EX QUIBUS UNUS FUIT ODORANNUS : COMMUNITY AND SELF IN AN ELEVENTH-CENTURY MONASTERY (SAINT PIERRE-LE-VIF, SENS)

Catherine Bright[*]

Abstract: Odorannus (ca. 985–ca. 1046), a Benedictine monk of Saint Pierre-le-Vif, Sens, wrote historical works, musical theory, biblical exegesis, liturgy, pastoral care works, and was also a goldsmith who crafted a reliquary for the remains of Saint Savinian. His writings, which he himself compiled in 1045, survive in an autograph manuscript. They speak to his dynamic social interactions in the insecure milieu of early eleventh-century France. This article highlights the personal nature of Odorannus's texts and of his revision process, and demonstrates that the diverse roles Odorannus came to play due to his accomplishments allowed for his self-importance as an author and member of his community, despite his humble status as a monk. It includes discussion of Odorannus's foundation legend and chronicle for Saint Pierre-le-Vif, his letters and exile to Saint Denis in the early 1020s, as well as aging and the ritual commemoration of the dead.
Keywords: Odorannus of Sens, authorial identity, Saint-Pierre-le-Vif, Benedictine monasticism, monastic foundation legend, exile, *invidia*, aging, commemoration of the dead, compilation.

INTRODUCTION

For the year 1015 in his chronicle, the monk Odorannus (ca. 985–ca. 1046), of the abbey of Saint Pierre-le-Vif in Sens, noted the death of the abbot Rainard.[1] Odorannus briefly described the efforts of this abbot in reestablishing the prestige of Saint Pierre-le-Vif, which had experienced losses over the tenth century. One of Rainard's notable accomplishments, Odorannus explained, was teaching the liberal arts to the abbey's monks. In the earliest manuscript that preserves the chronicle, an interlinear gloss by the word "monks" states "one of whom was Odorannus" (*ex quibus unus fuit Odorannus*).[2] The modern editors of Odorannus's works have judged the manuscript to be an autograph, contending that the body of the text, as well as most of its glosses and marginalia, are in Odorannus's own hand.[3] This claim means that some

---

time after he wrote the original draft of the chronicle, Odorannus added the interlinear gloss during the revision process, apparently considering it worthwhile to identify himself as a particular figure among this anonymous group of learned monks, thereby designating a self in its community.

Odorannus's chronicle is one of several of his texts which he himself compiled in his old age and presented in 1045 to his abbot Ermenaldus for use by the monks of Saint Pierre-le-Vif. The compilation includes a biography of the alleged royal Merovingian foundress of the monastery, Theudechild; the chronicle for the years 675 to 1032; and various letters and texts regarding canon law, biblical exegesis, episcopal ordination, liturgy, pastoral care, and the theory and practice of music. Odorannus wrote a prologue, a table of contents, and a preface for these works, and included a brief concluding statement after the last text. He composed the life of Theudechild apparently upon request from his king, Robert the Pious, the second Capetian king of France (r. 996–1031), and with the encouragement of his archbishop, Leotheric.[4]

Odorannus had a distinctive relationship both with his fellow monks and with his wider community. In his chronicle and some of his other writings, Odorannus reported that he was directly involved with prominent lay political figures, notably with King Robert, who commissioned Odorannus to build a reliquary for the remains of Saint Savinian, the first bishop of Sens.[5] He was thus singled out on some occasions in a positive way, but also in negative ways, such as spending a brief period in exile from his monastery, seemingly due to his possible involvement in heresy. However, Odorannus's career cannot be established with

---

consists of 100 folios including only Odorannus's works, with some later notations on blank pages toward the end of the manuscript. For the contents in order, see the appendix below. The first part of the manuscript is missing, beginning partway through Odorannus's prologue to his collected works; see below, n. 110. A close palaeographical examination of the handwriting of each text brought the modern editors to their recognition of Odorannus's hand. Regarding the interlinear glosses in particular, the editors suggest, by comparing the handwriting of these additions to that of the main text, that it is "extrêmement vraisemblable d'attribuer à Odorannus lui-même la rédaction de ces gloses qui constituent un éclaircissement ou une explication du texte" (35). The editors specify whenever the glosses are in a different hand. The autograph nature of the manuscript is not a chief concern of the present essay, but where questions relating to it arise, I follow the editors' argument that Odorannus's works do appear in his own hand. One exception is Capitulum XII of his collection, whose script the modern editors show to be different (35–36).

[4] Odorannus, *Opera*, Prologus, 70–71.

[5] Odorannus *Opera*, Capitulum II, 100–113 describes these dealings at length.

certainty, because the little information that we have about him and his immediate social sphere is essentially that which he provided. His early life and formation are particularly obscure areas, due to the nature of the evidence he left.[6] Arguably the most historically interesting aspect of the compilation is the extent to which it speaks of Odorannus's own monastic experience in the political uncertainty of early eleventh-century France.

While lay communities such as Sens were being newly defined, monastic communities were concomitantly engaged in the definition and protection of their identity in the areas being shaped around them. The most prominent example of this process is the monastery of Cluny, whose broad influence reached even Saint Pierre-le-Vif as the latter was recovering its own wealth and stability.[7] Indeed, monks like Odorannus could be attached to their own communities but also to the monks and abbots of other monasteries, such as Cluny or Fleury.[8] John Van Engen has called upon the notion of a "Benedictine outlook" to describe monasticism in the period into which Odorannus falls (850–1050), the centuries preceding what scholars have called the "crisis of cenobitism," referring to the slow promulgation of new orders and even eremeticism in the late eleventh and twelfth centuries. By means of their far-reaching "outlook," Benedictine monks completely reconciled worldly concerns with the piety of the monastery. Nurturing and defending the abbey was a laudable pursuit for prominent lay donors, ordinary faithful neighbors, and the Benedictines themselves.[9] Odorannus, writing works for and about Saint Pierre-le-Vif, and closely engaged with some of the chief political actors of his time, provides a

---

[6] See Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 8–9.

[7] Historical studies of monasticism in this period have focused overwhelmingly upon the relationship between monasteries and the lay world. See Constance Brittain Bouchard, *Sword, Miter, and Cloister: Nobility and the Church in Burgundy, 980–1198* (Ithaca 1987); and Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be the Neighbor of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909–1049* (Ithaca 1989). The abbot Odo of Cluny had played a part in reforming Saint Pierre-le-Vif in the mid-10th c. See Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Rhinoceros Bound: Cluny in the Tenth Century* (Philadelphia 1982) 48–49. It would seem a link continued between the two monasteries, with the influence of Cluniac liturgical developments evident in Odorannus's own liturgical treatise on the commemoration of the dead; see n. 121 below.

[8] It seems the efforts of Abbot Rainard in reinvigorating education and prosperity at Saint Pierre-le-Vif were influenced by a parallel process that was occurring at the prestigious monastery of Fleury. See Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 8–9, 65.

[9] John Van Engen, "The 'Crisis of Cenobitism' Reconsidered: Benedictine Monasticism in the Years 1050–1150," *Speculum* 61 (1986) 285–302.

vivid example of the kaleidoscopic "Benedictine outlook."

Despite its apparent value as a rich source for an inquiry into ceno-
bitic life in this period, Odorannus's compilation has largely been
overlooked by modern historians. While his works have been edited at
times since the late sixteenth century, the complete contents of his
autograph manuscript were not edited, translated, and annotated until
1972.[10] Moreover, scholarly interest in his work has been somewhat
limited to the geographical region of its provenance, with his name ap-
pearing most frequently in older studies on the history of the modern
département of the Yonne.[11] Largely thanks to the 1972 edition,
Odorannus's compilation is continuously cited in modern studies of the

[10] See n. 1 above. For previous editions and the manuscript history, see Bautier et al.
(n. 3 above) 36–40.

[11] It is telling that the version of Odorannus's works cited in studies pre-dating the
1972 edition was often that by Louis-Maximilien Duru in his *Bibliothèque historique de
l'Yonne* (Auxerre 1863) 2.385–446. Some scholars have been concerned with the identi-
fication of Theudechild, and thus with Odorannus's biography of this legendary figure.
See Maurice Prou, *Étude sur les chartes de fondation de l'abbaye de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif.
Le diplôme de Clovis et la charte de Théodechilde* (Sens 1894). Historians in the 19th and
early 20th c. mainly wanted to assess the value of Odorannus's chronicle as a historical
source. See Augustin Fliche, "Les sources de l'historiographie sénonaise au XIe siècle,"
Bulletin de la société archéologique de Sens 24 (1909) 19–62; Ferdinand Lot, *Les der-
niers carolingiens: Lothaire, Louis V–Charles de Lorraine (954–991)* (Paris 1891) 338–
344; Gabriel Monod, "Études sur l'histoire de Hugues Capet," *Revue historique* 5 (1885)
255–256. Some authors discussed Odorannus's biographical details, such as Henri Bou-
vier, *Histoire de l'église et de l'Ancien Archidiocèse de Sens* (Amiens 1906) 1.354–383;
idem, *Histoire de l'abbaye de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif de Sens* (Auxerre 1891) 79–92; and
Augustin Challe, "Odoranne, de Sens, écrivain et artiste du commencement du XIe
siècle," *Bulletin des sciences historiques et naturelles de l'Yonne* 6 (1856) 275–316.
These authors looked upon Odorannus sympathetically due to his remarkable erudition in
an otherwise hazy period of regional history. Other readers of Odorannus's work include
musicologists, who have occasionally noted his modest contribution to music history. See
Henri Villetard, *Office de Saint Savinien et de Saint Potentien, premiers évêques de Sens*
(Paris 1956); idem, "Odoranne de Sens et son œuvre musicale," *Comptes rendus, rap-
ports et vœux du Congrès Parisien et Régional de Chant liturgique et de Musique
d'église* (Paris 1912) 61–68. See also Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 56–64. Still others have
examined the manuscript record of Odorannus's works. See Fabrice Delivré, "Les chro-
niques de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif au miroir de la primatie sénonaise: enquête sur les manu-
scrits d'Odorannus, du Pseudo-Clarius et de Geoffroy de Courlon," *Bibliothèque de
l'École des chartes* 163 (2005) 481–503; Elisabeth van Houts, "André Duchesne et son
édition de la Chronique d'Odorannus de Sens," *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Insti-
tuut te Rome* 41 (1979): 203–208. The autograph nature of the earliest manuscript does
not seem to have attracted attention, with Odorannus's name absent from two scholarly
overviews of such texts: Paul Lehmann, "Autographe und originale namhafter lateinisi-
cher Schriftsteller des Mittelalters," idem, *Deutsches Erforschung des Mittelalters: Aus-
gewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze* (Stuttgart 1959) 1.359–381; Hartmut Hoffmann,
"Autographa des früheren Mittelalters," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelal-
ters* 57 (2001) 1–62.

eleventh century, yet no one has devoted a significant historical investigation to it. For the most part, the works within the compilation have been sporadically mined for information by modern scholars, but not analyzed for their own sake and on their own terms.[12]

Those few who have commented upon Odorannus portray him as a remarkable, dynamic, capable, even self-conscious character. By and large, they have taken a special interest in the personal nature of Odorannus's work.[13] What these scholars have neglected to consider, however, is the tension which is inherent in this very distinctiveness, given Odorannus's humble status as a "mere" monk. His was an environment that sought to meet the traditional goals of monasticism outlined in the Benedictine Rule (mid-sixth century), a code which anticipates the basic human challenges of communal existence.[14] Such difficulties are reflected in Odorannus's complex interactions with his monastic group. He was a cenobitic religious, living among fellow monks, ideally in relative anonymity, in order to pray for the world and to achieve salvation. Yet he compiled and left behind a body of texts throughout which his particular name and personal experiences are conspicuous. Odorannus's talent and occasional notoriety, as well as his apparent desire to preserve his own work, become highly charged when set alongside the monastic goal of perfection through communal means.

The central issue that this essay addresses, therefore, is the dynamic relationship between the self and the community as discerned through a reading of Odorannus's compilation. It is an attempt to highlight the complexity of the monastic experience, which is often considered to be a stable and normative aspect of medieval Christian society. Odorannus

---

[12] One exception is Jacques Dubois, "Au temps des premiers capétiens les moines en pleine expansion affirment leurs libertés," *Pouvoirs et libertés au temps des premiers capétiens*, ed. Elisabeth Magnou-Nortier and Pierre Desportes (Paris 1992) 196–214, who cites the latter part of the chronicle as one of a number of sources which demonstrate the "freedoms" of monks in the early years of the Capetian dynasty. Unfortunately, Dubois merely quotes a large portion of the chronicle (at 201–205) but does not follow up with any close analysis of the text.

[13] For example, Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 68, noting this personal aspect: "Nous avons ainsi, tracé par lui-même, un portrait très vivant et pouvons nous représenter ce que fut le caractère de ce moine."

[14] See Benedict, Rule, 4, 5, 6, 7, 65, trans. Terrence G. Kardong, *Benedict's Rule: A Translation and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN 1996) 80–168, 542–555. Despite the inevitable difficulties of a life lived among others, the Rule made clear that the cenobitic lifestyle was optimal for monks (Rule, 1, trans. Kardong, 34–35).

identified closely with his community of brethren at the monastery, but certain functions he fulfilled as an erudite monk of the early eleventh century also attached him to an elite community of laypeople and religious men outside his cloister. In what follows, I argue that the roles available to Odorannus allowed him to understand himself as an important member of his community, as *unus ex quibus*, Odorannus. Moreover, he wanted to be remembered as such. Throughout his texts, and in his compilation as a whole, he inserted himself personally into the work he was doing for his monastery. He was a monk, but also a self-concerned writer. Aspects of his collected compositions reflect the very human preoccupation with leaving behind a record of one's accomplishments and hardships. In short, Odorannus's compilation demonstrates a remarkable tension between authorial identity and monkish humility and anonymity.

To be sure, the following questions and conclusions are fundamentally shaped by the highly privileged group of texts under investigation, texts which necessarily reflect Odorannus's extensive learning, his place in the minority group of the clergy, and his personal dealings with prominent figures of the day. His specialized expertise in music and as a goldsmith is especially remarkable. Moreover, it was Odorannus himself who compiled his works. Consequently, the unique nature of Odorannus's compilation and the very fact that it survives for us today means that it cannot be used as an accurate mirror of its wider context. On the other hand, it should not necessarily be understood as an exception that proves a rule. I do not wish to suggest either that Odorannus was entirely different from others or that all monks were exactly like him. But even though one cannot suppose all his Benedictine contemporaries were equally accomplished, Odorannus does provide a window on his society, demonstrating that it was possible even for cloistered monks to have multifaceted functions both inside and outside the cloister. If I come to any general conclusion in this article, it is not that Odorannus was a total aberration, but rather that his compilation is a compelling and noteworthy remnant from the setting in which it was produced, and an example of the diversity that characterized the Benedictine monastic world of early eleventh-century France.

My question has its background in scholarship concerned with the notion of the medieval "individual," which typically focuses only on the late eleventh and twelfth centuries. In the broadest sense, this scholarship seeks to determine what—or how—medieval people thought of

themselves.[15] Many scholars have explored this question in depth, especially since Colin Morris' claim that the late eleventh and twelfth centuries in Western Europe were a period to which can be attributed the "discovery of the individual."[16] His conclusions have been revised, most significantly by Caroline Walker Bynum, who underscored the importance of looking at the models by which certain people in the period from 1050 to 1200 attempted to define themselves. Bynum's new perspective affirmed the necessity of looking at the community surrounding the self.[17] After years of revision of the "individual" debate, the most pressing methodological difficulty remains the danger of projecting modern preoccupations with individualism into the Middle Ages.[18] While Odorannus's writings contain frequent instances of self-reference, use of the first person, and personal opinions, there is no outright commentary by Odorannus on himself as a particular character in his interior and exterior world.[19] This article does not, however, seek to demonstrate what Odorannus thought of the concept of a "self." Rather, it examines the roles for the self within its community and certain implications of these roles in Odorannus's

[15] A very helpful article for understanding the complex history of this debate is Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Y avait-il un 'moi' au haut Moyen Âge?" *Revue historique* 307 (2005) 31–52.

[16] Colin Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050–1200* (New York 1972).

[17] Caroline Walker Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" eadem, *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley 1982) 82–109. Also Bynum and Susan R. Kramer, "Revisiting the Twelfth-Century Individual: The Inner Self and the Christian Community," *Das Eigene und das Ganze: Zum Individuellen im Mittelalterlichen Religiosentum*, ed. Gert Melville and Markus Shürer (Münster 2002) 57–85.

[18] See Dominique Iogna-Prat, "Introduction générale: la question de l'individu à l'épreuve du moyen âge," *L'Individu au Moyen Âge: Individuation et individualisation avant la modernité*, ed. Brigitte Miriam Bedos-Rezak and Dominique Iogna-Prat (Paris 2005) 7–29. The pursuit has not been abandoned, however, and recent scholarship has produced exciting studies which look for the medieval individual in new ways, often widening the focus somewhat from the cathedral schools of the 12th c. to include the monasteries of the 11th. See Sébastien Barret, "L'individu en action: Quelques réflexions autour des coutumes et statuts clunisiens (XIe–XIIIe siècles)" *Das Eigene und das Ganze* (n. 17 above) 531–562; Jennifer A. Harris, "Peter Damian and the Architecture of the Self," *Das Eigene und das Ganze* (n. 17 above) 131–157; Ellen Joyce, "Scribal Performance and Identity in the Autobiographical Visions of Otloh of St. Emmeram (d. 1067)" *Essays in Medieval Studies* 22 (2005) 95–106.

[19] Remarks of the sort that one would find in an autobiography, the favorite type of source for the pursuit of the medieval "individual." See Michael Clanchy, "Documenting the Self: Abelard and the Individual in History," *Historical Research* 76 (2003) 293–309. See also Jay Rubenstein, "Biography and Autobiography in the Middle Ages," *Writing Medieval History*, ed. Nancy Partner (London 2005) 22–41.

compositions.[20]

I begin with Odorannus's historical works in order to demonstrate that he entwined his own experiences and authorial activity with the history of Saint Pierre-le-Vif's prosperity. Secondly, I observe Odorannus's letters, portraying tension that arose between Odorannus and his social environment inside and outside the cloister. He adopted self-conscious authorial strategies to engage with this environment in which he both experienced and instigated discord. Lastly, I consider what it meant for such a monk to leave written work behind in his old age and how senescence could be a period renegotiate what one's self has been—and will be—in one's community. I move through Odorannus's texts not necessarily according to the order in which they appear in his compilation, nor the order in which they were written, but according to the various themes they highlight.[21]

CONSTRUCTING THE COMMUNITY

Whether by handling the monastery's archives or relating his own experiences with the reliquary which he built for the remains of Saint Savinian, Odorannus played a creative and personal role in formulating an identity for his community. The texts that display this process most visibly are Odorannus's historical writings, appearing first in his compilation: namely, his biography of Theudechild and chronicle of Saint Pierre-le-Vif. Odorannus's attention to the story of his abbey's development is a "historical turn" that reveals a concerted effort at Saint Pierre-le-Vif in defining and defending the community's place in a changing world.[22] In a conventionally humble voice, Odorannus nonetheless asserted himself as an author of—and an important character

[20] See David Gary Shaw, "Social Selves in Medieval England: The Worshipful Ferrour and Kempe," *Writing Medieval History* (n. 19 above) 5, emphasizing that the process of observing a "social self" "requires focusing on how the individual helps to make up the society which simultaneously forms him or her." See also Shaw's monograph, *Necessary Conjunctions: The Social Self in Medieval England* (New York 2005). I favor the term "self" over "individual," though both are used in this essay, partly following Shaw's use of the "social self" terminology which emphasizes external definition and interpersonal interactions.

[21] I do not have the space to touch upon each of Odorannus's texts. For a complete list of the contents of Odorannus's compilation in order, see the appendix below.

[22] This community effort demonstrates a focus on the past and present. To be sure, the future—in terms of the judgment of God—was also a chief concern in the late 10th and early 11th c., a concern which is reflected in modern scholarship on this period. See the essays in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950–1050*, ed. Richard Landes, et al. (Oxford 2003). I leave aside these notions of the future.

in—the long history of his monastery.

The tenuous material stability which Saint Pierre-le-Vif seems to have achieved by Odorannus's time prompted the monastery to "remember" (i.e., create) an origin story to celebrate and protect its new, prosperous place in a highly unstable world. The abbey had experienced invasions by the Normans and Hungarians in the late ninth and tenth centuries, as well as subsequent plunder by lay and ecclesiastical authorities. Though a number of abbots and bishops worked successfully toward the monastery's restoration,[23] ongoing political struggles for Sens created some uncertainty for this newly rejuvenated spiritual centre. In 1015, King Robert the Pious seized Sens from Count Rainard II.[24] Saint Pierre-le-Vif was just outside the city walls of Sens, which was one of many contested areas in which Robert and his successor Henry I (r. 1031–1060) attempted to assert their royal power over prominent counts and bishops. Because the Sens nobles had among them sympathizers to the old Carolingian regime, Capetian influence there would grant the new dynasty much-needed support.[25] A royal presence at Sens would also provide them a foothold toward jurisdiction in Burgundy. Saint Pierre-le-Vif itself was embroiled in these politics, with one of its abbots, Ingo (d. 1025), being an appointee and relative of King Robert.[26] After the latter's death, the city again came

---

[23] A good summary of the invasions and subsequent restoration effort at Saint Pierre-le-Vif to the time of the abbot Rainard is John Ottaway, "Traditions architecturales dans le nord de la France pendant le premier millénaire," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 23 (1980) 163–166.

[24] Archbishop Leotheric and King Robert allied for control of Sens against the troublesome count Rainard II, the brother-in-law of Otto-William, duke of Burgundy. Eventually reaching an agreement, the king and count decided that the latter would maintain his position as count of Sens until death, at which time authority would pass to the king. See Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 98–99.

[25] The key text for anti-Capetian sentiment in Sens is the so-called *Historia Francorum Senonensis*, apparently written within the archbishop Seguin's chapter circle. See Robert-Henri Bautier, "L'avènement d'Hugues Capet et le sacre de Robert le Pieux," *Le roi de France et son royaume autour de l'an mil*, ed. Michel Parisse and Xavier Barral I Altet (Paris 1992) 32; Joachim Ehlers, "La monarchie capétienne et la genèse de la nation française," *Pouvoirs et libertés* (n. 12 above) 73–74; Patrick J. Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton 1994) 150–151. For Odorannus's intermittent engagement with this source until 1015 in the chronicle, see Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 45–46; Fliche, "Les sources" (n. 11 above) 19–62; Lot (n. 11 above) 343.

[26] On the political expediency of Robert's various abbatial appointments of Ingo, see Andrew Lewis, "The Identification of Abbot Ingo (Ob. 1025) Cousin of King Robert the Pious," *Revue bénédictine* 101 (1991) 316–321. See also Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 9–10 and Laurent Theis, *Robert le Pieux: le roi de l'an mil* (Paris 1999) 145.

into question, when Queen Constance and her relative Count Odo II of Blois worked to wrest control of the region from young Henry I.[27]

In such a turbulent environment, Odorannus's resourceful engagement with his monastery's foundation legend may well be an example of what Amy Remensnyder has termed the "imaginative memory" with which monks constructed tales of origin in order to legitimize and defend their institutional interests and identities.[28] Moreover, Saint Pierre-le-Vif was one of a broader network of monasteries, each of whose members sought to validate the existence of their respective institutions. It was necessary to delineate a foundation history if a small abbey like Saint Pierre-le-Vif was to gain recognition from lay donors and other monasteries, such as Cluny or Fleury.[29] The abbey's origin narrative appears in Odorannus's compilation in the form of a short biography, which identified the house's founder as Theudechild, a daughter of King Clovis himself.[30] Making use of the donation document or "testament" of Theudechild, Odorannus verified that the princess had bestowed land upon the monastery. He quoted in full two poems of praise by the Merovingian court poet Venantius Fortunatus (ca. 540–605), both addressed to a "Queen Theudechild." Odorannus concluded by also quoting a brief epitaph from an inscription at Saint Pierre-le-Vif affirming Theudechild's donation to the monastery. The origin story made clear that Theudechild had desired to establish a community for monks under a rule and an abbot, thereby creating a holy place for her burial.[31]

While Odorannus's foundation narrative seems typical, its claims become controversial in light of the donor-princess' uncertain identity. In fact, there is no record that Clovis had a daughter named Theudechild. Moreover, Fortunatus had written the celebratory verses for a different Merovingian noblewoman of the same name.[32] It appears that

---

[27] See n. 52 below.

[28] Amy G. Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca 1995). See also eadem, "Croyance et communauté: la mémoire des origines des abbayes bénédictines," *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen Age* 115 (2003) 141–154. On the creative use of archival material to shape future notions of the past according to the concerns of a troubled present, see Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance* (n. 25 above).

[29] See n. 7 and n. 8 above.

[30] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum I, 76–83.

[31] Ibid. 78–79.

[32] Venantius Fortunatus was from Ravenna and became a poet at the royal court in Merovingian Gaul, as well as serving as bishop of Poitiers. For a translation of his Theu-

either Odorannus or the monks who assembled the archive before him had appropriated certain texts for the purpose of establishing the monastery's communal past and its present identity. As Remensnyder has shown, many monasteries similarly looked to the early Frankish past for their origins, and to Clovis in particular, who was remembered as glorious both for his political power over the Franks and for his famous conversion to Christianity.[33] By identifying Clovis' "daughter" as the pious founder of Saint Pierre-le-Vif, Odorannus was affirming a legend which endowed his monastery with lofty, recognizable claims to temporal and spiritual greatness.

It so happens that the donation document itself, which formed the basis for Odorannus's biography of Theudechild, bears the same ambiguity as the princess' identity. Odorannus noted that Theudechild gave her land in Francia and Aquitaine to the monastery, and that anyone so inclined could verify her donation by reading the actual charter in the monastery's archives.[34] By referring directly to his textual evidence, Odorannus urged his audience to give credence to the abbey's claims. However, as Maurice Prou argued convincingly over a century ago, Theudechild's charter was probably a creation of the tenth century, written under the auspices of Archbishop Anastastius of Sens between 967 and 976, when the monastery was reaffirming its land holdings after invasion.[35] It seems that the source which legitimized the monastery's property was as dubious as the identity of the donor of the lands themselves.

One might readily question the extent of Odorannus's naïveté in

---

dechild poems, see *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, ed. and trans. Judith George (Liverpool 1995) 8, 38–39. George's biographical note on Theudechild shows that the obscure woman to whom Fortunatus addressed his poems may have been the daughter of Clovis's son, the Merovingian noble Theoderic I, and Suavegotta (131). For Odorannus's citation of the poems and Theudechild's identity, see Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 43–44 and Prou (n. 11 above) 30–32.

[33] Remensnyder, *Remembering Kings Past* (n. 28 above) 118. Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum I, 76–77 refers to Clovis's baptism to praise the king and to highlight the subsequent foundation of the monastery of Saints Peter and Paul in Paris by Queen Clothild.

[34] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum I, 78–79. The modern editors discuss the importance of this affirmation to Saint Pierre-le-Vif's land claims in Mauriac in the Auvergne at page 79 n. 3. There is a reference to these lands in the 12th-c. *Chronique de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif de Sens, dite de Clarius. Chronicon Sancti Petri Vivi Senonensis*, ed. and trans. Robert-Henri Bautier and Monique Gilles (Paris 1979) 52–53. The text of the "testament" is translated by Bouvier as an appendix in his *Histoire de l'abbaye* (n. 11 above) 201–203.

[35] Prou (n. 11 above) 44. Prou's conclusions suggest that Odorannus was not the actual forger of the text; rather, he used the donation document in an instance of selective, creative engagement with archival material.

making use of legend and a spurious source to assert the privileges of his monastic community.[36] With deliberate intertextual references not only to the presence of the testament in the monastery's archive, but also to "several little works which we possess" (*opuscula … quae apud nos habentur*) by Fortunatus,[37] Odorannus was highlighting his own use of the community's archival material in order to support his claims.[38] The foundation legend was an important part of the abbey's identity as a holy institution. Placed at the beginning of his compilation (recall that Odorannus was both author and compiler of his works), it immediately demonstrated that Odorannus's œuvre was working for the good of Saint Pierre-le-Vif.

Appearing after the biography of Theudechild in the compilation is Odorannus's chronicle of Saint Pierre-le-Vif. The modern editors have divided the chronicle into two sections. The first, documenting the years 675 to 1015, is based largely upon outside sources.[39] Entries in this section are usually two to three lines long, recording well-known events in Francia and documenting donations of privileges to Saint Pierre-le-Vif or other occurrences that were important to the monastery's development.[40] A significant change in form occurs, however, in the

---

[36] Some scholars maintained that Odorannus believed what his sources told him. See Bouvier, *Histoire de l'abbaye* (n. 11 above) 18. See also Abbé Blondel, "La vérité sur les chartes de fondation de l'abbaye de Saint-Pierre-le-Vif," *Bulletin de la société archéologique de Sens* 18 (1897) 189, who hotly refuted Prou's findings, preferring to trust the testament and Odorannus's affirmation of its claims. See also Joseph Perrin, "Le martyrium de saint Savinien, premier évêque de Sens," *Bulletin de la société archéologique de Sens* 31 (1917) 135, who says that Odorannus used the poems "en pleine connaissance de cause." Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 42, merely suggest that he used texts by "les juxtaposant avec une grande habileté."

[37] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum I, 78–79.

[38] For an example of the process by which an author emphasizes his own personal role in his writing by identifying his sources, see Ellen Joyce, "Speaking of Spiritual Matters: Visions and the Rhetoric of Reform in the *Liber visionum* of Otloh of St Emmeram," *Manuscripts and Monastic Culture: Reform and Renewal in Twelfth-Century Germany*, ed. Alison I. Beach (Turnhout 2007) 75. On intertextuality and the *auctoritas* of medieval archivists, see Patrick J. Geary, "Medieval Archivists as Authors: Social Memory and Archival Memory," *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory*, ed. Francis X. Blouin Jr. and William G. Rosenberg (Ann Arbor 2005) 106–113.

[39] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 45–48.

[40] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 88–91 notably included canons from the synod of Ponthion in 876 for their relevance to the "primacy" of the archbishop of Sens. Odorannus's chronicle has frequently been read solely for its engagement with the primacy issue. See Augustin Fliche, "La primatie des Gaules depuis l'époque carolingienne jusqu'à la querelle des investitures (876–1121)" *Revue historique* 173 (1934) 329–342. See also Delivré (n. 11 above) 481–503.

second section covering the years 1015 to 1032, which ceases to feature the traditional year-and-description format and is based entirely upon Odorannus's personal reminiscence about his involvement in the events surrounding the translation of Saint Savinian's relics.[41] Saint Pierre-le-Vif possessed the relics of Saint Savinian and his companion, Potentian, episcopal martyrs whose supposed mission to Gaul may have taken place as early as the third century.[42] Odorannus recorded that in 847 the archbishop Wenilo had initially brought their bodies, among others, to the basilica in Sens.[43] In this second part of the chronicle, Odorannus detailed the circumstances surrounding the commission he received from the king and queen to build a new, ornate reliquary for Savinian's remains. The shift in the chronicle from laconic entries by a seemingly anonymous author to this personalized, descriptive section allows Odorannus's particular voice to emerge in the history of his community.

Monastic chronicles, like foundation legends, typically sought to celebrate the various people who had brought the community to its position of social importance.[44] The first time he referred to himself in the chronicle, Odorannus conveyed his own status as a contributor to the

[41] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 48–50. Despite the internal shift in the chronicle, Odorannus's modern editors have not suggested any time lapse in its composition, palaeographically speaking. It is rather a change in source material and style.

[42] See Augustin Fliche, *Les vies de saint Savinien, premier évêque de Sens* (Paris 1912) 37–51.

[43] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 86–87. See also Fliche, *Les vies de saint Savinien* (n. 42 above) 16.

[44] For example, not only did Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 100–101 laud King Robert's attention to the rich decoration of relics, but he also defended the legitimacy of his reign. For the year 982 (actually 987) Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 96–97, wrote that the Carolingian Louis V died, "after he had given the kingdom to the duke Hugh" (*donato regno Hugoni duci*) and that Robert was ordained king. Lot (n. 11 above) 380 entitled this description of Hugh's accession a "prétendue cession du royaume." By Odorannus's account, the royal title was not usurped, but transferred from a dying dynasty. It is unsurprising that Odorannus would endorse the rule of his great patron, Robert. See Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 47; Augustin Fliche, "Séguin, archevêque de Sens, primat des gaules et de Germanie," *Bulletin de la société archéologique de Sens* 24 (1909) 172. The best example of Robert's favorable representation by monks is Helgaud of Fleury, *Vie de Robert le Pieux. Epitoma vitae regis Rotberti Pii*, ed. and trans. Robert-Henri Bautier and Gillette Labory (Paris 1965). Historians invariably note this aspect of Robert's legacy. See Georges Duby, *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago 1980) 183–184; Blaise Dufal, "Royauté capétienne et idéologie bénédictine dans la *Vie de Robert le Pieux* par Helgaud de Fleury," *Paris et Ile-de-France. Mémoires* 57 (2006) 7–46; Sarah Hamilton, "A New Model for Royal Penance? Helgaud of Fleury's *Life of Robert the Pious*," *Early Medieval Europe* 6 (1997) 189–200.

monastery. He noted his period of exile from the abbey—apparently
due to accusations brought against him by his brethren—in order to in-
troduce his positive role in the community.[45] For the year 1023, he
wrote:

> … the monk Odorannus, after he had made the crucifix and the well of the
> monastery, suffered, for the punishment of his sins, the intrigues of deceitful
> brothers; with the help of God, he barely escaped death; after he had spent
> some time at Saint Denis, he returned with the greatest honor to his own
> monastery.[46]

By describing the event of his return to Saint Pierre-le-Vif at the begin-
ning of his narrative of the translation of Savinian's remains to a new
reliquary, Odorannus intimately linked personal experience with the
story of his monastery's development. He emerges as a character with-
out whom the abbey's history would be incomplete. The monk con-
nected his glorious homecoming to circumstances of material prosper-
ity for Saint Pierre-le-Vif, thereby drawing a parallel in the text be-
tween his personal wellbeing and that of his institution.[47] Like the ab-
bey, Odorannus had suffered at the hands of enemies, but overcame ad-
versity.

To commence retelling the blessed events which followed his re-
demptive return, Odorannus provided a rare interpretation of a crisis in
the royal marriage. In 1003, King Robert was married to Constance of
Arles, but maintained a relationship with his previous wife, Bertha of
Blois, whom he had repudiated due to what clerics deemed too close a
tie of kinship.[48] In 1010, Robert journeyed to Rome to meet with the
pope, apparently seeking to renew his earlier union with Bertha.
Odorannus wrote that this previously rejected wife followed Robert

---

[45] Odorannus's separation from his monastery is discussed further below.

[46] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 100–101: "Odorannus monachus, postquam cruci-
fixum et puteum monasterii fecit, peccatis suis promerentibus, insidias a falsis fratribus
perpessus, Deo propicio vix mortem evasit. Qui apud Sanctum Dionisium aliquantisper
commoratus, cum maxime honore propriis sedibus est redditus."

[47] See Remensnyder, "Croyance" (n. 28 above) 153–154, who notes that a monk who
was constructing his abbey's past was also engaging with his personal past, as the two
were very closely linked.

[48] Increasingly stringent ecclesiastical notions of what constituted consanguinity made
it difficult for nobles like Robert to enter into marriages acceptable to the clergy. See
Constance B. Bouchard, "Consanguinity and Noble Marriages in the Tenth and Eleventh
Centuries," *Speculum* 56 (1981) 268–287. On Robert and Constance's marriage, see also
Christian Pfister, *Études sur le règne de Robert le Pieux (996–1031)* (1885; repr. Geneva
1974) 46–60.

south, wanting to recover her former royal position.[49] Were Bertha's hopes to be fulfilled, the present queen Constance would be cast aside. Unfortunately for Robert and Bertha, they did not receive the papal sanction they sought.

Here, Odorannus introduced Saint Savinian into the story as an active character. He described an anxious Constance sleeping at Theil, near Sens, where she stayed while Robert went to Rome. In a dream, she saw a luminous, white-haired man dressed in priest's clothes and carrying a staff, who revealed himself as Savinian and told her that God would relieve her profound sadness. The next morning, Constance proceeded to ask nearby churchmen about Savinian's identity. She learned from Theoderic of Saint Pierre-le-Vif that he had been a martyr and the first bishop of Sens.[50] Theoderic assured her of a speedy response if she should pray to the saint. The queen went to Saint Pierre-le-Vif, prayed before Savinian, and became joyful, just as the saint had promised. Sure enough, the king returned only three days later with renewed love for Constance, and reasserted her authority over the royal possessions. The queen promptly responded to Savinian's miraculous intercession by commissioning a new reliquary to replace his lead tomb. Here, Odorannus enters into the actions of his royal patrons. Robert summoned Odorannus, "who seemed to him capable of executing such a work" (*qui ad hoc opus perficiendum videbatur idoneus*).[51] The monk, by the renown of his own artistry, gained the privileged opportunity of commemorating this important miracle, thanks to Constance's faithful generosity.[52]

[49] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 100–101: "Quod ut Berta regina, dudum causa consanguinitatis a rege repudiate, comperit, prosecuta est eum, sperans se, faventibus ad hoc quibusdam aulicis regis, jussu apostolico restituram toro regio."

[50] Theoderic was a monk of Saint Pierre-le-Vif who became bishop of Orléans around the year 1010; Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 102 n. 1.

[51] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 100–103. Most studies dealing with marriage and Capetian France refer to this episode. See Georges Duby, *The Knight, the Lady, and the Priest: The Making of Modern Marriage in Medieval France*, trans. Barbara Bray (New York 1983) 81, 83–84; Jean-Hervé Foulon, "Stratégies politiques, fondation monastique et recours à Rome vers l'an Mil: le cas de Beaulieu-lès-Loches," *Revue historique* 307 (2005) 259–260; Pfister (n. 48 above) 69; Theis (n. 26 above) 145–146.

[52] Constance's favorable treatment by Odorannus is interesting. After Robert the Pious' death, the widowed Constance allied herself with Odo II of Blois, the great opponent of the early Capetians, a contentious political move that pitted her against her own son, Henry I (r. 1031–60). See J. Dhondt, "Une crise de pouvoir capétien, 1032–1034," *Miscellanea Mediaevalia in memoriam Jan Frederik Niermeyer* (Groningen 1967) 137–148; Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 25–26. Writing in the 1030s, Odorannus would have had to

In Odorannus's narrative, Savinian's intercession led to a crucial event: the translation of the saint's relics from tomb to ornate reliquary.[53] Robert called upon Leotheric to move Savinian's body to its new reliquary. The king himself then came to Saint Pierre-le-Vif and carried the reliquary to its new resting place "on his own shoulders" (*propriis scapulis*).[54] By describing Robert's kingly presence and impressive physical interaction with the relics, Odorannus demonstrated how important an event this was for the abbey. In an environment that so valued saintly patronage, the presence of holy remains in a lavish new reliquary bearing royal endorsement at Saint Pierre-le-Vif would give new renown among monasteries to this abbey of Sens.

In his chronicle, as the reliquary's fashioner, Odorannus became a privileged witness to the miracles that surrounded the relic translation. After Constance's initial dream, there were three miracles which, Odorannus wrote, "we have seen with our eyes and, in part, touched with our hands" (*occulis nostris vidimus et ex parte manibus contractavimus*).[55] The first occurred while Odorannus was journeying to Dreux in order to acquire gold from Robert and Constance for the commissioned reliquary. The miracle took the form of a straying star that realigned with its proper course, signifying to the servants accompanying Odorannus that they would successfully complete their journey. Upon Odorannus's return to Saint Pierre-le-Vif, he recalled, the small amount of gold that Constance had personally entrusted to him became—marvelous to tell—significantly weightier. Odorannus and the other wit-

---

consider the tension which Constance's name probably incited. He may have tried to deflect the upsetting events posterior to the miracle in order to maintain the sanctity of Constance's patronage, and by extension, to avoid sullying his own work and the monastery's glory it sought to promote. Indeed, contemporary clerical sources represented her negatively. See Fulbert of Chartres, *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, ed. and trans. Frederick Behrends (Oxford 1976) 222–223, who in 1027 said that Constance was "quite trustworthy when she promises evil." For an analysis of Constance's career and her reputation among clerics, see Penelope Ann Adair, "Constance of Arles: A Study in Duty and Frustration," *Capetian Women*, ed. Kathleen Nolan (New York 2003) 9–26.

[53] The translation of a saint could become a liturgical celebration, serving to re-authenticate the relics and re-legitimize their initial translation. In general, see Patrick J. Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca 1994) 194–218. In the manuscript containing Odorannus's works, there is a notated office of Saint Savinian and Potentian (fols. 91–94). Villetard, *Office* (n. 11 above) in his edition of its music, concluded that it was a later addition to the manuscript and not written by Odorannus. See also Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 30, 40.

[54] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 108–111. Helgaud, *Vie de Robert le Pieux* (n. 44 above) 110–111, provides another instance of Robert doing this.

[55] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 104–105.

nesses immediately understood divinity at work in this second won-
der.[56] An aged, blind layman was the recipient of the third miracle. He
came to the abbey church several days before the translation ceremony
and encountered Odorannus working alone on the reliquary. Upon be-
ing admitted by Odorannus, the old man prayed at the saint's shrine.
Some days later, after the translation ceremony, while the king was at
dinner with the assembly, the blind man came before everyone, an-
nouncing that he could see anew.[57] In each miracle, Odorannus is an
eyewitness whose actions are preconditions to the wondrous events.
Had he not journeyed to Dreux, acquired gold, and shown the old man
to Savinian's shrine, none of the marvels would have been possible.[58]

Because Odorannus had such an active role in the story that sought
to glorify his saint, his chronicle exhibits moments of his personal in-
tercourse with others throughout the events of Savinian's translation.
For example, after the ceremony, King Robert retired to the church for
solitary prayer. An emotional encounter ensued when Odorannus drew
near:

> The king, seeing him from far away, with a calm hand signal, gestured to
> him to approach. "Tell me," he said. "What was Saint Potentian for Saint
> Savinian?" The brother humbly answered him that he had been his com-
> panion in the toils of travel, his successor in honor and his colleague in
> martyrdom. Then the king began to lament and to beat his breast, because he
> had separated the relics from one another.[59]

In this scene, Odorannus is again a privileged interlocutor. He appears
as an advisor and friend to the king, due to his knowledge of the history
of Savinian and Potentian's saintly companionship. Moreover, he was a
witness as Robert increased his devotion to Saint Pierre-le-Vif's mar-

---

[56] Ibid. 104–107.

[57] Ibid. 108–111.

[58] Another instance of personal experience in miracle stories is the case of Bernard of
Angers, the cleric who wrote a portion of the miracle collection of Saint Foy at Conques.
See Kathleen Ashley and Pamela Sheingorn, *Writing Faith: Text, Sign, and History in the
Miracles of Sainte Foy* (Chicago 1999) 43, analyzing Bernard's self-insertion as a char-
acter in the miracles, often becoming the "person for whom events take place." For the
full discussion, see 39–45. See also *The Book of Sainte Foy*, trans. Pamela Sheingorn
(Philadelphia 1995).

[59] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 110–111: "quem aspiciens, eminus tranquilla
manu innuit ut accederet propius; cui: 'Enarra mihi', inquit, 'sanctus Potentianus sancto
Saviniano quid fuerit.' At ille quod socius ejus in itineris labore et successor in honore et
college martirii fuerit humiliter intulit. Tunc rex graviter coepit conqueri et pugnis pectus
tondere eo quod eos ab invicem separasset corpore."

tyrs. After beating his breast, Robert vowed to commission a reliquary for Potentian as well, but died before this second project could commence.[60] Nevertheless, Odorannus, by answering the king's query, was crucial to securing what would have been further illustrious patronage.

It was the reliquary that made possible this personal connection between goldsmith and king. Odorannus's modern editors, working from a seventeenth-century sketch and description of the reliquary, have done much to illuminate the treasure, which was apparently lost during the French Revolution. The reliquary was remarkably large for its time, with precious stones on the anterior face, depicting Robert and Constance. On the lid were scenes of the life and passion of Savinian. It was inscribed with rhymed verse about the saint as well as the king and queen's patronage.[61] Those who would look upon Saint Pierre-le-Vif's treasure would see the images from Savinian's life alongside the images of the royal patrons, showing the piety of both parties. One was meant to recognize the patronage and artistry which had brought Savinian to his present glorious state, where he could be venerated by many over time.[62] Under Savinian's watchful eye, Saint Pierre-le-Vif could claim an identifiable position in the large community of monasteries of eleventh-century France.

With the reliquary, Odorannus memorialized the royal patronage for his monastery's spiritual and material prosperity, but his subsequent textual description of this patronage served to memorialize the monk himself. He was both the goldsmith who fabricated the reliquary and the author who detailed the circumstances of its production. Given that Odorannus provided almost no practical details about his production of

---

[60] Ibid. 110–111.

[61] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 16–25. Odorannus's handiwork was a casket reliquary, or *châsse*. Though evidence of reliquaries in the central Middle Ages is scarce, it seems that the casket was the most common reliquary type. Less common was the body reliquary, like that of Saint Foy at Conques. See Claire Wheeler Solt, "Romanesque French Reliquaries," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History* 9 (1987) 171, 187, and for her description of Odorannus's reliquary, 193–194. There is a reproduction of the actual sketch made in 1650 by Dom Cotron in Jean Hubert, "Introïbo ad altare," *Revue de l'art* 24 (1974) 16. See also Geoffrey Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca 1992) 162.

[62] On the relationship between reliquaries and "imaginative memory," see Amy G. Remensnyder, "Legendary Treasure at Conques: Reliquaries and Imaginative Memory," *Speculum* 71 (1996) 884–906.

the reliquary, save for a brief note toward the end of the chronicle,[63] Lynn White included him among other Benedictines who allegedly were trained to be overly modest about their work.[64] Indeed, the Benedictine Rule portrays humility as fundamental to a monk's success and pride as his greatest obstacle.[65] Odorannus needed to describe his magnificent contribution in a spirit of monastic humility. At times, however, he seems to have suspended this ideal, for he clearly believed his experiences were important to Saint Pierre-le-Vif's development.

NEGOTIATING THE SELF

Odorannus was a distinguished, constructive member of his monastic community, but this same prominence caused him to experience—and apparently to incite—social discord. The crucial moment of this disunity was when he was forced to leave his monastery in 1023, ostensibly due to accusations which his fellow monks had brought against him. Odorannus spent two years at the monastery of Saint Denis before the abbot Ingo recalled him to Saint Pierre-le-Vif.[66] This period of exile was a key aspect of the tension between Odorannus's self-conscious authorial identity and his communal, monastic identity. Nor did his troubles end in the 1020s. The negative side of Odorannus's experience demonstrates that he identified closely with a community of scholars outside Saint Pierre-le-Vif while still concerning himself with his life within the cloister. The friction in Odorannus's social interactions is evident in certain rhetorical strategies that appear in his letters such as self-victimization, indirection, expressions of affection, and accusation of critics as "envious" or even heretical. His letters, written mainly during the 1020s and 1030s, make up the majority of his compilation. Odorannus did not group them together, but rather they appear interspersed throughout the collection. In the letters, Odorannus wrote as though to a partisan audience comprised of both friends and detractors.

---

[63] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 108–109: "Fratre vero, sub cujus arbitrio et previdentia tocius operis fabrica constabat, in choro monasterii residente et imagines argenti, quod cooperculo capse superponi disposuerat, cera molli refovente."

[64] Lynn White Jr., "Medieval Engineering and the Sociology of Knowledge," *Pacific Historical Review* 44 (1975) 5. See also Jacques Dubois, "Le travail des moines au Moyen Age," idem, *Aspects de la vie monastique en France au Moyen Age* (Hampshire 1993) II (80–81); Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, trans. Catharine Misrahi (New York 1982) 18.

[65] Benedict, Rule, 7, trans. Kardong (n. 14 above) 132–135.

[66] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum III, 116–117.

I consider there to be two major audiences for these letters: the direct addressees along with their associates, and also those who would see Odorannus's compilation at Saint Pierre-le-Vif, be they Odorannus's contemporaries or his successors. For both audiences, it seems this author-monk anticipated hostility and sought to maintain the good graces of sympathetic readers.[67]

Odorannus recorded his exile under the year 1023 in his chronicle, stating that he "suffered, for the punishment of his sins, the intrigues of false brothers; with the help of God, he barely escaped death" (*insidias a falsis fratribus perpessus, Deo propicio vix mortem evasit*).[68] The circumstances which thus brought Odorannus to Saint Denis are not entirely clear. Odorannus's modern editors suggest two main reasons why he left Saint Pierre-le-Vif. On the one hand, the combative politics in Sens may have forced him to shun his own milieu.[69] On the other hand, the monk's own references to his exile suggest that it was trouble within the abbey—namely the conspiratorial activity of his own brethren—that drove him away. Moreover, in one of his letters, likely written soon before his departure, Odorannus told his correspondents Ayr-

---

[67] It is no secret to readers of Odorannus's compilation that the monk's affective personality and notable erudition occasionally had him at odds with his community. Studies prior to the 1972 edition of the compilation nearly always used Odorannus's words as accurate descriptions of reality, characterizing Odorannus's accusers in the same words used by Odorannus himself. See Challe (n. 11 above) 294. Since the 1972 edition, however, scholars have often cited Odorannus in studies concerning the development of heresy in the central Middle Ages, now devoting some attention to his literary strategies. See Guy Lobrichon, "The Chiaroscuro of Heresy: Early Eleventh-Century Aquitaine as Seen from Auxerre," *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000*, ed. Thomas Head and Richard Landes (Ithaca 1992) 90, who referred briefly to Odorannus as a "polemicist," who used language deliberately and self-consciously to defend himself in an environment of doctrinal and political controversy. I have not encountered any in-depth investigation of Odorannus's letters. I recognize that, by focusing on "rhetorical/literary strategies," I am engaging in an examination that has been very much informed by the "linguistic turn" in historical analysis. See Robert M. Stein, "Literary Criticism and the Evidence for History,"*Writing Medieval History* (n. 19 above) 67–87. I refer to the older (pre-"linguistic turn") studies partly for a historiographical frame of reference, partly because of the scarcity of more recent examinations.

[68] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 100–101. His striking language emphasizes the seriousness and violence of banishment from the monastery. See Jane Sayers, "Violence in the Medieval Cloister," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 41 (1990) 533–542. See also *Exile in the Middle Ages*, ed. Laura Napran and Elisabeth van Houts (Turnhout 2004).

[69] The city was divided between the archbishop Leotheric, who was a supporter of Robert the Pious and Count Rainard II, a rival to royal power. Odorannus was himself an ally of the king, so he may have left Sens due to the threatening animosity of Rainard's contingent outside the cloister walls. See Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 13.

fredus, an ecclesiastic of the cathedral school at Orléans and abbot of Saint Avitus, and Hugh, archdeacon of Sens, that he had been accused of heresy. He stated, "moved by envy, separating themselves from the truth, [my critics] accuse me of having spoken wrongly of God" (*invidia stimulante a veritate desipientes, quod de Deo male sentiens*).[70] In light of this reference, the modern editors of the letter note that Odorannus's banishment occurred concurrent with the trial of heretical clerics at Orléans in December, 1022. This environment of persecution may have become an occasion for Odorannus's "envious" brethren to damage the name of their prominent fellow monk and have him expelled.[71]

Robert-Henri Bautier's influential study of the events at Orléans demonstrates that the trial of "heretics" was driven by rival factions and their partialities toward specific ecclesiastical candidates.[72] The main targets were canons from the cathedral chapter in Orléans who seem to have rejected the validity of the sacraments. Robert the Pious and Queen Constance presided at the trial with church dignitaries. The council ended with several clerics being burned to death.[73] Bautier showed that Odorannus was closely connected to this controversy, suggesting that his correspondent Ayrfredus was a part of the scandal as a churchman at Orléans. Moreover, Odorannus's critics had apparently charged him with heretical beliefs at Saint Pierre-le-Vif. While it is hardly certain that Odorannus was a member of the heretical circle at Orléans, he nonetheless had ties to a divisive and potentially unorthodox milieu.[74]

Odorannus was keenly aware of the hazards close around him. After all, he claimed that his own brethren had been the enemies who had

---

[70] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XIII, 264–265.

[71] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 14–16.

[72] Robert-Henri Bautier, "L'hérésie d'Orléans et le mouvement intellectuel au début du XIe siècle: documents et hypothèses," idem, *Recherches sur l'histoire de la France médiévale: Des Mérovingiens aux premiers Capétiens* (Hampshire 1991) VIII (63–88).

[73] Modern historiography heralds the trial of 1022 as one of the first instances of the organized persecution of heretics in medieval Europe. See R. I. Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, 2nd ed. (Oxford 2007) 14–15; Michael Frassetto, "The Heresy at Orléans in 1022 in the Writings of Contemporary Churchmen," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 49 (2005) 1–17; Karen Sullivan, *Truth and the Heretic: Crises of Knowledge in Medieval French Literature* (Chicago 2005) 56–57 n. 34, for a helpful treatment of the sources and scholarship. See also Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton 1983) 106–120.

[74] Bautier, "L'hérésie" (n. 72 above) 82–84 and Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 16.

falsely accused him and forced him to leave the monastery.[75] He had reached a climactic moment of struggle with his community, which prompted him to doubt the value of living with others as a studious monk. In the letter to Ayrfredus and Hugh, Odorannus expressed this disillusion, saying that if he were a wandering monk[76] or a cowherd,

> … maybe then no one would envy me, no one would slander me. But since, abiding in my monastery, I desire to discover the truth of subtle things by means of diligent research, … I face the malicious gossip and the insults of envious men; and as if my spirit were rising up from the deep precipice where I have been plunged, I am bound to respond to their slander.[77]

Odorannus seems to have considered the quiet of his monastery to be far more inconstant than even the uncertain environment of the outside world. He claimed only to have been studying carefully in the noble monastic pursuit of discerning truth, but that others had turned against him. Odorannus portrayed himself to be completely dejected and, as the brunt of gossip, ostracized and alone. By referring to the life of a wandering monk or cowherd, however, it would seem he was merely trying to emphasize how bad the situation had become rather than suggest that he was seriously contemplating life outside a cenobitic community. Nonetheless, Odorannus's exclusion from Saint Pierre-le-Vif clearly prompted him to consider the adversity that was possible in the abbey.

As his polemical letter to Ayrfredus and Hugh demonstrates, Odorannus was himself an active member of the persecuting public. In response to the allegations that he had been fostering heretical belief, Odorannus in turn accused his detractors of heresy. He wrote that they had been "injected with the mortal poison of the anthropomorphites"

---

[75] See Heinrich Fichtenau, *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages, 1000–1200*, trans. Denise A. Kaiser (University Park 1998) 33, noting Odorannus's social proximity to the Orléans affair: "the public atmosphere seems to have become highly charged, which under certain circumstances could prove dangerous to anyone espousing unusual doctrines."

[76] The Benedictine Rule states that a wandering monk (*girovagis*) is the worst kind of monk, as he defies stability. Benedict, Rule, 1, trans. Kardong (n. 14 above) 34–35. On the key importance of stability in monastic rules, see Adalbert de Vogüé, "'To Persevere in the Monastery Unto Death' (Stability in St. Benedict and Others)" *Word and Spirit* 16 (1994) 125–158.

[77] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XIII, 264–265: "… fortassis nemo invideret, nemo detraheret. Quia vero in cœnobio residens, subtilium rerum … investigare diligenter veritatem cupio, maledicta et opprobria ab emulis sustineo, erecta quasi ex quodam praecipiti mente profundo, eorum respondere detractioni compellor."

(*mortiferum antropomorfitarum virus inferrent*).[78] He never named his critics, nor did he say whether they were at Saint Pierre-le-Vif, but he made it clear that they, rather than he, were the ones guilty of unorthodox belief.[79] Odorannus's complete recrimination cannot be evaluated, however, because the letter survives only as a fragment that ends in the middle of a supportive citation.[80] Through a close study of the manuscript around this abrupt break, the modern editors suggest that the letter must have been added by one of Odorannus's students after his death in 1046.[81] Moreover, in this letter, Odorannus referred to another of his texts, a *lamentatio* (no longer extant), in which he had already defended himself against slander; therefore, he told Ayrfredus and Hugh, he was reluctant to do it again.[82] When compiling his works in 1045, Odorannus omitted both the letter to Ayrfredus and Hugh and the *lamentatio* he referenced within it. Is it possible that he did not want to preserve texts that suggested his tenuous relationship with orthodoxy? Perhaps in later years he thought that the accusations of anthropomorphism were damning to his own authorial legacy at Saint Pierre-le-Vif rather than to his erstwhile detractors.[83]

In such an accusatory environment, a key aspect of Odorannus's writing activity was defending his authorial reputation as a respectable monk. The notion of good and bad repute was a recurrent issue in medieval social life. Reputation, or *fama*, was a vital way in which people understood each other in contexts varying from the literary to the le-

---

[78] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XIII, 264–265. See also Bautier, "L'hérésie" (n. 72 above) 83–84.

[79] The particular claim of anthropomorphism was quite unusual. Phyllis G. Jestice, "A Great Jewish Conspiracy? Worsening Jewish-Christian Relations and the Destruction of the Holy Sepulcher," *Christian Attitudes Toward the Jews in the Middle Ages: A Casebook*, ed. Michael Frassetto (New York 2007) 36, has noted that in accusing his adversaries in this way, Odorannus was oddly in alignment with Jewish belief, which denied any corporeality to God's being. See also Meir Bar Ilan, "The Hand of God: A Chapter in Rabbinic Anthropomorphism," *Rashi, 1040–1990: Hommage à Emphraïm E. Urbach*, ed. Gabrielle Sed-Rajna (Paris 1993) 321–335.

[80] Odorannus claimed that this citation came from Augustine, but the modern compilation editors were unable to locate the reference. See Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XIII, 264 n. 3.

[81] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 54–55.

[82] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XIII, 264–265.

[83] Cf. Mary Garrison, "'Send More Socks': On Mentality and the Preservation Context of Medieval Letters," *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, ed. Marco Mostert (Turnhout 1999) 77: "texts and collections were vulnerable to selection and omission at every stage of recopying."

gal.[84] While Odorannus did not use the word *fama* in his writing, he did employ the term *honor* (another important word related to one's reputation[85]) in two texts to describe his return to Saint Pierre-le-Vif after exile.[86] For Odorannus, reputation meant defending his good name in the opinions of readers, both the recipients of his letters in other monasteries and the future readers of his work at Saint Pierre-le-Vif.[87]

One such intended reader of Odorannus's writing was Abbot William of Saint Denis, to whom Odorannus wrote a letter soon after his own return to Saint Pierre-le-Vif, probably in 1025.[88] The letter had a dual purpose of thanking William for his hospitality, and of providing a collection of canon law texts, which were to aid William in his ministry as abbot.[89] Odorannus began by referencing his banishment from Saint

---

[84] See the collected essays in *Fama: The Politics of Talk and Reputation in Medieval Europe*, ed. Thelma Fenster and Daniel Lord Smail (Ithaca 2003). David Gary Shaw has underscored the importance of shaping a reputation—which often meant protecting one's good name against slander—as a fundamental occupation of the "social self" in the Middle Ages. Shaw, "Social Selves" (n. 20 above) 14–15: "At every point, the pursuit of a certain kind of social identity … is an attempt to secure a certain image, a certain social self. This means that you defend that image against slanders, against the opinions of others"; idem, *Necessary Conjunctions* (n. 20 above) 18, 124–126, 129–132.

[85] On honor, see Shaw, *Necessary Conjunctions* (n. 20 above) 31–33, 44–45.

[86] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum II, 100–101: "cum maxime honore propriis sedibus est redditus"; and *Opera*, Capitulum III, 116–117: "Postquam vero a donno Ingone abbate divinitate propicia arcersiri merui, muneratum me diversis donis cum maximo honore propriis locis reddidisti."

[87] It is often with letters that modern scholars attempt to approach medieval persons as individuals. See John F. Benton, "Consciousness of Self and Perceptions of Individuality," *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Oxford 1982) 265–266; Clanchy (n. 19 above) 293. See also Giles Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections* (Turnhout 1976) 33, on the increase of letters and letter collections in the 11th and 12th c., when such texts and collections "took on a more personal and self-revelatory tone."

[88] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 12 n. 1 suggest that this William—otherwise unknown as an abbot of Saint Denis—may have been the well-known reforming abbot, William of Volpiano (962–1031) and that Saint Denis was one of many abbeys that were under his guidance.

[89] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum III, 114–133. Odorannus cited canonical authority on the particular issue of false accusations within ecclesiastical orders. He also dealt with the problem of the reconciliation of priests. This subject matter was not coincidental given Odorannus's claim that the "intrigues" of his brethren had driven him from his monastery. See Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 50–51; and Franz Brunhölzl, *Histoire de la littérature latine du Moyen Âge*, trans. Henri Rochais (Turnhout 1990) 204, who writes that the letter "était manifestement destinée à justifier en droit et après coup." See also Leclercq (n. 64 above) 191–235, arguing for a "monastic theology" which, unlike the scholastic method, caused monks to base their study specifically on personal experience. I am inclined to view Odorannus's letter to William in this way. Because he viewed himself as being falsely accused, his study of canon law bent towards his own experience.

Pierre-le-Vif and subsequent welcome at Saint Denis:

> … when, by the cunning of my enemies, almost the entire universe joined forces against me to the extent that, under the influence of envy, all audience was refused me, I hardly had the grace to reach the threshold of the benevolent Denis when you deigned to receive me much more honorably than befitted by smallness, and to admit me into the community itself, with the accord of all the brothers, not as a visitor, but as a citizen; not as a guest, but as a member of the house.[90]

The sense here is the same as in the letter to Ayrfredus and Hugh: it was paradoxically within his home monastery that Odorannus had felt alone. At Saint Pierre-le-Vif, Odorannus allegedly suffered the wicked plots of "enemies" and could speak to no one, but his experience at Saint Denis was one of harmony in the community. He was once again a brother; not a wandering monk, but a "member of the house." There is an implicit contrast between expulsion and welcome. His emphatic words suggest that he still had faith in the capacity of a cenobitic community to be his spiritual home. In this case, it was a matter of which particular monastic community among many.

Odorannus was not always so forthright in his address but could also express himself indirectly, through quotation of well-established authorities. He was self-conscious and purposeful in applying this rhetorical strategy of indirection to deflect authorial responsibility.[91] An example appears in the fourth text in his compilation, a letter to the monk Evrardus in response to three theological questions. Odorannus prefaced one of his responses by writing:

> … in order not to furnish any occasions of murmuring for those who bear envy toward me and who amuse themselves personally in speaking wrong-

---

[90] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum III, 116–117: "Nam cum invidorum astutia universus pene orbis contra me conspirasset in tantum ut cupiditate prevalente audientia mihi denegaretur, mox ut limina almi Dionisii adtingere merui, honorabiliter ultra quam pusillitatem meam decebat suscipere et in ipsa congregatione unacum voluntate omnium fratrum me non ut inquilinum et ospitem sed ut civem et domesticum dignatus es deputare."

[91] For an examination of the method of indirection, not by letter writers, but by cartulary writers, see Geary, "Medieval Archivists" (n. 38 above) 106–113. Paul Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln 1994) 77 and passim, has noted certain "strategies of indirection" by which authors of dream literature in the Carolingian period would remove themselves from their narratives, which often contained criticism of political authorities. See also Dutton, "Whispering Secrets to a Dark Age," idem, *Charlemagne's Mustache and Other Cultural Clusters of a Dark Age* (New York 2004) 129–150.

fully of me, I will offer [this response] by taking shelter, successively, under the names of the authors whom I shall cite.[92]

Odorannus went on to reference Gregory the Great and Isidore of Seville, and he included a lengthy excerpt (extensively glossed) from the *Apotheosis*, a theological poem by the fourth-century Christian writer Prudentius.[93] Odorannus saw that an "envious" audience—perhaps members of Evrardus' monastery who might see the letter, or even other scholastic monks at Saint Pierre-le-Vif—might be dissatisfied with his responses. He therefore called upon respected theologians in the Latin Christian tradition to lighten his burden of authorial accountability.

Odorannus's judgment of others as "envious" is an important manifestation of his self-consciousness. He used this description both for the conspiring brethren whose plots, so Odorannus wrote, were the reason for his expulsion, and also to characterize the potential readers who might take issue with his response to Evrardus. Moreover, he applied this rhetorical strategy in the prologue and preface to his compilation, in which he acknowledged envy as a threat to his texts. He wrote that he hoped his works might be useful to those who could read them "without being tormented by envy" (*absque scrupulo invidiae*),[94] and explained that he had compiled his writings "so that they might not perish by chance due to the malice of envious men" (*ne forte invidorum astu presentia opuscula deperirent*).[95] By means of this characterization of his enemies, Odorannus was shaping his authorial reputation as a persecuted monk in an adverse social setting.[96]

---

[92] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum IV, 136–139: "ne, modum epistule excedens, emulis qui, dum mihi detrahunt, semetipsos illudunt, susurrandi occasionem prebeam, prescriptis auctorum nominibus separatim subnectam."

[93] Ibid. 138–147.

[94] Odorannus, *Opera*, Prologus, 70–71.

[95] Odorannus, *Opera*, Incipit argumentum hujus operis, 74–75.

[96] It was not unusual for medieval authors to defend their work by ascribing the sin of envy to their critics. Bridget K. Balint, "Envy in the Intellectual Discourse of the High Middle Ages," *The Seven Deadly Sins: From Communities to Individuals*, ed. Richard Newhauser (Leiden 2007) 41–55, demonstrates that this practice was prevalent in the later 11th and 12th c., partly because the intellectual climate increasingly demanded the protection of one's reputation against detractors. It is notable that, while Odorannus was a product of the turn of the millennium, he may also be considered among these later writers who were concerned with their reputations as authors. Perhaps the best-known purveyor of this rhetorical strategy was Peter Abelard (1079–1142), the controversial ecclesiastic and autobiographer whose engagement with *invidia* was but one of his many defensive authorial acts that have made him a recurring focal point of scholarly examina-

Invidere means "to envy," but also "to look upon with an evil eye," a nuance which underscores the point that those who accused their critics of *invidia* were aware of the presence of an audience; of portraying themselves as innocent under hostile observation.[97] Accusing someone of envy brought the focus simultaneously onto oneself (the envied) and on the audience (the envious person or people). In noting the presence of "envious" readers, Odorannus was asserting the virtue of his work in the face of whatever objection might be brought against him. Any criticisms his accusers might put forth would be necessarily unjust, sinful, and by extension, utterly invalid.

Odorannus took care to distinguish between the envy of his detractors and the charity of those who would be a benevolent audience for his work. Indeed, the direct addressees of his letters are all characterized as such. Take, for example, a letter Odorannus wrote to the monk Robert, explaining musical tones:

> May friendship truly be the association of souls, oh reverent brother; the perfect charity of your soul, which is sweeter to me than the sweetest honey, attests to it; that which not only was unashamed of me in the persecution that I recently suffered, but which, moreover, has made the ever-rigorous Judge benevolent on my behalf—so I hope—by often pouring forth tears from the deepest recesses of your pious heart.[98]

tions of the self. See Clanchy (n. 19 above) 294; Constant J. Mews, *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard: Perceptions of Dialogue in Twelfth-Century France* (New York 1999) 33–34, 93–94; Sarah Spence, *Texts and the Self in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge 1996) 66–72. See also Frederick Tupper, "The Envy Theme in Prologues and Epilogues," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 16 (1917) 551–572. Envy appears in some writings contemporary to Odorannus. An example is Rodulfus Glaber, *The Five Books of the Histories*, ed. and trans. John France (Oxford 1989) 226–227, who blamed the destruction of his work at Saint Germain of Auxerre on a fellow monk, who had influenced the brethren with "the venom of his envy" for Rodulfus's skill in making stone inscriptions.

[97] Note that the root verb of *invidere* is *videre*, "to see." On envy and its "visual" aspect, see Balint (n. 96 above) 43; F. N. M. Diekstra, "The Art of Denunciation: Medieval Moralists on Envy and Detraction," *In the Garden of Evil: The Vices and Culture in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard Newhauser (Toronto 2005) 445–446; Matthew Shoaf, "The Heart, the Eyes and Medieval Envy," *Micrologus: Natura, Scienze e Società Medievali* 11 (2003) 213–228; Mireille Vincent-Cassy, "L'envie au Moyen Age," *Annales E.S.C.* (1980) 253–271. Envy had not always been a cardinal sin. On its ancient and medieval development, see Morton W. Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins: An Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature* (East Lansing 1952).

[98] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum V, 150–151: "Quod vere amicitia sit animorum societas, testator, reverende frater, dulcior mihi melle dulcissimo, perfectissima tui animi caritas, quae me in tribulatione nuper posito non solum non erubuit, verum etiam ex pii

Here, Odorannus linked friendship to his banishment from Saint Pierre-le-Vif. He saw his ideal friend as being completely charitable, to the extent that this friend would remain faithful and commiserate with him throughout his time of trial. What one can read between the lines of this passage are not only the praiseworthy traits of a true *amicus*, but also the appreciation for Robert's friendship that Odorannus gained due to his exile.[99] He expressed gratitude that Robert had not become ashamed of him in his disgrace. It is evident that Odorannus viewed his banishment from Saint Pierre-le-Vif as a serious threat to his name. By means of such affective words to Robert, he may have intended to reaffirm a social bond after a time of personal trial with his community.[100] Again, in times of trial and controversy, perhaps Odorannus felt that his true community was to be found outside Saint Pierre-le-Vif.

As I have already suggested, Odorannus directed his writing not only to whatever Robert, Evrardus, or William he might be addressing, but also to a broader readership. Jean Leclercq and Giles Constable among others have emphasized that in the Middle Ages, letters were received publicly; consequently, authors wrote mindful of how their letters might be read by a given community and, later, preserved and collected.[101] In Odorannus's letter to Robert on musical tones, he showed

cordis intimo lacrymas sepe fundendo et frequenter supernae majestati hostiam laudis immolando, semper tremendum judicem, ut spero, mihi placatum reddidit."

[99] See Brian Briggs, "*Expulsio*, *Proscriptio*, *Exilium*: Exile and Friendship in the Writings of Osbert of Clare," *Exile in the Middle Ages* (n. 68 above) 140, demonstrating that exile caused Osbert of St. Clare (d. ca. 1158) to appreciate friendship, and that exile could even become an occasion for friendship.

[100] Letters were closely linked to notions of friendship, a relationship that became a major aspect of Latin epistolography in the early 11th c. with the development of the cathedral schools. See Brian Patrick McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350–1250* (Kalamazoo 1988) 187. See also Morris (n. 16 above) 96–107, who suggests that developing friendships was an integral part of "discovering" one's identity. The friendship in medieval letters was not, however, an impartial manifestation of interpersonal intimacy. It also displayed an important social and even a political bond that could denote mutual responsibilities as much as a personal relationship. See Julian Haseldine, "Epistolography," *Medieval Latin: An Introduction and Bibliographical Guide*, ed. F. A. C. Mantello and A. G. Rigg (Washington, DC 1996) 652. More generally, see Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge 2004).

[101] Leclercq (n. 64 above) 178; Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections* (n. 87 above) 11; idem, "Monastic Letter Writing in the Middle Ages," *Filologia mediolatina: rivista della fondazione ezio franceschini* 11 (2004) 22. See also Haseldine (n. 100 above) 650. More generally on letters, see Carol Dana Lanham, "Writing Instruction from Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century," *A Short History of Writing Instruction from Ancient Greece to Modern America*, ed. James J. Murphy, 2nd ed. (Mahwah, NJ 2001) 110–117.

his concern for such open reception of his writing, noting the possibility that his work might "fall among the hands of my enviers" (*devenerit in emulorum manibus*), and that these hostile readers might "mock it in public" (*publice subsannaverint*).[102] Robert was a monk like Odorannus, so this "public" may have been the brethren within Robert's own monastery. Such cloistered communities were part of the context of persecution that seems to have shaped Odorannus's defensiveness. One must not forget that while Odorannus wrote his letters to those outside his monastery, he compiled them for the monks of Saint Pierre-le-Vif. Perhaps he hoped to warn future readers of his compilation at the abbey against the kind of discord that had occurred during his own career, and of course, to ensure his innocence and the value of his work.

APPROACHING DEATH

In the estimation of his modern editors, Odorannus, though extremely self-conscious, was always a faithful monk.[103] While I agree with this judgment, I would suggest that the tension between his role as an author and his status as a devout Benedictine should not be understated. His letters include frequent and fervent—if conventional—calls for prayer from his correspondents. One of his letters was addressed to monks at Saint Germain of Auxerre. In closing, he wrote:

> I beseech your holiness, beloved brothers, so that, having pity on me, you may remember me—I who struggle in the pitching tides of this age—by dint of the oars of your prayers, so that I might be worthy, with God's grace, to reach eternal salvation.[104]

While Odorannus again took care to portray himself as a hapless victim of the world's inconstancy, he expressed the necessity of prayerful, steady brethren who could help him attain salvation. He was keenly aware that the purpose of his earthly life was to reach Heaven, and he

---

[102] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum V, 200–201.

[103] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 68–69.

[104] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum VI, 210–211: "His ita dispositis, humili mente deposco sanctitatem vestram, amantissimi fratres, ut, mei miserendo, orationum vestrarum remigiis me in salo hujus labentis evi laborantem sustentetis, quatinus pervenire merear, auctore Deo, ad portum æternae salutis." Note a similar call for prayer in a letter of the controversial 10th-c. cleric Rather of Verona, *The Complete Works of Rather of Verona*, trans. Peter L. D. Reid (Binghamton 1991) 216: "I pray that the anchor of your prayers may hold me, wretchedly tossing among the shoals of this world, while you expect me to founder from my incapacity; only let not God's pity disdain to hear the sighs of a sinner."

trusted the devotion of his fellow cenobites to bring this about. At the same time, the social tensions he experienced with monks roiled the "pitching tides" in Odorannus's world.

If monks could thus be both salutary and deleterious for one another over time, what did it mean to grow old and die in a monastery? After all, monks spent their lives pondering death, for it was only in the final separation from earthly life that one could truly begin to live in the presence of God.[105] But a human life is a complex process—even the apparently immutable life of a monk. Not every monk would have come to the same understanding of death and salvation. One's earthly concerns were not necessarily dissolved because death was at hand, but may even have become more immediate in senescence than they otherwise would have been.

In the waning years of a life full of a variety of experience, Odorannus collected some of his works and presented them to his abbot. The works were gathered together when their author was somewhat decrepit and weary, but also at a time when liturgists (Odorannus among them) were emphasizing the importance of yearly prayer for the dead. While aging may have been physically onerous, monasteries sought to care for the dying and to liturgically remember their lives. In such a commemorative environment, monks who were approaching death could be sure that they would not be forgotten. Odorannus's act of compilation—distinct from his act of writing—suggests a desire to be thus remembered at his home abbey. When considering Odorannus's collected works as a whole, his main audience narrows down to one: the monks who would read his work at Saint Pierre-le-Vif.

The brief preface at the beginning of Odorannus's compilation, as well as the "warning to the reader" (*ammonitio lectoris*) that concludes it, describe the author-compiler in terms of his infirmity and age. In the preface, Odorannus wrote: "Beginning to convalesce from a long and very grave malady of the feet, Odorannus, in the year of the Incarnation of the Lord, 1045, nearly sixty years old, has gathered in one body the present works."[106] Intending the reader to identify him as the author and

---

[105] On the Christian notion in the Middle Ages that all living people were merely travelers in a "strange" world, see Gerhart B. Ladner, "*Homo viator*: Mediaeval Ideas on Alienation and Order," *Speculum* 42 (1967) 233–259.

[106] Odorannus, *Opera*, Incipit argumentum hujus operis, 74–75: "Convalescens aliquantulum a diutino et gravissimo pedum incommodo, Odorannus, Incarnationis dominicae anno I.XL.V, etatis vero suae fere LXmo ... presentia opuscula ... in uno cor-

compiler of his writings, Odorannus referred specifically to his age and physical condition, complaining of bodily discomfort and characterizing himself by ill-health. Again, at the end of his compilation, Odorannus wrote in a short poem that, though his "spirit surely [was] full of vigor" (*vigente ingenio*), his eye was "already weakening and his small joints growing cold" (*caligante oculo et frigescente articulo*).[107] He restated what was written in the preface: "Odorannus, a monk nearing sixty years old, wrote up this present book" (*Hunc … Librum Odorannus / Pœne sexagenarius / Exaravit monachus*).[108] Clearly the physical aspects of age were a chief concern for Odorannus as an author. He associated his decrepit state with his act of compilation: the future reader should be quite aware that the author-compiler had been a weary old man.

Odorannus seems to have understood old age not merely as a way of describing himself, but as one stage of life on a broader trajectory of spiritual and physical change.[109] In his prologue, he quoted a lengthy passage from Ecclesiastes on youth and old age.[110] The biblical passage urges youths to remember God before their life comes to a close, recognizing life's transience (Ecclesiastes 12). Odorannus included several glosses on the verses that demonstrate his understanding of the admonition to youths in terms of physical age.[111] As the modern editors have observed through an examination of these interlinear notes, Odorannus

pore collegit." Perrin (n. 36 above) 134, noted the "personal accent" in this preface of Odorannus as an old monk demonstrating confidence in his œuvre. The age of sixty was generally considered "old age." See Shulamith Shahar, "Who Were Old in the Middle Ages?" *Society for the Social History of Medicine* 6 (1993) 313–341.

[107] Odorannus, *Opera*, Finis hujus operis et ammonitio lectoris, 266–267. By *articulo*, Odorannus probably referred to the joints of his writing hand. I have translated it as "small joints," but it could also be translated as "fingers."

[108] Ibid. 266–267. See also Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum X, 250–251, a letter to the archbishop Gilduin in which Odorannus referred to himself as "stifled by the very great infirmity of his body" (*maxima corporis invalitudine detentus*).

[109] For conceptions of the life cycle during the Middle Ages, see Elizabeth Sears, *The Ages of Man: Medieval Interpretations of the Life Cycle* (Princeton 1986).

[110] It is important to note that the first part of the manuscript containing Odorannus's writings is missing, leaving only a fraction of the prologue to his compilation extant. This fragment begins in the midst of the quotation from Ecclesiastes. See Delivré (n. 11 above) 487–489, who suggests that Odorannus's chronicle was one of three texts brought into a Renaissance debate on the primacy of the archbishops of Sens, and that a later account of the translation of Savinian and Potentian had been added to the manuscript of Odorannus's works, but subsequently removed, presumably along with part of Odorannus's writing.

[111] Recall that the modern editors consider this manuscript to be an autograph; Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 29–36.

read the verses "as a physiological description of old age," comparing the earthly things in the passage to the bodily aspects of aging.[112] For example, he added a note about feet swelling with subcutaneous humor (*humore subcutaneo tumescunt sive incrassantur pedes*).[113] It is evident that this aging monk was keenly aware of the burdensome changes that accompanied senescence. With his interlinear glosses, he connected these corporeal alterations to the more abstract, worldly transformations one would encounter in departing from youth.

Monasteries acknowledged physical human development, but seniority rather than biological age was the important factor in the hierarchy of obedience and the division of roles that monks observed.[114] At the same time, chronological old age naturally continued to exist behind the cloister walls as a personalizing feature among monks.[115] The distinction of age could pertain to physical differences, but also to certain merits of character that came with time. Chapter 37 of the Rule stipulates that alimentary indulgences should be granted to children and the elderly, due to their physical fragility.[116] Furthermore, a "wise old monk" is to take up the office of porter for the monastery.[117] A ninth-century commentary on the Rule emphasized "that it is not the age of the body that must be looked for in the porter, but that which comes from wisdom and understanding."[118] What was important about a monk's age in his various roles in the monastery seems primarily to have been a moral superiority that had developed over the years.

We have seen that Odorannus experienced and accomplished much in his lifetime. His decrepitude and awareness of death's approach offered an occasion for thinking back upon his years. Given the complexity of Odorannus's experience that may be inferred from his texts,

---

[112] Bautier et al. in their note at Odorannus, *Opera*, Prologus, 70–71 n. 1.

[113] Odorannus, *Opera*, Prologus, 70.

[114] The Benedictine Rule addresses the issue of rank at several points. Chapter 63 calls for junior monks to respect their seniors, and for the latter group to love their newer brethren. Benedict, Rule, 63, trans. Kardong (n. 14 above) 515. See also Isabelle Cochelin, "Étude sur les hiérarchies monastiques: le prestige de l'ancienneté et son éclipse à Cluny au XIe siècle," *Revue Mabillon* 72 (2000) 5–37.

[115] Adalbert de Vogüé, *Reading Saint Benedict: Reflections on the Rule*, trans. Colette Friedlander (Kalamazoo 1994) 296, explained the parallel between seniority and natural old age as a balance between idealism and realism for monks.

[116] Benedict, Rule, 37, trans. Kardong (n. 14 above) 309.

[117] Benedict, Rule, 66, trans. Kardong (n. 14 above) 556.

[118] Smaragdus of Saint Mihiel, *Commentary on the Rule of Saint Benedict*, trans. David Barry (Kalamazoo 2007) 516.

and the references to age and death in his prologue and preface, it seems that he approached the end of life with his own concerns close in mind. This personalized turn was not necessarily unusual for monk-authors. A striking comparative example of intimate reminiscence is evident in the fifth book of the *Five Books of the Histories* by Rodulfus Glaber (985–1047), in which this troubled monk of Saint Germain of Auxerre moved from scattered descriptions of the world in the preceding books to a highly personal account of visitations from the devil, spurring himself and others to self-examination in the face of death.[119] While Glaber's old-age reminiscence manifested itself in descriptive prose, Odorannus's appeared in his act of compilation and revision. Many of Odorannus's works were written over ten years before he compiled them. His opinions might have changed by the time he came around to assembling his works. Moreover, as his prologue and preface show, Odorannus seems to have come to a new understanding of his status as an author. Though he had earlier portrayed himself as a contributor to Saint Pierre-le-Vif or as a persecuted writer, at the time of compilation, he portrayed himself chiefly as an old monk who was sick and in need of prayer. Clearly, Georges Minois's suggestion that "monks were not born; they did not die; they subsisted eternally, because they were no longer individuals, they were a community"[120] is a generalization that is wide of the mark; Odorannus's old age and approach to death prompted reflection that was distinctly personal.

Moreover, as a liturgist, Odorannus understood and suggested the ways death should be treated and commemorated in the monastery. The liturgical treatise in his compilation proposed the formation of a confraternity for the commemoration of the dead, corresponding to a wider context of liturgical development, chiefly shaped by Cluny. The formal feast of All Souls' Day, the day after All Saints, was inaugurated around the year 1030 under the auspices of Abbot Odilo of Cluny

[119] Rodulfus Glaber, *Five Books of the Histories* (n. 96 above) 216–253, esp. 216–229. See Dennis M. Kratz, "Monsters and Monstrous Visions: The Art of Rodulfus Glaber's *Historiarum Libri Quinque*," *Latin Culture in the Eleventh Century*, ed. Michael W. Herren, et al. (Turnhout 2002) 1.508–519. For a discussion of old age in medieval sources that emphasizes the reminiscent aspect of senescence, see Juanita Feros Ruys, "Medieval Latin Meditations on Old Age: Rhetoric, Autobiography, and Experience," *Old Age in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to a Neglected Topic*, ed. Albrecht Classen (Berlin 2007) 171–200.

[120] Georges Minois, *History of Old Age: From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, trans. Sarah Hanbury Tenison (Cambridge 1989) 166.

(994–1048). It is likely, therefore, that Odorannus wrote the treatise in the early 1030s.[121] While this work is attributed to Odorannus, it appears (along with its entry in the table of contents) in a different hand. One cannot say definitively if Odorannus wanted this text in his compilation or if it was later written into the manuscript containing his works. The modern editors do not, however, doubt its authorship.[122] I proceed with the assumption that he was the author, though perhaps not the compiler, of this text.

It is noteworthy that Odorannus's liturgical proposal was included in the compilation after his death, given the treatise's content: the confraternity for which it advocated was to witness the sickness and dying of an individual member and to commemorate his death in the years to come. This prayer group was to include monks, priests, and laypeople from the province of Sens, "joined by the bond of charity" (*conecti vinculo karitatis*) to the congregation of monks at Saint Pierre-le-Vif.[123] Odorannus suggested that if any member of the confraternity should become sick, the abbot and brothers would take great pains to visit him. On the occasion of the invalid's death, seven masses were to be said "for the salvation of his soul" (*pro salute animae*).[124] In addition, the office would be sung in the monastic assembly for the deceased member of the confraternity. This charitable social network would hardly cease its attentions when someone died: one of the network's chief functions would be to commemorate that death each year, the day after the feast of All Saint's Day.[125] Odorannus made it clear that the names of the departed were to be written down for a sub-deacon to read aloud

---

[121] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 56, note the significance of his treatise for liturgical history, placing it within the context of Cluniac development. See also their note at Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XII, 260–261 n. 2. The literature on Cluny's liturgy is extensive. On the establishment of All Souls' Day as a feast, see Giles Constable, "Commemoration and Confraternity at Cluny During the Abbacy of Peter the Venerable," idem, *Cluny from the Tenth to the Twelfth Centuries* (Hampshire 2000) X (254); Megan McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca 1994) 75–77; Van Engen (n. 9 above) 293. On the written records for prayers for the dead, see Dominique Iogna-Prat, "Les morts dans la comptabilité céleste des Clunisiens de l'an Mil," *Religion et culture autour de l'an mil: royaume capétien et Lotharingie*, ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat and Jean-Charles Picard (Paris 1990) 55–69; Armando Petrucci, *Writing the Dead: Death and Writing Strategies in the Western Tradition*, trans. Michael Sullivan (Stanford 1998) 44–53; Joachim Wollasch, "Les obituaires, témoins de la vie clunisienne," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 22 (1979) 139–171.
[122] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 32, 54–55.
[123] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XII, 260–261.
[124] Ibid. 260–261.
[125] Ibid. 260–261.

at the altar, "so that this exhortation may have perpetual vigor" (*ut haec exortatio perpete vigeat*).[126] He thus emphasized the importance of written memory for the abiding recurrence of the feast. In short, the proposal sought to bring the brotherly love of the monastery to a wider spectrum of people. Saint Pierre-le-Vif would be a community that actively acknowledged sickness, death, and entry into salvation: key moments in the life of a Christian.

The ritual surrounding a monk's sickness and dying was chiefly a shared experience; it was crucial that other confraternity members be present.[127] Odorannus's liturgical treatise highlighted this communal step in one's life. Dying seems to have been a stage at which the caring presence of others was more immediately important than at other moments in one's life. As Frederick Paxton has emphasized for the early Middle Ages, death rituals were, above all else, rites of passage. The purpose of the actions involved was to assist the dying member with his separation from the earthly community and to see him well on his way to the heavenly community.[128] At the point in one's life when individual bodily and religious concerns were at their most prominent, the presence of the confraternity was meant to allay these anxieties. Conversely, this important communal presence at one's death meant that the collective focus would be on one particular person in his decisive spiritual moment.[129] An aging monk would likely have understood and

---

[126] Ibid. 260–261.

[127] McLaughlin (n. 121 above) has observed that prayers for the dead were "associative": they connected people in tangible ways. To my knowledge, McLaughlin (n. 121 above) 89 n. 131, is the only author, with the obvious exception of Odorannus's editors and the few others who have commented directly on Odorannus, who makes reference to Odorannus's act of confraternity. On death as a shared experience, see Philippe Ariès, "The Reversal of Death: Changes in Attitudes Toward Death in Western Societies," *American Quarterly* 26 (1974) 539–540, emphasizing the public nature of pre-modern death. I have read Ariès' sometimes problematic conclusions with caution. One of the reasons his suggestions are troubling is his insistence on the public/private divide. He co-edited (with Georges Duby) a four-volume series on this topic, *A History of Private Life* (Cambridge, MA 1987–91). See Janet Nelson's highly critical review of the ancient and medieval part of the series, "The Problematic in the Private," *Social History* 15 (1990) 355–364.

[128] Frederick S. Paxton, *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca 1990). See also idem, "Death by Customary at Eleventh-Century Cluny," *From Dead of Night to End of Day: The Medieval Customs of Cluny*, ed. Susan Boynton and Isabelle Cochelin (Turnhout 2005) 297–318.

[129] Induction into the monastery, in its emphasis on the idea of transition into a new life, similarly featured a balance between being communal and focusing on an individual member. See George Klawitter, "Dramatic Elements in Early Monastic Induction Cere-

have come to appreciate the significance of a charitable communal presence in the face of death.

It goes without saying that death would have been a different experience depending on a monk's character, stage in life, and position within his social sphere.[130] Odorannus had been both celebrated and controversial in his community. I would suggest that for Odorannus the approach to salvation had much to do with his own life and experiences. The liturgical commemoration of the dead meant that each year he would be remembered among his fellow monks and other confraternity members. At the end of one of his letters, Odorannus inserted his name into a brief outline for prayer. He wrote: "Lord, deliver the soul of your servant Odorannus from all the chains of his sins, so that, in the glory of the resurrection, he may live resurrected among your saints."[131] This final statement portrays his trust in the workings of communal prayer for the absolution of an individual monk. He wanted others to remember him in a ritualized fashion.

It seems that Odorannus sought commemoration not only through the liturgy, but also through the reception of his texts. Perhaps by leaving writings for posterity, Odorannus hoped to ensure not only that he would be remembered, but also that he would be remembered in a particular way when monks included his name among so many others in prayer. Through the act of compilation, Odorannus engaged in a task of text preservation that was typically reserved to an author's disci-

monies," *Drama in the Middle Ages: Comparative and Critical Essays*, ed. Clifford Davidson and John H. Stroupe, 2nd series (New York 1991) 43–60.

[130] Perhaps because of the special social moment that death represents, scholars often consider medieval conceptions of death and intercession when attempting to approach the subjectivity of historical persons. Philippe Ariès claimed that in the central to late Middle Ages, the end of one's life became a "death of the self," or "one's own death," with emphasis moving away from the strictly communal concerns of death in earlier periods. See Philippe Ariès, *Western Attitudes toward Death: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, trans. Patricia M. Ranum (Baltimore 1974) 27–52; idem, *The Hour of Our Death*, trans. Helen Weaver (New York 1981) 95–293. See also idem, "Reversal of Death" (n. 127 above). On questions of individuality with attention to prayers for the dead, see Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Purgatory*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago 1984) 125, 233; Giles Constable, *The Reformation of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge 1996) 305, contending that notions of death and salvation became more "lonely" in the 12th c. See also Sharon Farmer, *Communities of Saint Martin: Legend and Ritual in Medieval Tours* (Ithaca 1991) 119–123.

[131] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum IV, 148–149: "Solve, Domine, animam famuli tui Odoranni ab omni vinculo delictorum ut in resurrectionis gloria inter sanctos tuos resuscitatus respiret."

ples.[132] It is therefore important to consider the personal choice that led to the conservation of these works. Michael Clanchy observes that keeping one's letters was the most familiar way to "document the self," a process by which an authorial "self" would be retained for posterity.[133] Odorannus's collection also served to "document the self," for by gathering his works together Odorannus ensured that they would be remembered under his specific authorial name. Indeed, in his "warning to the reader," cited above, he wrote:

> By the grace and disposition of the Creator, with his spirit surely full of vigor, but his eye already weakening, and his small joints growing cold, Odorannus, a monk nearing sixty years old, wrote up this present book. You who read it, pray for him.[134]

Odorannus proffered his collected works to future readers with a request for prayer on his behalf. The brothers who would pray for Odorannus's soul after he died were the same studious monks who (he presumed) would be reading his collected writings. It seems that Odorannus wanted to ensure that he would not be forgotten by his community.

The act of compiling one's own works is a curious one: it seems to reveal for us a somewhat autobiographical moment for an author reconsidering his works—giving credence to his authorship by recognizing its history.[135] Odorannus noted that the works he had collected were "among numerous writings that I have written at various times" (*ex multis quae diversis temporibus peregi*).[136] He would also have had to

---

[132] For some interesting comments on notions of authorship and contexts of a particular author's texts being preserved in the Middle Ages, see E. P. Goldschmidt, *Medieval Texts and Their First Appearance in Print* (London 1943) 86–121.

[133] Clanchy (n. 19 above) 293.

[134] Odorannus, *Opera*, Finis hujus operis et ammonitio lectoris, 266–267: "Auctore et gubernatore Deo / Hunc, licet vigente ingenio, / Tamen jam caligante oculo / Et frigescente articulo, / Librum Odorannus / Pœne sexagenarius / Exaravit monachus. / Vos qui legitis, / Orate pro eo."

[135] A much more prominent and problematic example of this procedure is in the *Retractationes* of Augustine (354–430), who did not compile his works, but around the year 427 looked back upon his writings to reassess their content according to his current state of mind. See Augustine, *The Retractions*, trans. Mary Inez Bogan (Washington, DC 1968). See also Meredith F. Eller, "The 'Retractationes' of Saint Augustine," *Church History* 18 (1949) 183, calling the *Retractationes* "a critical summary of the growth of [Augustine's] thought as revealed in his writings." See also Allan D. Fitzgerald, "*Retractationes*," *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids 1999) 723–724.

[136] Odorannus, *Opera*, Prologus, 70–71.

choose which of his texts would be most useful to others, and what things he wished especially to be preserved (and forgotten). Might we also view Odorannus's interlinear glosses on his autograph manuscript as modest reconsiderations of his writing? He returned to his texts after writing them to add these notes between the lines, clarifying and emphasizing meaning, or adding new thoughts altogether.[137] Above all, the governing organizational principle for his compilation was the fact that he himself had written the texts collected therein.[138] His compilation process was one last authorial act of asserting himself as a prominent member of his community.

With his compilation, and in the liturgy, Odorannus sought to maintain a posthumous presence at Saint Pierre-le-Vif. Death did not mean that he would be severed from his community, especially since he would have left a textual legacy behind. Odorannus's movement from physical life to death partly meant that he would be present for his disciples and fellow monks in the form of texts, instead of in person.[139] The preface to his works made this particularly clear by means of a corporeal metaphor. Odorannus wrote that he had "gathered in one body the present works" (*presentia opuscula … in uno corpore collegit*), and concluded his preface by describing the spatial qualities of a physical form, writing that "if a body lacks one or the other of these elements, it is not a solid body" (*quicquid vero uno utrum alio caret, illud corpus solidum non est*).[140] It seems that each of the writings Odorannus chose to leave behind were essential parts of this larger *corpus* that he had carefully constructed. It was a physical entity that would remain in the abbey. When readers opened the manuscript containing his writings, they would be sure to encounter the introductory words that stressed the authorship and purpose of the collection. Future students, poring over Odorannus's musical writings, his comments on canon law, or his historical work, would read the monk's own name in-

---

[137] Cf. Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 35, and n. 2 above.

[138] I have not observed any striking pattern or logic behind the internal organization of Odorannus's works. They are neither chronologically nor thematically grouped. It is, however, probably significant that he began his compilation with the life of Theudechild and the chronicle for Saint Pierre-le-Vif. This placement suggests that Odorannus identified himself and his work with Saint Pierre-le-Vif. His abbey in Sens was a crucial aspect of his authorial identity.

[139] On the bonds between living and dead, see Geary, *Living with the Dead* (n. 53 above).

[140] Odorannus, *Opera*, Incipit argumentum hujus operis, 74–75. The modern editors show that this is a wordplay between the two uses of *corpus*; 75 n. 1.

serted at certain instances in the texts, and they would learn that this author had been a dynamic member of his community, at times in conflict, at times celebrated. While Odorannus was *unus ex quibus* in his abbey, so too was Saint Pierre-le-Vif a specific monastic community in the midst of others. Odorannus left his works behind in order to document himself for posterity, but also to celebrate and enrich his monastery. As an author whose works would be read, and as a monk whose name would be said aloud in prayer, Odorannus, the individual, would not be forgotten. He would be tangibly present at his particular community of Saint Pierre-le-Vif.

CONCLUSION

As Marjorie Chibnall rightly stated of Odorannus and the academic team who produced the 1972 edition of his compilation, "it is indicative of the wide range of early eleventh-century monastic culture that four modern scholars have combined their skills to edit his works."[141] Indeed, Odorannus's expertise was far-reaching, and his collection demands a great deal of further study. It would be especially worthwhile to look for more examples of the monk-author experience in Odorannus's world, a pursuit which this article has, for reasons of scope, been unable to attempt.

One feature of Odorannus's authorial career that I have not yet discussed was music. His compilation includes a tonary, which is a booklet listing and commenting upon the melodies used during the liturgy,[142] as well as a letter with illustrations to the monks of Saint Germain of Auxerre on the construction and function of the monochord.[143] These two didactic compositions demonstrate that Odorannus, as a music theorist and practician, employed his knowledge in order to help other monks understand the chants they regularly performed.[144]

In some of Odorannus's compositions, the language of musical har-

---

[141] Marjorie Chibnall, Review of Odorannus of Sens, *Opera Omnia*, ed. and trans. Robert-Henri Bautier et al. (Paris, 1972) *American Historical Review* 79 (1974) 774.

[142] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum V, 150–201. For a description of the tonary, see Michel Huglo, *Les Tonaires: Inventaire, Analyse, Comparaison* (Paris 1971) 326–328.

[143] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum VI, 202–225. A monochord is a rudimentary single-stringed instrument used to achieve proper vocal pitch. See the editors' glossary of musical terms; Odorannus, *Opera* (n. 1 above) 276.

[144] Full analysis of Odorannus's musical writings has been the work of the modern editors of his compilation and others. See Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 56–64, and the notes for Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum V and Capitulum VI, 150–225.

mony, namely *concordia* and *discordia*, enters into his discourse on communal life, alternately peaceful and hostile. Karl Morrison considered this connection between musical language and communal relations in a fascinating study of self-knowledge during the Carolingian Renaissance. He argued that the early medieval notion of "concord," that is, of voices blending together in monody, provided a way of understanding commonality and difference between people.[145] The meaning of concord was "unison, not unity," because "distinctions were essential to concord."[146] Discord was its binary opposite, denoting not those vocal differences that could be reconciled in a single melody, but "confusion, characteristic of Satan and his works."[147] Consequently, discord was to be avoided by monks.

In Odorannus's compilation, the concord/discord binary appears in an exhortation, penned by Odorannus, from Abbot Ingo to the unruly monks of Saint Martin at Massay.[148] The letter is quite simple: it urged the community of monks at Massay to turn their focus from temporal aggravations toward eternal salvation. The monks were to avoid deception (*finctio*), conspiracy (*conspiratio*), and scandal (*scandalum*), in favor of the peace that was fundamental to communal monastic living. Through his secretary Odorannus, Ingo declared: "May this truth, proven and believed up to our time by the wisest men, escape none of you; that is to say, that by concord, things of small importance become greater, [but] by discord, the greatest things fall to pieces."[149] Concord would therefore be a constructive condition for the monks to nurture amongst themselves. Discord would topple the structure of peaceful cenobitic life.

Odorannus's writings clearly demonstrate that, from time to time, certain monks could be "off key." The music theorist himself claimed

---

[145] Karl F. Morrison, "'Know Thyself': Music in the Carolingian Renaissance," *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, Settimane di Studio 39, pt. 1 (Spoleto 1992) 369–479. Morrison describes monody as "many voices in one sonority" (387). For other medieval metaphors about monastic community life, see Giles Constable, "Medieval Latin Metaphors," *Viator* 38 (2007) 6–7.

[146] Morrison (n. 145 above) 380–381.

[147] Ibid. 380.

[148] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XI, 254–257. Ingo had maintained an absent leadership at Saint Martin, the monastery in his care before King Robert the Pious appointed him abbot of Saint Pierre-le-Vif.

[149] Odorannus, *Opera*, Capitulum XI, 256–257: "Illud autem neminem nostrum fugiat, a doctissimis viris usque ad nostram aetatem probatum et creditum quia per concordiam parve res crescunt, per discordiam vero maxime dilabuntur."

to have been the object of conspiracy, one of the very crimes against concord that was vehemently decried in Ingo's exhortation to the monks of Massay. Both Odorannus and those around him could initiate discord. Though a controversial thinker and an exile, Odorannus was also a celebrated constructor of his community's identity, chronicling its history and crafting the treasure of Savinian's reliquary by his skill as a goldsmith. Eventually, he became the aged, weary compiler of his own writings. Odorannus sought to memorialize his special contributions to Saint Pierre-le-Vif as well as the trials he had encountered there. As a self-conscious author, he was aware of how those surrounding him had shaped his experience, and how, in future generations, new voices would speak his name. Just as with a chant, in which each particular voice had to achieve the same pitch, a good monastic community had to include men who could regularize their personal differences to form a pious and prosperous brotherhood.

APPENDIX

The contents of Vatican *Reg. lat.* 577, the manuscript containing Odorannus's works.[150]

Fol. 1r. – 2r.	Prologue	*Prologus*
Fol. 2r. – 3r.	Table of Contents	*Incipiunt capitula*
Fol. 3v.	Blank	
Fol. 4r. – v.	Preface	*Incipit argumentum hujus operis*
Fol. 5r. – 10v.	Life of Theudechild	*Capitulum I*
Fol. 10v. – 32r.	Chronicle	*Capitulum II*
Fol. 32v. – 46v.	Letter of Abbot William of Saint Denis	*Capitulum III*
Fol. 46v. – 58v.	Letter to the monk Evrardus on three theological questions	*Capitulum IV*
Fol. 58v. – 71v.	Letter to the monk Robert regarding musical tones (includes a tonary)	*Capitulum V*
Fol. 72r. – 80v.	Letter to the monks of Saint Germain of Auxerre regarding the monochord	*Capitulum VI*
Fol. 80v. – 85r.	Letter to the monk Arembertus on miscellaneous religious questions	*Capitulum VII*
Fol. 85v. – 86r.	Speech for episcopal election in Sens	*Capitulum VIII*
Fol. 86r. – 87r.	Sermon for episcopal ordination in Sens	*Capitulum IX*
Fol. 87r. – 88r.	Letter to Archbishop Gilduin of Sens	*Capitulum X*
Fol. 88r. – 89r.	Exhortation from Abbot Ingo to the monks of Saint Martin at Massay	*Capitulum XI*
Fol. 89r. – 90v.	Proposal for a confraternity	*Capitulum XII*
Fol. 91r.	Letter to Ayrfredus and Hugh	*Capitulum XIII*
Fol. 91v. – 94r.	Notated Office of Saint Savinian (later addition)[151]	
Fol. 94v.	Blank	
Fol. 95r.	Conclusion and warning to the reader	*Finis hujus operis et ammonitio lectoris*
Fol. 95v. – 96r.	Epitaphs for seven Senonais ecclesiastical authority figures	
Fol. 97v. – Fol. 100r.	Diverse later notations, including neumes[152]	

[150] I have reproduced and simplified the list provided in Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 30–31. The English titles I provide here reflect how I refer to Odorannus's works throughout the essay; the Latin titles are those included in the manuscript.

[151] Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 54–55, suggest that the folios containing Capitulum XIII and the Office of Saint Savinian were inserted after Odorannus's death between Capitulum XII and the Finis hujus operis et ammonitio lectoris.

[152] For a detailed list of these later additions, see Bautier et al. (n. 3 above) 30–31.