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Executive Summary

This workshop was held at Eichstätt in Germany over 3 days from 7 to 9 October 2013. Participation involved 21 people from nine different countries. The meeting aimed to promote a new transnational research programme entitled ‘Monasteries in the Shadow of Empires’, which explores the role of religious orders in the processes of state building among smaller aspirant states outside of the ‘imperial’ centres of medieval Europe. At the core was the character of religious houses in these regions and their role in the creation of distinctive and often competing cultural and political identities. Through looking at various forms of encounter and representation, the workshop debated new concepts, methods and data and tried to establish appropriate tools for a more specifically comparative and multidisciplinary investigation of medieval monasticism.

In particular, the intention of our workshop was to explore the role of religious houses and orders, notably Cistercian and Franciscan, in the process of medieval state building. This is a new and critical issue in historical studies and central to the current debate about the transformative powers of institutions, such as monasteries, in the building of regional identities and cultural traditions.

What we tried to achieve during our debates was to set a firm base for a comparative exploration of the character and impact of monasticism in relation to the wider development of regions, and in particular to those regions or aspirant states that emerged in the shadow of stronger neighbours and had clear ambitions to preserve their own political coherence and cultural traditions. There is evidence that monasteries, in the Middle Ages, played an active role in shaping and developing the distinct polities and identities of these discrete regions. Here some monasteries, through patrons often of local royal or aristocratic lineage, actively engaged in this process by drawing on local narratives and symbols of ‘native’ culture (for instance historical writing, artistic production) and binding them, syncretically, into the international agendas of the Western Church. This involvement of religious houses in preserving cultural traditions strengthened the authority of rulers seeking to resist powerful neighbours. It also acted reciprocally to the advantage of individual houses in their strategies of consolidation. Monasteries in these contexts could be recruited to projects of resistance, but other houses, even from the same order and in the same region, could also be instruments of political and cultural domination.

Our aim was to articulate perspectives for a comparative investigation of these complex relationships across time, orders and context within different examples of such regions, namely medieval Wales, Ireland, Catalonia, Galicia, Hungary, Bohemia, and representative regions from Transylvania, the Balkans, and Scandinavia.

In our discussions we have also tried to break down the disciplinary boundaries often inherent in monastic studies and have engaged a wide range of scholarship in the fields of history, archaeology, historical geography and literary and art history. We have addressed historical and theoretical issues through looking at a broad range of historical, archaeological and topographical source material, indicating the expression of identity and power, and examined their form and content in the context of political and social action in the chosen regions.

There are three key themes that were addressed in great detail and in separate sessions during the workshop:

1) Regional aspects of monasticism and state building
   ● this looked on the complex impact that religious orders and communities had in processes of state and identity building at a regional level
   1) Cultural communication and narrative
      ● this considered processes of memorialisation, including the promotion of saints’ cults, burial, the naming of places, teaching and preaching, as well as the contribution of monasteries to the production of cultural narratives or regionally focused history
      ● there was also a session that dealt with society, encounter and the engagement of monasteries with local rights and traditions through the adaptation of estate organization, farming methods and industrial production
   2) Spatial impacts: landscapes, art and iconography
• this discussed the role of art and architectural form within sacred spaces and adjacent landscapes as representatives and symbols of wider political and ideological meaning and context; in particular the uses of local style, where it was placed and how it was perceived. It also reflected on the meaning of monastic topographies as well as on art, décor, iconographies and their potential for symbolization.

These issues were evaluated in the context of the actions taken by monks and monastic agents, to construct a rounded understanding of how the monasteries may have created a presence and a role for themselves in the political and social life of distinct European regions. This presence and role would thus reflect local aspiration on the one hand and international ideologies and systems on the other: cultural fusions with a political intent. The overarching goal was to stimulate a debate to explore whether the idea of monasteries acting in the Shadow of Empires is a sustainable concept on the European scale, allowing us to build towards a major pan-European project.

2. Scientific content of the event

Welcome, greeting and presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF): All the participants were welcomed by Professor Janet BURTON and Dr. Anne MÜLLER on behalf of the convenors with a brief introduction to the theme of the workshop: medieval monasteries in the shadow of empire. The purpose of the next three days was identified as attempting to find common ground around this theme, to build a network of prospective participants in a potential major research project and to begin the process of formulating a set of methodologies and outcomes in anticipation of an application for funding. The President of the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Professor Dr. Richard SCHENK O.P., welcomed the participants of the workshop to the university which was very pleased to be hosting an academic gathering on this theme. Apologies were given for the fact that no representative from the ESF was able to be present. Instead a PowerPoint on the work and intentions of the Foundation was shown to, and appreciated by, the participants.

The following opening academic session provided a broad outline of “Monasteries in the Shadow of Empires”, aims and approaches. Janet BURTON began with a short presentation which focussed on the connections within her own work with the theme of the workshop. As a scholar of monasticism, especially the Cistercians, in the north of England she was familiar with the concept that many monasteries, in their origins, were aspirational and transitional especially in regions close to borders which, such as that between Scotland and England, were still in the process of negotiation and fluidity at the time of foundation. This influenced issues of identity and allegiance in complex political and cultural circumstances at both the local and national level. This could be related in some ways to the relationship of cores to peripheries in much the way that Emilia JAMROZIĄK has explored and problematized in her comparative work in Britain and central Europe. However, the questions can begin with the straightforward identification of why monasteries of specific orders and affiliations were founded where they were and, indeed, the converse, why were they not founded in certain places. In Cistercian studies, for example, this debate has become more complex as scholars have broken down the simple notion that this order was so strongly and centrally controlled that it produced uniform institutions in form and action across the whole of Europe. This has both spatial and temporal implications as the initial ideals were broken down by being tempered by local circumstance and changes over time. In the work of the Monastic Wales Project, which Professor BURTON directs with Karen STÖBER, such issues of border, transition and adaptability have come increasingly to the fore, especially in the Welsh-speaking areas of the north and west of Wales.

Karen STÖBER, also drawing on the work of the Monastic Wales Project, began by addressing the matter of patronage, emphasising that detailed study often revealed enormous complexity in the social relations of power at local level, especially in border or Marcher regions such as Wales. The study of a monastery
such as the Cistercian Abbey of Margam in south Wales, often caricatured as an Anglo-Norman foundation, shows that it had an overlapping network of alliances and patronage which drew in Welsh lords as well as the Anglo-Normans themselves. There was the issue too of smaller monastic houses where the interplay of local power and bigger political structures such as the state was more acute and localised patronage held a greater influence. Monasteries on frontiers, however, offered a good place to study such complexities in adaptation and fluidity: a clear example is Catalonia and the role of the regular canons. Part of the purpose of the workshop is to explore the nature of mechanisms through which change happens, such as the place of patrons in seeking to resist powerful neighbours in line with their own personal authority and ambitions. This will require specific projects as well as more general study and these will need to be interdisciplinary.

David Austin as an archaeologist has viewed the subject through the lens of material culture and in particular through the place of monasteries and their meanings within their contextual landscapes on varying scales of resolution. His approach has come via rural settlement and castle studies where the reconstruction of the local is an essential methodology. His empirical study has focussed on the Cistercian Abbey of Strata Florida in central Wales which appears to have been created under native Welsh patronage as an intellectual, cultural and political counterweight to the threat of English imperial expansion and appropriation. Constructed as a very large precinct with extensive endowments the Abbey acquired the reputation for cultural production in the Welsh language and for political support for political ambitions towards state formation among the Princes of Pura Wallia. This persisted until late in the Middle Ages and, indeed, a strong national sentiment for it still survives in contemporary culture. Professor Austin in co-convening this workshop seeks to establish whether such conscious acts of political and cultural engagement are common or unusual in the monastic experience of Europe.

Following this introduction no formal discussion was held, but much informal debate continued during the evening.

The next morning session, chaired by Dr Karen Stöber, set the frame for our theme “monasteries and state building” through looking at regional aspects. At the beginning, Beatrix Romhányi outlined comparative approaches to the role of Cistercians and Franciscans in European state building within Hungary. Cistercian Abbeys began with the first at Cikádor in 1142 in central Hungary from its mother church at Heiligenkreuz, with nineteen foundations in all, for the most part royal in patronage with only a very few private creations. By contrast the Franciscan foundations began, in a first phase of Balkan mission, in the late 1220’s and accelerated after 1260 to reach 40 friaries by the late 13\textsuperscript{th} century, while in a second phase, with the observant movement around 1500, more than 100 other friaries were founded. Less urban in location than elsewhere in Europe the foundations had royal, aristocratic and burgess patrons directing the institutions towards a spiritual defence of Hungary against the Ottoman danger. With regard to the Cistercians Dr Romhanyi focussed on the western border where the grange was not normal, rather small land estates with incomes in money rents, salt and industrial activity. The Cistercians elsewhere in Hungary were not involved in colonisation processes, but in the west there was internal colonisation (\textit{landesbau}). As for the Observant Franciscans there was an anti-Ottoman alliance between them and political elites, with an associated sacral representation if the Hungarian aristocracy with friaries attached to private residences. Friars themselves tended to be recruited from the mercantile classes in the market towns. They also had a role in promoting the Christian Hungarian Empire with missions to the Balkans and among the Orthodox populations of Hungary. One other order that needed comment was the Paulines where the foundation of their monasteries was an expression of political loyalty or alliance as in the case of Czestichowa (King Louis I) and a group including Szalonak, Banugarta Sopron and Wiener Neustadt under King Matthias Corvinus after the Hungarian lands were restored by the Emperor Frederick I.
Esther Pascua Echegaray then explored three issues in studying the transformation in inter-faith relations in Galicia and Castile-Léon with close attention to the Cistercians and Franciscans. First, the two orders developed in the expansionary period of the Reconquista, sharing certain common features within very complex networks of power. People of intellectual capacity were, through these processes, introduced into politics and social action with an ability to appropriate cultural meanings often within a lexical framework. They developed also the capacity to produce self-representation of their ideas and history, especially through the production of utopian narratives. Next, Dr Echegaray looked at three important theoretical ideas: the need to deconstruct the historiographical myths about the Cistercians and Franciscans which tend to make these narratives uniform and generalist; the need to avoid teleological narratives which ‘explain’ the presence and activities of these orders in straight, causative, lines – instead account must be taken of complexity and indeterminacy, perhaps ‘freezing’ the studies into specific periods; and finally the need to focus on agency rather than structure, having regard to competing and contending arguments, to what was possible and what was tolerable. Thirdly, Dr Echegaray looked at the two orders in turn, beginning with her earlier work in Galicia where the Cluniacs (1142-1212) had begun with a slow expansion, supporting Santiago, while the Cistercians were much more rapid, at first under two kings with geo-strategic intentions, but by the 1180’s and 90’s this royal initiative was being questioned because the monasteries were not powerful enough in their own right, having, rather, to negotiate themselves into local networks of power, including marriage alliance and the requirement to consolidate authority. Monasteries were thus local, regional and national with patterns of change and interchange which were complex in the extreme. Finally Dr Echegaray considered her more recent project, a social analysis of Castilian religious orders in the 15th century. The 14th and 15th centuries saw social turmoil in the context of two civil wars: towns were disorderly in their activities and social cohesiveness broke apart with communities set against institutions. The Friars Minor were key actors in the re-establishment of order working with the new rulers, being ecumenical but with little space for syncretism, emphasising the purity of the faith. As part of this they developed emotional discourses in the communities with the dramatization of emotional events.

Jan Kremer explained that in Bohemia the relationship to the Holy Roman Empire was complex and in the 12th century power was shifting away from aristocratic families. The first wave of monastic foundation was of the Benedictines, followed, in the second half of the twelfth century, by the regular canons. Changing alliances and changes in rulership in medieval Bohemia caused a shift from its situation in the ‘shadow of empire’ into its centre. He stressed the importance of the new orders in the introduction of charters, and the transition from oral to written recording. There is a debate among Czech historians about the emergence of the three states as an interpretational framework and expressed the opinion that the word ‘state’ was problematic in this context, and he addressed the issue of different ethnic groups in Bohemian communities. There was a need for an in-depth study of the regular canons and the mendicant orders.

Looking at medieval Denmark, Kurt Villads Jensen then explained that in this region the monasteries were directly implicated in the state building process. The first Cistercian Abbey was founded by Archbishop Eskil of Lund at Herrevad in 1142; then Vitskøl in 1158 with land granted by King Valdemar I; Sorø was re-founded as Cistercian in 1161 under the patronage of the powerful Hvide dynasty of Zealand; and Tvis next in 1163 endowed by Prince Buris. There were 13 in all. The Franciscans followed a similar trajectory. Professor Jensen focussed on three main points: regum et sacerdotum in state cults and royal burial; the role of the monasteries in royal and religious expansion; and the place of the writing of history in monasteries as mythopoesis. The matter of royal control of the church begins with the dispute between the Emperor and Danish kings about the appointment to arch-dioeceses which was not resolved until the creation of Lund in 1103, following which there was close royal and ecclesiastical cooperation until the mid 13th century. At this time and until the early 14th century, in the successive reigns of Erik IV, Christopher I, Erik V and Erik VI, the crown was in bitter dispute with the church, a dispute
in which the monastic orders took different positions with the Cistercians supporting the church and the Dominicans on the side of the king. Earlier, in the better times, a royal cult centre of St Cnut was begun at the Benedictine monastery at Ringsted, while later, during the Kalmar Union, the cult of saint kings in Scandinavia was consolidated, although this was complicated by the new Nordic Saint, Birgitta. The monasteries also took a role in the expansion of the Danish state and its central Christian ideology. This was achieved through preaching and the founding of monasteries in missionary areas, the Dominicans in Estonia and Finland and the Cistercians in Mecklenburg and Pomerania with different families in specific areas, the Clairvaux lineage in Denmark itself and Morimond in the Saxon region. Monks too were the authors of historical narratives which laid down the myths of origin for Danish power and authority in the north of Europe. For example Saxo Grammaticus, clerk to Archbishop Absalon of Lund and perhaps a Cistercian, in the Gesta Danorum of c. 1200, asserted the claim of Denmark to have been an empire before Charlemagne and the Germans. A similar text was the Annales Ryensis written at the Cistercian house of Ryd: it was equally anti-German in its tone. A different type of text was the Exordium Monasterii Carae Insulae which created a foundation narrative for the Cistercian monastery of Øm, but one which is integrated into the politics of Denmark. A similar text was the Annales Ryensis written at the Cistercian house of Ryd: it was equally anti-German in its tone. A different type of text was the Exordium Monasterii Carae Insulae which created a foundation narrative for the Cistercian monastery of Øm, but one which is integrated into the politics of Denmark. In conclusion Professor Jensen made five other points: there was no simple pattern of difference between Cistercians and Franciscans; there was not much regional identity in the material culture of the monasteries; internal competition between the monasteries was as important as any contrast with the Empire; the most important aspect was the writing of historical narratives as mythopoesis; and Cistercians and Franciscans ought to be studied alongside other orders.

In the following discussion the role of post-medieval history and historiography in the shaping of our perceptions was raised, with many supporting the notion that this needed to be constantly critiqued to avoid the traps created by being teleological in our narratives. The social context was also felt to be important with a clear understanding of the role of women, for example. There was also felt to be a need for some theorised and critical exploration of key concepts such as ‘state’, ‘kingship’ and ‘empire’ which were overly simplistic and tended to deny discourses of complexity.

Chaired by Prof. William MARX, the subsequent session was looking at structures and the role of cultural communication and narrative in the process of identity building. Kateřina HORNÍČKOVÁ first discussed the cult of saints in Bohemia which arrived with royal feudalism and the role of women in their promotion. Treasuries within monasteries founded by royal families held relics related to these dynasties, a trend to be found also among aristocratic families, but these are less well-documented. In the promotion of cults the local power of saints was exploited through the physical presence and tangibility of the relics, especially those of martyrs, and in this way saints could be appropriated by a region and have an influence on regional development. A clear example of this is the change from a cult of St Peter to that of St Wenceslas when Moravia was acquired by Bohemia in 1130. In addition, where new dynasties were establishing themselves at the local level, saint cults were created to match the development of this local dynastic power. In Central Europe in general, saints are typically those of dynasties with a direct connection between religious and secular power: in Prague the episcopal seat and cathedral were built in the castle. Relics were often appropriated through monastic networks with the Benedictines early on creating founder or missionary saint cults with some being translated to Austria via monastic expansion and the reform movements of the 11th and 12th centuries (Augustinian and Cistercian). Centralising powers were more often competing than collaborating, something that was reflected in the use of cults and the appropriation of relics through royal and aristocratic patronage. This was linked also to economic purposes with the development of pilgrimage centres focussed on the cult with the monasteries entering the public stage through the presentation of relics and their display in imperial ceremonies, especially after Charles IV introduced the imperial cult in the mid 14th century. For this Prague monasteries were used for fostering certain cults, especially Bohemian national and imperial saints, with the expansion of cults in Bohemia being a
symbolic manifestation of close relations between these monasteries and the royal house. The Cistercians had particularly close links which they used for obtaining and authenticating relics, an active and sometimes aggressive process. Indeed the foundation of monasteries was a stabilising factor for new frontiers and the appropriation of relics such as the holy crown enhanced the importance of religious houses and their place in political power and strategy. Relics in the 14th century were distributed to monasteries to strengthen their local ties, and, to further enhance their authority in the 15th century, monasteries developed complex ceremonies around multiple relics often donated by the local elites. In the Hussite wars these cults of saints end in the affected areas, but continued in areas supported by local Catholic nobility where they had clear political connotations. There was thus complex identity construction through the use of national and regional saints, but research on this is currently underdeveloped with a particular lack of more profound studies.

Rudolf Kilian WEIGAND began by outlining the research on late medieval sermons being conducted in Eichstätt (Forschungsstelle für geistliche Literatur des Mittelalters) opening with those of Meister Eckhart in 1983. A key aspect of this work has been to view sermons in their contemporary context since they are products of social negotiation. It is essential, therefore, to look at manuscripts as they were actually produced, for example, the edition of Thomas de Cantimpré ‘Liber de natura rerum’. We have tended to read how modern historians interpret medieval texts, but this is problematic if we want to try to get at what medieval authors actually say, that is what was the essence of the text for a medieval audience. Two of the key preachers were Meister Eckhart and Johannes Tauler over a period of c.100 years from 1260 to 1361, when the Dominicans were very successful in vernacular sermons. Traditionally these have been edited by author and theme but this suppresses the local and contextual complexities. There are 82 sermons by Johannes Tauler (c. 1300-61), but these exist only as the vernacular texts themselves without Latin versions of contemporary commentary. This is in contrast to the 130 extant sermons of Meister Eckhart. These have all been edited and inserted into a database with two main fields: manuscript and text. This is now available at http://pik.kn.de. Sermons were the “mass media” of the Middle Ages with extensive audiences for both text and oral delivery. They were sources of information for the courts of the elite, with the clergy acting as intermediaries between them and the communities. Sermons also were events with different elements of society gathered together in one place. By the fifteenth century there could be upwards of 5 hours preaching in a single day, with sermons being repeated in a number of different locations.

Dafydd JOHNSTON talked about the promotion of ‘national’ histories within a group of Welsh Cistercian houses, especially Valle Crucis, Aberconwy and Strata Florida. These were part of a family of Cistercian Abbeys originating in Whitland and founded specifically under the patronage of Welsh native princes in those areas known as Pura Wallia which remained beyond English control until the later 13th century. Wales in the Middle Ages did not exist as a nation, but was rather a number of small principalities periodically in conflict with each other, although an aspiration to a coherent statehood did exist and this inspired resistance to conquest certainly until 1282 when the last native prince Llywelyn ap Gruffydd was killed. Thereafter it continued to have an ambiguous political existence until it was finally incorporated into the English State with the Act of Union of 1536. Within this time frame the Cistercians had an important role in the production of texts in the Welsh language and their houses were clearly focuses of native political resistance and ideology. For example, in 1238 Llywelyn ap Iorwerth, Prince of Gwynedd and Wales, called a meeting of all his vassals and allies at Strata Florida Abbey to confirm the succession of his son to the hegemony he controlled in the name of a Princedom of Wales, and in 1274 the seven abbots of the native abbeys met at the same place to compose a letter to the Pope in support of Llywelyn ap Gruffydd. The Cistercians were thus linking regional powers and part of this was the preservation and production of texts, and, although it is difficult to identify definitively where a manuscript was produced, research in recent years has provided better evidence to point to a Cistercian provenance for key documents.
One of these is the Hendregadredd Manuscript, a collection of praise poems in Welsh by professional court poets of the 12th-13th centuries which is now known to have been produced at Strata Florida c.1300. There are a number of scribes involved and the sources for the individual items seem to draw on the Welsh Cistercian network and the result gives a powerful sense of national identity. Another important text for the Welsh ‘myth of origin’ is the Book of Aneirin containing the earliest Welsh poetry, supposedly late 6th century, especially the Gododdin. There are two hands and one at least can be associated with the Abbey of Aberconwy. A critical text in the construction of an heroic British and Welsh past was Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia Regum Britanniae which was preserved, if not created, by monks of both Strata Florida and Valle Crucis. The role of Welsh Cistercians in the writing of Welsh history is more certain in the case of the earliest truly Welsh chronicle, the Brut Y Tywowsogyon with versions in both Latin and Welsh. This is closely associated with Strata Florida. The mother house at Whitland is, in turn, closely associated with the preservation and production of the Welsh Law Codes of Hywel Dda which are so important in identifying the structures of Welsh society and the binding processes of legal provision. There seems then to have been a conscious programme of cultural conservation by Welsh Cistercians in the 12th and 13th centuries with key myths in Welsh history being promoted such as “survival in defeat”, with some evidence that this continued through links with local lay patrons into whose hands some of these manuscripts were passed to create a persistent sentiment of resistance.

In the ensuing discussion it emerged that the foundation charter of Valle Crucis made reference to the fact that the Abbey was created at the behest of the Abbots of four existing native Cistercian houses, thus reinforcing the sense of a conscious intention in their development. Comparison was also made with Ireland where the national myth was fully formed by the 12th century before the new orders were established, but even so this was in the context of pre-reform monasteries, albeit under the influence of powerful local lay rulers. On the theme of sermons it was noted that in Hungary the surviving texts were entirely in Latin, although probably delivered originally in the vernacular. The were probably used as training texts in a situation where power was highly centralised and there was little political space for monasteries to act within communities.

Taking up the dynamics of cultural encounters, the first session in the afternoon, which was chaired by Professor Janet BURTON, also focused on expressions of identity and power in regional contexts. In particular it discussed diverse contexts for adaptability and accommodation, be it economic, such as estate organisation and farming methods, or religious as through the cult of saints. Emilia JAMROZIANK set out a series of research questions concerning the place of monasticism in East-Central and Northern Europe. As the model of centre-periphery is very limiting in examining such trans-European structures as the Cistercian order we need to find new ways to address the reasons for the successful spread of monastic communities on the frontier of the Latin world. However, the understanding of monastic dynamics cannot be restricted to the earlier period (12-13th c.), but should address the later middle ages too. The relative lack of studies on traditional monasticism in the later middle ages across Europe leads to the perpetuation of the myth of decline, especially in the face of mendicant movement that superseded the cloistered monastic communities. Even if such black-and-white image is not shared by medievalists anymore (but certainly very influential in popular literature and interpretations presented at many monastic sites) better understanding of post-1300 monasticism, not only in the core of Western Europe (traditionally seen as the norm), but the frontier in the north (Scandinavia, northern England, Scotland) and east-central parts of the continent (Pomerania, Poland, Silesia, Bohemia and several smaller regions within their boundaries) that experienced important political, economic and cultural change. As Dr. JAMROZIANK has emphasized in her discussion and also argued in her most recent publications, the success of the Cistercian order was primarily linked to their adaptability within the parameters of identity that allowed accommodation without loss of distinctiveness. Such direction of study will allow us to better understand the degree of agency of
monastic communities in relation to both central and dispersed political powers. The examination of the nature of encounters of monastic communities with the outside world should encompass several areas: the role of cultural capital of monasteries at the point of foundations in the 12th century; encounters with patrons and benefactors within the intercessory roles and hospitality; the encounters with the dead and the role of burials; finally, the encounters though *cura animarum* and various forms of interaction with the lay piety. Regarding her role in the future direction of the research project, Dr. JAMROZIAK suggests new investigation on the cultural encounters on the intra-regional frontiers in East-Central Europe between 1300 and 1550, in particular a study of the role of Cistercian monasteries and nunneries on the Germanic-Slavonic frontier in this region. The core idea of this approach is to understand both the place of these communities within their immediate regions and in the relation to dispersed centres of political authority and signifiers of regional identity.

The theme of László FERENCZI’s presentation was Cistercian economic practices in Central Eastern Europe and its social background. He underlined problems related to the interpretation of written as well as landscape archaeological evidence concerning especially the problem of grange economy. Differing practices are paralleled with the flexible use of terminology in the sources, as well as the heterogeneity of the available source materials, which are all circumstances underpinning the importance of regional and comparative approaches. In terms of social historical contexts, there are only a few Cistercian sites where evidence is suitable. The speaker stressed here that more in depth research is needed to understand the context of Cistercian patronage, looking at certain regions and counties as a whole. However, a new social historical enquiry is also needed to map familial - political ties between different types of noble family. Obviously, the late medieval period especially offers a promising opportunity with regard to this. Attention was drawn to the fact that there are other contexts which have not been looked at in detail in terms of late medieval patronage of monasteries. Namely, the changes in religious practices, the growing importance of pilgrimages, indulgences to certain institutions, the possible political context of promoting certain religious institutions by granting indulgences, different layers of meaning attributed to the cult of certain types of relics might be highlighted in the framework of case studies. By and large the late medieval period was an economic downturn for most Cistercian monasteries. Nevertheless, what L. FERENCZI suggests is that future discussion should include investigation of the above mentioned issues that might explain why certain monasteries managed to cope with less favourable economic conditions by building on these issues, or reorganizing the management of the estate.

Bringing us to the Franciscan Order in late medieval Transylvania, Carmen FLOREA discussed the ways that the Mendicant communities contributed to the shaping of cultural identities. Her paper concentrated on the strategy devised by the Observant Franciscans in the domain of saints' cults. The friars’ apostolate had to meet both the exigencies of their order and the local circumstances under which they pursued their ministry. From this point of view, the cults promoted by the friars can be regarded as highly valuable indicators of the modalities with which the Observant Franciscans not only preserved their identity, but also contributed to the creation of specific cultural identities in the territories where they settled. In order to illustrate the ‘mechanics’ of saints cult, Florea offered two case studies. The first one concerned the free royal town of Cluj, where the Observant Franciscans did not manage to establish a convent until the end of the fifteenth century (in 1486), but evidence of their apostolate dates back to 1451 when an indulgence has been granted to the altar of St. Francis placed in the parish church of the town. The Franciscans’ impact on the parishioners' religious life is even better revealed by the functioning of a Franciscan confraternity, mentioned in 1462 as being organized and pursuing its religious goal around the altar of St. Francis from the town's most important parish church. Another cult strongly promoted by the Observant was that of St. Anne and one was able to trace the Franciscan propagation of this devotion in Transylvania by scrutinizing the supervision the convent in Tg.-Mures undertook regarding the house of the tertiarys in the town. It has been observed
that the legend of St. Anne compiled in this convent for the use of female religious was turned to educational purposes, intending to enforce a specific way of life and pious conduct.

When it comes to a comparative analysis of saints’ cults as part of a future collaborative project, what C. FLOREA suggests is a new study of Franciscan agency in the propagation of saints’ cults in Transylvania. On the one hand, this topic would fit from a quantitative point of view into the overall idea of “Monasteries in the Shadow of Empires”, as the Observant Franciscans managed to create a strong network of convents in this region. Further, a more qualitative approach would examine the form and function of cults the Franciscans promoted. Were these cults popular in the core regions of the Latin Christendom? Or, on the contrary, given the particular features of Transylvania (cultural diversity through the presence of different ethnic and linguistic groups, high degree of ecclesiastical autonomy in what concerns the urban churches and those on noble domains, an intensified urbanization process in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) did the friars ingeniously adapt the propagation of the cults they sustained to the religious needs and expectations of Transylvanian late medieval society?

Chaired by Professor David AUSTIN, session three in the broad thematic field of “structures of identity” moved on to spatial impacts: landscapes, art and iconography. Jozsef LASZLOSKY argued that traditional historiographies have focussed either on one monastery or on one order (universal or regional). The ‘traditional’ monastic map shows ‘important’ western sites – this applies to both histories written from documentary sources and from monastic excavations. He held up Mick Aston and Tim Pestell as exceptions to this pattern in working within the British landscape history tradition. In Germany a similar form of study, ‘Klosterlandschaft’ by Melville and Meier is, however, not the same as monastic landscapes. He then suggested scales on which we might look on monasteries and their impact on the landscape. The first was the large-scale European, where we might think of western and eastern zones, with an emphasis on interaction, notably missionary activity. Research issues in relation to this might be:

- A general lack of written evidence
- Chronological discrepancy. These are generally ‘later’ foundations.
- The problems of the church hierarchy. What is the ‘general’ and what is the ‘local’?
- The presence of different churches – Orthodox and Latin

An example of a monastery in the shadow of two empires (Byzantine and Roman) is the Benedictine abbey of Somogyvar, a foundation of King Ladislaus I, sited in a county castle and housing invited French monks. This was a local / regional house but in the shadow of empires. The presentation then looked at the waves of Cistercian foundations in terms of chronology and spatial distribution, and also of affiliation. The main example used was Cilcador. It also looked at exploratory models. The paper suggested exploring the following phases:

1. The first foundation, followed by a long period with no foundations
2. The next wave, under Bela III, with local impact, and in the shadow of empires
3. The 12th and 13th centuries, with mixed forms of direct and local foundations
4. The first decade of the 13th centuries, with major new foundations and attempts at a new empire (Hungary).

Turning to the Friars Minor, the presentation commented on the site of the Friars Minor at Buda, Esztergau, Visegrad. There was a close connection with royal palaces and urban settlement and spatial interaction. A suggested research proposal might look at three levels of investigation:

1. Major historical / geographical regions – but look at general trends and get away from national narratives
2. Large monastic landscapes – the interaction of monasteries, political power, socio-economic processes
3. Case studies of well-selected single monasteries
Tadhg O’KEEFFE introduced a number of Irish sites, including Buttevant, co.Cork, founded by David de Barry in 1251. This was a frontier town and the friary was a centrepiece of a new town in Gaelic Irish territory. The castle and the parish church lie to the south [in the old town] and in a line of sight from the friary. There is a discourse or dialogue between the two. There is an unusual crypt: did the crypt start life as a castle and was the friary built on top of the castle? The very elaborate tower was inserted in 1271 on the death of the founder. The 15th-century transept is the portion visible from the castle. The triumphal arch is important and recalls Aachen. The house was dissolved in 1540 and given to English settlers. The narratives are historical, architectural, landscape (historical), historiographical, and those of a national metanarrative (identity, contestation of power, acculturation). The challenge is therefore to find a way to knit the type of narratives together and find a new methodology to unite the different methodologies, to understand the differences rather than aim at comparisons. He suggested:

1. Trajectories (not teleology)
2. A multiplicity of trajectories – intersection of architectural traditions; regular tradition; familial / political articulation of power; agency – though not about the individual or individualism.
3. Localities – questions of scale, space and place, experience / recognition / cognition
4. The space in between – the question of double or layered identities

Margit MERSCH focussed on the Franciscans in Cyprus and how the Franciscans here and elsewhere built a power base in the Mediterranean, as the Lusignan kings of Cyprus tried to ease tensions between East and West. The speaker looked in particular at the location of the mendicants in Nicosia and Famagusta and moves from rural to urban sites. The mendicants in Cyprus had a political and a pastoral role. The presentation also looked at the role of the mendicants in Crete and in the relations between Latins and Greeks. This involved an investigation of the location of convents in relation to Venetian and Greek topographies, and the design and style of churches (particularly in comparison to those in Italy). In Cyprus there was a close connection with the royal court, and the tendency was to work against the interests of Venice, pursuing accommodation and peace, and missionary activity, rather than a western agenda. In Greece many houses were small and rural.

By looking at Ireland as an island’s experience with European cultural and spiritual encounters, Edel BREATCHNACH then raised the questions of cores and peripheries and what these actually meant. The spiritual aspects of monasticism are often forgotten in other narratives. The encounter is between God and man. The landscape is the portal into the medieval mind and is a trigger to movement through the environment. The remainder of the presentation looked at a number of sites and how they acted as triggers:

1. Baltinglass, co Wicklow (Cistercian). This is a ‘classic’ Cistercian site in a fertile river valley. The name suggests a strategic pass and this is between S and N Leinster. The putative kings needed to hold this pass. The house was founded 1148/50 by Diarmait MacMurchada, king of Leinster, who brought the Anglo-Normans to Ireland and was therefore vilified. He also brought Cistercians to Ireland in the shadow of reform by church and papacy.

2. Hore Abbey, co Tipperary (Cistercian). This was a thirteenth-century foundation made at the foot of the Rock of Cashel. This was a royal ceremonial centre where the kings of Munster were inaugurated. Up to 1101 it was held by the kings of Munster and then gifted to the church as part of the reform movement. It became the metropolitan centre of southern Ireland. The site was transformed and a Gothic cathedral added. There were a Dominican house and a Franciscan house, and Hore abbey was established c. 1272. An urban ecclesiastical site grew up around a ceremonial site.

3. Timoleague, co Cork. Franciscan – from pre-Norman to friars and lords. This was the church of an early Irish saint, and may have been intended by an Irish lord to be a Cistercian
foundation. The Cistercians did not stay and the Franciscans took over the site. This had a coastal location and its wealth came from fishing. It was a conduit for cultural influence.

The final and last morning session, chaired by Anne Müller, began with a presentation by Christina Lutter on ‘Social and cultural communities across monastic, civic, and courtly cultures in high and late medieval Central Europe’, in which she introduced a new interdisciplinary research project at the University of Vienna. She explained the nature and methodology of the project, which looks at visions of communities, and comparative approaches to ethnicity, region and empire in Christianity, Islam, and Buddhism, 400-1600. The key region in question comprises the eastern part of the Austrian Empire, and the key research question addressed was the investigation of the role of ethnicity and religion between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries in relation to other categories of affiliation. She looked at the crucial role of monastic orders and houses, at how social affiliation was created by small groups, and at how social spaces (courts, cities, religious institutions) enacted and negotiated within social relations and interactions. These social spaces provided the framework for groups becoming communities (imagined, enacted, real, felt). The presentation further investigated the textual, pictorial, material, and architectural genres for representing communities; the terms, notions, and languages, employed and their function; strategies of representation; models of identification. This demonstrated the scope for comparative studies of monasteries in Austria (both single monasteries and regions), and on monastic landscapes.

3. Assessment of the results, contribution to the future direction of the field, outcome

In the final round table discussion David Austin invited comments on taking the workshop forward to a major project, and the shape and content such a project might take, what themes it might develop. Professor Austin suggested that we had all agreed that we would need to define a scale of resolution, but that everyone seemed to be in agreement on a methodology of comparative study, and that the approach was non-teleological but one of notions and acts of perception, narratives of social complexities, and cultural production.

Esther Pascua Echegaray commented on the conception of two words, culture and identity, which are open and every changing and commented that the adoption of the vernacular in language and iconography was not always a defence of localism but may be about innovation of meaning. There is an issue of complexity. Jozef Laszlovszky expressed unease (confirmed by several papers) about the use of the word ‘empire’ in the title of the workshop, as well as the notion of ‘state-building’ as applied, for instance, to the tenth century. He was happy with the notion of cultural production, and suggested how monastic networks could lead to ‘knowledge transfer’, transmitting types of knowledge that came to be used in different ways. The Cistercians and Franciscans give scale and contacts, distribution patterns and substantial networks. He therefore approved the selection of these two groups. He commented that good comparative work needs good datasets.

Margit Mersch urged that we look at gender in monastic networks – there is much going on in female monastic networks. Kurt Villads-Jensen remarked that behind ‘empire’ is still the idea of a core and peripheries which needs to be circumvented. He stressed the importance of regionality and of avoiding the ‘old and new’ Europe. We need to look at the mendicants as a whole and not just the Franciscans, and at other areas such as Portugal, southern France, and Italy.
Edel BHREATHNACH stressed that monasticism interceded for all society and it is when they are perceived to cease doing this that the need for reform kicks in. Piety (which must not be forgotten) is reflected in the shifting cult of saints. The medieval mentalité is that piety transcends politics.

Beatrix ROMHANYI commented on scale and resolution: the diffusion of groups at different rates and with different techniques of dispersal. Rudolf WEIGAND was of the opinion that monastic networks needed to be set in the context of other networks (such as educational). Emilia JAMROZIĄK suggested the term ‘knowledge horizon’ – monasteries tell stories about their own past and retelling the past can be about the imagined past of patrons as well as communities. Christina LUTTER spoke of the quality of religious people as intercessors, and the spiritual and material economy are two sides of the same coin. This may also relate to the gender issue. In terms of social networks she suggested that it is helpful to use low-threshold vocabulary. She agreed with the problem of core-periphery vocabulary and stressed that we need to stress the regions. These regions are not conceived of as centre.

Tadhg O’KEEFFE thought that ‘empire’ was a difficult word. There is confusion between the Holy Roman Empire and aspirations blocs such as England and the English in Ireland. There were competing hegemonies in Europe and we need to be careful about terminology. Sophisticated methodologies are needed and we need sensitivity to the range of things that questions can answer (if we ask the right ones). Religious groups are knowledge communities. They are bounded by rules but also by the knowledge they own. Perhaps we could talk about ‘Building Europe’ rather than ‘State Building’. Carmen FLOREA saw three main aspects: terminology; chronology; methodologies. A comparative approach could be limiting – we need a broad comparative framework and this leads to the question of scale. ‘Shaping Europe’ is a possibility.

Dafydd JOHNSTON asked about the composition of the proposed group: should it remain as it is or go pan-European? Jan KREMER raised problems of vocabulary and meaning – the need to define culture and communities. Christina LUTTER added that we could link terminology and theory to methodology. She liked Joszef LASZLOVSKY’S three level suggestion. Esther Pascua ECHEGARAY thought that shadow of empires is a metaphor, and added that Portugal should be included. We need to identify moments of change. Joszef LASZLOVSKY stressed that we need to make clear what we want to compare and why – a set of criteria.

There was thus an energetic discussion and a great deal of commonality and a range of suggestions were put forward for future directions of this project. There was a strong consensus among those present that the work begun within the framework of the ESF-funded workshop was well-conceived and should be developed further, and that it should involve the participation of the members of the invited group, as well as a number of additional scholars from countries including Portugal and southern France in order to give the project a truly pan-European dimension. Moreover, the focus on certain religious groups ought to be widened to include other orders, notably the regular canons.

Our aim will now be to make a full funding application for the ‘Monasteries in the Shadow of Empire’ project. As a first step we would seek small-scale financial support in order to facilitate a follow-up meeting of the four convenors and three other members of the group attending the ESF-funded workshop, in order to create a project development team and to further develop a major funding application. At the heart of this application will be the three-level suggestion made by Joszef LASZLOVSKY, and which was discussed in the closing debate of the workshop. Key aspects in a future application are the comparative multi-disciplinary methodology emphasized by several participants, as well as the importance of a rigorous theoretical underpinning based on agency and non-teleological narrative.
4. Final programme

Monday, 7 Oct. 2013

Venue:
Bischöfliches Seminar (Episcopal Seminar) Collegium Willibaldinum
Room: Prinz Max von Sachsen, F222
Leonrodplatz 3, 85072 Eichstätt

Afternoon  
17:00-17:30  Welcome by the convenors and greeting from Richard Schenk OP, President of the Catholic University Eichstätt-Ingolstadt
17:30-17:50  Presentation of the European Science Foundation (ESF) (Scientific Review Group for the Humanities)
17:50-18:40  Broad outline of “Monasteries in the Shadow of Empires”; aims and approaches

Janet Burton (University of Wales Trinity Saint David, Lampeter, UK); Karen Stöber (Universitat de Lleida, Spain); David Austin (University of Wales Trinity Saint David, Lampeter, UK); Anne Müller (University of Wales Trinity Saint David, Lampeter, UK)

Dinner in the Restaurant "Trompete"

Tuesday, 8 Oct. 2013

Venue:
Bischöfliches Seminar (Episcopal Seminar) Collegium Willibaldinum
Room: Prinz Max von Sachsen, F222
Leonrodplatz 3, 85072 Eichstätt

09:00-10:40  I. Session: Setting the Frame
Monasteries and state building: regional aspects
chair: Karen Stöber (Universitat de Lleida, Spain)

09:00-09:20  “Hungary”
Beatrix Romhányi (Károli Gáspár Calvinist University, Budapest, Hungary)

09:20-09:40  “Galicia and Castile-Léon”
Esther Pascua Echegaray (Madrid Open University, Spain)

09:40-10:00  “Bohemia”
Jan Kremer (Academy of Sciences, Pragues, Czech Republic)

10:00-10:20  “Denmark”
Kurt Villads Jensen (University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark)

10:20-10:40  Discussion
10:40-11:00  Coffee / Tea Break
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
<td><strong>II. Session: Looking at structures of identity</strong></td>
<td>William Marx</td>
<td>Kateřina Horníčková</td>
<td>Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:20</td>
<td><strong>“Cult of Saints”</strong></td>
<td>William Marx</td>
<td>Kateřina Horníčková</td>
<td>Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20-11:40</td>
<td><strong>“Preaching”</strong></td>
<td>Rudolf Kulian Weigand</td>
<td>Catholic University Eichstätt, Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:40-12:00</td>
<td><strong>“Promotion of ‘national’ histories”</strong></td>
<td>Dafydd Johnston</td>
<td>Centre for Advanced Welsh &amp; Celtic Studies, Aberystwyth, UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:30</td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-14:00</td>
<td><strong>Lunch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-14:20</td>
<td><strong>Part II: Society, economy, and encounter</strong></td>
<td>Janet Burton</td>
<td>Emilia Jamroziak</td>
<td>University of Leeds, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:20-14:40</td>
<td><strong>Society, economy, and encounter in medieval Hungary</strong></td>
<td>Janet Burton</td>
<td>László Ferenczi</td>
<td>Central European University Budapest, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:40-15:00</td>
<td><strong>Society and Medicant communities in Transilvania</strong></td>
<td>Janet Burton</td>
<td>Carmen Florea</td>
<td>University Babeș Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-15:20</td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:20-16:40</td>
<td><strong>Coffee / tea break with a visit of the Cathedral of Eichstätt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:40-17:00</td>
<td><strong>Part III: Spatial impacts: landscapes, art and iconography</strong></td>
<td>David Austin</td>
<td>József Laszlovszky</td>
<td>Central European University Budapest, Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-17:20</td>
<td><strong>Space and architecture in monastic Ireland</strong></td>
<td>David Austin</td>
<td>Tadhg O’Keefe</td>
<td>University College Dublin, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:20-17:40</td>
<td><strong>Franciscan spaces in Mediterranean</strong></td>
<td>David Austin</td>
<td>Margit Mersch</td>
<td>University Kassel, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:40-18:00</td>
<td><strong>Monastic Ireland and Europe: material culture</strong></td>
<td>David Austin</td>
<td>Edel Bhreathnach</td>
<td>Discovery Programme, Dublin, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00-18:30</td>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dinner in the Restaurant “Krone”*
Wednesday, 9 Oct. 2013

Venue:  
Conference Room of the Benedictine Abbey St. Walburg  
Walburgisberg, 85072 Eichstätt

09:00-11:00  Morning Session: Perspectives

09:00-09:30  “Social and cultural communities across medieval monastic, civic, and courtly cultures in high and late medieval Central Europe – presentation of a new interdisciplinary research project at the University Vienna”  
Christina Lutter  (University Vienna, Austria)

09:30-11:30  Round Table discussion: perspectives for the pan-European project “Monasteries in the Shadow of Empires”

11:30  End of the Workshop

12:00  Shuttle service to Munich Airport
5. Final list of participants

1. David AUSTIN  
   School of Archaeology, History and Anthropology  
   University of Wales Trinity Saint David

2. Edel BHREATHNACH  
   Discovery Programme Ireland  
   Dublin

3. Janet BURTON  
   School of Archaeology, History and Anthropology  
   University of Wales Trinity Saint David

4. László FERENCZI  
   Department of Medieval Studies  
   Central European University

5. Carmen FLOREA  
   University Babeş Bolyai, Cluj  
   Faculty of History and Philosophy

6. Kateřina HORNÍČKOVA  
   Austrian Academy of Sciences Vienna

7. Emilia JAMROZIAK  
   School of History  
   University of Leeds

8. Dafydd JOHNSTON  
   Centre for Advanced Welsh & Celtic Studies  
   University of Wales

9. Jan KREMER  
   Centre for Medieval Studies  
   Acad. of Sciences Prague  
   Charles University Prague

10. József LASZLOVSZKY  
    Department of Medieval Studies  
    Central European University

11. Christina LUTTER  
    Institute of Austrian Historical Research  
    University Vienna

12. William MARX  
    Center for Cultural Studies  
    University of Wales Trinity Saint David

13. Margit MERSCH  
    Department of Medieval History  
    University Kassel

14. Anne MÜLLER  
    School of Archaeology, History and Anthropology  
    University of Wales Trinity Saint David  
    currently: Zweckverband Kloster Heidenheim

15. Esther PASCUA ECHEGARAY
6. Statistical information on participants

**Austria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gender/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dr. Lutter, Christina</td>
<td>Institute of Austrian Historical Research, University Vienna</td>
<td>F/42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Horníčková, Kateřina</td>
<td>Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna</td>
<td>F/35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Czech Republic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gender/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mag. Jan Kremer</td>
<td>Centre for Medieval Studies; Acad. of Sciences Prague</td>
<td>M/29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Denmark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gender/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Kurt Villads Jensen</td>
<td>Center for Medieval Studies</td>
<td>M/sen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Germany**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gender/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anne Müller</td>
<td>University of Wales Trinity Saint David; Zweckverband Kloster Heidenheim</td>
<td>F/43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Rudolf Kilian Weigand</td>
<td>Catholic University Eichstätt</td>
<td>M/sen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mersch, Margit</td>
<td>University Kassel, Dep. of Medieval History</td>
<td>F/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Richard Schenk</td>
<td>Catholic University Eichstätt</td>
<td>M/sen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hungary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Gender/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Laszlovszky, József</td>
<td>Central European University Budapest</td>
<td>M/54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dr. Romhányi, Beatrix</td>
<td>Calvinist University Budapest</td>
<td>F/56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferenczi, László, M.A.</td>
<td>Central European University Budapest</td>
<td>M/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Dr. Breathnach, Edel (University College Dublin, Micheál O’Cléirigh Institute)</td>
<td>F/sen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Dr. O’Keefe, Tadgh (University College Dublin, School of Archaeology)</td>
<td>M/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Dr. Florea, Carmen (University Babeş Bolyai, Cluj; Faculty of History and Philosophy)</td>
<td>F/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Dr. Stöber, Karen (University of Lleida; Faculty of Philosophy)</td>
<td>F/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pascua Echegaray Esther, M.A. (Madrid Open University)</td>
<td>F/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Austin David (University of Wales Trinity Saint David)</td>
<td>M/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Burton, Janet (University of Wales Trinity Saint David)</td>
<td>F/59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Jamroziak, Emilia (Univ. of Leeds, Dep. of History)</td>
<td>F/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Johnston, Dafydd, (Centre for Advanced Welsh &amp; Celtic Studies, Aberystwyth)</td>
<td>M/56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. William Marx (University of Wales Trinity Saint David)</td>
<td>M/sen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Austria: 2
- Czech Republic: 1
- Denmark: 1
- Germany: 4 (incl. local organizer, with her current working place in Germany)
- Hungary: 3
- Ireland: 2
- Romania: 1
- Spain: 2
- UK: 5

Female: 11
Male: 10