, to be paid each year in perpetuity from [his] cellars at Joinville.” In recognition of these alms, the monks at Remonvaux would chant a regular mass, as well as one mass of the Holy Spirit, once a year for as long as Joinville lived. After his death they were to chant a mass on his anniversary.

---

218 A *vidimus* of 1502 records the donations of several other benefactors to Remonvaux during the thirteenth century; see AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H 1002/2.

219 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 308, published in L. Delisle, “Chartes du sire de Joinville, pour le prieuré de Remonvaux,” *Bibliothèque de l’école des chartes* D III (1857): 60-62, plate after 104. According to a charter dated 4 September 1769, the bodies of the lords of Lafauche were exhumed from Remonvaux and transferred to the castle of Lafauche. This occurred after the Caulite Order had come under the control of the Cistercian abbey of Sept-Fons in 1764. See Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 315.

220 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 308: “Et daing et outroie pour le remede de m‘arme et de mes ancestors audiz freres an aumone perpetue. dimi mui de vin a la mesure de Joinville. a parre chascun an a touz jors. an vananges en mon seliers a Joinville, pour chanter les messes leans, et il fust tenu a chanter chascun an une
None of the thirteenth-century charters names a prior of Remonvaux, though a charter of 1302 names a certain Durand.\footnote{211}

Beaupré (\textit{Bellum pratum})

We know very little about the priory of Beaupré. Folz suggested that it was founded circa 1250, but he did not support this with evidence, nor did he suggest a founder.\footnote{222} We know nothing about the location of the priory, except that it was near the community of Soumaintrain, roughly thirty kilometers south-southwest of Troyes, "between Saint-Florentin and Hervy [Ervy-le-Chatel], in the diocese of Sens."\footnote{223} According to Quantin, the priory no longer exists.\footnote{224}

I was able to find just three charters concerning Beaupré in the thirteenth century, none of which records the name of a prior. The first of these, written in \textit{ancien français}, is little more than a list of acquisitions. According to the language of the charter, it contains:

"Les choses aquises de cesl de Beaupré puis [depuis] lou temps que l’amortissemanz de lor lectre [lettre] lor fuit donee." (The things acquired of those of Beaupré since the time that the amortization of their letter was given to them.)\footnote{225} The term \textit{amorîssemanz} would seem to indicate that the monks at Beaupré had paid off some debt, and that they acquired the items listed here after they had paid the debt. The list

\footnotetext[211]{See Roussel, \textit{Le diocèse de Langres}, 2: 188.}
\footnotetext[222]{Folz, 100.}
\footnotetext[223]{Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 15. Cf. Cottineau, 1: 310; and Besse, \textit{Archives de la France monastique}, 15: 67.}
\footnotetext[224]{Quantin, \textit{Dictionnaire topographique}, 10: “Autrefois il existait en ce lieu un prieuré dépendent de l’ordre du Val-des-Choux.”}
\footnotetext[225]{Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 293.}
contains both rents in kind and money, as well as pieces of land of varying sizes, most of which they acquired through purchase. Approval of this transaction came from "lou roi Thibaut," i.e., the king of Navarre. But whether this was Thibaut IV or V is anyone’s guess. Recall the difficulty Birch and Folz had in identifying which Thibaut appears in the statutes of the general chapter of 1266. With only a single document, and no other point of reference or internal evidence, the detective work can quickly come to a standstill. The charter’s date could range from 1234 (when Thibaut IV became king of Navarre) to 1270 (the last years of Thibaut V’s reign). No less than fourteen different names appear in the charter—in addition to king Thibaut’s—all of whom had dealings with the Caulites of Beaupré. Though the names are easy enough to read, I have as yet been unable to connect any of these people to the greater context.

The second charter concerning Beaupré in the thirteenth century is preserved in the Grand Cartulary, which contains a transcription of a *vidimus* dated 1496. The *vidimus* records that Henry, count of Champagne and king of Navarre (Thibaut V’s brother), confirmed the donations of Nicolas *de Caducio* and Emengarde *de Chassiuco*, both of whom donated an annual grain rent. The transcription in the Grand Cartulary dated this transaction in 1201, but since Henry ruled Navarre from 1270 to 1274, a date of 1271 is more likely.²²⁶

The third and final charter for Beaupré in the thirteenth century is preserved in an archival inventory of 1757, which lists a *vidimus* dated 1375. This *vidimus* also records Henry approving annual grain rents to the monks of Beaupré from William of Charmillis and Etienne of Putieret.²²⁷

²²⁶ Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 220, p. 305.

²²⁷ Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 302, “Inventaire de tous les titres à papiers du prieuré de Beaupré, diocèse de Sens, mis en ordre par les soins de Dom Benoît Chenevet, prieur titulaire dudit prieuré, MDCCCLVII.” Chenevet was the penultimate prior of Val-des-Choux before it was joined to Sept-Fons in 1764.
Caulite priories in the county of Nevers

The story behind the foundation of four Caulite priories in the county of Nevers provides an interesting slice of life in the late twelfth century. In 1184, Peter of Courtenay—grandson of Louis VI, and first cousin of King Philip-Auguste of France—married Agnes, countess of Nevers and Auxerre. They had one daughter, Mahaut (b. 1188). Agnes inherited the county of Tonnerre, but died in 1193, leaving five-year-old Mahaut the sole heir of the counties of Nevers, Auxerre, and Tonnerre. Peter assumed the regency of these counties, and soon began an attempt to expand his land holdings and strengthen his power base. This meant warring with his neighbors. In 1199, he made a dubious claim against the county of Gien, held by Hervé of Donzy. Peter maintained that Hervé’s ancestors had promised Gien to him, and in addition that the counts of Nevers had for generations held certain rights over the castle of Gien. Hervé contested Peter’s claim, and the two made ready for battle. Hervé gathered his loyal vassals, and prepared to defend the territory he thought rightfully his. Peter hoped to outnumber Hervé’s forces, and gathered together a conglomeration of knights errant who had been laying waste to the countryside along the banks of the Loire. On the feast of Saint Stephen (3 August), 1199, Hervé took Peter’s forces by surprise, rendering swift defeat, and Peter of Courtenay found himself the prisoner of Hervé of Donzy. The French king Philip-Auguste negotiated with Hervé for his cousin’s release, but Hervé drove a hard bargain. He would release Peter


247
only if the king granted him Peter’s county of Nevers. Hervé also wanted guarantees that after Peter’s death the king would grant him the counties of Auxerre and Tonnerre. Finally, as a security measure to keep Peter from causing any trouble in the future, Hervé wanted the hand in marriage of Mahaut. Although Peter had already promised Mahaut to Philip of Nemur, son of Baudoin, count of Flanders, these plans were abandoned to meet Hervé’s demands. In October 1199, Peter of Courtenay signed the contract allowing Hervé to marry Mahaut—then eleven years old—after which marriage he would become count of Nevers.\footnote{The marriage arrangements between Hervé and Mahaut are published in Quantin, Cartulaire général. 2: 501; cf. Lespinasse, Hervé de Donzy. 8.}

The marriage arrangements between Hervé and Mahaut came together in great haste. At the time, no one considered that Hervé and Mahaut shared a common great, great grandfather, Engelbert of Carinthie, thus violating the laws concerning consanguinity.\footnote{For the shared lineage of Hervé and Mahaut, see Lespinasse, Hervé de Donzy, 38, or Bierre, Hervé IV, 74-74. The history of consanguinity as an impediment to marriage is long and complex. In general, canon law required seven degrees of separation before a man and woman could legally marry. If they did not enjoy seven degrees of separation, they need a special dispensation, usually from the pope. Since Hervé and Mahaut only enjoyed four degrees of separation, their marriage came under scrutiny. Ironically, the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215—just after the matter of Hervé and Mahaut’s marriage had been settled—changed the canon regarding consanguinity from seven to four degrees of separation. See J. Brundage, Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe (Chicago and London, 1987), 355-57; and Lateran Council IV, canon 50, in J. Alberigo, et al. eds., Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta. 3rd edition (Bologna, 1973), 257-58.}

After a decade or so of marriage, the closeness of their family ties came to light. In 1205, Odo III asked Pope Innocent III to undertake an investigation. This was a direct threat to Hervé’s power, for if the pope should annul his marriage to Mahaut, then he would no longer be count of Nevers. In the mean time, Hervé came under fire from the pope because of (sometimes violent) conflicts with the monastery of Vézelay. It seems, among other things, that Hervé was over-stepping his rights with regard to the monastery’s wine. In 1212, Innocent III negotiated a settlement. Hervé agreed to stop harassing the monks of Vézelay. In exchange, the pope dropped the investigation of Hervé and Mahaut’s marriage,
and granted a special dispensation to ratify their union. In appreciation for this, Hervé built three monasteries in his territories. An anonymous biography—one of several collected in the *Gesta pontificum Autissiodorenium*—concerning William of Seignelay (Silligniacensis), bishop of Auxerre from 1207 to 1220, preserves the names of these three monasteries, all founded in the diocese of Auxerre during William’s tenure as bishop:

What religious places were created under [William] in the diocese of Auxerre: Indeed in those times, in his diocese were created religious places, from whose cradle they had the off-spring of Epeau, that is under the rule observed by the brothers of Val-des-Choux, although that place was not subject to it otherwise; and of Beaulieu, or Beaularriz as the name is called according to our custom, where the brothers of the Carthusian Order would serve the Lord; which two religious places Hervé, count of Nevers, the founder of them, bestowed and endowed; as well as the third place, that is the newly planted abbey of Celle, near Auxerre, devoted to the nuns of the Order of Saint Anthony of Paris.

For our purposes, one of the monasteries Hervé founded was the Caulite priory of Epeau, which in turn founded three daughter-houses in the county of Nevers: Plein Marchais, Reveillon, and Beaulieu.

---

231 For Hervé’s conflicts with Vézelay, especially as they related to the consanguinity issue, see Lespinasse. *Hervé de Donzy*. 39-45.

232 Lespinasse. *Hervé de Donzy*, 47. Crosnier. *Les congregations ... de Nevers*. 1: 438, interpreted the events surrounding Hervé’s marriage and the founding of the three monasteries differently. According to Crosnier, it was Mahaut who insisted that Hervé appeal to the pope in order to legitimize their marriage. Innocent III agreed to grant them special dispensation, but only on the condition that Hervé build three monasteries in his lands. Crosnier saw this as an extension of the Pax Dei, the church’s official policy aimed at reducing feudal warfare. Part of the Pax Dei included building more monasteries, which carried the right of asylum that could provide safe-haven for those vanquished in battle and protection from often merciless victors. Crosnier’s argument is not nearly as well documented as Lespinasse’s, and to my mind does stand up as well. Cf. Bierre, *Hervé IV*, 75, who adhered to Crosnier’s argument.


249
Epeau (Espallum)

The name Epeau is from the Latin for "shoulder," whence the French "epaulets" that military men wear on the shoulders of their uniforms. Indeed the priory of Epeau was located on the shoulder of a wooded hillock, overlooking the Talvane River, just east of Donzy, roughly forty kilometers due north of Nevers. Crosnier described the church of Notre-Dame d'Epeau as "vast and gracious," and continued thus:

This little basilica, with three naves [a nave and two side aisles], is divided into six sections up to the transept, which preserves the breadth of the principal nave. The pillars are composed of mono-cylindrical columns alternating with others flanked by small columns whose cross-section gives the appearance of the shape of a cross. The four pillars of the transept, which supported the monastic bell raised in this region, according to custom, are formed of bundles of columns.

In part of the choir, a large section precedes the sanctuary ... [it was] lit at one time by long gothic windows. The section of which we speak is flanked on each side by two chapels at right angles. All the wall reliefs and the capitals are decorated with vegetation designs, and are done with special care. At one of the angles of the northern arm of the transept, there is a small tower destined without doubt for a double use: to receive the regulating bell of the community, and to lead to the belfry or to the main lantern dominating the transept. It was at the north [end of the church] that the conventual buildings were located.

Even today, a century after Crosnier's description, the ruins at Epeau provide a dramatic setting for historical reverie. (See Figure 6.12.)

The earliest extant document for Epeau dates the foundation at 1214, though there might have been an active (non-Caulite?) community on that site as early as 1207. We

---

234 See Niermeyer, 982, definition 3.

235 Crosnier, Les congregations religieuses, 1: 453-54.

236 Lespinasse, Hervé de Donzy, 48, said 1212; Crosnier, Les congregations ... de Nevers, 1: 453, said 1209; Bierre, Hervé IV, 77, said 1207; though, again, Lespinasse's work was the best documented.
Figure 6.12: Remains of the church at Epeau.
no longer possess the original foundation charter for Epeau, but we can reconstruct Hervé’s endowment from three distinct sources. The first of these is a *vidimus* from the provost of Donzy, dated 1297, which dated the foundation of Epeau at 1214. This charter is badly faded, but we can still read that Hervé and Mahaut—for the remedy of their souls and the souls of their parents—gave the new monastery a house at one time called Latrèsche, but then called the priory of Bagneaux (Lat.: *Balneolis*, Eng.: Baths); ten *muids* of wheat to sustain the monks; a mill, and the free use of the woods at Frettoy for the purpose of rebuilding the mill; the oven at Donzy; use of the dead wood in the forest at Donzy, and in other forests where the people of Donzy enjoyed free use; and twenty *muids* of wine at the measure of Auxerre to be paid annually. From Petit—who either saw this *vidimus* a century before I did, when it was in better condition, or who may have even had access to the original charter—we learn that the wheat rent was to be paid from revenues at Entrein, some seventeen kilometers to the north of Epeau, and that the wine rent was to be paid from the tithe of Clamecy, roughly forty kilometers to the northwest. The donated mill was located in Entrein, on a small pond. Next to this pond was a fishery, which was also a part of Hervé and Mahaut’s original alms. Petit’s synopsis of the donation also tells us that the new monastery at Epeau was to receive 125 *livres nivernois* from the revenues of Donzy. Abbé Marolles provided even more detail concerning the original endowment, but also some

237 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, B 11665.

238 Crosnier, *Les congregations religieuses*, 1: 453, identified this as the name of the parish: “Latrèche, dépendant de la paroisse de Bagneaux, *Balucolis*?;” but Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, B 11665, clearly states: “domum nostram que dicebatur de Latresche et nunc dicitur prioratus de Balneolis.”

239 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, I F 433, fol. 93. Crosnier, *Les congregations religieuses*, 1: 456, tells us that the twenty *muids* of wine was known in the town of Clamecy as the “tithe of the monks of Epeau,” which wine the monks continued to receive until 1660.
alternate readings for some of these gifts. According to Marolles’ synopsis of the donation, in place of 120 (not 125) livres nivernois assigned to the revenues of Donzy, Hervé would give the monks at Epeau his oven at Donzy, as well as his cartelage, i.e., one-fourth of his customary due as lord of Donzy, in perpetuity, except the rights to the tithe which the canons of Saint Caradeuc held on this oven and cartelage. Marolles also tells us that the fishery at Entrein specialized in eels, the tithe of which was to go to the monks at Epeau. Both the vidimus of 1294 and Marolles give us the name of the first prior of Epeau: Brother Constant. In 1215, Humbert, then prior of Val-des-Choux, promised Hervé and Mahaut that the monks of Val-des-Choux would hold a yearly mass on the anniversary of their death, and in addition would recite a daily Collect for them, in appreciation of their founding the new monastery.

One might well wonder how the count and countess of Nevers came to pick the Caulite monks to populate one of their new monasteries. According to the charters, Hervé made his foundation gifts at Epeau to “Constant and those brothers of Val-des-Choux.” Yet this does little to explain how Hervé came to know of this relatively new monastic order. The answer may lie with the bishop of Auxerre. Recall the anonymous chronicle, which

---

240 G. de Soutra, ed., Inventaire des titres de Nevers, de l’abbé Marolles (Nevers, 1873), 283-284; hereafter Inventaire Marolles.

241 Inventaire Marolles, 278, also records a second charter, dated April of 1214, in which Constant, called the prior of Balneolis (Espau) received an oven and grain rent from Donzy and Entreins in exchange for 120 livres tournois which Hervé owed the monastery.

242 Marolles used the term “cartelage,” which I have taken to be a variation of “cartulis,” which Niermeyer, 875, defines as “liable to the tribute of one-fourth of the crop.” Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, B 11665, used the term “kartalogia” (?); Niermeyer, 174, translates “chartalogia” as the English “cartularies,” but this makes little sense in the context of the donation.

243 Inventaire Marolles, 516. The “Collect” is the first prayer of the mass.
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recorded the foundation of three monasteries by Hervé during William of Seignelay's tenure as bishop of Auxerre (1207-1220). William was the nephew of Bernard of Montbard, lord of Epoisses, known to us from his donation to Val-des-Choux in 1207, the same year in which William became bishop. It seems reasonable to assume that Hervé, suddenly confronted with the task of founding three new monasteries, might ask the bishop's advice concerning the kind of monastery he should establish in his diocese of Auxerre. In answering Hervé's query, the bishop might well have had his uncle's recent donation to Val-des-Choux in mind. While there is no document to prove this interaction, it is at least a reasonable hypothesis for the westward migration of the Caulite Order.

Hervé and Mahaut continued their support for the Caulite Order. In 1219, they increased their endowment to Epeau to include the use of the forest at Bellefaye, between the forests of Cuffy and Chevrauly. And in 1226, Mahaut gave the monks at Val-des-Choux 60 sols of rent, to be paid annually from revenues on her lands at Potières (*terre Pulteriarum*). Mahaut made this gift so that the Caulites would celebrate a mass on the anniversary of her own death, and that of Hervé, who had died four years earlier, in 1222. The medieval nobility did not often allow its daughters, holders of important lands and titles, to remain unmarried. They were either found suitable husbands, or were married to the church. Thus in 1226, Mahaut was re-married, this time to Guy of Forez, who became count of Nevers from 1226 until his death in 1241. It is interesting that Mahaut made this donation to Val-des-Choux in the same year that she re-married, perhaps as a way of expressing some feelings (of love? of respect?) she had for Hervé, by making a donation to the monastic order they had both supported for so long. Mahaut also outlived Guy of

---

245 *Inventaire Marolles*, 269. The inhabitants of Donzy also enjoyed the use of the forest at Bellefaye.

246 Peincédé, 28.2: 1172, no. 95.
Forez, upon whose death she entered the monastery of Fontevrault, where she remained until her own death in 1257. Mahaut dictated her last will and testament in 1257, in the presence of a certain William, then prior of Epeau, to which priory the countess of Nevers left 60 sols in her final bequest.

We know the names of three thirteenth-century priors of Epeau. The first of these was Constant, who appeared in Epeau's foundation charters in 1214. The second was William, who witnessed Mahaut's will in 1257, and also notarized, in a charter dated September of 1246, the debt of 500 livres tournois that a knight of la Rivière owed to the countess of Nevers. Hence, William's tenure as prior lasted from at least 1246 to 1257. The last prior of the thirteenth century that we know of, John, appeared in a charter dated August of 1276, which records an exchange between the monks of Epeau and the current count and countess of Nevers. Robert of Bethune, of the house of Flanders, had become count of Nevers upon marrying Yolande of Burgundy, the great grand-daughter of Hervé and Mahaut. Yolande's marriage to Robert offers another example of the acquisition of the county of Nevers through marriage of the female line. Yolande had been married to John of France, the son of King Louis IX, but after only four years as count of Nevers (1266-70), John died. A year later, Yolande found herself married to Robert of Bethune, who was count of Nevers from 1271 to 1296. For whatever reason, Robert and Yolande asked the

248 Mahaut's will is published in J. Lebeuf, Mémoire concernant l'histoire civile et ecclesiastique d'Auxerre et de son diocèse. 2nd ed. (Auxerre. 1848-55), 4: 110-111.
249 Inventaire Marolles, 63. 515.
250 Nevers, AD de la Nièvre, H 236: "... frere Jahan, prieus de l'Espaul."
251 We have already seen this with Peter of Courtenay and Agnes, and with Mahaut, and her marriages to Hervé and Guy de Forez. This was also true of Mahaut III, the granddaughter of Hervé and Mahaut, whose marriage to Odo of Burgundy made him count of Nevers from 1257 to 1266. See A. Grisot, Aspects du Nirvenais, 9.
monks at Epeau to relinquish the rights they had obtained from Hervé concerning the usage of the forest at Donzy, rights the monks had enjoyed for over half a century. In exchange for relinquishing these rights, the count and countess abandoned to the monks 50 arpents of woods adjoining the forest of Epeau.\(^{252}\)

According to the anonymous biography of William of Seignelay, bishop of Auxerre, although the monastery at Epeau recognized Val-des-Choux as its place of origin, it did not continue to submit to that monastery, and soon became a motherhouse in its own right.\(^{253}\) Epeau founded three filial priories in the course of the thirteenth century: Plain-Marchais, Reveillon, and Beaulieu.

**Plein-Marchais (Planus marchesius)**

The Grand Cartulary lists “Sainte-Barbe-de-Plein-Marchais” as a dependent house of Epeau.\(^{254}\) As such, it must have been founded after 1214, the date of Epeau’s foundation. Yet two schools of thought seem to have developed concerning the foundation date for Plein-Marchais. The first of these claims that the priory was founded in 1213, a good year before the foundation of its motherhouse!\(^{255}\) The second holds that Guy of Mello, bishop of Auxerre, founded it in 1249.\(^{256}\)

---

\(^{252}\) Nevers, AD de la Nièvre, H 236: “... a joignant de notre autre bois.”

\(^{253}\) See note 228, above; cf. Crosnier, Les congrégations religieuses, 1: 456.

\(^{254}\) Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 16. It is unclear when and why “Sainte Barbe” was added to the name. Cottineau, 2: 2293, listed the priory as “Notre Dame de Plano Marchesio.”

\(^{255}\) See Cottineau, 2: 2293; or Quantin, Dictionnaire topographique, 99. Quantin even cited the last will and testament of the founder John of Toucy, which clearly dated the foundation at 1249, yet he stuck with 1213.

\(^{256}\) See Besse, Archives de la France monastique, 15: 99; Crosnier, Les congrégations religieuses, 1: 456; or Folz, 100, who called it the priory of Lavau, probably because of its location in that parish.
Bishop Guy was the son of William of Mello, and the nephew of Dreux of Mello, two knights who followed Louis IX on the Seventh Crusade (1245-1250). Guy had barely assumed his responsibilities as bishop of Auxerre, when father, uncle, and several other crusaders asked him to be the executor of their wills, in case they should not return. One of these other knights was John of Toucy (Johannes de Tociaco), the lord of Saint-Fargeau, whose last will and testament is the sole document for the priory of Plein-Marchais that I was able to find. The will, written in Latin, calls the new foundation Plain Marchais.

According to this will, John stipulated that his grange at Boraz be used to found a monastery of the Caulite Order in the parish of Lavau, (roughly thirty kilometers northeast of Donzy). The will also tells us that the priory was to be subject to the bishop of Auxerre and his successors, as was the priory of Epeau and other religious houses in that diocese. The bishop was to have the right to visit the monastery and make corrections if the prior and brothers were not living in accord with Caulite practice. Any increase in the number of brothers in the new house was also to be subject to the bishop’s consent. Though John’s will is not specific about what that number was, we assume that it was still limited to twenty, as per Innocent III’s bull of 1205.

It seems obvious that the bishop of Auxerre, faced with the task of founding a new Caulite priory in his diocese, turned to the priory of Epeau as the nearest exemplar of that order. John’s will does not tell us, however, how Plein-Marchais came to be subordinate to Epeau, as indicated by the Grand Cartulary, or why he chose to found a Caulite priory as

---

[257] Lebeuf, Mémoire, 1: 437.

[258] Niermeyer, 651, defines “marca,” “marcha,” or “marchia” as a boundary or the frontier, whence the English word “march.” Perhaps, then, Plein marchais took its name from a location on an “flat borderland.”

opposed to a monastery of some other order. One possible response to the latter question lies in John’s fellow crusaders. Dreux of Mello, the bishop’s uncle, was the son-in-law of Andrew of Montbard, the founder of the Caulite priory of Vausse, to which priory Dreux himself had also made donations. This may be a conjectural stretch, yet it does not seem unreasonable to envision Dreux of Mello, familiar with the piety of the Caulite monks, counseling John of Toucy to found a priory of that order. We obviously do not know what happened, but concerning John’s reasons for choosing the Caulites for his new foundation, this seems as satisfying a theory as any other.

Saint-Nicholas-de-Reveillon

Following its entry on Plein Marchais, the Grand Cartulary also lists “Saint-Nicholas-de-Reveillon ou Revillon” as a dependent house of Epeau.²⁶⁰ We know very little about the early years of this monastery. I have been unable to find a single charter in which its name appears. I am therefore uncertain how (or whether) the name would have been rendered in Latin or Old French. According to Baudiau, the priory was called Saint-Nicholas-de-Reveillon because of its proximity to an old seigniory of that name.²⁶¹

Most historians have dated its foundation at least by 1250, though one posited 1302.²⁶² None provided any reasoning or evidence for these dates. Baudiau maintained that Hervé of Donzy had given a site to the Caulite monks of Epeau, on the condition that they found a monastery of their order.²⁶³ If Epeau was founded in 1214, and Hervé died in

²⁶⁰ Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 16.

²⁶¹ J. Baudiau, Histoire d’Entrain (Nevers, 1879), 184.

²⁶² For a date circa 1250, see Baudiau, Histoire d’Entrain, 184; Besse, Archives de la France monastique, 15: 99; Cottineau, 2: 2454 (Cottineau called them “Cistercians of the house of Epeau”); and Folz, 100. For the date of 1302, see Crosnier, Les congregations religieuses, 1: 456.

²⁶³ Baudiau, Histoire d’Entrain, 184.
1222, then—if Baudiau is right—Hervé must have donated the site between the years of 1214 and 1222. Yet this still does not tell us with certainty whether the Caulites developed this property right away, or waited for some time after Hervé's death to construct their new priory. The tombstone of a certain curate named Estienes Li Gras (Stephen the Fat), discovered in 1857, bears the date 1140. This is evidence that Reveillon might have been the site of a parish church, but the gravestone is clearly too early for a Caulite connection.²⁶⁴

Reveillon was located in the diocese of Auxerre, near the community of Entrain, roughly fifteen kilometers northeast of Donzy. According to Baudiau, its location, in the middle of a dense forest, was perfect for meditation and prayer. Huguenots pillaged the monastery in 1568, after which the monks of Reveillon fled to Epeau, never to return.²⁶⁵ This could account for my inability to locate any charters from the thirteenth century concerning Reveillon. Because of the lack of documentary evidence, we do not know the names of a single prior or benefactor of this priory.

Beaulieu (Bellus locus)

We know even less concerning the Caulite priory of Beaulieu. Besse reported only that Beaulieu was a filial priory of Epeau.²⁶⁶ Cottineau called it a "priory of the Cistercians of Epeau" and located it in the parish of Clamecy, near Rix.²⁶⁷ Crosnier stated that it was a

²⁶⁴ See Baudiau, Histoire d'Entrain, 185, with a line rendering of the tombstone on the facing page. The entire inscription reads "Estienes Li Gras, curez de hay, qui trespassa le samedi apres l'octave de la purification de Nostre Dame, l'an de grace mil cens et XL [1140], pri por li. amen." The fact that the inscription is in ancienne français casts some doubt on the date of 1140, which Baudiau either misread, or which, for whatever reason, could have been a forgery.

²⁶⁵ Baudiau, Histoire d'Entrain, 184.

²⁶⁶ Besse, Archives de la France monastique, 15: 98.

²⁶⁷ Cottineau, 1: 294.
filial house of Epeau, and that it had been founded in the thirteenth century. I have not been able to locate any charters from the priory of Beaulieu, nor have I discovered even a single mention of Beaulieu in the charters of other Caulite priories (not even, for example, in the Grand Cartulary).

Caulite priories in the royal lands of Normandy

The Grand Cartulary lists two monasteries in Normandy: Royal Pré, and another "small priory, also in Normandy." 

Royal Pré (Regale pratun)

Louis IX, king of France (1226-1270), founded the priory of Royal Pré in April of 1255. The foundation charter called the new monastery "prioratus Sancti Michaeli de Bastebort" because of its location on a small mountain of that name. In 1255, Saint Louis would have just returned from the Seventh Crusade. It is possible that he heard of the Caulite Order from Hugh of LaFauche, whom we have already encountered as the son of the founder of the Caulite priory of Remonvaux. As mentioned above, Hugh was killed in Egypt while Louis was on crusade. One of his final acts was to have Joinville ratify Remonvaux’s foundation and donations. The king could surely have heard of the Caulite

---

268 Crosnier, Les congregations religieuses, 1: 456. Crosnier cited p. 98 of Notice des monastères du diocèse d'Auxerre, for reference to Beaulieu, but I have as yet been unable to track down this work.

269 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 17.

270 The foundation charter for Royal Pré (Saint-Michel) is published in L. Delisle, ed., Cartulaire normand de Philippe-Auguste, Louis VIII, Saint Louis, et Philippe le Hardi (Caen, 1852), 93-94, no. 529; and in Martène Vet. script. 6: 1334.

271 The Muslims retook Jerusalem in August 1244. The Seventh Crusade lasted from 1245-1250. Saint Louis took the cross in June 1248. He was captured in May 1250, but immediately ransomed and freed. From 1250 to 1254, he stayed in Holy Land fortifying cities. See the chronology in LeGoff, Saint Louis, 924.
Order through several other channels. Yet based on the timing of the Royal Pré foundation, upon the king’s return to France, it seems reasonable conjecture that Hugh’s final act to the Caulites—perhaps related to Louis by Joinville—may have influenced the pious king to found a Caulite priory of his own. The name Royal Pré (“Royal Meadow”) first appeared in a charter dated June 1257. This was perhaps intended as a contrast to Louis’s most famous foundation and preferred retreat, the Cistercian monastery of Royaumont (“Royal Mountain”).

According to the foundation charter, Royal Pré was located on a site that was “useless, and almost uninhabitable” (inutilis et quasi inhabitabilis), and subject to “frequent storms and winds” (crebro insurgentium tempestatum et ventorum). It was in the diocese of Lisieux, in the parish of Angoville, near Cricqueville, roughly twenty kilometers northwest of Bayeux. In 1914, there were still ruins on the site, though I was unable to locate these in 1999.

In the foundation charter for Royal Pré, Saint Louis donated all the lands lengthwise between the mountain of Bastebourg and waters known as Ancre, and widthwise between the two houses, respectively, of a certain Nicolas Herent and of a certain Anselm. These lands included arable fields and meadows, forests and gardens, amounting to some forty acras. In January 1256, the Caulites at Royal Pré promised to chant mass once a day in

272 Delisle, Cartulaire normand, 109: “Beate Maria Virginis de Regali Prato.”
273 For the foundation of Royaumont, see LeGoff, Saint Louis, 121-123.
274 Delisle. Cartulaire normand, 94.
275 Cf. C. Hippeau, Dictionnaire topographique du Département du Calvados (Paris 1883), 244-45.
277 Delisle. Cartulaire normand, 94.
perpetuity for the soul of the king and his ancestors. A charter dated June 1257 shows Louis making donations of several meadows to “the brothers of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Royal Pré.” I was able to find only one other charter that records a donation to the Caulites at Saint-Michel, according to which a certain Henry le Cot donated one sextier of oats in June 1259. No prior is ever named for Royal Pré in the extant charters.

I have not been able to locate any charters or other reference to the unnamed, “small priory in Normandy.” According to the Grand Cartulary, it was under the authority (collation) of the prior of Royal Pré. The consensus among historians is that Royal Pré acted as a hospice for priors and their retainers on the way from Scotland to Val-des-Choux and back for the annual general chapter. Which brings us to the next section of this chapter.

---

278 See Delisle, *Cartulaire normand*, 97-98, no. 538. The date given in the charter is January 1255, but since the mass is obviously offered in response to the foundation, it must, by modern reckoning, be 1256. In thirteenth-century France, the “new year” began with Easter; hence January 1255 would come after April 1255. See R. Ware, “Medieval Chronology, Theory and Practice,” in J. Powell, ed., *Medieval Studies, an Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Syracuse, New York, 1992), 260.


280 Yzeure. AD de l’Allier, H 215, p. 17.

281 See Birch, xix; Mignard, 461; Anson, *A Monastery in Moray* (London, 1959), 12. Sometime after 1267 (the statute’s date is uncertain, see Birch, 119), the Caulites excused their priors in Scotland from attending the annual chapter. This was no doubt on account of the great distance between Scotland and the motherhouse. The statute did not offer a specific alternative for when the Caulite priors of Scotland should attend the general chapter at Val-des-Choux, for example, every other year or every third year. Chapter 8 deals with the Caulite general chapter in greater detail, but one of its main functions was to monitor the observance of the filial monasteries. Hence it seems unlikely that the Scottish priors would be allowed to go for years without checking in. Nonetheless, the first documents to address this issue seem to be to charters dated, respectively, 7 May 1506 and 18 December 1506. In the first of these, the prior of Val-des-Choux appoints the prior of Beauly to visit the priory of Ardchattan. In the second document, the prior of Val-des-Choux informs the prior of Beauly that his monastery is not exempt from episcopal visitation. This shows that the prior of Val-des-Choux was looking for a way to monitor his far-away filial houses on a local basis. The documents of 1506 are published in S. MacPhail, *History of the Religious House of Pluscardyn* (Edinburgh, 1881), 195–197.
Caulite priories in Scotland

The Grand Cartulary mentions four Caulite priories in Scotland, though not by name. The three for which we have any information, Pluscarden, Ardchattan, and Beauly, were all founded in the same year, 1230.

Historians generally agree that it was William Malvoisin, Bishop of Saint Andrews, who brought the Caulites to Scotland. Circa 1180, Malvoisin became clericus regi, secretary to king William the Lion of Scotland—an office that afforded him extraordinary influence over the king. In 1199, he became Chancellor of Scotland. In 1200 he was consecrated bishop of Glasgow, then in 1201 transferred to the bishopric of Saint Andrews. When William the Lion died in 1214, Malvoisin enthroned the new king, Alexander II of Scotland, who appointed Malvoisin Ambassador to England in 1215. After a brief visit to King John of England—who was trying to recover from his embarrassment at Runymede—Malvoisin went to Rome to attend the Fourth Lateran Council. It was likely on this journey that he was introduced to the Caulite Order.

According to MacPhail, Malvoisin had witnessed the decay of monastic practice in Scotland, and hoped to reinvigorate religious life there. On his way across France to Fourth Lateran, Malvoisin learned of two new religious orders: the Dominicans and the Caulites. Anson suggested that the Scottish bishop had visited Val-des-Choux, which lay more or

---


283 MacPhail, Plascardyn, 62. This seems plausible for the Caulites, though less likely for the Dominicans. If Malvoisin learned of the Dominicans at Fourth Lateran, in 1215, he would have encountered an order whose petition for status as a new religious order Innocent III had rejected. It was not until 1216, under Honorius III, that the Dominicans received approval to practice under the Rule of Augustine. See Lawrence, 252-253.
less on the road to Rome. MacPhail discussed another "tradition," according to which Alexander II was in France circa 1217, and met Dominic, founder of the Dominicans, as well as members of the Caulite Order. MacPhail felt this theory was untenable, since it was difficult to prove that Alexander II had ever gone to France. However king and bishop encountered them, they saw these orders as the answer to Scotland's religious woes. The Dominicans, dauntless preachers, could minister to the flocks in Scottish towns, while the Caulites could serve as an example of the most austere piety. In 1230, four Dominican houses were established in the Scottish towns of Edinburgh, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Ayr, and Montrose. In that same year, according to the Melrose Chronicle, the Caulites came to Scotland. They established three priories, Pluscarden in the county of Elgin, Ardchattan in Argyle, and Beauly in Ross, all in Scotland's far northern reaches.

Pluscarden

According to the Liber Pluscardensis, compiled circa 1461, "This King Alexander [II of Scotland] founded the priory of Pluscarden and of Beauly." The foundation came

284 Anson, A Monastery in Moray. 5.

285 MacPhail, Pluscadryn, 62, note 3.


287 See F.J.H. Skene, ed., Liber Plascardensis, (Edinburgh, 1877), 1: 72: "Rex iste Alexander fundavit prioratum de Pluscardy et de Beaulie." The Liber Pluscardensis is a chronicle of the kings of Scotland down to James I. It was composed circa 1461—the chronicler claims to have known Joan of Arc, who died in 1430. The chronicle survives in six manuscript copies, none of which bears the title Liber Plascardensis. According to Skene, xviii, it was George Buchanan, a sixteenth-century, Scottish historian who referred "on two occasions so unmistakably to this book as the Liber Plascardensis, that this has been unhesitatingly adopted as the title;" cf. G. Buchanan, Rerum Scoticarum Historia (Frankfurt, 1584), book X, 329, 348-349. Skene, xix-xxiii, also cites a detailed argument of his fellow scholar (and relative?) W.F. Skene, who claimed that "the Liber Plascardensis ... is the correct name of this work, and that it was
in 1230, soon after the region of Morayland had come under the king's submission. Alexander's main gift consisted of the forests of "Ploscardin" and Huchtertyr. The king retained for himself the stags, goats, and wild boar of these forests. He forbade the monks to hunt, though he did allow them to lay traps for wolves. The monks at Pluscarden were free to exploit anything else they could find in the forests, but they were never to use their properties or privileges against the king, either in war or peace. If the throne ever found it necessary to take back these lands, this was only to be done in exchange for another suitable location.  

The priory of Pluscarden was located in Morayshire, roughly forty kilometers northeast of Inverness. By 1230, the site was already well established as a place of worship. Long before the Caulites arrived, the valley was known as Vale of Saint Andrew. Hence Pluscarden found itself not only under the protection of the Virgin and John the Baptist, as did all Caulite houses, but also under the protection of Saint Andrew. Pluscarden was the victim of several attacks during the fourteenth century, most notably in 1303 by the armies of King Edward I of England, and again by the Wolf of Badenach, who set fire to the priory in 1390. All of this is to say that Pluscarden has undergone numerous reconstructions, the most recent of which occurred in the mid-twentieth century, when Benedictine monks re-inhabited the priory. Pluscarden's best-preserved feature from the thirteenth century is the north transept. Its great rose window was re-fitted with stained glass in the 1960s, and

probably compiled in the Priory of Pluscarden, in the year 1461." Ironically, the passage above is the only mention of Pluscarden or Beauly in the entire chronicle.

288 MacPhail, Ploscardin, 69. Cf. J. Spottiswoode, An Account of all the Religious Houses that were in Scotland at the time of the Reformation; included in R. Keith, An Historical Catalogue of the Scottish Bishops (Edinburgh, 1824), 427.

289 MacPhail, Pluscardyn, 81, 83.
though the style of this glass reflects modern sensibilities, the impression of a "veritable wall of light" is surely representative of thirteenth-century tastes. (See Figure 6.13.)

The earliest charter concerning Pluscarden dates from 1233. In it, Bishop Andrew took the monastery and all its holdings under his protection. The charter records several previous donations, including mills at Elgin, Dunkinedur, Molen, Dulpotin, the castle of Forais, and tithes from the mill at Pluscarden. The monks also received fishing rights at Polfode, as well as a church at Durres, the vicar of which they would have to provide.291

---


291 MacPhail, Plascardyn. 69-70.

Figure 6.13: Remains of the church at Pluscarden.
According to Barret, no Scottish king after Alexander II was as generous to Pluscarden. Robert the Bruce (r. 1306-1329) granted fishing rights on the River Spey, though this takes us beyond the scope of this dissertation.\textsuperscript{292} In July 1263, Pope Urban IV confirmed Pluscarden’s foundation, and acknowledged Pluscarden’s right to elect its own prior, a privilege fundamental to Caulite practice.\textsuperscript{293} MacPhail listed six priors at Pluscarden for the thirteenth century. In 1239, a prior named Simon witnessed a charter of Bishop Andrew. John Frer and John Suryass both appear as priors in undated charters, which, based on internal evidence, MacPhail dated before 1264. Andrew was Pluscarden’s prior until 1264, when he became prior of the Cistercian abbey of Newbattle. In 1274, Sir William appeared as prior in a charter resolving a land dispute between the prior of Beauly and Henry of Nottingham. That charter also named Robert of Bosyll, a fellow monk at Pluscarden. Simon appeared in a charter dated 1286, and was likely in attendance at the first Scottish Parliament in 1290.\textsuperscript{294}

\textbf{Beauly (\textit{Bellus locus})}

Conflicting evidence from chronicles and charters makes the foundation of Beauly priory difficult to unravel.\textsuperscript{295} A chronicle contained in the Wardlaw manuscript, compiled in the seventeenth century, claims that the Caulites “came out of France ... anno 1222,” and

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{292} Barret, “The ‘Kail Glen’ Monks of Scotland.” 223.

\textsuperscript{293} MacPhail, \textit{Pluscardyn}, 72-73.

\textsuperscript{294} MacPhail, \textit{Pluscardyn}, 91-93.

\textsuperscript{295} For references to Beauly’s foundation, I am indebted to D. Easson and I. Cowan, \textit{Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland}, 2nd ed., (London and New York, 1976), 70-71. The chronicles of Melrose and the Frasers discussed in this paragraph are all cited from Easson’s work.
\end{flushright}
that on 9 July 1223, John Byset of Lovat founded the priory of Beauly. According to this chronicle, the Caulites sent six monks and one prior to inhabit their new Scottish monastery. Prior and monks:

landed at Lovat and the country provided for them during the erection of the monastery; John Bisset in his time taking care of the edifice, which afterwards was industriously carried on in Insula de Archinbady.

But the date of 1222 contradicts the Melrose Chronicle, cited above, which first placed the Caulites in Scotland in 1230. Both Chisholm-Batten and Barret posited 1230 as Beauly's foundation date, with John Byset as the founder, but some historians have diverged from this view. The earliest reference to Beauly is a bull of Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241). The date on this bull is difficult to read. Chisholm-Batten dated it in 1231, but Spottiswoode's description of a bull, which is possibly the same one, makes 1230 a more likely date. In this bull, Gregory IX places the priory and all its holdings under his protection, as well as the protection of Saint Peter. These holdings included those that John Byset had given them in Sitheney and Karcurri, as well as fishing rights in the River Forne. The priory of Beauly was located in the parish of Kilmorach, roughly sixteen kilometers

---

296 J. Fraser, ed., Chronicles of the Frasers: the Wardlaw manuscript entitled 'Polichronicon seu polychronica temporum, or, The true genealogy of the Frasers'. 916-1674 (Edinburgh, 1905), 61, 63. The Wardlaw manuscript is not the most reliable source. See Easson's note in Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland, 70.

297 Chronicles of the Frasers. 62. note 1. explains that insula is a translation of the Gaelic innis, which in addition to "island" also means "green pastureland" or "river meadow."

298 Chisholm-Batten, "Beauly," 6; Barret, "The 'Kail Glen' Monks of Scotland," 220. Cf. Folz, 99, who attributed the foundation to Alexander II in 1230; and Cottineau. 1: 300, who claimed that it was "founded around 1263." Some lists of Scottish monasteries attribute the foundation to John Byset; see Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, ms. 32.2.12; while others attribute the foundation to Alexander II; see Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Library. ms. Db 6.19; and Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, ms. 22.1.14.

west of Inverness. The name Beauly, from the French *beau lieu*, means “beautiful place.” Recall that one of the Caulite priories in the county of Nevers also bears this name, as do several other monasteries in France and England. The name befits the location: on the north bank of the winding Beauly River, surrounded by mountains, moors, and forests. The size of the church at Beauly—150 by 24 feet—suggests that its community never grew much larger than the six monks and one prior who originally settled there. The ruins at

---

300 Chisholm-Batten, “Beauly,” 14-15, mentioned Beaulieu in Langres, France, and king John’s foundation in the New Forest, which he called King’s Beaulieu (*Bellus Locus Regis*).
Beauly have several features dating from the thirteenth century: the wall of the south chancel; the eastern nave, which contains three triangular windows, similar to those found at Pluscarden; the south transept; and part of the north transept. The church was damaged over the centuries, once by lightning, but ultimately by the English Civil War.

In 1231, William Byset, the founder’s brother, donated to the Caulites at Beauly the church of Abertarff (Aberterth), with all its tithes and other ecclesiastical rights. In 1242, Andrew, Bishop of Moray, confirmed William Byset’s gift of the church at Abertarff, which lay in the diocese of Moray. The language of the charter seems to indicate that the monks at Beauly had special privileges over this church. They were to hold it “for their own use” (ad proprios usus), i.e., they appropriated it in the legal sense. The use of the church meant “for their support” (ad sustentationem eorum), i.e., as a benefice, without any obligation for the care of souls. This sustenance included grain tithes, as well as salmon tithes, the latter most likely fished from Loch Ness. The rights to lands from another church caused discord between the Caulites at Beauly and the rector of that church. In 1235, Gillichrist a Rosse gave the monks lands at Tarradale. In 1274, Henry of Nottingham, rector of the church at Tarradale, claimed rights to those lands by virtue of his office. The bishop elect of Caithness settled the dispute by allowing the monks the tithes from the church of Tarradale, in exchange for which they would outfit Henry with two horses and two grooms for six months a year, over the course of eight years. For his part,

---


302 Barret, “The ‘Kail Glen’ Monks of Scotland,” 222-223. Barret also noted that when Cromwell built his fort at Inverness, 1652-57, he quarried much of the stone from the ruins at Beauly.

303 Chisholm-Batten, “Beauly,” 32, published this charter.

304 Chisholm-Batten, “Beauly,” 36-37, published this charter.
Henry of Nottingham was to protect and faithfully serve Beauly for the duration of the contract. This was the charter witnessed by the prior of Pluscarden. I have been unable to identify any of the priors of Beauly.

Ardchattan

The history of Ardchattan priory is obscure. Duncan MacDougal founded the monastery circa 1230. Barret suggested that Ardchattan's foundation "was made as a peace offering to Alexander II and his chief adviser, Bishop Malvoisin." Following the attempted rebellion by the lords of Argyll in 1221, the territory of Argyle came under the crown in 1222. As part of this new arrangement, Alexander II required Duncan MacDougal, lord of Lorn, to hold his territories from the crown as well. The bishopric of Argyll had already been established, circa 1200. According to Barret, Ardchattan's location in western Scotland, with its links to Beauly and Pluscarden in the north, would strengthen the influence of church and crown. This seems a viable theory, though Barret offers no evidence to support it.

Ardchattan was located on the north shore of Loch Etive, roughly one hundred kilometers northwest of Glasgow. Barret measured the choir at 66 feet in length, but otherwise claimed that very little of the church remained. What little remains of the

\[^{304}\text{Chisholm-Batten, "Beauly," 53-54, published this charter.}\]


\[^{306}\text{Barret, "The 'Kail Glen' Monks of Scotland," 218.}\]

\[^{307}\text{Barret, "The 'Kail Glen' Monks of Scotland," 218.}\]
conventual buildings has been incorporated into a modern dwelling. The old refectory comprises the center of this dwelling, which still exhibits some rib vaulting.\textsuperscript{309}

Nothing is known of the foundation gifts or other donations to Ardchattan. Our picture of its priors is equally sketchy. According to Easson, the prior of Ardchattan swore fealty to King Edward I in 1296.\textsuperscript{310}

\textit{Caulite priories in the Holy Roman Empire}

In a statute requiring priors from filial monasteries to visit Val-des-Choux once a year for the general chapter, the Caulite customary exempted priors \textit{de Alemania}.\textsuperscript{311} Historians have long recognized this as a sign that the Caulites did have priories in German-speaking lands, but few have ventured to guess where these might have been. Folz suggested that the priory of Remonvaux was in \textit{Alemania}, because of its location in the diocese of Toul.\textsuperscript{312} As I have shown above, although the city of Toul was in the Empire during the thirteenth century, its diocesan borders extended into French territory—where Remonvaux was located. The Grand Cartulary makes no mention of priories in German-speaking territories. Neither do any charters exist which might bear this out. Yet Pfüll has made a good argument for at least one Caulite priory in the Holy Roman Empire.


\textsuperscript{311} Birch, 119.

\textsuperscript{312} See Folz, 103, note 7.
Sankt-Elizabeth’s-Thal (*Vallis Sanctae Helizabeth*)

Pfülf’s argument rests on two histories published in the eighteenth century. The first of these is a brief history of the Carthusians edited by Martène and Durand. The history contains several *exempla*, of which the following concerns the Caulites:

Those poor [monks], allotting in that place very fertile lands for fruits and herbs, whose name is still called cabbage [*caulium*], whence those brothers are called the Caulites ... who living almost as Carthusians, held themselves for many years to a high standard. How they live now is obvious in the cloister of Horn, near Rurelmont ... that was constructed here in honor of Saint Elizabeth.\(^{313}\)

The second is a history of the dukes of Gelderland (the Netherlands), which relates the story of a count Theodoric of Horn, who in 1211 undertook a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostella, in northwest Spain, arguably the most popular medieval pilgrimage site after Jerusalem and Rome. During his journey to Compostella, Theodoric fell ill, and found care at a Caulite monastery. He was so moved by the hospitality of the monks that he promised, out of gratitude, to found a Caulite monastery in his county.\(^{314}\) According to Pfülf, the monastery Theodoric founded was Sankt-Elizabeth’s-Thal, located near the village of

\(^{313}\) Martène, *Et script.* col. 213: “Ille pauperes ... assignantes eis locum pro fructibus et herbis valde fertilem, cui et ex hoc adhuc Caulium vocabulum est; unde et ipsi fratres Caulitae sunt vocati ... qui viventes quasi sint Carthusienses, per multos annos multum bene habuerunt se. Quamter autem nunc habeant appareat clare in claustro de Horn ex opposto Rurelmont ... quod constructum est ibi in honorem sanctae Elizabeth.”

\(^{314}\) J. Knippenbergh, *Historia ecclesiastica ducatus Geldriæ* (Brussels, 1719), 77: “Anno 1211 Theodoricus filius Domini de Horn zelo visitandi Reliquias sacras Beati Jacobi Apostoli in Galliciam perrexit. Ast in reditu infirmitate detentus in Monasterium quoddam Caulitarum divertit, qui a primario Ordinis Conventu in Burgundia sito, ac Caulium Valls dicto, Caulitarum nomen fortis sunt: in dicto igitur Monasterio perbenigne habitus, reconvaluit: illo autem in vicem obsequiorum & charitatis sibi impensae plura offerebat. Prior & Religiosi nil se admissuros dicebant, attamen si quid gratitudinis omnino praestare constituisset, Ordinis sui Coenobium in Domino suo excitaret, quem votis protinus annectit Theodoricus: missi igitur Religiosi, qui facto per ditionem Hornanam scrutinio domun viri cuicusdam militaris Vreholt, dictam Coenobio excitando percommodam indicarunt: coempta igitur per Theodoricum domus, ab dictis monachis anno 1212 habitari coepit, eamque demum, quem dixi Theodoricus anno 1240 in Monasterium convertit, ac Divae Virginis Mariae, necnon Sanctae Elisabethae nuncupavit, quod privilegiis, ac reditibus sucht Valei Sanctae Elisabethae nominari deinceps voluit: Elisabethae quippe Hungarorum Regis filliae, quae aliquot abhinc annis jam sancte obierat, proindeque inter Sanctos relatae, nomen ubivis celebre hababatur.”
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Runheim, not far from Roermond (Rurelmont) in modern-day Belgium.\textsuperscript{315} The story of Theodoric’s pilgrimage and response to Caulite hospitality could be part of a foundation legend, similar to the trope we saw with Gauthier of Sully’s foundation of Val-Saint-Benoît. Yet beyond the reasons for the foundation, whether real or constructed, the two sources introduced by Pfül allow us to identify the site of another Caulite priory. The first Caulites occupied the site of the new priory in 1212, but the foundation was not completed until 1240. The priory was named for Elizabeth of Hungary, who had been canonized in 1235.\textsuperscript{316}

In 1245, Innocent IV presided over the Council of Lyon. It was at this council that the pope excommunicated Emperor Frederick II, as part of their long struggle, discussed above. He also placed the Holy Roman Empire under interdict, which would effect the monks throughout the Empire.\textsuperscript{317} Yet in January 1245, the pope issued a bull granting exemptions from the ban on the celebration of the divine office during the interdict. The closing line of the bull mentions “the prior and convent of the monastery of Saint-Helisabeth, of the Order of Val-des-Choux, in the diocese of Liège (Leodiensis).”\textsuperscript{318} Recall that in 1243 the monks of Vauclair had placed their holdings under the pope in a gesture of support for the pope’s cause. Innocent IV’s bull of 1245 could have been a

\textsuperscript{315} O. Pfül, “Der Orden von Val des Choux in Deutschland,” in Stimmen aus Maria-Laach 59 (1900): 476.

\textsuperscript{316} Pfül, “Der Orden von Val des Choux in Deutschland,” 476-477.

\textsuperscript{317} The basic idea of the interdict was to force offenders against the church to repent by shutting down all religious functions in the area under interdict, in the case above, this meant the entire Holy Roman Empire. See E. Kriehbiel, The Interdict: Its History and Operation (Washington, D.C., 1909); and E. Conran, The Interdict (Washington, D.C., 1930).

\textsuperscript{318} The incipit and explicit of this bull are published in E. Berger, ed., Les registres d’Innocent IV (Paris, 1884), 1: 150, no. 913: “Lyon, 21 janvier 1245. Licentia celebrandi officia divina tempore generalis interdicti, clausis tamen januis, etc.” (Reg. an. II, no. 163, fol. 136v), “… priori et conventui monasterii Sancte Helisabeth, ordinis Vallis cauliun, Leodiensis diocesis. — Dat. Lugduni, XII kalendas februari, anno secundo.”
reciprocal gesture on his part toward the Caulites at Sankt-Elizabeth’s-Thal, who found
themselves, by accident of geography, in a territory under interdict. By the mid-fifteenth
century, monastic rigor at Sankt-Elizabeth’s-Thal was waning, and the priory was joined to
house of Augustinian canons in nearby Windesheim.\textsuperscript{319}

\textit{Caulite priories on the Iberian Peninsula}

Some historians have posited the existence of Caulite priories in Spain and
Portugal.\textsuperscript{320} I have been unable to find any evidence to support this claim. The Grand
Cartulary’s list of Caulite priories made no mention of monasteries on the Iberian
Peninsula. Nor was I able to find mention of Caulite priories in \textit{España Sagrada}, Florez’s
extensive catalog of Spanish monasteries.\textsuperscript{321} Though I have no evidence, I would
nonetheless like to posit a theory for Caulite priories in Spanish-speaking lands. Recall that
Thibaut II, count of Champagne, founder and benefactor of Caulite priories in his county,
was also king of Navarre, a territory in Spain near the French border. It does not seem
unreasonable to suggest that Thibaut would have wanted Caulite priories in his Spanish­
speaking territories, since they had served him so well in Champagne. It is my hope that
future research may bear this out.

\textsuperscript{319} Pfülf, “Der Orden von Val des Choux in Deutschland,” 476–477.

\textsuperscript{320} Courtépée, \textit{Description générale et particulière}, 4: 235: “the order of Val des Choux still exists [in
the 1770s] in Spain and Portugal.” Cf. J. Marilier and J. Richard, “La Bourgogne du Haut Moyen Age”, in
J. Richard, ed., \textit{Histoire de la Bourgogne}. 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Toulouse 1988), 129. My guess is that Marilier and
Richard simply followed Courtépée’s assertion.

Conclusion

Interestingly enough, the priory of Sankt-Elizabeth’s-Thal, one of the furthest away from the motherhouse, was actually one of the first to be founded.\textsuperscript{322} Val-Duc, the filial house nearest to Val-des-Choux, was one of the last to be founded.\textsuperscript{323} What this tells us is that the Caulite Order did not spread gradually, like water poured slowly on a smooth tabletop, but rather more like raindrops, lightly dotting the landscape of Burgundy and Scotland—with a droplet in \textit{Alemania}—as benefactors endowed new foundations. While Val-des-Choux sent monks to some of these new foundations, its filial priories also participated in the order’s colonizing efforts. For example, Val-Croissant colonized two daughter houses, while Epeau had three.

The Caulite Order expanded in part because each community was limited in size. There is a certain internal logic to this argument. If the Caulites wanted monasteries of no more than twenty members, then they would have to expand when their numbers reached more than twenty. They might just as easily have turned away new recruits and remained a single monastery in Burgundy, but we know that this was not the case. They expanded. The Caulites were concerned not just with maximum numbers in their community, but also with minimum numbers. Recall that in 1269 they negotiated with Thibaut V over the number of monks who could settle at Val-Dieu, an issue directly related to the size of Thibaut’s donation. If Thibaut did not contribute enough, then the number of Caulite monks praying for his soul would diminish.

The Caulite mandate to live from rents offered an attractive alternative to benefactors in the thirteenth century, when huge land donations were not economically viable except for the greatest nobles and kings. Thus we witness, as a frequent foundation gift, the rights

\textsuperscript{322} Sankt-Elisabeth’s-Thal was founded in 1212. Clairlieu may have been founded as early as 1197, and Vausse as early as 1204, but I have been unable to confirm these dates.

\textsuperscript{323} Val-Duc was founded in 1248.
regarding whatever forest surrounded the new monastery. This had been the case at the motherhouse, but was also true for Val-Saint-Benoît, Genevroye, Vausse, Vauclair, Val-Duc, Val-Dieu, Remonvaux, Epeau, Royal Pré, and Pluscarden. Donors often delimited the rights to these forests within specific boundaries, and spelled out in no uncertain terms what the Caulites could and could not do in these forests. For example, the monks at Remonvaux could gather any kind of wood they needed, except chestnut. The monks at Vauclair could pasture their pigs in the woods surrounding their monastery, but the monks at Genevroye could not. As with the motherhouse, Caulite filial priories depended on the donations of rents in kind and money. But as at the motherhouse, filial priories also consciously attempted to consolidate their holdings by purchasing tithes, rents, and even land. Such was the case at Genevroye, Beaupré, and Val-Saint-Benoît. And like the monks at Val-des-Choux, monks at Caulite filial priories often entered into disputes to defend what they perceived as their rights, for example, the dispute over an enclosure between the monks at Val-Duc and the Hospitallers; or the almost decade-long dispute over tithes between the monks at Genevroye and the curate of Buxières.

 Expansion of the Caulite Order did not occur in a vacuum, but was part of the context of the thirteenth century—an age of crusading, and of continuing reform in the church. We can link Caulite expansion with the Crusades through the knight John of Toucy, who before departing for the Seventh Crusade arranged for the foundation of Plein-Marchais in his last will and testament. Or through Gauthier of Sully, who founded Val-Saint-Benoit upon escaping imprisonment by Muslim pirates. Or through Hugh of LaFauche, who before dying in Egypt on the Seventh Crusade, had Joinville reconfirm the foundation of Remonvaux. We can link Caulite expansion to church reforms through Bishop Malvoisin, who brought the Caulites all the way to Scotland to infuse the religious life there with more piety.
The last Caulite foundation occurred in 1266, when Thibaut V established Val-Dieu. By the beginning of the fourteenth century, the maintenance of the Caulite Order was basically a holding action. Some of the descendants of Caulite benefactors continued to pay the alms that had been promised "in perpetuity." Others did not, and found themselves in court. Sometimes the Caulites won, sometimes their debtors. The order eventually fell into a state of decline—a topic that lies beyond the scope of this work—however, the Caulite Order managed to hold on until the late eighteenth century. Yet long before their decline and dissolution, the Caulites’ dynamic period of expansion had come to a halt.
CHAPTER 7

THE CAULITE CUSTOMARY

The safest general characterization of the European philosophical tradition is that it consists of a series of footnotes to Plato.

—Alfred North Whitehead

Introduction

In much the same sense that Whitehead characterized European philosophy, European monasticism may be seen as a series of footnotes to Saint Benedict. The first Cistercians, reacting against Cluniac practices, self-consciously returned to what they considered a stricter adherence to the Rule of Benedict. In order to achieve this stricter adherence, however, they created a customary: a set of rules, if you will, for following the Rule; a rather lengthy footnote to Benedict. This Cistercian gloss on Benedict can be seen, for example, in such documents as the Ecclesiastica officia. The Carthusians, though arguably not Benedictines, also glossed Benedictine practices. According to Lawrence, “Many [Carthusian] customs, including the liturgical instructions, were taken from the

---

1 A. Whitehead, Process and Reality (New York, 1929), 63.

2 See D. Knowles, Cistercians and Cluniacs, the Controversy between St. Bernard and Peter the Venerable (Oxford, 1955).

3 D. Choiselet and P. Vernet, eds., Les ecclesiastica officia cisterciens du XIIème siècle (Reiningue, France, 1989). Hereafter, EO.
Benedictine Rule or from the practice of the black monks." In the thirteenth century, even as Cistercian and Carthusian prominence gave way to the waxing influence of the Friars, new monastic orders continued to gloss the Rule of Benedict. Some of these orders reconfigured Cistercian and/or Carthusian practices to create glosses on glosses, their own footnotes to Benedict, in an attempt to return to some "truer" monastic practice. Such was the case with the Caulites.

As discussed in Chapter 2, a major concern of earlier Caulite scholars was the nature of Caulite practice. They addressed this question either through direct observation, e.g., James of Vitry, or through a study of the Caulite customary. Their conclusions concerning the Caulites varied. Some labeled them as purely Carthusian. Others called them purely Cistercians. Still others claimed that they combined Cistercian and Carthusian practices.

---

4 Lawrence, 160-161. Lawrence also argued that, during the course of its development, the Carthusian order adopted some Cistercian practices, e.g., the practice of holding the general chapter. Some scholars of the Carthusians have disagreed with Lawrence, regarding the Carthusians as essentially non-Benedictine. For example, in the introductory remarks to Giguès 1er, Prieur de Chartreuse, Coutumes de Chartreuse, edited and translated into French by an anonymous Carthusian monk (Paris, 1984), 69-70 (hereafter CG), the anonymous Carthusian editor pointed out that in chapter 23, in the Carthusian form of profession, the clause "secundum regulam beati Benedicti" is noticeably absent. The same editor also made the argument that Benedict wrote primarily for cenobites—which, in the prologue to his rule, Benedict called "the best kind of monks"—rather than hermits, who were the centerpiece of the Carthusian movement.


6 Henry Calcàr claimed in his exempla that the Caulites were an order "viventes quasi sint Carthusienses:" see Martène, Vet. script., 6: 213. Hélyot, Histoire des ordres monastiques, 6: 179-180. claimed that Viard had given his disciples regulations very similar to those of the Carthusians. He took James of Vitry to task, claiming that the thirteenth-century author was mistaken in his claim that "these religious follow the foundation of Cîteaux." Hélyot admitted that the Caulites did wear the habit of the Cistercians, but he claimed that their customs and way of life were very different. Brockie maintained that the Caulites derived their practices from the Carthusians, and certainly not from the Cistercians. See the introductory note to "Antiquae constitutiones ordinis Vallis Caulium." in Holste-Brockie, 3: 12.

7 B. Chasseneuz, Catalogus gloriae mundi (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1579), bk. 4, consid. 58, p. 119, maintained that the Caulites lived "sub regula Benedicti" as well as "sub habitu Cistercienses cum habitum eorum deferant." A. Le Mire, Chronicon cisterciensis ordinis (Cologne, 1614), 249-252, re-published
James of Vitry even seems to have changed his mind concerning the Caulites. In the *Historia occidentalis* he called them Cistercians, except for the modest cells they constructed (alluding to a Carthusian practice). But in the *Sermo ad canonicos regulares*, he called them regular canons, comparing them to the Praemonstratensians, the Order of Saint Victor, the Arrouaise, and the Val-des-Écoliers.

James of Vitry's chapter on the Caulites from the *Historia occidentalis*, thus implicitly agreeing with James that Caulite customs derived from Cistercian practices. P. Vermeer, "Cîteaux-Val-des-Choux," *COCR* 16 (1954): 35-44, maintained that Cistercian documents most influenced the Caulite customary, with only slight Carthusian influence. Vermeer argued against the many scholars who had claimed a mixed Cistercian/Carthusian rule for the Caulites, especially since none had ever offered any evidence to back this claim. Unfortunately, Vermeer's article suffers from several methodological flaws, which I will discuss below.

Martène, *Thes. nov.*, 4: 1651-1652, note to the edition of the Caulite constitutions: "Primi Vallis Caulium patres usus suos partim ex Cartusiis, partim ex Cisterciis acceperunt." The editors of *Gallica christiana*, 3rd ed., 4: 742, stated that the Caulites lived "sub regula ... sancti Benedicti et constitutionibus Cisterci. quibus multa ex Carthusianorum instituto petita accesserunt." Mignard, 419, argued that Viard gave his companions "the rule of Saint Benedict, mixed with the principal observances of Cîteaux, and with many others emanating from the Carthusian institutes." MacPhail, *Pluscardyn*, 30, also linked the Caulites to the Carthusians. He argued that the "new rule" of the Caulites must have been especially strict, since it had "sprung from the Carthusians." Macphail then amended this assertion, citing Innocent III's papal bull of 1205, which "makes clear considerable departures from the Carthusian and close assimilation with the Cistercian Rule." Birch, xii, wrote that "The Rule ... combines much that was beneficial, confessedly derived by its author from those of the Benedictines, the Cistercians, and the Carthusians. It is this selection of what was found to be best in these three orders, with additions not hitherto in use, that makes up the Rule of the new Order of Val-des-Choux." Birch never made clear exactly where the author "confessed" this. Folz, 100-104, also argued for a mixed Cistercian/Carthusian rule. He corrected some of the flaws in Vermeer's article, and provided a table that demonstrated the provenance of some of the Caulite customs.

In the *Sermo*, James listed seven religious orders that lived according to the Rule of Saint Augustine. In addition to those named above—which were canons regular—James included the Dominicans (*ordo Fratrum Praedicatorum*), the Grandmontines and Caulites. None of which modern scholars consider canons regular, though the Grandmontines did follow an adapted form of the Augustinian Rule. James himself identified the Grandmontines and Caulites in the *Historia* as monastic orders that lived according to the Rule of Saint Benedict. See J. Longère, ed., "Quatre sermons ad canonicos de Jacques de Vitry," *Recherches augustiniennes* 23 (1988): 174-175. One possible explanation for this apparent discrepancy is that James wrote the *Sermo* before he wrote the *Historia*. Needing an appropriately pious example for his sermon, James chose the Caulites, without really knowing whether they were in fact canons regular or not. Later, having visited Val-des-Choux, James amended his view of the Caulites, and portrayed this view in the...
This chapter tries to understand Caulite practice by studying the Caulite customary, though it will not ignore the findings of earlier scholars, as far as their insights might prove useful. It begins with a brief description of the customary, and an attempt to construct a chronology for its evolution. It then examines the sources from which the Caulites derived their customary.

**Evolution of the Caulite customary**

The customary is preserved in two manuscript copies, which for the sake of convenience and according to tradition we call manuscripts P and M. Since manuscript P was written for the priory of Val-Croissant, it had to have been created after 1216, the date of that monastery’s founding. Since manuscript M was created for the priory of Petit-Saint-Lieu, it had to have been created after 1224, the date of that monastery’s founding. Recall that there are three published editions of the customary: one by Martène and Durand, which represents a third, no-longer-extant manuscript; one by Brockie (a copy of Martène and Durand’s edition); and one by Birch, which because of its completeness I cite

---

*Historia.* Since the Sermo is undated, this supposition is difficult to prove. According to Longère, 152. James began preaching before he left for the Holy Land—he was bishop of Acre from 1216 to 1226—but he did not start to write and publish his sermons until after his return from Palestine. Another possible explanation is that James was more concerned with the quality of Caulite religious life, than with quantifying the Caulites as “so much Cistercian” mixed in with “so much Carthusian.” Hence, if James called them Augustinian canons one day and Cistercians the next, it might not have mattered that much to him. It may also have been the case that medieval observers drew less of a distinction between monks and regular canons than we do. The need to categorize is a modern mania, one from which James might well have been immune. I am grateful to Giles Constable, for suggesting this latter possibility to me in a talk we had on 19 February 1998.

11 Manuscript P is at Paris, BN, lat. 18047; manuscript M is at Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 232.

12 Fol. 35v of manuscript P names Val-Croissant in the novice’s oath of profession. Fol. 118r of manuscript M names Petit-Saint-Lieu in this same context.
throughout this work. Appendix B provides a detailed archival description of the manuscripts, while Appendix C offers a comparison of the contents of these manuscripts and editions. On some level, the purpose of any monastic customary was to act as a guide for the ritualized aspects of the monastery—keeping in mind that even seemingly mundane tasks like eating can be ritualized. Thus the Caulite customary contains several elements that are not immediately pertinent to our current inquiry, e.g., instructions for calculating Easter. For the purposes of this chapter, the most important elements contained in the customary are the Rule of Benedict (henceforth RB); a copy of Innocent III’s bull of 1205: a portion of the Honorius III’s bull of 1224; the 161 chapters of the customary proper; the sixty-four brief, untitled, miscellaneous rules; the section concerning the conversi; and the statutes of the general chapters. As Appendix B shows, not all copies of the customary contain all of these elements. One of the hazards in studying a document like a monastic customary is in viewing that document as a finished product, rather than as a work in progress. The problem at hand is to unravel the many elements and discuss them in terms of the customary’s evolution.

When Viard first left Lugny to unite the hermits living in Val-des-Choux, he brought his Carthusian experience with him. As Chapter 4 has shown, he also brought the watchful eye of his superiors at Lugny. The prior of Lugny had the right to visit sick monks at Val-des-Choux, and no novice could be admitted to Val-des-Choux except with the approval of Lugny. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising to find Viard constructing a rule for his new community based on Carthusian practices. Yet we also see the influence of other monastic customs influencing Viard’s earliest choices. The

customary preserves these choices in a section entitled *De prima institutione Vallis Caulium* ("Concerning the first customs of the Caulites"). While the title was likely the addition of a later redactor, it seems a safe assumption that the rules in this section indeed reflect the Caulites' earliest written customs. We should note, however, that the earliest Caulites may have practiced these customs without necessarily writing them down. These first customs covered a range of issues important to monastic communities. They restricted both the healthy and the infirm from consuming meat or animal fat. They required the prior to eat with the community and to dress as the other monks dressed. They imposed dietary restrictions such as fasting on bread and water during certain times of the year. They prohibited contact with women, and restricted the movement of the monks outside the bounds of the monastery. They assigned certain hours of the day for contemplation. They restricted the number of members in the community to twenty, monks and *conversi* combined. They allowed talking in each monk's cell under certain circumstances, and forbade the entry into another monk's cell without permission.\(^\text{14}\)

There are many similarities between these customs and those that Innocent III approved in his bull of 1205. As discussed in Chapter 4, Innocent III's bull allowed the Caulites a prior rather than an abbot. It restricted their diet to bread and water during certain times of the year, and limited the number in their communities to twenty, monks and

\(^{14}\) Birch, 91-92: "Omni tempore tam sanis quam infirmis esus carnium aut sagiminis a prima institutionum observantia interdictus est. Prior in eodem refectorio simili cibo sicut et vestibus contentus comedit. Feria sexta omni tempore jejunamus preter in nativitate Domini, et in festis duodecim lectionum in estate pane et aqua et uno pulmento contepi, etiam in quadragesima idem pulmentum subtrahitur eadem feria. Femine interiores terminos non ingrediantur nec monachi exteriore transeunt nisi pro ordinibus, excepto priore, qui tamen egrotans vel occupatus vel si urgens necessitas, vel evidens utilitas postulaverit unum quem voluerit potest potest destinare. A matutinis usque ad horam laboris et a vespéra usque ad occasum solidis spiritualibus est vacandum, exceptis illis quos prioris discretio pro aliqua certa causa et necessaria duxerit retrahendos. Numerus tam conversorum quam monachorum ultra vigenarium non extenditur ... Si quis importunus celle se intulerit hoc solum ei loqui possumus, interrogantes si licentiam habeat loquendi nobiscum. Nullus sine licentia cellam alterius ingreditur, cujus inveniens clausum ostium non aperit sed significatione sonitus postulat aperiri, quo aperito signo potest intimare propter [quod] venerat non ingrediens."
conversi combined. It forbade private possessions, consumption of meat and animal fat, contact with women, and the wearing of linen and flaxen clothes. It required them to wear habits of thick, un-dyed wool, though the wearing of hair shirts was optional. It required that they work and dine in common, and that the prior eat and dress as the rest of the community. It required that they daily hold chapter, celebrate mass, and sing the canonical hours; that they be given specific times for reading and prayer; and that they live from rents in order to maintain their withdrawal from the world.\textsuperscript{15}

There are differences between the *prima institutio* and Innocent's bull. For example, the bull made no mention of cells, a topic that received several lines in *De prima institutione*. As discussed in Chapter 4, the reason for this could be the manner in which the bishop of Reims presented the new order of the Caulites to the pope. Since the customary also contained a copy of Innocent's bull, it seems likely that the Caulites had woven this into the fabric of the customary, i.e., they should not only follow the *prima institutio*, but also anything not covered in the *prima institutio* that they found in Innocent's bull.

Many of the provisions contained in these two documents were common to monastic communities going back to Benedict or earlier (e.g., the restrictions on women visitors; the ban on eating meat). Other customs indicate the influence of Cistercian and Carthusian practices on the Caulite customary. Cistercian influences included the use of conversi, and perhaps the wearing of habits made from un-dyed wool—a Cistercian trademark that rendered their nickname "the white monks."\textsuperscript{16} Eating and working together also seems to be an attempt at combining Cistercian fellowship into an otherwise eremitic life—though the Carthusians also enjoyed periodic fellowship, and we can also trace this

\textsuperscript{15} Innocent III (1205).

\textsuperscript{16} One could just as easily argue that the Carthusians influenced the design of the Caulite habit. See the discussion on Caulite habits as depicted on the tomb of Odo III's children in Chapter 4.
practice back to the RB. The clearest Carthusian influence included the limits set on the number of members in the community, and the use of individual cells for prayer and study. Like the Carthusians, the Caulites organized their monasteries under priors rather than abbots. Innocent wrote that the Caulites should elect one of their monks to be prior. These earliest Caulite customs also reveal innovations. The most noticeable of these is the fact that the Caulites lived on rents “silentium servaturi.” This seems a challenge to the Cistercians, whose economic success based on active cultivation of their lands often drew criticism for being too worldly. It is important to note at this point that neither the prima institutio nor Innocent III’s bull made any reference to following the RB. More importantly, Innocent did not explicitly tell the Caulites to adapt their customs to the rule of some pre-existing order—the time in question being prior to the mandates of the Fourth Lateran Council. This brings us to the question of when and why the Caulites came to adopt the RB, as well as the customs found in Carthusian and Cistercian texts. To unravel these problems, it will be necessary to reconcile the evidence in two important documents in Caulite history: the bull of Honorius III, which allowed the Caulites to mitigate their more stringent customs; and James of Vitry’s description of the Caulites in the Historia occidentalis.

 Barely twenty years after Innocent III’s confirmation of the order, the Caulites were finding the prima institutio too difficult to carry out. In 1224, they approached Honorius III (1216-1227) in the hope of mitigating their practice. Quoting the Gospel of Matthew 26:4, the pope reminded the Caulites that, “The spirit is indeed willing, but the flesh is weak.” Honorius then conceded to the prior at Val-des-Choux, as well as to the priors of affiliated houses, the right of the Caulites to soften their observance as they judged fit in their general chapter. The language in the bull seems to indicate that they already practiced something like a general chapter, for it states that the Caulites:
Should be able to temper the rigor of their observances in their general chapter 
(Rigorem observantiarum ... temperare valeant in vestro generale capitulo).

The bull does not say “in a general chapter,” but “in their general chapter.” This subtle difference leads me to believe that the Caulites already practiced meeting in general chapters, and that Honorius was not suggesting some innovation in his bull. By 1224, if we count the recently founded priory of Petit-Saint-Lieu, the Caulites had at least ten monasteries at varying distances from Val-des-Choux—one in far away “Alemania.” It makes sense that they would have met in general chapters to ensure that the rigor of their practice was not diluted as the order expanded. The Caulites were just the latest of a growing number of monastic orders to adopt this Cistercian innovation. The earliest statutes of Caulite general chapters, which are identified as such, are dated 1238. But one part of the customary may reflect the record of earlier general chapters, namely, the sixty-four miscellaneous rules. Birch, in his edition to the customary, called these “sixty-four miscellaneous rules without titles.” The nature of these miscellaneous rules, as well as their place in manuscript P, suggests that they were added into the customary, one after the other, as issues arose. It is only near the end of the miscellaneous rules that the Caulites began to use language that suggested a more formal process, such as a general chapter. For example, it is not until number sixty-two of the sixty-four miscellaneous rules that the Caulites used the phrase, “We establish through the general chapter.”

---

17 Honorius III (1224).

18 Birch, 103: “Sexaginta quatuor regulæ miscellaneous sine rubricis.” The phrase, in Latin, was entirely Birch’s invention, and does not appear in either of the manuscripts.


20 Birch, 107: “Statuimus per generale capitulum.” Folz, 101, also believed that the sixty-four miscellaneous chapters must have been written before 1224 (“que l’on peut déduire de la bulle d’Honorius III”) and 1238, when the first dated statutes of the general chapters appeared.
The miscellaneous rules demonstrate that the Caulites had actually altered their original practice even before asking Honorius III for permission to do so. For example, number nine of the miscellaneous rules concerned the approval of Caulite novices by the monks of Lugny. Recall that Chapter 4 used the existence of this rule to demonstrate the close links between Val-des-Choux and its Carthusian “motherhouse” of Lugny. What Chapter 4 did not mention is that the Caulites eventually scored through number nine for erasure. They followed this act of liberating themselves from Lugny by adding number twenty-one of the miscellaneous rules, which declares that “from that point” (amodo), monks made their professions to the Caulite Order according to the RB. We know that the Caulites adopted the RB before Honorius III’s bull of 1224, because his bull describes the Caulites as observing the RB:

The Rule of the Blessed Benedict which you have professed and observe. (Beati Benedicti regulam quam professi estis et servatis).

The bull does not say that they will be professed to and observe the RB, or that they should be professed to and observe it, but that they already were doing so at the moment Honorius issued the bull.

It is my contention that the Caulites adopted the RB some time between 1205 and 1215. It had to be after 1205 because Innocent III’s bull of that year made no mention of the Caulites being Benedictines—and in a bull that essentially outlines monastic practice, one might reasonably expect some mention of the RB if it were important to that practice. It had to be before 1215 because of the strictures imposed in that year by the Fourth Lateran

---


22 Birch, 104: “Professiones amodo fiant in ordine nostro secundum reglam beati Benedicti.”

23 Honorius III (1224).
Council. Canon 13 of the Fourth Lateran prohibited the proliferation of new religious rules, and required any new orders that came into being to adopt religious rules that already existed.24 Canon 13 would surely require the Caulites to seek papal approval before making any radical changes to their original practice. Thus in 1224, roughly a decade after Fourth Lateran, the Caulites asked Honorius III for permission to alter their practices. I believe that the radical change they wished to implement was the adoption of the Ecclesiastica officia (henceforth EO), in an adapted form that would suit their needs. The fact that Honorius III’s bull did not mention the EO makes the argument that much stronger that the Caulites adopted it after 1224. It is at this point that James of Vitry comes to our aid to support these claims.

Recall that James of Vitry’s description in the Historia occidentalis had the Caulites “observ[ing] the Cistercian rule in diet and vestments and the Divine Office and all the rest, strictly and diligently.”25 This seems to be a clear description of Caulite life after the adoption of the EO, and—if I am correct—after 1224. Yet our task is not as simple as stating that James of Vitry observed the Caulites after 1224, and described their practice as incorporating Cistercian customs. The chronology of James of Vitry’s life, particularly concerning his composition of the Historia, creates problems with any such statement.

According to Hinnebusch, editor of the Historia, James of Vitry composed his work between 1219 and 1225. James indicated as much in the prologue when he wrote that he

24 For the text of Canon 13, see Alberigo, Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta, 242. H. Tillman, Pope Innocent III, transl. by W. Sax (Amsterdam, New York, and Oxford, 1980), 214-215, maintained that these limits came from the council, and not necessarily from the pope. Thus when Dominic came to Rome seeking approval for the Order of Preachers, in the midst of the Fourth Lateran Council, he received a cool reception. Honorius III eventually approved the Order of Preachers in 1216—without violating the mandate of the Fourth Lateran Council—because the Dominicans had adapted the Rule of Saint Augustine for their practice. Cf. Lawrence, 252-253.

25 Vitry, Historia, 120: “Sunt alii fratres in episcopatu lingonensi monachi deo amabiles et ualde religiosi. qui de Valle Caulium nominantur. Hii religionem cysterciensis ordinis in uictu et uestitu et diuinis officiis et in omnibus aliiis districte et diligenter obseruant.”
began writing in Damietta, Egypt. By 1216, James had already assumed the duties of bishop of Acre in the Holy Lands, but from April 1218 to 1221, he accompanied the knights of the Fifth Crusade on the siege of Damietta. James visited Italy in 1222-1223, then returned to the Holy Lands. He remained bishop of Acre until 1225, when he returned to Europe. Hinnebusch offered the arguments of two scholars concerning the dating of the Historia. Based on internal evidence concerning Saint Francis's preaching at Damietta in 1219, and the lack of any mention of the Franciscan Rules of 1221 or 1223, Funk believed that James wrote the Historia between 1219 and 1221. Based on James' description of the Canons of Bologna, who were arguably Dominicans, Mandonnet countered that James could have learned of the Order of Preachers on his trip to Italy (though there is no evidence that James actually visited Bologna). Hence, according to Mandonnet, the terminus ad quem of the Historia had to be post-1223, i.e., after James' trip to Italy. Mandonnet insisted, however, that James must have finished the Historia by 1225, before his return to Europe, otherwise he would have more accurately described the Canons of Bologna as the belonging to the Order of Preachers.26 For our purposes, we must reconcile the chronology of James' life and the composition of the Historia with when and how James learned of the Caulites. Three possibilities exist. First, James could have encountered the Caulites personally before leaving for the Holy Lands, i.e., before 1216. Second, he could have encountered the Caulites personally after returning from the Holy Lands, i.e., after 1225. Third, he could have learned of the Caulites from a third party while he was still in the Holy Lands. i.e., between 1216 and 1225.27

26 For the events of James' life, see Vitry, Historia, 3-7. For the arguments concerning the dating of the work, see Vitry, Historia, 16-20.

27 A fourth possibility is that James' description of the Caulites was simply wrong. Hinnebusch suggested this possibility when he invoked Brockie's criticism of James in Holste-Brockie, 3: 12. Brockie refuted James' description, claiming that the Caulites did not embrace Cistercian practices. "as much as ...
If we hold that the Caulites did not adopt the EO until after 1224, then the first of these, that James encountered the Caulites before 1216, is untenable. James could have observed the Caulites following Cistercian customs in food and vestments before 1216, since we already see these practices expressed in 1205 in the bull of Innocent III. But James could not have witnessed the Caulites observing the Divine Office as per the Cistercians before 1216, since they had not yet adopted the EO—a major component of which is the Divine Office.

The second possibility, that James encountered the Caulites after 1225, is more feasible from the point of view of our argument. If the Caulites adopted the EO in 1224, then it would make perfect sense for James to describe the Caulites practicing the Divine Office according to Cistercian custom after 1225. Unfortunately, this runs counter to the arguments of Funk and Mandonnet for dating the Historia. To overturn Funk and Mandonnet, I would have to argue that James finished the Historia after 1225, but that he did not make any additional reference concerning the Franciscan Rules of 1221 and 1223, nor any revisions concerning the Canons of Bologna as part of the Order of Preachers. Hinnebusch suggested the possibility that James could have inserted the chapter on the Canons of Bologna into the completed text of the Historia after returning to Acre from his journey to Italy. From here, it does not seem such a stretch to imagine James doing the same for the Caulites, sometime after his return to Europe in 1225, i.e., after they had adopted the EO, and would have appeared more Cistercian to him.

estimated in [James’ Historia],” for “nowhere can one discover such a familiar relationship between the Caulites and Cistercians as one can between the Caulites and Carthusians.” Brockie’s edition of the Caulite customary was “apud Martene Thes. aneed. Tomo IV,” which edition did not include the large portion of the Caulite customary containing the (adapted) Ecclesiastica officia, as in manuscript M. Hence Brockie’s criticism of James is ill founded, and Hinnebusch’s use of Brockie ill conceived.

28 Innocent III (1205): “Simul laborabitis et simul in refectorio comeditis ... grossae lanae vestes, non tinctas et pellitias habituri.”
The third possibility, that James learned of the Caulites from a third party while still in the Holy Lands, seems the least likely. Recall that André de Montbard was also in Damietta in 1219, and that he issued a charter in that year naming the prior of Vausse as one of the mediators of a gift to the Hospitallers. André was well familiar with the Caulites, having approved gifts donated to the priory of Val-Croissant. Yet for our purposes André is not a likely informant for James of Vitry’s work, since anything he could have told James would have concerned the Caulites pre-1224. Recall that André visited Vausse after his release from captivity during the Fifth Crusade. There is no indication that he went back to the Holy Lands before James left in 1225. In fact, any third party who could report on Caulite practice after 1224 would need to relay this information to James before the author of the Historia left the Holy Lands in 1225. Yet the more compelling reason to reject the “third party” theory is the feeling in the Historia of a first hand account, with its description of vegetable gardens within the bounds of the monastery and individual cells for meditation and prayer. Only an observer with access to the cloister and inner grounds of the monastery could have observed such features, which would not have been accessible to the ordinary visitor. To assert that the Caulites performed the Divine Office according to Cistercian custom requires a level of liturgical knowledge that was only available to an observer of James’ training and experience.

The best reconciliation of the evidence, therefore, is that James of Vitry observed the Caulites after his return to Europe in 1225, when they practiced the Divine Office according to the EO of the Cistercians. If we accept this, then the evolution of the Caulite customary becomes clearer. Circa 1193, Viard came to Val-des-Choux with instructions and customs from the Charterhouse at Lugny. The Caulites eventually formalized these in the document De prima institutione. When Innocent III confirmed the Caulite Order in 1205, the customs listed in his bull reflected the pope’s understanding of Caulite practice, as mediated by the bishop of Reims. Hence the prima institutio and Innocent’s bull have some
discrepancies, but are essentially the same. As their order grew, the Caulites met in something resembling the general chapter of the Cistercians. During the period between 1205 and 1215, they broke away from their “motherhouse” at Lugny, and began observing the RB, in addition to the prima institutio. Yet the original customs were still too severe for the new community. In 1224 they wanted to temper their customs, and sought papal approval to do so. They received permission from Honorius III to mitigate their practice through their already existing general chapters. It was at this point that the Caulites adopted the EO, under the influence of which James of Vitry observed the Caulites, and described them as following Cistercian customs in a chapter (inserted?) in the Historia occidentalis.

Sources of the Caulite customary

Having constructed a feasible evolution for the Caulite customary, let us now examine the specific sources—Benedictine, Cistercian, and Carthusian—upon which the Caulites drew in the creation of their customary. A proper discussion of the influence of these sources must be three fold. First and most obvious, we must examine the customary using a comparative approach, one that analyzes the phrases of different texts for their relative similarity. Second, we must look to the subtler meaning in phrases to tease out the origins of the ideas behind them. Third and last, we must look at the structure of the customary, for this too can reveal the intention of the its creators. Thus to state that the Caulites were Benedictines because their customary contained the RB is not enough, for Benedictine customs are embedded in other parts of the Caulite customary as well. And we cannot simply proclaim that the Caulites borrowed the EO from the Cistercians, for this would minimize their critical adaptation of that text. We must also take care to differentiate between practices borrowed or adapted directly from the RB, and Benedictine practices borrowed via Cistercian practices—after all, the Cistercians were also Benedictines. For example, the Caulite customary asserts that the holy days of Lent were to be observed
"according to the admonitions of blessed Benedict, our father." At first glance this would seem to be a direct Benedictine influence, but the section is actually copied verbatim from the EO.²⁹

Finally, this chapter in no way pretends to include every single example of the practices the Caulite customary borrowed or adapted from other monastic orders. For a complete treatment of the derivations of practices in the Caulite customary, please refer to Appendix C.

Benedictine Influences

At the beginning of this chapter, I argued that Western monasticism has consisted of a series of footnotes to Benedict. In the spirit of that argument, it seems appropriate to begin our examination of outside influences on the Caulite customary with a discussion of borrowings from the Rule of Benedict.

Indeed, the most obvious evidence for Caulite use of the RB is its inclusion in toto in their customary.³⁰ As established above, the Caulites must have adopted the RB sometime between 1205 and 1215. Number twenty-one of the miscellaneous rules, which the Caulites arguably added to their customary before the Fourth Lateran Council, demonstrates that Caulite monks made their professions according to the RB. By 1224, Honorius III said of the Caulites that they "are professed to and observe the Rule of blessed Benedict." Yet even after Honorius III’s assertion of 1224, the Caulite adoption of the RB seems not to have been a fait accompli. The Caulites continued to re-affirm their commitment to following the RB, as is evidenced in the records of their general chapters. For example, in 1249, they allowed meat to be given to the weak and infirm, "according to

²⁹ Birch, 11: "Hiis vero sanctis diebus XI me secundum beati Benedicti patris nostri monita." Cf. EO, ch. 15.

³⁰ See manuscript M, fols. 50r-74v.
the Rule of blessed Benedict.” In 1262, they decided that “in order to avoid transgressions, the Rule of the blessed father Benedict should be strictly kept.” In 1266, they again confirmed the place in their order of the RB, which “we call our Rule, because we are held by our profession of mouth to direct our lives and customs according to it.”

References to the RB also appear in other sections of the Caulite customary. For example, a chapter “On summoning the brothers for council” (De adhibendis ad consilium fratribus) shares the same title as chapter 3 of the RB, as well as many of its ideas. Among other things, it contained the notion that the prior, before reaching a decision on important matters, should consult with both young and old members of the monastery. A chapter of the customary “Concerning more serious faults” (De gravioribus culpis), seems to have taken its verbal cues from Chapter 25 of the RB. It banished monks who were guilty of serious faults from the church, the common table, and from discourse with other monks.

31 Birch, 111, Statutes of 1249: “Item liceat dare carnes omnino debilibus et infirmis. secundum regulam beati Benedicti.”

32 Birch, 112, Statutes of 1262: “Statutum est in nostro generali capitulo propter transgressiones evitandas, ut regula beati Benedicti abbatis firmiter teneatur.”

33 Birch, 114, Statutes of 1266: “Attendamus fratres et corde suscipiamus, voluntate teneamus conversacione et opere verbum salutaris doctrine regule videlicet sancti patris nostri Benedicti quam ideo regulam appelamus, quia ad ipsum vitam nostram dirigere et mores componere ex oris nostri professione tenemur.” Lorraine, “Genevroie,” 28, suggested that the Statutes of 1266 signified the first moment when the Caulites adopted the RB; but Folz, 103, agreed that invocations of the Rule in statutes of the general chapters post-1224 were reminders, not first instances of the Rule’s use.

34 Birch, 92: “Si quid magnum tractandum fuerit, conveniendi sunt in unum monachi omnes. Et omnium consulta libere voluntate prior quod melius estimabit, exequatur. Nullus tamen suam sententiam aut defendens aut approbans suis sibi magnus in oculis videatur; in levioribus aut privatum sufficiat aut paucorum quod tutius erit super consilium seniorum.” Cf. RB, ch. 3. Folz, 113, claimed that this chapter of the Caulite customary was derived from the Carthusian CG, ch. 38, but since that chapter deals with the care of the sick and bears no resemblance to the above, I must assume this to be a typographical error.

35 Birch, 92, De gravioribus culpis: “Frater qui in gravioribus culpis invenitur, ab ecclesia, et a mensa, et a fratrum consortio, et a colloquio separatur, circa quem maxima a priorie est diligentia adhibenda.” Cf. RB, ch. 25: “Si autem frater qui gravioris culpae noxa tenetur, suspendatur a mensa, simul ab oratorio. Nullus ei fratum in nullo iungatur consortio nec in conloquo.”
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The chapter "Concerning novices" (*De novitiis*) reinforces the idea that Caulite monks were to promise "stability ... conversion of ways ... and obedience according to the Rule of Saint Benedict.” The chapter entitled “That none be made a monk without probation” (*Quod nullus sine probacione monachus fiat*) tells us that the Caulites admitted Benedictine monks to their order without probation. This chapter implies that the Caulites were essentially Benedictines, and that they would admit other Benedictines, who presumably had undergone probation elsewhere. All of this evidence supports the idea that the Caulites had become Benedictines, but in the same sense that the Cistercians were Benedictine, i.e., they followed the RB, but enhanced it with their own customary.

After their break from Lugny, the Caulites began to see their order as distinct from other forms of monastic life, and the customary also reflects this new awareness. For example, number forty-two of the miscellaneous rules shows that the Caulites restricted monks of other orders—in particular the Cistercians and Carthusians—from joining the Caulites, unless they were free to do so. They confirmed this restriction again in their general chapter of 1262, proclaiming that "no one from another order should be accepted into [their] house." In spite of this restriction, Carthusian and Cistercian customs exercised a lasting influence on the Caulite customary.

---

36 Birch, 77: "... stabilitatem ... conversionem morum ... et obedientiam secundum regulam sancti Benedicti." The Caulites greatly adapted the chapter "Concerning novices" from EO, ch. 102, inserting their own oath of profession into the Cistercian chapter. Cf. EO, pp. 294-298.

37 Birch, 94: "Magnopere nobis omnibus cavendum est ne aliqui sine regulari probatione aliquo modo collegio nostro sotientur, exceptis monachis quos beatus suscipit Benedictus."

38 Birch, 106: "Nulli monacho Cisterciensi vel Cartusiensi vel cujuslibet ordinis tribuaturs habitus noster nisi absoluto nec in habitu suo morari possit nobiscum ultra tres ebdomadas."

39 Birch, 113, Statutes of 1262: “Nullus de ordine alio in domibus nostris recipiatur.”
Carthusian Influences

The Caulites' spiritual founder came from a Carthusian monastery, bringing Carthusian practices with him. Yet by the time the Caulite customary arrived at the "finished form" we now study, literal Carthusian influences would represent but a small portion of the overall product. We have already discussed the major Carthusian influences found in the *prima institutio* and Innocent III's bull of 1205. These included the Caulite limit on the number of members in their communities, their use of individual cells, and their guidance by a prior rather than an abbot. The most important Carthusian text with which to compare the Caulite customary is the *Consuetudines* ("The Customs") compiled by Guigues du Pin, a.k.a. Guigo I, sometime between 1109 and 1128. Only two chapters of the *Consuetudines* offer any literal influence on the Caulite customary. The first of these is chapter 56, entitled "What to do in danger" (*Quid agendum sit in periculis*), which influenced the Caulite chapter entitled "Concerning the breaking of silence out of necessity" (*De silentio pro necessitate rumpendo*). Silence was a paramount concern in a contemplative community, but there were obviously some situations in which the monk's silence could and should be broken. Both the Carthusian and Caulite versions of this rule concern the breaking of that silence in emergency circumstances, such as "sudden distress, or fire, or other such dangers." We also encounter Carthusian borrowings in the chapter of the Caulite customary "Concerning novices" (*De novitiis*). Among Carthusians and Caulites alike, a senior monk was to instruct the novice, speaking to him in his cell at

---

40 See Lawrence, 160.

41 Birch, 92: "Si alicubi vel morbi subitanei, vel ignis, vel alicuius talis periculi necessitas, soluto tam a patiente quam a supervenientibus silentio qui prius poteritt accurrat." Cf. CG. ch. 56: "Si alicubi vel morbi subitanei, vel ignis, vel alicius talis periculi necessitas ingruerit, soluto silentio qui prius potent succurrat."
opportune times.\textsuperscript{42} The language in both of these chapters is almost identical, leaving no
doubt that the Caulites borrowed from their Carthusian predecessors.

Although only two chapters of the Carthusian \textit{Consuetudines} provided any direct
textual fodder for the Caulite customary, we will see below a pervasive Carthusian influence
in the Cistercian texts that the Caulites borrowed and adapted.

\section*{Cistercian Influence}

Early in their history, the Caulites showed an affinity for Cistercian customs:
wearing undyed habits, using \textit{conversi}, working and dining in common. In 1214, the
Caulites and Cistercians even developed a close relationship, as the Cistercians included the
Caulite mother-house in their fraternity of prayers.\textsuperscript{43} Number forty-four of the
miscellaneous rules provides an early example of the Caulites acknowledging adoption of
Cistercian customs. In this case, the Caulites were to make their petitions to the saints
“according to Cistercian custom.”\textsuperscript{44} But the Caulites did more than just borrow concepts
from the Cistercians. As they did with the RB and the Carthusian \textit{Consuetudines}, the
Caulites also borrowed and adapted entire passages from Cistercian texts. Numerically
speaking, more chapters of the Caulite customary came from Cistercian texts than from the
texts of any other order. The main text from which the Caulites adopted practices was the

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item Birch. 76: “Deputetur ei [novitio] senior qui eum instruat loquens cum eo in cella eius novitii, horis
opportunis.” Cf. CG, ch. 22: “Cui in cellam introducto, seniorum aliquis deputatur, qui eum per unam vel
si amplius opus fuerit ebdomadam, horis competentibus visitans, de necessaria instruat.” Folz, 102, also
drew this comparison.
\item Cistercian statute of 1214: “Conceditur priori de Valle Caulium ut domus ipsius beneficiis ordinis et
cum ceteris conscribatur.” See Martène, \textit{Thes. nov.}, 4: col. 1313; and Canivez, \textit{Statuta}, 1: 424, no. 34.
\item Birch, 106: “Ad suffragia sanctorum que flunt ad horas beate Marie agamus nos secundum morem
Cisterciensium.”
\end{itemize}
Ecclesiastica officia (EO), but they also adopted practices from the Cistercian Usus conversorum, and from statutes of the Cistercian general chapters.

The Caulites did more than simply insert the Cistercian EO wholesale into their customary. They adapted it as well. For the most part, these adaptations concerned the size and economics of the houses, both of which related to the Caulite desire to avoid worldliness. The logic was simple. Small communities did not need as much as large communities, hence less need for worldly involvement. And by changing the very nature of the monastic economy, e.g., by living from rents, the Caulites could avoid the world even more. Implicit in all of these adaptations was a Caulite critique of the Cistercians from whom they borrowed. As Chapters 5 and 6 have shown, this critique did not necessarily work for the Caulites—who indeed became entangled in worldly affairs—but their editorial choices at least shed light on their intent. One such choice concerned the number of conversi in the Caulite community. Caulite priories were limited to twenty members, most probably one prior, twelve monks, and seven conversi. With so few conversi at their disposal, the Caulites would need to adapt those chapters of the EO dealing with conversi. We see this, for example, in the chapter concerning Christmas (De nativitate Domini). On Christmas night, the cellarer of the Cistercians was to assign two conversi to light a fire so that the monks could warm themselves during a pause in the services. The Caulite adaptation of this chapter allowed for only one conversus performing the same task, a reflection of the comparatively smaller scale on which Caulite houses operated. Another adaptation in the EO concerned the changing of Cistercian “abbot” to Caulite “prior” throughout the Caulite customary. For example, the Caulites borrowed roughly one-half of their chapter “Concerning the prior” (De priore) from the chapter in the EO “Concerning the priority of the abbot” (De prioritate abbatis).

---

45 Birch, 3: “In nocte natalis Domini, cellerarius provideat unum conversum qui ignem in calefactorio monachis preparat ad intervallum.” Cf. EO, ch. 4: “In nocte nativitatis domini cellerarius provideat duos conversos qui ignem in calefactorium monachis ad intervallum calefaciendis preparat.”
the abbot” (De abbate). Throughout this chapter, “abbot” is changed to “prior.” The second half of the Caulite chapter “Concerning the prior” comes from a chapter in the EO bearing the same title. Here such changes were not necessary, since the term “prior” was already in use. In the single editorial act of changing “abbot” to “prior,” we can see the Caulite critique of the Cistercians in action. Having an abbot was a sign of a complex corporate structure. Having a prior indicated the simplicity of a smaller community, hence an easier withdrawal from the world. Interestingly, in spite of their opting for priors over abbots, the Caulites still wanted their prior to be elected “according to the customs of the Cistercians” (secundum morem Cisterciensium).46

We can see this same critique of Cistercian size and economics in the Caulite adaptation of a Cistercian text dedicated to dealing with lay brothers, the Usus conversorum, henceforth UC. Since the Caulites did not intend to have granges—those tracts of land so famously exploited by the Cistercians—the Caulites excised the term “grange” (grangia) throughout the UC, wherever it might have appeared in the Caulite customary. For example, the first chapter of the UC is entitled “How the brothers should conduct themselves on the granges” (Quomodo se habeant fratres in granginis). But in the Caulite customary this first chapter simply begins with “Here begins the order concerning the lay brothers” (Incipit ordo de conversis), with no mention of granges at all. Another example is the chapter in the UC concerning women on the granges, which is excised entirely from the Caulite customary. Women visitors on a distant grange were not a temptation that Caulite conversi had to face, since they were wholly occupied within the walls of the monastery.47

46 Birch, 81-82. Cf. EO. ch. 110 and 111.

The statutes of the Cistercian general chapters—(Statuta capitulorum generalium), henceforth SCG—also influenced the writing of the Caulite customary.\(^{48}\) We find traces of the SCG in several chapters of the Caulite customary immediately following the prima institutio. Because of their placement in the customary, these were likely the earliest Caulite customs recorded, after the prima institutio. For example, in composing a section of their customary “Concerning the general chapter (De generali capitulo), the Caulites borrowed from the prologue of the Cistercian SCG of 1134.\(^{49}\) The only significant differences in the Caulite text were the substitution of “prior” for “abbot,” and the changing of the location of the meeting to Val-des-Choux. The Caulites still intended the general chapter to be a regular, annual meeting of all the priors of their order, just as it was for the abbots among the Cistercians.\(^{50}\) Another chapter in the Caulite customary borrowed from the SCG of 1134 fell prey to strong, residual, Carthusian influence. It concerned the dedication of all Caulites churches “to the queen of Heaven and Earth, the Blessed Mary and to Saint John

\(^{48}\) The standard edition for these statutes has been J. Canivez, ed., Statuta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis: ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786. 8 vols. (Louvain, 1933-41). C. Berman. The Cistercian Evolution: The Invention of a Religious Order in Twelfth-Century Europe (Philadelphia, 2000), has recently challenged the traditional dating of these statutes (especially those of 1134)—which Berman prefers to call “ideals” rather than “statutes.” She has also taken Canivez’s edition to task; Berman, 48-51. The core of Berman’s argument is that the “statutes” and other primitive documents were not composed circa 1135 (the traditional date), but roughly thirty years later; see Berman, 61-68. Berman’s argument is compelling, but it does not effect our work on the Caulites. Even if monastic scholars come to accept Berman’s revised dating of the Cistercian “primitive documents,” this dating still precedes the advent of the Caulites. Hence the Cistercian texts could still influence the Caulite texts, which is the essence of my argument. Whatever the conclusions about Berman’s redating come to be, it is still necessary to cite individual Cistercian “statutes” from Canivez’s edition because of its accessibility to most scholars.

\(^{49}\) Again, this is the traditional dating.

\(^{50}\) Birch, 102; “Continentur in statutis generalis capituli, quod singulis annis semel conveniant omnes priores cenobium qui Dei gratia in diversis sunt constituta locis ad domum Vallis Caulium.” Cf. Canivez, Statuta, 1: 13, prologue: “In carta caritatis inter cetera continentur, quod singulis annis semel conveniant omnes abbates cenobium, que de gratia in diuersis sunt ordinatae provinciis ad cisterciensem ecclesiam.” After this introductory section, the Caulites were entirely innovative in the liturgy they performed for the opening of the general chapters. See Folz, 114.
the Baptist.”\textsuperscript{51} In fact, both texts share the common title “Quod omnia monasteria in honore beate Marie dedicentur;” into which the Caulites have simply inserted “et sancti Johannis Baptistae.”\textsuperscript{52} They also share much of the same language, though reshuffled through the wonders of the inflected Latin language. The Cistercian chapter reads as follows:

“Quia antecessores nostri et patres de ecclesia Molismensi, quae in honore est beatae Mariae ad cisterciensum locum, unde et nos exorti sumus, primitus venerunt, idcirco decernimus ut omnes ecclesiae nostrae ac successorum nostrorum in memoria eiusdem caeli et terrae reginae sanctae Mariae fundentur ac dedicentur.”\textsuperscript{53}

While the Caulite chapter reads as follows:

“Decernimus ut omnes ecclesie nostre ac successorum nostrorum in memoria regine celli et terre beate Marie et sancti Johannes baptiste, fundentur ac dedicentur, quia primus pater et constitutor ordinis nostri de ecclesia Luviniacensi que in honore est beate Marie et sancti Johannes baptiste ad locum Vallis caulium unde et nos exorti sumus primitus venit.”\textsuperscript{54}

The lines in italics reflect borrowings. It should be apparent that, beyond a shuffling of the phrases, only the names of the orders and their churches have been changed. Rather than multiply examples, I again refer the reader to Appendix C, which shows no less than twenty-one instances of Caulite borrowings from the SCG, with dates ranging from (the traditional) 1134 to 1209.

\textsuperscript{51} Cf. Vermeer, “Citeaux-Val des Choux.” 40. Folz, 113, believed this Caulite chapter to be wholly innovative, but the evidence clearly disproves his case.

\textsuperscript{52} The Caulite addition of John the Baptist is further evidence of Carthusian influence; see CG. ch. 23. the novices profession: “Ego frater ille, promitto stabilitatem et obedientiam, et conversionem morum meorum, coram deo et sanctis eius, et reliquis istius heremi, quae constructa est ad honorem dei et beatae semper virginis mariae et beati iohannis baptistae (italics mine).”

\textsuperscript{53} Canivez, Statuta, 1: 17, no. 18.

\textsuperscript{54} Birch, 94.
Conclusion

The relationship of the Caulite customary to the texts from which it borrowed is neither simple nor formulaic. In comparing the Caulite customary with the EO, Vermeer suggested that “les deux textes sont identiques.” Folz argued somewhat more conservatively that “in essence, almost the totality [of the corresponding part of the Caulite customary]... comes from the Officia ecclesiastica of Citeaux.” In reality, the correlation between the two texts is more complex than either of these portrayals. It is not enough to say that the Caulites borrowed the EO, substituted “prior” for “abbot,” excised “grange,” etc., and that was the end of it. Sometimes the Caulites kept the structure of the EO, preserving a chapter’s title but changing its content. For example, the chapter in the Caulite customary entitled, “How the priests and ministers should conduct themselves during festive masses” (Quomodo se agant sacerdos et ministri ad missas festivas), shares the same title and overall structure as chapter 53 in the EO. But because of the liturgical preferences of the Caulites, the contents of the chapter in their customary are completely different than the contents in the corresponding EO chapter.

More importantly than this, we must see the Caulite customary as a Caulite critique of those monastic orders from which they borrowed. Although Vermeer and Folz both noted Caulite emendations to other texts, neither offered an explanation for why those emendations took place. It is my contention that the Caulite adaptation of Cistercian practices indicates an implicit criticism of those practices. So, for example, when the Caulites limited the number of conversi they would have in each community, they were in effect saying to the Cistercians that too many conversi were a bad thing, that could lead to

56 Folz. 101-102.
57 Birch. 35-41. Cf. EO. ch. 53.
financial success and worldliness, and that the Caulites were not going to follow that path. Or perhaps the *conversi* rebellions experienced by the Cistercians and other orders in the last quarter of the twelfth century were still fresh in the Caulite memory, and the restrictions on the number of *conversi* was the Caulite attempt to avoid such rebellions in their own order. At some point the Caulites crossed out in the customary the chapters on *conversi*, perhaps indicating a decision to abandon the institution of lay brotherhood in their order.\(^58\)

We must also see adaptations in the Caulite customary as a critique of the Carthusians, from whose spiritual womb the Caulites had been born. When the monks at Val-des-Choux rejected their Carthusian motherhouse at Lugny, they essentially rejected traditional Carthusianism. The most ready proof of this is their great shift toward Cistercian customs, especially after 1224. In 1257, Pope Alexander IV stated that "the Carthusian order had never been reformed, because it had never been deformed." The consistent practice of the Carthusians was so impressive over time that Pius II repeated this statement in 1460, as did Pius XI in 1924.\(^59\) From a certain point of view, however, the Caulites may present a rebuttal to this papal declaration. When Viard left Lugny circa 1193 to found Val-des-Choux, he did so, according to the foundation legend, in order to lead a stricter life—a life more Carthusian than the Carthusians! By 1224, however, the Caulites regarded Carthusian customs as so severe that they asked Honorius III for permission to mitigate their practices. They did so largely by abandoning Carthusian customs in favor of the RB and numerous Cistercian customs, which the Caulites adapted to their particular monastic vision. Only traces of Carthusian customs—though important ones—remained in the final draft of the Caulite customary.

\(^{58}\) See Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 232, fols. 133r-134v. Chapter 8 discusses the topic of *conversi* further.

All medieval religious in the West were part of an historical process, one which involved refining and redefining (or in the case of the Friars rejecting) Benedictine monasticism. To some extent, monastic orders fixed the results of this process in their customaries, their footnotes to Benedict, or, in the case of the Caulites, footnotes to those footnotes.
CHAPTER 8

ORGANIZATION OF THE CAULITE ORDER

Let all things be done decently, and in order.

—1 Corinthians 14:40

Introduction

Whether medieval monks were directly following Paul’s admonition to the Corinthians, or whether they were somehow orderly by nature, is a question difficult to answer. Studying monastic customaries, it can seem at times as if their authors were obsessed—almost to the point of micro-management—with regulating every aspect of life in their communities.¹ Having discussed the development of the Caulite customary, we can now examine Caulite organization, the order within their Order. This, too, we should rightly view as a process, by which Viard’s loosely banded hermits grew into a structured eremus, and eventually into a fully developed monastic ordo. For example, the earliest documents of the Caulites reveal that they chose priors to head their monasteries, but it is only after the

¹ According to Hallinger, the monastic customary (consuetudo) had five basic functions. It was a work that “in meaning and in fact” (begrifflich und faktisch) stood beside the monastic rule (which for the Caulites meant the Rule of Benedict). The customary was intended as a supplement to and interpretation of the monastic rule. It was at the same time a revision of the rule, as well as the rule’s security (Sicherung). See K. Hallinger, “Consuetudo. Begriff, Formen, Forschungsgeschichte, Inhalt.” in Untersuchungen zu Kloster und Stift, Studien zur Germania Sacra 14. (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1980), 143. On the form of monastic customaries, and the kinds of topics that were regulated, see Hallinger, “Consuetudo,” 147-151.
Caulite adaptation of the *Ecclesiastica officia* that the duties of the prior became more defined—or at least written down. This chapter begins with a discussion of the internal structure of a single Caulite monastery: its priors and other officers; its monks, novices, and lay brothers; its methods for dealing with faults. The chapter then turns to the organization of the Caulite Order as a whole: the relationship of the daughter houses to Val-des-Choux, through a system known as filiation; the monitoring of observance among the filial houses through visitation; and the regulation of the order's observance, through an institution known as the general chapter.

**Internal organization of Caulite monasteries**

One of the most-praised features of the Rule of Benedict (hereafter, RB), is its treatment of the organization within the monastery. For example, that it allowed the abbots of monasteries to choose deans (*decani*), who might share their burden. Some of the offices that the RB discusses include the prior, the cellarer, the infirmarian, the porter, and the novice master. The Caulites certainly adopted all of these offices into the organization of their monasteries when they officially adopted the RB, sometime between 1205 and 1215, but they likely had monks performing the duties of these offices even before then. Those parts of the Caulite customary written before 1205 do not specifically mention all of these offices. For example, neither the *prima institutio* nor Innocent III's confirmation bull mentions an infirmarian. But we should not assume from this that before the adoption of the RB, the Caulite monks did not care for their sick brethren. Keeping this documentary

---

2 RB, ch. 21 concerns the deans of the monastery. See RB, ch. 65 concerning the prior, RB, ch. 31 concerning the cellarer, RB, ch. 36 concerning the infirmarian, RB, ch. 66 concerning the porter, RB, ch. 58 concerning the novice master (though the RB does not call him a novice master, but simply a “senior”).

3 Birch, 91. indicated that eating meat was forbidden at all times to both the healthy and the sick, but made no mention of who cared for the sick. Innocent III (1205) also forbade meat consumption, but did not differentiate between healthy and sick. Neither did Innocent's bull mention an infirmarian.
bias in mind, the following sections will pay special attention to those offices the Caulites did formalize, either before or after their adoption of the RB, the Cistercian *Ecclesiastica officia* (EO), and other customs.

**The Prior**

According to the RB, the head of any monastery was the abbot, from the Greek word, *abba*, meaning “father.” The prior, from the Latin word meaning “the first,” was the abbot’s first officer, who acted in the abbot’s absence, but who also came under the abbot’s authority. Such was the case, for example, among the Cistercians. In contrast, among the Caulites, there were no abbots, only priors. For the Caulites, this was at once a vestige of their Carthusian roots, as well as a critique of Cistercian practice. Hence, after the Caulites adopted the RB, they could not literally have interpreted those parts of the RB that deal with the abbot’s role in the monastery. The Caulite gloss on the RB, found in their adaptation of the Cistercian EO, took this into account—wherever the word “abbot” appeared in the EO, the Caulite customary substituted the word “prior.” Yet, as the highest-ranking officer of the monastery, the Caulite prior took on many of the abbot’s responsibilities. In fact, when the Caulites adapted their description of the prior’s duties

---


5 The term “prior” had different meanings according to the order that used it. According to RB. ch. 65. “Too often in the past, the appointment of priors has been the source of serious contention” due to priors being “puffed up with pride and thinking of themselves as second abbots.” Most of the chapter continues in this negative vein, revealing little of the prior’s actual duties, except that he should “carry out respectfully what his abbot assigns to him.” On the historical development of the prior’s role, see G. Picasso, “Priore. In ambito monastico,” in *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione* 7 (1983): 861. On the role of the prior among the friars, see D. Montagna, “Priore, Tra i Mendicanti,” in *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione* 7 (1983): 862-64.
from the EO, they conflated the Cistercian chapters on the abbot and prior, De abbate and De priore, respectively, into one chapter in the Caulite customary, De priore. Chapter 7 discussed this critical choice in terms of the Caulite desire to run their monasteries on a smaller scale. But substituting “prior” for “abbot,” conflating the two offices into one, also meant that the Caulite prior would have the same powers and responsibilities as—would in essence be equivalent to—his counterpart, the Cistercian abbot.

Innocent III’s bull confirming the Caulite Order tells us that the Caulites elected their prior from among the members of their own community. Once they had adapted the EO for their own purposes, sometime after 1224, the Caulites elected their priors “according to the customs of the Cistercians” (secundum morem Cisterciensium). Of course, this did not mean that the Caulites elected their priors in the same manner that the Cistercians elected their priors—Cistercian priors were appointed by their abbots. Allowing for the substitution of terms, this meant that the Caulites elected their priors in the same manner as the Cistercians elected their abbots. When the abbacy of a Cistercian monastery fell vacant, the abbots of its filial houses came together with the monks of that monastery to

---

6 Innocent III (1205): “Quod inter vos unus monachorum, quem vos, filii monachi, eligit est esse prior.” The issue of how the head of a monastic community was chosen has a long history. RB, ch. 64, provided that monastic communities should elect their own abbots, except where the community chose a candidate who would lead them into vice. In such cases, a bishop or other authorities could step in and appoint an appropriate abbot. For a vivid example of a tumultuous abbatial election in the early thirteenth century, see The chronicle of the election of Hugh, Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds and later Bishop of Elv. ed. and trans. by R. Thomson (Oxford, 1974). During the Carolingian period, most abbots were appointed from the Frankish aristocracy. See J. Décarreaux, Moines et monastères à l’époque de Charlemagne (Paris, 1980). In the early tenth century, Duke William of Aquitaine granted his new foundation at Cluny the right to elect their own abbot, without interference from him or any other outside authority. See M. Pacaut, L’Ordre de Cluny: 909-1789 (Paris, 1986); or B. Rosenwein, Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century (Philadelphia, 1982). The custom of appointing abbots was a main point of contention in the lay investiture struggle. See U. Blumenhal, The Investiture Controversy: Church and Monarchy from the Ninth to the Twelfth Century (Philadelphia, 1988). The Caulites retained the right to elect their own priors until the beginning of the sixteenth century. In 1508 and 1521, the French king appointed two of Val-des-Choux’s priors, while in 1585 and 1606, the pope appointed two more. See Gallia christiana. 4: 744; and Birch, xvi.
help elect its new abbot. Likewise among the Caulites, when the prior of a filial monastery
died, the prior of Val-des-Choux was called upon to nominate a candidate to replace him.
Thus the monks of the filial monastery chose their prior under the guidance of Val-des-
Choux’s prior, who was called the “father prior” (pater prior). When it came to electing
a new prior for Val-des-Choux, the priors who had been sent out from the motherhouse to
found filial monasteries—the priors major—returned, and in concert with the monks of Val-
des-Choux elected a new prior for the motherhouse. In 1267, the Caulites amended the
way in which they elected priors. Henceforth, only the convent of the house in which a
prior was to serve could participate in that prior’s election. This shift in procedure would
seem to indicate that the filial priories were seeking more autonomy from the motherhouse,
or perhaps from the order as a whole.

The head of any monastic community wore many hats, and this was no less true
among the Caulites. Once they had adapted the Cistercian EO in 1224, the role of the
Caulite prior became a fusion of Cistercian abbot and prior. But even before their
adaptation of Cistercian customs, the Caulites revealed their concern with the prior’s many
duties. From the sixty-four miscellaneous rules (see Chapter 7), we know that the prior
checked each monks’ asceticism by inspecting their cells twice a year, to make sure that no

---

7 Lawrence, 188.

8 Birch, 82: “Quem cum obire contigerit, eligant sibi priorem monachi. secundum morem Cisterciensium
hoc modo. Vocetur prior de Valle Caulium. et quos ipse prescri[pl]serit convocentur. Ad arbitrium patris
prioris. monachi eligant sibi priorem.”

9 Birch, 82: “[Manuscript M reads:] Statutum est quod prioratus ordinis Vallis Caulium ad nominationem
prioris majoris sunt. [Then in both manuscripts:] In domo autem Vallis Caulium quia mater est omnium
[nostrum] presentes priores qui de domo Vallis Caulium exierint. et monachi ejusdem domus simul priorem
eligant.” The priors major were the priors of Val-des-Choux’s eldest filial houses, i.e., those filial priories
that had filial houses of their own, e.g., Val-Croissant, which was a motherhouse to Val-Saint-Benoît and
Uchon. The priors of these filial houses had powers analogous to the priors of the eldest daughters of
Citeaux. The section on filiation, below, discusses priors major further.

10 Birch, 116, statutes of 1267: “Statutum est in nostro generali capitulo, quod nullus eligatur prior nisi a
conventu proprie domus in qua debet fieri prior et in eadem domo.”
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one was secretly hoarding private property.\textsuperscript{11} We know that the Caulite prior was an authoritarian figure, against whom no monk could lodge a complaint.\textsuperscript{12} Any monk who disobeyed the prior was punished by having to eat on the floor of the refectory, losing his wine allotment, and if he persisted in his disobedience the punishment would continue until the prior released him.\textsuperscript{13} Disobedience must at times have been expressed through violent blows, for the statutes of 1238 provided that anyone who struck his prior in anger was to be expelled from his monastery.\textsuperscript{14} Yet, the prior was to be as humble as the monks he led. Innocent III’s bull tells that the prior wore the same clothes and ate the same food as the monks in his charge.\textsuperscript{15} And the prior’s powers were not absolute. The customary often required him to consult the community before making decisions, especially where money was concerned.\textsuperscript{16} The prior was the spiritual father of his monastery. He was not the only priest in the Caulite community, but only he, the prior, was to give blessings to that community’s members.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{11} Birch, 106: “Unusquisque prior cellas monachorum suorum in anno bis ad minus scrutetur.”

\textsuperscript{12} Birch, 103: “Nullus monachus ordinis nostri priorem suum appellare potest [nisi ad ordinem].” The phrase “nisi ad ordinem,” added later, means “except according to regulations;” see Niermeyer, 745, “ordo,” def. 3. The addition of this phrase must have indicated a desire at some point in Caulite history to place a check on the prior’s power. Hence, Caulites monks could not lodge complaints against their prior capriciously, but could do so only according to procedures laid down in the customary. Unfortunately, the customary does not indicate what those procedure might have been.

\textsuperscript{13} Birch, 103: “Monachus qui inobediens fuerit priori suo in refectorio ad terram comedet semel super vestimentum suum ablata ei portione sua vini, quod si denuo inobediens fuerit, in predicta penitentia permaneat, donec prior dicit sufficit.”

\textsuperscript{14} Birch, 108, statutes of 1238: “Item qui percusserit priorem suum cum ira de domo sua propria expellatur.”

\textsuperscript{15} Innocent III (1205): “Prior vobiscum in eodem refectorio comedit, simili cibo et vesti contentus.”

\textsuperscript{16} See for example, Birch, 108, statutes of 1238: “Item nulli priori liceat dare non indigentibus munera vel exenia ultra valorem dimidie marche nisi conventu consentiente. Item prior aliquis mutuo non accipient ultra XLa solidos nisi conventu consentiente.”

\textsuperscript{17} Birch 105: “Prior det omnes benedictiones.”
Like the heads of other monasteries, Caulite priors were the main representatives of their communities in dealings with the outside world. For this reason, their names often appear in charters recording donations, sales or transfers of properties. For example, Humbert, second prior of Val-des-Choux, ceded certain rights and properties in Louesme and Vanvey to the Cistercian monastery of Longuay.\textsuperscript{18} Renaud, fifth prior of Val-des-Choux, appears in two charters dated 1255, the first concerning the gift of a vineyard, the second concerning a grain purchase.\textsuperscript{19} The priors of the motherhouse at Val-des-Choux also represented the entire Caulite Order. Hence we see John, fourth prior of Val-des-Choux, in charters dated 1244 and 1246, in dealings concerning the filial priory of Clairlieu.\textsuperscript{20} Renaud, above, appears in a charter dated 1251 concerning the filial priory of Vauclair.\textsuperscript{21} Laurent, the last prior of Val-des-Choux during the thirteenth century, appears in a charter dated 1293 concerning the filial priory of Petit-Saint-Lieu.\textsuperscript{22} Caulite priors also represented their monasteries in disputes with parties outside the monastery. Thus Renaud, again, appeared in a charter of 1261 concerning discord between Val-des-Choux and the church of Saint Bartholomew at Vanvey.\textsuperscript{23} Renaud’s successor, Gauthier, appears in a charter of 1271 in a dispute between the Caulites and a local curate over tithes in the town of Saint-Germain.\textsuperscript{24}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[18]{Chaumont. AD de la Haute-Marne. 6 H 2, fol. 133r-v.}
\footnotetext[19]{Concerning the vineyard, see Yzeure. AD de l'Allier. H 259. Concerning the grain purchase, see Yzeure. AD de l'Allier. H 242.}
\footnotetext[20]{Paris, BN, ms. lat. 5993 A, fol. 414r-v.}
\footnotetext[21]{Yzeure, AD de l'Allier. H 326.}
\footnotetext[22]{Dijon. AD de la Côte d'Or. 65 H 997.}
\footnotetext[23]{Yzeure, AD de l'Allier. H 285.}
\footnotetext[24]{Dijon, Côte d'Or. 18 H cart 205. fol. 75r-v.}
\end{footnotes}
Like their counterparts in other monasteries, Caulite priors were important players in the world outside their communities. They were frequently called upon to witness and "make known" (notum facere) the transactions of third parties. For example, in 1232, another prior of Val-des-Choux named Humbert witnessed the will of Nicholette of Magny, one of the founders of the Caulite priory of Petit-Saint-Lieu. In 1241, he witnessed the acquisition of land made by the Templars of Epailly, and in 1243, the sale of land to the abbey of Pothières. Manasser, third prior of Val-des-Choux, appears in a charter dated 1236 as the executor of the will of Hugh, bishop of Langres. Gauthier, above, also witnessed two charters concerning the acquisition of land by the ducal family. One of these,

25 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 112 H 1206.

26 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 111 H 1185.

27 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 9 H 122.

28 See Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or 1 F 433, fol. 145; Gallia christiana, 4: 742-743.
dated 1270, involved the duke himself. The other, dated 1269, involved the duke’s son Robert. Finally, Laurent, above, witnessed an exchange between the duke of Burgundy and the prior of Magny-sur-Tille in a charter dated 1292. This charter has the seal of the Caulite prior still attached. (See Figure 7.1.) The seal is cast in green wax, is mandorla-shaped, and measures 45 x 28 mm. It depicts a small, two-story gothic building. In the top floor of the building is the Virgin Mary, seated on a bench, wearing a crown, with the infant Jesus on her left knee. Below her, kneeling and facing to the left, is a praying monk. The entire image seems to be a clear reference to the Caulite practice of dedicating their churches to the Virgin Mary. The inscription reads “SIGILL’ PRIORIS VALLIS CAVLIVM,” i.e., the seal of the prior of Val-des-Choux. The prior’s seal was one of the signs of his power, with which he confirmed transactions in the name of the monastery.

Caulite priors were also active as mediators in the disputes of others. Thus the authors of the Gallia Christiana tell us that Humbert I, above, mediated a dispute in 1220 between the monks of Beaulieu and the prior of Failo. During their general chapter of 1238, the Caulites tried to limit their priors’ involvement in the world. They mandated that no prior be an arbiter or advocate or guardian in secular causes, except for the purposes of bringing about peace. The specificity of “secular causes” shows the Caulites’ on-going

29 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or, B 1380.
30 Peincédé. 1: 194.
31 Dijon. AD de la Côte d’Or B 1298. The seal is published in A. Coulon. Inventaire des sceaux de la Bourgogne (Paris, 1912), 277, no. 1529, and plate LIX.
33 Gallia Christiana, 4: 742-743: “Humbertus anno 1220 fuit sequester concordiae inter monachos Bellilocensis et priorem de Failo.”
34 Birch. 108. statutes of 1238: “Constitutum est in nostro generali capitulo ut nullus prior in causis secularium arbiter sit vel advocatus aut tutor, nec in talibus occupetur nisi ad bonum pacis tractandum.”
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struggle to avoid involvement in the world outside the monastery. Yet in 1239, the prior of Vausse arbitrated a dispute between the monastery of Moutier-Saint-Jean and Andrew of Rochefort, concerning the mill at Saint-Jean.\footnote{See Reomaus, seu historia monasterii Sancti Joannis Remoensis a Petro Roverio (Paris. 1637), 262: cited in Petit, “Vausse,” 62.} And again in 1242, Vausse’s prior negotiated a dispute between the lord of Savoisy, and the monks of the abbey of Puits-d’Orbe concerning the woods of La-Bouchaille.\footnote{See Petit. Charte, 103, no. 351.} Whether these mediating actions fell within the bounds of the statute of 1238, i.e., that the prior’s sole purpose was to bring about peace, is difficult to say.

Usually a prior served in his office till death, but priors sometimes relinquished their offices or were even deposed. Following the Cistercian custom, Caulite priors who left their monasteries or relinquished their offices returned to the rank they held upon entering the monastery. This was in keeping with Benedict’s ideal of maintaining stability in the monastic community.\footnote{Birch, 95: “Priores qui domus suas vel prioratus suos relinquunt, in ordinem conversionis sue redeant.” Cf. Canivez. Statuta. 1: 30, no. 75: “Abbatas qui abbatias suas relinquunt, in ordinem conversionis suae redeant.” See RB, ch. 1, for Benedict’s critique of the “gyrovagues,” wandering monks who showed no stability; and ch. 58, which tells how novices, once accepted into the community were never to leave the monastery. For Benedict’s treatment of rank in the monastery, see RB, ch. 63: “Monks keep their rank in the monastery according to the date of their entry, the virtue of their lives, and the decision of the abbot.”}

The Sub-Prior

As the name implies, the sub-prior was the second in command to the prior. The prior chose the sub-prior for the office. The chapter in the Caulite customary concerning the sub-prior provides a good example of the Caulites following the basic structure of the
Cistercian EO, but radically changing its content. According to the Caulite customary, the sub-prior had several duties to perform in the absence of the prior. He was to perform the weekly invitatory, but was not to read at chapter or collation. He was to beat the tabula and lead the monks to work. He could speak with the infirm just as the prior did, and hear confessions. In fact he could act as the prior in all things, except that he was not to occupy his place in the church. There were restrictions on the sub-prior’s liturgical and administrative duties. He was forbidden from chanting solemn masses and from blessing candles and palms and fires. He was not to anoint the sick or bury the dead. He was neither to accuse nor absolve anyone of grave faults. He was not to banish monks from the monastery, nor to accept novices, unless the prior commanded him to do so. He was not to hear criminal confessions unless out of dire need. In the absence of the prior, the sub-prior could bless certain readings, and in church he could say the Pater noster, begin the Te Deum, and read the Gospel readings. When the prior returned from a voyage, while eating with his servants, the sub-prior was allowed to talk with him, both inside and outside the monastery—probably as a way of catching up on important matters. Once the prior was back, however, the sub-prior was not to presume to have rights or privileges beyond those of any other monk. In contrast, a Cistercian sub-prior did not have nearly as much liturgical or administrative responsibility. This makes sense, since with a prior and abbot above him.

38 Birch. 82: “Subprior ebdomadam invitatorii debet facere, nec tamen cum prior absens fuerit in capitulo legere nec ad collationem. Tabulam ad laborem pulsare cum prior defuerit, et frates ad laborem ducere ... Si in infirmatorio fuerit, loqui potest sicut prior, deficiente priori ... Confessiones si priori visum fuerit, recipiat. Decetero presente priore et absente intus et foris de omnibus et in omnibus voluntate prioris se agat, excepto quod locum ejus in ecclesia non occupabit. nec missas sollemnes pro eo non cantabit. nec candelas, nec ramos, nec ignem benedicet. Infirmissum non unget. mortuum non sepeliet. Nullum in gravem mittet culpam, aut inde absolvet. Monachum de monasterio non etit [sic]. novitium non recipiet. nisi prior jussisset, nec confessionem de criminalibus peccatis nisi in extremis positi recipiet. Liceat ei benedictiones legentibus dare, scilicet in ecclesia, in capitulo, in refectorio, et ad collationem absente priore. Liceat etiam ei in ecclesia pater noster dicere, te Deum laudamus incipere, et lectionem de euaangelio legere. Si quando prior de via regressus cum servitoribus comediet interim intus et foris loqui poterit. Presente priore nichil plus ceteris presumat.” Cf. EO, ch. 112. Only the following lines had any direct influence: “Si quando prior de via regressus cum servitoribus comedet, interim intus et foris loqui poterit. Si in infirmario fuerit, nichil plus ceteris presumat.”
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the Cistercian sub-prior was that much further from the top of the monastery’s hierarchy. Some time around 1244, certain Caulite sub-priors may have been trying to re-write their job descriptions. In that year, the statutes of the Caulite general chapter reassert that the sub-prior was to perform his office “just as it is contained in the chapter concerning the office of the sub-prior.” It is difficult to determine whether the sub-priors were vying for more power, or if they were somehow not meeting the standards set for them in the customary. Of the hundreds of charters and other documents concerning the Caulite Order, only one preserves the name of one of its sub-priors. This happened in 1262, when the sub-prior, Thibaut, asked the bishop to approve the election of Henry as the new prior of the monks at Val-des-Choux.

Following the chapter concerning the sub-prior, the Caulite customary continued to follow the structure of the Cistercian EO, containing chapters that outlined the duties of novice master, sacristan, cantor, infirmarian, cellarer, and refectorer.

The Novice Master

According to the RB, the novice master should be “a senior chosen for his skill in winning souls, [who will] look after [the novices] with careful attention.” The task of the novice master was to train candidates in the customs of the monastery, in preparation for


their monastic profession. The redactors of the Caulite customary borrowed the chapter concerning the novice master almost verbatim from the EO. The major difference between the two dealt with a transitional period after which the novice had made his profession. During this period, the candidate was no longer a novice, but was still new to being a monk. For this reason, both Cistercians and Caulites allowed the relationship between novice master and student to continue for a certain prescribed time. In essence, they were allowed to converse at times or places when custom normally forbade talking. Among the Cistercians this was two months. The Caulites reduced this to three weeks. The shorter transitional period could indicate that the Caulites perceived their way of life as less complex than that of the Cistercians, hence their new monks did not need such a long transitional period.

The Sacristan

The charge of any monastery’s sacristan was the physical care of its church and cloister, its buildings, relics, liturgical vessels and vestments, and the books that monks used in the choir. He was also responsible for keeping time in the monastery, and for ringing the bell that called the monks to work or prayer. The duties of the Caulite sacristan came almost entirely from the Cistercian EO, though the Caulites did append several lines not present in the edition of the EO used in this work. These additional lines concerned a series

42 Birch, 83: “Deinde per tres ebdomadas in cella sua ... cum eo loqui.” Cf. EO. ch. 113: “Deinde per duos menses in auditorio iuxta capitulum ... cum eo loqui.”


44 Birch, 83-84: “Sacrista debet horologium temperare et ipsum ant[el] [laure] des in hyeme privatis diebus nisi dies fuerit sonare, et ante vigilias ad se excitandum cotidie et etiam ad significandum quando redeundum est de labore.” Cf. EO. ch. 114. In RB, ch. 47, the abbot was supposed to announce the time for the work of God, or to assign a careful brother for this task. On keeping time in the monastery, see Moulin, *La vie quotidienne des religieux*, 57-59.
of the sacristan’s extra duties: the lighting of candles in the church after dark; the preparation of the salt and water on Sundays; the preparation of books for the readers at table and collation; the preparation of chalices, vestments, and other sacred objects for private masses; the retrieving of books that had been borrowed; and the supply of provisions for processions. In both the Caulite and Cistercian traditions, the sacristan was given a helper (solatio) to perform these tasks.

The Cantor

The main duties of the cantor and sub-cantor was to intone the hymns and psalms, and to lead the communal chant during the liturgical offices. The cantor required an assistant because the monastic choir was divided into two halves, and the monks in each half needed someone to lead them. The chapter concerning the cantor in the Caulite customary begins as does its analog in the EO. There were only minor differences between the two chapters. For example, the Caulite cantor began the verse before and after eating, and the blessing during the biberes, a drink the monks shared in the evening after Vespers. The

---


46 See Moulin, La vie quotidienne des religieux, 215-216.
Cistercian cantor only began these verses when the abbot was busy doing his week of masses.⁴⁷

The Infirmarian

The RB mandated that monastic communities should isolate their infirm members, and a “God-fearing, diligent, and assiduous” infirmarian appointed to their care.⁴⁸ Among the Cistercians, and eventually the Caulites, this care of the infirm came to include visiting them every morning to chant Matins with them. Most of the Caulite infirmarian’s duties derived from those of his Cistercian counterpart. One minor difference involved the use of books in the infirmary. Both Caulite and Cistercian infirmarians were directed to bring the appropriate books for Matins from the church and then to put them back in the church when they were done.⁴⁹ But the EO seemed to indicate that other books might be found in the infirmary, which the infirmarian was to replace in the armoire (armarium) before the office of Complines, at the end of the day. The Cistercian infirmarian was also specifically instructed not to read while on duty in the infirmary.⁵⁰ Neither of these provisions appeared in the Caulite customary.

---

⁴⁷ Birch. 87: “[Cantor] debet etiam versum ante cibum et post cibum … et ad biberes benedicite incipere.” Cf. EO, ch. 115, which does not contain the above provision, but: “Cum abbas ebdomadam de missis fecerit. [cantor] in refectorio versus et benedictiones pro eo dicere.” Concerning the bibere after Vespers, EO. ch. 80, says that the community said the blessing, but not that the cantor started it.

⁴⁸ RB, ch. 36: “Quibus fratribus infirmis sit cella super se deputata, et servitor timens Deum et diligens ac sollicitus.” See Moulin, La vie quotidienne des religieux. 217-220.

⁴⁹ Birch. 87: “Ad matutinos … libros ad hoc necessarios ferre de ecclesia si necesse est et referre.” Cf. EO, ch. 116.

⁵⁰ EO, ch. 115: “Libros qui in infirmitorio fuerint, ante completorium in armarium reportare … Legere ibi non debet.”
The Cellarer

The worldly goods of the monastery came under the care of the cellarer. This was a position of great power and responsibility. According to the RB, the cellarer should be "wise, mature, sober, not a gross eater, not carried away by pride, not a trouble maker, not scornful, not sluggish, not a spendthrift, but God-fearing." An early Caulite statute—one of the last of the sixty-four miscellaneous rules—reflected the spirit of the RB. It stated that the cellarer should eat and drink the same as the prior, and everyone else in the community, i.e., the cellarer's access to the food supply did not give him special privileges. The Caulites adopted most of the duties of their cellarer from the EO, for example, that the cellarer could talk with anyone except monks and novices of their own order. The rule of silence should not be broken with members of the community, but clearly this would be necessary if the cellarer was to conduct the monastery's business with others. But there were notable differences between the cellarer's duties expressed in the Caulite customary and those in the EO. Interestingly, since the Caulites were an order attempting to live from rents, these differences all centered on money. For example, the Caulites required their cellarer to render accounts four times a year; and he was not to lend more than five sols without the consent of the prior.

---

51 See Moulin, La vie quotidienne des religieux, 213-214.
52 RB, ch. 31.
53 Birch, 107: "Cum priores et cellerarii totius ordinis nostri eodem cibo et potu quo et conventus vivant."
54 Birch, 88: "Cellerarius potest loqui cum omnibus, exceptis monachis et novitiis nostri ordinis." Cf. EO, ch. 117.
55 Birch, 88: "Quater in anno computet coram priore vel pluries si prior voluerit presente monachorum aliquo:" 106: "Cellerarius non accommodat ultra quinque solidos sine consensu proprii prioris."
The fact that Caulite charters preserve the names of three of the cellerers at Val-des-Choux is proof of the importance of the cellarer’s office. In 1270, a cellarer named brother Laurent was invested with the authority to act in the name of the prior and the monastery, as was brother Anceline, the cellarer in 1281. A charter dated 1294 names the cellarer at Val-des-Choux as an important witness in a trial that came before the court of the duchess of Burgundy.

The Refectorer

The refectorer was in charge of the monastery’s dining hall, its refectory. The office of refectorer was different from the weekly kitchenerers (septimanarii coquinae) discussed in the RB, in that it was a more permanent position. The Caulites drew many of their refectorer’s duties from the EO. For example, both Cistercian and Caulite refectorers placed the napkins, spoons, bread, and wine or cider on the table at meals. But among the Caulites, the refectorer seemed to work more closely with the cellarer, and even to take on some of his duties in the cellarer’s absence. The refectorer was to take care, however, not to do anything against the wishes of the cellarer, except with the prior’s permission. The refectorer was also to maintain silence, just as any other member of the community, unless

56 For Laurent, see Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 272: “Fratrem Laurentium cellararium Vallis cauillum nomine ecclesie Vallis cauillum corporaliter investierunt ....” For Anceline, see Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258: “Fratrem Ancelinum, cellerarium Vallis cauillum ... nomine dictorum prioris et conventus Vallis cauillum ...”

57 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 245: “Nos Beatryz, jadis fame de noble baron Hugue, duc de Burgogne, faisions savoir ... que cum Gautiers, diz le Riches d’Eignay, deit et proposast en jugement pardevant noz al de contre relieux homes, le priour et le covent dou Vaul des Chois .... li priors et li celeriers procureur de ladite yglise [etc.]”

58 See RB, ch. 35.

he found himself conducting official business outside the bounds of the monastery.\textsuperscript{60} Because the refectorer's job directly affected the entire community, he was at times excused—as were the cellarer, the infirmarian, and the prior—from certain liturgical obligations.\textsuperscript{61}

The Porter and the Guest Brother

The Caulite customary follows the chapter on the refectorer with a chapter concerning the verse said at the mealtime (\textit{De versa refectionis}). But the EO follows this chapter with two more chapters concerning officers of the monastery, namely the porter and the guest brother. The porter's charge was to guard the gates of the monastery. He fed passing travelers, turned away less serious candidates for the novitiate, and welcomed pilgrims and guests.\textsuperscript{62} The guest brother (\textit{monachus hospitalis}) was to care for the needs of these guests after they had been given entrance to the monastery's guesthouse.\textsuperscript{63} Even though the Caulite customary did not include these two chapters from the EO, the Caulites must have had someone in their communities to fulfill these duties. In fact, we know that they had a porter because another section of the customary, adopted verbatim from the EO,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{60}Birch, 89: “Si cellerarius defuerit, officium illius peragat. Caveat autem omnino ne quicquam contra voluntatem cellerarii sine jussu prioris faciat, sed de omnibus eum consulat et ad consilium ejus distribuat. Silentium sicut ceteri teneat, nec terminos exteriorese exeat. ubi ipse et cell[er]arius in monasterio simul fuerint nisi prior iussit.”
  
  \item \textsuperscript{61}Birch, 104: “Qui ad benedictionem collationis defuerit, similiter qui ad orationem que dicitur ante horas in stallo suo non fuerit, in capitulo veniam petat excepto cellerario et refectorario et infirmario et priori nisi quando \textit{credo} dicitur.”
  
  \item \textsuperscript{62}See RB, ch. 53, 58, 66; EO, ch. 120. Moulin, \textit{La vie quotidienne des religieux}, 223, suggested that, in general, at a certain point in monastic history, the office of porter always came to be held by a layman, that he held that post for life, and that the position became hereditary. There is no indication one way or the other that this was the case for the Caulites.
  
  \item \textsuperscript{63}See RB, ch. 53; EO, ch. 119; Moulin, \textit{La vie quotidienne des religieux}, 220-22. Chapter 9 discusses the Caulite guesthouse and the kinds of guests that might have stayed there.
\end{itemize}
discusses one of his duties. During Maundy Thursday, the celebration of the Last Supper, the porter, or someone else the prior chose, was to select as many poor from outside the monastery as there were monks within. The poor were led into the cloister, where the monks would wash their feet, in imitation of Christ washing the feet of his disciples in the Gospel of John, 13:1-20. It seems that the Caulites did not have a guest brother, per se, but that the cellarer performed many of his duties. A chapter in the customary concerning the reception of guests (De hospitibus susciplendi) shares the same title as a chapter in the EO, but its content is different. The EO chapter has the porter taking initial responsibility for guests, while among the Caulites this responsibility fell to the cellarer. According to the Caulite customary, guests were to be received “with attentiveness and care, because in receiving them Christ is received”—a sentiment that echoes the RB.

The Other Monks

With only thirteen monks in the monastery, and nine of them carrying out some official office, this leaves, at most, only four monks qua monks. This does not mean that the remaining monks had no special duties in the monastery, or that the monks who carried out long-term duties—such as the prior or cellarer—did not also take on short-term duties. Although the customary is not explicit on this matter, such had to be the case in so small a community. Some of the short-term duties outlined in the customary rotated on a weekly

---

64 Birch, 14: “Post sextam horam portarius vel cui prior jussit, tot pauperes eligat quot sunt monachi in monasterio [etc.]” Cf. EO, ch. 21.

65 Birch, 62: “Hospites in domum Dei advenientes susciplendi sunt cum diligentia et caritate, quia in ipsis quandoque Christus suscipitur. Cellerarius sciat se eis necessaria preparare et adhibere in quantum poterit humanitatem juxta uniuscujusque personam modum et dignitatem.” Cf. EO. Ch. 87. See RB, ch. 53: “Omnes supervenientes hospites tamquam Christus suscipiantur.” The core of this idea is from the Gospel of Matthew. 25: 35.

66 Recall from Innocent III’s bull of 1205 that Caulite custom limited every monastery of their order to twenty, monks and lay brothers combined. The number of monks was probably thirteen, one prior and twelve others, after the Carthusian model, in imitation of Christ and the twelve disciples.
basis, and hence were called hebdomadary offices. One of these was the reader of the week 
*ebdomadarius lector*, a position also found in the RB. The reader of the week read to the 
monks—from the Rule or other edifying texts—as they dined. Another position found in 
the RB was that of the weekly kitchen servers. Benedict believed that the brothers should 
serve one another, as an exercise in Christian humility. Among the Cistercians and Caulites, 
this position evolved into at least two weekly kitchen servers (*ebdomadarii coquine*). One 
of these would always mind the ovens, so that the other could attend services—hence 
assuring that the community would eat according to schedule without sacrificing the 
spiritual welfare of the cooks. Some of the hebdomadaries had more liturgical duties, for 
example, the weekly chanter for the invitatory (*ebdomadarius invitatiorii*), or the priest of the 
week (*ebdomadarius sacerdos*). The Caulites borrowed all of these hebdomadary offices 
almost verbatim from the Cistercian EO. Interestingly, in that same section of the EO, the 
Caulites chose not to borrow customs concerning the servers in church (*servitor ecclesie*), 
or the weekly washers of guests’ feet (*ebdomadarii ad mandatum hospitum*), both found 
among the Cistercians. This may have had to do with the small number of monks in 
Caulite communities—too few to take on these extra tasks—or it may possibly have been a 
liturgical choice. The Caulites also did not adopt the practice of having a separate cook for 
their priors, although the Cistercians did so for their abbots. The Caulite prior did not 
need a separate cook because—as per Innocent III’s bull of 1205—he ate the same food 
and at the same table as the other brothers.


68 Birch, 78-79. Cf. EO, chs. 103 and 104.

69 See EO, chs. 105 and 107.

70 See EO, ch. 109: “De cocis abbatis.”
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The Novices

To become a monk, one first had to become a novice. Benedict’s Rule outlines the procedure for accepting novices into the monastery. Yet, even before adopting the RB, the Caulites anticipated dealing with novices in their order. For example, from Innocent III’s bull of 1205, we learn that Caulite monasteries had a novitiate, or probationary period, that was to last one year. The chapter in the Caulite customary concerning novices (De novitiis) derives almost verbatim from the EO. A person hoping to enter the novitiate was brought into the chapter house to make his request, but only after having waited for four days. The prior asked him what he desired, to which the prospective novice replied, “God’s mercy, and yours.” The prior then questioned him on his intentions, to see if he was prepared to submit himself to the authority of the prior and the Rule. If the prospective novice agreed, then the prior announced, “what has begun in you, let God complete.” The community responded, “Amen,” and the prospective novice returned to the guesthouse. The community and the candidate repeated this ritual three times. After the third time, if he had survived the prior’s scrutiny, the candidate’s novitiate began. This same chapter of


72 Innocent III (1205): “Erunt novitii vestri in probatione per annum.” Cf. RB, ch. 58, which prescribes that the Rule be read to novices two months after their entry to the novitiate, then again after another six months have passed, then again after another four months. After a novitiate totaling twelve months, the novice may then be accepted into the community.

73 Birch, 76: “Monachus quis fieri volens facta petitione, post quatuor dies intret capitulum. quo dum adductus fuerit prosternatur ante analogium. Interrogatus a priore quid querat, respondet misericordiam Dei et vestram. Cui ad jussum prioris erecto proponat prior asperitatem ordinis voluntatem ejus exquirens. Quod si responderit se velle cuncta servare ... subjungat prior Qui cepit in te Deus ipse perficiat. Responso amen, inclinet et discedat. Eodem modo faciat quociens post lectam regulam misericordiam petit in
the Caulite customary on novices also borrowed from Carthusian customs. For example, it provides that an elder monk go to the novice's cell to instruct him at certain hours, and that a day be fixed on which the novice be accepted as a full-fledged member of the community, on which day he would dispose of or bequeath any property he might still possess.\(^{74}\)

Once accepted into the novitiate, the real training began. Most of this training took place under the guidance of the novice master (see above), who instructed novices in the Rule of Benedict. Sometimes other monks might be assigned to read the Rule to novices, but monks were forbidden from engaging a novice in conversation for any other reason if the novice master was not present.\(^{75}\) The prior could send a monk to console a novice who was having doubts.\(^{76}\) It was important for novices to understand and appreciate their rank in the community. According to the RB, rank in the community was based on the date of entry into monastery, a monk's merit of life, and the abbot's judgment.\(^{77}\) The position of

\[^{74}\] Birch. 76: "Deputetur ei senior qui eum instruat loquens cum eo in cella ejus novitii. horis opportunos." Cf. CG. ch. 22: "Cui in cellam introducto. seniorum aliquis deputatur. qui eum ... horas competentibus vistans. de necessarius instruat." Also Birch. 76: "Cum autem tempus benedictionis institerit. vocatus in capitulo si probabilis apparuerit et obedience et perseveratie sue pretiterit argumentum. quid de rebus suis. si quas habet. fieri debeat. disponat. et dies ei faciende professionis certus assignet." Cf. CG. ch. 22: "Cum autem tempus quo benedici debeat institerit. si probabilis apparuerit. et in petendo misericordiam sedulius fuerit. dies ei quo si perseveraverit in totum susci pi debet certus constituetur."

\[^{75}\] Birch. 68: "Si autem novitii in domo fuerint. loqui non debent nisi magister eorum presens fuerit ... Monachus tamen qui novitii legit regulam. loqui potest cum eis sine magistro suo."

\[^{76}\] Birch. 103: "Prior potest mittere monachum ad novitium turbatum et consolandum."

\[^{77}\] RB. ch. 63 deals with the subject of rank in the monastery. RB. ch. 62, addresses the topic of priests entering the monastery, and states that their priesthood should not give them special privileges, but that the date of their entry into the monastery should determine their rank in the community.
novices in processions or other liturgical events reinforced their rank in the community. For example, during Candlemas (the purification of the Blessed Mary, 2 February), the sacristan distributed candles to members of the monastic community according to their rank: monks and novices, then lay brothers, then guests.78

After a year had passed, and the novice was ready to make his solemn profession to the community, he did so according to the Rule of Benedict.79 This meant that the novice promised stability, conversion of his ways, and obedience before God and the saints. He made a written petition of this promise in the name of the saints whose relics were present in the church, and in the name of the prior. He was to write this promise in his own hand, but if he was illiterate, then another monk, most likely the novice master, would write it for him, and the novice put his mark on it. He placed this note on the altar himself, then prostrated himself in front of each member of the community so that they might pray for him. He was then stripped of his own clothes and dressed in the habit of the monastery. From this day forward he was considered one of the community.80 The Cautite oath of profession echoes many of these points, and is remarkably similar to the Carthusian oath of profession:

I, brother such-and-such, priest or deacon or cleric or layman, promise my stability and conversion of ways and obedience according to the Rule of the holy Benedict and apostolic confirmation in the presence of God and the blessed martyrs whose relics are had here, and all the saints in this place called Val-Croissant, constructed in honor of Mary, most blessed mother of God and ever virgin, and of the holy John the Baptist, in the presence of our lord prior.81

78 Birch. 31: “Interim sacrista reliquas candelas monachis et novitiis ac conversis laicis familie etiam atque hospitibus. si fuerint, distribuât.” Cf. EO. ch. 47.

79 Birch. 104: “Professiones amodo liant in ordine nostro secundum regulam beati Benedicti.”

80 See RB. ch. 58.

As seen in the oath of profession, Caulites novices might at times be priests or deacons or clerics, in addition to being laymen. Because the Caulites kept their communities small in number, they often must have found themselves wanting for priests to serve their liturgical needs. For this reason, the Caulites allowed previously ordained priests or deacons entering their novitiate to perform their offices even before their novitiate had ended.® This special duty was not to upset the rank in the monastery.®

It was not always necessary to go through the novitiate to join a Caulite monastery. Recall from Chapter 7 that the Caulites accepted monks already following the Rule of Benedict.® Yet, the Caulites did set certain restrictions concerning whom they would admit into their communities. For example, they did not allow monks to be accepted into the Caulite Order unless they were free to do so, i.e., they were not still members of some other monastery.® The Caulites did not accept anchorites into their order, for although they were essentially eremitic in their practice, their life had too many communal aspects to support the presence of total solitaries.®

---

heremi. quae constructa est ad honorem Dei et beatae semper virginis Marie, et sancti Iohannis Baptistae in presentia domni illius prioris.

® Birch, 107: “Propter paucitatem personarum constituim us ut novitii ad ordinem nostrum venientes et ad ordinem sacerdotii vel diaconatus vel subdiaconatus ordinati offitio suo fungantur infra annum novitiatus sui pro dispositione et voluntate prioris.”

®® RB. ch. 60. provided that any priest entering the monastery should “give everyone an example of humility,” and “take the place that corresponds to the date of his entry into the community.”

® Birch, 94: “Magnopere nobis omnibus cavendum est ne aliqui sine regulari probatione aliquo modo collegio nostro sotientur, exceptis monachis quos beatus suscipit Benedictus.”

®® Birch, 106: “Nulli monacho Cisterciensi vel Cartusiensi vel cujuslibet ordinis tribuatur habitus nostro nisi absoluto nec in habitu suo morari possit nobiscum ultra tres ebdomadas.”

®®® Birch, 107: “Statuimus per generale capitulum ne alicui priorum ordinis nostri liceat alicuem solitarium recipere vel habere sub cura sua, nec alicui solitario permittatur portare vel habere habitum nostrum.”
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The Lay Brothers

While the primary role of monks in any monastery was spiritual, the role of a monastery’s lay brothers, also called conversi, was temporal. These lay brothers maintained the physical plant of the monastery, interacted with the outside world, and acted as a buffer between that world and the monks. Among the Caulites, for example, a charter dated 1274 records the name of a conversus, Lambert, acting in the name of the monastery during a land sale. Lay brothers were often less formally educated, and always performed a simpler liturgy than the monks. Among the Caulites for example, conversi repeated the Lord’s Prayer again and again. The conversi also held a specific, lower rank in the monastery, which their place in processions and other liturgical events clearly expressed.

For example, among both Caulites and Cistercians, the adoration of the cross on Good

87 Research into the institution of conversi has a long tradition. Not surprisingly, scholars have developed several different theories for how and why the institution developed. K. Hallinger, “Woher kommen die Laienbrüder?” Analecta sacri ordinis cisterciensis 12 (1956): 24 ff. believed that lay servants yearned for a religious life similar to that led by the monks they served. Over the course of centuries, according to Hallinger, the institution of lay brotherhood evolved, with the intent of giving these lay servants an outlet for religious expression. Not all scholars interpreted the evolution of lay brotherhood in purely religious terms. For example, E. Werner, “Bemerkungen zu einer neuen These über die Herkunft der Laienbrüder,” Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft 6 (1958): 356, viewed conversi from a Marxist perspective. According to Werner, the deciding factor for becoming a conversus was the certainty a monastery offered in providing a daily meal. For J. Dubois, “L’institution convers au XIIe siècle: Forme de vie monastique propre aux laïcs,” in I laici nella “Societas Christiana” dei secoli XI e XII, Atti della terza Settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola, 21-27 agosto 1965 (Milan 1968): 261, becoming a conversus was a way for lay people to express their religiosity without being subject to the requirements of the clergy. While Dubois seemed to echo Hallinger’s theory of religious motivation, he rebuked Hallinger’s notion that the conversi had somehow risen from the ranks of the monastery’s lay servants. In contrast, M. Toepfer, Die Konversen der Zisterzienser (Berlin 1983), has shown that conversi came not only from the ranks of the peasantry, but also from the nobility and bourgeoisie. On the basis of Toepfer’s evidence, it seems most likely that the institution of conversi evolved out of some combination of piety and practicality.

88 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 258: “Predicti Arbertus et Perota, mater eius, se devestierunt [of the land in question] coram nobis, et fratrem Lambertum, conversum predicti domus Vallis caulium nomine predictore prioris et conventusu investierunt.”

89 Birch, 97: “Hic ordo psallendi omni tempore teneatur, nisi quod in estis duodecim lectionum duplicentur ad no[c]turns tantum pater nostur cum gloria, ut sint quadragina.”
Friday (Parasceve) followed a specific order: first the prior and dean of the monastery, then the monks and novices, and finally the conversi. The lower station of conversi could also be exalted. Recall the foundation legend of Val-des-Choux, which cast Viard as a “simple conversus” so driven by piety that he left the Carthusians to found a new monastery. While Chapter 4 has adequately dispelled the historicity of this legend, it was doubtless a powerful trope for its creators.

As early as Innocent III’s bull of 1205, we see the Caulites embracing the use of lay brothers, or conversi, in their houses. Recall that Innocent’s bull restricted the number of conversi and monks to twenty. The prima institutio also contained this restriction. Since Caulite monasteries were limited to twenty members, monks and lay brothers combined, and since we have already posited the number of monks at thirteen—one prior and twelve others, following the Carthusian model—then the ideal number of lay brothers in any Caulite priory was seven. We can trace limits on the number of conversi among the Caulites to their Carthusian heritage. In Carthusian monasteries, the custom was to have only twenty-nine members: thirteen monks and sixteen conversi. Neither Innocent III’s bull nor the prima institutio say anything about how the Caulites regulated their conversi. Nor would Caulite adoption of the RB have had any effect on their treatment of conversi, since lay brotherhood was not an institution that Benedict either anticipated or addressed in his Rule.

---

90 Birch, 17: “Prior vero solus in alba sine manipulo et post illum similiter diaconus, ac deinde monachi et novicii duo et duo, et conversi laici corpore prostrati, in presbiterio crucem adorent et osculantur breviter. et dum adorant sedeant qui voluerit.” Cf. EO, ch. 22.


92 See note 61, above.

93 CG, ch. 78: “De numero habitatorum ... 1. Numerus habitatorum huius heremi. monachorum quidem tredecim est; 2. Laicorum autem numeros quos conversos vocamus, sedecim statutus est.
The first time we see the Caulites addressing the question of conversi at any length is in their adoption of two Cistercian documents, the EO and the *Usus conversorum*. ("use of lay brothers," henceforth UC).\(^94\)

As with other subjects in the EO, on the subject of *conversi*, the Caulites did not merely adopt the Cistercian customs wholesale. Rather, they adapted those customs to meet their particular needs. Since the Caulite monasteries had fewer *conversi* than their Cistercian counterparts, one important adaptation had to do with number. For example, both Cistercians and Caulites shared a similar liturgy on Christmas Eve, recorded in their customaries in a chapter entitled *De nativitate Domini*. Since this service took place in the middle of a cold winter night, and since medieval churches were cold and drafty places, both Cistercian and Caulite customaries afforded their monks the opportunity to warm themselves half way through the liturgy in a special room called the calefactory, literally, "the warming place." In the EO, we see two *conversi* preparing the calefactory fire for the monks. In the Caulites customary, a single *conversus* takes on this duty.\(^95\) The reason for this adaptation is that the Caulites have fewer *conversi*. Another example of this adaptation because of numbers concerns Holy Thursday (*De cena Domini*). Here, the Caulite customary assigns a single *conversus* to lead the poor into the cloister for the ritual foot washing. By contrast, the EO assigns an undetermined number of *conversi* to this task.\(^96\)

\(^94\) See UC. 186-196.

\(^95\) Birch. 3: "In nocte natalis Domini, cellarius provident unum conversum qui ignem in calefactorio monachis preparat ad intervallum, si frigus fuerit." Cf. EO, ch. 4: "In nocte nativitatis domini cellarius provideat duos conversos qui ignem in calefactorium monachis ad intervallum calefaciendis preparant si tamen frigus hoc exegerit." (Emphasis mine.)

\(^96\) Birch. 14: "Dum nona cantatur, conversus ducat pauperes in claustro, ibique eos sedere et discalciari faciat, incipiens ab ostio ecclesie quo monachi exire et intrare claustrum solent." EO, ch. 21: "Et interim dum nona cantatur conversus laicis aduerit monachi hospitalis et ceteri fratres laici quos cellararius advocaverit ducant pauperes in claustro ibique eos sedere et discalciari faciant incipientes ab ostio ecclesie quo monachi exire et claustrum intrare solent."
In addition to these adaptations in the EO, the Caulite customary has an entire section on the subject of *conversi*, borrowed and adapted from the Cistercian *Usus conversorum* (UC). This section deals with a range of topics, from when *conversi* should rise for Vigils to how they should make their profession, from the days on which they should not work to their food, clothing, and beds. The most significant adaptation of the UC by the Caulites concerns the subject of granges. Among the Cistercians, the grange was an important economic unit, often located at a great distance from the monastery, and managed almost entirely by *conversi*. Not surprisingly, the first chapter of the UC concerns how the brothers should conduct themselves on granges (*Quomodo se habeant fratres in grangiis*). Although the Caulites copied this chapter almost verbatim into their customary, they made one significant adaptation: they changed the title of the chapter to *Incipit ordo de conversis*. This reflects the Caulite desire to live from rents, rather than send their lay brothers to far away granges in hopes of exploiting them for economic gain—as did the Cistercians. Other UC chapters adapted by the Caulites also reflect this critique of Cistercian practice. In fact, the Caulites systematically excised references to granges or grange masters (*grangiarius*) in UC chapters 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 19, and 20. One or two such omissions might signal scribal error. Systematic omission from nine chapters implies intent. The section of the Caulite customary on *conversi* did not discuss granges because the Caulites did not use granges or *conversi* in the same way that the Cistercians did.

Interestingly, all the chapters on *conversi* in manuscript P were crossed out for erasure, implying that the Caulites, at some point in their history, either stopped having

---

97 Birch. 96: “Incipit ordo de conversis.” Cf. UC, ch. 1: “Quomodo se habeant fratres in grangiis.”

98 On the Cistercian use of granges, see Lekai, *Cistercians*, 295-298.
conversi, or at least stopped regulating their behavior according to these rules. The documents do not reveal whether the Caulites experienced or had heard of the conversi revolts in other religious orders.

The Daily Chapter, a.k.a. The Chapter of Faults

While the choir was the center of a monastery’s spiritual life, the chapter was the place where monks dealt with the rest of the monastery’s business, including the correction of those who had strayed in their observance. The chapter—so called because it always included the reading of a chapter from the Rule of Benedict—met daily in a space adjacent to the choir called the chapter house. The Caulites adapted their practices concerning the daily chapter from the EO, a section entitled “Concerning the chapter and confession” (De capitulo et confessione). Among the Cistercians, the daily chapter took place immediately following the morning mass, but the Caulites held their chapter after Prime, the liturgical hour before the morning mass. As among the Cistercians, the Caulite daily chapter was highly ritualized. The monks entered the chapter and stood, bowing, behind their assigned seats. The prior or his surrogate presided over the chapter. The first reading came from the martyrrology of Usuard, in particular the stories of saints whose feasts fell on that day of the chapter. Then followed the Gloria patri, the Kyrie eleison and the Pater

99 Birch, 96, note 1. The crossed-out chapters in manuscript P include all the chapters on conversi, from “Incipit ordo de conversis” to “De pena inobediente,” (Birch, 96-100).

100 J. Donnelly. The Decline of the Medieval Cistercian Laybrotherhood (New York, 1949). 71-80. lists 123 revolts by Cistercian conversi occurring between 1168 and 1308.

101 On the daily chapter in general, see Lawrence. 114-115; and Moulin. La vie quotidienne des religieus. 41-44. On the daily chapter among the Cistercians, see Lekai. Cistercians, 365-66.

102 Birch. 48-51; cf. EO ch. 70.

103 Birch. 48: “Prima cantata, fratres veniant in capitulum.” Cf. EO. ch. 70: “Post missam matutinalem sacrista pulset signum ad convocandum fratres in capitulum.”
Finally, the reader of the week read a chapter of the RB. At this point in the daily chapter, the Cistercians read out the names of those assigned to weekly tasks (e.g., reader of the week, priest of the week). The Caulites excised this portion of the EO from their customary, hence it is unclear when they assigned these tasks—though the chapter would have been the obvious time and place. Both Cistercians and Caulites then commemorated the dead of their order, after which the prior or his surrogate announced, “Let us speak of our order” (*loquamur de ordine nostro*). The Cistercians then allowed for the absolution of the deceased, a practice that the Caulites excised from their customary.

One of the main elements of the daily chapter was to address faults against the community—hence the term “chapter of faults.” As in other monastic communities, the Caulites required public confession and satisfaction from those members of their community who had acted outside the bounds of the Rule. Such faults might include absence from liturgical duties (unless occupied with official monastery business), though

---

104 EO, ch. 70: “Et accipiens tabulam legat breve si ipso die legendum fuerit.”
105 Birch, ch. 49; cf. EO ch. 70.
106 EO, ch. 70: “Et tunc si absolvendus est defuntus. ad ammonitionem cantoris absolvantur.”
107 Public satisfaction for faults was a monastic practice that went back to the desert fathers. See G. Ghislain, “Capitolo delle colpe,” in Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione, 2 (1975): 176. According to RB, ch. 46: “If someone commits a fault … he must at once come before the abbot and community and of his own accord make satisfaction.” Punishment was one aspect of the chapter of faults; see C. Morgand, “La discipline pénitentielle et l’Officium capituli d’après le Memoriale qualiter,” in Revue Bénédictine 72 (1962): 22-60. Yet, the chapter of faults was not solely for punishment, but for correction that would lead to the cohesion of the community as well as the spiritual perfection of the individual; see G. Ghislain, “Le chapitre des coulpes, signe de communion,” in Collectanea cisterciensia 27 (1965): 178-193; and G. Penco, “Il significato spirituale del capitolo delle colpe.” in Vita Monastica 17 (1963): 60-71. Interestingly, the American utopian experiment known as the Oneida community revived the practice of the chapter of faults in the nineteenth century; see, S. Olin, “The Oneida Community and the Instability of Charismatic Authority,” in Journal of American History 67 (1980): 290.
108 For example, see Birch, p.104: “Qui ad benedictionem collationis defuerit, similiter qui ad orationem que dicitur ante horas in stallo suo non fuerit. in capitulo veniam petat excepto cellerario et refectorario et infirmario et priore nisi quando ‘credo’ dicitur;” and 105: “Qui de choro exierit ad horas. in capitulo veniam
there might also have been more serious faults. Any monk who had committed a fault was to come forward and seek forgiveness. If a monk did not come forth on his own, others in the community could accuse him (clamare). They were not to do this in a roundabout way, but directly, stating simply that “So-and-so had done such-and-such” (ille fecit hoc). The accused then had the opportunity to admit or deny his guilt. If there were other witnesses, they could also speak. To avoid retribution, the accused was not allowed to counter accuse his accuser during the same chapter. Those guilty of serious faults were made to sit at the feet of the prior and strip out of their upper garments. They were then thrashed with a rod. The prior ensured that the accuser did not also administer the punishment. Among the Cistercians, a monk of lower rank was not to thrash a monk of higher rank, e.g., a deacon could not flog a priest. The Caulites seem not to have made this distinction, for they excised that section of the EO from their customary. During the thrashing, the guilty were to remain silent, or if they said anything it could only be, “It is my fault, I will emend myself” (mea culpa, ego me emendabo). No one in the chapter was to speak, unless it was a more senior brother, humbly interceding for the accused. The thrashing continued until the prior gave the word to stop. The accused then dressed and stood in his place until the prior told him he could take his seat. No one was to speak of the faults or punishments of

petat nisi obedientialis fuerit, similiter ad officium defunctorum nisi redierit. .... Qui deprecatus fuerit responsorium, aut lectionem, vel invitatorium, in capitulo veniam petat.”

109 Birch, 49: “E[x|posita sentntia nullus dicataliquid vel veniam petat donec dicatur a tenente capitulum. ‘loquamur de ordine nostro.’ ... Post hoc veniam petat qui voluerit. Deinde fiant clamationes si fatiende sunt. Qui autem clamaverit non querat circuitiones in clamatione sua, sed apte dicat ‘ille fecit hoc,’ et qui clamatus fuerit mox ut audierit nomen suum, non respondens in sede, petat veniam a tenente capitulum et interroganti ‘quid dictis’ respondat prostratus, ‘mea culpa,’ et ad jussum illius erectus, si reus fuerit, humiliter confliteatur, dicens ‘ego me emendabo.’ Si autem se culpabilem non intelligit, dicat ‘non recordatus sum.’ Ipse vero qui eum clamavit, non repetat Ipsam clamationem nisi interrogatus. Alius tamen si novit quod sit reus, potest illud dicere. Et sciendum quod qui clamatus fuerit ipsa die clamantem non clamabit.” Cf. EO, ch. 70.

110 EO, ch. 70: “Ille qui inferioris gradus est, non debet verberare superiorem, id est, diaconus sacerdotem.”
another outside of the chapter. Their silence on the inner workings of the chapter kept the Caulites from causing scandal among the monastery’s *familia*, patrons, and any other lay or clerical outsiders.

The punishment discussed above concerned transgressions against the Rule, i.e., against the common good. But there were also private sins, which the monks could confess to the prior at the end of the daily chapter. Among the Caulites, these personal confessions took place on Saturdays.

Permission to attend the chapter was also an indication of status in the monastic community. It was in the chapter that lay brothers made their professions after a one-year novitiate. After this, the customary restricted their attendance at chapter to Sundays and feasts on which they did not work. During these times, the lay brothers could confess their faults. Here Caulite practice diverged from its Cistercian model. Recall that Caulite monasteries were relatively small, with no more than twenty members, monks and lay brothers combined. Cistercian monasteries were much larger by comparison, and their lay brothers often lived in larger groups on far away granges. Hence, while Caulite lay brothers simply attended the monks’ chapter on certain days, Cistercian lay brothers held their own chapters, separate from Cistercian monks. By 1260, the Caulites seem to have

111 Birch, 50: “Quando aliquis in ipso juditio verberandus fuerit, jussus exui max assideat ante pedes prioris et eum excubillum et capam ponat eam ante se super genua sua. Per capitium vero tunicam excueant brachia, et totum corpus usque ad cingulum, et sic consistens inclinato capite, nil dicat nisi tantum ‘mea culpa, ego me emendabo.’ Quo crebris repetat, sed neque iterum alius loquatur nisi forte aliquis de senioribus pro eo humiliter intercedat. Qui autem verberatur, postquam fuerit jussus indui, non se moveat donec prior dicit ‘ite sessum.’ Porro caveatur, ne quis loquatur alius extra capitulum vel significet de culpis. vel de secretis causis que in capitulo tarctantur.” Cf. EO, ch. 70. Among the Cistercians, the accused were thrashed in their place in the chapter, not at the feet of the prior.

112 Birch, 51: “In generali confessione que post capitulum solet fieri, feria sexta supradictus modus teneatur.”


114 Birch, 99: “Omnibus dominicis diebus et festivis quibus non laborant, veniant in capitulum, et postquam acceperint monachi venias suas, accipiunt conversi suas si se reos cognoverint.” Cf. UC, ch. 11:
reconsidered the presence of lay brothers at the chapter where monks were confessing their faults, for in that year they passed a statute that required lay brothers to leave the chapter with the novices.\textsuperscript{115} The daily chapter was also a time when high dignitaries might address the community. These could be bishops, abbots, or even the king. Sometimes these dignitaries sought to enter into confraternity or an association of prayers with the monks. Recall that Hugh IV, duke of Burgundy, entered into such a confraternity with the Caulites in 1262. In the presence of such dignitaries, the Caulites followed Cistercian practice, i.e., they interrupted the business of the daily chapter, and paid their distinguished guests due respect.\textsuperscript{116}

The daily chapter was an institution around which the Caulites organized their individual monasteries. We now turn to the ways in which the Caulites organized their order as a whole.

\textit{Organization of the Caulite Order}

To understand the organization of the Caulite order, we need to examine three closely linked aspects: how Caulite monasteries related to each other through filiation; how Caulite monasteries monitored each other's practice through regular visitation; and how the Caulites reported their findings from visitation and corrected the faults of their filial monasteries through the general chapter. Finally, this chapter will examine how the filial priories attempted to gain greater autonomy by checking the power of the motherhouse.

\textsuperscript{115} Birch, 114: "Item conversi exeant a capitulo cum noviciis."

\textsuperscript{116} Birch, 50: "Quod si episcopus vel abbas monachorum vel canonicerorum vel etiam rex capitulum aliquando intraverit, assurgentem ei omnes inclinent cum antes eos transierit." Cf. EO, ch. 70.
Filiation

Loosely following the Cistercian model, the Caulites linked their monasteries to each other through filiation. The basic idea of filiation was that the motherhouse would look after the daughter houses it had founded, and that those daughter houses would in turn look after the daughter houses that they had founded, and so on. The Cistercian system of filiation is often seen as a confederation—Lawrence called it a “strong federal framework”—rather than a strictly “top-down” hierarchy. It was not based on subordination, but on mutual love, which bound the daughter houses to each other and to the motherhouse at Cîteaux. The goal of this system was to ensure that the Rule was strictly and uniformly observed. Though the goal was well intentioned, the Cistercian system of filiation proved to be anything but efficient, since it was based on links of foundation—as opposed to location in geographic regions. This proved to be less than practical when monasteries had numerous daughter houses in far away lands, requiring the abbot of the motherhouse to be constantly traveling to fulfill his visitation duties. Among the Caulites, filiation was also based on foundation links, yet because expansion of the Caulite Order was relatively smaller than that of the Cistercians, filial groups of Caulite monasteries were located closer together. Recall from Chapter 6 the family groupings of Caulite monasteries in the duchy of Burgundy, and the counties of Nevers and Champagne.

---

117 We can see Cistercian filiation in Cîteaux’s relationship to her four eldest daughters, La Ferté, Pontigny, Morimond, and Clairvaux, and in the relationship of these “eldest daughters” to the filial monasteries that they founded. For example, under the abbacy of Saint Bernard, Clairvaux established more than 60 daughter houses of her own. See Lawrence, 187-89; Lekai, Cistercians, 26-28. On the inner workings of filiation among the Cistercians, see J. Mahn, L’ordre cistercien et son gouvernement, des origines au milieu du XIIe siècle. 2nd edition (Paris, 1951), 217-228.

118 Lawrence, 187.

119 See Lekai, Cistercians, 50.
Among the Cistercians, a monastery’s foundation date indicated its rank within the order. Hence, La Ferté, founded in 1113, was the eldest daughter of Cîteaux, while Pontigny, founded in 1114, was the second daughter. This was analogous to determining a monk’s rank in the monastery based on his date of entry. The Caulites seem to have adapted this system of rank for monasteries within their order, to some extent for political purposes. The Grand Cartulary states unequivocally that Val-Croissant was the “first daughter of the order;” that Val-Dieu was called the second daughter, “even though it was founded after others” in the list; that Vausse was the third daughter; and Genevroye the fourth. Val-Croissant was founded in 1216, Vausse before 1219, and Genevroye in 1216. This makes these three priories among the earliest foundations of the Caulite Order. This might lead us to conclude that the Caulites based the ranks of monasteries in their order upon the date of foundation. Val-Dieu, founded in 1266, offers a special exception to this rule. In the same year as Val-Dieu’s foundation, the Caulites declared that the new monastery should have primacy in matters concerning the visitation of the motherhouse, over Vausse and Val-Croissant, both of which had been founded much earlier. The Caulites did this to honor Val-Dieu’s founder, Thibaut V, count of Champagne and king of Navarre. Here the Caulites had clearly granted rank in their order for political purposes, to gain favor with the nobility.

---

120 See RB, ch. 63.

121 Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 215, pp. 13-14. We must use caution in interpreting the Grand Cartulary, since it relates a state of affairs at the time of its creation, i.e., in 1776. For example, by 1776, all ties to the Caulite priory of Sankt-Elizabeth’s-Thal in the Low Countries had been lost, hence its name and filial rank found no place in the Grand Cartulary. Yet since Sankt-Elizabeth’s-Thal was founded in 1212, it must surely have held a high filial rank during the thirteenth century. The Grand Cartulary does not rank any of the priories in its list beyond the first four.

122 Birch, 115, statutes of 1266: “Fratres apud vos non debent invenire (exennia), et ideo quia per generale capitulum concessum fuit Theobaldo, Dei gracia illustri regi Navarriae, cujus reverencia sibi exigit honorem, quod prior domus quam fundavit in Bria, que dicitur Vallis Dei, primum locum post dom[...]um priorem Vallis Caulium habeat in eadem domo cum prioribus de Vacie et de Valle Crescenti’ visitator existat.”
From the example of Val-Dieu, we see that filiation was the organizational framework designed to facilitate visitation.

Visitation

According to the Cistercian “Charter of Charity” (Carta caritatis), once a year, the abbot of the greater church was to visit the monasteries which he had founded. The term “visit” can sound rather friendly. What it really meant was “inspect,” i.e., to monitor the practice among the monks of their filial monasteries. The Cistercians called the person conducting the visitation the visitator. Among the Caulites, the visitator was sometimes the prior of Val-des-Choux, whom the Caulites called the “great prior” (prior magnus), though it could also be a prior from one of the daughter houses, or even someone that the great prior had designated. A danger existed that the visitator might come into conflict with the resident prior of the monastery he was inspecting. The Caulites took precautions to avoid this in a chapter of their customary concerning the form of visitation (De forma visitationis), borrowed from statutes of the Cistercian general chapters of 1134. According to this statute, the visitator was to use the utmost caution and diligence during his inspections, to correct the excesses of his brothers, but also to increase the monks’ respect for their own prior. If the visitator did not act accordingly, the customary provided for his punishment during the general chapter.

---

123 See the Carta caritatis prior published in J. Bouton and J. Van Damm, eds., Les plus anciens textes de Citeaux (Achel. 1974), 94: “Semel par annum visitet abbas majoris ecclesiae omnia coenobia quae ipse fundavit.”

124 See Canivez, Statuta, 1: 20, no. 33; Moulin, La vie quotidienne des religieux, 224-227; and Lekai, Cistercians, 71-72.

125 Birch, 101: “In facienda visitatione cautelam maximam et diligentiam visitator adhibeat, ut fideliter et prudenter ad corrigendos excessus us et conservationem pacis intendat, et quantum poterit salva ordinis disciplina animos fratum ad ampliorem reverentiam proprii prioris et gratiam in Christo mutue dilectionis inducat.... quod si contra hanc formam egerit visitator per superiorum priorum vel alios priores ut meruerit
Visits to a daughter monastery could become a strain on that monastery’s resources, should the visiting prior stay too long, or should he have too many in his retinue. In 1253, the Caulites sought to regulate the great prior’s visitation of daughter houses to one per year, which visit was not to last more than three days, leaving on the third day, or even the second, except when the monastery he was visiting was located far from the motherhouse. He was also to have his arrival announced at least a day in advance. We might also see this limitation on the great prior’s visits as a part of a larger trend to limit the influence of the motherhouse, which I will discuss at greater length, below.

As among the Cistercians, the priors of the Caulites’ eldest daughter houses—called the priors major—bore responsibility for monitoring the observance of the motherhouse. Visitation of Val-des-Choux originally took place during the feast of Saint Luke (18 October), but this was later changed to the feast of Saint John (24 June). Two priors from the eldest daughter houses visited Val-des-Choux once a year, though the number of priors was eventually increased to three.

Each visitator provided a charter, sealed with his seal that recorded those infractions in need of correction. He took this charter with him, and read it as a kind of “field report” at the next general chapter.

---

126 Birch, 111. statutes of 1253: “Constitutum est per generale capitulum, quod prior Vallis Caulium singulis annis visitet filias suas cum priore per tres dies, si viderit expedire: et si necessitas viderit [sic] evidens exegerit,[sic] possit exire tercia die vel secunda, exceptis domibus in remotis partibus constitutis: et scire faciat adventum suum per unum diem ante.”

127 Birch, 103: “Visitatio Vallis Caulium erit in festo sancti Luce [changed to “Johannis” in the margin in ms. P]. Duo [changed to “tres” in ms. P] majores priores visitabunt eam.” Among the Cistercians, visitation of Cîteaux took place on the feast of Mary Magdalen (22 July); see Lekai. Cistercians, 71.

128 Birch, 102: “Provideat visitator ut in karta sigillo suo signata ... scribat que corrigenda vel ordinata stauerit. et carta ... committat ... legendam sequenti anno in capitulum.”
The General Chapter

The general chapter was arguably the greatest of Cistercian innovations. It was essentially the daily chapter writ large, or as Lawrence put it, “the standard monastic chapter in macrocosm.” Where the goal of the daily chapter was to ensure the proper observance of monks within a single monastery, the purpose of the general chapter was to ensure the proper observance of each monastery in the order, providing correction where necessary.

The Caulites seem to have adopted the general chapter by at least 1224, as seen in Honorius III’s bull of that year, which allowed the Caulites to mitigate their practices as they judged fit “in vestro generali capitulo.” The first dated statutes of the Caulite

---


130 On the inner workings of the Cistercian general chapter, see Mahn, L’ordre cistercien et son gouvernement. 173-216; and Lekai, Cistercians. 26-32.

131 Honorius III (1224): “Nos igitur presentium autoritate concedimus, ut hii qui in domo vestra vel alis sibi subjectis per tempora priores extiterint rigorem observantiarum hujusmodi non obstante quod annotate sunt in confirmatione predicta temperare valeant, in vestro generali capitulo prout viderint expedere.” The Caulites were not the only ones to follow the Cistercians in the practice of the general chapter. During the course of the twelfth century, several monastic and canonical orders adopted this practice, including the Premonstratensians, the Carthusians, the Arrouaisse, and the Gilbertines. See Lekai, Cistercians, 30; P. Lefèvre, ed., Les Statuts de Prémontré, réformés sur les ordres de Grégroire IX et d’Innocent IV au XIIIe siècle (Louvain, 1946), 84-91; J. Clark, ed., Transumptum ex chartis capituli generalis ab anno 1250 ad annum 1379. Analecta cartusiana 100:29 (Salzburg, 1998); L. Mills, L’Ordre des chanoines réguliers d’Arrouaise (Brugge, 1969),1: 533-55; and B. Golding, Gilbert of Sempringham and the Gilbertine Order, c. 1130-c. 1300 (Oxford, 1995), 103. Chapter 12 of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 (De communibus capitulis monachorum) mandated that all monastic orders that had not already done so adopt the practice of general chapters, and required that two Cistercian abbots “in the vicinity” of the motherhouses supervise this transition. See Alberigo, ed. Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta. 240-241. The new orders of the Franciscans and Dominicans required general chapters from their inception. See T. Desbonnets, From Intuition to Institution: The Franciscans, transl. by P. Duggan and J. Du Charme
general chapter were those of 1238. Ideally, all the priors of the Caulite Order were to attend the general chapter at Val-des-Choux. Following the Cistercian model, the Caulite general chapter met annually, beginning on the feast of the Holy Cross (14 September). The Cistercian general chapter could last from seven to ten days, and attending abbots numbered in the hundreds. With a much smaller number of priors to incorporate into the agenda, the general chapter at Val-des-Choux must have unfolded more efficiently, and seems to have lasted only three days. During these three days, the Caulites did not require priors attending the general chapter to participate in the hours in the oratory, no doubt so that they would could use the full time to conduct their business.

If the great prior's visitation to a daughter house could put a strain on that monastery's resources, then the economic strain on the motherhouse during the general chapter—with priors from every daughter house converging on Val-des-Choux—was that much greater. For this reason, the Caulites restricted the size of the visiting priors' retinues. In 1253, they mandated that priors attending the general chapter could only bring two horses and one servant with them. At a later date, the motherhouse received payment from priors for the expense of stabling their horses: 5 sols for two horses, 3 sols for one


133 Birch, 74: “Tempore generalis capituli nostri, scilicet in inventione sancte crucis.” Cf. EO. ch. 98.

134 Lawrence, 190.

135 Birch, 102: “Tribus vero diebus generalis capituli cantabit unus de prioribus missam conventus;” and idem, 104: “Tribus diebus generalis capituli non tenentur priores ire ad horas in oratorio.”

136 Birch, 111, statutes of 1253: “Item statuimus, quod nullus prior ad capitulum generale secum possit adducere nisi duos equos et unum famulum.”
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horse. Attendance at the general chapter must have been especially costly for the priors of monasteries located far from Val-des-Choux. Hence at some time during the thirteenth century the Caulites exempted priors from Scotland and “Alemania” (i.e., the prior of Sankt-Elizabeth’s-Thal) from attending. Yet even the attendance of priors geographically closer to the motherhouse seems to have been a problem in the last half of the thirteenth century. In 1267, 1287, and again in 1289, the Caulites reasserted the requirement that every prior attend the general chapter, unless he was seriously ill or had a serious excuse. These late dates could signal another attempt by the Caulites to limit the influence of the motherhouse over the filial priories. By not attending the general chapter, the priors of the daughter houses were passively asserting a desire for more autonomy.

The group dynamic of the Caulite general chapter must have been very complex. Following the Cistercian model, the Caulites also adopted the use of “diffinitors,” a position analogous to the chief executive officer of the general chapter, with the authority to hear cases and make decisions. For example, a monk or conversus convicted of a serious crime could not be pardoned by his own prior without the consent of the great prior or of a diffinitor. In 1266, we see the priors of Genevroye and Clairlieu acting as diffinitors of

137 Birch, 119, undated statutes, but between 1268 and 1287: “Prior qui cum duobus equis venerit quinque solidos et qui solus venerit tres solidos pro expensis solveret teneatur.”

138 Birch, 119, undated statutes, but between 1268 and 1287: “Item statutum est in nostro generali capituló quod omnes priores nostri ordinis, exceptis illis de Scotia et de Alemania quolibet anno convenire teneantur in domum Vallis Caulium vigilía dicti capituli.”

139 Birch, 116, statutes of 1267: “Item statutum est quod omnes priores ad generale capitulum personaliter veniant, nisi gravi infirmitate vel alia evidentia causa et manifesto fuerint detenti;” and 120, statutes of 1287: “Constitutum in nostro generali capitulo quod quilibet prior nostri ordinis quolibet anno ad generale capitulum [venire] teneatur, omni occasione et excusatione preter infirmitatem corporis ... pretermissis;” 120-121, statutes of 1289: “Quilibet prior nostri ordinis ad nostrum generali capitulum Vallis Caulium omni occasione et excusatione postpositis, venire teneatur, nisi gravi et evidentia infirmitate sit detentus.”

140 Birch, 118-119, undated statutes, but between 1268 and 1287: “Monachus vel conversus si convictus fuerit de supradictis enormis reatibus et in penitencias deductus supradictis secundum demerita prior suus non possibilit dispensare con [sic] eodem nisi de prioris Vallis Caulium vel unius diffinitoris consensu speciali et mandato.”
the general chapter, attaching their seals to the record of that chapter. At a certain point, the order began to exercise caution in its adoption of the chapter’s decisions. According to a statute of 1244, the Caulites waited one year after the general chapter, then re-read the legislation from the previous year, then only entered it into “the book” (in libro) if all approved. The phrase “in libro” is vague, but it seems to point to a “liber usuum,” a book of usages, i.e., a customary. In 1287, the general chapter reminded all monasteries that they should be entering its statutes into the liber usuum, and that these statutes were to be read in their own daily chapter, in the presence of the entire community. Reaching consensus must have been difficult at times, a test of Christian charity and patience. In 1262, the Caulites adopted legislation to punish any prior who “drove another prior mad.”

The issues addressed at the general chapter spanned a wide range. There were often liturgical questions to answer. For example, in 1248, the general chapter asserted that the octave of the feast of the Blessed Virgin’s nativity (8 September) should be celebrated according to the Cistercian rite. The general chapter also addressed practical matters, both large and small. For example, in 1266, it mandated that priors not mortgage or sell the

141 Birch, 116. statutes of 1266: “In cujus rei testimonium, nos priores de Juniperia et de Claro Loco, diffinitores in generali capitolo constituti, communis pacis et veritatis bonum querentes et nichil proprium in hac parte amantes, sigillis nostris voluimus presentem litteram sigillari.”

142 Birch, 110. statutes of 1244: “Item statuta nostra non scribantur amodo in usibus, donec revolato anno iterum legantur in capitulo tunc si approbata fuerint, scribantur in libro.”

143 Birch, 120. statutes of 1287: “Item statuimus quod quilibet prior nostri ordinis predicta statuta scribi faciat in domo sua in libro usuum et quod in capitulo coram omnibus ex integro perlegantur.”

144 Birch, 113. statutes of 1262: “Item statumus, quod si prior priorem aliquem dementaverit ... penam levioris culpe solvere teneatur.”

145 Birch, 110. statutes of 1244: “Octave nativitatis beate Marie virginis celebrentur in ordine nostro sicut in ordine Cistieriensi.”
property of any monastery without first consulting its members. In 1268, it regulated the number of times that monks could be shaved: in summer every fortnight (quindena), but in winter every three weeks. The general chapter also attempted to regulate the population within Caulite monasteries. For example, in 1268, it required that every Caulite priory have at least three monks. Such a small number, one-fourth of the standard thirteen monks, could indicate a decline in recruitment to the Caulite Order in the second half of the thirteenth century. Setting the minimum number of monks at three was probably the best the Caulites could do to ensure some semblance of strict observance. One monk could easily become lax in his practice. Two could conspire to conceal their laxity. With three monks in each community, there was a greater possibility that lax observance would be kept in check.

Even in such small communities, monastic life was not always the contemplative idyll we might like to imagine. For some, its isolation and rigor must have strained the limits of their human capacity. The general chapters issued several statutes to deal with conflict within the monastery. In 1252, it legislated that any monk who had defamed his prior or a fellow monk, or had threatened arson or homicide, was to be sent to another monastery, and there severely punished. In 1253, however, the Caulites amended this

---

146 Birch, 114, statutes of 1266: “Cavere debent priores ne sine consilio et consensu conventus sui in causa alicujus mutui facti vel faciendi seu vendicione rerum suarum sigilla sua apponant.”

147 Birch, 118, statutes of 1268: “Item statuimus, quod in estate, ad [sic] Pascha usque ad festum omnium sanctorum, de quindena in quindenam fiant rasure, et in hyeme per tres septimanas.”

148 Birch, 117, statutes of 1268: “In qualibet domo nostri ordinis ad minus sint tres fratres ad domus et ordinis honestatem.”

149 Though I can cite no psychological study to support this theory of group dynamics, the idea occurred to me upon recalling my own experience growing up in a family of three brothers.

150 Birch, 109, statutes of 1252: “Item statuimus quod monachus qui defamaverit priorem vel fratres vel ordinem nostrum, vel minatus fuerit incendium vel homicidium, mittatur ad aliam domum et hoc cum magna pena.”
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view on punishment, insisting that monks could not be transferred to another monastery if they had penance to perform in their own. In 1262, the visitatores won the authority to transfer malcontent monks from one monastery to another, in the hope that peace might return.\footnote{Birch, 112, statutes of 1262: "Item statuimus, quod visitatores ordinis nostri plenariam habeant potestatem, ubi fratres inquiètes, litigiosos, pacem domus sue turbantes, invenerint, in domo alia mittendi nec posse reverti, nisi de licencia prioris."}

Limits on the motherhouse

At a certain point in their history, the priors and monks of the Caulite daughter houses seem to have desired more autonomy. We have already seen how they tried to limit the influence of the great prior by restricting his visits to once a year. This was partly an economic consideration—the monks of the filial priories did not want to have to feed the great prior and his retinue whenever they happened to show up. Yet its effect had implications for the control that the great prior could exercise over the daughter houses. If he only came once a year, and then for only three days, this means that the monks in the daughter house were, for better or worse, more in charge of their own lives. We have also seen how attendance of priors at the general chapter seems to have been a problem in the last half of the thirteenth century. By not attending the general chapter, the priors of the daughter houses avoided correction from the great prior, and thus enjoyed more autonomy.

I am not suggesting some Whiggish interpretation of Caulite history, by which oppressed filial priories inevitably struggled for their independence. Yet, the documents do seem to bear out the presence of a trend, however small, in the direction of more autonomy. The best example of this came in 1248, when the Caulites decided that the great prior should announce his visits to Vausse and Val-Croissant—the eldest daughters of the order—at least eight days in advance, and that one or two other priors of the order would need to
accompany him. They also mandated that the great prior could not depose the prior of a daughter house except with the approval of two or three other priors of the order. Finally, from that point on, no prior's resignation would be accepted without great deliberation and the counsel of other priors. All of these statutes kept the great prior from making important decisions without the supervision of other priors. The Caulites might have left the deposition of priors entirely in the hands of the great prior, but this would have given significant power to the motherhouse. The fact that the Caulites required more than one prior to depose a fellow, sitting prior—rather than leaving the power of deposition solely in the hand of the great prior—seems to indicate a desire on the part of the Caulite filial priories to check the power of the motherhouse. The other priors participating in these important decisions would have had the interest of their own priories in mind, and would likely have related more to the difficulties of their fellow priors. The overall effect was the diffusion of the great prior's power.

Conclusion

Having seen how the Caulites adapted so much of their customary from the Cistercian EO, it is not surprising to discover that the internal structure of Caulite monasteries, as well as the organization of the Caulite Order overall, are strikingly similar to their Cistercian model. Yet we must not forget those differences, both subtle and profound, that mark real innovation on the part of the Caulites. These are perhaps most noticeable

---

152 Birch, 110, statutes of 1248: "Item statutum est quod prior Vallis Caulium nunquam visitet domos Vaccie et Vallis Crescentiis sine uno priore vel duobus, et dictis domibus adventum suum per octo dies vel amplius singulis annis seire faciat per certum nuncium. Item statutum est quod prior Vallis Caulium nec alii patres possint deponere aliquem prioriorem nisi cum duobus prioribus vel tribus. Statutum est eciam, quod prior Vallis Caulium et alii patres priores resignationem aliquorum priorum non recipiant, nisi cum deliberatione magna et consilio aliquorum priorum."
when reading the statutes of the Caulite general chapters. For here, it was not a matter of copying, editing, or adapting some pre-existing text to suit the impulse of order-minded redactors, attempting to infuse their vision of reform into the evolving Caulite customary. The many changes in the statutes of the general chapter show how the monastic reform envisioned by the earliest Caulites came head to head with quotidian practice. Monks tried what their innovative predecessors had given them, then adapted it further, so that it might better fit the realities of their daily existence. In the following chapter, by way of assembling all that we have gathered thus far, we will attempt to enter the daily life of monks, as lived in a Caulite monastery.

153 It is interesting to note that the Cistercians experienced a similar attempt to limit Cîteaux's power roughly twenty years later. See the discussion of the quarrel of 1263-65 between the abbot of Cîteaux and the abbots of the four eldest daughter houses in Mahn, L'ordre cistercien et son gouvernement, 229-238.
Long ago, on the road to Val-des-Choux …

Vorle packed away his fishing gear, slung the morning catch over his shoulder, and headed back toward the monastery. It was mid September, the feast of the Holy Cross, and the air was crisp. The trees that lined the uneven dirt path were just entering autumn’s vibrant colors, made brighter against the grey, overcast sky. The scent of wild orchids, known by the locals as “slippers of Venus,” had long faded from this path, and would not return till the following spring. The distant air held the faint baying of dogs.

The year was 1218. Vorle had worked for the Caulites for thirteen years. His life with the monks had been good. The work was often backbreaking, but as a member of the monastic familia he would be guaranteed a burial plot within the walls of the monastery. And now, after many years in the service of the monks, he was allowed to fish. This not only broke up the monotony of his everyday existence, but also gave Vorle a momentary feeling that he was the master of his own life.

Vorle had been fishing in waters recently donated to the Caulites. He favored the spot at the rock ford, the spot that he distinctly had been told was the starting place of the monks’ fishing rights. These waters lay east and slightly south of the monastery, beyond the village of Essaroi. Vorle enjoyed passing through the village because it offered the chance of seeing—and occasionally conversing with—women, who were not allowed
within the monastery’s walls. On this morning he had no luck, the women were occupied with chores. The outskirts of Essaroi announced the entry to the forest.

Cresting a hill, Vorle was greeted by a stone boundary marker, adorned with coats of arms like some petrified crusader. On one side of the marker stood the duke’s coat of arms: blue and black. On the other, the emblem of Val-des-Choux: diagonal blue and gold bars inserted over a larger field of blue with gold fleur-de-lis in the background.

“This is the duke’s forest,” the stone sentry proclaimed. “That forest is the monastery’s.” Vorle had helped to set these boundary markers in the same year he had come to Val-des-Choux. One of his chores was to gather firewood from within these bounds. For Vorle, the marker was both a memory and a sign of the monastery’s proximity.

Suddenly the dogs sounded closer. There was movement in the brush. Vorle stopped in his tracks as a stag broke from the woods and charged into the clearing in front of him. The great buck looked tired and disoriented; for a moment, it seemed as surprised to see the serf as the serf was to see him. It zigzagged and doubled-back. Then springing across the dirt path it vanished into the woods on the other side. The hounds now burst into the clearing, panting and salivating. Vorle tried to flatten himself against the stone boundary marker. The hounds seemed confused. The stag’s criss-cross pattern made its scent stronger in the clearing, and the smell of fresh-caught trout emanating from Vorle’s direction was no help either. Then came a great clattering of hooves, and horsemen broke from the woods. They quickly reminded the hounds of their charge, and the whole group was off again in the direction of the stag. Vorle had seen many courtly hunts in the duke’s forest, but none since the duke’s death. He knew that by day’s end the hounds would have exhausted the stag. Once it had lost all will to run or fight, the master of the hunt would maim it with a sword, then drive the sword through its heart. That evening, the lord of Rochefort would dine on venison. The baying of the dogs disappeared into the distance, and the forest returned to isolated silence.
Vorle walked another half-hour or so until the silence was finally broken again, this time by the church bell’s ringing the hour of Sext. For Vorle, this meant that he was in time for lunch. Looking down from the ridge at the top of the valley, he could see Val-des-Choux nestled within its stone walls. Walking next to these walls there was no way to see in, but from Vorle’s vantage he could trace almost the entire ground plan of the monastery. Nearest to where he stood, at the south end of the walls, was a large pond, fed by a natural spring, the community’s water supply. Beyond this were the small plots where the monks cultivated their vegetables. These plots bordered the south wing of the monastery’s buildings. Reading from left to right at the south end of the valley, these comprised the work buildings and cloister. Closest to the west wall was a building that housed the flour mill. To the right of the mill house was an entry that led from the gardens into the courtyard of offices. Next to this entry was the kitchen—Vorle’s ultimate destination to deliver his catch—and next to the kitchen was the outer wall of the cloister. The church rose up from behind the cloister, its upper row of ogival windows clearly visible from the top of the valley. A momentary break in the clouds allowed a single beam of sunlight to illuminate the church’s high-pitched roof, but this vanished almost as quickly as it had appeared. It was noon. In three more hours the sun would disappear behind the west hill, casting the monastery in an early dusk.

The only door to the monastery, the portery, was at the north end of the wall, so Vorle would have to walk the length of the west wall to gain entry. He was thankful, at least, that this was a downhill trek. As the path descended, and the twelve-foot height of the monastery walls became more real, he took a last look into the compound at the trees that dotted the orchard, which surrounded the pond and gardens, then wrapped around the east end of the cloister and church. The orchard disappeared, and Vorle finished his walk in the wall’s shadow. Ahead of him he saw more rolling hills, which completely encircled the monastery. Vorle turned the corner and noticed a wagon passing through the portery.
Guests, Vorle thought. Just inside the main entrance was the door to the porter’s office and lodgings. Vorle passed through the portery after the wagon, then entered the workers’ courtyard. Vorle called this the big courtyard, since it was as large as the other two courtyards put together. In the northeast corner of this courtyard was a small dining room for travelers. Next to this was a small chapel for the lay brothers, who lived in a dormitory just above the chapel. The wagon pulled up to stables to the left. Vorle passed the watering hole in the center of the courtyard, and walked into one of the workshops opposite the stables to deposit his fishing gear. At the far end of the courtyard, he passed through a covered link that led into the church courtyard.

He was startled as a door inside the link flew open. This was the office of the cellarer, who was in charge of the monastery’s supplies. Vorle held up his fish and bowed his head slightly, in imitation of the monks, but the cellarer brushed past him, quickly and silently, on the way from his own office to inquire about the guests. Vorle turned, and continued on his way to the kitchen. Entering the church courtyard, he passed his own lodgings, and the lodgings of other workers, immediately to his right, along the west wall. Beyond this was the guesthouse, an extension of the same building. To his left Vorle could see the monks’ cemetery, adjacent to the church. He crossed quickly in front of the public doors to the church—the muted sounds of midday chant lingered in the open air—and passed through the arched link to the courtyard of offices. On the west side of the courtyard, he passed the bakery, dairy, laundry, and flour mill, the last of which he had viewed just minutes before from the opposite side, from the top of the hill. He walked into the link, which from this angle would lead to the monks’ vegetable plots. The door to the kitchen was tucked away inside this link. He entered the kitchen, and delivered his fish.

***
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I offer this reverie of Vorle's imagined fishing trip to allow the reader a slower, more experiential approach to the monastery at Val-des-Choux. Figure 9.1 provides an aerial view of the monastery as it exists today. The workers' courtyard, with the cluster of trees at its center, is on the left. The spring-fed pond, now framed in concrete, is in the lower right-hand corner. Part of the west wall is visible at the top of the photo. The geometric shape in the center is a French garden (once the monks' vegetable plots). This is not a view that would have been available to anyone before the twentieth century. I hold that a late-twelfth-century monastery is best understood when approached by late-twelfth-century means: on foot, by a lonely dirt road, in the (almost complete) silence of the forest. Earlier authors have located Val-des-Choux "in the center of a deep circle of hills, hidden to
the world,” in a place that “deserves the name of solitude,” “in a very dense forest,” “in a terrifying solitude.” Such descriptions echo the “place of horror and infinite solitude” found in Deuteronomy 32:10, and locate the monastery in biblical space. Even at the end of the twentieth century, with signs guiding the occasional visitor along forestry service roads to this now historic site, it is striking how the monastery’s ruins seem to appear out of nowhere. It is this sense of solitude and surprise that I hope the reverie evokes.

Vorle’s purpose here is to act as the readers’ eyes and ears, thus allowing them to encounter the path from Essaroi to Val-des-Choux first-hand, even to the extent of remembering the faded scent of orchids along that path. His character is based upon a serf who appears in a charter dated 1205, which states only that Odo III, duke of Burgundy, “for the remedy of his soul,” gave the Caulite monks “his man from Châtillon named Vorle.” This is the only time Vorle’s name appears in the documents. We do not know his age at the time of the donation, nor the date of his death. For the sake of the reverie I have allowed him to live until 1218, thus affording him the chance to go fishing in the waters of Essaroi, donated to the Caulites in that year by Simon de Rochefort. Vorle’s fishing trip takes place on the feast of the Holy Cross (14 September), so that he might encounter an imagined courtly hunt racing through the forest just outside the walls of the

1 Mignard, 412.
2 Courtépée, “Remarques d’un voyageur curieux,” 78.
3 Martène, and Durand. Voyage littéraire, 112.
4 Mignard, 412, note 1, discussed the “slipper of Venus” orchids (cypripedium calceolus) that Vorle encountered on his imagined walk, as well as the “pyrole” (pyrola rotundifolia), according to Mignard, the “charming companion of this queen of orchids.” Villiers, “Le Val-des-Choux.” La Revue de Bourgogne (1914): 380, noted that the “cinéraire de Sibérie” (cineraria sibirica), “thymeli des Alpes” (Daphne cneorum), and Superb carnations (Dianthus superbus) were also native to the area.
5 Dijon, AD de la Côte d’Or, 66 H Inv 40, fol. 192r.
6 Yzeure, AD de l’ Allier, H 267. See also Peincedé, 28.2: 1155, no. 18.
monastery. Like his predecessors and ancestors, Duke Odo III enjoyed hunting in the woods surrounding Val-des-Choux. Because of his very real death on 6 July 1218, Odo III was unable to take part in the imagined hunt, above. Thus, again for the sake of the reverie, I cast the duke's vassal, Simon de Rochefort, leading the hunt. In so doing, it was not my intention to imply some violation of the duke's hunting rights, or other intrigue of any kind. Simon's fief was simply the closest one to Val-des-Choux, so if some lay lord was hunting, it might as well have been Simon. The description of the courtly hunt is based on the work of Cummins, as well as my own experience of being surprised by such a hunt—still practiced by the landed gentry—on my own walk from Essaroi to the Val-des-Choux.

Imagining Vorle’s experience of Val-des-Choux is partly a literary device, but it is also a necessity, for those buildings that existed in his time, the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, no longer stand, victims of the French Revolution, of neglect, of time. What remains within the walls at Val-des-Choux, what can still be seen at a distance, are buildings reconstructed circa 1670: a quadrangle consisting of stables and barns, with what had once been living quarters in one section. Other than their layout they do not necessarily resemble the buildings that stood in the thirteenth century. Jutting anachronistically from the southeast corner of this quadrangle is the home of the current proprietors, built in the eighteenth century. A closer inspection of the compound, beyond what still stands, reveals moss-covered foundation stones, a level trace in the ground where once stood the walls of the church and cloister. Beneath a neatly manicured lawn, roped off
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7 See J. Cummins, *The Hound and the Hawk: The Art of Medieval Hunting* (New York, 1988), 32-46. The feast of Holy Cross was traditionally the last day of hunting season.


9 This house was built for the dukes of Penthièvre, who were frequent visitors to Val-des-Choux. In Figure 9.1, it is the white house with the dark grey roof. Mignard, 415, dated this in the mid-eighteenth century. The current brochure for the guided tour of Val-des-Choux dates it in the seventeenth century.
from public access, a portion of cellar opens up beneath what once had been the kitchen. In searching for our medieval monastery, a strange inversion takes place. What is accessible to the twentieth-century eye did not exist for Vorle; and what Vorle knew as the monastery at Val-des-Choux in the thirteenth century is something to which the mind's eye of the twentieth-century can only allude.

The ground plan published by Mignard in 1864 is a useful aid in several regards, especially for locating the monastery walls, vegetable plots, and fresh spring. (See Figure 9.2.) But the monastery has changed radically since Mignard's time. Hence, I have adapted Mignard's plan, enlarging it to show in more detail what Val-des-Choux looked like in the thirteenth century, with an insert to show what remains today. (See Figure 9.3.) The insert shows the location of the current proprietor's home, which appears as a dotted outline on the thirteenth century ground plan. I feel almost certain that there was a building on that spot before the eighteenth century—if nothing else, the symmetry of the courtyards seems to dictate this—but it also could have been open space, affording Vorle his view of the cemetery.

The following description of Val-des-Choux during the thirteenth century is based on earlier ground plans and descriptions of the site; the work of art and architectural historians; and my own visits to Val-des-Choux. To my knowledge, no thorough archeological excavation of the site has ever been undertaken. While such a study would bring obvious benefits to my inquiry, I nonetheless believe that we may still draw reasonable conclusions from the evidence at hand. Since so much physical evidence is unavailable to us, my description will at times be more functional than visual. Let me begin this reconstruction and analysis, then, with the forest through which Vorle approached Val-des-Choux, followed by the spring and monastery walls, described above from Vorle's vantage
Figure 9.2: Mignard’s ground plan of Val-des-Choux.
Figure 9.3: Val-des-Choux in the thirteenth century.
at the top of the south hill. I will then retrace Vorle’s imagined steps through the
monastery, providing more detailed descriptions of the portery, the buildings of the
workers’ courtyard, the church courtyard, the courtyard of offices, the cloister, and finally
the church.

*The forest*

Most authors have described Val-des-Choux in terms of its distance from Châtillon-
sur-Seine, twelve kilometers to the northwest, the nearest, relatively big town on the map.
Yet, even in the late twelfth century, the monastery at Val-des-Choux found itself within a
six kilometer radius of a number of smaller farming villages which formed the core of its
monastic seigniory: Voulaines, Vanvey, and Villiers-le-Duc, to the north, Rochefort, Saint-
Germain-le-Rocheux, and Montmoyen to the south. The proximity of these towns to the
monastery shows that, even with the limits of medieval travel, while Val-des-Choux may
have seemed like it was in the middle of nowhere, it was not entirely disconnected from the
outside world. Essaroi, through which Vorle passed on his way back to the monastery, is
the closest of these villages, lying three kilometers to the east and slightly south of Val-des-
Choux, a walk of roughly forty-five minutes. Hence the feeling of isolation at Val-des-
Choux, the sense that the monastery was cut off from the world, was largely a perception
created and enhanced by the dense forest surrounding it.

The Caulite foundation myth cast the hermit Viard pursuing his “stricter life” in the
forest. In part, this shows the power of the forest in the medieval imagination. For most
medieval people, the forest was something one passed through en route from one town to
another, a place to gather firewood on the outskirts of town, or a place for the nobility to
hunt. It was not a not place where ordinary men chose to rest for very long. This was more
than just a literary trope, for the medieval forest was indeed full of dangers: from wild
animals to bandits to marauding knights. But to medieval hermits seeking escape from the world, the forest became the metaphoric desert of Saint Anthony. The first task of Viard and his earliest followers, then, was most likely clearing some portion of the woods at Val-des-Choux for the site of their new monastery. The Caulites were not unique in clearing and cultivating forests, but merely followed the lead of the Cistercians and other monastic orders.

Having cleared the valley’s basin, the monks would at some point surround this clearing with a high wall. This separated Val-des-Choux from the forest, but it did not diminish the import of the forest to the monks within. In fact, over the course of the thirteenth century, Caulite use of the forest continued to grow. In 1205, Odo III gave the monks at Val-des-Choux extended rights to “all the forests around their monastery,” but contained those rights “within posted limits (metae)”

James of Vitry described the space within these boundaries (terminus) as “outside the walls of their monastery ... beyond which none [except, under certain circumstances, the prior or his delegates] was allowed to stray.” The metae were the stone boundary markers that Vorle encountered in the forest during his imagined return to the monastery. Their purpose was at once secular and spiritual. They delineated the terminus, that portion of the forest that the Caulites could use—for example, to gather firewood—and separated it from the rest of the duke’s forest at large. At the same time, they marked out the sacred space of the monastery. According
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10. On the clearing of forests, see Duby, Rural Economy. 70-71. J. Le Goff, Medieval Civilization, 400-1500, trans. by J. Barrow (Oxford, 1988), 131, creatively argued that trees “were a refuge of pagan spirits, and were pitilessly attacked by monks, saints, and missionaries.”

11. Yzeure. AD de l’Allier, H 273: “… omne nemus circa domum ipsorum quod continentur infra metas ad illud determinandum positas et assignatas.”

12. Vitry, Historia. 120: “Prefixerunt autem extra septa monasterii sui terminos, quos non licet eis euagando preterire. Solus autem prior ... potest exire.” Niermeyer, 1022, defined “terminus” as “a demarcated area granted to a monastery,” (definition 7).
to Birch, the metae enclosed an area of 500 to 600 arpents (roughly the same in acres), and some of the markers bore the shield of arms of Burgundy, others that of France. The immediate use of the terminus was the gathering of firewood, but the Caulites eventually cultivated this land as well. The Caulite customary tells us that when the monks were gathering wood extra terminos, i.e., outside the demarcated area and far from the church, then they should drop what they were carrying upon hearing the signal for prayer, and hasten to the hour being called.

In 1209, Odo III had expanded the Caulites' rights to the forest around their monastery. He had granted them full and free use of the forest, except that they should not have the right to sell or alienate any part of it, nor were they to use it for the pasturage of livestock. Odo's son Hugh, shortly after becoming duke, approved the alms granted by his father, in a charter dated 1235, which included the entire text of Odo's donation.

Chapter 5 has already discussed Hugh's expansion of Caulite rights to the forest, in 1266, to include the pasturage of twenty cows with their calves, and eight oxen. But Hugh also limited the area of pasturage for fear that the Caulite livestock might do damage to certain parts of the forest. Apparently the pasturage of livestock in the duke's forest turned out to be a failed experiment, for in 1269, Hugh re-issued his confirmation of Odo's original

---

13 Birch, xvii.

14 Birch. 55: "Si conventus extra terminos laboraverit, et forte bajulaverit ligna vel quid tale quod sine dampno reliqui potest, quando audierint quod ante pulsatur, dimittant ibi quod bajulant, et ad horam festinent." Cf. EO, 75. The EO addresses, in several places, the question of what kind of work could be done infra terminos versus extra terminos. See note 163 in Choisselet and Vernet's edition. By adopting this rule from the EO, the Caulites must have anticipated times when they would need to work beyond the boundaries that Odo III had established (see note 12 above).

15 Yzeure. AD de l'Allier, H 273.

16 Yzeure. AD de l'Allier, H 273.

17 Yzeure. AD de l'Allier, H 273.
The spring

The most vital, natural feature at Val-des-Choux is its fresh spring, which pours into the pond in the southern half of the monastery’s compound. This was the Caulites’ water supply. According to one legend, an angel, on hearing the prayers of the first hermit to live at Val-des-Choux, descended from heaven and struck open a great rock, causing the abundant spring to gush forth, thus bringing life to the harsh valley. Whether through divine intervention or the accidents of geology, the spring played an important role in life at Val-des-Choux. Water from the spring provided obvious uses: irrigation for the monk’s gardens; drinking water for the monks (and eventually their livestock); water for laundry; and for the removal of waste in the latrine (domus necessaria). The spring continues beyond the walls of Val-des-Choux as a brook, running north from the monastery to the river Ource. Before he died in 1218, Odo III gave the monks at Val-des-Choux the fishing rights to this brook. At some point, the Caulites walled in the spring-fed pond and stocked it with fresh-water trout, thus rendering fishing

---


19 Mignard, 456. As usual, Mignard offered no source for this legend. Hence it is uncertain whether it originated in the thirteenth century or later.


trips outside the monastery less urgent. They also created a fish pond just north of the monastery walls for the same purpose. This second pond allowed the Caulites to harvest fish in one pond during the year, while the stock in the other was being replenished. Several Caulite priories practiced this “two pond method,” including Uchon, Val-croissant, and probably Val-Saint-Benoît. 22

The monks at Val-des-Choux also used water from this spring in their rituals. One example of this was when the Caulite priest and those assisting him would begin their
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preparation for masses by washing their hands. In addition, upon entering the church, the monks would first approach the altar, where the priest would bless water. The cantor began the antiphons "Vidi aquam" (I saw the water) or "Asperges me" (Sprinkle me), depending on the time of year, and the prior aspersed the community with holy water.23

Of course, a spring was not the only source for daily or ritual water, and indeed some Caulite monasteries were not so lucky as to have a fresh source of water. For example, the priory of Vausse, located on a more open plain, secured its water supply by building stone gutters into the roof of its cloister, which guided the collected rain water into cisterns. (See Figure 9.4.)

The monastery walls

Benedict’s Rule states that “If possible, the monastery should be set up so that everything necessary is carried on within the monastery, that is, the water, the mill, the garden, and the various crafts, so that there be no need for the monks to wander about outside, which is not good for their souls.”24 At a certain point in time, the Caulites enclosed their monastery and a portion of the terminus with great stone walls. These form a rectangle around the “valley of cabbages,” a perimeter running more or less along a north-south axis, and containing between eight and nine acres of land. The twelve-foot wall rises and falls according to the contours of the valley, its numerous flat pilasters providing buttresses against the corrosive effects of rain running downhill. These walls were hardly

---

23 Birch, 35: “... sacerdos ebdomadarius, et qui ei debet ad missam servire, eant lavare manus ... postea benedititur aqua ... et sacrista preparat sacerdoti que necessaria sunt sicut sal et aqua et aspersorium. Qua benedita, incipiat cantor vidi aquam [?] vel asperges me [an antiphon from Psalm 50:9] ... tunc prior ... procedat aspergendus aqua.”

24 RB, ch. 66.
sturdy enough to repel attacks by marauding knights, but they were no doubt effective at protecting the crops within from foraging deer and other woodland creatures, and in maintaining the monks' isolation from the world.

All the land within the walls not occupied by buildings was taken up by cultivation. The Carthusian tradition had each monk cultivating a small garden attached to his individual cell, thus facilitating maximum isolation from the rest of the community. Perhaps because of the limited amount of sunlight available in the "valley of cabbages," it seems more likely that the Caulites' gardens would have been located behind the cloister, within the monastery's walls. (See Mignard's map, Figure 9.2.) Being closer to the spring-fed pond would also have made irrigation easier. At some point the Caulites also began to grow crops outside the walls, yet still within the cultivated areas of the terminus. James of Vitry wrote that the Caulites "[had] within the terminus, gardens of vegetables and trees ... that they may eat the labor of their hands." A map in the Grand Cartulary shows cultivated lands (terres labourables) outside the current walls of the monastery, but this map was created in 1776, and may or may not reflect Caulite cultivated lands of the thirteenth century. According to their customary, the Caulites worked their garden plots in the afternoons, on days when work was not prohibited, between the hour of Nones (roughly 3

---

25 Mignard, 456. recounts another legend concerning an attack on Val-des-Choux by roving English knights during the Hundred Years War. According to this legend, some English and their Navarese allies, hearing of the great casks of Pommard wine stored in the monastery, attacked Val-des-Choux on a Christmas Eve some time in the last quarter of the fourteenth century. Peter of Châteauvillain, once a knight, then prior of Val-des-Choux during the 1370s, took up arms against the invaders. After successfully defending his monastery, the repentant prior washed his hands of English and Navarese blood. The legend tells us that the ghost of Peter of Châteauvillain may still be seen each Christmas Eve, washing its hands of the blood of the guilt of having taken Christian life. Since this work does not concern itself with the fourteenth century, I have relegated the charming legend of Peter of Châteauvillain to this footnote.

26 Vitry, Historia, 120: "Habent autem infra terminos suos hortos olerum et arborum ad quos excolendos ... ut manducent labores manuum suarum."

PM) and the first signal for the evening prayers at Vespers. If the Caulites did grow cabbages in their valley, such a fact was perhaps too obvious to have found mention in the documents.

The portery

The one entry to the monastery was the portery (portaria). The entrance at Val-des-Choux is a large door in the north end of the workers' courtyard, the quadrangle mentioned above, which had been rebuilt in the 1670s. We have no way of knowing what this entrance looked like in the thirteenth century. Currently, there is a statue of Saint Benedict above the door. On either side of the door are two large basins in the shape of seashells, in which travelers could wash their feet before entering the monastery. These were the doors by which the monks left to gather wood in the forest; through which they admitted the poor so that the prior might wash their feet on Maundy Thursday (cura Domini), and from which they turned away women.

The workers' courtyard

Most of the buildings in the workers' courtyard are self-explanatory. There were granaries (granicae) for storing grain, stalls (stabula) for sheltering animals, and rooms for housing the various tools and paraphernalia necessary to the monastery's maintenance. What was once a well in the center of this courtyard is now planted with trees. One can

---

28 Birch, 55-56.

29 Birch, 14.

30 Birch, 91.
easily imagine, however, the utility this once served in watering horses just ridden into the monastery from great distances.\textsuperscript{31}

The northeast corner of this courtyard housed the \textit{conversi}, those lay brothers charged with many of the monastery’s temporal affairs. The dormitory of the \textit{conversi} was separate from that of the monks, a symbol of their lower status in the monastic community. Nonetheless, the \textit{conversi} were allowed to use animal skins on their bedding, while the monks were only allowed blankets. Otherwise the beds of the \textit{conversi} were to be “just as those of the monks,”\textsuperscript{32} who never slept on mattresses.\textsuperscript{13} The \textit{conversi} sometimes ate in the small dining room next to the porter’s office, at other times they ate in the main refectory, with the servers of the meal, after the monks had dined.\textsuperscript{34} This was again symbolic of their status in the community. Yet, according to the customary, the food they received was to be equivalent to that of the monks.\textsuperscript{35} Next to this small dining room, the \textit{conversi} had a chapel of their own. The liturgy of the \textit{conversi} was vastly more simple than that of the choir monks, though there were also times when the \textit{conversi} participated in small ways in the main liturgy in the church.

The cellarer’s office was located at the southeast corner of the workers’ courtyard. As such, it provided a link between goods entering the monastery from the outside world and their distribution in the community. The cellarer was also in charge of assigning work

\textsuperscript{11} Mignard, 414.

\textsuperscript{12} Birch, 100: “Lectos habeant sicut monachi. excepto coopertorio pro quo indulte sunt eiusmod pelles.” Cf. UC, ch. 17: “Lectos habeant. sicut monachi preter lenam; laco cum pellibus utuntur.”

\textsuperscript{33} Innocent III (1205): “Et nunquam super calcitris quiescentes.”

\textsuperscript{34} Birch, 98: “Si autem in uno refectorio comedentes cum monachis servitoribus [et cetera].” The use of the word “if” suggests that the monks might sometimes have eaten elsewhere.

\textsuperscript{35} Birch, 100: “Eisdem escis vescemtur quibus monachi.”
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to the *conversi*—for example, to keep a fire going in the calefactory—and his proximity to their quarters facilitated this task.

*The church courtyard*

The door to the cellarer’s office was tucked into a passage that led to the church courtyard. Upon passing through this link, the first building on the right was the lodging of the *familia*. The term *familia* in medieval Latin, though cognate with the modern English “family,” is not so easily defined. It could mean all the serfs or dependants of any kind subservient to a lord. In this case, the lord could conceivably be the monastery’s prior. These dependents could be living anywhere within an estate (i.e., in lodgings not directly attached to those of the lord), or at a manor, closer to the lord’s control. The term *familia* could indicate all of the residents in a monastery, including the monks. It could also indicate a single household of serfs. Recall from Chapter 5 that the Caulites gave Robert, duke of Burgundy, *octo familias hominum* in exchange for certain tithes. Members of the *familia* could also be people attached to a church or monastery who enjoyed special status, sometimes called *sainteurs* in French. Based on the treatment of the *familia* in the Caulite customary, I believe that at Val-des-Choux (and other Caulite monasteries) this was comprised of the collective serfs—people like Vorle, or the “eight families of men” mentioned above. From the customary, we know that the Caulites allowed members of the *familia* to participate in some monastic rituals. For example, on Palm Sunday, the Caulites

---

36 Birch, 3: “Cellerarius provideat unum conversum qui ignem in calefactorio.”

37 See Niermeyer, 407-408.


distributed blessed palm fronds (*ramos benedictos*) to the monks and novices, with any remaining palms going to the lay brothers, the *familia*, and the guests (in that order).\(^{40}\)

During the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin, the Caulites distributed candles, again, first to the monks and novices, then to the lay brothers, *familia*, and guests.\(^{41}\) When the Caulites prayed for the deceased during masses for the dead, they followed this same hierarchy: monks and novices first, followed by the lay brothers and "familiars of our order" (*familiarium ordinis nostri*).\(^{42}\) When members of the *familia* fell ill, the Caulites made special arrangements to administer communion;\(^{43}\) and when they died, they were buried with a special service within the monastery’s walls.\(^{44}\) Other than this, the customary is noticeably silent on the role of the *familia*, especially on the nature of their living quarters or other responsibilities they may have had toward the monastery.

Next to the lodging of the *familia* was the guesthouse. Even though they desired to withdraw from the world, the Caulites’ customary required them to welcome guests. Echoing the Rule of Benedict, the customary instructed the monks to receive guests with attentiveness and charity (*diligentia et caritate*), for in receiving guests they were receiving

\(^{40}\) Birch, 12: "... scacrista ramos benedictos monachis ac noviciis distribuat. Reliquam partem fratibus laicis et familie ac hospitibus si affuerint porrigat." Cf. EO, ch. 17.

\(^{41}\) Birch, 31: "Interim sacrista reliquas candelas monachis et novitiis ac conversis laicis, familie etiam atque hospitibus, si fuerint, distribuât." Cf. EO, ch. 47.

\(^{42}\) Birch, 35: "In commemoratione omnium fidelium defunctorum et in commemoratione parentum nostrorum, fratrum et sororum nostrarum, consanguineorum et benefactorum nostrorum, duodecimo kalendas Decembris sollemnem facimus memoriam omnium monachorum, novitiorum, conversorum, familiarium ordinis nostri preterito anno defunctorum." Cf. EO, ch. 52. For use of the term *familia* in the Cistercian context, see Choisselet and Vernet’s edition of the EO, 419–420, note 46.

\(^{43}\) Birch, 75: "Cum hospitalis viderit ... aliquem de familia debere communicari, dicit priori, qui mittat ad eum sacerdotem quem voluerit et qui cum eo eant." Cf. EO, ch. 100 (the Cistercian practice did not include the *familia* in this consideration).

\(^{44}\) Birch, 75: "Cum ... aliquis de familia nuntiatus fuerit obisse, prior providat quomodo anima commendetur. Hostellarius qualiter apte preparetur." Cf. EO, ch. 101 (the Cistercian practice did not include the *familia* in this consideration).
In spite of the requirement to charity, the Caulites did not want their guests to disrupt their monastic routine. For their part, the guests desired to gain spiritual advantage through association with monks. They therefore likely tried to participate as much as possible in the religious life of the monastery. The monks responded by laying down restrictions. For example, guests could not partake in Palm Sunday processions or hear sermons in the chapter house, except in special circumstances, e.g., when the guest was an important person who could not be kept out. Guests could also exploit monastic charity and become economic burdens. The prior had to balance the charity owed to guests with his obligation to protect the monastery’s resources. For example, guests that had become ill put a greater burden on the monastery’s resources because the monks had to set aside time to administer communion. More than this time commitment, it seems that the Caulites’ sick guests could take advantage of their wine allotment. For example, in 1287, patients in the infirmary, including guests, were given permission to drink in the infirmary. But in 1289, the Caulites revoked this privilege, no doubt having witnessed abuses even after such a brief trial period. Guests could also die while enjoying the hospitality of the Caulites.

\[\text{Birch. 62:} \text{“Hospites in domum Dei advenientes suscipiendi sunt cum diligentia et caritate, quia in ipsis quandoque Christus suscipitur.” Cf. RB. ch. 53: “Omnes supervenientes hospites tamquam Christus suscipiantur.”}\]

\[\text{Birch. 13:} \text{“Et sciemundum, quod ad processiones que fiunt per claustrum, non licet hospitalibus incedere nec ad sermones in capitulum intrare nisi aliqua fuerit tam reverenda persona, cui hoc permetti deceat.” Cf. EO. ch. 17.}\]

\[\text{Birch. 75. Cf. EO. ch. 100.}\]

\[\text{Birch, 120:} \text{“Item statutem est in dicto capitulo quod si prior pro aliquo hospite transeunte alicui seu aliquibus monachorum suorum in infirmatorio bibendi licenciam dederit, quod monachi seu monachus in infirmatorio non remaneant sed redeant ad conventum, et simili de prioribus statuimus quod ad conventum redeant si sue fuere voluntatis.”}\]

\[\text{Birch, 121:} \text{“Item statuimus illud quod factum fuit Anno Domini M\textsuperscript{e}CC\textsuperscript{e}LXXX\textsuperscript{viii} [sic] quod pro hospite transeunte possit prior vel ejus vices gerens dare licenciam bibendi in infirmatorio ... illud statutum totaliter revocamus.”}\]
and the customary made provisions for these circumstances as well.\textsuperscript{50} The location of the guesthouse at Val-des-Choux made sense in terms of the charity required toward guests: it was directly across from the public entry to the church, which would facilitate their spiritual needs. But this location also served the monks, since the church and courtyard of offices created a kind of buffer zone between the guesthouse and cloister, thus protecting the monks from meddling visitors.

The Caulites received a wide range of visitors. The dukes of Burgundy were frequent guests at Val-des-Choux. Another regular guest was the bishop of Langres, in whose diocese Val-des-Choux was located. Recall that the bishops of Langres were regular supporters of the Caulite Order, beginning with Bishop Garnier’s gift in 1195, the first recorded donation to Val-des-Choux.\textsuperscript{51} Having been appropriately greeted by the prior and the rest of the community, the first stop for a visiting bishop was the guesthouse.\textsuperscript{52} As mentioned above, the Caulites did not want women within the walls of their monasteries. This was in keeping with their earliest constitutions, and the practices confirmed by Innocent III.\textsuperscript{53} Yet it seems that for a time the Caulites experimented with allowing certain women the possibility of lodging within their walls. This was limited to women who had founded Caulite houses, or who donated to the order through tithes, etc. Monks, if they were alone, were not to speak to these female guests, with the exception of the prior and the cellarer.\textsuperscript{54} Among the most powerful female benefactors to Val-des-Choux was Alix.

\textsuperscript{50} Birch. 75-76. Cf. EO, ch. 101.

\textsuperscript{51} Peinecé. 28.2: 1157, no. 24.

\textsuperscript{52} Birch. 62.

\textsuperscript{53} Birch, 91: “Feminae interiores terminos non ingrediuntur;” Innocent III (1205): “Feminae interiores terminos non intrabunt.”

\textsuperscript{54} Birch. 107: “Vetetur insuper ne mulieres jaceant infra domorum nostrarum clausuras exceptis illis qui loca nostra fundaverint, aut in eis redditus suos apposuerint. nec monachus cum eis loquatur nisi sint duos vel tres. excepto priori et cellerario.”
duchess of Burgundy, who acted as regent from 1218 to 1229 (the years between the death of her husband, Odo III, and the majority of her son, who would become Hugh IV). The Caulites called upon Alix several times to settle disputes in which they had become entangled with other lay and ecclesiastical lords. It would have been impolitic, indeed, had they refused hospitality to someone of Alix's stature. Nonetheless, the customary also offers evidence that the Caulites stopped welcoming female guests of any stature at some point in their history, for the entry in the customary which records this practice was scored through for erasure.\textsuperscript{55}

The phrase used to describe that place where the Caulites restricted women guests, the \textit{interior terminus}, helps us to understand the way in which the Caulties constructed space in their monastery. Recall that the \textit{terminus}, the "demarcated area granted to [the] monastery," was only partly enclosed by the monastery's walls. The monks had gardens and orchards \textit{infra terminos}; which meant within the walls, but also the cultivated lands outside the walls of the monastery. The monks were not to go \textit{extra terminos}—beyond the boundaries \textit{(metae)} of the forest established by Odo III—unless they had the prior's permission. From the custom above, we learn that women were not allowed to enter the \textit{interior terminus}, i.e., the \textit{terminus} bound by the monastery's walls. This suggests that the monks constructed the space of the monastery in ever-diminishing concentric circles. Going from the outside to the inside, this space included 1) the area \textit{extra terminos}: beyond the ducal boundaries in the forest; 2) the area \textit{infra terminos}, but outside the monastery's walls; and 3) the \textit{interior terminus}, within the monastery's walls, where women visitors were not allowed. Each circle offered the monk more isolation from the world, within which he could pursue his spiritual quest. With this in mind, it seems plausible that the monks

\textsuperscript{55} See Paris, BN, ms. lat. 18047, fol. 48r-v. Birch, 107, note 1, also states that "this sentence [was] scored through for erasure."
constructed further circles of isolation. Within the *interior terminus* lie the cloister; then each monk's individual cell; and finally, each monk's soul, which only God could penetrate.

Directly across from the guesthouse was the church, but we will save its description for last, passing instead through another link to the courtyard of offices, and returning to the church through the cloister (at the end of our tour).

*The courtyard of offices*

Having passed through the link to the courtyard of offices, the first building on the right was a combination bakery, dairy, and storeroom for fruit. A laundry room followed this, and finally a building containing a mill.⁵⁶

From the very conception of the Caulite Order, the eating of meat and animal fat was forbidden.⁵⁷ Hence bread became important to the Caulites on many levels. It was their main staple during the entire year. According to Innocent III's confirmation charter, the Caulites ate "twice a day from Easter to the exaltation of the Holy Cross [September 14], thereafter contenting [themselves] with bread, water, and one cooked dish daily."⁵⁸ Lest zealous monks become careless, the customary instructed those working in the bakery—on hearing the signal for prayer—to first put whatever bread they might be carrying in an appropriate place, so as not to do it damage, then to hasten to the choir.⁵⁹ The Caulites produced bread of varying quality, which the cellarer would distribute at different times. For example, if a monk had finished most of his regular allotment of bread at lunch, then he received more coarse bread (*grossoire pane*) at the evening meal.⁶⁰ Bread was also the main ingredient in a monastic concoction known as the *mixtum*, which was comprised of one-quarter pound of bread, and one-fourth a measure (*hemina*) of wine.⁶¹ The *mixtum* was a kind of snack consumed by the reader and cook, who would be serving their fellow

---

⁵⁶ See Mignard, 412.
monks during the meal. The mixtum was intended to tide them over until they could sit down to the meal after the others had finished.\footnote{Birch, 91: "... esus cam ium aut sagiminis ... interdictus est." Cf. RB, ch. 39, which forbid all monks, except the very sick, from eating the flesh-meat of four-footed animals, which seems to indicate that chicken and fish were acceptable.}

Bread also served other functions. For example, to keep napkins from becoming greasy, the Caulites were not to wipe their hands or knives on napkins unless they had first wiped them with bread.\footnote{Birch, 55: "At si quid portaverint quod sine dolo relinqui non non possit, sicut panem, vinum vel hujusmodi. aptum locum querant et ibi dimittant." Recall that Caulites gathering wood outside the monastery walls were to drop what they were doing when they heard the signal for prayer.} For monks being disciplined, bread was the one solace of their punishment. For example, the prior of Val-des-Choux was supposed to visit the other monasteries of the Caulite Order. But according to a statute of 1248, if the prior did not give ample warning of his visit, then he was to fast on bread and water for three Fridays.\footnote{Birch, 88: "Illis qui ad prandium usque ad terciam partem panis comedunt ad cenam de grossiore pane ut hubetur superaddere."}

In 1253, the Caulites passed a statute by which any monk who spoke insults or invectives to his prior would—in imitation of Cistercian practice—be put outside the door of the

\footnote{Birch, 53: "De Misto. Si dies fuerit prandii ad mixtum percutiatur signum in ecclesia tribus ictibus ante sextam. Si autem jejunii totidem post sextam. Quo audito mense lector et cocus veniant in refectorium ... Sumpto itaque mixto, si quid residuum fuerit, reponant panem in archam et vinum in vas." Cf. EO, ch. 73.}
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monastery, with only bread and water, for as long as he persisted. Likewise a monk who spoke insults or invectives to another monk would have to go for three days with coarse bread and no wine.65

In the same rooms that housed the bakery, the Caulites stored apples from their orchard.66 In addition to being eaten, these were also pressed into hard cider (sicera).67 By 1267, the Caulites seem to have adapted their recipe for the mixtum, for a statute of that year informs us that the mixtum was comprised of bread, wine and fruit (fructum arborum).68

The bakery and fruit storage rooms also served as a dairy. The cows that grazed the forest around Val-des-Choux—for a time at least—provided milk for cheese, which the Caulites also produced and stored in these rooms. The customary charged the cellarer with distributing this cheese.69

The laundry room was located between bakery-dairy-fruit storage rooms and the mill.70 Laundry day at Val-des-Choux was on Saturday, when the cellarer washed the hand

---

65 Birch. 111: "Quicumque priori suo improperium vel convicium dixerit vel contra ipsum contumacious fuit, mone Cistertiensi ad portam mittatur. in pane et aqua quamdiu ibi fuerit permanitus ... Similiter frater qui fratri suo improperium vel convicium dixerit, tribus diebus sit in grosso pane sine vino et absque misericordia tribus diebus disciplinetur."

66 Birch. 61.

67 Birch. 88. On sicera, see Moulin, La vie quotidienne des religieux. 125.

68 Birch. 116: "Item statutum est in tempore vindemie, quod fratres possint mixtum sumere pro voluntate proprii prioris, scilicet panem et vinum et fructum arborum."

69 Birch. 88: "Nihil preter statutum aut solitum insulito priore facere. nec grande videlicet ultra duodecim nummos aut caseum preter licentiam ejus donare."

70 It was Mignard, 412, who claimed this layout of the buildings: bakery, laundry, mill. It makes more sense to me to place the mill adjacent to the bakery, both in terms of saving steps from the mill to the oven, and in terms of sanitary considerations—I, for one, would not want to trek through the laundry room with my flour on the way to the bakery. But Mignard was there when a good portion of these buildings still stood, and I was not. Without archeological evidence, we are left with Mignard's word. It is certainly possible that unknown (geographic?) conditions caused the Caulites to lay out their buildings as Mignard suggested.
and foot towels, as well as the altar cloth (*palla*). The sacristan washed the liturgical vessels, some of them in warm ashen water (*aqua cinericia calida*) that made a kind of soap, tossing the wastewater into the pond.

Beyond the laundry room was the mill. The many donations of grain tithes discussed in Chapter 5 were delivered to Val-des-Choux and ground into flour in the mill for use in the bakery. The Caulites possessed all or part of several other mills during the course of the thirteenth century, for example, the mill at Chaumont donated by Blanche, countess of Champagne. It is more likely that the Caulites used these other mills as sources of revenue, rather than as tools for grinding the flour needed on a daily basis—especially since Chaumont, for example, is some fifty kilometers away.

A door from the mill led out to a covered tunnel of sorts that ran the width of the building, through which one could pass from the courtyard of offices to the vegetable plots. Opposite the door leading from the mill was a door leading into the kitchen. In the thirteenth century, the kitchen and the refectory were both in the same building.

---

71 Birch, 80: “Sabbato vero tersoria manuum ac pedum lavent.”

72 Birch, 84: “Pallam quidem cum ceteris linteis lavandam cellerario reddat.”

73 Birch, 84: “Corporalia, offertoria, tersoria, quibus digiti sacerdotis terguntur post communionem, et pallam altaris super quam extenditur corporale in vase ad hoc deputato separatim lavet. et singulas lavaturas in piscinam proiciat ... cetera in olla ad hoc deputata aqua cinericia calida ipsemet lavet.”

74 Mignard, 412. maintained that the building that housed the mill also contained an olive press. Although the Caulites did use olive oil for ritual purposes—see Birch, 84 on anointing the sick—it is questionable whether they would have pressed their own olives. The zone for successfully growing olives is far to the south of Val-des-Choux, along the Mediterranean coast; see D. Matthews, *Atlas of Medieval Europe* (New York, 1983). 27.

75 Innocent III (1210): “Ex dono etiam nobilis mulieris B[lanche], comitisse Campanie, jus quod habetis in molendino apud Calvum-Montem.”

76 Mignard, 412. posited a newer refectory, built at a later date, adjacent to the kitchen in the south wing of the cloister, which would have been more in keeping with Cistercian design.
The kitchen was more than just a place where meals were prepared. It was a center of Caulite activity, to a large extent because it had a fire. Copyists entered to liquefy their ink. The cantor entered to erase his tablet. The sacristan entered to light a lamp, or to get embers (to put in the censer), or for blessing salts. These monks only entered, however, if there was not a sufficient fire in the calefactory, or in their own cells. The infirmarian, prior, cellarer, and refectorer could also enter the kitchen, as well as anyone the cook had called in to place or remove the cauldron from the fire. Among other things, this cauldron was used to boil water for the tonsuring of monks. For the tonsuring, razors, combs, scissors, and sharpeners were readied. The crown of the tonsure was not to be too small, and well above the ears. The prior decided who should be tonsured, and no one whom the prior invited to be tonsured had the right to refuse. According to Cistercian custom, tonsuring took place in the cloister, but the Caulite customary is not specific on this location.

Originally the Caulites followed the Cistercian schedule for tonsuring, which prescribed it seven times each year: within six days before the feasts of Christmas, Lent, Easter, Pentecost, Mary Magdalen (22 July), the Virgin Mary’s birth (8 September), and All Saints (1 November). In 1251, the Caulites added six more days for tonsuring: the conversion of Saint Paul (25 January); the Sunday on which they chanted “Cantate Domino” (Psalm

---

77 Birch, 52: “Nullus ingrediatur coquinam exceptis scrip toribus ad liquefatiendum incaustum et cantore ad planandum tabulam, vel pro aliquo ad officium suum pertinenti, et sacrista vel quilibet alio propter lumen vel propter prunas, vel pro sale benedicendo. Sed nec isti intrare debent si in calefactorio vel in propriis cellis ignem invenerint. Coquo etiam infirmario, prie re, et cellario qui omnes officinas possunt ingredi cum refectario, illo etiam quem cocus vocaverit ad ponendum vel deponendum caldarium.” Cf. EO, ch. 72.


97: "Sing to the Lord a new song," chanted on the fourth Sunday after Easter; the feast of John the Baptist (24 June); the Assumption of the Virgin Mary (15 August); and the feasts of Saints Michael (29 September) and Andrew (30 November). This effectively prescribed that Caulite tonsuring take place once a month. Yet in 1268 the Caulites again changed their tonsuring policy. Henceforth, in the summer, i.e., from Easter to All Saints, they would be tonsured every two weeks, and in winter every three.

Next to the kitchen was the refectory, the monks' dining hall. As with all other aspects of Caulite life, dining took on ritual forms. The Caulites borrowed much of their dining ritual from the Cistercians. The main meal of the day followed the hour of Sext, at midday. One monk was assigned each week to read at this meal. Since the Caulites did not want this monk to suffer unduly while his brothers dined, they allowed the reader to eat the mixtum before the midday prayers, and only after he had finished eating did they sound the bell for Sext.

After Sext, the monks washed their hands and waited in the cloister, until the prior sounded the bell for the meal. Upon entering the refectory, they bowed before their seats in the direction of the prior's table. Then they stood until the cantor began the blessing, after which they began the "Gloria patri," bowing one choir to the other, and saying the "Kyrie" and "Pater noster" silently. When the priest had said "et ne nos" (and lead us not into temptation), they straightened themselves and stood in the direction of the prior's

---

80 Birch, 109: "De rasuris, prima est in nativitate Domini, secunda in conversione sancti Pauli, tertia in die bordarum, quarta in Pasca, quinta in dominica qua cantatur Cantate Domino, sexta in Pentecoste, septa in die sancti Johannis Baptistae, octa in die Marie Magdalene, nona in die assumptionis beate Marie, decima in nativitate beate Marie, undecima in die sancti Michaelis, duodecima in die omnium sanctorum, tertiadecima in die sancti Andree."

81 Birch, 117-118: "Item statuimus, quod in estate, ad Pascha usque ad festum omnium sanctorum, de quindena in quindenam fiant rasure, et in hyeme per tres septimanas."

82 Birch, 56: "Ille vero qui lecturus est ad mensam mixtum sumit preparatum sibi in refectorio. Sumpto mixto, pulsetur ad sextam."
The priest said “Let us pray, Lord bless [your gifts]” (Oremus, benedic Domine), making a sign of the cross. Then, when they had completed the blessing, they bowed to the reader and said “Lord, command [to bless this reading]” (Domne jube). Having accepted the blessing, the reader read to the brothers now seated at the tables.

As in other monastic orders, the Caulite refectory was also a place of instruction, where readings of Scripture and the church fathers took place during the meal. In many of their refectory reading practices, the Caulites borrowed directly from the Cistercians. For example, beginning on Septuagesima (the third Sunday before Lent), they read from Genesis to the books of Kings, with anything not completed during Vigils continued in the refectory. On Sundays during this time, they began the refectory reading with the Homilies of the Gospels. On the two Sundays before Easter, they read the book of Jeremiah in the refectory as well as in the church. Their reading in the refectory of the Acts of the

---

1 Birch. 56, contains the phrase “benedic Domine.” The full formula, “benedic Domne dona tua,” is in the EO, ch. 76. It was used as a blessing in the refectory.

2 Birch. 56, contains the phrase “Domne iube.” The full formula, “Domne iube benedicere.” is in the EO, ch. 53. Since it was said before the reading, my assumption is that they were imploring the Lord to bless the reading, or perhaps the reader.

Birch. 56: “Qua cantata [i.e. Sext], fratres abluant manus et sedeant in claustro donec prior pulset campanam ad refectionem, et tunc ingentishes refectorium ante sedes suas inclinent versus prioris mensam; deinde stant donec cantor incipiat benedictae et dicit versus, cum Gloria patri inceperint, inclinatur chorus contra chorum Kyrieleison et pater noster sub silentio. Cum sacerdos dixerit et ne nos, erigat se et stans versus principalem mensam, dicit oremus, benedic Domine, faciens unam crucem. Tunc benedictione completa, erigit se fratres inclinato lectore ac dicente, Domne jube, et cetera. Et accepta benedictione, legat fratribus ingreientibus mensas.” Cf. EO, ch. 76.

Birch, 11: “Hoc tempore, ab septuagesima usque ad dominicam qua libri dividuntur, pars Genesis ad vigiliias legatur ex quae vigiliarum lectionibus per totum hoc tempus ad arbitrum cantoris vel sacriste sufficeret possit. Reliqua vero, si quid ab his vigiliis residuum fuerit, alique libri qui sequuntur usque ad libros regum in refectorio legantur. Ubi hoc sollicite provideatur, ut ante dominicam qua cantatur officium Judica me Deus perlecti sint. Verumptamen in dominicis diebus legantur prius in refectorio homelic euangeliiorum dominicalium.” Cf. EO, ch. 11. It is not clear from the text which homilies the Caulites meant here. Choiselet and Vernet suggested that the Cistercians read the homilies of Pope Gregory I. See their edition of the EO, 467, note 248.

Birch, 11: “Iheremie prophete, legendum tam in ecclesia quam in refectorio.” Cf. EO, ch. 16.
Apostles after the week of Easter seems to have been a Caulite innovation. Yet from Pentecost to the kalends (first) of November, they followed the Cistercians again, reading in the refectory—in the following order—1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Wisdom, Sirach, Job, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Ezra, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and finally the four Evangelists. Sometimes the reading from Vigils would be carried over to the refectory. Here again, the Caulites followed Cistercian practice. For example, at Vigils, from the kalends (first) of August until Advent (28 November), they first read Maccabees, then Ezekiel, then, Daniel. If there remained anything from the Vigils reading, they continued this reading in the refectory. Once they had finished Daniel, they read in the refectory the twelve minor prophets—Hosea, Joel, Amos, etc. During Advent,
they read Isaiah both at Vigils and in the refectory. Sometimes movable feasts could
make certain stretches of time longer or shorter, making it difficult to complete a set of
readings within that time frame. So, for example, if the time from the feast of the Lord’s
circumcision (1 January) until Septuagesima (the third Sunday before Lent) was short, the
Caulites read the letters of Paul not only in the church, but also in the refectory. The
monks’ intention behind this rigorous reading schedule was to have read—or heard
read—the entire bible, with commentaries such as the Homilies, within one year.

Before the bell for the meal had sounded and the brothers had entered the refectory,
the cook had already put one dish on the table. If there were other dishes, he served these
after the monks had been seated. The customary mentions by name only six foods in the
Caulite diet: bread, wine, hard cider (sicera), cheese (caseus), and apples and crude
herbs (poma vel herbe crude). We assume, however, that the Caulites enjoyed a typical
monastic diet for the region in which their monastery was located, even though the
customary does not list the full menu. No brother was to give his food to another, but if a

---

91 Birch, 1: “In adventu Domini, dominica prima, Ysayas incipiatur, et deinceps totus legatur per adventum,
et non solum ad vigilias, sed et in refectorio prout tempus expierit.” Cf. EO, ch. 1.

92 Birch, 7: “Quod si tempus a circum cisione usque ad septuagesimam breve fuerit, non solum in ecclesia
sed in refectorio legantur epistole Pauli, quod fiat secundum quod sacrista ordinaverit.” Cf. EO, ch. 8.

93 Birch, 56: “Porro cocus unum pulmentum disponat ad minus priusquam pulsetur campana, aliud afferat
cum sederint.”

94 Birch, 53, 55, 56, 88, 110, 111.

95 Birch, 53, 110, 111.

96 Birch, 88, 89.

97 Birch, 88.

98 Birch, 61.

99 For more on monastic diet, see P. Meyvaert, “The Medieval Monastic Garden.” in E. MacDougall,
monk had something from outside the monastery—for example, a gift from a family member—he was to share it with his fellow monks.\textsuperscript{100} The cook might also serve a pittance before the bell had sounded, or later in the meal if the prior so commanded.\textsuperscript{101} A pittance (OF: \textit{pietance}, cognate with piety) was a small allowance of food donated in exchange for a monk’s prayers.

Once the reading had begun, the meal commenced. The serving of food and other actions at the table were highly ritualized. The brothers uncovered their bread only after the prior had uncovered his.\textsuperscript{102} This signaled the monk’s humility, as well as reinforcing the monastery’s hierarchy. The idea dates back to Pachomius, who wrote that monks “should not have the audacity to serve themselves at table before the head of their house.”\textsuperscript{103} No one left the table unless permitted, with the exception of the cellarer and sacristan, thus reinforcing the monks’ obedience to the prior. No one was to walk around while eating. This would distract from the reading. The monks were not permitted to wash their cups, though they could rinse them out if they wished.\textsuperscript{104} From the description of some Cistercian monasteries, we know that the refectory sometimes had a fountain next to the kitchen door. It was here apparently, that the monks might rinse out their cups.\textsuperscript{105} As mentioned above, no one was to wipe his hands or knife on his napkin, unless he had

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{100} Birch, 57: “Nullus fratrem de cybro suo dividat. Cui tamen ab extraneo aliquid dividitur, refutare non debet.” See EO. ch. 75, which speaks of sharing the food of the community, rather than the monk’s own food.
  \item \textsuperscript{101} Birch, 56: “Piantia ante campane pulsum vel quando prior velit potest apponi.”
  \item \textsuperscript{102} Birch, 56: “Incepta lectione, fratres discooperiant panes priore discooperiente.”
  \item \textsuperscript{103} Cited in Choisiselet and Vernet’s edition of the EO. 450, note 170.
  \item \textsuperscript{104} Birch, 56: “Ex hoc nullus exeat, nisi jussus, preter cellarium et sacristam propter librum. Nullus incedat comedendo nec ablauat ciphum, sed liniat qui voluerit.”
  \item \textsuperscript{105} See EO. 470-47. note 260.
\end{itemize}
previously wiped them off with bread. While drinking, the monks were to hold their cup with two hands. This was to keep the monks from accidentally spilling wine and possibly staining their napkins or un-dyed wool habits. Chapter 32 of Benedict’s Rule concerned the care of the monastery’s iron tools, clothing, and articles of whatever kind (quibuslibet rebus). Wiping greasy fingers on napkins or spilling wine on habits were signs of disrespect toward the monastery’s goods, and according to Benedict, any monk who treated the goods of the monastery in a slovenly or careless manner was to be corrected. If anyone saw someone who required something, he was to request it from the cellarer, thus exercising Christian charity toward his fellow monk. Whoever passed something and the person to whom it was being passed were both to bow to each other. If the prior made someone pass something, he was first to bow to the person passing it, then that person was to rise and bow humbly to the prior. If the cook happened to cross in front of the prior’s table while serving, the cook bowed to the prior. Bowing at the initiation or conclusion of these mundane tasks was also intended to reinforce the monk’s humility. Monks were to maintain silence during the meal, but were permitted to use a kind of sign language (signum facere) if they needed a spoon, salt, or water, but not for

---

106 Birch, 56-57: “Nullus tergal manus vel cutellum ad mapulam, nisi prius terserit com pane ... Qui bibit, duabus manibus cyphum teneat.”

107 RB, ch. 32: “Si quis autem sordide aut neglegenter res monasterii tractaverit, corripiatur.”

108 Birch, 57: “Si quis deesse aliquid alicui viderit, a cellario requirat. Qui aliquid apponit et cui apponitur, invicem sibi inclinet.”

109 Birch, 57: “Cui prior aliquid miserit prius inclinet deferenti deinde assurgens, humilitet se versus priorem. Sic fiat, si mittitur ab abbate ibidem comedente.”

110 Birch, 56: “Si [cocus] ante priorem transit, inclinet.”

other things.\textsuperscript{112} When the prior wanted the reading to be finished, he said, “Tu autem Domine.” The reader responded with “Deo gratias,” and left. The brothers then covered what was left of their bread.\textsuperscript{113} The meal was over, and there remained only the after-dinner prayers of thanks.

The prior sounded a bell, and immediately the monks rose and stood before their tables, in that order which they stood before the meal. They repeated the verses that the cantor began at the dismissal bell. Once these were said, they bowed for the “Gloria.” The priest of the week said “Agimus tibi gratias.” The monks responded with “Amen,” and exited chanting “Misere mei Deus,” which the cantor had begun. As they chanted, they proceeded into the church, where they finished giving thanks for the meal. After this, they were free to go to the dormitory or to other tasks until the first sound for Nones. Once all the monks had left the refectory, the reader and conversi dined with the cook, who had removed the bowls and collected the spoons before the reader had finished reading.\textsuperscript{114}

As with other spaces in the monastery, the Caulites restricted entry to the refectory. No one was to enter the refectory except the infimarian, in the line of duty, the cook, and

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{113} Birch, 57; “Cum prior finiri voluerit lectionem, dicit tu autem d. Quo dicto, et response Deo gratias. exeat lector. Fratres cooperiant quod superest de pane.”

\textsuperscript{114} Birch, 57; “Prior pulset campanam, et max surgant et stant ante mensas eo ordine quo ante refectionem steterunt, dicentes versum quem cantor incipiat dimissa campana. Quo dicto, inclinato ad gloria, dicit sacerdos ebdomadarius agimus tibi gratias, etc., et response amen. exeat cantantes. misere mei Deus. incipiente cantore. Ad gloria patri inclinent vel prostormantur super miserierdas secundum tempus. in dextro choro, et alternatim cantando intrent ecclesiam in stalla sua versis vultibus ad altare. Fratribus intrantibus ecclesiam, qui prior chorum intraverit, si hic implere conventiener potest, pulset signum. Finitis gratis, surgentes inclinent, et eant cum reverentia in dormitorium. usque ad primum signum none. Notandum autem quod providere debet cocus quod removeantur scutelle et colligantur coelearia priusquam lector finiat lectionem. Post hec, lector et cocus cum conversi manducet.”
\end{flushleft}
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those whom the refectorer had called for help. Anyone who needed a drink could enter, as could the sacristan if he needed salt. The reader could enter before the sounding of the mealtime bell, and prepare his book for reading, but the other monks were to sit in the cloister and wait for the bell.\textsuperscript{115} Monks entering the refectory for a drink apparently became a problem around 1268, for they passed a statute in that year forbidding the practice unless permission was given.\textsuperscript{116}

The refectory was a symbol of the communal aspect of Caulite life. Thus in their earliest regulations, the Caulites required their prior to eat the same food as the other monks in the refectory, just as it required the prior to dress as the other monks.\textsuperscript{117} Yet the Caulites were not advocates of some absolute equality. As in Benedictine practice, rank was assigned to members of the community based on the seniority of entry into the monastery.\textsuperscript{118} Such seniority was most often displayed in processions, and as the customary tells us, in the refectory. This could only be altered if the prior had some good reason for doing so.\textsuperscript{119} One part of maintaining the stability of the community came through administering discipline, which could also take place in the refectory. For example, any monk who committed an offence in the refectory was to seek forgiveness before the

\begin{itemize}
  \item Birch. 52: "Refectorium similiter nullus ingredi debet excepto infirmario pro officio suo et coco, et cum ad juvandum se vocatus fuerit aliquis a refectorario, et ceteris omnibus qui bibere indiguerint, et sacrista pro salino et officio suo. Lector mense potest etiam ante pulsam canpane introire, et preparare sibi librum ad legendum dum alli sedent in claustro expectantes pulsam canpane."
  \item Birch. 116: "Item statutum est, quod nullus monachus post primum prandium hyeme vel estate, bibendi causa, presumat refectorium intrare nisi jussus vel licenciatus."
  \item Birch. 91: "Prior in eodem refectorio simil i cibo sicut et vestibus contentus comedit;" and Innocent III (1205): "Prior vobiscum in eodem refectorio comedit, simil i cibo et vesti contentus."
  \item See RB, ch. 63.
  \item Birch. 91: "Ordinem sive in refectorio, sive ubicumque eum tenemus quem singulis suus ad religionem dedit adventus nisi quem prior vel preposuerit vel supposuerit propter aliquam causam."
\end{itemize}
prior’s table. The prior then signaled when the offending monks could return to his seat.\textsuperscript{120} If a monk had been disobedient to the prior, he was sentenced to eat on the ground, fully clothed, during one meal. This punishment included taking away the monk’s portion of wine. If the monk persisted in his disobedience, he had to continue eating on the floor without wine, until the prior lifted the sentence.\textsuperscript{121} Punishment also came to monks caught complaining about the food. The consequence for grumbling was the loss of wine privileges for one meal.\textsuperscript{122} Punishment for some faults meant banishment from the refectory. For example, monks guilty of certain faults were not allowed to dine with their brothers, but had to eat outside the refectory in a place that the prior deemed appropriate. They were also denied the right to drink with their fellow monks, and had to wait for them to finish before being allowed to drink.\textsuperscript{123} This shows the value the Caulites placed on the communal aspects of their life, for they viewed being denied access to the community as punishment.

\textsuperscript{120} Birch, 57: “Qui ibi aliquid deliquerit. ante mensam prioris veniam petat. Facto signo a priore ad locum suum redeat.”

\textsuperscript{121} Birch, 103: “Monachus qui inobediens fuerit priori suo in refectorio ad terram comedet semel super vestimentum suum ablata ei portione sua vini. quod si denuo inobediens fuerit. in predicta penitentia permaneat, donec prior dicat sufficit.”

\textsuperscript{122} Birch, 107: “Cum priores et cellerarii totius ordinis nostri eodem cibo et potu quo et conventus vivant, et aliqui monachorum loquendo et murmurando de cibo et potu, eos sepius perturbaverint et non considerantes domorum paupertatem. Ideo statuimus ne de cetero aliquis loquatur de cibo etiam vel de potu extra capitulum, quod si forte aliquem loqui contingerit, qui audierit clamare teneatur clamatus vero in capitulo absque misericordia disciplinetur, et in refectorio ad unam refectionem vinum perdat.”

\textsuperscript{123} Birch, 92: “Qui multatur culpe levioris sententia, a fratrum mensa est alienus … extra refectorium comedat in loco quo priori visum fuerit. Qui post refectionem servorum neque ad biberes eat cum aliis. neque illi qui pro versu tercio perdito in pena sunt. sed post alios eat bibere in refectorium.” Cf. RB. ch. 24.
The cloister

The cloister at Val-des-Choux was a courtyard made square by the buildings that surrounded it. The refectory and kitchen formed the west wall. A building that contained the common dormitory and individual cells formed the south wall. Buildings on the east wall of the cloister contained the chapter house and other rooms. The church comprised the cloister’s north wall, which also contained an entry to the church exclusively for the monks. The cloister had covered galleries, and at its center stood a stone cross. Vausse, the best preserved of all the Caulite priories, offers a good idea of what the interior of the cloister at Val-des-Choux might have looked like. (See Figure 9.5.)
The combination of individual cells and a common dormitory was a Caulite adaptation of Carthusian and Cistercian practices. According to James of Vitry:

The Caulites constructed modest little cells for greater tranquillity and peace, so that in times of meditation, reading, or prayer, they would be that much more devoted since they were secluded—the door of sensuality closed. Alone in their cubicle, they could give themselves over to God.\textsuperscript{124}

The cell was obviously a place for spiritual contemplation, and the Caulite customary assigned specific times for this purpose. For example, between Lauds and the daily chapter, brothers could pray in their cells.\textsuperscript{125} Between the daily chapter and the hour of Terce, the monks had the choice of celebrating private masses, or of retiring to their cells and turning their attention to spiritual matters.\textsuperscript{126} After Mass, the Caulites returned to their cells for prayer and meditation until the hour of Sext.\textsuperscript{127} After Nones, the Caulites could work in their gardens, or be in their cells, up until the first signal for Vespers.\textsuperscript{128} Solitude was critical for this spiritual pursuit, and the customary made several provisions to keep monks in their cells from being disturbed. The sacristan at times distributed books to the monks’ individual cells, but he was only to go to the door of the cell, and not to presume to enter without the permission of the prior.\textsuperscript{129} In fact, no Caulite monk was to enter the cell of

\textsuperscript{124} Vitry, \textit{Historia}, 120: "... cellulas modicas causa maioris tranquillitatis et pacis sibi construxerunt. ut in eis tempore meditationis, lectionis, orationis, tanto deuotius quanto secretius, clauso sensualitatis ostio, intra cubiculum suum soli deo uacare queant."

\textsuperscript{125} Birch, 48: "Interim fratres orent in cellulis vel in oratorio."

\textsuperscript{126} Birch, 51: "Fratres egressi de capitulio mox qui voluerint celebrent missas privatas si non redeant ad cellas spiritualibus vacantes usquequo a sacrista pulsetur signum ad tertiam."

\textsuperscript{127} Birch, 56: "Fratres egredientes de missa ingrediuntur cellas orationi, meditationi vacantes usque ad sextam."

\textsuperscript{128} Birch, 55: "Post nonam ad biberes, post biberes unusquisque in deputato sibi ortulo aut in cellula potest unusquisque usque ad primum signum vespere laborare."

\textsuperscript{129} Birch, 85: "Pro libris dandis vel accipiendis usque ad ostia cellarum ire sed non intrare. Nullus enim sine licentia prioris cellam alterius ingredi presumat."
another without permission. If a monk came upon a cell that had the door closed, he was not to open it, but to knock if he needed something from the monk within. Once the door was opened, he could make understood through sign language (signo potest intimare) why he had come, but he was not to enter the other monk’s cell.\footnote{Birch. 91-92: “Nullus sine licentia cellam alterius ingreditur. cujus inveniens clausum ostium non aperit sed significatione sonitus postulat aperiri. quo aperto signo potest intimare propter [quod] venerat non ingrediens.”} This prohibition against two monks being in the same cell—with a door that could be closed—could also couch a concern for homosexuality.

The cell was not just a place for contemplation. Monks could also work there, for example after receiving penance and being aspersed with holy water, monks might return to their cells to work alone.\footnote{Birch. 51: “Si eis injungitur de penitentia ante presbiterii gradum persolvant prostrati, deinde aspergentes se aqua benedicta ad cellas redeunt laborantes per se singuli.”} Any monk who was not working with the others could be in his cell, but he was required to wear his cowl or hood.\footnote{Birch. 103: “Frater qui non laborat tempore laboris potest in cella sua esse in cuculla vel in capa.”} This requirement to wear the full monastic garb was a reminder that the time in the cell was not for leisure. The cell was also a place where novices received instruction from the novice master.\footnote{Birch, 76: “Deputetur ei senior qui eum instruat loquens cum eo in cella ejus novitii. horis oportunis. Si plures fuerint novitii, convocet eos magister suus in cellam unius;” and 83: “In unius cella omnes ad docendum eos de ordine suo certis horis adducere.”} For the first three weeks of their novitiate, novices were allowed to speak only in their cells, as well as to travelling monks.\footnote{Birch. 83: “Deinde per tres ebdomadas in cella sua et cum peregrinis monachis cum eo loqui.” Cf. EO. ch. 113, which restricted the novices’ speech to the auditorium for two months.} Following a practice that is probably as old as monasticism itself, the Caulites were forbidden to have personal property.\footnote{Innocent III (1205): “Nullus vestrum proprium possidebit.” Cf. RB. ch. 33. “Si quid debeant monachi proprium habere.”} To ensure that they upheld this

\begin{footnotes}
\item[130] Birch. 91-92: “Nullus sine licentia cellam alterius ingreditur. cujus inveniens clausum ostium non aperit sed significatione sonitus postulat aperiri. quo aperto signo potest intimare propter [quod] venerat non ingrediens.”
\item[131] Birch. 51: “Si eis injungitur de penitentia ante presbiterii gradum persolvant prostrati, deinde aspergentes se aqua benedicta ad cellas redeunt laborantes per se singuli.”
\item[132] Birch. 103: “Frater qui non laborat tempore laboris potest in cella sua esse in cuculla vel in capa.”
\item[133] Birch, 76: “Deputetur ei senior qui eum instruat loquens cum eo in cella ejus novitii. horis oportunis. Si plures fuerint novitii, convocet eos magister suus in cellam unius;” and 83: “In unius cella omnes ad docendum eos de ordine suo certis horis adducere.”
\item[134] Birch. 83: “Deinde per tres ebdomadas in cella sua et cum peregrinis monachis cum eo loqui.” Cf. EO. ch. 113, which restricted the novices’ speech to the auditorium for two months.
\item[135] Innocent III (1205): “Nullus vestrum proprium possidebit.” Cf. RB. ch. 33. “Si quid debeant monachi proprium habere.”
\end{footnotes}
mandate, the customary allowed the prior to inspect their cells twice a year. It seems that some cells in Caulite monasteries might have been equipped with fire places, for the customary tells us that monks could only enter certain other rooms—the kitchen or the calefactor— if they did not have a sufficient fire in their own cells.

Above the cells, in the same building, was the dormitory. While a monk’s individual cell served his spiritual needs, the dormitory was a place for taking care of temporal affairs, particularly the needs of the body.

Because the dormitory was a group setting, modesty and consideration were paramount concerns. The monks could enter the dormitory whenever they needed, but upon entering they were to put their cowls on their head. In so doing they would avoid eye contact that might tempt them into idle conversation. The monks were not to sit in the dormitory, unless putting on or taking off their shoes, or putting on their surcoats (tunicas), and then they should sit on their beds or on a stool, i.e., not on the floor. The monks could also change clothes in their own cells. These precautions while dressing and undressing were to keep them from immodest displays of nudity, which could possibly incite the monks to homosexual thoughts or actions. To prevent the slightest flash of bare skin,

---

136 Birch, 103: “Unusquisque prior cellas monachorum suorum in anno bis ad minus scrutetur.”

137 Birch, 52: “Sed nec isti intrare debent [coquinam] si in calefactorio vel in propriis cellis ignem invenirent;” and further down the same page: “Calefactorium possunt ingredi ad illa que superius diximus facienda ... si ignem non habent in cellis.”

138 Mignard, 416.

139 The Caulite borrowed many of their practices concerning the dormitory from the Cistercians. See especially, EO. ch. 72, the section entitled “De dormitorio.”

140 Birch, 52: “Dormitorium ingeriuntur quotiens opus habuerint. Ingredientes ponant caputia in capitibus suis.”

141 Birch, 53: “In dormitorio non sedeant nisi quando se calciant vel discalciant, vel tunicas mittant, et tune in lectis suis vel in subpedaneis vel in cellulis suis. Exuentes vero et induentes se honeste et caute. faciant ne nudi apparent.”

392
monks were not to get into bed standing up, but were to sit at the edge of the bed and
discretely turn their feet onto the bed. No one was to sleep above the covers, unless they
were ill or being bled. Out of consideration for their fellow monks, no one was to shake
out their clothing in the dormitory. As in other locations throughout the monastery, the
monks were to keep silence in the dormitory, and in addition to keeping silent, they were
not to use sign language unless the prior was present, or if they were doing so on the part of
the prior. In addition to his biannual inspection of individual cells, the prior frequently
inspected monks’ beds as part of his campaign against monks hoarding private
possessions.

Located near the dormitory—for easy access—was the latrine (domus necessarius).
Based on the rules in the customary for using the latrine, discretion was paramount. When
they used the latrine they were to hide their faces in their hoods as much as possible. If
they had to sit in their scapulars, they were to cover themselves in the front as much as
possible. In their cowls, they were to sit in such a way that the cowl covered their bodies all
the way to the floor. In fact, any time that they entered the dormitory in their cowls—for
example, following the drink after Nones—they were to use the latrine before taking off
their cowls.

142 Birch, 53: “Nullus in lectum ascendat rectus sed de sponda divertat pedes in ipsum lectum, nec jaceat
super coopertoria preter minitos et infirmos qui extra chorum sunt.”

143 Birch, 53: “Nullus ibi excutiat indumenta.”

144 Birch, 81: “Silentium ad mensam in quantum rationabiliter poterit teneat, in ecclesia, in dormitorio, et
in aliis determinatis locis.”

145 Birch, 82, “Cellas bis per annum ad minus scrutari, et lecta frequentor.”

146 Birch, 52-53: “Intrantes autem domum necessarium abscondant vultus in caputiis suis quantum possunt
et ita assideant cuculla ad pedes demissa. Si quando vero sederint in scapularibus suis, quantum possunt ab
anteriore parte se cooperiant.”

147 Birch, 61: “Dicta nona ... eant [ad] dormitorio ... si necesse habent ire ad necessaria eant antequam
exuantur cuculle.”
The dormitory was obviously a place for rest, and this could happen throughout the day. For example, the Caulites might take an afternoon siesta after the midday meal, staying in the dormitory until the hour of Nones. Even during this time, monks were allowed to read in their beds, so long as they did not disturb their fellow monks. This disturbance might occur because the monastic practice was to read aloud, thus creating a kind of feedback system—from eye to mouth to ear—which reinforced that being read. Even after Nones, Caulites could retire to the dormitory. Yet if they intended to prepare themselves for work, for example, in their gardens, they should do this in their own cells. At the end of the day, immediately following Compline, the monks were to hurry to the dormitory where they would spend the night. Only the sacristan, cellarer, or those caring for the sick were allowed to leave the dormitory after Compline. What the Caulites wore to bed seems to have changed over time. Circa 1205, the Caulites were to sleep in their tunics, belts, and boots.


149 Birch, 57: “Qui vult legere in lecto suo potest ita quod aliis non perturbetur.”

150 J. Leclercq, The Love of Learning and the Desire for God, transl. By C. Misrahi (New York, 1961). 15, called this “acoustical reading” in his treatment of monastic reading technique and the “lectio divina.” The admonition to read without disturbing others is also found in RB, ch. 48: “Post sextam autem surgentes a mensa pausent in lecta sua cum omni silentio, aut forte qui voluerit legere sibi sic legat, ut alium non inquietet.”

but never in their cowls. Yet by the time they adopted more Cistercian practices, the Caulites also slept in their cowls. They were never to sleep on mattresses.

The remaining architectural evidence does not allow easy location of some of the spaces in the cloister, including the calefactory, the auditorium, the infirmary, and the chapter. We should nonetheless discuss these because of their presence in the customary.

The calefactory (calefactorium), literally “the warm-making place,” was a room in the cloister with a fire, specifically for warming up on cold winter nights. As with everything else, certain rules governed the use of the calefactory. Monks could obviously enter to get warm, but also to oil their shoes (sotulares) or to be bled. If they did come in just for the warmth, they were do so in all modesty, and were not to expose their bare feet in the presence of others. On Christmas Eve, when the liturgy ran longer, it was the cellarer’s job to provide one conversus to keep the fire in the calefactory going, so that the monks could warm themselves during intervals in the prayer. This regulation obviously demonstrates that the church itself was not heated.

The auditorium was a place where the monks gathered to talk. In an atmosphere where silence was the rule, this offered the Caulites a respite from the severe isolation of

---

152 Innocent III (1205): “Cum tunicis, cinguio et caligis omnes jacebitis. et praeter haec, vos, filii monachi, cum cuculla nusquam.”

153 Birch, 60: “Qui max mittentes caputia in capitibus et nusquam devertentes preter obedientiales et eos qui extra dormitorium jacent … omnes ingrediuntur dormitorium. unde nullus excepto sacrista, cellerario, custode infirmorum, exeat. Sine cuculla, tunica, cinguio, caligis non jacent.” See EO. ch. 82, which did not require sleeping Cistercians to wear a belt.

154 Innocent III (1205): “Nunquam super calcitris quiescentes.”

155 Birch, 52: “Calefactorium possunt ingredi ad illa que superius diximus facienda, ad solutares ungendos si ignem non habent in cellis. et ad minuendum. et caelefatiendum quod honeste et non nudis pedibus presente aliquo faciendum est.” Cf. EO. ch. 72, the section entitled “De calefactorio.”

156 Birch, 3: “In nocte natalis Domini, cellerarius provideat unum conversum qui ignem in calefactorio monachis preparat ad intervallum. si frigus fuerit.” Cf. EO. ch. 4, which, in the much larger Cistercian community, provided for two conversi to keep the calefactory fire going.
their otherwise quasi-eremitic life. The customary provided specific instances when monks
would be permitted to talk. For example, no more than two monks were to talk together at
the same time, unless the prior or his agent was party to the conversation. If more than two
monks found themselves together, they were to keep silent, which also held for those being
bled. On those feasts when the Caulites allowed conversation, all were permitted to talk, but
they were to do this in a voice that was not so loud that it disturbed others. The Caulites
were generally permitted to talk in the presence of bishops, abbots and priors of the
Cistercian order, and priors of the Carthusian order. They could talk to console a troubled
brother, or if they went on a walk. The cellarer, if working with the community, was not to
talk with the prior or subprior, except in private, and then briefly. Novices were not to talk
unless the novice master was present, but monks reading the rule to a novice could talk
outside the novice master’s presence. In the auditorium itself, the Caulites could
converse on Sundays and on those feast days when they had no other work, from Nones
until the first sound of Vespers. The Caulites did not allow their novices to participate in
these conversations. For their part, the monks were to speak of useful things, avoiding idle

157 Birch, 68: “Hic notandum est quod duo tantum monachi non possunt loqui insimul, nisi prior vel qui
ejus vicem supplet. Si autem prior vel subprior occupati fuerint, potest mittere prior quem voluerit. Et si
prior defuerit, potest similiter et subprior. Festis autem quibus generale colloquium habemus, possunt
omnes loqui, ita tamen quod unus non sic loquatur demissa voce quin possit audiri; et si forte contingent quod
remaneant tantum duo in colloquio, taceant donec fuerint plures, et sic de minutione. Coram autem
episcopis et abbatibus [et prioribus] Cisterciensis ordinis et prioribus Cartusiensis possunt loqui generaliter.
Ad consolandum fratem fluctuamet potest mittere prior vel subprior quemcumque voluerit, similiter et
fratri qui aliqua causa extra colloquium fuerit. Quocumque istinent ad spaciendum fratres possunt loqui.
Cellerarius si in communie labore affuerit, loqui non debet nisi seorsum cum priore vel subpriore, et hoc
tamen cum brevitate. Sicut autem stabilitum est de infirmitore ita habeatur. Si autem novitiis in domo
fuerint, loqui non debet nisi magister eorum presens fuerit ... Monachus tamen qui novitiiis legit regulam,
loqui potest cum eis sine magistro suo.” The words in brackets erased, but still legible.

158 Birch, 52: “Auditoria nunquam ingrediuntur exceptis dominiciis diebus et festis quibus non laboramus,
ubi possumus colloqui a nona usque ad primum sonitum vesperrum.”
talk and insisting upon edifying conversation. The sick were not to use the auditorium for conversation, unless they had returned to the choir with the other brothers. On weekdays or non-feast days, if the need arose, the Caulites could use the auditorium with permission. For a time, the Caulites followed the Cistercian practice of restricting the number of brothers speaking to the prior to two, unless he had called more of them together for some purpose. At some unknown date, the Caulites struck through this line in the customary as an indication that they had amended that practice. Overall, the Caulites seem to have mitigated the Cistercian practice in the auditorium. For example, the Cistercians could only enter the auditorium if they had some need, and did not seem to practice conversing on Sundays and other feasts, as did the Caulites.

Care of the sick was a major concern of the customary, which assigned this care to the infirmarian. Though we do not know the exact location of the infirmary in the cloister at Val-des-Choux, it must have had been laid out in a similar fashion to the dormitory, i.e., with beds. The Caulites borrowed their practices in the infirmary to a large extent from the Cistercians. Both orders were concerned with controlling undue conversations in the infirmary. They did not want the infirmary to become a refuge for monks who might simply be seeking an escape from the governing silence. So for example, sick Caulite

---

159 Birch, 58: "Tunc si festum fuerit in quo non laboramus, surgente priore post pulsum campane cant in auditorium ubi congregatis omnibus [a brief reading took place, then] ... Finita lectione exequnt novitii statim nisi detineantur. Deinde frater usque ad primum signum vespere de utilioribus loquantur. Caveant vanilloquia, edificationis colloquis insistentes, ibi nullus loquaturs privatim quod prior non possit ut debeat audire."

160 Birch, 68: "Infirmi vero causa loquendi auditorium non debent intrare, nisi ad diei horas cum aliis fratribus in choro venerint persolvandas."

161 Birch, 52: "Quod si alio tempore aliquod opus habuerint querant signo vel sonitu ad ostium et tunc si concessum fuerit ingrediatur, [ubi nunquam plures quam duo tempore lectionis loquantur, nisi forte prior pro aliqua necessitate plures convocandos sibi judicaverit.] The section in brackets scored through for erasure.

162 See EO, ch. 72, the section entitled "De auditorio."
monks in the infirmary could speak with the infirmarian, but only in a place designated for that purpose, or if given permission by the prior. They could do this in summer, from the time of the daily chapter up to the first signal for Nones, and from Nones up to the first signal for Vespers. In winter they could do this from the chapter, up to the first signal for Vespers. But they were not to talk unless in the presence of the infirmarian, and not before Mass unless necessary. The infirmarian could talk with the sick if he needed to, but the sick were not to talk to each other.\textsuperscript{163} The sick lying in bed were not allowed to talk, unless alone (while reading aloud?), or with the prior or subprior, or with the prior of Lugny. Once monks were well enough to move around, they were to keep silent as usual, and only the prior could judge if they should be allowed to talk. If infirm monks got permission from the prior to speak in a predetermined place, then they were not to talk in bed. Sick Caulites were not to talk during meals.\textsuperscript{164} The sick were excused from their regular liturgical duties,\textsuperscript{165} as well as from work.\textsuperscript{166} At the same time, the infirm were to participate as much as they were able in the communal liturgy. For example, they could chant Vigils and the

\textsuperscript{163} Birch. 66: "Infirmi de infirmitorio possunt loqui cum infirmario, sed non nisi in loco ad hoc determinato, tamen licentia prius quesita a priore. In estate sic licet a capitule usque ad signum meridiei, et a nona usque ad signum vespérerum. In hyeme a capitule, usque ad signum vespérerum. Sed tamen loqui non debent nisi coram infirmario, et neque ante missam nisi de necessariis. Infirmarius potest loqui cum infirmis in infirmitorio de necessariis, sed infirmus non." Cf. EO. ch. 92. The Cistercians were not as specific concerning the seasons and times of day when talking would be permitted.

\textsuperscript{164} Birch. 67: "Cum infirmo jacenti in lecto non potest loqui nisi solus fuerit nisi in presentia prioris vel subprioris vel prioris Luviniaci. At ubi melioratus hue et illuc deambulare poterit silentium more solito teneat, nisi forte alicui, magna debilitate adhuc detento, prior adhuc loqui amplius judicaverit expedire. Sed si infirmus quesita licentia a priore volens loqui in loco determinato, non loquatur amplius in lecto. Ad mensam non loquatur infirmus." Cf. EO. ch. 92. The Cistercians made no provisions for the sick to speak with the abbots or priors of other monasteries. As shown in Chapter 4, this practice was evidence of the profound link between Val-des-Choux and its motherhouse of Lugny.

\textsuperscript{165} Birch. 66-67: "Qui ita infirmus est ut continuo jacent aut subita infirmitate gravetur, assidue adsistat ei infirmarius, et ab horis ecclesie, et a capitule, et a collatione ubi major instat necessitas liceat remanere." Cf. EO. ch. 92. The Cistercians specifically mention being bed-ridden because of fever.

\textsuperscript{166} Birch. 54: "Pulsata tabula a priore vel a quolibet jussurit, conveniant omnes in unum, exceptis infirmis et si quos prior pro utiliore labore in capitule absolverit." Cf. EO. ch. 75.
other hours in the infirmary, but any monk who wanted to go to church for these hours or
the Mass could do so if it was not a great burden. The infirmarian was to help any monk
confined to the infirmary to chant Vigils and the other hours. If the monks in his care were
too sick to chant, then the infirmarian was to chant alone. Those who were too fatigued
were not required to genuflect in the infirmary or in church, either at the regular hours or at
the Mass, except at the “Agnus Dei” in the church. At the blessing of a novice, those who
were able could take their place in the choir, seated if necessary. Those who wished to
receive communion could do so according to their rank in the monastery. Unless their
illness dictated otherwise, monks were to maintain their fasting during those times when
they fasted, and not to change their diets in the refectory. In 1249, the Caulites adapted
their practice by allowing the sick to consume meat. This was to be done in accordance with
the Benedictine practice, which meant that when the monks had recovered they were once
again to abstain from meat.

The one regular practice conducted in the infirmary was bloodletting (minutio). The
practice of bloodletting dates back to antiquity, but was legitimized by the Roman physician
Galen (AD 129-200), who had advocated a theory of health based on the balance of four
humors: blood (considered warm and moist), phlegm (considered cold and moist), yellow

---

167 Birch, 67: “Vigilias et alias horas in infirmitorio cantent... Ad horas diei qui voluerint cant in
ecclesiam, et ad missam nisi multum graventur. Si unus tantum in infirmitorio sit infirmus, infirmarius
adjuvet eum cantentem vigilias et alias horas. si infirmo grave est infirmarius solus cantet. At vero illi
quos gravat nec in infirmitorio, nec in ecclesia, sive ad horas, sive ad missam genua flectant, nisi ad Agnus
Dei in ecclesia. Ad benedictionem novitii si surgere possunt, in ordine suo sint in choro, et sedeant qui
voluerint. Qui communicare voluerit, ordine suo ad communionem accedat.” Cf. EO, ch. 92.

168 Birch, 67: “Si quis talem habuerit infirmitatem que non multum debilitet eum, sed tamen conventum
omnino tenere non possit, nisi jussu prioris, consuetudinana jejunia non solvat, nec cibos refectorii mutet.”
Cf. EO, ch. 92. The Cistercian customary mentions specific non-debilitating ailm ents, for exam ple, an
abess (puta inflatura), and cuts (incisio membrorum), which would not keep sick monks from continuing
their regular diet or fast.
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bile (considered warm and dry), and black bile (considered cold and dry). One method for achieving the balance of these humors was to bleed a vein, thus relieving the surplus of the humor that had caused the original imbalance, and returning the patient to health.\(^{170}\) At some point, bloodletting became a regular practice in monasteries, i.e., it was not performed in response to illness, but at scheduled intervals, as a preventative measure. During this time, monks being bled were not permitted to read, chant, or anything else. They were to eat bread for the first two days. On the third day, if there was a pittance, they were to eat with the rest of the community. The three-day recovery period was to take place in a dark room, since contemporary medical theory held that exposure to excessive light after blood-letting would cause cataracts.\(^{171}\) Regular blood-letting in the monastic context must have taken on a feel of ritual purification. One can imagine how the monks, rising after three days in a dark room, could have constructed an analog to Christ rising after three days from the tomb.

\(^{170}\) For Galen's theories of blood-letting, see P. Brain, *Galen on Blood-letting* (Cambridge, 1986). For medieval blood letting in general, see P. Gil-Sotres, “Derivation and Revulsion: the Theory and Practice of Medieval Phlebotomy,” in L. Garcia-Ballester, et al. eds., *Practical Medicine from Salerno to the Black Death* (Cambridge and New York, 1994), 110-155. For monastic blood-letting in particular, see L. Gougaud, “La pratique de la phlébotomie dans les cloîtres,” *Revue Mabillon* 13 (1924): 1-13; B. Harvey, *Living and Dying in England, 1100-1540: The Monastic Experience* (Oxford, 1993), 96-99; and N. Siraisi, *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine: An Introduction to Knowledge and Practice* (Chicago and London, 1990), especially, ch. 5. Siraisi, 115-117, relates the story of Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny (d. 1156), who during the winter of 1150-51 sought the advice of a *medicus* named Bartholomeus. Because of his busy schedule as abbot, Peter had postponed his regular, bi-monthly blood-letting. He then suffered an attack of catarrh (inflammation of the respiratory tract). The local *medici* advised Peter to postpone his blood-letting again, since blood-letting during an attack of catarrh could cause the patient to lose his voice. For Peter, this would mean not preaching or celebrating the divine office. But Peter felt that the blood and phlegm building up in his body were bringing on a fever. Four months after his last blood-letting, Peter finally had his blood drawn in large amounts, twice in three weeks. As predicted, the catarrh remained, and Peter lost his voice for three months. To cure Peter’s ailment, Bartholomeus recommended “hot baths, inhaling medical steam, poultices for the chest, lozenges to dissolve in the mouth, gargles, and, for good measure, a laxative.” Peter’s letter and Bartholomeus’s response are in G. Constable, ed., *The Letters of Peter the Venerable* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), 1: 379-383. letters 158a and 158b.

\(^{171}\) Gil-Sotres, “Medieval Phlebotomy,” 153.
On the fourth day they returned to the choir at Prime. Among the Cistercians, bloodletting took place four times per year, in February, April and September, as well as some time around the feast of John the Baptist (24 June). Caulite monks adapted this schedule to five times a year, before Advent, before Lent, after Easter, sometime around the nativity of John the Baptist, and finally sometime in September. Since bloodletting obviously kept monks from fully participating in the community for a short time, the Caulites restricted its practice. For example, the priest of the week, the reader and cook were not to be bled with the others unless for some dire reason. The prior announced in the chapter who would be bled the day before the bloodletting was to occur.

The chapter house was located next to the south transept of the church, echoing the shape of the apse as it jutted out from the east wing of the cloister. It was the meeting place of chapter of faults and the the general chapter, discussed in Chapter 8. Following the Cistercian model, the Caulites held this meeting on the feast of the Holy Cross (14

---

172 Birch, 66: “Prima die et secunda inscidatur panis eis a refectorario. Tribus diebus mane et sero tam minuti quam aliis simil simul comedunt, si pitantiam habeant; si non, non desit minuti propter hoc. Lectionem mense habeat in conventu cum eo comedentes ... Quarta die ingrediuntur chorum ad primam, ante hanc diem non licet eis legere nec cantare nec alid quid faciat aliquis de obedientia sua.”

173 EO. ch. 90: “Et si fieri convenienter potest, his minuantur mensibus, februario, aprili, septembri. Quarta vero minutio circa festivitatem sancti iohannis baptiste fiat.” Cf. EO. ch. 90. The Cistercian customary specifically prohibited bloodletting during Advent, Lent, and Easter (as well as the three days following Christmas, during Pentecost, and during major fast times).


175 Birch, 64: “Ebdomadarius missa, lector et coccus. cum alius non se minuent nisi pro gravi necessitate. et misericordiam tunc in capitulo petent.”

176 Birch, 64: “Cum autem minui debent die precedenti prior dicat in capitulo. illi et illi minuantur.”

177 In all likelihood, there was a small sacristy immediately adjacent to the south transept, i.e. between the south transept and the chapter house. This was a room where the Caulites stored sacred vessels and vestments.
September)—hence in the reverie, the guests Vorle sees entering the portery might have been latecomers to the general chapter.

The church

Thus far, I have described what we might call the "non-liturgical spaces" at Val-des-Choux—though obviously spaces like the refectory and chapter house had quasi-liturgical aspects. Much of my description of non-liturgical spaces has been functional. This was largely out of necessity, since most of those spaces no longer exist. Neither did earlier visitors to Val-des-Choux consider those spaces important enough to warrant much description. Not so with the church. Here, with the aid of writings and engravings left to us by earlier scholars, I will limit myself to a visual description of the Caulites’ first church. Figure 9.6 offers a view of the ruined state of the church at Val-des-Choux as it appeared in 1833. This illustration confirms much of Mignard’s 1864 description, which is the basis of the following treatment.

As was common in the design of monasteries, the church at Val-des-Choux was located to the north of the cloister. In this location, the church’s higher roof would not keep the sunlight from reaching the cloister. The church’s floor plan had a cruciform shape. It had three pitched gables, the lines of which reveal the transept in the design. Each of the gables was crowned with a sculpted stone cross. In each gable were twin windows, above which was a trefoil rose window of imposing diameter, decorated with beautiful glass. This rose window was so remarkable that, according to Mignard, "those who had seen it felt not

\[\text{Birch, 74: "Tempore generalis capituli nostri, scilicet in inventione sancte crucis." Cf. EO, ch. 98.}\]

\[\text{Neither Mignard’s ground plan, nor my adaptation of same (Figures 9.2 and 9.3, respectively), reveal the cruciform shape of the church’s floor plan. This is evident, however, from the side view shown in Figure 9.6.}\]
the slightest regret at having nothing left but its memory." All the windows were gothic in design, framed with round molding. A corbelled cornice ran both above and below the windows. The buttresses were attached to the walls. The apse was a semi-circle, which ended in the center with a two-story tower that did not pass the level of the gables. The church had a nave and two side aisles. Along each side of the nave, four gothic arcades rested on square pillars of medium size. These pillars were flanked by columns with varied capitals: most were Corinthian, though some were carved with symbolic figures. Lamps hung from keystones in the vaults, the ribs of which branched outward, and ended either on

---

180 Mignard, 416.

181 The tower was likely a later edition.
corbels or on small columns embedded in the inner walls at different heights. In the side aisles, the ribs of the vaults melded into the shafts of columns that were backed against the outer walls.

Mignard believed the church at Val-des-Choux showed a mixture of stylistic elements that signaled a transitional phase between Romanesque and Gothic architecture. As proof of this, he pointed to the square pillars of the principal nave, which he described as “already less heavy than those of the twelfth century ... and rendered even more svelte by the small columns that accompanied them.” He also cited “higher-pitched gables,” and “more-free-standing capitals” than those common to the Romanesque period.182

Contrasting this description of the church at Val-des-Choux with descriptions of filial churches in Chapter 6, we can see that the design of Caulite churches did not seem to follow any unified aesthetic—as did the Cistercians, for example, especially under Bernard of Clairvaux.183 Since most of the Caulite churches were built during the first half of the thirteenth century, their most common feature is an expression of transition from Romanesque to Gothic. Mignard saw this in the mother church at Val-des-Choux, but one also witnesses it in the church at Val-Saint-Benoît,184 as well as the church at Clairlieu.185 Other Caulite churches seem more easily categorized as Gothic. Recall the church at Val-

182 Mignard, 417.
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Croissant, which Denizot described as fourteenth-century Gothic;¹⁵⁶ or the church at Vauclair, with its “very delicate architecture,”¹⁸⁷ which Jolibois interpreted as “beau gothique.”¹⁸⁸ This stylistic variation in Caulite churches was no doubt affected by regional variations, i.e., the personal taste of temporal founders in combination with the skills and availability of designers and craftsmen. Yet proximity in time and space did not seem to alleviate this range in variation, for even the three priories in Scotland, founded within three years of each other, and in relative proximity, do not seem to be related in terms of architectural style.¹⁸⁹

Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to describe daily life inside—and to some extent just outside—the walls of the main Caulite house at Val-des-Chouxs.

The construct “daily life” is immediately misleading. I imagine that if we asked a Caulite monk to describe his day, the greater part of his description would focus on activities in the church. My purpose here has been to focus on that part of Caulite life that might not have been perceived as the focus of monastic life. Hence the range of discussion has included everything from diet to discipline, from gathering wood to greeting guests, from laundry to latrines. Yet even in the exercise of what we might call mundane activities, there were ritual aspects, from the bowing, praying, and reading of Scripture at refectory meals to the rather formalized method of getting into bed so as not to expose bare flesh in the dormitory. Such mundane rituals reveal to us that the Caulites were not only men of

¹⁵⁶ Dijon. BM. ms. 1732, fol. 214r.
¹⁸⁷ Courtépée, Description générale et particulière du duché de Bourgogne. 4: 271.
¹⁸⁸ E. Jolibois, La Haute-Marne ancienne et moderne, dictionnaire (Paris. 1858), 537.
great religious devotion, but that they also were simply men. While in one sense they had “left the world,” in another sense they struggled to get along in it. Part of this getting along included testing their Christian charity by living together in a community, a task made easier by regulating, as much as possible, all aspects of what I have termed “daily life.” I hope this chapter has provided certain specific evidence, in support of my claim in Chapter 7, that the Caulites adopted some Cistercian practices, while adapting others. For example, it has shown that Caulite adoption of Cistercian refectory and infirmary practices was almost wholesale. Caulite use of the chapter house also followed Cistercian practice, though the Caulites allowed their *conversi* to attend chapter with the monks at certain times rather than require them to hold their own chapter, as did the Cistercians. The Caulites also mitigated some Cistercian practices, for example, by allowing more opportunity for conversation in the auditorium. Concerning such practices as tonsuring and bloodletting, the Caulites adapted Cistercian practice by increasing the number of times these would occur. Perhaps the most notable innovation in the Caulite use of space was their adoption of a common dormitory (following the Cistercians) in concert with individual cells for each monk (following the Carthusians). One final and important commonality between the Caulites and the Cistercians was their preference for seeking out remote sites for their monasteries. This can be seen not only in the geography of their locations, but also in the poetic names the Caulites gave their priories. Names like Vauclair, Val-Croissant, and Val-Dieu were clearly intended to evoke a sense of place, of a monastery in a clear valley, in a crescent valley, in a valley of God.

There were obviously a number of ways I might have organized the material in this chapter. I chose to invite the reader on a “walking tour” of the monastery—seen first through the eyes of the historical yet fictionalized serf, Vorle of Châtillon, but ultimately through my eyes. Although this particular walking tour happened at Val-des-Choux, and although variations certainly existed between the space at Val-des-Choux and her filial
monasteries, I think the functional aspect of this chapter still holds for any Caulite priory. My purpose in this approach, even with its fictive elements, was to avoid the trap of analyzing monastic activity as if it happened in a vacuum. It was with equal zeal that I hoped to avoid a discussion of monastic space as some product of architectural history, separated from how and why people used that space. For Caulite monasteries were spaces where real people prayed and worked, ate and slept, sinned and repented, came and went, lived and died.
Fairy tales told in English always end with the line, "And they lived happily ever after." The Germans are much more practical in this matter, ending their Märchen with the logical certainty that "if they have not died, then they are still living." Unfortunately for the Caulites, neither of these applies.

After the foundation of Val-Dieu in 1266, the Caulite Order does not seem to have expanded any further. If anything, over the next five centuries, it began to contract. The reasons for this are many and complex. Changing spiritual preferences was certainly one of the causes. As Protestant movements spread to France and Scotland, the accompanying anti-clericalism took its toll on the Caulites. In 1567, the Huguenots attacked Val-Dieu, causing so much damage that none of the monks could remain.\(^1\) In 1568, the same thing happened at Reveillon, forcing the monks there to abandon the site and flee to their motherhouse at Epeau.\(^2\) In 1576, Clairlieu found itself under attack by the Huguenots.\(^3\) This same period in Scotland saw the forces of the Reformation slowly driving the Caulites from Pluscarden and Beauly.\(^4\)

Changing spiritual preferences also found expression in the Caulite economy. The burst of enthusiasm benefactors had shown the Caulites in the thirteenth century waned.

---


\(^3\) Maillard, "Notice historique." 124.

Beginning in the mid-fourteenth century, the Caulite economy became little more than a holding action. Few new donations came in, and the Caulites found themselves in court again and again, trying to hang on to the revenues of earlier days. One prominent example of this concerned Odo III’s donation of property in Louesme. Recall from Chapter 4 that this property, originally a gift to the Caulites, had been transferred in 1210 to the Cistercians of Longuay, who in exchange agreed to pay the Caulites four *muids* of wheat annually. In 1221, when the Templars came to hold the property in Louesme, they balked at the annual wheat payment, forcing the Caulites to seek remedy in the courts. The judgment came against the Templars, who had to deliver the wheat to Val-des-Choux “in their own wagons.” In later centuries, when the lands at Louesme and the debt that went with it passed to the Knights of Malta, then to the Knights Hospitaler, these orders also balked at paying. And they, too, saw the Caulites drag them into court. The final judgment on this matter came in 1760, surely making this annual wheat payment among the longest contested debts in history.

Caulite religious observance also seems to have fallen into decline in the later centuries of its history. In 1759, Val-des-Choux had been reduced to four monks, all of them aged, only one of them a priest. In Mignard’s words, the Caulites were “marching with great steps toward decadence.” This was true not only at the motherhouse, but also at the filial priories. By 1705, the Caulites at Val-Saint-Benoît had disappeared, but the people of that region apparently still sing a song about a monk of Val-Saint-Benoît, who every night would sneak out of his monastery to go hunting in the surrounding woods—shades...

---

^ See Mignard, 435-440.

of Chaucer's monk "that lovede venerie." There were attempts to remedy the situation. In 1764, Val-des-Choux and its remaining dependent priories were attached to the Cistercian monastery of Sept-Fons. It seemed that strict observance might return to Val-des-Choux, especially under the Cistercian abbot Dorothée Jallontz, but with the advent of the French Revolution that revival was to be short-lived.

Today at Val-des-Choux, church and cloister are nothing more than a trace in the ground. The buried stones of the foundation must have proved too difficult to move. I do not believe that the ghosts of monks long dead still haunt the site—though I was tempted to visit the motherhouse on Christmas Eve to see if I could spot Peter of Châteauvillain, eternally penitent, according to the local lore, eternally washing his hands of English blood in the midnight spring. If the spirit of the Caulites does live on in any sense, it is perhaps better to seek it at Val-Saint-Benoît, where nuns of Our Lady of Adoration now pray on the site they have re-dubbed the monastery of Bethlehem; or in Scotland, where Benedictines have renovated and repopulated the ruins of Pluscarden.

---


8 Mignard, 467-469.

9 For the legend of Peter's slaughter of marauding English knights during the Hundred Years War, see Chapter 9, note 25.
APPENDIX A

CONCORDANCE OF SHELFMARKS AT YZEURE, AD DE L’ALLIER

In the mid-1960s, the Archives départementales de l’Allier—which houses by far the greatest number of Caulite documents—moved from Moulins-sur-Allier to a more modern building in the nearby suburb of Yzeure. This move precipitated a re-cataloguing of many documents, including those of the Caulite Order. This study uses the current shelfmarks, but scholars who wrote before the archives moved used the older shelfmarks. One example of this is H. Gautier, “Les documents d’archives du Grand Prieuré du Val-des-Choux.” *Bulletin de la Société d’Emulation* 28 (1925): 20-38, 87-103, the very purpose of which was to identify Caulite documents in the AD de l’Allier. Another is R. Folz, “Le monastère du Val des Choux au premier siècle de son histoire,” *Bulletin philologique et historique du comité des travaux historique et scientifique* (Paris, 1960), which was arguably the most important of all the earlier works on the Caulites. This appendix provides a concordance of old and new and old shelfmarks. Rather than list every single number in series that are sequential, I have provided a simple method for calculating the shelfmark number in those series. The examples to the right should make clear my intentions.

Although the concordance below just gives the number, the proper citation of these shelfmarks is:

Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H [followed by a number].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old shelfmark</th>
<th>New shelfmark</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H 185 – H 232 | Add 30 to the number | H 185 = H 215  
               |               | H 200 = H 230 |
| H 232 bis     | H 263        |          |
| H 233 – H 253 | Add 31 to the number | H 233 = H 264  
               |               | H 250 = H 281 |
| H 254 – H 265 | Add 38 to the number | H 254 = H 292  
               |               | H 260 H 298  |
| H 266         | H 305        |          |
| H 267         | H 306        |          |
| H 268 – H 281 | Add 40 to the number | H 268 = H 308  
               |               | H 280 = H 320 |
| H 282         | H 323        |          |
| H 283 – H 293 | Add 41 to the number | H 283 = H 324  
               |               | H 290 = H 331 |
| H 914         | H 285        |          |
| H 915         | H 286        |          |
| H 916         | H 287        |          |
| H 917         | H 288        |          |
| H 918         | H 289        |          |
| H 919         | H 290        |          |
| H 920         | H 307        |          |
| H 921         | H 322        |          |
| H 961         | H 291        |          |
| H 962         | H 304        |          |

Table A.1: Concordance of shelfmarks at Yzeure, AD de l’Allier.
APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTIONS OF MANUSCRIPTS OF THE CAULITE CUSTOMARY

As discussed in Chapter 7, the Caulite customary survives in two manuscript copies. Paris, BN, ms. lat. 18047 (manuscript P) and Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 232 (manuscript M). The following descriptions are based on my own inspection of the manuscripts in situ.

The Paris manuscript [P]

Paris, BN, ms. lat. 18047

Caulite customary; thirteenth century (some later addenda).

In Latin on parchment; in two hands of the thirteenth century in French Gothic script. Ill + 50 fols. + Ill; 270 mm x 190 mm (text frame 200 mm x 145 mm); one column of 29 lines; thirteenth-century foliation in upper right hand corner in brownish ink; modern foliation in pencil in bottom left hand corner, near the binding.

Collation: 1-6⁺ + 7².

Binding: marbled cardboard covers, cloth spine, shelfmark on the front cover, paper flyleaves with vertical watermark lines roughly 30 mm apart.

Decoration: flourished and rubricated initials throughout; rubricated chapter titles; simple ink drawings of odd creatures evolving out of the initials at fols. 6v and 28v.

Texts: I. fols. 1r-46v: the Caulite customary, which consists of 161 discrete chapters, inc. in adventu domini ...; fols. 46vb-48v: a set of 64 brief, untitled, miscellaneous rules;
inc. nullus monachus ordinis nostri ... ; fol. 48 vb: statutes from the year 1238; fol. 49r-v: undated statutes, probably from the late thirteenth century; fol. 50r: statutes from the years 1287 and 1289; fol. 50v: undated statutes from the fourteenth century. The entries on fols. 40 and 50 are in a different hand. Both of these fols. suffered water damage, which makes their reading uncertain.


History: this manuscript belonged to the Caulite dependent house of Val-Croissant (*Vallis crescens*)—founded in 1216 in the diocese of Autun—as evidenced by that monastery's name appearing in the novice's oath of profession, fol. 35v: “Ego frater .... in hoc loco qui vocatur Vallis Crescens.” Fol. 50v also bears witness to this fact with the following note in sixteenth-century script: “Ce p[resent] livre est a Notre Dame du Vault Croissant; qui le pranda daumpné sera et en enfer ira.”

The Yzeure manuscript [M]

Yzeure, AD de l'Allier, H 232 (former shelfmark H 202)

*Martyrologium* of Usardus; Rule of St. Benedict; copies of papal bulls; Caulite customary: thirteenth to fifteenth centuries.

In Latin on parchment; written in several hands of the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries in French Gothic script; 144 fols.; 320 mm x 230 mm; one column of 29 lines; medieval foliation in upper right hand corner in brownish ink.

Collation: 1-4⁸ + 5⁷ + 6⁴ + 7² + 8-10⁸ + 11² + 12-19⁸ + 20-21² + 22¹.

Binding: Wood covers bound in leather with tooled design on front cover (inter-locking diamond shapes which create a “Celtic knot” frame); three metal studs with an ornate floral design, one on top of the other, roughly 80 mm apart, form a vertical line on the front cover which dissects the interlocking diamond frame design. The
back cover of the book has a similar design, also with three studs dissecting the
center of that design on the vertical, but with four extra studs at the four corners of
the rectangle of inter-locking diamonds intended to keep the back of the book
from rubbing against the table or lectern. The volume is held closed by two metal
clasps, which are connected to two leather straps, roughly 30 mm wide. The clasps
bear simple ornamentation.

Decoration: rubricated initials and chapter titles throughout; fol. 50 r: highly decorated
initial A, the cross stroke of which (done in a later hand) consists of text indicating
that the Caulites followed the Rule of Benedict; fol. 66 r: a drawing of a flower or
piece of fruit on the vine; fol. 111 v: some fancy work in the first rubricated initial,
done in pencil but never realized in ink.

Texts: I. fols. 1r-49v Martyrologium of Usuardus. inc. nono kalendas januarii...: includes
marginal references to Caulite founders and donors, e.g., fol. 4r: “Commemoracio
domi Viardi, primi prioris Vallis Caulium,” and fol. 26 v: “Commemoratio
Odonis, ducis burgundie, bone memorie, fundatoris vallis caulium.”

II. fols. 50r-74v: the Rule of Saint Benedict; inc. ausculta o fili ...; fol. 74 vb
contains a list of Latin adverbs and prepositions. e.g., “Usquemodo. Aliomodo.
Quonammmodo.” This is perhaps a sort of mnemonic. or short grammar lesson.

III. fol. 75r: a page of penmanship practice, e.g., “ego frater Lucas.” These are in
different hands and have clearly been done over the centuries. Fol. 75v: a copy of
Innocent III's papal bull of 1205, approving the Caulite Order, inc. solet annuere ...;
the first three lines of Honorius III's bull of 1224, which mitigated the severity of
the Caulite rule, inc. juxta vocem dominicam ....

IV. fols. 76r-143r: the Caulite customary, of which: fols. 76r-77r: the table of
contents for the Caulite customary (these do not always coincide with the actual
contents); fol. 77v: another page of penmanship practice; fols. 78r-125v: 134
chapters of the Caulite customary, the first 132 of these roughly correspond with chapters 1-132 in manuscript P; fols. 126r-127v: three chapters which correspond to chapters 140, 159, and 160 in manuscript P; fol. 127vb-128v: two of the 64 untitled, miscellaneous rules in manuscript P; fol. 129r-132v: statutes of the general chapters of 1262, 1263, 1260, 1266, 1269, 1268; fols. 133r-134v: “Incipit ordo de conversis;” fols. 134vb-141r: instructions for celebrating the mass according to the dominical letter; fols. 141v-142r: instructions for calculating Easter; fol. 142v: statutes of the general chapter of 1485; fol. 143r: an illegible note written in a cursive hand; fol. 143v: more penmanship practice.


History: this manuscript belonged to the dependent house of Petit-Saint-Lieu (Sanctus Locus)—founded in 1224 in the diocese of Dijon—as evidenced by that monastery’s name appearing in the novice’s oath of profession, fol. 118r: “Ego frater .... in hoc loco qui vocatur Sancti loci.” In 1764, when the Caulites united with Sept Fons, a monastery near Moulins, the manuscript was transferred there. Hence after the French Revolution, manuscript M found its way to the departmental archives in Moulins, rather than Dijon, where many Caulite documents found a home, closer to their Burgundian base.
APPENDIX C

COMPARISON OF CAULITE MANUSCRIPTS AND EDITIONS

The table on the following pages uses these abbreviations:


P  Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS lat. 18047.


RB  Regula Benedicti: the Rule of Saint Benedict. The numbers indicate chapters.

SC  Statuta Capitulorum Generalium Ordinis Cisterciensis: ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786. 8 vols. Edited by J. Canivez. Louvain, 1933-41. When followed by a chapter number, these indicate statutes from 1134. When followed by a date in parentheses, these indicate statutes of later years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birch</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Martène</th>
<th>H-Brockie</th>
<th>Derivative/Innovative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 1-25</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 1-25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 28</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 29-52</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 29-52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 53</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative; shares the same title as EO, 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 54-59</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 54-59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 60-63</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 63-66.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 64-67</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 68-71.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 68-72</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 73</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 74-75</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 76</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative; Folz said it derived from CG, 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 77</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 78-82</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 78-82.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 83-84</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 85-92</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 85-92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 93</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 94-105</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 93-104.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 106</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 107</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 108.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 108</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 110.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 109-115</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 112-118.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 116</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 121.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 117-118</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 119</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EO, 67.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 120</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.1</td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 121</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.2</td>
<td>RB, 3; Folz believed this summarized CG, 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 122</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.3</td>
<td>CG, 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 123</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.4</td>
<td>SC, 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 124</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.5</td>
<td>RB, 25; SC, 64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 125</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.6</td>
<td>SC, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 126</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.7</td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 127</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.8</td>
<td>SC, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 128</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.9</td>
<td>SC, 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 129</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C.1: Comparison of Caulite manuscripts and editions.  (Continued.)
Table C.1, continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birch</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Martène</th>
<th>H-Brockie</th>
<th>Derivative/Innovative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 130</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Ch.10</td>
<td>Ch.10</td>
<td>Vermee: linked to SC. 17. Folz: innovative; for content cf. CG. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 131</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Ch.11</td>
<td>Ch.11</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 132</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Ch.12</td>
<td>Ch.12</td>
<td>SC. 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 133</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.13</td>
<td>Ch.13</td>
<td>SC. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 134</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.14</td>
<td>Ch.14</td>
<td>SC. 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 135</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.15</td>
<td>Ch.15</td>
<td>SC. 48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 136</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.16</td>
<td>Ch.16</td>
<td>SC. 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 137</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.17</td>
<td>Ch.17</td>
<td>SC. 66.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 138</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.18</td>
<td>Ch.18</td>
<td>SC. 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 139</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.19</td>
<td>Ch.19</td>
<td>SC. 77.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 140</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch.20</td>
<td>Ch.20</td>
<td>SC (1182) §5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 21</td>
<td>Ch. 21</td>
<td>SC (1161) §11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 22-23</td>
<td>Ch. 22-23</td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 141-143</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UC. 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 144-145</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UC. 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 146</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UC. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 147-148</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UC. 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 149-150</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UC. 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 151-154</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UC. 15-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 155-158</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 159</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 24</td>
<td>Ch. 24</td>
<td>SC. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 160</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 25</td>
<td>Ch. 25</td>
<td>SC. prologue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 161</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch. 26</td>
<td>Ch. 26</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 162</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch called this “Sixty-four misc. chapters without titles.”</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of 1238</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of 1251</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of 1252</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of 1244</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of 1248</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of 1249</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of 1253</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes of 1254</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Manuscript M, Martène, and H-Brockie contain all sixty-four, except for 3/64 and 30/64.
The table above shows the relationship between the extant manuscripts of the Caulite customary and its various printed editions.

The column on the far left of the table shows the sequence of customary chapters and statutes in Birch’s edition. Birch used manuscript P (see Appendix B) as the base document for his edition—which he entitled *Ordinale conventus vallis caulium* —and manuscript M (see Appendix B) as a supplementary document. Manuscript P lacks the statutes of the general chapters dated 1244 to 1268 found in manuscript M; whereas, manuscript M lacks the following chapters found in manuscript P: 133-139; all but the first line of 140; 151-158; and 160-161. Birch began with the 162 chapters found in manuscript P, the last of which he labeled “sixty-four miscellaneous rules without headings.” He published the statutes of 1238 from manuscript P, then turned to manuscript M for statutes from 1251, 1252, 1244, 1248, 1249, 1253, 1254, 1262, 1263, 1260, 1266, 1267, and 1268, in that order. Birch then returned to manuscript P for two undated statutes (but presumably post-1268), statutes from 1287, 1289, and finally statutes of uncertain date from the fourteenth century. Birch also published the instructions concerning the celebration of

---

1 Birch, 103-107: “Sexaginta quatuor regule miscellaneous sine rubricis.” The title is entirely Birch’s invention. There is no such heading in either manuscript.
offices according to the dominical letter, found in manuscript M. Birch’s edition is useful, since it is based on manuscripts to which we still have access today. It is not exhaustive, however, because it fails to take into account the idiosyncrasies of the eighteenth-century editions, which seem to draw on a different source.

Martène and Durand claimed that their edition of "Antiquae constitutiones" came ex antiquo codice Ms. Vallis Caulium. Structural differences between Martène and Durand’s edition and the two extant manuscripts show that Martène and Durand did not base their edition on either manuscripts P or M, but on a third no-longer-extant manuscript. The comparison shown in the table demonstrates this point. Martène and Durand began their edition with the chapter of the customary entitled De prima institutione vallis caulium, and continued through Birch’s "sixty-four miscellaneous chapters," not including the third and thirtieth of these. Martène and Durand published numbers 62, 63, and 64 of Birch’s "sixty-four" as part of the statutes of the general chapters, which is reasonable enough since these all begin with phrases such as "Statuimus," but as such these remain undated statutes. They also published statutes from 1238, 1244, 1248, 1249, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1254, 1260, 1262, 1263, 1266, and 1268, in that order. Martène and Durand did not publish the chapters 1-119, 129, or 141-150 found in manuscripts P and M. Nor did they publish chapters 155-158, found only in manuscript P. Martène and Durand could not have worked from manuscript M because that manuscript lacked chapters 133-139, and 160-161, found in manuscript P, which Martène and Durand’s edition included. Yet, they did not work from manuscript P because that manuscript lacked statutes of the general chapters from 1244 to

---

2 Martène, Thes. nov., 1651.
3 See chapter 120 in Birch, 91.
1268 (except for 1267), which Martène and Durand included in their edition. Therefore, Martène and Durand must have worked from a third manuscript.

Brockie's "Antiquae constitutiones ordinis vallis cauliun," was also "ex antiquo codice MS. Vallis Caulium." The source for this document in Brockie's edition is much easier to trace, however, since Brockie indicated in the marginalia that the old codex in question is "apud Martène, Thes. anced. Tomo. IV," discussed above, published forty-two years earlier. Brockie chose not to publish any of the statutes of the general chapters, yet he must have had access to the statutes of the general chapters, since he mentioned the statutes of 1266 in his "observatio critica."

---

4 The fact that Martène and Durand published the statutes of the general chapters in chronological order may indicate that they appeared thus in the manuscript from which they worked, or it may simply be an attempt on their part to be orderly and helpful.

5 Holste-Brockie, 13.
APPENDIX D

SELECT PAPAL BULLS CONCERNING THE CAULITE ORDER

This appendix is intended as a useful reference, not as a critical edition of the documents it contains. The three bulls that follow have all been published elsewhere. I provide them here because of their importance to this study, as evidenced by the frequent citations to them throughout the work. I have identified the bulls first by the abbreviation used in the footnotes. I follow this with the shelfmark, followed by a description of the bull’s contents. Finally, I have cited other works where the reader might find critical editions of these documents.

Innocent III (1205).
Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 222.
Approves the foundation of the new Caulite Order.

"Innocentius, episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilectis filiis, priori et fratribus Vallis caulium, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

"Solet annuere sedes apostolica piis votis et honestis petentium precibus favorem benevolum impertiri. Ex litteris sane venerabilis fratris nostri, G[uidonis], electi Remensis
accepimus, quod, dum transiret per dioecesim Lingonensem, vos invenit in Valle-Caulium
novellam institutionem ordinis assumpsisse, de cujus meritis diligenter inquirens, nil in eo
nisi religiosum comperit, et honestum. Invenit siquidem, prout eadem litterae continentabant,
quod inter vos unus monachorum, quem vos, filii monachi, eligetis debeat esse prior, cui
omnes, monachi videlicet et conversi, quorum societas vicesimum numerum non transcendent,
tanquam spirituali patri reverentiam et obedientiam curabitis exhibere. Nullus vestrum
proprium possidebit. In conventu singulis diebus missa et horae canonicae cantabantur;
privatas quoque missas, qui voluerit celebrabant. Capitulum tenebitis omni die, facturi
duodecim lectiones temporibus constitutis. Simul laborabitis et simul in refectorio
comeditis, carnibus et sagimine non utentes. Prior vobiscum in eodem refectorio comedit,
simili cibo et vesti contentus. A festo resurrectionis dominice usque ad exaltationem sancte
crucis, bis comeditis in die; residuum temporis sub jejuniorum abstinentia transcurritis.
pane, aqua et uno pulimento contenti sexta feria existentes. In die nativitatis dominice non
jejunabitis nec sexta feria in estate. ubi festum intervenerit duodecim lectionum. Vivetis de
redditiibus, silentium servaturi. Femine interiores terminos non intrabunt, nec vos exterioros,
excepto priore, nisi causa ordinis transcendentis. Prior tamen, si occupatus fuerit vel ergotans
et urged necessitas vel evidens utilitas postularit, poterit unum quem voluerit destinare.
Cilicia induetis ad carmen, eos qui ferre non poterunt non cogentes; lineas et cannabinas
vestes nullatenus induetis, grossae lanae vestes, non tinctas et pellitias habituri. Cum tunicis,
cingulo et caligis omnes jacebitis, et praeter haec, vos. filii monachi, cum cuculla nusquam, et
nunquam super calcitris quiescentes. Erunt novitii vestri in probatione per annum, et vos
filii monachi, a matutinis usque ad horam laboris et a vesperis usque ad occasum solis.
lectioni, orationi et contemplationi vacabitis, exceptis quos prioris discretion pro aliqua certa
et necessaria causa duxerit retrahendos. Nos autem, vestris justis postulationibus annuentes,
personas vestras et locum in quo divino estis obsequio mancipati, cum omnibus que
impressiariun rationabiler possidetis aut in futurum concessione pontificum, largitone
regum vel principum, oblatione fidelium seu aliis justis modis, prestante Domino, poteritis adipisci, sub beati Petri et nostra protectione suscipimus. Specialiter autem ordinem ipsum provida deliberacione de assensu episcopi diocesani statutum auctoritate apostolica confirmamus et presentis scripti patrocinio communimus. Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostre protectionis et confirmationis infrengere vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attemptare presumperit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum.

"Datum Rome, apud Sanctum Petrum, III idus februarii, pontificatus nostri anno septimo [11 February 1205]."

Innocent III (1210).
Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 222.
Confirms many of the earliest donations to Val-des-Choux.
See Birch, 142-143.

"Innocentus, episcopus, servus servorum dei, dilectis filiis, prioris et fratribus Valle caulium, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

"Justis petentium desideriis dignum est nos facile prebere consensum et vota que rationis tramite non discordant effectu prosequente complere. Eapropter. dilecti in Domino filii, vestris justis postulationibus grato concurrentes assensu, elemosinam quam nobilis vir Oddo, dux Burgundie, domui vestre concessit, intuitu pietatis, nemus videlicet circa domum vestram limitibus certis distinctum et liberum usuarium in toto alio nemore et jus de feodis ipsius, domum et terram hospitalis de Leesme cum pertinentiis suis et unum hominem cum rebus ipsius ad excolendam terram in usus vestros, viginti modios vini in decimis suis de Pomarz percipientios annuatim; ex dono etiam nobilis mulieris B[lanche] comitisse Campanie, jus quod habetis in molendino apud Calvum-Montem, et sex libras in nundinis Barri annuatim; ex dono nobilis viri Milonis, domini Nucerii, centum annuos solidos
Divionensis monete; ex dono nobilis viri Milonis de Brabanz, unum sextarium frumenti, unum ordei et unum avene in terciis Belnete et Melicii annuatim percipiendae; ex dono Willelmi, militis de Warach, unum modio vini censualem super domo sua petrina de Divione; ex dono Lamberti de Barro, quadraginta solidos censuales reddendos ab illis qui tenent domum de Ruella apud Barrum super Album; ex dono venereabilis fratris nostri Garnerii, episcopi quondam Lingonensis, de assensu capituli Lingonensis, unum modium frumenti in terciis de Castellione, et sex modios vini in decimis de Musseio annuatim; ex dono bono memorie Roberti, episcopi Lingonensis, quattuor modios vini annuatim, assensu capituli Lingonensis, in dictis decimis Musseii et partem virgerii quod commune habuerat vobiscum et unum hominem ad ipsius custodiam deputatum, cujus virgerii partem alteram Ebrardus, Lingonensis decanus, vobis prius contulerat de assensu ipsius R., episcopi Lingonensis; ex dono Gualteri, canonicis Lingonensis, tres modios vini censuales super vinea sua de Musseio; ex dono nobilis viri Guidonis de Chappis, domini Julliaci, quinque sextaria avene et unum frumenti annuatim percipienda apud Biceium in Costa; ex dono Laure, quondam majoris Divionensis, unum petiam vinee apud Divionem in finagio de Braio; ex dono Constantii, quondam magistri Avallonensis, totum jus quod habebat in vineis apud Tabulas et apud Domitiacum; ex dono nobilis viri Bernardi, domini Espessie, sex sextaria frumenti in horreo suo de Espessia et tres modios vini in vinea sua de Corcelliens annuatim percipiendos; ex dono Bartholomei, prepositi de Vilers, totum jus quod habetis in decimis ville Sancti Fidolis;—sicut ea omni juste ac pacifice possidetis et in ipsorum donatorum autenticis continentur, vobis et per vos eidem domui vestre auctoritate apostolica confirmamus et presentis scripti patrocio communimus. Decernimus ergo ut nulli omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostre confirmationis infringere vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attemptare presumperit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei et beatorum Petris et Pauli apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum.
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“Datum Laterani, VI idus Maii, pontificatus nostri anno terciodecimo [10 May 1210].”

Honorius III (1224)

Yzeure, AD de l’Allier, H 222

Mitigates the practice of the Caulite Order.

See P. Pressutti, ed., Regesta Honorii papae III (Rome, 1888-95), 4936. Also published in Mignard, 427, and Birch, 148-149.

“Honorius, episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilectis filiis priori et fratribus ordinis Vallis Caulium, salutem at apostolicam benedictionem.

“Juxta vocem dominicam, spiritus quidem promtus est, caro autem infirma, unde continget quod fervor spiritus aliquid interdum amplexit, cui post modum carnis infirmitas reluctatur, sane petitio vestra nobis exhibita continebat quod preter Beati Benedicti regulam quam professi estis et servatis, quantum fragilitas humana permittit, quasdam vobis speciales observantias indicastis quarum rigorem, pro eo quod anotate sunt in confirmatione vobis ab apostolica sede concessa, veremini autoritate propria temporare; propter quod cum frequenter ingerant vobis difficiltatis articulum, apostolice provisionis remedium implorastis. Nos igitur presentium auctoritate concedimus ut hii qui in domo vestra vel aliis sibi subjectis per tempora priores extiterint, rigorem observantiarum hujusmodi, non obstante quod annotate sunt in confirmatione predicta, temperare valeant, in vestro generali capitulo, prout viderint expedere. Indulgemus etiam ut ordinis vestri prioribus benedicere liceat ordinis ejusdem novitios et fratribus suis beneficium absolutionis impendere cum in se invicem manus injecerin violentas. Adicum insuper ut trahi non possitis in causam per litteras apostolicas, nisi expressam de ordine vestro fecerint mentionem. Ad hec presentium auctoritate districtius inhibemus ne quis talliis collectis seu aliis quibuslibet exactionibus insolitis et indebitis vos aggravare presumat, vel a vobis de ortis et virgultis vestris aut

427
vestrorum animalium nutrimentis decimas extorquere. Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostre concessionis et inhibitionis infregere vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attemptare presumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei et beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus se noverit incursurum.

“Datum Laterani, ibidus Aprilis, pontificatus nostri anno octavo [13 April 1224].”
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