

Imagining the Self, Constructing the Past

Imagining the Self, Constructing the Past:

*Selected Proceedings from
the 36th Annual Medieval
and Renaissance Forum*

Edited by

Robert G. Sullivan and Meriem Pagès

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Imagining the Self, Constructing the Past: Selected Proceedings
from the 36th Annual Medieval and Renaissance Forum

Edited by Robert G. Sullivan and Meriem Pagès

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2016 by Robert G. Sullivan, Meriem Pagès and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9704-3

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9704-4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Robert G. Sullivan and Meriem Pagès	
Representing the Self in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period	
Chapter One.....	6
Spiritual Motherhood and Monastic <i>familia</i> : Defining the Boundaries between Blood Kin and Monastic <i>familia</i> in the Early to Central Middle Ages Susan Wade	
Chapter Two.....	22
Intercessory Identity: Heraldry and Portraiture in the Royal Chapel at Pyrga, Cyprus Stephen J. Lucey	
Chapter Three.....	44
Gender Fluidity in Medieval London: Considering the Transvestite Prostitute Eleanor-John as a Lesbian-Like Woman Samantha Charland	
Chapter Four.....	53
Public Display, Sartorial Excess, and the (Un) Making of Men on the Early Modern Stage Jess Landis	
Chapter Five.....	62
'The tongues of dying men': Semiotic Publics and Speech Acts in Shakespeare's <i>Richard II</i> Catherine E. Elliott	

Recollecting the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period

Chapter Six	72
“De innumeris enim virtuosis Romanis”: The “exempla” and “auctoritas infidelium” in Remigius Dei Girolami’s <i>De bono communi</i>	
Nicholas Newman	
Chapter Seven.....	90
<i>Oedipi et Sphingis Dialogus</i> , ms FLP Lewis E 164, An Unknown Rendering of the Oedipus Legend and a New Dynamic between Oedipus and the Sphinx	
Tina-Marie Ranalli	
Chapter Eight.....	108
Being, Doing, and Agency in Shakespeare’s <i>Pericles</i>	
Robert Kellerman	
Chapter Nine.....	125
Celestial Interlocutors and Heavenly Intercessors: Celtic Saints and Their Angels	
June-Ann Greeley	
Chapter Ten	144
King Mark: Cornish, Cuckolded, and Condemned	
Jim Slocombe	
Chapter Eleven	156
Shakespeare’s “Engagingly Repellent” <i>Richard III</i> and the Historical King Richard	
Claire-Marie Hart	

Re-creating the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period Today

Chapter Twelve	166
Absent Material: Waxed, Wooden, and Ivory Writing Tablets in the Medieval and Modern Periods	
Andrea Morgan	
Chapter Thirteen.....	190
Percivale’s Sister Revisited	
Peter Schwartz	

Chapter Fourteen	199
May the Bard be with You: <i>William Shakespeare's Star Wars</i>	
Elizabeth Preysner	

Emerging Scholars

Chapter Fifteen	210
Training a New Generation of Scholars	
Thomas H. Luxon	

Chapter Sixteen	211
<i>Twelfth Night's</i> Epilogue: The Interweaving Balance	
Jennifer Campbell Cormack	

Chapter Seventeen	221
'We're All Mad Here': Fantasy, Foucault, and Shakespeare's <i>Twelfth Night</i>	
Lacey Jones	

Chapter Eighteen	229
The Third Sex: Androgynous Gender and Desire in <i>Twelfth Night</i>	
Lauren Russell	

List of Contributors	237
----------------------------	-----

INTRODUCTION

ROBERT G. SULLIVAN AND MERIEM PAGÈS

The following essays are based on papers originally presented at the 36th Annual Medieval and Renaissance Forum held at Keene State College in Keene, New Hampshire on April 23 and 24, 2015. The Forum was started at Plymouth State University in New Hampshire in 1980 and moved to Keene State College in 2015. Now in its thirty-eighth year, the Medieval and Renaissance Forum has the distinction of being one of the oldest and largest regional conferences on the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period in the United States. In addition to a plenary lecture by a leading scholar in the field (past speakers have included Stephen G. Nichols, Joan Ferrante, Debra Higgs Strickland, Thomas Forrest Kelly, Carolyn Dinshaw, and Suzanne Conklin Akbari), some 60 papers are presented at the Forum by professors and graduate students, and special sessions are dedicated to undergraduate presenters. The smaller size and welcoming and relaxed atmosphere of the Forum have meant that despite its conventional academic structure, the conference has remained very much open to new discussions and areas of interest, encouraging presentations on topics such as pedagogy and medievalism as well as more traditional papers on medieval and Early Modern art, history, and literature.

We selected our theme for the 36th Annual Medieval and Renaissance Forum “Representation, Adaptation, Recollection” based on our perception of how strongly the Middle Ages and the Renaissance continue to pervade the popular imaginary. From the television show *Game of Thrones* to video games like *Assassin’s Creed*, fantasy literature based on medieval themes and culture for both older readers and young adults, medieval and Renaissance fairs and pirate impersonations, popular reception and constructions of the medieval and the Early Modern world allow for a population under economic and social duress both to escape to an alternate reality and at the same time to contemplate alternative approaches to our problems. The open quality of the Forum helped to make it the perfect venue for a discussion of the myriad ways in which the

Middle Ages and the Renaissance are adapted, recollected, and represented in our own day and age.

Although not all of the essays here directly engage with the main theme of the conference, the majority do address the issue of representation in some fashion or other. In their treatment of the concept, they fit broadly into three categories: 1) the representation and performance of the self or gender in medieval and Early Modern history and literature; 2) the recollection and utilization of the past in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period; and 3) the reception, interpretation, and construction of the medieval and the Early Modern periods in our understanding of our own society.

Several historical and literary essays deal with self-fashioning and representation in medieval and Early Modern works. For example, in “Spiritual Motherhood and Monastic *familia*: Defining the Boundaries between Blood Kin and Monastic *familia* in the Early to Central Middle Ages,” Susan Wade examines how early medieval monastic institutions encouraged behavior that would not only create a sense of community among religious but also lead them to replace their former ties of kinship with new spiritual ones.

Focusing on a later period in medieval history, Stephen J. Lucey argues in “Intercessory Identity: Heraldry and Portraiture in the Royal Chapel at Pyrga, Cyprus” that the royal patrons of the Chapel at Pyrga in Cyprus portray themselves as being in direct contact with Christ and the Virgin on the chapel frescoes in an effort to protect themselves and their people from the outbreak of plague that devastated the island in the middle of the fourteenth century. At the same time, the essay presents ingenious arguments for a new dating of the chapel. Likewise dealing with the later Middle Ages, Samantha Charland discusses how the transvestite prostitute Eleanor/John Rykener saw herself and the extent to which that self-representation coincided or conflicted with how others perceived her in “Gender Fluidity in Medieval London: Considering Transvestite Prostitute Eleanor John as a Lesbian-Like Woman.”

Looking beyond the Middle Ages, Jess Landis analyzes early modern English drama in “Public Display, Sartorial Excess, and the (Un) Making of Men on the Early Modern Stage” to show how late sixteenth-century English men represented themselves to themselves and to each other and how they were in turn represented on the London stage. In “‘The Tongues of Dying Men’: Semiotic Publics and Speech Acts in Shakespeare’s *Richard II*,” Catherine Elliott complements Landis’s research by examining the manipulation of language in *Richard II* as an attempt on the

part of the play's characters to re-consider and re-fashion their political and social identities.

A second group of essays emphasizes the role played by the past in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Three articles in particular stress the significance and use of the ancient world in medieval and Early Modern thought. Both Nicholas Newman in "'De innumeris enim virtuosus Romanis': The 'exempla' and 'auctoritas infidelium' in Remigius Dei Girolami's *De bono communi*" and Tina-Marie Ranalli in her essay on the *Oedipi et Sphingis Dialogus* investigate the ways in which medieval and Early Modern authors looked back to the classical era to tackle contemporary debates. Girolami used classical figures, particularly from the era of the Roman Republic, to discuss the Investiture Controversy, and by reinventing the story of Oedipus and the sphinx, the anonymous author and illustrator of the *Dialogus* display some of the conflicting late seventeenth-century notions of the self and other, East and West, and male and female. Ranalli's essay is the first detailed presentation and discussion of this fascinating Early Modern manuscript. Finally, Reformation ideas about good works, faith, and salvation provide the starting point for Robert Kellerman's re-evaluation of Shakespeare's usually neglected *Pericles*.

In "Heavenly Interlocutors and Intercensors: Celtic Saints and their Angels," June-Ann Greeley explores the influence of early Celtic and Christian ideas of angels on Celtic hagiography of the early Middle Ages. Dealing with a very different textual tradition, Jim Slocombe also addresses the issue of the recollection of the Celtic past in his "King Mark: Cornish, Cuckolded, and Condemned," an essay which traces the evolution of Mark's character and the sharp degradation of Continental and especially English views of Cornwall and the Cornish from early Celtic narratives to Malory's *Le Morte d'Arthur*.

One last essay fits into this category, Claire-Marie Hart's "Shakespeare's 'Engagingly Repellent' Richard III and the Historical King Richard." Here, Hart pits the historical Richard against Shakespeare's version of the last Plantagenet king. In doing so, her piece looks backwards and forwards in time. While Hart analyzes Shakespeare's highly distorted depiction of Richard, she also draws our attention to our own contemporary re-appropriation of this short-lived monarch, thereby hinting at some of the ways in which history is re-written to suit new needs and generations.

Hart's contribution provides an excellent transition to the third section of the volume, one comprised of essays that address the role played by the medieval and the Early Modern in our relationship with our own society. The first two essays in this section, Andrea Morgan's "Absent Material:

Waxed, Wooden, and Ivory Writing Tablets in the Medieval and Modern Periods” and Peter Schwartz’s “Percivale’s Sister Revisited” compel their readers to question conventional interpretations of medieval art and texts. In her discussion of wax writing tablets, Morgan encourages us to reconsider how we look at ivory and wooden writing tablets, objects that possessed artistic but especially functional value in the Middle Ages, a fact that is now almost always obscured by the absence of the wax that they were originally created to contain. In a similar vein, Peter Schwartz asks that we allow ourselves to re-envision the character of Percivale’s sister in Malory’s *Le Morte D’Arthur*, emphasizing that our modern understanding of this figure as passive and the product of a misogynistic imagination does not align itself with a nuanced, more medieval reading of her.

Finally, Elizabeth Preysner’s “May the Bard Be With You: *William Shakespeare’s Star Wars*” highlights the culturally and socially legitimizing function of Shakespeare even in modern popular culture. Preysner’s essay exemplifies how representation connects past and present.

Our final group of essays presents the work of three undergraduate scholars from Dartmouth College. Under the tutelage of Professor Thomas Luxon, Jennifer Cormack, Lacey Jones, and Lauren Russell produced papers that re-evaluate Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* with refreshingly new perspectives on gender and the meaning of the play’s epilogue. We are proud to include these essays because they reflect the range of the participants at the Medieval and Renaissance Forum and the goal of all to contribute to the mentoring of a new generation of medieval and Early Modern enthusiasts.

**REPRESENTING THE SELF IN THE MIDDLE
AGES AND THE EARLY MODERN PERIOD**

CHAPTER ONE

SPIRITUAL MOTHERHOOD
AND MONASTIC *FAMILIA*:
DEFINING THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN
BLOOD KIN AND MONASTIC *FAMILIA*
IN THE EARLY TO CENTRAL MIDDLE AGES

SUSAN WADE

This paper examines how early medieval monastic regulations used the arrangement of the dormitory to help to define and articulate the boundaries between blood kinship and spiritual *familia*. Because Merovingian monasteries were often established, inhabited, and ruled by the progeny of aristocratic clans, the harmony of the monastic community depended on establishing a distinction between the loyalty due to consanguineous relations and the *koinonia* of the monastic spiritual community.

Monastic rules for both men and women contain specific injunctions that the love for Christ be demonstrated by love for one another. As in Saint Benedict's *Rule*, chapter sixty-nine, which prohibits brothers in the monastery from defending each other even if their relation (*consanguinitas*) is close, many monastic rules address the problems that may arise from monks and women religious defending relatives in the monastery.¹ When individuals joined the monastery they renounced any claims of kinship in order to devote themselves to the community of love represented by the monastic *familia*. Ceremonies such as tonsure emphasize the novice's forsaking of all blood ties, often immutably

¹ "Praecauendum est, ne quavis occasione praesumat alter alium defendere monachum in monasterio aut quasi tueri, etiam si qualivis consanguinitatis propinquitate iungantur." Rudolf Hanslik, ed., *Benedicti Regula*, in *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* (hereafter referred to as CSEL) 75 (Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1977), 174.

binding the individual and their inheritance to the monastic community.² While rituals and ceremonies employed symbolism that distanced monks and women religious from their blood clans, monastic rules also endeavored to establish regulations that defined the hierarchy of the monastic spiritual *familia* through the use of monastic interior space. The articulation of space to build spiritual *familia* is particularly evident in the organization of the dormitory, in which certain secular associations of beds with consanguineal lineage appear to have been used to define the relationships between the younger novices and the more experienced religious within the monastic house. Indeed, in one rule for women, the seventh-century *Regula cuiusdam ad virgines*, secular familial sleeping arrangements are assimilated and modified in order to promote the idea of monastic mother and child. Although the rules for the dormitory were obviously meant to maintain monastic order during the potentially dangerous hours of sleep, early monastic rules also conceptualize the dormitory as a powerful physical and spatial manifestation of a monastic hierarchy that formalized the idea of monastic progeny and contributed especially to the understanding of spiritual motherhood.

In a period during which powerful aristocratic clans dominated the foundation and endowment of monasteries, maintaining the delicate balance between kinship loyalties and the unity of monastic *familia* was crucial, particularly during times of secular political turmoil and regime change. The importance of minimizing clan loyalty within the monastery is well demonstrated by Gregory of Tours's description of the inter-

² In territories under Frankish law the cutting of a child's hair was considered a parental right, and cutting a child's hair without permission was punished by heavy fines. Thus, the tonsure of a novice held powerful significance in both religious and secular realms. The ritual of tonsure found in the *Rule of the Master* outlines how the tonsure cut the novice from the world. According to the *Master*, when the novice had "cut the malice" out of his heart he was then ready to have his hair cut ("Et juste post pectoris caesa militia, tondebis et caput"). The novice was tonsured by the abbot while encircled by the brethren of the community singing psalms ("Tondatur enim sic: stat ipse frater medio oratorio curuatis in genibus, tondente eum abbate, psallentibus in circuito cunctis"). Thus, the *Master's* tonsure ceremony is essentially a rebirth in which the new monk is cut from his former life and family ties and received into the new life of the monastic *familia*. Dom Adalbert de Vogüé, ed. and trans., *Règle du Maître* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1964), 392. For an examination of haircutting as a symbol of family identity, see Susan Wade, "Gertrude's Tonsure: An Examination of Hair as a Symbol of Gender, Family, and Authority in the Seventh-Century *Vita* of Gertrude of Nivelles," *Journal of Medieval History* 39 (2013): 129-45, doi:10.1080/03044181.2013.781534.

familial uprising at Radegund's monastery at Poitiers, in which the abbess Leubevera was deposed and humiliated by the royal princesses Clotild, who claimed to be a daughter of Charibert, and her cousin Basina, Chilperic's daughter. While Clotild and Basina accused abbess Leubevera of keeping a man in her bed, Gregory attributes the revolt at Poitiers to Clotild's desire to administer the monastery and its estates. Gregory relates the uprising to Clotild and Basina's continuing self-identification as royal princesses, stating that Clotild threatened to go to "my royal relations to tell them about the insults that we have to suffer for we are humiliated here as if we were the offspring of low-born serving women."³ As bishop of Tours, Gregory met with Clotild just before the rebellion at Poitiers and wrote the transcript of the subsequent tribunal; thus, he understood the rebels' motivations and the sense of clan unity that fostered the unrest.⁴

In addition to creating conflict within the monastery, family ties and loyalties could lead to disputes of succession. Such a situation was experienced at the monastery of Nivelles after the death of its founder, Gertrude, in 659. Gertrude was succeeded by her niece Wulftrude, the daughter of Gertrude's brother Grimoald, who had been executed shortly before Gertrude's death. Wulftrude's succession to the position of abbess of Nivelles was jeopardized by several Merovingian rulers including the queens Balthild, widow of Clovis II, and Emnehild, widow of Sigibert III and mother of Dagobert II, whom Grimoald had tonsured and removed from the throne.⁵ In an effort to exploit a period of weakness for the powerful Pippinid tribe, these rulers tried to remove Wulftrude from her

³ Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum X*, ed. Bruno Krusch, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* (hereafter referred to as MGH SRM) 2:460. See also Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, trans. Lewis Thorpe (London: Penguin, 1974), 526.

⁴ Gregory writes that as Clotild set out on her journey to bring her complaints about the abbess to the royal family she stopped at Tours to accuse the abbess of mistreatment and asked that Gregory undertake the rule of the women of Holy Cross while she was away. Gregory urged Clotild to return to her abbey, assuring her that if the abbess was found to have engaged in wrongdoing she would be punished by the proper authorities. Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, MGH SRM 2:460.

⁵ In an attempt to secure the throne of Austrasia for his son, Grimoald had tonsured the heir to the throne and exiled him to an Irish monastery. Grimoald's coup was unpopular with the Austrasian aristocracy, and he was executed by Clovis II of Neustria. See Rosamund McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms Under the Carolingians* (London: Longman, 1983), 25–6.

office as abbess of Nivelles.⁶ Gertrude's *Vita*, written at the end of the seventh-century and thus just after these events, refers specifically to this incident, stating that because of "hatred of her father," kings and queens through "the jealousy of the devil" tried to depose Wulfrude to take custody of "the things of God" that were under her control.⁷ The *Vita* clearly impresses on the reader that Wulfrude was administering God's possessions and not her own inheritance, which illustrates the importance of defining the dominion of the monastic *familia* as a separate and inviolable sphere beyond the bonds and feuds of blood kin.⁸

Problems arising from the administration of inheritances and blood loyalties contributed to the volatility of monastic disputes into the central Middle Ages, as suggested by the rebellion at the monastery of Lobbes in 957, in which Abbot Erluin was blinded and had part of his tongue cut out by three young monks. During this period, Bishop Balderic of Liège had placed his brother Count Régnier III of Hainault in the position of the monastery's advocate and lay abbot. The monks of Lobbes were suspicious of Régnier's intentions for the monastery, particularly the count's potential to control the abbey's wealth.⁹ Before Erluin took the

⁶ Although the *Additamentum nivialense de Fuliano* identifies Grimoald as a key player in the foundation of Nivelles, he is not mentioned in Gertrude's *Vita*, which also does not specifically name Grimoald as Wulfrude's father. The *Vita's* failure to mention Grimoald is telling; the lacuna may be due to Grimoald's unsuccessful coup, or it is also possible that Grimoald's absence from his sister's life reflects the end of his line. *Additamentum nivialense de Fuliano*, MGH SRM 4:460. For Grimoald's role in the foundation of Nivelles, see Alain Dierkens, "Saint Amand et la fondation de l'Abbaye de Nivelles," *Revue du Nord* 269 (1986): 329.

⁷ "Contigit autem ex odio paterno, ut reges, reginae, etiam sacerdotes per invidiam diabuli illam de suo loco primum per suasationem, postmodum vellent per vim trahere, et res Dei, quibus benedicta puella praeerat, iniquiter possiderent." *Vita sanctae Geretrudis*, MGH SRM 2:460. See also J. J. Hoebanx, *L'abbaye de Nivelles des origines au XIVe siècle* (Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1951), 63.

⁸ As Régine le Jan has noted, the Austrasian aristocracy were hostile to the foundation of the monastery of Nivelles because of their concern about the increasing power of the Pippinid family. The diminishment of the family's power at Grimoald's death prohibited the clan from endowing new monastic establishments until the rise of Begga's son Pippin II in the early eighth century. See Régine le Jan, "Convents, Violence, and Competition for Power in Francia," in *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. Frans Theuvs, Mayke De Jonh, and Carine van Rhijn (Boston: Brill, 2001), 244–69.

⁹ Régnier was made lay abbot shortly after the monastery was partially destroyed during the invasion of the Hungarians. See Folcuini, *Gesta abbatum Lobbiensium, Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptorum* (hereafter referred to as MGH SS) 4:68.

abbacy of Lobbes he had been abbot of the reform monastery of Gembloux, and Régnier's choice to appoint Erluin to head Lobbes may have been an attempt to reform the monastery. However, Régnier's appointment of Erluin replaced the monastery's legitimately elected choice for abbot, and the monks of Lobbes were furious at this intervention; indeed, Lobbes's *Gesta abbatum* suggests that Régnier enticed Erluin to unseat the rightful abbot of Lobbes through persistent flattery.¹⁰ Although the resulting uprising may have been partly due to Erluin's attempts to implement monastic reform at the monastery, the *Gesta abbatum* of Lobbes attributes the attack to misuse of monastic property, specifically stating that Erluin planned to cover the cost of a "scandalous" Christmas celebration by selling the harvest from the village of Biesmerée, from which the monastery received large appropriations of money and food each year.¹¹ While Biesmerée may not have been the direct patrimony of any of the three young monks involved in the attack on Erluin, the *Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium* describes the three as "vain nobility," suggesting that the rebellion at Lobbes may have been partially motivated by a sense of aristocratic clan entitlement.¹² It is also possible that Erluin's mutilation resulted from an attempt to influence the use of the monastic revenue received at the reception of oblates and novices.

The revenues from some villages near Biesmerée were also a point of contention between Lobbes and Nivelles as early as the late tenth century. Lobbes was a Pippinid foundation established by Gertrude's nephew Pippin II (father of Charles Martel) in the late seventh century and is only about 15 miles from Nivelles. In 980, at the request of Abbot Folcuin of Lobbes, Notger, the bishop of Liège, issued a decree of interdiction over seventy-two villages because they were paying tithes to the monasteries of

¹⁰ "Hic Erluinus Raginerum adulatione assidua lactabat, et paulatim et per incrementa ad Laubiensis abbatiae ambitum anhelabat, nec destitit, donec ad praepositurae honorem, qui tunc maior habebatur, amoto Blitardo ipsius monasterii monacho, invitis licet fratribus, proveheretur." Folcuini, *Gesta abbatum Lobiensium*, MGH SS 4:68.

¹¹ "Profectus fuerat Erluinus Bermeriacas, ut annonam quae ibi fuerat venundaret in solutione debiti quod praefato obsonio oppigneraverat." Folcuini, *Gesta abbatum Lobiensium*, MGH SS 4:68. A ninth-century list of Lobbes's holdings identifies the village of Biesmerée as providing large donations of both money and food to the monastery, including a pig, chickens, and eggs. Archives de l'Etat à Mons MS 34, fol.17.

¹² The *Gesta abbatum Gemblacensium* was written at Erluin's abbey of Gembloux by Sigebert.

Nivelles and Fosse rather than to Lobbes.¹³ Many of these villages were situated near the monasteries of Nivelles or Fosse, and the reason given for the sudden flow of Lobbes's tithes to Nivelles was that it was easier to make payments to a monastery that was closer.¹⁴ While distance may have been a factor, it seems unlikely to have been the only reason for this sudden switch of allegiance. For example, one of the excommunicated villages was Gimiacus, which is close to Biesmerée, whose own community continued to pay tithes to Lobbes into the mid-tenth century.¹⁵ These few brief examples highlight the problems that consanguineous political and economic loyalties might represent to the unity of the monastic *familia* and the security of monastic income.

Since clan loyalty and blood ties might remain pronounced within the monastery, it seems reasonable that monastic rules would co-opt a secular symbol of procreation and lineage to define the boundary of the spiritual *familia* as separate and superior to consanguineous kinship relationships. The monastic understanding of the bed as a symbol of monastic *familia* appears to stem in part from lay practices and cultural assumptions. Legislation about beds in Title Sixty-One of the *Capitula legi Salicae addita*, a sixth-century addition to the *Pactus legis Salicae*, indicate that these were valuable objects and one of the most important components of a woman's dowry.¹⁶ Salic law stated that if a woman died and left no children her husband's family kept the couple's bed, even if the deceased

¹³ An edited version of the document of interdiction appears in J. Vos, *Lobbes son abbaye et son chapitre* (Louvain: Peeters, 1865). See also Hoebanx, *L'abbaye de Nivelles*, 124; J. Warichez, *L'abbaye de Lobbes depuis les Origines jusque'en 1200* (Paris: Casterman, 1909), 174-5; and Alain Dierkens, *Abbayes et chapitres entre Sambre et Meuse (VII-XI siècles)* (Sigmaringen: J. Thorbecke, 1985).

¹⁴ The names of several of the villages under interdiction also appear on a list of Lobbes's holdings composed in 889: Luponium, Bulien, Fleosium, Boson Vallis, Basius, Gimaicus, and Dampremy. Archives de l'Etat à Mons, MS 34, fols. 33-39.

¹⁵ Both villages are near the modern Belgian city of Charleroi and the Abbey of Fosse. Gimiacus appears on two other lists of the monastery's properties compiled between the mid-tenth century and the early eleventh century. In a document written around 960, the village is described as providing Lobbes with nine measures of spelt and a pig every other year. "Solvit unusquisque de spelta modios VIII et ad alterum annum porcum I." Archives de l'Etat à Mons, MS 34, 14.

¹⁶ When referring to the *Pactus and the Capitula legi salicae addita*, this essay uses the single text compiled and edited by Karl August Eckhardt for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. See Karl August Eckhardt, ed., MGH, *Leges nationum Germanicarum* (hereafter referred to as *Pactus Legis Salicae*, MGH LL) 4:1 (Hannover: 1962), 256.

wife had living relatives from her family of origin.¹⁷ Frankish law also stipulated that a bed (*lectum*) and bed clothes (*lectaria*) be part of the *achasius*, the portion that men who wanted to marry widows had to pay to appease the widow's in-laws for the loss of her dowry. Indeed, the ownership of the bed was considered to be so important that it was specifically included in the oral contract required by the wife and her second husband on delivery of the monetary and material goods of the *achasius*. The law stipulates that the following statement be made in front of nine witnesses: "I give this *achasius* that I may have peace with the parents: the bed, the blanket, the coverlet, the work bench and the arm chair which I delivered from the house of my father—I give these things."¹⁸ This practice was not necessarily confined to the Franks; according to Carlo Calisse, the Frankish custom of *achasius* was introduced and incorporated into Lombard legal codes and influenced Italian marriage laws and customs until the eleventh century.¹⁹

Clearly, the bed was an object that represented perhaps the most important and valuable piece of furniture a family owned. However, the cultural symbolism attributed to the marriage bed was partially influenced by the object's use for procreation and the continuation of the family lineage. The stipulation that a widow who wished to remarry must leave her marriage bed with the family of her deceased husband, even if the bed had been part of the original dowry, suggests that the bed was associated with the male blood line. If the widow's earlier marriage had yielded offspring, the couple's children would inherit the bed, and if there were no children, the bed was retained by the deceased's relatives when the wife remarried. Thus, the object that symbolically suggested the continuation of the male bloodline stayed with the male side of the family whether or not the man had produced heirs.

In secular society, beds were also objects that could be shared by close relatives and friends. Evidence for family members sharing beds can be found in its prohibition in monastic rules. The sixth-century rule of

¹⁷ "Certe si mulier de anteriore marito filios non habuerit et cum dote sua ad alias nuptias ambulare voluerit, sicut superius diximus, achasium donet." *Pactus legis Salicae*, MGH LL 4, 257.

¹⁸ "Et sic postea scamno cooperiat et lecto cum lectaria ornet; et ante IX testes parentibus defuncti mariti inuitat et dicat: "Omnes mihi testes scitis, quia et achasium dedi, ut pacem habeam parentum, et lectum stratum et lectaria condigna et scamno cooperto et cathedras, quae de casa patris mei exhibui, hic demitto." *Pactus legis Salicae*, MGH LL 4, 257.

¹⁹ Carlo Galisse, *A History of Italian Law*, vol. II (Boston: Little Brown, 1928), 558.

Ferreolus of Uzès states, “One bed should not hold two persons, even if they are close relatives or friends, because secret prayer is better directed at God when there is no witness.”²⁰ Ferreolus’s injunction against bed-sharing among relatives points to the monastic use of the bed as a space intended to divide kinship loyalty and also identifies the bed as a locus particular to monastic spiritual devotion. For those dedicated to the religious life, the bed represented a place to deny physical pleasures in pursuit of spiritual refuge.

The use of the dormitory as a space to build the cohesion of the monastic *familia* is also attributable to the meanings associated with the monastic bed. From the time of Gregory the Great, the bed was employed as a metaphor for the monastery and for monastic experience. When medieval authors wrote about the monastic meaning of the bed, they often linked the solitude and bodily relaxation offered by the bed to a “*cubile* of the mind.” As Gregory the Great states in the *Moralia in Job*, “For holy men to sleep in a bed is to be at rest in the resting place, the *cubile*, of their minds.”²¹ In this passage, Gregory specifically connects visionary dreams or night visions (*visiones nocturnae*) with contemplation of the divine, thus defining the bed as a conduit to mystical spiritual knowledge.²² The bed was so crucial to the idea of spiritual contemplation that by the twelfth century Honorius Augustodunensis identified it as the third metaphor for

²⁰ “Ut duo, quamlibet proximi vel amici, propter secretam orationem, quae melius ad Dominum nullo teste dirigitur, ut animo et uno lecto non teneantur.” Ferreolus of Uzès, *Rule, Patrologiae cursus completus: series Latina* (hereafter referred to as PL) 66, col. 0974.

²¹ “Quia autem sancti viri cum exteriori actioni non deserviunt, intra mentis cubilia conquiescunt, apte subjungit: *Et dormiunt in lectulo*. Sanctis enim viris dormire in lectulo est intra mentis suae cubile quiescere.” Gregory the Great, *Moralium in Job* 23:39, PL 76, cols. 0274D-0275A.

²² “Nox quippe est vita praesens, in qua quandiu sumus, per hoc quod interna conspicimus, sub incerta imaginatione caligamus. Propheta namque ad videndum Dominum quadam se premi caligine sentiebat, dicens: *Anima mea desideravit te in nocte* (Isai. XXVI, 9). Ac si diceret: In hac obscuritate vitae praesentis videre te appeto, sed adhuc infirmitatis nubilo circumscribor. David quoque hujus noctis caliginem vitans, claritatem veri luminis praestolatus ait: *Mane astabo tibi, et videbo* (Psal. V, 5). Adhuc ergo in nocte minus se videre conspicit, qui ad videndum Deum futurum mane concupiscit. Quia vero, ut diximus, ab exteriori actione cessare dormire est, bene Eliu subdit: *Quando irruit sopor super homines*.” Gregory the Great, *Moralium in Job* 23:39, PL 76, cols. 0274D-0275A.

the religious life in his treatise on the *Vita claustralis*. To Honorius, the bed, like the monastery, offered “spiritual rest.”²³

While the possibility of spiritual vision during the period of nightly rest emphasized the bed’s importance to the monastic *habitus*, the arrangement and actual use of beds in the dormitory was intended to promote monastic discipline through the night hours. The bed held significance as one of the few spaces that a monastic could claim for his/her own personal use within the monastery. Because monastic men and women technically owned no personal property, the bed offered both a place of refuge and a place of resistance. For this reason, many early monastic rules give specific instructions about the use of the monastic bed and the arrangement of the dormitory.

Albrecht Diem writes in his article on the *Regula Donati*, “New Ideas Expressed in Old Words,” that the texts of early monastic rules must be approached with caution, partly because we do not know whether the focus on certain types of regulations signals an issue already under control or a point of uncontrolled turmoil.²⁴ However, while it is difficult to ascertain the level of implementation of early monastic regulations, these rules do reveal an attempt to form a monastic culture and identity. Thus, the directives on the use of beds and dormitories found in early medieval rules suggest an attempt to construct the bed and the dormitory as a distinctively monastic space.

Because the bed was identified as a place of private prayer and sleep, the injunction that monks and women religious sleep alone is found in almost all early monastic rules. A notable exception is found in Columban’s rule, which states simply that monks should come to their beds sleep-walking and be awakened before they are rested, “Lassus ad stratum veniat ambulansque dormitet, necdum expleto somno surgere

²³ “Tertio est ut lectus in quo requiescunt laborantes. Qui enim sub duro dominio sunt, et terrenis opibus inserviunt, in magno labore sunt. Hi cum ad claustrum perveniunt, quasi a labore in lecto requiescunt. De quo lecto dicit Dominus in Evangelio: *Duo in lecto, unus assumetur, et alter relinquetur* (Luke XVII); significans duo genera hominum in claustro degentium, unum, quod carnalem requiem tantum diligit, aliud, quod spiritualem semper inquirat.” Honorius identifies two types of monks: the first seeks only physical rest in the bed, while the second sees the bed as a place of spiritual rest. Honorius Augustodunensis, *De claustrali vita*, PL 172, cols. 1247-1248; see also Giles Constable, “Metaphors for Religious Life in the Middle Ages,” *Revue Mabillon* 19 (2008): 231-42.

²⁴ See Albrecht Diem, “New Ideas Expressed in Old Words: The *Regula Donati* on Female Monastic Life and Monastic Spirituality” *Viator* 43 (2012): 1-38.

compellatur.”²⁵ Most early rules also designate that the dormitory should be so arranged that older monks and women religious could impart monastic discipline to adolescents even during the hours of sleep. Chapter Twenty-Two of the Benedictine *Rule* states that monks should “sleep singly in single beds, clothed and girded with belts,” but prohibits monks from taking their knives to bed with them.²⁶ Chapter Twenty-Two also suggests that if possible all the monks should sleep in the same room with the senior monks caring for the younger monks. Benedict outlines the nightly routine and the arrangement of the dormitory with the commands that “a candle must burn all night long” and that “younger monks should not have beds next to one another but should be interspersed among the seniors.”²⁷ Benedict’s injunctions echo the *Regula magistri*, on which they may have been based, by directing the abbot to place monks’ beds in a circle with the abbot’s bed in the middle, thus allowing the abbot to watch his monks “as a careful and solicitous shepherd watches his flock gathered into one sheepfold.”²⁸ The space of the dormitory was thus a kind of

²⁵ Columbanus, *Sancti Columbani opera*, ed. G. S. M. Walker (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1970), 140.

²⁶ “Singuli per singula lecta dormiant; lectisternia pro modo conuersationis secundum dispensationem abbae sui accipiant. Si potest fieri, omnes in uno loco dormiant; sin autem, multitudo non sinit, deni aut uiceni cum senioribus, qui super eos solliciti sint, pausent. Candela iugiter in eadem cella ardeat usque mane. Uestiti dormiant et cincti cingulis aut funibus, ut cultellos suos ad latus suum non habeant, dum dormiunt, ne forte per somnum uulnerent dormientem et ut parati sint monachi semper et facto signo absque mora surgentes festinent inuicem se praeuenire ad opus Dei, cum omni tamen gravitate et modestia. Adulescentiores fratres iuxta se non habeant lectos, sed permixti cum senioribus. Surgentes uero ad opus Dei inuicem se moderate cohortentur propter somnulentorum excusationes.” *Benedicti regula*, CSEL 75, 84.

²⁷ *Benedicti Regula*, CSEL 75, 84.

²⁸ “Nam in uno atrio uelut triclinio lecta ordine in circuitu ordinentur. In quo circuitu lectum abbas in medio habeat, ut omnium taciturnitatem uel reuerentiam in circuitu considerans, omnium ouium suarum gregem intra unum ouile collectum quasi diligens uel sollicitus pastor adtendat.” De Vogüé, *La Règle du Maître*, 160. For differing arguments on the relationship between the *Regula magistri* and the *Benedicti Regula*, see De Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l’antiquité*, vol. IX (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 2005), 103; Marilyn Dunn, “Mastering Benedict: Monastic Rules and Their Authors in the Early Medieval West,” *The English Historical Review* 105 (1990): 567-94; Marilyn Dunn, *The Emergence of Monasticism: From the Desert Fathers to the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); and De Vogüé, “The Master and St. Benedict: A Reply to Marilyn Dunn,” *English Historical Review* 107 (1992): 95-103.

ultimate monastic Panopticon, in which the monk was aware of being constantly monitored.²⁹ The idea of being watched is furthered by Ferreolus who continues his injunction against two monks sleeping in the same bed by reminding his readers of the constancy of God's presence. Quoting verse fifty-five of Psalm 119, "At night I remembered your name Oh Lord, and I kept your law," Ferreolus continues, "So that every devout person, once leisure has been granted, may fulfill this saying more profitably, let him be the sole occupant of his couch, as we have said above, having for company not a sleeping brother but a watching Lord, a far better thing."³⁰

Like monastic regulations for monks, rules for women religious included directions on how to use beds. In chapter nine of his *Rule for Virgins*, Caesarius of Arles states that no separate bedrooms or closed chests be allowed; rather all the women should sleep together in one room each in their individual bed.³¹ Regulation against closed chests or restrictions on items that could be taken into the bed aimed to limit the number of contraband materials brought into the monastery and can be found in many rules for dormitories. The language of Chapter Sixty-Five of the seventh-century *Regula Donati*, based on Benedict's chapter on dormitories, states that women religious should sleep alone in their beds (*singulae per singula lecta dormiant*) with a candle burning through the night.³² Donatus's rule is believed to have been written at the request of

²⁹ As Michel Foucault wrote, the purpose of the penal Panopticon was "to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power." In many ways, monastic rules create a Panopticon in which the abbot or abbess function as the physical manifestation of the eyes of God, who is also always watching and evaluating monastic behavior. See Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage, 1977), 201.

³⁰ "Et illud: *Memor fui in nocte nominis tui, Domine, et custodivi legem tuam* (Psalm CXVIII). Hoc ergo ut devotus quisque vacatione concessa utilius possit implere, strati sui, ut supra diximus, erit solus ipse possessor, habens secum meliori commutatione pro dormitorio fratrem Dominum vigilantem." Ferreolus, *Regula*, PL 75, col. 974.

³¹ "Nulli liceat semotam eligere mansionem, nec habeat cubiculum vel armarilum aut alium huius modi, quod peculiarius claudi possit; sed omnes diuisis lectulis in una maneant cellula." Caesarius, *Césaire d'Arles, Oeuvres monastiques*, ed. and trans. Adalbert de Vogüé, vol. 1 (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1988), 186-7.

³² "Singulae per singula lecta dormiant, lectisternia pro modo conversationis secundum dispensationem matris singula accipiant. Si potest fieri, omnes in uno loco dormiant; si autem multitudo non sinit, denae aut vicenae cum senioribus quae super eas sollicitae sint, pausent. Luminaria jugiter in eadem cella ardeant usque

Gauthstrude, abbess of Jussanum, and combines the male rules of Benedict and Columbanus and Caesarius's *Rule for Virgins*.³³ Donatus also suggests that the entire monastic community should sleep in the same room. In monasteries so heavily populated as to prohibit everyone from sleeping in one room, older women religious are commanded to watch over their younger sisters.³⁴ As with Benedict's, Donatus's rule states that in smaller monasteries the presence of the abbess provides a model and a corrective for the community during hours of nightly rest. Donatus's rule thus reiterates the monastic understanding that the dormitory is an area in which inexperienced monks and women religious are watched and tutored by the more mature members of the monastic *familia*.

An exception to the typical prohibition on bed-sharing can be found in the *Regula cuiusdam ad virgines*.³⁵ Like Donatus's rule, the *Regula cuiusdam* was written for use in a Frankish monastery for women and is believed to be the last Frankish rule written specifically for women before the adoption of the Benedictine rule by all monasteries.³⁶ Chapter Fourteen of the *Regula cuiusdam* directs that two women religious should sleep together in one "little bed" (*lectulum*).³⁷ While this command is singular in

mane." Donatus, *Sancti Donati Vesontionensis episcopi, regula ad virgines*, PL 87, col. 293. As Albrecht Diem points out, Donatus does not specifically prohibit women religious from carrying knives to bed, suggesting that the women of Donatus's monastery did not carry knives. Diem, "New Ideas Expressed in Old Words," 6.

³³ The rule is addressed to Gauthstrude, and believed to be the earliest Frankish rule to incorporate Benedict's instructions. De Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique*, vol. XI (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 2007), 11; Diem, *Das monastische Experiment: Die Rolle der Keuschheit bei der Entstehung des westlichen Klosterwesens* (Munich: LIT, 2005), 249; Dunn, *Emergence of Monasticism*, 174.

³⁴ "Adolescentes sorores juxta se non habeant lectos, sed permistae cum senioribus. Surgentes vero ad opus Dei invicem se moderate cohortentur propter somnolentarum excusationes." Donatus, *Regula ad virgines*, PL 87, col. 203.

³⁵ The singular nature of the *Regula cuiusdam's* instructions for dormitories is reflected in Benedict of Aniane's *Concordia regularum* which incorporates much of the *Regula cuiusdam*, including Chapter Fourteen on the regulations for dormitories, but excludes the commandment that women share beds. See Benedicti Anianensis, *Concordia regularum, Corpus Christianorum* (hereafter referred to as CC) 2, ed. Pierre Bonnerue (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999), 249.

³⁶ See Albrecht Diem, "Rewriting Benedict: The *Regula cuiusdam ad virgines* and Intertextuality as a Tool to Construct a Monastic Identity," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 17 (2007): 313-28 and especially 315.

³⁷ "Proinde ergo decernimus ut binae et binae, praeter infirmas et seniores in lectulis dormiant." *Regula cuiusdam patris ad virgines*, PL 88, col. 1065.

early monastic rules, the language of this directive actually reinforces the understanding that the dormitory and the bed were considered locations that solidified the cohesion of the monastic *familia* and reinforced the instruction of monastic discipline. This is particularly clear in the discussion in the *Regula cuiusdam* of the potential hazards that unguarded sleep might represent: “[They] must be watched with special care lest through negligence of maternal sollicitude (*maternae sollicitudinis*) adjacent members might incur harm on account of their weakness. Thus, we determine that other than the old and the sick, they should sleep in a little bed two by two.”³⁸ With this injunction, the *Regula* implies that maternal feelings could offer protection from sinful behavior. The author of the *Regula cuiusdam* furthers the idea that maternal feelings can shield monastic women from illicit physical sensations with the instruction that younger women should sleep with the older, more senior members of the community whose “religion is above suspicion;” two adolescents were absolutely forbidden from sharing a bed so that they would not be “seized by sin in the heat of the flesh.”³⁹ Chapter Fourteen of the *Regula cuiusdam* very deliberately focuses on the bed as a space in which women religious should express maternal concern and loving discipline and thus appears to instruct women to adopt their younger or less experienced sisters as monastic progeny.

In this way, the *Regula cuiusdam* identifies the bed as a space in which the monastic mother could offer younger women sanctuary from temptation. Albrecht Diem has suggested that the *Regula cuiusdam* was composed as a supplement to the rules of Benedict and Caesarius of Arles, and many of the regulations within the *Regula cuiusdam* expand and further develop elements of Benedictine practice for Frankish monasteries.⁴⁰ Since this is a text meant to promote and elaborate on the fundamental elements of monastic practice for monasteries “within the Iro-Frankish monastic movement,” Chapter Fourteen of the *Regula cuiusdam* appears to emphasize an essential concept of the *Rule of Benedict* and the *Regula magistri*, one that identifies the bed and the

³⁸ “[T]amen solerti custodia specialiter intuendum, ne per negligentiam maternae sollicitudinis subjecta membra damna capiant imbecillitatis. Proinde ergo decernimus ut binae et binae, praeter infirmas et seniores in lectulis dormiant.” *Regula cuiusdam patris ad virgines*, PL 88, col. 1065.

³⁹ “Sic tamen fiat, ut una ex illis semper senior sit: de cuius religione non dubitetur. Juvenculas vero nullatenus simul quiescere censemus, ne in aliquo carnis adversitate aestu delicto rapiantur.” *Regula cuiusdam patris ad virgines*, PL 88, col. 1065.

⁴⁰ See Diem, “Rewriting Benedict,” 327-8.

dormitory as a space manifesting the construct of authority inherent in the hierarchy of the monastic *familia*. Thus, although it is singular, Chapter Fourteen of the *Regula cuiusdam* takes the monastic significance of the bed to its logical conclusion by conceptualizing the bed as a place in which the recognition of the spiritual structure and organization of the monastic family is imparted through the sensory transmission of near and motherly concern during the hours of sleep. That this motherly and spiritual transmission is part of the process of building the cohesion of the monastic *familia* to help break the loyalties of blood kinship ties is also supported in Chapter Twenty-Three. This later chapter of *the Regula cuiusdam* contains an expansive prohibition on women religious preferring or defending their relatives against their monastic sisters.⁴¹

The *Regula cuiusdam*'s use of the bed as a space to express motherly feelings toward less experienced or younger women thus quite pointedly builds a mother/child relationship between women religious. As with other early rules, this rule co-opts the meaning of secular beds as a place to procreate heirs in order to build the cohesion of the monastic *familia* by promoting the idea of monastic offspring. Through the conscious construction of a new monastic parentage, early medieval rules attempted to transfer the loyalties of the monastic from their lineal blood heritage to the spiritual family represented by the monastery. While monastic rules might prohibit the expression of clan loyalty within the monastery, identifying acts and spaces that delineated the parent/child relationship of the monastic *familia* was also essential to minimizing conflicts arising from loyalties to consanguineous kin. As demonstrated by the stories from Poitiers, Nivelles, and Lobbes, the preoccupation with molding the strength and unity of the spiritual *familia* mattered not only to the harmony of the monastic community, but was also of critical significance to the monastery's economic prosperity.

⁴¹ Chapter Twenty-Three of the *Regula cuiusdam* rigorously bans women religious from defending kin stating, "Defendere proximam vel consanguineam in monasterio nullo modo permitti censemus. Quid enim aliam defendat, quae jam sibi non vivit, sed Christo quem imitata manet crucifixa? Quae propriam animam ut uberius saluti jugeret, prius perdidit?" *Regula cuiusdam ad virgines*, PL 88, col.1070. As Albrecht Diem has suggested, this chapter was probably meant to limit kinship and clan feuds within Frankish monasteries that were often filled with the offspring of powerful Merovingian aristocracy. See Diem, "Rewriting Benedict," 321-3. For more on clan loyalty and monastic foundation, see le Jan, "Convents, Violence, and Competition," 244-69.

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources:

Archives de l'Etat à Mons MS 34, fol.17.

Edited Primary Sources:

- Additamentum nivialense de Fuliano*. MGH SRM 4.
 Benedict of Aniane. *Concordia regularum*. CC 2.
 Benedict of Nursia. *Benedicti regula*. CSEL 75.
 Caesarius of Arles. *Césaire d'Arles, Oeuvres monastiques*. Edited and translated by Adalbert de Vogüé. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1988.
 Columbanus. *Sancti Columban opera*. Edited and translated by G. S. M. Walker. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1970.
 Donatus. *Regula ad virgines*. PL 87. Cols. 273-298.
 Ferreolus. *Regula ad monachos*. PL 75. Cols. 959-976.
 Folcuin. *Gesta abbatum Lobiensium*. MGH SS 4.
 Gregory I, *Moralium in Job*. PL 75 and 76.
 —. *Moralia in Job*. Translated by Ex Fontibus Company. Create Space Independent Publishing Platform, 2012.
 Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum X*. MGH SRM 1.
 —. *History of the Franks*. Edited and translated by Lewis Thorpe. London: Penguin, 1974.
 Honorius Augustodunensis. *De claustrali vita*. PL 172. Cols. 1247-1248.
Pactus legis Salicae. MGH LL 4.
Regula cuiusdam partris ad virgines. PL 88. Cols. 1053-1070.
Vita sanctae Geretrudis. MGH SRM 2.
 De Vogüé, Dom Adalbert, ed. *Règle du Maître*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1964.

Secondary Sources:

- Calisse, Carlo. *A History of Italian Law*. Boston: Little Brown, 1928.
 Constable, Giles. "Metaphors for Religious Life in the Middle Ages." *Revue Mabillon* 19 (2008): 231-42.
 De Vogüé, Adalbert. *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 2007.
 —. "The Master and St. Benedict: A reply to Marilyn Dunn." *The English Historical Review* 107 (1992): 95-103.

- Diem, Albrecht. "New Ideas Expressed in Old Words: The *Regula Donati* on Female Monastic Life and Monastic Spirituality." *Viator* 43 (2012): 1-38.
- . "Rewriting Benedict: *The Regula cuiusdam ad virgines* and Intertextuality as a Tool to Construct a Monastic Identity." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 17 (2007): 313-28.
- . *Das monastische Experiment: Die Rolle der Keuschheit bei der Entstehung des westlichen Klosterwesens*. Munich: LIT, 2000.
- Dierkens, Alain, *Abbayes et chapitres entre Sambre et Meuse (VII-XI siècles)*. Sigmaringen: J. Thorbecke, 1985.
- . "Saint Amand et la foundation de l'abbaye de Nivelles." *Revue du Nord* 269 (1986): 326-34.
- Dunn, Marilyn. *The Emergence of Monasticism: From the Desert Fathers to the Early Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977.
- Hoebanx, J. J. *L'abbaye de Nivelles des origines au XIVe siècle*. Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1951.
- Le Jan, Régine. "Convents, Violence, and Competition for Power in Francia." In *Topographies of Power in the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Frans Theuws, Mayke de Jong, and Carine Van Rhijn, 244-69. Boston: Brill, 2001.
- McKitterick, Rosamund. *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians*. London: Longman Press, 1983.
- Vos, J. *Lobbes son abbaye et son chapitre*. Louvain: Peeters, 1865.
- Wade, Susan. "Gertrude's Tonsure: An Examination of Hair as a Symbol of Gender, Family, and Authority in the Seventh-Century *Vita* of Gertrude of Nivelles." *Journal of Medieval History* 39 (2013): 129-45. doi:10.1080/03044181.2013.781534.
- Warichez, Joseph. *L'Abbaye de Lobbes depuis les origines jusqu'en 1200*. Paris: Casterman, 1909.

CHAPTER TWO

INTERCESSORY IDENTITY:
HERALDRY AND PORTRAITURE
IN THE ROYAL CHAPEL
AT PYRGA, CYPRUS

STEPHEN J. LUCEY

The Royal Chapel at Pyrga, Cyprus is located in a village in the district of Larnaca in the south central region of the island. A small vaulted structure, it preserves the most complete example of a Franco-Byzantine fresco program from Crusader-controlled Cyprus.¹ The paintings in the chapel have suffered from neglect and depredation. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, much of the frescoed surface was salt-

¹ The first extensive study of the monument is Jens T. Wollesen, *Patrons and Painters on Cyprus: The Frescoes in the Royal Chapel at Pyrga* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010). See also Athanasios Papageorgiou, *The 'Royal Chapel' at Pyrga. A Guide*, trans. Andreas Stylianoy [sic] (Nicosia: Office of the Republic of Cyprus, n. d.). Prior to Wollesen's monograph, the monument had received only limited attention within the context of broader studies of Cypriot art and architecture. See Jean-Bernard de Vaivre, "La chapelle royale de Pyrga," in *L'art gothique en Chypre*, eds. Jean-Bernard de Vaivre, Philippe Plagnieux, and Christian Corvisier (Paris: Institut de France, 2006), 297-304; Melita Emmanuel, "Monumental Painting in Cyprus during the Last Phase of the Lusignan Dynasty, 1374-1489," in *Medieval Cyprus: Studies in Art, Architecture, and History in Memory of Doula Mouriki*, eds. Nancy P. Sevcenko and Christopher Moss (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 241-51; Andreas Stylianou and Judith A. Stylianou, *The Painted Churches of Cyprus: Treasures of Byzantine Art*, 2nd ed. (Nicosia: A.G. Leventis Foundation, 1997), 428-32; and Camille Enlart, *Gothic Art and the Renaissance in Cyprus*, ed. and trans. David Hunt (London: Trigraph, 1987), 325-34.