

may prove to be entirely different in the other gospels'. In the light of the information presented in this article it would seem that the facts are very different. No clearly 'Caesarean' text emerges in Matthew and Luke. All we can say is that Origen uses a text similar to that of $\aleph B$, and that that text finds a certain degree of support from individual members of the family known as 'Fam. Θ ' by students of the text of Mark.

R. V. G. TASKER.

CLUNIAN EXEMPTION

GALLIA CHRISTIANA (iv col. 1119), when recording the fact that the first monks of Cluny were called *Gignienses*, explains 'id verum de origine, non de dignitate, qua nunquam Gignico inferius fuit Cluniacum, utpote a sua fundatione liberum ab omni potestate praeterquam apostolica'. This exemption was a privilege which the Cluniacs valued highly; it was perhaps the most jealously guarded element in their tradition; Peter the Venerable would make much of it in a letter to St Bernard (Petr. Ven. *Epp.* I. xxviii, *ap.* Migne *P.L.* clxxxix coll. 138 sq.; *ap. Bibl. Cluniac.* col. 676 E). Before his departure from Cluny soon after the Epiphany of 1120 Calixtus II, himself a Cluniac monk, conferred upon the abbot of the *Caput Ordinis* the cardinalate *ex officio* 'ut Abbas Cluniacens. semper et ubique Romani fungatur officio Cardinalis, manuque propria ipse te Papa annulo vestivit' (Hugon. *Monachi Cluniac. Ep. ad Dom. Pont. Ab. Cluniac. ap. Bibl. Cluniac.* col. 560A; cf. *Gall. Christ.* iv col. 1135). The first recipient of this exceptional honour was Pontius de Melgueil, no very favourable specimen of the great line which began with St Berno (*Gall. Christ.* iv coll. 1135 sq.). Noticeably a Papal Diploma, dated February 22nd of this same year (1120), in addition to providing that monks of Cluny 'ubilibet habitantes nulla omnino persona praeter Romanum Pontificem, et Legatum, qui ad hoc missus fuerit, excommunicet et interdicat', cuts at the root of Benedictine *stabilitas* by granting that a person 'cuiuslibet Ordinis professionisve'—in point of fact, any *gyrovagus*—may be received at Cluny, 'nisi forte certa de causa excommunicata sit' (*Bibl. Cluniac.* coll. 573 E, 574 A). That the exemption was generously interpreted, so as to include civil as well as ecclesiastical authority and both for all time, may be inferred from the fact that the writer of the letter to Abbot Pontius already cited remarks that the cardinalate was conferred 'ut sic manifestum appareat cunctis, quia tecum et tua Cluniacus solius Papae Romani proprie propria censetur, quae sub alterius iure pontificis, seu cuiuslibet potestatis, providente

Domino, nec fuit aliquando, nec erit in futuro' (*Ap. Bibl. Cluniac.* col. 560 A and B; *ap. Migne, P.L.* clxvi col. 845).

In order to understand this, in particular to realize that Calixtus II, in issuing this diploma, was not innovating in the matter of exemption, it may be well to refer to the original *Charta Fundationis* of Cluny granted to St Berno by William the Pious, Duke of Aquitaine, in the year 910. There are to be found in the Collection de Bourgogne (*Tom.* lxxvi) at the Bibliothèque Nationale two copies of this *Charta*, numbered *Or.* 5 and 6; A. b. 1, c. 1. No. 5 is either the original or an authentic copy made at the time. No. 6 is a fine fourteenth-century copy of no. 5, but not entirely—although materially—complete (cf. Bruel *Recueil des Chartes de l'abbaye de Cluny* i pp. 124 sqq., ed. *Imp. Nat.* 1876). It is inscribed: *Testamentum Guillelmi Pii . . . Et per illud testamentum apparet quod Cluniacenses sunt exempti a fundacione.* The *Testamentum* is given by Marrier and Quercetan in the *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis* (Coll. 1 sqq., Parisiis, 1614). The exemption runs as follows: 'Placuit etiam huic testamento inseri ut ab hac die nec nostro, nec parentum nostrorum, nec fastibus (*Or.* 6: *fascibus*) regię magnitudinis, nec cuiuslibet terrenę potestatis iugo subiciantur monachi ibi congregati; neque aliquis principum secularium, non comes quisquam, nec episcopus quilibet, non pontifex supradictę sedis Romanę, per Deum et in Deum omnibusque sanctis eius, et tremendi iudicii diem contestor, deprecor, inuadat res ipsorum seruorum Dei, non distrahat, non minuat, non procamiet, non beneficiet alicui, non aliquem prelatum super eos contra eorum uoluntatem constituat.'

William, however, we may think to have been on doubtful ground in himself dealing with the purely ecclesiastical status of Cluny. The reference to the Roman See cited from the *Testamentum* should, perhaps, rather be regarded as of the nature of a solemn commendation of its interests and possessions to the charge of the Supreme Pontiff. In any case it is laid down in the *Testamentum* that 'per quinquennium autem Romę ad limina apostolorum ad luminaria ipsorum concinanda, x. solidos prefati monachi persoluant; habeantque tuitionem ipsorum apostolorum adque Romani pontificis defensionem'. This *tuitio* and the *defensio* appropriate to it were confirmed by John XI in a Bull of March 931 addressed to Abbot Odo (*ap. Migne, P.L.* cxxxii col. 1055); and again by Agapetus II in a Bull of March 952 to the effect that 'sane ad recognoscendum, quod praedictum coenobium sanctae apostolicae sedi ad tuendum atque foendum pertineat, dentur per quinquennium x. solid.' (*ap. Bibl. Cluniac.* col. 274). About forty years later we find in a Bull of Gregory V (996-999) for the first time language which clearly implies that the Abbot of Cluny is the ordinary of the entire Congregation, 'neque ipsius loci fratres,

ubicunque positi, uniuscunque episcopi maledictionis vel excommunicationis vinculo teneantur adnecti' (*Bullar. Cluniac.* 10. c. 1), an extension beyond all territorial limits of the privileges of William's *Testamentum*. No less evident is it made in a Bull of Benedict VIII, granted in 1016, that alike civilly and ecclesiastically the *Caput Ordinis* and all its *pertinentia* owed no allegiance whatsoever, save only to the Apostolic Sec: 'Ita sit ab omni subiectione cuiuslibet personae, sive regis, sive episcopi, sive comitis liberum, ut aliquid debeat nisi Deo, et sancto Petro et sedis apostolicae summo pontifici. Quae libertas a cunctis antecessoribus nostris . . . tam de ipso, quam de omnibus ad se pertinentibus . . . monasteriis, cellis, terris cultis et incultis, corroborata et confirmata est' (*Bullar. Cluniac.* 6. c. 1. no. 2). Again we have the world-wide extension of privilege and the appeal to antiquity, with their implication of the solidarity of the entire Congregation from the first.

The years 989 to 1031 were a period during which one of the greatest of all Cluniacs, William of Volpiano, was making his reforming influence felt over a large area of Western Christendom (cf. Albers *Consuetud. Monastic.* iv pp. 26 sqq.; Robert of Torigny *De Immutatione Ord. Monach.*, ap. Migne *P.L.* ccii col. 1314). From Fécamp to Fructuaria, from Dijon to Admont, Cluniac enthusiasm was doing really valuable work; it was sound policy to give it a free hand; moreover a policy justifiable, as it might seem, constitutionally by the terms of the *Charta Foundationis* as it had for about a century been interpreted. Meanwhile the civil power was granting Charters of Privilege to various Cluniac houses, the monarchic tendency of which was to strengthen the autocracy of the *Caput Ordinis*; for even were these houses abbeys—as distinct from simple priories directly subject to Cluny—their autonomy was strictly limited by the fact that they were always within the Congregation, never outside it. Abbot Odilo (*cir.* 992–1049), whom Cluny owed to William of Volpiano (Mabillon *S. Odil. Elog. Hist.* iii 8, ap. Migne *P.L.* cxlii col. 838), was peculiarly successful in this direction. For example in 998 and 999 privileges were, by his instrumentality, confirmed to Payerne (Peterlingen, *Paterniacum*) in the diocese of Lausanne and to St Majolus of Pavia respectively, both of these houses of the Congregation—the former having been originally a cell of Baume-les-Moines—by the Emperor Otto III [cf. Mabillon *Annal. Bened.* III. xli (xxvii), an. 904, 321; xlvi (lxvii), an. 962, 563; Jotsald. *Vita S. Odil.* ii 7, ap. Migne *P.L.* cxlii col. 920; *Mon. Germ. Hist. Dipl.* ii (1), 273, pp. 692 sq.; 314, pp. 740 sq.]. It is true that St Majolus is referred to in the *Praeceptum* (April 13, 999) as commonly called (*ab omnibus dicitur*) 'Cella sancti Mayoli', but the enumeration of its possessions and the penalty imposed by the Imperial authority in any case of their violation—'componat centum

libras auri?—by any person, be he duke or archbishop, as well as its proximity to the city of Milan, would suggest that it was at the time something more than a simple priory (*Bibl. Cluniac.* col. 409; cf. Quercetan *Notae ad loc.* col. 66 c).

Thus, when in 1077, forty-six years after the death of William of Volpiano, Abbot of Fécamp, the Congregation came to England, Lanzo, first Prior of St Pancras, Lewes, represented a vast centralized administrative system—as it were an *imperium in imperio*, whether considered ecclesiastically or civilly. But it was a system with a soul, with a heart throbbing to its utmost capillaries. ‘Veraciter asseratur nullum omnino monasterium posse illud vincere religione ad monachos, affabilitate ad hospites, karitate ad omnes’; so William of Malmesbury wrote of Lewes (*Gesta Pontif. Angl.* ii 98 p. 207 R.S.). Three years later, in 1080, a council held at Rome under Gregory VII decreed that neither archbishop, nor bishop, nor even Apostolic Legate, ‘super illum locum et monasterium’—*sc.* Cluny—‘unquam buccam suam aperiat, aliquamve exerceat potestatem’ (*Bullar. Cluniac.* 21. c. no. 2). But, we shall remember, *ubi Lanzo Cluniacensis, ibi Cluniacum!* Such was the solidarity in question.

The earlier decades of the succeeding century, during which the Congregation became more and more firmly buttressed in its independence by the presence of its sons in the *Curia* and in the Chair of Peter, evidenced the significance, in the matter of exemption, of the *Testamentum* of William the Pious. And yet, if we remember the part played by Cluny at such an international—for it was no less—crisis as the Schism in the Papacy, when under the rule of Peter the Venerable it threw its whole weight into the scale against the claims of Anacletus II, its own—as we shall scarcely hesitate to describe him—degenerate offspring, we cannot fail to recognize how crucially beneficent could be, and indeed often was, the goodwill of this great social monachism which was Cluny (*Vita Petr. Ven. auctore Rodulpho* 4, *ap.* Migne *P.L.* clxxxix col. 15 sqq.). William of Malmesbury, writing perhaps between the years 1120 and 1125, even before they had been proved by the acid test of the disastrous Schism, could tell of ‘Cluniacenses . . . ubique gentium pene dispersi’—‘locupletes in saeculo’, it may be, but ‘et splendidissimae religionis in Deo’ (*Gesta Pontif. Angl.* ii 74 p. 151 R.S.).

It will be noticed that the *tuitio* and *defensio* of Cluny had been, in the terms of the *Testamentum* of William, entrusted to the Roman Pontiff; in terms not differing materially they were accepted by such Popes as Agapetus II, Benedict VIII, and Gregory VII. But, when William of Malmesbury wrote of these *locupletes in saeculo*, the hour at which they ceased at the very centre of the great system to retain their

political independence had already struck. In 1119 the incursions of the Counts of Châlon-sur-Saône were so devastating and irresistible that they sought and obtained a safeguard against them from Louis le Gros. This safeguard pledged the King, with regard to Cluny and its possessions, 'manutenerē, defendere, et custodire, sicut res proprias, et ipsis Abbati, et Monasterio Cluniacensi garantire, cum omnibus bonis et rebus suis in regno nostro positis, vim et violentiam remove, damna et iniurias, a quocumque inferantur facere emendari . . . quotiens nos, vel successores nostri Reges Franciæ, per Abbatem et Conventum Cluniacenses fuerimus requisiti'; it being stipulated: 'Fortalitia autem, castra et munitiones propter necessitates, et defensiones Coronæ Regni Franciæ publice faciendas, in manu Coronæ Franciæ habebimus, Abbate et Conventu Cluniacensibus prius requisitis' (*Bibl. Cluniac.* col. 576 D and E). And this happened perhaps less than a year before Calixtus II, a Cluniac monk—the fact may be emphasized—bestowed the *ex officio* cardinalate upon Abbot Pontius de Melgueil. May we suppose that this was a counter on the part of the Pope, an attempt to recover for himself the dignity of an immemorial protectorship and for the house of his profession its privileged position? In any case the twelve months beginning about the middle of the year 1119 had been closely packed with events which set the lists for a long historic conflict. St Bernard had written his memorable philippic against the violation of Benedictine *stabilitas* in the case of Robert of Châtillon (*Ep.* i, *ad Robertum*)—committed perhaps with the connivance of the Pope; Calixtus had at Saulieu on December 23rd given by Bull his endorsement to the two documents of the Cistercian Constitution, the *Charta Charitatis* and the *Consuetudines* or *Usus* (*Jaffé Regest.* 6795), the former of which explicitly disclaimed exemption from the jurisdiction of diocesan ordinaries (*Charta Char. Praefat.*); Louis le Gros had by his pledge of tutelage established a precedent gravely detrimental to the political independence of Cluny, and that at the *Caput Ordinis* itself. All these factors ultimately made for the undoing of the *Testamentum* and of its confirmatory Papal privileges both in their civil and in their ecclesiastical aspects. How far Calixtus realized this it is difficult to say. There was perhaps—quite unconsciously—a Cistercian challenge; in the circumstances it could scarcely have appeared otherwise to a Cluniac Pope within the walls of Cluny. The bestowal of the *ex officio* cardinalate, although in the nature of the case this never really materialized, would at the moment have been reassuring to the Cluniacs as at least a symbol of the continuance of the aboriginal *tuitio ipsorum apostolorum atque Romani pontificis defensio*, the essentially exemptive character of which was to be yet for long their somewhat empty glory. But the worm was in the

wood. The prestige of Cluny, dazzling as for centuries it remained, never completely recovered from the happenings of the year 1119-1120.

WATKIN WILLIAMS.

AN EARLY ARMENIAN FRAGMENT OF LUKE xvi 3-25

A FINAL classification of Armenian manuscripts of the gospels will be complicated by the necessity of collecting fragmentary texts which can be assigned with some assurance on palaeographical grounds to a relatively early date. With the exception of one manuscript in the British Museum which bears the date 633 A.D.,¹ which may go back to its archetype, the earliest dated manuscript of the Armenian gospels is that of the Lazarevski Institute, 887 A.D., and codices of the ninth and tenth centuries are rare.² The Armenians, however, frequently employed in binding the leaves of gospel manuscripts which they had discarded, and some of the oldest specimens of Armenian palaeography are to be found as fly-leaves of much later codices. In this way a considerable body of gospel text has been preserved, the classification and investigation of which will be an indispensable part of a critical edition of the Armenian version.

Two such ancient leaves are bound up in an Armenian gospel manuscript of the Staatsbibliothek at Berlin, Cod. Arm. 8. The manuscript is dated 1432 A.D. and is of paper, but the two parchment fly-leaves are written in a clear, bold *erkarthagir* which suggests a ninth century hand.³ The text includes Lk. xvi 3 *gorcel oc . . . xvi 25 mxifari*. The following is a collation with Zohrab's edition, Venice 1805.

- | | | | |
|-----|---------|---|--|
| (1) | Lk. xvi | 4 | <i>arariç : gorceçiç.</i> |
| (2) | | 4 | <i>liniçim : linim.</i> |
| (3) | | 5 | <i>lapanaç, par</i> illegible. |
| (4) | | 5 | <i>iwroy + ew.</i> |
| (5) | | 6 | <i>Yissown</i> (sic). |
| (6) | | 7 | <i>darje . . . , al</i> illegible. |
| (7) | | 7 | <i>çmiwsn.</i> |

¹ Add. 19727; cf. F. C. Conybeare 'Catalogue of Armenian Manuscripts in the British Museum' *J.T.S.* xxx p. 361. Merk, who has collated portions of this manuscript, has found that it corresponds in the main with the vulgate text. Cf. A. Merk, *Biblica* iv p. 369.

² Cf. F. Macler 'Le Texte de l'Évangile d'après Matthieu et Marc' (*Annales du Musée Guimet Bibliothèque Études*, xxviii, Paris 1919) p. 2, A. Merk 'Armenische und griechische Palaeographie', *Studi e Testi*, xl p. 4.

³ Cf. N. Karamianz *Verzeichniss der armenischen Handschriften* p. 7; Merk *Armenische und griechische Palaeographie* p. 4.