ACROSS THE THRESHOLD

Monastic codification of neighbour-love

METTE BIRKEDAL BRUUN

NEIGHBOURS ARE BEINGS who are next to one another, physically or otherwise.[1] This element of proximity foregrounds a spatial dimension of neighbour-love. Research and daily human experience show that human beings are surrounded by virtual and physical zones—delineations that segregate individuals from their surroundings and fellow humans.[2] These zones are physically, culturally and emotionally coded domains where relationships are negotiated and bonds are forged or severed.[3]

Read by one kind of light, human communities and societies consist of many more or less heterogeneous entities of individuals clustered by choice, imposition or coincidence. They may be brought together temporarily and accidentally (e.g., in a bus), on a regular and regulated basis (e.g., in a workplace), for a longer period of time (e.g., in an apartment building) or in various other forms of constellations. Some of these entities are visible and physical (e.g., a school class or next-door neighbours), some are less tangible (e.g., segments of "like-minded" or "fellow human beings in need"). Such entities come with internal and external boundaries. Situations of such boundary-drawing involve negotiation and implicit or explicit regulation of the many ways in which the boundaries of each individual meet, converge, collide and rub against each other directly or remotely. In continuation of such spatial vocabulary, neighbour-love may be perceived as a particular way of relating to such meetings; a way that privileges, or even requires, traits such as compassion, kindness, respect and charity, each of which may, in turn, be analysed and broken down into grades and nuances.

In this chapter, I consider a case of imposed neighbour-love between cohabitants. This is a case in which the zones mentioned above

are articulated with particular and highly ritualized intensity. I am concerned with the monastic world and thus with intently regulated relationships between human beings who share a space. This is a reduced perspective, but one that gives rise to some more general considerations. When neighbour-love is codified as minutely as it happens in the cloister, it draws the clear, albeit idiosyncratic, contours of one version of an otherwise somewhat elusive notion. The monastic neighbour-love represents a version saturated with particular norms and defined by particular historical contexts, and it reminds us to look for underlying values and contextual specificities when dealing with this grand and apparently timeless principle.[4] An explicit codification of neighbour-love as the one we are studying here thus helps us to ask analytical questions to other instances: What are the teleological drivers of a given notion of neighbour-love; what characterizes the inherent anthropology; what are the evident—but also the surprising—practical manifestations of this neighbour-love? The focus on cohabitants, in turn, alerts us to the physical manoeuvring in the shared space, eliciting questions such as: How does our body meet with other bodies in a given space; how do we acknowledge or ignore the meeting; how do we show respect for the material and immaterial boundaries that surround the other? Forgoing general definitions of neighbour-love and sticking to the historical vocabulary of this particular case, I shall examine the argument that notions of neighbour-love are situated in particular historical contexts and framed within particular value systems. We shall now turn to one such particular historical context and value system to see how it helps us to shed light on our overall interest.

Into monasticism

For all its particularity, and to a modern gaze indeed peculiarity, the monastic world is an instructive case in our quest for a deeper understanding of neighbour-love. The monastery is a microcosm, the structures of which lend themselves to analyses that may be applied to other communal entities. Benedictine monasticism, designated by its abiding by the 6th-century Rule of St Benedict (hereafter "the Rule"),

is organized in closed communities.[5] Benedictine monks and nuns profess the three regular vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, but they are also bound by their vow to *stabilitas loci*, steadfastness, which ties them to one particular house and its walled precinct—ideally for life. Several different monastic orders abide by the Rule; individual orders and, indeed, abbeys vary as to how strictly or literally they interpret it. The application of the Rule and of the additional constitutions developed over time, in short, depends somewhat on social, cultural and political circumstances as well as the people who inhabit and lead a given house at a given period.

The Cistercians are, historically, one of the more austere versions of Benedictine monasticism:[6] not everywhere and not throughout their history, but in the principle that, according to the foundation narratives, inspired their foundation. The Order was founded in 1098, allegedly in an air of reform, and through the centuries reform recurs as a basic paradigm, leading in the 17th century to a fraction into the common branch and the stricter branch, the so-called Abstinents; the Trappist reform represents a further intensification of the Abstinent ideal.[7] Cistercians share the cloistered space and a minutely regulated communal life. They are bound to one another for better and for worse. The community is seen as a bulwark against the devil because it strengthens the individual; but the community is also a central component of ascetic discipline—nothing serves the cultivation of humility better than the close cohabitation with other human beings. Monastic regulations and other texts shape this daily cohabitation and seek to prevent social and soteriological disaster.

Two Cistercian authors and contexts loom large in this chapter and need a brief introduction. Bernard of Clairvaux (*c.* 1090–1153) is the main figure, but not the founder, of the Cistercian Order and the force behind its 12th-century mushrooming from the Burgundian origin to 350 houses spread across Europe. He preached crusade and engaged wholeheartedly in church politics, but he also authored works of theological sophistication and spiritual depth. In this chapter we meet him primarily as an abbot concerned with monastic cohesion. Bernard towers over the first generations of Cistercians who

sought to describe and solidify the Cistercian ethos with the founding narratives and the early constitutions as the primary textual foundation and the bulky mid-12th century manual *Ecclesiastica Officia* as a key representation of the ideal daily life in a Cistercian abbey. Armand-Jean de Rancé (1626–1700) was the abbot and reformer of the Cistercian abbey of La Trappe in Normandy and, with a vast correspondence as the principal vehicle, among the drivers of a surge of upper-class penitence. Here we are mainly interested in his monastic regime which gave rise to a set of constitutions that elaborated and intensified the Rule and the medieval constitutions, as well as to volumes of Trappist biographies that fleshed out, so to speak, the Trappist ideal. What follows is a synchronic study of Cistercian mores on the basis of medieval and early modern texts, straddling the 6th-century Rule of Benedict, the 12th-century Cistercian foundation documents as well as texts pertaining to the late 17th-century Trappist reform. A stringent historical analysis would separate these texts and study them in their respective contexts. For our purpose, however, it makes sense to read them together as normative indicators of a certain ethos of charity that hinges on the ongoing historical modulation of a particular norm.

The aim of monastic life is to purge human beings of the consequences of the Fall and to prepare them for salvation.[8] It is the underlying understanding that, in their paradisiacal condition, Adam and Eve were turned towards God in perfect awareness that they owe him their lives and their human dignity. The serpent cajoled them to forget this foundation in prideful self-sufficiency, thus making the first humans turn towards themselves instead of God. This turn, their sin, caused their expulsion from Paradise and with them all humankind. The monastic movement seeks to correct this basic, fatal pride by an intense mortification of body and spirit and by constant cultivation of humility. Physical and spiritual asceticism, continuous liturgical service, unfaltering obedience to the abbot, manual labour and penitential prayer for oneself and others are the pillars of this life. Charity in the shape of alms, prayer and caring for the sick and needy are primary ob-

ligations. In some orders, notably the mendicants, charity manifests in preaching and teaching. Not so in the orders that follow the Rule; their houses are built in rural areas, and the inmates make their living from agriculture.

Caritas, charity, is the declared hallmark of the Cistercian Order. When they drew up their foundational texts in the first and second generations of the Order, the Cistercians chose to call their constitution, a detailed elaboration of their understanding of the Rule, the *Carta caritatis*, the Charter of Charity, thus describing love as the backbone of the Order and its groundbreaking, institutionally coherent organization.[9] This name, they say, signals that every decree of the charter speaks of charity, and that the entire text pursues but one goal, namely to help the Cistercians perform in their daily life the decree of Romans 13:8, "Owe no one anything, except to love one another".[10] According to Cistercian wisdom, the longevous love of one another across wide geographical expanses is best secured by thorough regulation such as the Charter of Charity.

> In this decree, then, the aforesaid brethren, taking precaution against future shipwreck of their mutual peace, elucidated and decreed and left for their posterity by what covenant, or in what manner, indeed, with what charity their monks throughout abbeys in various parts of the world, though separated in body, could be indissolubly knit together in mind.[11]

Unity in mores and customs is the token of this charity. It shows in the familial organization of the abbeys in motherhouses and daughterhouses that are bound to one another by yearly visits. The unity is solidified, at least in principle, at the yearly Chapter of abbots in the mother abbey at Cîteaux. The first and basic decrees of the Charter of Charity concern this organization, the relationship between houses, and the fundamental requirements regarding books and buildings.[12] As time went by, however, and Cistercian life was conducted under different abbatial regimes and in widely different regional circumstances and sometimes far removed from the Burgundian centre,

more and more specification was needed. The institutes that came out of the yearly Chapter speak their clear language of the goading and restriction required to maintain this charitable unity.

When choosing *caritas* as their stamp, the early Cistercians claimed a role as true heirs to the New Testament call for love of God and love of neighbour (Matthew 22:36–40), and positioned themselves in a long-standing tradition of deliberating the complex relationship between love of God, love of neighbour and the perverted post-lapsarian love of self. It is helpful to keep in mind basic distinctions of *eros* (*ἔρως*, *amor*) and *agape* (*ἀγάπη*, *caritas*, *amor*) and their roots. Simplifying complex matters crassly, it is worth bearing in mind that *eros* grows out of a Hellenistic tradition and the Platonic idea of the surge of the human soul; *eros* is driven by desire and directed towards fulfilment. *Agape* is a New Testament motif, expressed in, e.g., 1 Corinthians 13:4–5, "Love [*η ἀγάπη*] is patient; love is kind; love is not envious or boastful or arrogant or rude. It does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful"; and in 1 John 4:8, "God is love" (*ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*); *agape* is related to *filía* (*φιλία*), *caritas*, *dilectio* and *amicitia*. In his *Agape and Eros* (1932–1939, originally in Swedish 1930–1936) the Swedish Protestant theologian Anders Nygren seminally identified these two as the key principles of love in the Christian tradition. Nygren's study reflects a particular theological and historical context, but for a broad view it is helpful to bear in mind his robust definition of *eros* as a quest and *agape* as a state. According to Nygren, *eros* is passionate, it strives, it seeks to ascend and to acquire; *agape* is affectionate, it sacrifices, it seeks to overflow and to give. Semantic overlaps, however, between the Latin terms and the infinite elaborations of these terms make it difficult to maintain Nygren's unequivocal division.[13] In the shape of *amor* and *caritas*, *eros* and *agape* are no longer clear and stable semantic oppositions. Bernard of Clairvaux's texts on love are an example of such blending. The ongoing effort to turn the awkward triad made up by love of God, love of neighbour and love of self into a pure dual love of God and love of neighbour is the nucleus of the normative texts of the monastic movement from its early days in the Egyptian desert. The texts of the desert speak of a longing to be

transformed by a love which is at once vertical, directed towards God, and horizontal, directed towards the neighbour.[14] The latter form of love is expressed in good works, be they hospitality, compassion for the needy, restraint of anger or the effort to comply with God's command to love our enemies (Matthew 5:44).[15] The vertical love of God requires the right kind of motivation. John Cassian's (*c.* AD 360–435) 4th-century *Collationes*, with stylized representations of dialogues with desert fathers, is one of the texts that conveyed the desert spirit to centuries of monks. One of his dialogues is conducted with the 100-year-old Chaeremon who teaches his guests the three steps of love of God. The first and most primitive form of love of God does not even deserve to be called love, but is rather a slavish fear (*timor servilis*) of Hell; the second degree is also twisted, incited as it is by the hope of beatitude, and Cassian compares it to the mercenary's expectation of a wage; the third and final degree of love, however, is a filial love (*affectus filii*) of God which neither fears, nor hopes, but simply trusts in the divine father's mercy.[16] Through this movement from fear, via hope to love, the monk may eventually reach that purity of heart which, for Cassian, is the ultimate goal of desert asceticism and which motivates his solitude, his fasts, his vigils and his labour.[17] Cassian reminds us that, within a monastic horizon, ascetic mortification and love of God are closely connected. This worldview, its anthropological corollaries and its implications for the relationship with self and neighbour is the principle that underlies monastic life. In our Cistercian context, love of neighbour is thus inseparable from love of God. The ability to love is at the core. In the Cistercian texts, the exposition of love is embedded in a complex spiritual discourse that is developed partly in distinct treatises on love;[18] partly in commentaries on the Song of Songs which delve into the stages and facets of the spiritual embrace of the soul as the bride and Christ as the groom.[19]

However, monastic love is not all about spiritual profundity, but also about daily life. There is a direct link between the elaborate dynamics of the love of God and love of human and the detailed commands that the monks, for instance, pay heed to whether their monastic hood is up or down, spit only in the spittoons and arrange their

habit with propriety when on the latrine.[20] These ideals for quotidian life regulate, spiritually and physically, the daily interaction in the abbey and its restricted space.

Community

The Cistercian notion of charity relies on manifest regulation and strict separation from the wider world. This double internal and external delineation lends itself to sociological analysis along the lines of Mary Douglas's cultural theory and its preoccupation with the different degrees and kinds of control that distinguish a particular group from its surroundings and which secures its internal bonding and cohesion.[21] While theory is not our main concern, Douglas does remind us of the acuteness of the external and internal thresholds of a given group, but so do the monastic sources. Allegedly the precondition of a well-functioning monastic community is the capacity of its inmates to abide by the commands of the Rule, the constitutions and the abbot. This capacity is tested at arrival, and the Rule is frank in its reminder: "Do not grant newcomers to the monastic life an easy entry."[22] Anybody who desires to take up a Benedictine novitiate must wait at the gate for four or five days in order to show the vigour of his resolve. In his novitiate, he is surveilled by a senior monk who scans his every action and his state of mind to determine whether he does indeed truly seek God and is able and ready to submit himself to the monastic regime of obedience and manual labour and some eight hours of liturgical service every day. The novice is constantly made aware of the corporeal and spiritual travails that lie ahead. After two months the Rule is read to him cover to cover to make sure that he understands the norm he is now subject to. He is then tested for another six months, including another reading of the entire Rule, and then yet another four months and a third reading of the Rule.

When, finally, the novice is received into the monastic community, "he must be well aware that, as the law of the rule establishes, from this day he is no longer free to leave the monastery, nor to shake from his neck the yoke of the rule".[23] He joins his fellow monks in the church where he promises stability, adherence to monastic life and

obedience.[24] Then he prostrates himself before each monk, asking for his prayers and divests himself of his former life and his possessions "without keeping back a single thing for himself, well aware that from that day he will not have even his own body at his disposal. Then and there in the oratory he is to be stripped of everything of his own that he is wearing and clothed in what belongs to the monastery."[25] The entry into the monastic community contains in nucleus everything that characterizes this community and its particular form of neighbour-love; that is, a love marked by brotherly surveillance and complete submission not only to the abbot, but also to the other brothers.

Monks in space

Cistercian regulations pay minute attention to navigation in the shared space. They abound in guidelines concerning the activities in the cloister as well as in the church, the chapter, the dormitory, the refectory and the lay brothers' quarters. Each of these rooms has a particular function and spiritual ambience as well as its own set of looming temptations.[26] The church is a space of worship and orientation to God; the monks do not greet one another here;[27] only the abbot must be saluted.[28] Restlessness and a wandering mind is a danger, and the monks must not provoke it in each other. The chapter is the assembly room where the monks gather to listen to sermons, readings from the Rule and information about mundane matters. Upon entering the chapter, the monks bow to each other; this is a space dedicated to communal affairs.[29] The dormitory is an altogether different place. Here bodily needs take precedence, and one must be on guard. There are guidelines as to how to lie down in bed, how to undress while lying on the bed, how only to sit on one's bed when putting on and taking off one's shoes. The latrines are equally charged; the monks must take care to hide their face in their hood and keep their hands in front of them with their sleeves rolled up; the habit, however, must by no means be rolled up, but left hanging to the floor.[30] The Trappist guidelines for the refectory seem to balance monastic propriety and grand-siècle manners. Eat in a way that is neither too fast, nor too slow; only have the knife in hand when actually cutting, and never

ever put it in the mouth; keep your elbows off the table. Only the lowered gaze—yet without too much thought on the food on the plate—is monastic through and through. Singularity must be avoided, and this is according to the general Cistercian preference for unity, but the command not to begin with the fruit or the cheese does have a ring of late 17th-century etiquette to it.[31]

The walls of the different monastic buildings constitute one form of boundary, the monastic hood another. This is regulated with zeal as well. When drawn up, the hood prevents the monk from looking to the sides; communal spaces are spaces fraught with dangerous distraction, and since the eyes are particularly susceptible to being led—and leading—astray, the hood provides a much-needed shield. Bernard's treatise on humility, *De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae*, is rich in allusions to monks who keep a jealous eye on their peers in the attempt to distract them from their work, provoke ascetic competition or outshine them. The hood helps to curb such unwanted activity. The hood must be down, in respect for the divine, when the monk enters the church,[32] but as soon as he sits next to his brothers, the hood must be up.[33] The same is required for the dormitory and the latrines for reasons obvious from the above.[34]

The command to silence creates another zone around the monk. The Rule prescribes silence, the Cistercians augment this decree, and the Trappists became known as keen champions of silence.[35] In the monastic movement silence is considered a means to curb verbal offences between monastic inmates: from gossip and quarrelling to laughter.[36] In Rancé's words, it would be useless to withdraw from the world, if the monks take with them into the cloister the worldly spirit that comes with any form of speech.[37] Allowing speech, in other words, would enable everybody in the abbey to remain who they were before becoming monks. In a suggestive paragraph, Rancé conjures up the menaces that will occur—and as we might perhaps infer, have occurred—if the command to silence is not honoured. The schemer will scheme; someone who is angry will find occasions for rage; someone lascivious will kindle impure desires; a liar will tell lies; a pleaser will play favourites with particular friends; in short, passions and

vices will rule untrammelled.[38] Monastic discipline and the imposition of silence go a long way to secure harmony. They are, however, not a cure-all, and we do find textual hints at cracks and fissures in the disciplinary solidity, such as Rancé's paragraph on silence. And one of Bernard's sermons suggestively portrays the many ways in which monks harass each other without words, grunting resentfully at a brother or muttering, murmuring, sneering, laughing or frowning at him.[39] Such indications point to the threshold between the brothers; their zone of interaction, as it were, and we may just begin to imagine what that looks like.

At the threshold between brothers

Cistercian neighbour-love hinges on the ability of each monk to exploit the supportive and chastising opportunities offered by the community. Monks help each other in their quest for perfect humility and triumph over their lapsarian pride, for example, by paying attention to each other's transgressions and reporting them in Chapter so that they may be punished. The *Ecclesiastica Officia* provides the formula for relating a brother's sin as well as the ensuing choreography of prostration and flogging.[40] But monks also act as each other's servants or disciples, humbly subjecting themselves to each other's needs in a reversal of their former status to an almost pre-lapsarian state of humble simplicity. The Trappist biographies disseminate such transformations with the monks cast as each other's teachers, students, servants and supporters but above all as ever-malleable subjects ready to be edified by good examples. In these portraits we meet the haughty, irascible, lustful Piemontese soldier Count de Santena. He was transformed into the meek and gentle Brother Palemon who wished nothing but to be at his brothers' feet in demonstration of his absolute respect.[41] Dom Arsène's vita develops along similar all-transformative lines. He was a doctor of theology at the Sorbonne who entered La Trappe, and there subjected himself to be taught, shedding completely the glamour and arrogance of erudition. As a novice he conducted himself with child-like simplicity; he listened to the novice master, pretending that the novice master was older and wiser although he was in fact younger

and much less learned than Dom Arsène. He volunteered to carry out the most menial and humiliating tasks, least fitting for a person of his former rank, and took a supreme delight in seeing himself in submissive dependency of his fellow monks.[42] Dom Arsène's obedience was founded, the biography says, in a total destruction of himself, a veritable state of death which is in keeping with the Trappist ideal of radical mortification.[43] All in all, he behaved "with a simplicity that delighted his brothers".[44] The term is *charmer*, and in this context, the charm thus elicited is a state of pious delight inspired by Dom Arsène's beautiful example.

This inspiration evoked by Dom Arsène in his brothers is vital. One dimension of monastic neighbour-love is the obligation to kindle piety and humility in each other. The alternative has dire consequences. The monastic texts have an undercurrent concerned with the need to avoid scandal. For us, the term scandal may come with a hint of titillation, but the original meaning is at once graver, more charitable and more terrifying. The Greek *σκάνδαλον* means "snare", "trap" and "stumbling block", and it recurs in the New Testament as a wrecker of divine designs. In the Gospel of Matthew, for example, stumbling blocks are obstacles that hinder God's plan.[45] In the Pauline corpus this soteriological register is supplemented with a more pragmatic understanding of stumbling blocks as actions, words and ideas that bring a fellow human being to fall,[46] but the word is also applied to the message of the crucified Christ which in its capacity as stumbling block becomes a form of test.[47] In the monastic context, the notion of scandal is rarely addressed as directly and as elaborately as in the treatise 'Traité sur le scandale qui peut arriver même dans les Monastéres les mieux réglez' ('Treatise on the scandal that may arise even in the best-regulated abbeys') which was written by Pierre le Nain (1640–1713), who was sub-prior of La Trappe.[48] Le Nain explains that *scandale* is etymologically linked with the Greek word for limping and that "those who scandalize their brothers, wound their conscience and give them cause to fall, and with this fall, prevent them from walking straight along the way of God and cause them to deviate from the rightness of his commands".[49] Behaviour that may

cause scandal could be anything from eating meat even if one is not ill and thus exempt from the prohibition of meat[50] to yawning during the office[51] or addressing oneself to a brother without permission.[52] The Rule is the bulwark against scandal. In le Nain's words, "in so far as one observes the Ordonnances of the Rule and the brothers are united with one another in charity, it is impossible for laxness to enter the monastery".[53] The monastic community is, as it were, a disciplinary grinding stone upon which each monk's piousness is honed, but it is also a fragile milieu where it is easy to cause lapses with grave consequences. Thus a substantial part of regulations and other monastic texts are concerned with avoiding that encounters between the brothers become a cause of scandal.

Concluding remarks

Cistercian monks are human beings living together in an enclosed community and bound to a particular place. They are, generally, in that place by choice, but not together with their particular fellow monks by choice. Their life is heavily regulated and intensely surveilled and supervised. All of this happens with the one aim of cultivating a humility that is deemed necessary for salvation. While acutely geared to the particular monastic teleology, the texts that aim to shape and regulate the Cistercian community, its daily life and overall ethos come with a sharp view of human cohabitation. In the Cistercian view, in order to be effective and indeed affective, charity requires a lot of regulation.

Cistercian monks are hardly typical of human communities. Nonetheless, the monastic case offers some basic elements that are helpful for further reflection. The Cistercian monastery exhibits some robust, material and ritualized versions of thresholds and boundaries that may exist in other communities, albeit in much vaguer and more elusive forms. It reminds us of the gates and probation that mark the entry into a given community. The image of the novice, waiting at the gate, making his initiatory steps under watchful senior eyes and with regular reminders of the ethos he will be bound by, is delightfully concrete. It also reflects the special form of neighbour-love that

prevails in this community. The formalized monastic profession encourages us to look for the explicit and, more likely, implicit rites of passage that mark the entry into a given community, be it defined by material or immaterial boundaries. What happens at the threshold to the community? What does this negotiation tell us of the inherent ideal of neighbour-love? Who is excluded? In similar vein, while the tightly-knit cloistered community is something quite particular, it may perhaps help us to ponder some of the dynamics of neighbour-love exemplified elsewhere. I suggest that this highly charged mode of action and form of communication may serve as an analytical catalyst for thinking about the actions and communications that connect or disconnect people in other contexts. The day-to-day contact might incite a closer look at the physical and spiritual or mental zones and boundaries that we create around ourselves or that are imposed upon us by external norms. The radical lapsarian anthropology that underlies the Cistercian mindset as well as the interactions imbued with this mindset may seem alien to us; but it prompts us to look for anthropological assumptions underlying other instances of neighbour-love and the way in which they resurface in views of self and of others. Finally the notion of *σκἄνδἄλον* and the obligation not to cause a brother to stumble raise the question if, and if so, how this concern appears in other instances and ideals of neighbour-love.

NOTES

1 This is particularly clear in the Germanic languages where *Nächste* (German), *næste* (Danish) and *nästa* (Swedish) remind us that our neighbour is the person next to us. Cf. the chapters by Michael Azar, Christian Benne and Irina Hron in this volume.

2 A classic study of *proxemics*, the individual use of space, is Hall 1969.

3 The slippery and opaque notion of *privacy* concerns such zones. I come to neighbour-love from an engagement with notions of privacy and the private in the early modern period and research conducted at the Danish National Research Foundation Centre for Privacy Studies (DNRF138) at the University of Copenhagen. Sincere thanks are due to my colleagues at the Centre. For our approach, see my chapter Bruun 2021. No stable definition of privacy exists, but there are various schools of definitions. Some of these underline boundary drawing and access control (see, e.g., Altman 1977 and Margulis 1977) while others underline the social interaction that takes place in the regulation of information (e.g., Nissenbaum 2010).

4 This call for contextualization is in fact the opening message of Akiyama 2018, p. 1.
5 For a Latin–English version of the Rule with substantial comments as to its different elements and the character of Benedictine monasticism, see Benedict of Nursia 1980.
6 For a general introduction to the Cistercians, their ideals, historical development and life in the world, see the articles in Bruun 2013a.
7 For the 17th-century rift, see Lekai 1968. For briefer surveys, see King 1999; Casey 2013.
8 My paraphrase of the lapsarian condition sums up teaching established in the first centuries of Christianity based on literal and allegorical interpretations of the Bible. The details of this teaching vary from author to author; suffice it for our current purpose to work with the more general version, largely rooted in Augustine (354–430), which undergirds Benedictine life.
9 For these documents, see McGuire 2013. The principal study of the role of *caritas* in the worldly repercussions of the Cistercian Order remains Newman 1996. For the self-understanding created in the foundational documents, including narratives of the first settlements in the marshlands of Cîteaux, see Bruun 2008.
10 "[N]emini quicquam debeatis nisi ut invicem diligatis", *Exordium cistercii* II.13, Waddell 1999, p. 402. All translations from the Bible are from the New Revised Standard Version.
11 "In hoc ergo decreto prædicti fratres mutuæ pacis futurum præcaventes naufragium, elucidaverunt et statuerunt suisque posteris relinquerunt, quo pacto quove modo, immo qua caritate monachi eorum per abbatias in diversis mundi partibus corporibus divisi animis indissolubiliter conglutinarentur." *Carta Caritatis Prior*, Prologue, Waddell 1999, p. 442.
12 *Carta Caritatis Prior*, Waddell 1999, pp. 443–450.
13 Nygren 1953. For more on Nygren, see Ola Sigurdson's article in this volume.
14 For the concept of love in the desert fathers, see Burton-Christie 1993, pp. 261–295.
15 For the love of neighbour, see Burton-Christie 1993, pp. 263–295.
16 John Cassian 1958, 11.6–11.7, pp. 104–107.
17 John Cassian 1955, 1.7, p. 84.
18 Bernard of Clairvaux wrote a *De diligendo Deo*, Aelred of Rievaulx (1110–1167) a *De speculo caritatis*, William of Saint-Thierry (*c.* 1080–1148), a Benedictine who ended his life as a Cistercian, authored a *De contemplando deo* and a *De natura et dignitate amoris* and, finally, Beatrice of Nazareth (1200–1268) composed a *De caritate Dei et vii eius gradibus*. While diverse in tone and tenor, these works share a concern with the love between God and human with implications for love of neighbour. For a discussion of differences between these Cistercian authorities, see McGinn 1994, pp. 158–323 and, briefer, McGinn 2013.
19 Bernard's *Sermones super Cantica canticorum* were continued by Gilbert of Hoyland (d. 1172) and completed by John of Forde (*c.* 1145–1214); William of Saint-Thierry composed as much as four works on the Song, *Brevis commentatio in Cantici canticorum priora duo capita*; *Commentarius in Cantica canticorum e scriptis Sancti Ambrosii*; *Excerpta ex libris Sancti Gregorii Papae super Cantica canticorum* and, finally, *Expositio super Cantica canticorum*. For more in-depth studies of this intricate *oeuvre*, see also Pranger 1994; Verbaal 2004; Engh 2014.
20 The use of the spittoons is decreed in the 12th-century manual *Ecclesiastica Officia* (1989), 72.15, p. 215. On spittoons, see also *Constitutions de l'abbaye de la Trappe* 1671, pp. 2–4.

21 See the classical presentations of her grid/group theory in Douglas 1966; 1970.
22 "Noviter veniens quis ad conversationem, non ei facilis tribuatur ingressus", the Rule 58.1; Benedict of Nursia 1980, p. 266; trans. p. 267.
23 "[S]ciens et lege regulae constitutum quod ei ex illa die non liceat egredi de monasterio, nec collum excutere de sub iugo regulae", the Rule 58.15–16, Benedict of Nursia 1980, p. 268; trans. p. 269.
24 "[C]oram Deo et sanctis eius", the Rule 58.18, Benedict of Nursia 1980, p. 268; trans. p. 269.
25 "Res, si quas habet, aut eroget prius pauperibus aut facta sollemniter donatione conferat monasterio, nihil sibi reservatus ex omnibus, quippe qui ex illo die nec proprii corporis potestatem se habiturum scit. Mox ergo in oratorio exuatur rebus propriis quibus vestibus est et induatur rebus monasterii. Illa autem vestimenta quibus exutus est reponantur in vestiario conservanda, ut si aliquando suadenti diabolo consenserit ut egrediatur de monasterio—quod absit—tunc exutus rebus monasterii proiciatur." The Rule 58.24–28, Benedict of Nursia 1980, pp. 268–270; trans. pp. 269–271.
26 See in particular *Ecclesiastica Officia* 1989, 70–83, pp. 202–242.
27 *Ecclesiastica Officia* 1989, 70.6, p. 202.
28 Rancé 1698, p. 7.
29 *Ecclesiastica Officia* 1989, 70.3–70.13, p. 202.
30 *Ecclesiastica Officia* 1989, 72.13–72.25, p. 214.
31 Rancé 1698, pp. 27–32.
32 Rancé 1698, p. 6.
33 Rancé 1698, p. 15.
34 *Ecclesiastica Officia* 1989, 70.13–70.17, p. 214.
35 I have discussed the Trappist silence in Bruun 2013b.
36 The Rule 6.8, see also 7.57; Benedict of Nursia 1980, pp. 190 & 200. Cf. Bruce 2007 and, for a Cistercian angle, Barakat 1975.
37 Rancé 1689, vol. 1, p. 353.
38 Rancé 1683, vol. 2, p. 162.
39 See Bruun 2011.
40 *Ecclesiastica Officia* 1989, 70, pp. 203–208.
41 Rancé 1696a, p. 29.
42 Rancé 1696b, vol. 1, pp. 307–308; see also the account of his adherence to Rancé and his counsels, pp. 310–311.
43 Rancé 1696b, vol. 1, p. 325.
44 Rancé 1696b, vol. 1, pp. 307–308; my translation: "avec une simplicité qui charmoit tous ses Freres".
45 For example, Matthew 13:41: "The Son of Man will send his angels, and they will collect out of his kingdom all causes of sin and all evildoers" with "evildoers" as the translation of *σκάνδαλα*; Matthew 16:23: "But he turned and said to Peter, 'Get behind me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to me; for you are setting your mind not on divine things but on human things'"; Matthew 18:7: "Woe to the world because of stumbling blocks! Occasions for stumbling are bound to come, but woe to the one by whom the stumbling block comes!"
46 Romans 14:13: "Let us therefore no longer pass judgement on one another, but resolve instead never to put a stumbling block or hindrance in the way of another."
47 1 Corinthians 1:23: "but we proclaim Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles"; Galatians 5:11: "But my friends, why am I still being persecuted if I am still preaching circumcision? In that case the offence of the cross has been removed", with "offence" as the translation given for *σκάνδαλον*.
48 It was printed in D'Arnaudin 1715, pp. 277–360.
49 D'Arnaudin 1715, p. 278; my translation: "ceux qui scandalisent leurs fréres, blessant leur conscience, leur font un sujet de chûte, & par cette chûte, les empêchent

de marcher droit dans la voye de Dieu, & les détournent de la rectitude de ses Commandemens".

50 Rancé 1683, vol. 2, p. 221.

51 Rancé 1698, p. 5.

52 *Ecclesiastica Officia* 1989, 71.21, p. 212.

53 D'Arnaudin 1715, p. 287; my translation: "tant qu'on observe les Ordonnances de la Régle, & que les fréres seront unis les uns avec les autres par la charité, il est impossible que le relâchement s'introduise dans le Monastére".

REFERENCES

Akiyama, Kengo 2018. *The Love of Neighbour in Ancient Judaism*, Leiden: Brill.

Altman, Irwin 1977. 'Privacy regulation: Culturally universal or culturally specific?', *Journal of Social Issues* 33:3, pp. 66–84.

Barakat, Robert A. 1975. *The Cistercian Sign Language*, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications.

Benedict of Nursia 1980. *RB 1980: The Rule of St. Benedict*, eds and trans Timothy Fry, Imogene Baker, Timothy Horner, Augusta Raabe & Mark Sheridan, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.

Bernard of Clairvaux 1992. *De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae*, in *Bernhard von Clairvaux: Sämtliche Werke*, vol. 2, ed. Gerhard Winkler, Innsbruck: Tyrolia Verlag, pp. 36–135.

Bruce, Scott G. 2007. *Silence and Sign Language in Medieval Monasticism: The Cluniac Tradition, c. 900–1200*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruun, Mette Birkedal 2008. 'The wilderness as a *lieu de mémoire*: Literary deserts in Cîteaux and La Trappe', in Mette Birkedal Bruun & Stephanie Glaser eds, *Negotiating Heritage: Memories of the Middle Ages*, Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 21–42.

Bruun, Mette Birkedal 2011. 'Wandering eyes, muttering, and frowns: Bernard of Clairvaux and the communicative implications of gesture', in Steven Vanderputten ed., *Monastic Oral Communication*, Turnhout: Brepols, pp. 337–363.

Bruun, Mette Birkedal ed. 2013a. *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruun, Mette Birkedal 2013b. 'Trembling in time: Silence and meaning between Barthes, Chateaubriand and Rancé', in Babette Hellemans, Willemien Otten & Burcht Pranger eds, *Religion and Pastness*, New York: Fordham University Press, pp. 100–120.

Bruun, Mette Birkedal 2021. 'Towards an approach to early modern privacy: The retirement of the Great Condé', in Michaël Green, Lars Cyril Nørgaard & Mette Birkedal Bruun eds, *Early Modern Privacy: Sources and Approaches*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 12–60.

Burton-Christie, Douglas 1993. *The Word in the Desert: Scripture and the Quest for Holiness in Early Christian Monasticism*, Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Casey, Michael 2013. 'The Cistercian Order since 1600', in Mette Birkedal Bruun ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 50–62.
Constitutions de l'abbaye de la Trappe 1671. Paris: Michel le Petit et Estienne Michellet.
D'Arnaudin, A. 1715. *La vie de Dom Pierre le Nain, religieux et ancien souprieur de l'Abbaye de la Trappe*, Paris: Saugrain l'aîné.
Douglas, Mary 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, London: Routledge.
Douglas, Mary 1970. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*, London: Barrie and Rockliff.
'Ecclesiastica Officia' Cisterciens du XIIème siècle [Les] 1989, eds and trans Danièle Choisselet & Placide Vernet, Reiningue: Abbaye d'Œlenberg.
Engh, Line C. 2014. *Gendered Identities in Bernard of Clairvaux's 'Sermons on the Song of Songs': Performing the Bride*, Turnhout: Brepols.
Hall, Edward T. 1969. *The Hidden Dimension*, New York: Anchor Books.
Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version 1989. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
John Cassian 1955. 'Collationes', in *Jean Cassien: Conférences 1*, ed. and trans. Eugène Pichery, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
John Cassian 1958. 'Collationes', in *Jean Cassien: Conférences 2*, ed. and trans. Eugène Pichery, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
King, Peter 1999. *Western Monasticism*, Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications.
Lekai, Louis J. 1968. *The Rise of the Cistercian Strict Observance in Seventeenth Century France*, Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
Margulis, Stephen T. 1977. 'Conceptions of privacy: Current status and next steps', *Journal of Social Issues* 33:3, pp. 5–21.
McGinn, Bernard 1994. *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism*, vol. 2, *The Growth of Mysticism*, London: SCM Press.
McGinn, Bernard 2013. 'The spiritual teaching of the early Cistercians', in Mette Birkedal Bruun ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 218–232.
McGuire, Brian 2013. 'Constitutions and the General Chapter', in Mette Birkedal Bruun ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Cistercian Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 87–99.
Newman, Martha 1996. *The Boundaries of Charity: Cistercian Culture and Ecclesiastical Reform, 1098–1180*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
Nissenbaum, Helen 2010. *Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
Nygren, Anders 1953. *Agape and Eros*, trans. Philip Watson, London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Pranger, M.B. 1994. *Bernard of Clairvaux and the Shape of Monastic Thought: Broken Dreams*, Leiden: Brill.
Rancé, Armand-Jean de 1683. *De la sainteté et des devoirs de la vie monastique*, 2 vols, Paris: François Muguet.
Rancé, Armand-Jean de 1689. *La Régle de saint Benoist nouvellement traduite, & expliquée selon son veritable esprit. Par l'Auteur des Devoirs de la Vie Monastique*, 2 vols, Paris: François Muguet.
Rancé, Armand-Jean de 1696a. *Relation de la vie et de la mort de frere Palemon religieux de l'abbaye de la Trappe, Nommé dans le monde le comte de Santena*, Paris: Elie Josset.
Rancé, Armand-Jean de 1696b. 'Relation de la mort de Dom Arsene', in *Relations de la mort de quelques religieux de l'abbaye de la Trappe*, vol. 1, Paris: Florentin & Pierre Delaulne, pp. 303–336.
Rancé, Armand-Jean de 1698 [1690]. *Les Reglemens de l'Abbaye de Nostre-Dame de La Trappe en forme de constitutions qui contiennent les exercices et la maniere de vivre des Religieux*, Paris: Florentin et Pierre Delaulne.
Verbaal, Wim 2004. 'The preaching of community: Bernard of Clairvaux's sermons and the school of experience', *Medieval Sermon Studies* 48, pp. 75–90.
Waddell, Chrysogonus ed. and trans. 1999. *Narrative and Legislative Texts from Early Cîteaux*, Cîteaux: Commentarii cistercienses.