

INTRODUCTION

TWO CHARACTERISTICS are evident in the art and architecture of the Order of Cluny: the first, certain ground-plans, based on the successive churches at Cluny itself, alike in having a semicircular termination to the east end; and the second, rich decoration and furnishing, centred round the high altar of the church. That these characteristics were early recognized may be deduced from the peculiarities of Cistercian churches—a flat east end and an absence of ornament—which were as deliberate a contradiction of them as Cistercian austerity was of Cluniac humanism.

I have already made a study of the characteristic Cluniac plans;¹ and I have here attempted a study of the characteristic Cluniac art. Of late years, in consequence of the work of M. Emile Mâle on Romanesque iconography, of Professor Kingsley Porter on Romanesque sculpture, and of Professor Kenneth Conant on the remains at Cluny itself, such art has been widely studied, but such studies have tended either to merge the art of the Order of Cluny in Romanesque art in general, or else to be concentrated on questions of comparative date that have come to take a disproportionate importance. My study will be confined to the art used to beautify the churches and monasteries of the Order of Cluny; and the question of its exact dating will take a subsidiary place. On the date of the sculptures in Saint Hugh's great abbey-church at Cluny I gratefully accept the conclusions to which his exhaustive researches have led my friend Professor Kenneth Conant; on that of the sculptures of Sainte-Marie-la-Daurade at Toulouse, those of Made-moiselle Marie Lafargue.

Moreover, my concern is not with the development of style in Romanesque sculpture nor with the definition of local schools or the identification of particular masters, much of which has already been admirably done by Professor Kingsley Porter and those he inspired. I am not occupied with such differentiation, but with the sources of Cluniac iconography.

I have already endeavoured to show that in architecture, although the work was carried out by laymen, the authority, needs and tradition of the Order imposed certain plans and proportions which produced a characteristic type of church. In the realm of ornament I think an analogous truth may be found. The Rule of St Benedict prescribed manual labour for an average of seven hours a day, 'quia virtus est animae et corporis'. Such work was generally agricultural labour; but the tradition of learning established by the early abbots of Cluny turned this activity into other channels. 'It is more noble', wrote Peter the Venerable,² 'to set one's hand to the pen than to the plough, to trace divine letters upon the page than furrows upon the fields. Sow on the page the seed of

¹ Joan Evans, *The Romanesque Architecture of the Order of Cluny* (Cambridge University Press, 1938).

² *Epist.* I, 20.

INTRODUCTION

the word of God, and when the harvest is ripe, when your books are finished, the hungry readers shall be satisfied by an abundant harvest.'

The copying of manuscripts had been practised at Cluny at least as early as the time of Mayeul, Abbot from 954 to 994, and probably earlier. It was carried out in the peace and quiet of the lesser cloister.¹ The Precentor obtained the necessary parchment from the Chamberlain, and the Claustral Prior had it prepared for the use of the scribes, who were allowed to go into the kitchen to mix their ink and to dry their writings.² The surviving manuscripts of Cluny and its dependent houses, comparatively few though they are,³ show the gradual development of illuminated ornament and illustration. Their richness eventually became one of the accusations cast by the followers of St Bernard against the monks of Cluny. In the twelfth-century *Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian* the Cistercian criticizes the 'idle' works of the Cluniacs: 'I will say no more of the others, but will ask, Is it not useless to grind gold to powder, and therewith to paint great capital letters?'⁴

The uniformity of style that characterizes the extant manuscripts of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries that are known to come from Cluny, some of which are recorded to have been written there,⁵ suggests that all those needed for the services and public reading of the Abbey were produced in its own scriptorium; and the beauty of the writing and of the elaborately decorated initials show that a high tradition of technical excellence was there maintained. No one, moreover, who goes through the surviving illuminated manuscripts from Saint-Martial de Limoges and the Abbey of Moissac can fail to be struck by the similarity between the work of the two scriptoria. Here is an indisputably Cluniac art worthy of further investigation. Such ornament and such illustration, produced within the monastery for the monastery's use, was bound to influence the scheme of decoration of other sorts designed for the adornment of the monastery buildings. Moreover, the possession of shrines and book-covers and ornaments for the altar in ivory and precious metals provided the Abbey with other models, fine in craftsmanship and hallowed in association, that were bound to influence the designs prescribed for such crafts as monumental sculpture.

The Houses of the Order formed a closed community with a common literary culture.⁶ According to the Benedictine Rule the monks read in the cloister from the fourth to the

¹ At the Cluniac priory of Wenlock there is a large room over the south aisle that may have been used as a scriptorium.

² Pignot, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Cluny*, II, p. 418.

³ Too often the Bible of Souvigny is considered to be a typical Cluniac manuscript. Actually it was given to Souvigny only by Geoffroi Cholet, who died in 1457. He had been a monk of Mont-Saint-Michel and it may come from that house. See L. Bréhier, in *Bulletin de la Société d'émulation du Bourbonnais*, September 1910, and in *Études archéologiques* (Clermont Ferrand, 1910), p. 88.

⁴ Martène, *Thesaurus*, v, col. 1633; Coulton, *Art and the Reformation*, p. 47; J. Storm, *Untersuchungen zum Dialogus duorum monachorum Cluniacensis et Cisterciensis* (Bacholt, 1926); Watkin Williams, 'A Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian', in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxxi, (1930), p. 164.

⁵ E.g. B.M. Add. MS. 22820. See below, p. 10.

⁶ See, for a fuller account, Joan Evans, *Monastic Life at Cluny* (Oxford, 1931), ch. vi.

INTRODUCTION

3

sixth hour between Easter and October, and after Sext might either read in the cloister or rest on their beds. In the short winter days there was only time for an hour's reading; but with Lent the time was again increased. The Benedictine Rule prescribed that each monk should read at least one book during Lent.¹

Besides such private reading, there was reading aloud in church, refectory and chapter-house. At Septuagesima, Genesis was begun for the night office, and was finished in a week; Exodus followed at Sexagesima, and it and the succeeding books of the Bible were read in both church and refectory, so that the first eight books of the Old Testament were finished by Ash Wednesday. Augustine on the Psalms was read at Nocturns during Lent; the Prophecies of Jeremiah in the first days of Holy Week; part of the Acts of the Apostles during the Octave of Easter; Revelation and the Epistles in the fortnight following. The Acts were continued from Ascension to Whitsun, and the Books of Kings, the Song of Solomon, the Books of Job, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Esdras and Maccabees during the summer. Ezekiel lasted until Martinmas; Daniel, the twelve minor prophets, and Gregory's commentary on Ezekiel were read between then and Advent. Isaiah, the epistles of Pope Leo on the Incarnation, and the commentary of Augustine, sufficed for Advent. After Christmas came the Epistles of St Paul, with Chrysostom's treatise on the Epistle to the Hebrews if there were time for it. In Chapter part of the Benedictine Rule was read and commented on every morning, and every evening there was more reading, generally from the *Collationes* of the Fathers.

The library at Cluny contained all the texts needed for this official reading,² as well as many intended for private study: the Fathers and the early scholastics, the chief cœnobitic and eremitic Rules, and works of reference on Grammar, Law, Music, History and Science, as well as a certain number of classical texts.³

Obviously a community so nurtured on Holy Writ and its commentaries would have an understanding of its stories and its symbolism far greater than that enjoyed by any ordinary congregation. Thus there appears in the iconography of Cluniac art an originality and plenitude that arises naturally from the knowledge and interests of the Order, and a certain homogeneity that bears witness to the administrative unity of its hundreds of dependent houses.

¹ The list of those taken out of the library one Lent in the time of Abbot Odilo is preserved in *Consuetudines Farfenses*, edited by Dom Bruno Albers, O.S.B. (1900), cap. LI.

² See Delisle, *Fonds de Cluni*. The incomplete lists of the library at Moissac give psalters, hymnals, antiphonals, tropers, missals, lectionaries, testaments, martyrologies, collects, breviaries and the usual commentaries and patristic writings. See Delisle in *Cabinet des MSS.* II, p. 441.

³ In the twelfth-century *Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian* the Cistercian says: 'By your speech, by your quotations from the poets, I recognize a Cluniac, for you and your brethren take so much pleasure in the lies of the poets that you read, study and teach them even in the hours which St Benedict has definitely reserved for the reading of the Scriptures and manual labour.' The Cluniac replies: 'If we read the books of the pagans, it is to make ourselves perfect in their language, and thus to fit us better to understand the Scriptures; for in our Order, as you know, the reading of sacred books and prayer succeed each other without intermission. From reading we pass to prayer; and from prayer we return to reading.' Martène, *Thesaurus nov. anecdot.* v, col. 1573.

INTRODUCTION

The question of the employment of monastic craftsmen to carry out such artistic work is almost more difficult of solution than the analogous question of the employment of monastic architects.¹ It is reasonably certain that the monk more often practised a minor craft than he acted as 'constructor'. The Rule of St Benedict² prescribes:

Artificers, if there be any in the monastery, shall practise their special arts with all humility, if the abbot permit. But if any one of them be exalted on account of his knowledge of his art, to the extent that he seems to be conferring something on the monastery, then such a one shall be deprived of his art, and shall not again return to it, unless it hap that the Abbot again order it, the monk being humiliated.

Therefore, there were probably men working in stone, wood and metal alongside the ordinary monastic scribes; and those who commonly illustrated manuscripts may exceptionally have turned their hand to wall-painting. The actual evidence for such work is, however, remarkably slight, more especially as *facere* was often used in the early Middle Ages with little precision to mean *faire faire* as well as *faire* in the ordinary sense. We do not know whether the three monks Seguinus, Fulcherius and Petrus Glocens, who 'restored' the grange at Berzé in 1109³ painted its still surviving wall-paintings or only supervised the work. Such supervision, as opposed to execution, seems to be indicated by the inscription on the mosaic floor at Ganagobie:

Me prior et fieri Bertranne jubes et haberi
 Et Petrus urgebat Trutberti meque regebat.⁴

The abbot or prior of a Cluniac house might receive gifts in money or kind for the erection of a church, but it was he, and not the donor, who decided its plan and its decoration. So, too, the reigning abbot, or more frequently the dead abbot in whose reign the work was begun, may be modestly celebrated in the church, but the donors of money are not. The exception⁵ that proves the rule is a capital at Volvic. It shows on one side two archangels holding standards and censers, and on the other a layman and a priest each holding the same pillar. The inscription records the donation thus celebrated: 'GVILEIMES DE BEZ' PRO ANIMA SVA ET CO() INCIPIT DONALIA SANCTI PRECTI CVE FECIT'.⁶

I do not know any specific evidence for the employment of a Cluniac monk as a sculptor in stone. In certain instances, however, we are certain that laymen were employed. For example the statue of St Thomas on the chapter-house of Saint-Étienne

¹ On this see Joan Evans, *Rom. Arch. Ord. Clun.*, p. 10.

² Cap. LVII (ed. Woelfflin, Teubner text), 55.

³ Marrier, *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, col. 496; p. 510; Pignot, II, p. 368.

⁴ Mortet, *Receuil de Textes*, I, p. 355. Bertran was prior in 1122.

⁵ It is possible, but unlikely, that the little busts in the angle of the Carennac tympanum may represent donors.

⁶ The church is dedicated to St Projet, locally called St Priest.

INTRODUCTION

5

de Toulouse was signed: 'VIR NON INCERTVS ME CELAVIT GILABERTVS':¹ a wholly unmonkish formula. The abaci of the capitals on the left of the porch of the church at Carennac bear the inscription:

'GIRBERTVS CEMENTARIUS FECIT ISTVM PORTARIVM
 BENEDICTA SIT ANIMA EIVS':

and no monkish workman would be described as *cementarius*.

The solitary representation of a sculptor in Cluniac art occurs on a battered capital from the Daurade of Toulouse.² It represents him as a lay craftsman, seated on a little stool and bent over the capital on which he is working for dear life.

The occasional employment of Cluniac monks as goldsmiths is a little better authenticated. It would seem likely that these were men who had been goldsmiths before they took monastic vows. About 974³ the shrine of Saint-Martial de Limoges was badly damaged by fire. The monk Josbert, who was warden of the sepulchre, completely restored it in less than fifteen days, and further made a golden image of St Martial.⁴ In the first half of the eleventh century Odorannus, a monk of Saint-Pierre-le-Vif of Sens, a monastery twice reformed by Cluny but not actually in the Order,⁵ was sufficiently famous as a goldsmith to be commissioned by King Robert and Queen Constance to make shrines for Saint Savinien and Saint Potentien.⁶ Authentic records of Cluniac monastic goldsmiths of later date are wanting. The *Consuetudines* drawn up in the first half of the eleventh century describe a work room, 'ubi aurifices vel inclusores seu vitrei magistri convenient ad faciendam ipsam artem':⁷ it is near the novices' quarters, and not far from the lodging for poor pilgrims, in a place where monastic supervision would be possible, but outside the cloister itself.

Such, then, is the specific evidence for the existence of a decorative art that is Cluniac in manufacture as in destination, and except for the illuminated manuscripts—a very important exception—the evidence is trifling. But just as Cluniac architecture, through the influence of the abbots and the mysterious personality of a great community, has characteristics of its own, so, I venture to think, the decorative arts designed for Cluniac use have a homogeneity of their own. In so far as the Order of Cluny was Benedictine,

¹ The St Andrew is signed: 'GILABERTVS ME FECIT'. See Rachou, *Cat. Toulouse*, p. 154. Cf. the relief with Angel for Sun and a woman for Moon from Saint-Pons-de-Thomières, signed: 'SOL GILLO ME FECIT'. Sahuc, p. 31.

² Now in the Musée des Augustins at Toulouse. It really lies just outside the Romanesque period, and cannot be much earlier than the end of the twelfth century.

³ The Abbey of Saint-Martial became Cluniac under Abbot Aimo, 936–42 (Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser*, I, p. 81). It seceded later, and re-entered the Order in 1063. I am not sure if it was actually in the Order or not in 974.

⁴ Swartwout, *The Monastic Craftsman*, p. 29; Ademari Cabannensis Chron. in Labbé, *Bibliotheca MSS. Aquit.* II, p. 272.

⁵ Sackur, I, pp. 92, 280.

⁶ Swartwout, p. 55. The shrines were still to be seen in the seventeenth century. *Acta Sanctorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti*, saec. VI, par. II, 265.

⁷ *Consuetudines Farfenses* (ed. Albers), p. 139; Evans, *Mon. Life*, p. 125.

their characteristics may and do reappear in other Benedictine houses; but in so far as the Order of Cluny had traditions and a culture of its own, they remain characteristic only of that Order. Cluny, moreover, was unique in its heyday as being not merely a single monastery, but the head of a highly organized and completely dependent Order which at one time comprised at least some 1450 priories.¹ It is from their scanty remains that I hope to draw an outline of the art of a community of which it was said: 'Vos estis lux mundi.'

¹ See *Rom. Arch. Ord. Clun.*, Appendix.

Part I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLUNIAN ART

I. THE ORDER OF CLUNY

THE MONASTERY of Cluny was founded in 910, a Benedictine house indistinguishable by its Rule, its riches or its buildings from many others in France that in that century were either founded afresh, or refounded after they had been ravaged by the Hungarians or Normans. Its early buildings were rude and simple, and indeed little more than adaptations of the farm that had earlier occupied the site.¹ Its potentialities of development depended upon two factors: its geographical position and the personality of its abbots. In the first it was peculiarly fortunate. It lay in a sheltered valley, easily accessible, but not on the highway of the Saône; its land was not hemmed in by the estate of any great lord, nor was its monastery too close to any dominant cathedral city or to any great rival house. Its nearest bishop was at Mâcon, and its nearest abbot at Tournus. There was no strong overlord over its district, which was none the less out of the obvious line of march of any invasion or attack. In the second factor it was even more notably blessed. For the first two hundred years of its history it was governed by six men, of whom five were great and the sixth harmless. Not only were the five great administrators, great disciplinarians and great saints, but they were also men of high birth. Berno, the first abbot, was the nephew of Lewis the Stammerer; Odo, his successor, a man of noble family who had early entered the great monastery of Saint-Martin at Tours. Mayeul, who was abbot from 954 to 994, was of a noble family of Avignon; his successor, Odilo, a member of the Auvergnat house of Mercœur; and he in turn was succeeded by Hugh of Semur, of a great family of the Brionnais. Such a succession meant not only that the Abbey of Cluny maintained close relations with royal and noble families, who were in a position to confer temporal benefits upon it, but also that its abbots had inherited a feudal tradition of temporal administration that could be yet further developed in a community that was free of the feudal duty of military

¹ There is a possibility that an earlier abbey dedicated to St Peter, St Paul and St Andrew was founded on the site by Warin Count of Mâcon about 825, and afterwards destroyed by the Hungarians. The evidence, however, is far from conclusive. See Champly, *Histoire de l'Abbaye de Cluny*, p. 15; *Gallia Christiana*, col. 1118–19.

service, the feudal curse of private war and the feudal destiny of change of individual ownership.

These two factors caused the Abbey to achieve a development unique at that time. Cluny became not merely a great Abbey, but also a great mother-house having dominion over many affiliated houses, which were as strictly under the rule of its abbot as Cluny itself. This is not the place to describe the process of development.¹ It must suffice to say that it originated in the time of Odo. Many of the monasteries of Western Europe had not yet recovered from the ravages of the Normans and Hungarians, and in the strict Benedictine Rule which Berno had established at Cluny men saw a hope of restoring their discipline and solidarity. Consequently Odo was often called away from Cluny to re-establish the Benedictine Rule in houses in which it had lapsed; and though such houses retained the autonomy which was a principle of the Rule, a tradition of closer spiritual relationship than usual between Cluny and certain other monasteries was thus established. This work and this tradition was carried on by Mayeul during the forty years of his abbatiolate. His successor Odilo continued the work, but tended to make the monasteries he reformed actually subject to Cluny. The abbey had already founded priories at Souvigny and Sauxillanges, and had the right of ownership over Romainmôtier and Charlieu; Odilo established the claims of Cluny over Romainmôtier and entered into possession of Charlieu in 990, when he was still coadjutor to Mayeul. Gradually these possessions were extended into a congregation of monasteries all owing allegiance to Cluny and obedience to its abbot. Some of these, such as Saint-Victor at Geneva, Payerne, Saint-André de Gap, Moissac and Vézelay were ancient foundations; others, like La Voulte, Paray-le-Monial and Saint-Flour, were founded anew. Under Abbot Hugh, who ruled Cluny for sixty years, the Order of Cluny was enormously increased, by ancient foundations such as Saint-Martial de Limoges, Saint-Eutrope de Saintes, Sainte-Marie-la-Daurade and Saint-Étienne at Toulouse, and Saint-Pierre de Beaulieu, and by such new foundations as La-Charité-sur-Loire, Marcigny and Montierneuf at Poitiers. After the reign of Hugh the increase in the Order was small, and the list of more than twelve hundred dependent houses,² ranging from great abbeys to remote priories with three or four monks, is a monument primarily to his abbatiolate.

¹ See J. H. Pignot, *Histoire de l'Ordre de Cluny depuis la fondation jusqu'à la mort de Pierre le Vénérable* (Autun and Paris, 1868), 3 vols.; E. Sackur, *Die Cluniacenser in ihrer kirchlichen und allgemeineschichtlichen Wirksamkeit bis zur Mitte des elften Jahrhunderts* (Halle, 1892), 2 vols.; Joan Evans, *Monastic Life at Cluny*, ch. II.

² See *Rom. Arch. Ord. Clun.*, Appendix A.

II. THE TENTH CENTURY

Such a phenomenal development was naturally accompanied by a corresponding growth in the buildings both of the Abbey and the Order. Of its characteristic architecture I have already written; it remains to study its characteristic art, whether ancillary to architecture or independent of it.

The early tenth century, when Cluny was founded, was a time that in France more nearly deserved the name of a Dark Age than any for centuries before or ever since. The great fabric of Gallo-Roman society had been demolished; the Carolingian reconstruction had broken down, though the last kings of the dynasty yet ruled; and the medieval creation of feudalism, kingdom and nation had barely begun. After the reign of Charles the Bald there is a lacuna in the brilliantly illuminated manuscript of the history of French art; the text only begins again, and that in blurred fashion, in the middle years of the eleventh century.

We know that the church at Cluny was dedicated in 916 or 917; we know that the church of Souvigny was dedicated in 920 or 921; we know that Mayeul dedicated a second church at Cluny in 981; but while we know a little of the plan of these churches we know hardly anything of their decoration. Just enough remains of buildings of the date to make it unlikely that there was any notable exterior ornament, or more than a few rudimentary paintings¹ and stucco reliefs in the interior. The *Consuetudines* of Cluny tell us² that the chief altars were dedicated to St Bartholomew, St Martin, SS. John, James and Thomas, SS. Gregory and Augustine, St Taurin, St Benedict, St Colomanus and St Philibert, and give the Latin verses inscribed above each.

Certain stone carvings of the early centuries survive in churches that were later Cluniac, but they seem to be earlier than the inclusion of the monastery concerned in the Order.³ At Charlieu, for instance, there is a rude bas-relief of the late ninth century;⁴ but Charlieu did not become Cluniac in law until 938, nor in fact until 990.⁵ Two marble slabs of the

¹ E.g. the painting showing Saint Martial helping Christ to wash the Apostles' feet in the old church of Saint-Martial de Limoges. (See Arbellot, in *Bull. Hist. et Arch. du Limousin*, iv, p. 267.) The Abbey of Saint-Martial was affiliated to Cluny between 936 and 940 but was then outside the Order until 1063.

² Albers, *Consuetudines Farfenses*, XLIX, p. 183. Cf. the verses written later for the altars of Saint-Germain d'Auxerre by Radulphus Glaber, *Historia*, bk. v, cap. 1.

³ Similarly the ninth-century frescoes of Saint-Germain d'Auxerre are pre-Cluniac. See E. S. King in *Art Bulletin*, xi (1929), p. 359.

⁴ So dated by Monsieur de Lasteyrie, *Architecture romane*, p. 203. Dr Elizabeth Sunderland, however, with some probability considers it Cluniac and of the tenth century; *Speculum*, XXI (1946), p. 42.

⁵ It was seized by Boson, Duke of Provence, and though he left it by will to Cluny, the Abbey did not gain possession until the Council of Anse in 990. Pignot, I, p. 413. The ninth-century ambo at Romainmôtier dates from before the foundation of Cluny.

cancellum at Carennac survive, but they are of the early tenth century,¹ and Carennac was not Cluniac before 1045. A similar slab exists at Volvic, but Volvic was not Cluniac before 1095. At La Charité the twelfth-century tower is decorated with a frieze of four panels, which seem to come from a similar chancel screen. They too appear to be of the late ninth or early tenth century,² and La Charité was not founded until 1052 or 1056 and was not Cluniac before 1059. The extraordinary early sculptures at Marcilhac are more debatable. They cannot be much later than 1000, when Marcilhac depended on Moissac; but Moissac and its dependencies did not become Cluniac until 1047. They cannot therefore definitely be considered to have been set up under Cluniac inspiration.

The only works of art of the tenth century that can definitely be associated with Cluny are certain manuscripts with illuminated initials. These were most probably produced within the very walls of the Abbey by members of the Order, for the production of such manuscripts was the form of manual labour held in highest honour in the Abbey. A copy of Hrabanus Maurus³ ends:

Hic liber descriptus est iussu domni MAIOLI ABBATIS ab Herimanno sacerdote licet indigno et monachorum omnium ultimo. Et praelibati patris uoto oblatus sancto Petro Cluniensi Coenobio. Orat scriptor quatinus quicumque eum manibus susceperit legendum, ueniam illi a domino imploret per caminum.⁴

Its finely written text is adorned with plain capitals in red, green, silver and purple; and one initial (Fig. 1*a*) is ornamented in coloured inks entirely in penwork, with a picture of the Prophet Jeremiah. This we may regard as the earliest surviving attempt at artistic production within the cloister of Cluny. Another tenth-century manuscript, a copy of St Jerome on the Prophets Daniel and Hosea⁵ has marginal drawings of lions and monsters,⁶ but these seem to be later than the text.

Another⁷—Hrabanus Maurus on Ecclesiasticus—has initial letters formed of biting beasts; another of the second half of the tenth century, has an initial⁸ formed of peacock-

¹ See E. Lefèvre-Pontalis in *Congrès archéologique*, LXXXIV (1923), p. 420, and in *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de France* (1920), p. 259; they are now preserved in a neighbouring house.

² See P. Deschamps in *Bull. Mon.* LXXIX (1920), p. 223 and Albe and Viré, *L'Hébrardie Marcilhac* (Lot), *Histoire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Pierre-de-Marcilhac de l'Ordre de Saint Benoît* (1924). They may have come from an earlier non-monastic church on the site.

³ B.M. Add 22820. See H. Omont in *Millénaire de Cluny* (Mâcon, 1910), I, p. 127. The famous manuscript of Cicero at Holkham dates from the ninth century and did not belong to Cluny when it was written. W. Peterson, *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, classical series IX; E. Chatelain, *Paléographie des classiques latins*, pl. 27.

⁴ Another manuscript given to Cluny by Mayeul is Bibliothèque Nationale fonds latin 1438, but this is not ornamented.

⁵ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, nouv. acq. lat. 2248.

⁶ Fols. 22, 23 and 60.

⁷ Nouv. acq. lat. 1461, fols. 1 and 6.

⁸ Nouv. acq. lat 1438: fol. 54. Another is on fol. 137. St Ambrose on the Gospel of St Luke.