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I
THE SETTING
TWELFTH-CENTURY EUROPE

The twelfth is the only century which all scholars agree is medieval. Many would probably also assert that it represents the culmination of all that is signified by that term. Yet this century, far from being the placid plateau which such characterizations might seem to connote, was a time of great change, development, and conflict. Economically and socially, feudalism with its rural and local orientation, for centuries the basic order of European life, was rapidly being destroyed by the rise of a new commercial economy and a new urban way of life that accompanied it. The social disorder and cultural alienation which always accompany such major changes was present in abundance, and it had effects in every other aspect of twelfth-century life and thought.

The Political Background

Politically, several contradictory developments were taking place. The German empire was regarded as the continuation of the western Roman Empire on the ground of a papal transfer of imperial authority from the Greek to the German rulers. Although by this transfer the German emperors theoretically ruled all of western Europe, their actual control had long since been limited chiefly to Germany, and even there it had often enough been very insecure. But in this century, as a result of a succession of ambitious and able emperors, the empire was once more moving toward the fulfilment of its theory
through the extension of its effective rule over other parts of Eu-
rope, and first of all over Italy. But in that very expansion, the
empire encountered two other forces which opposed and ultimately
frustrated its claim to universality. The first of these was the
papacy. The papacy was not hostile to the idea of a universal earth-
ly empire in itself—it had formulated the theory of the transfer of
imperial authority precisely in order to preserve the tradition of
empire. But it had also come to regard itself as the senior partner
in relation to the empire, and had fought many challenges to its inde-
pendence and seniority with considerable success. In the twelfth cen-
tury, filled with the zeal and success of the reform movement, it was
not disposed to permit any imperial encroachment on its spiritual or
temporal prerogatives. The other force which the expanding empire en-
countered was the rise of local or regional consciousness and cohesive-
ness in Europe. This development was taking the form of more or less
stable nation-states in England and France, and of city-states in Ita-
ly. Norman Sicily was an especially aggressive example of the devel-
opment. During the previous century this kingdom had driven the last
vestiges of Byzantine power from Italy, and now it aimed quite openly
at further conquests both in Italy and in Byzantium. Finally, Byzan-
tium itself, although not one of the dominating forces in western Eu-
ropean politics, must also be recognized as a significant factor in
the scene, since it hoped not only to defend itself against the ambi-
tions of the Normans and the Turks, but actually to re-establish its
sovereignty throughout Europe in due time. The politics of the period
is a kaleidoscope of changing alliances and maneuvers, as each of the
powers involved sought to maintain and improve its position vis à vis the others.

Intellectual Developments

However weak and defensive Byzantium was politically during this period, intellectually it was the source of much that was new in Europe. There was a tremendous influx of Greek learning into the West, partly through a revival of the study of Greek language and literature in the West, but even more through a flood of newly-translated works which poured from the pens of several outstanding Latin translators living in Constantinople and others living in the formerly Byzantine regions of Sicily and southern Italy. Literary, philosophical, scientific, and theological works alike were translated. Some of these were simply improved translations of works which were previously available, but many of them, such as Aristotle's later works, had never before been translated. Anastos says that

so numerous and widespread were the manifestations of the penetration of Hellenic ideas into the life and thought of the West in this era that the twelfth century must be considered a turning point in the history of civilization on this account. ¹

The question whether there was also any direct influence of contemporary Byzantine thought on the development of Western thought during the period is uncertain. Uspensky's cautious conclusion quoted by

Vasiliev seems to be the most that can surely be affirmed at present:

"The circle of ideas in which the European mind was working from the eleventh to the thirteenth century was the same that we find in Byzantium."² But there is no question of the tremendous influence of the new translations, which found ready homes in the rapidly proliferating urban cathedral schools which were powerfully challenging the rural monastic centers for the intellectual leadership of western Europe.

In particular, the introduction of the later works of Aristotle provided the basis for a new outlook which was very different from the predominantly neo-platonic, mystical, and symbolic mentality of the earlier middle ages, and the new schools soon became the strongholds of the new philosophical doctrines. Men like Bernard of Clairvaux repeatedly pointed out the limitations of the new philosophical outlook, while not rejecting it entirely, and rebuked the arrogance of some of its practitioners who presumed in the excitement of their new weapons that they were now able to resolve all mysteries and discover all truth. But influential as Bernard was, his point of view did not modify either the ardor of the enthusiasts or their gradual prevalence on the intellectual scene.

It seems in fact that a new and different outlook was almost deliberately being sought for in this period; at least it is difficult to account for the speed with which the analytical replaced the mystical orientation without some such factor. Thus, the new books and the

new schools were instruments and occasions of the ferment of change in
the twelfth century; but the actual causes of that ferment are to be
sought in certain other realities underlying events.

First of all, the extensive social changes of the time tended
to make men more aware of change in general and of the need for new
answers to new problems. In his book Nature, Man and Society in the
Twelfth Century, which is an indispensable guide to the period, Chenu
discusses four other elements of twelfth century intellectual culture
which were basic to its openness to change. First was the maturing
theological assimilation of the Church fathers of the patristic age,
which had been pored over for so many centuries:

The proliferation of florilegia, their didactic manipulation in
the schools, the rival interpretation of texts with ill-defined
implications—all these things tended increasingly to impose the
principle of progress. Each of the Fathers was situated, delim­
ited, and characterized, with the effect of making his authority
only relative.\footnote{Chenu, M.-D., Nature, Man and Society in the Twelfth Century, ed.
and tr. by J. Taylor and L. K. Little (Chicago: University of Chicago
Press, 1968), p. 315.}

This development, which resulted in the questioning of the great St.
Augustine himself, was hastened, but by no means initiated, by the
newly re-introduced Greek logical texts. The centuries of meditation
on the Holy Scriptures bore its own intellectual fruit also.

There was now growing up a conscious awareness of the historicity
of the Bible, and thus of religious man, a historicity whose prin­
ciple was the supremacy of God, not only over all the cosmos, but
over all earthly events, . . . events which were no longer merely
the stuff of quickly allegorized symbols in which their reality
was dissolved.\footnote{Chenu, p. 175.}
Likewise, the acculturation of the barbarians who inhabited Europe, which had been proceeding for centuries, reached a maturity at this time.

In the twelfth century we find ourselves in an age when, in the Western Christian people, thanks to the spread of culture and thanks even more to a sensational apostolic awakening, became collectively aware of their environment and sought to rationalize it.\(^5\)

Chenu here mentions also the fourth element, the evangelical awakening, to which we will return, and which obliquely contributed to the fore-mentioned developments.

At a time when the symbol of the Primitive Church was to nourish evangelical awakenings, it [a renewed interest in history] represented a desire to find the major demands on the life of the Church inscribed in its early history.\(^6\)

Thus the problems of social change, the fruits of cultural formation and theological study, and a powerful spiritual renewal alike made the twelfth century peculiarly receptive to the new and very different intellectual directions which the influx of new literature of every sort made possible.

The Development of Historical Consciousness

The predominant trend in most of the new schools at this time was focussed on the concept of nature and the newly-discovered categories of Aristotle. Such a concern was essentially a-historical, "de-temporalized and de-existentialized," as Chenu says.\(^7\) But this was not the only direction of development, as he goes on to emphasize.

During the same twelfth century, certain men, sometimes the same

---

\(^5\) Chenu, p. xvii. \(^6\) Chenu, p. 176. \(^7\) p. 162.
ones, were following a wholly different line of thought, bringing their curiosity and talent to bear on humanity itself. In their view, the works and deeds of humanity, under the providence of God—the God of the Bible and not of Nature, God as Redeemer and not as the One—comprized a "universe" other than the physical: the human universe of sacred history. During the second half of the century these historians were far closer to the evangelical awakening of the Church than the philosophizing masters closed up in their dialectic in the schools.

Although it would be a long time before the study of ecclesiastical or general history would be incorporated into the curriculum of the schools, nevertheless in the perspective of centuries the twelfth century development of a consciousness of history and of historical change appears as the most original contribution of the period to the cultural heritage of the West. The development was, as Gilson implies, inevitable in any civilization permeated by Christianity. "How could a civilization," he writes, "believe in the fixity and permanence of things when its own sacred books—that is to say the Bible and the Gospel—were history books?" But still, it had to occur in fact, and this it did in the twelfth century.

An interest in the events of the past was not, of course, utterly new in western Europe. For centuries monastic chroniclers had been reporting events both ancient and contemporary; and the Venerable Bede, more than four centuries earlier, had shown the qualities of an excellent historian. Most of the twelfth century historians, like their

8Chenu, p. 163.


10Chenu, p. 168.
forerunners, were monks and inherited their traditions of historical interest. Far from the urban schools and their a-historical influences, many of them were far closer to the actual centers in which the history of the time was being made, namely at the imperial and royal courts as spiritual advisers to emperors and princes, living in the thick of the political battles by which Europe was being formed. This is the case with the greatest twelfth century historians such as Ordericus Vitalis, who traced the Norman adventures in England, Italy, and Aragon, William of Malmsbury and Matthew Paris, who were the historians and apologists of the Plantagenets, and Otto of Freising, both uncle and historian to the emperor Frederick Barbarossa. The only schoolman to contribute significantly to this development was Hugh of St. Victor, whose pedagogy favored the "understanding of Christian revelation as a series of events and thus an appreciation of the human and divine values of history."

The mental framework of twelfth century historians was largely theological and symbolist, as we might expect. All history begins with creation and ends in eschatology, and most works contained a great deal of typology and allegory along with the events narrated between these supra-historical events. As Chenu puts it,

11 History was generally despised in the schools. See Ghellinck, J. de, L'essor de la littérature latine au XIIe siècle (2d ed., 2 vols.; Brussels, 1955), II, 90: "The ironic history of history: eliminated by so cultured a writer as Peter Damian from the list of activities worthy of a monk ('ludicrously useless annals, frivolous telling of frivolous old wives' tales'), it was almost entirely by the efforts of monks that history regained life in the Middle Ages, and by their efforts that it flourished brilliantly."

12Chenu, p. 164.  
13Chenu, p. 165.  
14Chenu, p. 168.
The historian, however taken up with the concrete reality of his story, was yet inclined to dabble in symbolism, tempted to transfer analogically to the era of the Church the typology which was the law of the Old Testament, and which did not easily defer to any allegorical interpretation of Biblical history.\textsuperscript{15}

The really significant history in their view was that contained in the Holy Scriptures and carried on in the course of ecclesiastical history, into which all secular history had to be fitted to attain significance. Thus all the historians regarded as the chief significance of the pagan Roman Empire the fact that it was the last of a succession of ancient empires, ... a providential preparation for the age of Christ, in the course of history as well as in the geography of salvation. ... The crucial role of this destiny was the role which the empire played in unifying mankind, rendering all men open to the workings of grace.\textsuperscript{16}

And most of them regarded the Christian Roman Empire as a similarly providential continuation of the same work. "The unity of the empire," writes Chenu of their outlook, "in realizing the unity of the world, thereby realized the condition of the universal Kingdom of Christ."\textsuperscript{17}

The chronological schemes by which history was organized were usually drawn from the Bible. The four world orders found in Daniel, a seven-fold scheme based on the days of creation or the seven seals of the Apocalypse, and several versions of a three-fold scheme analogous to the Trinity were all used.\textsuperscript{18} But during the century attempts were also made if not to displace the biblical classification of history into

\textsuperscript{15}Chenu, p. 191. \textsuperscript{16}Chenu, p. 185. \textsuperscript{17}Chenu, p. 185. \textsuperscript{18}Chenu, pp. 179–90. The chief versions of the three-fold scheme were: (1) the times before the Law, under the Law, and under Grace; (2) sacred history, pre-Christian secular history, and the era since Christ; and (3) the age of the Father (Old Testament), the age of the Son (New Testament), and the age of the Holy Spirit (the history of the Church).
ages, at least to re-introduce the non-sacred categories of world history into it, whether through employing ancient sources or through new attentiveness to the actual unfolding of recent events.¹⁹

One of these attempts was the division of history into periods corresponding with an individual human life. This scheme favored the pedagogical conception of an order in which God began by treating humanity like an infant. The theologians continued to exploit the instructive potential of this parallelism; but historians drew from it, even for Christianity, an evolutionary perspective on institutions and events.²⁰

The flaw in this particular framework was that the final pre-eschatological age was that of old age and decay, and although such an ending would be consonant with the Greek view of history as a decline from a golden age, it was not harmonious with the presuppositions of twelfth century Christian historians, for whom history was moving toward a great cataclysm followed by everlasting fulfilment (for the blessed), rather than either a mere cessation of existence or another revolution of identical ages. Thus the use of the individual human life as the image of history was soon abandoned.²¹

Toward the end of the century, historians writing in the vernacular languages appeared, especially in England and France. This development reflected a continuing "secularization and popularization of history,"²² and a growing immersion in the temporal and its immediacy and totality, as contrasted with the older Latin historical tradition which was never entirely free from an underlying doctrinal con-

¹⁹Chenu, p. 27. ²⁰Chenu, p. 181. ²¹Chenu, p. 181.

The power of this awakening of historical consciousness, in which Anselm of Havelberg holds a leading place, is seen in that at the beginning of the thirteenth century it broke into official ecclesiastical thought. Canon 50 of the Fourth Lateran Council, dealing with a rather minor issue, included the following general statement of principle:

It ought not to be judged reprehensible if human institutions sometimes adapt to changing times, especially when urgent necessity or obvious utility demands it. God himself often changed in the New Testament what he had established in the old.\(^2^4\)

Chenu remarks that

the statement acknowledges not only the fact of a change in the times, but also the purely religious perception of the progressive working out in history of God's plan, as Anselm of Havelberg as well as others in the twelfth century had already understood it.\(^2^5\)

He concludes that the awakening of an active awareness of human history in men's minds is "not the least splendid achievement of Latin Christendom in the twelfth century."\(^2^6\)

Turning next to the spiritual development of the twelfth cen-

\(^2^3\)Chenu, p. 198.
\(^2^4\)Hefele-Leclercq, Histoire des conciles d'après les documents originaux (2d ed.; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1907-1921), II/2, 1372: "Non debet reprehensibile judicari, si secundum varietatem temporum statuta quandoque variatur humana, praesertim cum urgens necessitas vel evidens utilitas id exposcit, quoniam ipse Deus, ex his quae in Vcreti Testamento statuerat, nonnulla mutavit in Novo."
\(^2^5\)Chenu, p. 327.  \(^2^6\)Chenu, p. 162.
tury, we find as we would expect that it is very much interwoven with
the social, economic, political, and intellectual developments. In-
deed, so tumultuous were events that, as Chenu asserts,

in the twelfth century Christians found themselves having to make
various clear-cut religious choices even before they had the
chance to orient themselves intellectually.27

What is generally known as the Reform Movement in the eleventh cen-
tury was actually a part of a powerful evangelical awakening. And
although the great reform issue of Lay Investiture was settled by
compromise early in the twelfth century, the religious fervor and
zeal which underlay it continued to have ever-wider effects.

One of these effects was the rapid development and multiplica-
tion of new religious communities. These communities shared with the
traditional Benedictine monasticism the principle of the sharing of
goods and fortunes in communal living—this had always been regarded
as a necessary element in what was called the vita apostolica, the
apostolic life envisioned in the Gospel. But beyond this, some of the
new communities varied profoundly from the monastic standard. Instead
of the *Regula* of St. Benedict they followed any number of rules, old,
new or mixed. Instead of contemplation they inculcated preaching, es-
pecially itinerant preaching. Instead of a rural life they embraced
an urban. Indeed, they were the Church's response to the new urban
society, although neither they nor their critics were fully aware of
this sociological aspect of their reality.

The evangelical awakening exemplified by the mendicant brotherhoods
is set in the human context of rising guilds and religious confra-

27Chenu, p. 203.
ternities, of new generations of city-dwellers who are the objects of their ministry and the source of their recruits, of university schools in which the leading lights of the orders take their seats as masters of science and apostles of catholicity. 28

Many of these new communities were lay communities, some were composed of both lay and clerical members. Chenu notes that "beginning well before the time of Peter Waldo and up through the success of St. Francis, lay men were among the most active agents of the apostolic life." 29 This in itself was a radical innovation for the time. St. Benedict himself had been a lay man and in his Regula envisioned a primarily lay community, but for several centuries previous to the twelfth, a scholarly and liturgical orientation had replaced the original emphasis and had transformed the monasteries into predominantly clerical communities.

Moreover, many of the new lay communities adopted the most radical principle of all, that of communal poverty, claiming that this was an essential part of the vita apostolica. Like communal living, the principle of poverty had always been taken to be essential to the vita apostolica; but although monks could possess nothing personally, monasteries corporately could and did possess property. Given the patient and successful work of the monasteries over the centuries, not only in the service of God but in the conversion, acculturation, and education of Europe, it is not difficult to see why they became essential, honored, and even wealthy parts of feudal society. In any case, the adoption of communal as well as personal poverty was both shocking and genuinely radical. And at the same time it probably was, as Chenu

28 Chenu, p. xvii.  
29 Chenu, p. 220.
believes, the key to the impact of the new communities on the new
society which was emerging.

The Gospel was the leaven in the dough; but the leaven, through
too much kneading, seemed to have lost its effect. Now it re-
gained its original force. Poverty made the necessary break, for
it represented both a rejection of the avarice and vanity of the
new world and a liberation from the temporal security of the old
regime. 30

Most of the lay communities were local, probably many died
out after short terms of existence, and some were or became clearly
heretical or schismatic, or at least, as Salet has said, "aberrant
and anarchical." 31 But the importance of the movement cannot be mini-
mized, and was not overlooked at the time. Bernold of Constance,
writing in 1091, commented on them thus:

In these times there flourished in many places in the German King-
dom the common life, not only among priests and monks committed to
religious stability, but indeed among laymen, who offered them-

selves and their belongings very devotedly to this common life,
who although not seen to be dressed as either priests or monks,
were by no means to be thought unequal to those in merit. . . .  Wherefore,
the envy of the devil incited certain men to jealousy
against the most upright way of life of these brethren, and got
them to snap at it with the sharp tooth of malice, even though
they could see that these brethren were living communally in the
pattern of the primitive Church. . . . An innumerable multitude,
of women as well as of men, took up this kind of life in these
times, so that they might live together in obedience to priests or
to monks and most faithfully discharge for them the weight of the
daily service of auxiliaries. And there were in these villages
countless peasants' daughters who renounced marriage and society
to live in obedience to priests. But married people themselves
strve to live no less religiously and to obey religious men with
great devotion. Moreover, this pursuit, strongest in Germany,

30Chenu, p. 235.
31Salet, G. (Ed. and Tr.), Anselme de Havelberg: Dialogues:
Livre I—Renouveau dans l'eglise, Vol. CXVIII of Sources Chrétiennes,
n. 3.
flourished impressively everywhere there. 32

And before the turn of that century Pope Urban II, both a Cluniac monk and a zealous reformer, strongly supported the movement in the bull Quosdam accepimus:

We have learned about those who are agitating against the custom of your communities, in which you receive under obedience laymen who renounce the world and devote themselves and their belongings to the common life. However, we approve of this way of life and of this custom, having inspected them as if with our own eyes, and found them praiseworthy and all the more worthy of being perpetuated for their being cast in the form of the primitive Church. We consider them holy and catholic, and by virtue of our apostolic authority we confirm them with this letter. 33

The evangelical awakening and the new urban society had a powerful effect on the secular clergy also. Bihlmeyer sums this up as follows:

The religious fervor and ascetical spirit of the period were reflected in the secular clergy, and many of them attached to cathedral and larger parish churches (collegiate churches) began to live the vita communis or canonica as had been the practice in Carolingian times. The Lateran Synods of 1059 under Nicholas II and of 1063 under Alexander II exhorted priests, deacons and subdeacons to share their income, dwelling and fare, and to live an apostolic, that is, a common life. When the great leaders of ecclesiastical reform such as Hildebrand (Gregory VII), Peter Damian, Anselm of Lucca and Ivo of Chartres, and in Germany, the noted Provost Gerhoh of Reichersberg in Upper Austria, encouraged the movement, it spread more rapidly. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries many of the cathedral and collegiate chapters adopted a monastic rule, and thus canonici saeculares became canonici regulares. The majority of the chapters embraced the so-called rule of St. Augustine, a collection of ascetical instructions of the great Doctor (especially in Epistola 211 to the nuns of Hippo) which began to be regarded as a religious rule during the seventh or eighth century. The chapter members living according to this rule were called Augustinians or Augustinian Canons. At first there was no bond of union between the various houses, but in the course of time as new foundations were made or as reforms were carried out, houses were united into congregations some of which num-

32 Quoted in Chenu, p. 221, n. 38. 33 Quoted in Chenu, p. 220, n. 38.
bered more than a hundred establishments. The Canon movement be-
came a strong support for the more conservative course in church 
reform. It expressed a new view of the priesthood, and exerted a 
salutary influence on the spiritual life of clergy and people; but 
its most valuable contribution to the Church was the systematiza-
tion of parish work and the care of souls. 34

Naturally, many of these communities, like the lay communities, were 
located in or near towns, and all were missionary or at least pastoral 
in outlook. Yet, as Bihlmeyer says, these clerical communities repre-
sented a "more conservative course" of renewal. This fact is neither 
happenstance nor a sign of clerical incompetence. Chenu puts his 
finger on the cause:

It is consistently true that when the Church, in circumstances 
like these, seeks to find again its proper theater of activity in 
the world, it has recourse to laymen, who are familiar with and 
inhabit this world, and not first to clerics, who have more or 
less abandoned it. 35

These new communities then, both clerical and lay, constituted 
a tremendous challenge to the previously unquestioned predominance of 
monasticism, both in theory, by their reformulation of the vita apos-
tolica, and in fact, by their very popularity and success. But monas-
ticism was not without its defenders. One of the most outstanding of 
the many monks who undertook to re-assert the complete identity be-
tween the apostolic and the monastic life, and to show the error of 
those who set forth different ideas about the matter, was the Cluniac 
abbot Rupert of Deutz. Yet the very title of his defense, The Really 
Apostolic Life, hints at the defensiveness and querulousness of a man

34 Bihlmeyer, K., and H. Tiuchle, Church History, tr. by V. E. 
35 Chenu, p. 220.
driven against his will to justify himself and to assert of his ways what once had needed no defense, and indeed even now should need none in his eyes. Yet there was the unassailable fact, continually pointed out by the adherents of the new ideas, that the apostles had, after all, traveled about, and had preached to the people. Rupert, like other defenders of the exclusive legitimacy of the old ways, vigorously protested the changes made in the traditional monastic garb, and explained at length the symbolic importance of each item of it—which in itself indicates a certain insensitivity to the larger realities with which they were dealing.

The real response, however, of monasticism, not merely to the challenge to its hegemony of the spiritual life, but to the entire age and the evangelical awakening, was not this defensive posture at all, but a new phenomenon which revealed its continuing creative power: the Cistercian reform begun by Stephen Harding and so ably forwarded by Bernard of Clairvaux. The Cistercians remained true to those aspects of contemporary Benedictinism which were derived from St. Benedict's Regula: they were, for example, contemplative in spirit and rural in orientation. But in other respects they sought a renewal of the basic Benedictine simplicity and apostolicity of life. Liturgy, architecture, and manners alike were greatly simplified, scholarship

---

36 See Rupert of Deutz, De vita vere apostolica: Dialogorum libri V, in Patrologiae latinae cursus completus, ed. by J. P. Migne (Paris: Apud Garnier Fratres, 1890), CLXX, 609-684. (This collection is henceforth cited as P.L.)

37 Chenu, p. 214.

38 Rupert of Deutz, V, 22.
was de-emphasized, and manual labor was restored as an essential element of monastic life. Strong efforts, moreover, were made to break out of the embrace of feudalism: the institution of lay brothers both ended the need for serf labor on Cistercian lands and brought unlettered but devout laymen into vital connection with a spiritual milieu.

The growth of the Cistercian order (for the communities were organized into an order very early as a means of holding the individual houses to the reform ideals they had espoused) was tremendous. Well before the end of the twelfth century more than one hundred houses were scattered all over Europe, and this growth continued for centuries, although during that time its character was somewhat modified. But its success shows that its founders had seen accurately and reached out unerringly to meet a real and pressing need in the contemporary Church.

Yet in the end the challenge to monasticism was successful, in that henceforth the monastic life would be not the but only one way of the religious life, and that not the predominant way because of its continuing rural orientation in a town-oriented society. The success of the new communities and orders in ending the dominance of Benedictine monasticism in Western Christendom appears most clearly in the new forms of devotion which sprang up to supplement or supplant the monastic Daily Office as the staple of prayer.

Under pressure from the mass of the faithful, the uniformity of liturgical practice gave way; the monastic or canonical office be-

---

came something for religious who specialized in worship. There took place an extensive proliferation of popular forms of prayer: chaplets, rosaries, celebration of the joyful mysteries of Mary's life, etc., as well as some contemplative observances. The penitential system was transformed: a new psychological orientation was institutionalized in sacramental confession.40

Chenu sums up the spiritual development of the twelfth century and its significance well:

As the vital centers of civilization shifted, as towns assumed political and economic importance, as markets gave rise to a class of merchants and the perpetual circulation of money and men, as an ever greater number of men escaped feudal ties, as culture developed away from the old monastic schools, as the taste for liberty was aroused along with the fraternal solidarity of guilds and leagues, the approaches and methods of the monasteries no longer suited the needs of the age. But prelates and abbots were for the most part insensitive to the immense changes which were taking place, whether peacefully or violently, right before their eyes.41

The definition of the Christian life, far from being shaped about the monastic life as in Rupert of Deutz, on the contrary came to be formulated in its own terms, independent of the peculiarities of this or that state. The monastery could no longer be considered the "city of God" to which one would lead society. Society existed, and Christians lived in it; to do so was their calling.42

In a two-fold, yet unique impulse, the return to the primitive apostolic life, ignoring monastic feudalism, demanded and obtained the Christians' presence in the world. No longer was it a question of polarizing the perfect life through the monastic ideal and creating on earth an adumbration of the City of God; rather was it a question of casting the evangelical leaven into a world in which a new civilization was rising out from under the oppressive weight of feudalism.

Mere moral purification inspired by a zeal for personal reform was not by itself enough—the twelfth century already abounded with that; wanted now was the refraction of the Gospel's truth throughout a determinate social structure; wanted was the Church's encounter with the world, an encounter to be accomplished by a pure and forthright witness, but one sensitive to the values of the new society, rather than by the apparatus of a Christianity powerful—and compromised—by its establishment.43

40Chenu, p. 228. 41Chenu, p. 231. 42Chenu, p. 222. 43Chenu, p. 38.
Finally we must look more closely at one of these new communi-
ties, the one considered by Bihlmeyer the most outstanding of the
clerical responses to the spiritual awakening, both because it exem-
plifies the new spirit and also because of its particular relevance to
Anselm of Havelberg. The order of Canons Regular was founded by Nor-
bert of Xanten. Norbert was born around 1080, his father being Count
of Gennep in the Duchy of Cleves and his mother a cousin of Emperor
Henry IV of Germany. In time he became a canon at Xanten, and after
a powerful conversion experience he sought to persuade his fellow can-
ons to embrace a stricter mode of life more harmonious with the Gospel.
He failed in this effort, and leaving Xanten to undertake itinerant
preaching, he gradually gathered a band of like-minded men around him.
After asking and receiving the approval of Pope Gelasius II in 1118 and
of his successor Pope Callixtus II the following year at the Council of
Reims, he founded his community in 1120 on some property given to him
by Bernard of Clairvaux in the beautiful and desolate valley of Prémon-
tré (from which the order is called Praemonstratensian) about twelve
miles West of Laon. On Christmas Day, 1121, Norbert and forty follow-
ers first assumed the white habits and cloaks from which the order re-
ceived another of its names, that of the White Canons.

From the very beginning there was a close relationship between

44 Bihlmeyer-Triechle, II, 222.

45 Gasquet, (Card.), *Monastic Life in the Middle Ages* (London:
Bell, 1922), p. 243; also King, A. A., *Liturgy of the Religious Or-
Premontre and Citeaux. This resulted initially from the friendship between Norbert and Bernard of Clairvaux, but at an early date it was formalized in a document of brotherly concord between the two orders. Like the Cistercian, the Praemonstratensian order grew very rapidly. Its first general chapter in 1130, consisting of the abbots of all its houses, was attended by nearly one hundred abbots. By the fourteenth century, there were about 650 houses throughout Europe. The first Praemonstratensian convent for women was founded in 1122 at Premontre. The order also appears to have been the first to establish a "third order" for seculars, although the exact date of its beginning is not certain.

Norbert himself left Premontre in 1126 to become archbishop of Magdeburg at the request of Emperor Lothar II. By this move he became "one of the most prominent spiritual princes of the realm." But the change did not involve any turning away from his first purpose. Magdeburg was at the Eastern frontier of Christendom, and Norbert introduced Praemonstratensians as his suffragan bishops (Anselm was one of the first of these appointments), and also established a number of houses of the order for the purpose of converting the Slavs to the East. He died there in the spring of 1134.

A modern historian of the order characterizes it as "basically

47 King, p. 160.
48 King, p. 160.
49 Gasquet, p. 244.
50 Bihlmeyer-Tüchle, p. 222.
liturgical," but this was probably not its bent, at least in its first years. King states that the order's earliest liturgical statutes show positively an amalgam of existing usages and "various elements current in twelfth century France," and negatively a systematic elimination of "the external pomp of Cluny and the ostentation of Mainz." And Bihlmeyer states that although Norbert "gave his disciples the Augustinian rule with statutes strongly influenced by Cîteaux and the Consuetudines of Cluny and Hirsau," nevertheless "unlike the older orders, the Praemonstratensians from the beginning devoted themselves chiefly to preaching and the care of souls." Moreover, although a strong eucharistic cult did arise in the order after Norbert's successful preaching crusade against the heresy of Tanchelin in Flanders (1124-1125), nevertheless there were at Prémontré no more than nine altars for a community of over 500—certainly no indication of a strong emphasis on a priestly liturgical life in the community. Overall, it would seem that the liturgical element of communal life in Norbert's community was deliberately kept simple in favor of its missionary and pastoral endeavors.

It seems also that Norbert established the office of "Provost" (praepositus, first man [of equals] in his order to replace the monastic "Abbot" with all its accumulated prelatical and feudal connotations. "Provost" remained in use in the German Praemonstratensian houses for centuries—it endured the longest in Saxony—but

---

52 King, p. 172. 53 Bihlmeyer-Tuchle, p. 222. 54 King, p. 199.
eventually "Abbot" was substituted for it in conformity with the rest of the order.\textsuperscript{55} Beyond this attempt to break away from monastic traditions, Norbert impressed his order with a spirit which was at once missionary, strict and reforming, and contemplative.\textsuperscript{56} It may be that all these emphases are not simultaneously attainable in one community. The rule of St. Augustine\textsuperscript{57} which Norbert adopted, would lend itself satisfactorily to any or all emphases, but was not necessarily capable of holding them in unity.

In any case it is significant that Norbert's successor at Prémontré in 1126 was not Provost, but Abbot Hugh of Fosses, who ruled the mother house until his death in 1164. During this time the contemplative aspects of the order became dominant in all its houses West of Germany, to the complete exclusion of the missionary emphasis which had so governed Norbert. Then over a period of several centuries this completely monastic orientation spread throughout the German houses of the order.\textsuperscript{58}

This then is the setting—the material, political, intellectual, and spiritual milieu, and the particular religious outlook, for he was most likely an early disciple of Norbert—of the life and work of Anselm of Havelberg, to which we now turn.

\textsuperscript{55}King, p. 203. \textsuperscript{56}King, p. 159.


\textsuperscript{58}King, p. 159.
Relatively little is known about the course of life of Anselm of Havelberg, and nothing about his early years. Recent speculation regarding his birthplace inclines to Burgundy, although Liège, Saxony, the Rhenish frontier, and even Italy have been suggested.\(^1\) No certain date has even been suggested, although a later limit of 1100 can be established.\(^2\) It is thought that he may have studied theology and philosophy under Ralph of Laon,\(^3\) and more definitely held that he became a Praemonstratensian canon, indeed that he was one of the first disciples of Norbert of Xanten.\(^4\) In two extensive articles published in 1832, Riedel traced Anselm's *curriculum vitae* between 1129 and the


\(^2\) Fina, XXXII (1956), 79. The canonical age for episcopal conse­cration at the time was thirty years, and since Anselm was consecrated in 1129, he could not have been born in any year later than 1100.

\(^3\) Bayol, III, 458; Versteylen, A., "Anselm d'Havelberg," *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique* (1932-), I, 697; and Salet, p. 8, who regards this as a certainty.

date of his death in some detail. A more recent listing of the documentary evidence on which any such account must rest indicates that at some points Riedel must have employed informed speculation on the basis of his close acquaintance with the contemporary history of the Brandenburg March and the German emperors. Nevertheless, no scholars have disputed more than occasional details of his account.

The Imperial Bishop (1129-1146)

In 1129, Anselm was consecrated bishop of the diocese of Havelberg by Norbert, who had become the archbishop of Magdeburg three years earlier. Both Havelberg and Magdeburg, of which it was a suffragan see, lie along the Havel River, which at that time was the frontier between Germans and Slavs. North and East of the Havel were the semi-pagan Wends, the western-most branch of the Slavic peoples, who had, with varying success, been resisting German efforts to evangelize and dominate them ever since the emperor Otto I had established


7 Riedel is the editor of Codex diplomaticus Brandenburgensis: Sammlung der Urkunden, Chroniken, und sonstigen Quellenschriften für die Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg und ihrer Regenten (3 vols.; Berlin: F. H. Morin, 1843).

8 Hauck, IV, 971.
the see of Havelberg in 948.9 Brandenburg itself had only been
wrested conclusively from the Wends in 1127,10 and Havelberg would
continue to change hands until 1184, when German control became per­
manent.11 At the time of Anselm's consecration, his see was control­
led by the Wends, and he was not able to enter it until 1131, when
Lothar II conquered the area once more.12

It is unlikely that Anselm spent much time in Havelberg after
his first entry into the diocese, because he is known to have been
active and influential in the imperial court of Lothar during this
period. Lothar had been elected king of the Romans by the German
princes in 1125, and had supported Innocent II's claim to the papacy
following a divided vote of the college of cardinals in 1130. Anselm
accompanied Lothar on his Italian campaign of 1133, in which Lothar
conducted Pope Innocent to Rome and established him at the Lateran
over the objections of the Roman senate and people.13 Since Anselm
was a strong adherent of the reform movement and the reformed papacy,14
he may well have been instrumental in securing Lothar's agreement to
acts of homage to the pope which were later used as evidence for the
theory that the empire was a papal fief. Anselm was back in Germany

9Vlasto, A. P., The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom (Cam­
of Central and Eastern Europe (London: Polish Research Center, Ltd.,
1949), p. 51, gives 954 as the date of the founding of the see.


13"Innocent II," Encyclopedia Americana (New York: Americana
Corporation, 1958), XV, 143.

14Hauck, IV, 193.
in time to attend the Synod of Mainz that autumn. Archbishop Norbert
died on June 6, 1134, and Anselm presided at his funeral in the Mag-

In 1135, Lothar chose Anselm to head an embassy to the Byzant­
tine Emperor John Comnenos (r. 1118-1143), to plan concerted action
against Roger II of Sicily,\footnote{Fina, XXXII (1956), 94.} whose expansionist aims threatened
Byzantine, papal, and imperial territories in Italy alike.\footnote{Vasiliev, II, 415.} Politically the embassy appears to have been a failure—at least the Byzant­
tines took no part in the campaign against Roger\footnote{Fina, XXXII (1956), 94, n. 78. John later sent congratula­
tions to Lothar on his success in the campaign against Roger.}—but during the
more than six months Anselm was in Constantinople, he engaged in a
number of private discussions with Greek theologians on the issues
outstanding between the Greek and Latin Churches, culminating in two
semi-public debates on the same subjects at the invitation of the em­
peror and the patriarch Leon Stypes. Both debates were with Nicetas,\footnote{Modernized spelling given by Salet, p. 30, n.1. The name is spelled "Nechites" in the Latin texts of Anselm's Dialogi.}
the archbishop of Nicomedia and dean of the patriarchal theological
academy. The substance of these debates are contained in Anselm's
chief written work, the Dialogi, to which we will return; and both
concluded with agreement on the importance and urgency of a general
Church council to resolve the issues definitively and restore union
between the Churches. It is not impossible that these efforts toward
Church union were part of Anselm's commission, or alternatively that once in Constantinople he came to the conclusion that the resolution of other East-West problems was closely linked with this one.  

When Anselm returned to Germany in June, 1136, he found that the Wends had thoroughly ravaged the Havelberg district, and even destroyed his cathedral church. Little is certainly known about his activities during the following decade. It is believed that he accompanied Lothar on his last journey to Italy in 1136 for the campaign against Roger, and that he remained there in the curia of Innocent II until 1142, when he returned to his diocese. At some time following his return he established the Praemonstratensians in his cathedral chapter, and in the year 1144 he arranged the establishment of a house of Praemonstratensian canons at Jerichow within his diocesan territory. He may also have participated in theological discussions at Tusculum with a Greek bishop who accompanied a Byzantine imperial legation to the pope that year.

It should be noted here that these same years saw considerable turmoil in papal-imperial relations. Lothar had died in 1137, and Conrad III, who had been elected king of the Romans in his stead in 1138, did not by any means view his interests as so closely parallel with those of the papacy as Lothar had. Although Wibald of

20 Vasiliev, II, 476. He also cites several other Latin overtures to the Greeks looking toward Church union in the early years of the twelfth century.


24 Salet, p. 9. Tusculum is the modern Frascati, a suburb of Rome.
Stablo, a key advisor of Lothar and a strong supporter of the papacy (and also an intimate friend of Anselm since their youth\(^\text{25}\)), remained in Conrad's court—apparently because Wibald had been influential in securing Conrad's election\(^\text{26}\)—the differences between king and pope were such that Conrad was never crowned or recognized as emperor by the pope. On the death of Pope Innocent II in the fall of 1143, Celestine II (a former student of Abelard) was elected. However, he died the following spring, and Lucius II was chosen to succeed him. Lucius was a personal friend of Wibald, and at least an acquaintance of Anselm,\(^\text{27}\) and there may have been hope for a rapprochement with Conrad during his pontificate, but he was killed in a Roman revolt within a year of his election. Eugene III, a Cistercian abbot, was elected to the papacy on February 15, 1145, the very day of Lucius's death, but because of the turbulence of the political situation he was unable to live in Italy until 1148, and in Rome itself only intermittently after that. Relations between pope and German king appear to have worsened during his pontificate, at least until the death of Conrad in 1152.

Crucial Years
From the Wendish Crusade to the Death of Conrad III
(1146-1151)

The famous Diet of Speyer held during Christmas-tide, 1146,


\(^{26}\) Zatschek, X (1928), 451.

\(^{27}\) Zatschek, X (1928), 450.
probably was the occasion of the nearest approach to harmony between papal and imperial powers reached during Conrad's reign. Moved by St. Bernard's powerful preaching and his diplomacy, Conrad agreed to take the cross and lead the second Crusade to the Holy Land. Anselm was certainly present at that diet, for it is recorded that among many miracles effected by St. Bernard during that ecstatic week, he cured Anselm's severe headaches and throat ailment. Around the same time, probably beginning at the diet itself, plans were laid for another crusade to be conducted simultaneously with that of Conrad to the Holy Land. This was a crusade against the Wends, with the double purpose of Christianizing them and ending their resistance to German expansion to the North and East. Almost two centuries of efforts to convert the pagan Wends had been largely unsuccessful, although some of them were Christian. The mixture of German expansionism with German missionary work had never been overly subtle, and since 1134 Albert the Bear, Duke of Saxony, had openly pursued the policy of settling Germans in the area and moving Wends out wherever possible. In this crusade nearly the entire nobility of northern Germany united to resolve the problem decisively; indeed, they were specifically excused from any obligation to go to the Holy Land if they participated.

28 Bayol, III, 458; and Zatschek, X (1928), 453.
29 Herbert the Abbot, Historia miraculorum in itinere germanico patratorum: Liber VI vitae et miraculorum sancti Bernardi clareval-lensis abbatis, ed. by G. Waitz in Monumenta Germaniae historica: Scriptores (Hannover, 1882), XXVI, 127. (This series is henceforth cited as MGH.SS.)
30 Vlasto, p. 152.
31 Vlasto, pp. 147-52.
in the Wendish Crusade. The pope appointed Anselm as his deputy in the undertaking, with particular responsibility for maintaining peace and unity within the crusading army, and for seeing that its religious aims were actually carried out—a hopeless task!

The crusade succeeded in "pacifying" Havelberg and other frontier districts, but of course it failed utterly in its missionary aims. Anselm may have taken up residence in Havelberg as early as the autumn of 1148, but it could hardly have been a joyful homecoming. If he had not realized before, he could now see in detail what the crusade he had managed had accomplished. The area was severely depopulated—many villages were scarcely inhabited. The Wends who remained were so embittered that far from being ready for evangelization, they posed a threat to the safety of the Christian priests. Some who had previously been Christians lapsed into paganism. Moreover there were great internal diocesan stresses: on one hand was a clergy which had been free from close episcopal supervision for some years and now saw their flocks decimated partly through the activities of their bishop, and on the other was a cosmopolitan bishop of a somewhat arrogant disposition toward inferiors.

March of 1149 found Anselm again at the papal court in Tusculum. It was at this time that Eugene III commanded him to write an account of his debates with the Greek archbishop in the form of dialogues for use as a hand-book in any future discussions with Eastern theologians. Relations between the Latin and Greek Churches had

---

32 Hauck, IV, 629. 33 Hauck, IV, 635. 34 Hauck, IV, 193.
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assumed a much greater importance since the accession of Manuel I to the Byzantine throne in 1143 because of his strongly pro-Western predilections and policies. According to Vasiliev, Manuel actually hoped to unite the Eastern and Western empires under himself, and in order to gain the support of the pope in this project, was open to a union of Churches. According to Anselm, the pope's command to write the dialogues was the result of some discussions held shortly before between papal and Byzantine theologians, in which the former had found themselves without adequate answers to the arguments of the latter.

Anselm soon returned to the court of Conrad who had just gotten back to Germany from the disastrous second Crusade to the Holy Land. The only accomplishment of his journey was a firm alliance with Manuel against Roger II of Sicily concluded in Thessalonica on his return trip—an alliance which contained more immediate benefit for Manuel than for Conrad. But it had immediate results in papal-imperial politics. Concerned about the possible goals of the new alliance, the pope openly aligned himself with Roger. Conrad at this time ignored or dismissed those of his advisors who were of the curial party, including both Wibald whom he simply ceased con-

35Vasiliev, II, 376.

36Vasiliev, II, 421-23. Vasiliev cites a number of reasons for the pope's anxiety about this alliance. The most immediate was the fact that with the support of Conrad and of Venice, Manuel was about to launch a military campaign against Roger II. If successful, Manuel could be expected to try to regain other formerly Byzantine territories. The pope's anxiety seems to have been shared by most of the powers of Europe.
suling and Anselm whom he appears to have dismissed outright. Indeed, no churchmen were henceforth included in the inner circle of Conrad's foreign policy advisers.

Thus that same spring (1149) Anselm left the imperial court, somewhat in disgrace, and returned to his diocese. This abrupt reversal of fortune seems to have been the occasion of a grave interior crisis in Anselm, as he confronted the inconsistency of his evangelical beliefs and vocation with his actual life as an imperial politician and diplomat. He apparently met the crisis courageously. The unavoidable austerities—and even dangers—of life in Havelberg at this time transformed, according to Salet, the Praemonstratensian ideals of apostolic poverty and simplicity of life into daily realities for Anselm.

37 Hauck, IV, 193; and Zatschek, X (1928), 457f. Both these scholars maintain that beyond considerations of practical politics, Conrad was attempting to institute in his realm that independence of the Church—and even control over it—which he had observed on his visit to Manuel.

38 Wentz, "Das Bistum Havelberg," Germania sacra, I, No. 2 (1933), 35.

39 Salet, p. 10. In his important letter to Wibald at this time, Anselm eulogizes the hidden life as opposed to the appearance of Christ in Pilate's court, drawing a parallel with his own situation now in his diocese as compared with his time at court. Salet comments that some historians have seen in this eulogy merely the reaction of an ambitious man despised, or even hypocrisy, noting caustically Anselm's haste to get back to court as soon as imperial favor returned to him. "But," writes Salet, "there is no reason for us to doubt his sincerity when he wrote the letter. He was able to show all his life, rather like St. Bernard, a tension between a desire for a humble and solitary life and the obligation to work in the world to promote the Kingdom of God. Making a virtue of necessity, he was able to take this imposed retreat, this very punishing disgrace, as a providential occasion for interior renewal, with a view to work to come."
For the next two and one-half years, until the death of Conrad in February, 1152, Anselm is not known to have taken any significant part in political life. He is believed to have spent most of his time within his diocese, although he did travel elsewhere occasionally. He probably wrote the dialogues requested by the pope at this time, and he may have written some or all of his other works during this same period. His extant correspondence with Wibald is of this period. Since for Anselm "the primary apostolate was the struggle against error, and the primary charity was to enlighten souls," his literary labors during this time must be seen as a vital part of his pastoral work. But he was also directly engaged in strengthening his diocese. He refounded the ruined cathedral church. Abandoning for the most part the unsuccessful policy of converting the Wends, he vigorously sought to implement Duke Albert's policy of colonizing the area with Germans. In 1150 he secured from Conrad the exemption of his diocese from various taxes to encourage immigration.

---

40 There is no consensus on the dating of any of Anselm's works. See Bayol, III, 458; Jugie, I, 1417; Salet, p. 9; Fina, XXII (1956), 94ff.; and Ott, L., "Anselm von Havelberg," Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche (2d ed., 1958), I, 595. See also discussion of Anselm's works below.
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In early March, 1152, about two weeks after the death of Con-
rad III, Frederick Barbarossa was elected king of the Romans. It was
either at or sometime previous to this time that Anselm switched alle-
giance from the curial to the imperial party for unknown reasons,
and now once again he became thoroughly immersed in the political
scene. That same spring he is found linked with other German bishops
supporting Frederick in the first of his many struggles with the
pope. At the end of the year he was appointed one of Frederick's
ambassadors to Pope Eugene in the negotiations which resulted in the
Treaty of Constance between pope and emperor early in 1153. That
autumn Anselm made his second journey to Constantinople, this time
as Frederick's ambassador to negotiate his marriage to Maria, the
dughter of Manuel I, and to develop a common strategy against Roger
II. In the summer of 1154 he made his third trip to Constantinople,
again at the head of an imperial embassy. During this visit, as in
his first one nearly twenty years earlier, Anselm engaged in theologi-
cal discussions with an outstanding Greek prelate. These were held

45 Wentz, Germania sacra, I (1933), 35; and Zatschek, X (1928),
424, 467-69, 473. Ambition cannot be ruled out, but if that were the
reason, the question arises, why not pursue ambition at the papal
curia?

46 Zatschek, X (1928), 424; and Otto of Freising, The Deeds of
Frederick Barbarossa, tr. by C. C. Mierow and R. Emery (New York:

47 Salet, p. 11, n. 1.

48 Otto, Frederick Barbarossa, p. 123; and Wentz, I (1933), 36.
in Thessalonica with its noted archbishop Basil of Achrida, probably in October of 1154. Anselm's diplomatic labors for Frederick were all successful, and the emperor must have been well-pleased. Shortly after Anselm's return from Constantinople in 1155, the emperor arranged for his election and appointment as archbishop and exarch of Ravenna, and in Rome on June 18, the very day of Frederick's coronation as emperor, Anselm received the pallium of his new see from the hand of Pope Hadrian IV. Whether Anselm continued to spend much of his time in Frederick's service or now resided in his archdiocese for the most part is not known—indeed very little at all is known about the rest of his life—but the appointment was far from being merely honorary. Frederick was attempting to establish his authority throughout Northern Italy, and he doubtless expected Anselm to forward his interests in the exarchate and the Italian hierarchy generally. Anselm's task was complicated by the fact that a considerable number, perhaps


50 Otto of Freising, Frederick Barbarossa, p. 142, calls Anselm's appointment "a magnificent recompense" for his services.

51 Theodore the Monk, Annales Palidenses, ed. by G. H. Pertz, in MGH. SS. (Hannover, 1859), XVI, 89. Hadrian had only very recently become pope.

52 Hauck, IV, 210.
a majority, of the civil authorities of Ravenna preferred the rule of the Byzantine emperor to that of the German. 53 Indeed, when Frederick's legates came to Ravenna in the spring of 1158 to arrange for that city's assistance in his campaign against Milan, although Anselm and his fourteen suffragan bishops went out to meet them, and received them with great honor, the prefect and many of the nobles and knights of the city opposed them, and had to be put down by force. In this crisis Anselm again showed his diplomatic skills, by arranging for the release of all prisoners held by the emperor's legates in exchange for an oath of fidelity to the emperor from the entire city—an act which Ravenna had not given an emperor in 200 years, the chronicler notes. 54

Anselm joined the imperial armies before Milan that June, and was a vigorous advocate of the punitive siege which the emperor then undertook. When Anselm died suddenly in Frederick's camp on August 12, the word which spread through the army was that God had thus punished the archbishop for his hard-hearted council against Milan. 55 He was buried in the cathedral church at Ravenna. 56

53 Salet, p. 11, n. 3.
54 Pertz, G. H. (ed.), Annales Colonenses Maximi, in MGH.SS (Hannover, 1861), XVII, 767-68.
55 Vincent of Prague, Annales, ed. by W. Wattenbach in MGH.SS (Hannover, 1861), XVII, 671, 674.
The Man Himself

Even so incomplete an outline as we have of Anselm's life shows him a fascinating, many-sided, even puzzling person. His early discipleship to St. Norbert and the latter's choice of him for his suffragan in Havelberg is surely a sign not only of his adherence to the reform movement, but also of his zeal for the Gospel and for souls. Anselm's introduction of Praemonstratensian canons into his diocese, his strong and able support of the regular canons in his writings, and the fact that of the four suffragans of Magdeburg at the time of Norbert's death, Anselm was given the honor of officiating at his funeral—all these things support this impression.

Of entirely different, even incongruous significance is the fact that Anselm served as a court bishop under three German emperors and at least two popes, and undertook a number of purely political and diplomatic missions for them, devoting far more time to these labors than to the care and government of his bishoprics. Of his twenty-six years as the bishop of Havelberg Anselm probably spent less than five full years within his diocese, and perhaps a similarly small proportion of his three years in Ravenna. Further, in spite of Salet's defense of his action, one does get an impression of opportunism in Anselm's mysterious switch from the papal to the imperial party in 1151/52.

However little this aspect of Anselm's life may accord with that of a zealous missionary and reformer, it demonstrates unquestionably outstanding talents of persuasion and negotiation. Yet as we
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have noted, he had the reputation of being arrogant and discourteous towards inferiors and harsh toward enemies. And he could undertake leadership in a military crusade ostensibly designed to whip pagans into readiness to receive the Gospel of Christ—indeed Anselm could hardly have been unaware that many of the Wends were already Christians and were resisting Saxon invasion and oppression rather than Christianity per se. Thus as in his vocation and work, so in his dealings with men Anselm appears somewhat enigmatic.

His writings also reveal his many-sidedness. We see in them a sober, logical mind, and yet one not devoid of imagination and an ability to see new relationships and aspects of familiar concepts. There can be no doubt that his intellectual training in general, and his theological education in particular, were excellent. Certainly Salet's statement quoted above, that Anselm regarded the struggle against error as his primary apostolate and the enlightenment of souls as his primary expression of love, is amply proven in his works. Fina goes so far as to characterize Anselm's concept of charity as a very narrow, all too specialized view, notably lacking in warmth.\(^57\) I do not share this view; yet it is true that Anselm appears to move very easily from discussion of disagreements to scorn and ridicule of both the opposing viewpoints and those holding them.\(^58\) Even here, however, it must be remembered that the subjects with which he dealt were both controversial and hotly controverted, and thus provided

\(^{57}\)XXXIV (1958), 28-29.

\(^{58}\)It is not impossible that this is a literary technique of Anselm rather than simple intemperance, although in most instances it seems very real.
ample temptation to intemperance. There also appear in Anselm's writings occasional touches of a vanity which somehow make his political about-face less than startling. But beyond all this, I think his writings reveal him to be a man passionately concerned with truth, a man attempting to grasp the reality undergirding external appearances, conflicts, and differences, and to communicate that unifying reality convincingly.

It is in this overarching concern that we can approach most nearly to a view of the man himself, and see the personal unity behind the tremendous variety of his life and works. In this perspective I believe Anselm must finally be regarded as a man of unusual intelligence and ability who genuinely devoted himself and his considerable talents to the service of God and man, a person who ardently sought peace and unity—brotherhood, if you will—among men. After all, none of the controversies with which Anselm dealt either in his writings or in his episcopal and diplomatic labors were in any way of his making. Rather, finding himself in the midst of great conflicts and controversies, he set himself to seek their resolution. He did this in his political endeavors by exercising—and very effectively for the most part—the arts of negotiation, persuasion, and compromise. In relation to the intellectual issues, whether practical or theoretical, which are reflected in his writings, he sought the resolution of differences through delineation of deeper truths of reason or revelation on the basis of which a commonly accepted view could be built. Thus, behind the "multiformity" of Anselm's life, to use his own phrase, we see an abiding unity of purpose and motive.
which both informs his works and redeems his very human failings and inconsistencies.
THE EXTANT WORKS OF ANSELM

We turn now to a review of Anselm's known works. As has been noted, they all may have been written between June, 1149, and January, 1152, during which period Anselm is believed to have spent most of his time in Havelberg. His shortest work, however, the Treatise on the Order of Saying the Litany,¹ may well have been written much earlier. This was written at the request of his metropolitan, Frederick of Magdeburg, who became archbishop on May 7, 1142, and died January 15, 1152.² The Treatise is a liturgical essay setting forth a standard order for the various invocations, petitions, etc., of the litany and giving a rationale for the order proposed—apparently there had hitherto been no settled order in use throughout the diocese. The sequence which Anselm established is very like that prevailing in litanies still in use in the Roman liturgy. Although it is possible that the Treatise contributed to the establishment of this standard ordering of the litanies of the Roman liturgy, it is more probable that the purpose of this essay was precisely to introduce to this provincial frontier area the more sophisticated and orderly customs prevailing in Rome itself, with which, of course, Anselm must have been thoroughly familiar.


²Hauck, IV, 970.
In addition to his rationale for the order of the litany's suffrages, Anselm discusses briefly how the saints hear our requests for their prayers. He states that he is following Gregory the Great in holding the theory that the departed cannot know directly any of the doings of this world, so God communicates to the saints the invocations which, in his infinite wisdom, he knows they should honor. Beyond its strictly liturgical significance, the essay exhibits, in Fina's words, "a verbal picture of the medieval bishopric, the district, the monastic foundations, the Church lands, the crusades, and the shrines."\(^3\)

Four works comprise the bulk of Anselm's literary output. Although they are separable, their mutual inter-connections are such that all should be introduced briefly, in the order in which they were probably written, before looking at them individually in any detail.

The Letter of Defense of the Order of Canons Regular\(^4\) is a vigorous justification of Norbert's order against all the conservatives of the day who condemned it as a novelty, and especially in response to a written attack on it by the Cluniac abbot, Egbert of Huyssburg.\(^5\) The underlying issue in the Defense is the legitimacy of

\(^3\)XXXII (1956), 100.

\(^4\)Epistola apologetica pro ordine canonico regularum, P.L. CLXXXVIII, 1117-1140. This work is henceforth referred to as the Defense.

\(^5\)Only a fragment of Egbert's work is extant. It is quoted by Fina, XXXII (1956), 86-87.
change and diversity in the contemporary Church.

The second of the three books comprising the Dialogues bears the sub-title ΑΥΤΟΧΩΡΩ (Book of Oppositions), and contains the public discussion which Anselm had with the Byzantine archbishop, Nicetas of Nicomedia, on the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit, in Hagia Eirene Church in the Pisan quarter of Constantinople on April 10, 1136. The underlying issue treated here is also change and diversity, in this case that between the Greek and Latin Churches with regard to the doctrine of God.

The third book of the Dialogues contains the second discussion between Anselm and Nicetas, held on April 15, 1136, in the great basilica of Hagia Sophia before a large audience of students and professors. It deals with several subjects: the proper form of bread to be used in the Eucharist, the proper place of the mixture of water with wine in the Eucharist, certain Greek customs regarding anointing, and the primacy of the Roman see in the catholic Church. Here again the underlying issues are largely questions of change and diversity within the Church, although in the discussion of the Roman primacy it is the question of authority in the Church which is foremost.

The first book of the Dialogues is not a dialogue at all, but a survey of major instances of change and diversity in the his-

6 Dialogi: II, P.L., CLXXXVIII, 1159-1210. This work is henceforth referred to as Dialogue II.

7 Dialogi: III, P.L., CLXXVIII, 1209-1248. This work is henceforth referred to as Dialogue III.

8 Dialogi: I, P.L., CLXXVIII, 1139-1160. This work is henceforth referred to as Dialogue I.
tory of the Church "from Abel the Just to the last of the elect," as Anselm puts it. This book is a preface to the Book of Oppositions (Dialogues II and III) which Pope Eugene III had asked him to write—hence its inclusion under the inaccurate appellation of "dialogue."

In this work, Anselm steps back, as it were, from the immediate issues with which he had dealt in his life as a Canon Regular and his discussions with the Greeks, and deals with the very same issues in a broader and deeper manner altogether.

Two other works have at one time or another been attributed to Anselm of Havelberg, but neither is regarded as his at the present time. These works are the Life of Adalbert II and the Book of the Order of Canons Regular.

The Letter of Defense

It is clear from the prologue to the Dialogues as a whole, and especially from the introduction to Dialogue II, that Anselm's Defense was written before any of the Dialogues. However, it is impossible to determine certainly whether it was written long before those works, or was simply the first of the things he wrote during his two and one-half years' residence at Havelberg. The Defense is

9Vita Adalberti II, Magdeburgensis archiepiscopi, ed. by P. Jaffe in Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum (Berlin: Weidmannos, 1866), III, 563-603. For discussion of the authorship of this work, see Jaffe's preface to it, 565-68; Fina, XXXII (1956), 101; Winter, V (1882), 139-40; Riedel, Ledeburs Archiv, VIII (1832), 266.

10Liber de ordine canonicorum regularium. P.L., CLXXXVIII, 1091-1118. For discussion of the authorship of this work, see Fina, XXXII (1956), 101; Winter, V (1882), 143; Hauck, IV, 362ff; Riedel, Ledeburs Archiv, VIII (1832), 266; and Schreiber, G., "Studien über Anselm von Havelberg zur Geistesgeschichte des Hochmittelalters," Analecta Praemonstratensia, XVIII (1942), 57.
as long as Dialogue I, and like all the dialogues it deals with important issues in which Anselm was vitally involved—in this case by his very membership in the new order of Canons Regular. As we shall see, however, Anselm handles the issues much less objectively and irenically in the Defense than he does in the Dialogues. As a matter of fact, careful reading of the Defense provides strong evidence that Dialogues II and III are rooted in actual discussions, as Anselm claims, for in the Defense he simply cannot maintain, although he seems to attempt, a sense of even-handedness, equanimity, or balance in his treatment of the subject. Again and again he slips into heavy-handed sarcasm, mockery, or the very attitudes for which he castigates his opponent. It is possible, as I have already mentioned, that this element is a deliberately-chosen tactic rather than intemperance—could it be a medieval version of "confrontation tactics"?—for Anselm does appear to give attention to style in his writing. But if this is true, it is masterfully done, for the Defense reads as a very direct and plainly-spoken work.

The subject was unquestionably a hot one, and deeply felt on all sides. Its background was the rise of new communities and religious orders discussed above in Chapter I. The "black" monks (the older forms of Benedictinism, including the Cluniac houses but not the Cistercians whose habits were white) were extremely sensitive to the criticism of them which the very existence of the new orders and communities posed, and they both jealously defended their traditional position in the social order and heaped scorn on the silly novelty (as they thought) of the up-start communities. These new orders, in
turn, were understandably vulnerable to such charges in an officially
tradition-respecting society, and pressed their new understanding of
the vita apostolica vigorously as the original (and thus more genuine-
ly traditional) understanding of the Gospel. The Defense is a good
reflection of both the terms and the heat of the struggle.

The work is in the form of an open letter addressed to Egbert,
the abbot of the Cluniac monastery of Huysburg, as a public but per-
sonal response to a book or tract written by Egbert. Anselm, however,
seems to indicate at a couple of points that he is also dealing with
other matters connected with those in Egbert's work, but not actually
contained in it. We cannot know, of course, the extent to which this
is true because we do not have access to Egbert's own work.

The title and sub-title adequately state the general purpose
of the treatise as follows: "A Letter of Defense on behalf of the
order of Canons Regular ... against those who persistently contend
that the monastic order is more worthy to exist in the Church than
the canonical."11 Then, following the salutation and the first of
his numerous warnings to Egbert concerning his spiritual condition,
Anselm relates the circumstances of his encounter with Egbert's work,
and his shock at its contents. Anselm then states the theme of
Egbert's work as follows:

As can be gathered from your words, you assert that all the
faithful, whether of the Old or the New Testament, were monks,
and you are not afraid to say openly that that Scripture :
which Luke the Evangelist wrote—"They were all of one heart and

11 Defense, CLXXXVIII, 1117-20. "Epistola apologetica pro ordine
 canonicorum regularium ... contra eos qui importune contendunt, mo-
nasticum ordinem digniorem esse in Ecclesia quam canonicum."
one soul," etc.—applies to the society of monks and not rather to the apostles and their followers, among whom the name of monks was not then known. . . . You adduce also certain words of Blessed Augustine . . . in which he clearly commends an apostolic and common life, which you, however, very awkwardly try to twist to the monastic profession alone. . . . You also introduce certain things from the writings of John Chrysostom, which you cannot rightly understand for the purpose, because you seem to have so greatly restricted charity around monks, and not rather enlarged it to all catholics. Finally, you tie in the teaching of I know not what Rupert, whose authority is as easily condemned as approved since it is unknown in the Church. 12

As regards this Rupert—who is probably the Rupert of Deutz already referred to 13—Anselm concedes immediately that he has in fact read some of his writings, and indeed actually knows him personally; and he comments that "beautifully is the proverb told by the Greeks proved true in him: 'A fat belly does not give birth to a clear mind.'" 14

Hinting that Egbert has composed his work simply to become more widely known, Anselm accuses him of endangering the unity of the Church by defending the monastic order so superfluously. He himself would defend the monastic order, says Anselm, which "no Christian impugns


13. See p. 16 above.

unless he is mad."\textsuperscript{15}

Nevertheless, the perfection of monks, according to Anselm, must not be thought to be superior to that of clergy, as Egbert has attempted to prove. Anselm refutes Egbert's claim by asserting that personal moral worth, not ecclesiastical status, is the determinative factor:

I do not call a monk good because he is a monk; but because he is good, I praise the good man. I do not call a cleric good because he is a cleric; but because he is good I call him good, and I love the good man. I do not judge a layman either good or bad because he is a layman, but because he is either good or bad, as I approve the good or disapprove the evil, for "God is not an acceptor of persons, but in every nation he who fears God and does justice is accepted by him" (Acts 4).

And he goes on to assert that the great monastic founders of the past would disavow Egbert, both because they gladly subordinated themselves to the clergy, and also because of the great contrast between their austere way of life and the comforts of contemporary monks.

Anselm then mentions the particular instance which had probably moved Egbert to write in the first place. A man vowed to a community of Canons Regular—a provost, in fact—had left the order and entered a monastery. However he had been compelled to leave the monastery and return to his original community, presumably by the local

\textsuperscript{15}Defense, 1120C. "... nemo Christianus, nisi amens impugnat."

\textsuperscript{16}Defense, 1121B. "Ego nec monachum, quia monachus est, bonum dico; sed, quia bonus est, bonum praedico. Ego nec clericum, quia clericum est, bonum dico; sed, quia bonus est, bonum dico, et bonum diligo. Ego nec laicum, quia laicus est, aut bonum aut malum judico; sed, quia bonus aut malus est, aut tanquam bonum probo, aut tanquam malum improbo, 'non,' enim 'personarum acceptor est Deus sed in omni gente, qui timet Deum, et operatur justitiam, acceptus est illi' (Act., IV)."
bishop, although this is not stated. To Egbert, such a removal was an affront to the dignity of the monastic order, and he apparently protested the de facto status given to the so recently formed order by such a forced return to its fold: not only is the order a contemptible novelty in the Church, he says, but its very name is a ridiculous redundancy, since the words "canon" and "regular" are actually nothing but the Greek and Latin words for the same idea. Anselm replies to the first attack that it is irrational to equate the new and the contemptible, for

everything which has acquired antiquity or long standing is known most certainly to have once been new, and for that reason something is more or less contemptible not because it is or was new; nor is something more or less acceptable because it is or will be old; if nevertheless it is good and useful, it should be justly acceptable to all good men. For there are ancient good things and new good things, and ancient bad things and new bad things; and certainly as antiquity or newness brings to them no authority of evil, so none the less no antiquity or newness takes away from them their dignity of good.17

He admits the linguistic point about the name of his order, but says that the repetition serves to emphasize the basic distinction of those living under a rule. As to the return of the sometime canon regular, Anselm quotes a number of fathers and popes, who forbade anyone professed to a community to leave that community or join an-

---

17Defense, 1122D. "Equidem omne quod antiquitatem vel vetustatem suscepit, aliquando novum fuisse certissime constat, ideoque non quia novum est aut novum fuit, aliquid plus minusve est contemptibile; nec quia vetus est aut vetus erit, aliquid plus minusve est acceptabile: sed sive vetus sive novum sit aliquid, si tamen bonum est et utile, jure omnibus bonis debet esse acceptabile. Sunt enim antiqua bona, sunt et nova bona, et sunt antiqua mala, et sunt nova mala: et certe, sicut antiquitas vel novitas malorum nullam eis affert auctoritatem, its nihilominus nulla antiquitas vel novitas bonorum suam eis avertit dignitatem."
other without the approval of his original superior and community, and also specified the return of anyone who had left or transferred unlawfully, together with certain punishments incurred by such actions. He concludes in the first place that religious should stay in the order in which they were first called, and secondly that any exceptions, such as when criminous clergy are degraded from holy orders and made monks, must be handled through channels by proper ecclesiastical authority.

But in spite of Anselm's apparent repudiation of any categorical ranking of the monastic and clerical professions quoted above, he actually believes, insinuates, states, and argues the superiority of the clerical to the monastic state repeatedly throughout the Defense, frequently immediately after rebuking Egbert for proudly exalting monasticism. At this point in the work, Anselm notes that the very fact that criminous clergy are sometimes required to enter monasteries is clear proof of the inferiority of the monastic to the clerical state, for who, he asks, ever heard of punishing a criminous monk by degrading him, say, to the order of Canons Regular! But especially worthy monks can occasionally be promoted to the dignity of the clerical state, he says, as in the case of St. Gregory the Great. Finally, Anselm quotes St. Jerome, both cleric and monk, and St. Augustine in support of the superiority of the clerical state, and turns from arguments drawn from authority to those from reason to complete his case.

In the first place, Anselm now contends, if the monastic state were the highest, as Egbert maintains, there could be no transferring from it, since no one is ever to be advised to change from the
higher to the lower (except, as already mentioned, as a result of a publicly scandalous life). So the fact which Egbert and Anselm both affirm, that monks sometimes become clergy, is proof of the superiority of the clerical state in Anselm's eyes.

Next Anselm refutes Egbert's argument from certain acts of St. Benedict which seemed to imply a quasi-priestly authority, by distinguishing between extraordinary exceptions to rules "which occasionally happen by useful exception, or else by specific permission, or sometimes even by special command," and "things which have the strength of unchangeable law and irrefutable authority." 18

Then Anselm takes up Egbert's contention that canons regular should not be allowed the care of parishes and the cure of souls. On the contrary, Anselm says, "he who is really wise would rather invite all priests to an ordered life than to completely remove those living by rule from the care of the Lord's flock," 19 because those who have set their own lives in order are better fit to correct the lives of others.

At this point Anselm turns to the comparison, long since traditional by the twelfth century, between the active and the contemplative life, in which monks as adherents of the contemplative life are believed to follow the higher way, inasmuch as a life directly cen-

18 Defense, 1128C. "... quae fiunt interdum utili dispensatione, interdum discreta permissione, interdum etiam speciali jussione ... et ea, quae immobili lege, et invincibili auctoritate roburantur."

19 Defense, 1128D. "Qui enim recte sapit, omnes sacerdotes potius ad regularem vitam invitat, quam regulariter viventes a Dominicum ovium custodia penitus removeat."
tered on God personally is necessarily superior to one centered on serving him indirectly through good works toward one's fellow men. The Gospel exemplar of the active life is Martha (Luke 10) who, though serving Jesus, was busy with many things; and the exemplar of the contemplative life is her sister Mary, who sat at Jesus feet listening to him and worshipping him, whom Jesus commended as choosing the better part. Anselm first of all maintains that the terms are not absolute contrasts in the sense that contemplatives ignore good works or actives do not contemplate God. He cites many personages of the Old Testament to prove that though they were full of good deeds, they unquestionably also practiced contemplation.

Continuing, Anselm attacks the stronghold of the customary view by discussing the Martha-Mary incident at some length. Mary, as attending purely to Jesus himself, has indeed chosen the better part in relation to Martha bustling about busily, he says, but surely not the better part in relation to Jesus himself teaching both. Lay people do indeed have a choice between an active life of good works and the better life of contemplation. But membership in the clergy, he says, the office of teaching, the place of Jesus himself in the picture of Martha, Mary, and Jesus--this is not to be chosen for oneself. One is chosen for this by others if one is worthy; and this is superior to either of the ways which one may choose for himself. This is not to say, Anselm continues, that Jesus should be thought of as neither contemplative nor active, any more than he should be considered as one or the other. Rather, he must be seen to be the perfection and the perfect unity of both the active and the contemplative life,
and in this respect as in others the true model of the clergy.

Anselm concludes this portion of his argument by citing briefly the apostles Paul and John as pre-eminent imitators of Christ's practice of both the active and the contemplative life, and adds that the mystical beasts of Ezekiel's vision are said to "go forth [in contemplation] and return [in activity]." (Ezek. 1) And then, in heavy sarcasm he attacks Egbert (and all who hold his views):

But you, entering once into the Holies of Holies—if really you have as yet entered—although the highest priests have sometimes gone in and sometimes come out, you alone, as it appears to you—I repeat—never go out! O mighty one! O great one! O lofty one! O incomparable merit! Once you have gone into the Holies of Holies—if, indeed, you have gone in—and then, as you testify, you have not come out. O what manner, and how unique a privilege, of continuous and unending contemplation in the flesh, which has been granted neither to Aaron himself, nor to any of the high priests, nor to the apostles themselves who saw the Lord in the flesh! O man of ineffable beatitude, alone worthy for the heavenly lands! You have chosen the best part, because without interruption you have complete joy, you have already been filled by joy with the face of God, already you possess the delights at his right hand until the very end (Ps. 15), or rather before the end.20

Anselm reminds Egbert now that Satan frequently transforms himself into an angel of light to deceive and destroy those who are striving for spiritual perfection. Then, in a bitter-sweet simile, he likens

20 Defense, 1134AB. "At vero tu semel in Sancta sanctorum introiens, si tamen adhuc intrasti, summis pontificibus modo ingredientibus, modo egredientibus, tu, inquam, solus, sicut tibi videtur, nunquam es egressus. O ingens! o magnum! o sublime! o incomparable meritum! semel Sancta sanctorum intrasti; si tamen intrasti, et deinceps, sicut tu arbitraris, non existi. O quae et quam singularis continguis et interminabilis contemplationis privilegium in carne, quod nec ipsi Aaron, nec aliius summorum pontificum, nec ipsis apostolis, qui Dominum in carne viderunt, concessum est! O ineffabilis beatitudinis virum, solum solis caelestibus dignum! optimam partem elegisti, quod sine intermissione pleno gaudio fueris, jam adimpletus es laetitia cum vultu Dei, jamjam delectationes in dextera ejus possides usque in finam (Psal. XV), imo ante finem!"
Egbert to the apostle Paul blinded by the splendor of the vision of Christ and, unable to see the way, needing to be taught and guided by an Ananias in order to come into the way which leads to the fullness of faith and wisdom—if, he adds, an Ananias could be found which Egbert would consider acceptable.

Next Anselm asserts that many monks are often busy at various tasks and activities, and at such times are hardly to be considered contemplative, and he illustrates his contention with examples both of good and necessary activities and of useless, frivolous, or even wicked activities. These examples, as well as those which follow of the very different inward conditions which may underlie an outward practice of religious discipline, reveal not only Anselm's detailed familiarity with the outward aspects of the life, but also his considerable insight into its inner realities and difficulties.

Then Anselm proposes that alternately a Church with monks but no clergy, and then one with clergy but no monks, be imagined. Obviously, he says, a Church without monks could exist and still be the Church; whereas the Church simply could not exist without the clergy; and therefore the clerical profession is of more dignity than the monastic because of its greater necessity to the Church. But nevertheless, Anselm concedes, the variety of the various orders of the elect adorns and beautifies the Church—in which, he adds, unable to allow a loop-hole for monastic equality to endure for a paragraph, "as a good and perfect monk is to be loved and imitated more than a silly cleric; so a cleric living well and by rule is, without a doubt,
always to be preferred to the best monk."\textsuperscript{21}

Finally, Anselm compares two Pauls, the great apostle who is the model of the clerical profession, and the first hermit who is the model of the monastic. After outlining attractively and sympathetically the manner of life, the work, and the influence of each of them, he asks Egbert if he thinks it would have been better if Paul the apostle had laid aside his apostolic ministry and writing to go into a desert or monastery to practice the contemplative life; or whether it would not have been preferable for Paul the hermit—if, in fact, he would have proved capable of effective preaching—to have left his solitude and by apostolic labor brought forth and nurtured as many sons of the Church as the other Paul had. And as if to forestall any possible slighting comparisons of the contemporary clergy with their great model, he reminds Egbert again of the considerable contrast between contemporary monks and their model. As in some other instances in this work, the alternatives which Anselm poses here bear better witness to the heat of the controversy than to the quality of his logic—indeed, in this instance he comes near to betraying his own great insight of unity in multiformity by positing as the ideal the abandonment of one form of religious life in the Church for a better. The best we can say for Anselm here is that his involvement in the issue was so intense that he simply found it impossible to maintain steadily the reasonableness and fairness which show themselves at on-

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Defense, 1136C. "In qua, sicut bonus et perfectus monachus, plus quam ineptus clericus diligendus est et imitandum; ita bene et regulariter vivens clericus optimo etiam monacho procul dubio semper est praefерendus."}
ly a few points in the Defense, although at most points in his other writings.

In his conclusion, Anselm returns to a more calm, warmly devout, and irenic tone. He writes to himself, perhaps, as much as to Egbert:

*Let us beware* lest we should contend about an order so inordinately that we would deservedly fall away from every order of the blessed, having both fallen into exaltation and been cheated and led away into the envy of brothers through Satan, and we be Christians in vain: knowing this, that as in that Church which is in the heavens there are diverse orders of blessed spirits, so in the Church which is still on earth there are diverse orders of the faithful; and as they have not collapsed therein, unless lifted up and envious, so they are not going to rise into their place, unless they are humble and have charity.22

He gives here a picture of diversity within unity in the Church in eternity as well as in time, and also states the moral condition of the maintenance of such unity, whether in time or in eternity. In this passage Anselm rises well above the narrowly controversial framework within which much of the Defense is set, and gives us a glimpse of the spacious and profound view which will characterize Dialogue I.

He urges Egbert to prepare for Christ's return in glory by following his monastic customs (including acts of vicarious repentance for the people), even as he, Anselm, prepares for that event by fulfilling the requirements of the clerical state (including the prac-

---

22Defense, 1138A. "... ne de ordine sic inordinate contendamus, ut de omni beatorum ordine merito corruamus, et in elationem prolapsi, et in fratum aemulationem per Satanam circumventi et abducti, frustra Christiani simus: hoc scientes, quod, sicut in illa, quae in coelis Ecclesia, diversi sunt ordines beatorum spiritum, ita in hac quae adhuc in terris est, diversi sunt ordines fidelium; et sicut in-ibi non corruerunt, nisi elati et invidi, ita in locum illorum non sunt ascensuri, nisi humiles et charitatem habentes."
tice of poverty and the ministry of preaching, sacramental rites, and service to the people), until all things are finally brought to completion, and the never-ending day of the Lord dawns, in which all the elect will know complete joy and fulfilment. But meanwhile, he ends, while we are still on the way to that end, let us do all in the name of the Lord, let us not judge one another, and let charity reign above all.

In addition to the things which we have already noted in relation to this work, there are several aspects of it which call for comment. The first of these is the oft-recurring contrast between poverty and contemporary monks, who are both intimated and flatly stated to be fat and comfortable, as it were, or at least well off. Sometimes the contrast is with the poverty and austerity of the first monks, sometimes with that of the apostles, and sometimes with Anselm and his own order. Anselm describes himself as a pauper of Christ— a title for Praemonstratensians apparently chosen by St. Norbert himself— and he contrasts "my poverty and your brotherhood" as salient marks of the two ways of life. The Praemonstratensians did not flatly renounce the possession of communal property as did some of the new communities springing up in the twelfth century, but whether their relative poverty in comparison to the monks was a virtue created simply by the circumstance of their recent origin, or was the result of deliberately-pursued policies, there is the feeling of a very real contrast here. One feels that Egbert and his fellow-monks must

23 *Defense, 1140A.* "... mea parvitas, vel tua... fraternitas."
have been very sensitive, no doubt often defensively so, to the force of it. In the twelfth century, the black Benedictine monks were very much of the essence of what is called today "the establishment," and mutatis mutandis they no doubt shared many of its characteristic responses in a time of similarly deep cultural and religious upheaval.

Secondly, Anselm's emphasis on the unity of contemplation and apostolic activity has a very modern ring. We have already noted that this was not unique to Anselm since Norbert built both emphases into the ethos of his order, and we have also noted that the order became wholly contemplative relatively quickly, with only the houses in and east of Germany maintaining an active apostolate for several centuries. Thus it may be only in certain religious geniuses that the tension of a genuinely contemplative inner orientation and an equally extensive outward activity be maintained. However, Anselm maintains that this is the Gospel ideal, and also the stand-point of his order. It is just such a unity that appears to be the ideal of much twentieth century ascetical development. "Holy worldliness," "religionless Christianity," the life and work of Charles de Foucauld, and Dag Hammarskjöld's oft-quoted aphorism, "In our era, the road to holiness necessarily passes through the world of action," to mention only a few examples—all tend toward a union of the contemplative and the active similar to that for which Anselm contends in the Defense, although it should be noted that the modern movements are chiefly focussed on the laity rather than the clergy in this respect.

In this same connection, the perceptiveness of Anselm's exegesis of the Martha-Mary incident (Luke 10) must be mentioned. In the
Church fathers, and in some commentators of all ages, a balanced and realistic perception of human realities was maintained in the interpretation of the event as the image of the contemplative-active duality. But if Anselm's taunting mockery of Egbert's uninterrupted contemplation contains the truth of Egbert's view of himself or his statements about the life of monks—and it would be a pointless invective if it did not—then it would appear that an extremely simplified and absolute view of the difference between those who follow the contemplative and those who follow the active way had been adopted by Egbert, if not by other monks, at least for purposes of controversy if not in actuality. In his rather brief analysis, Anselm cuts decisively through such a simplified view to an interpretation which, set in the context of his entire treatment of the Scriptural witness vis à vis the contemplative-active controversy, constitutes a genuine contribution to Biblical and ascetical understanding.

Finally, a comment on Anselm's brief discussion of the coming end of the world, the overthrow of the enemies of God, and the fulfilment of the blessed in eternity. His treatise on history (Dialogue I) likewise ends thus, whereas his discussions with the Greek theologian (Dialogues II and III) do not, containing at most a passing reference to the subject. Although discussion of this subject would be necessary in any orthodox Christian treatment of the totality of history (and thus its presence in Dialogue I calls for no comment), its presence here is no more specifically germane to the subject of the

24 Quoted above, p. 54.
Defense than it is to those of Dialogues II and III. In my opinion, its presence here in this intensely personal work reinforces an impression of its pervading reality as a genuine keystone of Anselm's thought. It also appears to support Chenu's thesis of the development of a positive, dynamic, and optimistic conception of history in the twelfth century, one in which men and communities are seen as working and moving toward a goal pictured as ahead rather than above, through if not in time rather than out of it. I am not aware of any similar development in Byzantine theology, which rather appears to have maintained the ancient and patristic orientation toward eternity as above time. In the context of these considerations, the absence of emphasis on the goal of history in the future in the second and third Dialogues also strengthens the previously mentioned impression that these books reflect quite realistically the actual substance, spirit, and course of the discussions which they purport to represent.

Dialogue II

This and the following work purport to contain discussions between Anselm and the outstanding Byzantine theologian Nicetas of Nicomedia. However, they cannot be taken as verbatim accounts of the actual dialogues held on April 10 and 15, 1136, for several reasons. In the first place, although Anselm tells us that officially appointed notaries recorded the dialogues, he also notes that he himself objected to Nicetas's desire for a verbatim record. Instead, he request-

---

Chenu, p. 201. See also other citations noted on pp. 7 and 11 above.
ed that a record of the substance of the discussions be made, which Nicetas agreed to. Secondly, the papal command in obedience to which Anselm wrote the books was given to him some thirteen years after the debates themselves were held, and thus, even if Anselm possessed copies of the accounts made by the notaries, which is not unlikely, it is impossible that he could have remembered accurately all the lesser details of the discussions for so long a time in the absence of a verbatim record. Finally, Anselm states in the prologue to the Dialogues as a whole that

while living there in Constantinople for some time, I had many discussions and inquiries about their doctrine and rite, in public and private meetings of Latins and Greeks alike, and it pleased your Holiness graciously to command me to gather together the things which I said there, or heard or overheard said by them, and write an ἀντιλειμπέτων, that is a book of opposing positions in the form of a dialogue...

And so I have done what apostolic authority, which is always to be obeyed, has commanded... But I have preserved, as much as memory permitted, the tone of the dialogue which I had with the venerable and most learned archbishop of Nicomedia, Nicetas, in a public meeting in Constantinople, adding certain things no less necessary to the faith than fitting to this work.26

It is the final clause of this quotation which may indicate Anselm's deliberate introduction of matters not discussed with Nicetas in the

26 Dialogue I, 11403-1141A. "Ibidem aliarum moram faciens, multas super hujusmodi doctrina et ritu collationes et quaestiones, modo in privatis, modo in publicis, tam Latinorum quam Graecorum conventibus habui, placuit sanctitati vestrae et praecipiendo rogare, et rogando praecipere, quatenus ea quae vel ego ibi dixerim, vel ab illis dicta audierim et exceperim, in unum colligerem, et quasi ἀντιλειμπέτων, id est librum contrapositorum, sub dialogo conscriberem..."

"Feci itaque quod jussit apostolica auctoritas, cui semper otemperandum est... Conservavi autem quantum memoria subministrabat, tenorem dialogi quem cum venerabili ac doctissimo archiepiscopo Nicomediae Nechite in publico conventu apud urbem Constantinopolitam habui, addens quaedam non minus fidei necessaria, quam huic operi congrua."
in the public debates into the written dialogues. However, it should also be noted that this clause may well refer to Dialogue I, which Anselm says is a preface to the work, rather than to the actual contents of Dialogues II and III. However this may be, these two dialogues cannot be regarded as verbatim reports. At the same time, we have already noted evidence of their substantial accuracy, and we shall see further evidence pointing in the same direction shortly.

Anselm's tendency toward a sharp invective against his opponents has been mentioned above. This element is by no means absent from these dialogues, but at the same time there are several signs of a genuine appreciation of the Greek position on Anselm's part, and these give a ring of truth to Nicetas's laudatory contrast of Anselm's humility and love of truth with the arrogance and foolishness he says he has seen in most of the Latins he has had dealings with. Indeed, one almost suspects that in writing up the dialogues, Anselm had one eye on the importance of impressing the pope as a tough negotiator who had gained an acknowledged victory—a victory, however, which in fact Anselm did not gain and perhaps did not seek. Yet in one passage he appears to suggest considerable misunderstanding of the Greeks by the Latins, when he tells the pope he is writing so that these matters might become more accurately known to your discernment. For some Latins are greatly misled by the words of the Greeks, as they hear only the things left out of the words but do not understand by a tested meaning, thinking that they assert what they do not assert or deny what they do not deny at all.  

27 Dialogue I, 1140C-1141A. "... quanto verius ea discretioni vestrae innotescerent. Nonnulli quippe Latini Graecorum dictis plurumque falluntur, dum ea verborum tantum transita audiant, non autem examinato sensu intelligent, putantes eos affirmare quod non affirmant, aut negare quod nullatenus negant."
Dialogue II begins with an introduction which, besides citing the pope's command as a reason for writing, explains as additional reasons the scandal felt by "many" over the incongruity of the existence of Greek popes and saints with the fact of Greek heresy in regard to the Trinity and the sacraments, and the importunate requests of Anselm's brothers (in the Praemonstratensian order, presumably) and others for an explanation of the matter by him. Then in the first chapter of the dialogue itself, Anselm tells us about the invitation which he received from the emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople to discuss with the learned archbishop of Nicomedia, before an assembly of scholars, the chief differences between the Roman and Greek churches. He notes here the place of the meeting, Hagia Eirene Church in the Pisan Quarter of the city, the arrangements made for translating and recording the debate, the introductory civilities, and the statement of the issue to be dealt with, namely whether the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father (as both churches acknowledge), likewise proceeds from the Son (which the Latins assert and the Greeks question). It is also noted that the discussion will be conducted under three headings: arguments from reason, from Holy Scripture, and from the general councils and fathers of the Church, in that order.

The three translators appointed were the most notable translators of the era. See Anastos, p. 138.

The phrase "and the Son" (filioque, from which the dispute is often called the Filioque Controversy) was first added to the ecumenical creed in Spain during the sixth century. Although it was common teaching in the West, it was not inserted into the creed used in Rome itself until the tenth century.
The chapter concludes with Nicetas's opening statement, in which he explains how necessary it is to maintain the existence of only one first or ultimate principle in God in order to preserve true monotheism, and how, in the Greek view, the Latin assertion that the Holy Spirit derives his being from another source than the Father destroys that unity. This generally philosophical focus is the theme of discussion in the next six chapters, it recurs throughout the rest of the dialogue, and finally proves determinative, as we shall see.

Anselm's initial answer (ch. ii) is that the Son is not another ultimate source of the Holy Spirit, but the same ultimate source as the Father, by his possession of a substance identical with the Father's (by the Father's eternal generation of him), so that in proceeding from the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit nevertheless proceeds from only one first principle or ultimate source. In the next chapter (iii), Anselm undertakes a long digression into non-controversial matters, of which the chief is the priority of the Trinity to time. (In this dialogue, Anselm frequently and at some length moves off the subject, and he permits Nicetas to comment on it at several points.) Returning to the subject, Anselm adds to his essential argument that since the Father and the Son are one, the Holy Spirit could not proceed from the Father if he did not do so from the Son also.

To this Nicetas replies that by a similar reasoning you can prove that the same Holy Spirit proceeds from himself even as from the Father and the Son, because Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one essence of Godhead: and so, if he proceeds from them with whom he is substantially one, it is necessary to say that he also proceeds from himself
with whom they are also substantially one."

Anselm answers this objection by delineating the differences between the persons of the Godhead (ch. iv) as being precisely their mutual relationships, specifically saying of the Holy Spirit that "his being is his proceeding. Whence, therefore, he is, thence he proceeds; and whence he proceeds, thence he is. His very existence is his proceeding." This evokes a key question from Nicetas: "Does it seem to you that the Holy Spirit is to be said to proceed according to the common substance or according to the distinct and proper person?" To which Anselm's immediate answer (ch. v) is that this is a matter known only to God, and thus unanswerable by any creature.

The following four chapters are, again, digressions on Anselm's part. Chapter six is about the distinction between the properties of the persons and those of the Godhead. Then (ch. vii) he notes that the order of naming the persons of the Trinity, while fitting and fixed, does not indicate any differences in grade or dignity of divinity. In chapter eight, he illustrates the great variety and imprecisions.

---

30 Dialogue II, 1170D. "Simili ratione probari potest quod idem Spiritus sanctus procedat a semetipso sicut et a Patre et a Filio, quia Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus una sunt Divinitatis essentiae: et ita si procedit ab illis, cum quibus ipse est substantialiter unus, necesse est dicere ut etiam procedat a semetipso, cum quo et ipsi sunt substantialiter unus."

31 Dialogue II, 1171B. "Cujus esse est idem quod procedere. Unde ergo est, inde procedit; et unde procedit, inde est. Ejus esse nihil aliud est quam procedere."

32 Dialogue II, 1171C. "Verumne videtur tibi quod secundum communem substantiam, an secundum discretam et propriam personam dicensum sit Spirit sanctum procedere?"
sion of Biblical usage in naming the persons, their order and relationships, and states that this, far from indicating any confusion about the persons, simply shows that ultimately their works are of one operation. In the next chapter (ix) he maintains that the persons of the Trinity are not deficient nor the triune Godhead superfluous or tri-theistic, and he emphasizes that the intellectual and verbal complexity of trinitarian doctrine results only from the necessary inadequacy of mere human words to encompass the divine reality accurately.

For if the poverty of human words were able to find the one sole name which could aptly and adequately signify the unity of substance and trinity of persons in God, and this by a complete and adequate comprehension, certainly the Church of God would by no means have had to labor so in speaking and believing (as it has so often labored), setting forth so many words or names about God variously and faithfully. But the Christian faith is based neither solely in mere names nor in the profession of words, but in the pure truth itself of the Trinity and the Unity, and it arises from the truth itself, since truly there is one true God, and also a true Trinity of persons.33

Suddenly (ch. x) Anselm returns to Nicetas's question (which he had pronounced unknowable in chapter five), and answers it by asserting that the Holy Spirit proceeds neither according to the common substance nor according to the person, but according to the relationship. In making this statement Anselm ignores his earlier assertion

33 *Dialogue II*, 1177D. "Quod si humani sermonis inopia potuisset adventire unum solum nomen, quod apte et sufficienter significaret in Deo unitatem substantiae, et trinitatem personarum, et hoc pleno ac sufficienti intellectu; nimirum Ecclesia Dei nequaquam adeo laboraret, in dicendo et credendo, quae toties laboravit, multa verba de Deo sive nomina multiformiter et fideliter exponendo. Nec tamen in sola nudorum nominum, et verborum confessione, sed in ipsa trinitatis et unitatis mera veritate consistit fides Christiana, et fit ex ipsa veritate, qua vere unus Deus verus est, et vere vera trinitas est personarum."
that "his being is his procession," that is, that the essence of the 
personhood is the relationship, a lapse which neither conferee ap-
ppears to notice.

In the next chapter (xi) Anselm, beginning from a reiteration 
of the initial focus of the debate regarding the first principle in 
the Godhead, moves to the question of what essential relationship 
there is or can be between the Son and the Holy Spirit if they are 
not related by proceeding. This question is neither developed fur-
ther by Anselm nor directly answered by Nicetas anywhere in the rest 
of the debate; yet one feels that its weight is present throughout.

Chapter twelve contains the most extended of Anselm's several 
attacks on Nicetas and the Greeks. By a chain of propositions and a 
begging of the very question at issue, he concludes that the Greeks 
are guilty of an unforgiveable blasphemy. Nicetas vigorously rebuts 
this charge in the following chapter (xiii), whereupon Anselm accuses 
the Greeks of twisting Scripture to their own meaning, Nicetas sug-
gests that this is a danger on both sides, and they agree to turn to 
the specific examination of Holy Scripture regarding the procession; 
which is thus the subject of chapters fifteen through seventeen.

The first passage discussed is Christ's words to the apostles 
after his resurrection: "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John 20); which 
quickly leads into a discussion of the legitimacy of earthly analo-
gies in thinking about supernatural realities. No conclusion is 
reached: both regard some analogies as apt and others as misleading, 
but they do not agree on which fall into each category. The second 
passage is the statement that power went forth from Jesus to the sick
woman who touched the fringe of his garment (Luke 8). Anselm maintains that that power is the Holy Spirit, and that this occurrence, like the fore-mentioned giving of the Spirit by the Son, is a temporal expression of a basic eternal relationship. Nicetas raises the question of why Christ does not assert a procession of the Holy Spirit from himself if it is so, and then he acknowledges that the Holy Spirit is in some sense from the Son as well as the Father, "but nevertheless we do not dare to confess that he proceeds from both, because it is perhaps one thing for him to be from the Father and another for him to proceed."  

In answer to this (ch. xviii), Anselm amplifies at considerable length his earlier point that the being and the proceeding of the Holy Spirit are one, and with this the discussion returns to the realm of philosophy and speculative theology. In the course of his response to Anselm's argument, Nicetas makes a distinction which is central to the Greek position:

Now when you investigate by discussing whether the Holy Spirit derives the same being from the Father and the Son; and likewise, when you inquire whether his being and his procession are the same; and thus you attempt to prove that as his being is the same from both, so also his procession is the same from both; when you say this, I repeat, you should also note this, that although the Holy Spirit is of both and from both, he does not seem to be from both in precisely the same way, and so he does not proceed from both in precisely the same way. For he is from the Father as from him who derives his being from no one, and who derives from no one the fact that he is the source of and from whom the Holy Spirit has his being; but [the Holy Spirit] is from the Son as from his whose being is derived from the Father, and who also receives from the Father the fact that the Holy Spirit is of and

---

34 Dialogue II, 1189C (italics mine). "Nec tamen ab utroque eam procedere fateri audemus, quia fortasse aliud est eum a Patre esse, et aliud est eum procedere."
from him; and so it certainly appears that the Holy Spirit is truly of both and from both, but not that he either is of both in the same way, or proceeds from both in the same way.  

This may appear at first sight as a considerable concession on Nicetas's part, but in fact it adheres firmly to the Greek position. The Byzantine theologians and philosophers, steadfastly holding to patristic structures of thought, had come to allow the word "procession" only the the ontological relationship between the Holy Spirit and that ultimate, uncaused source who is the Father. The starting point of all theology for them was the Father, and the guarantee of the unity of the Godhead is his monarchy and sole ultimacy, not only in relation to the creation, but also in relation to the Son and the Holy Spirit within the Godhead. Nicetas holds to this root

---

35 Dialogue II, 1191B. "Proinde cum tu argumentando investigas utrum Spiritui sancto sit idem esse a Patre et a Filio; et iterum inquiris utrum sit ei idem esses, et idem procedere; et ita probare niteris quod sicut ei ab utroque idem est esse, ita quoque ab utroque sit ei idem procedere: cum hoc, inquam, dicis, hoc nimirum attendere debueras quod, licet Spiritus sanctus amborum sit, et ab ambobus sit, tamen ab ambobus non videtur aequaliter esse, ideoque nec aequaliter procedere. A Patre quippe est, tanquam ab eo qui a nullo est, et qui a nullo havet quod Spiritus sanctus ejus est, et quod ab eo est; a Filio autem est, tanquam ab eo qui a Patre est, et quo hoc ipsum a Patre habet, quod Spiritus sanctus ipsius quoque est, et ab ipso etiam est; et ita videtur quod Spiritus sanctus amborum quidem et ab ambobus sit veraciter, non autem quod amborum sit aequaliter, vel ab ambobus procedat aequaliter."

36 In this view the basic difference between creatures and the second and third persons of the Godhead may be indicated thus: whereas the Father has given to all things (including the Son and the Holy Spirit) all that they are or have, to the Son and the Holy Spirit he has given all that he himself is and has, namely the divine nature and attributes.

It is not unreasonable to say that whereas Eastern orthodox theology begins with the Father, and is first of all concerned to maintain true monotheism, Western theology tends to begin with the reality of a true and complete revelation in Christ, and thus to be first of all concerned to maintain the perfect equality of the Son with the Father as the foundation for such a revelation. Such differing ap-
perception throughout, while conceding much in other respects.

Anselm's answer (ch. xix) grants the reality of the distinction Nicetas has made, but asserts that it has nothing to do with the question at hand:

The Father, who is from no one, has nothing from the Son and nothing from the Holy Spirit. But neither does the Son, who is from the Father, have anything from the Holy Spirit. However, the Son has everything from the Father, even that he is God, for he is God from God; and he has from him even that the Holy Spirit should proceed from himself. Moreover, the Holy Spirit has from the Father himself that he should proceed from the Son just as he proceeds from the Father; and so whatever the Son is or has, and whatever, too, the Holy Spirit is, is entirely from the Father himself as the source. The Father, as author and first principle of begetting and procession, is from no one, and has nothing from anyone, and perhaps for this reason it is thought that the Holy Spirit is not of both in the same way, or does not proceed from both in the same way. But what is this? Our discussion has been undertaken not about how, but whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from both. But when this has been concluded, if it please you, this how must also be investigated. Indeed I want you to look at it briefly, since it is your wish. But I say that it appears to have no bearing at all on the Holy Spirit's equality of being and procession from both [Father and Son], that the one from whom he is and proceeds, namely the Father, is from no one, but the other from whom he similarly is and proceeds, namely the Son, is from the Father; because he neither is nor proceeds before or after, or less or more, from either because of this; but he proceeds once and eternally from both by no mode of inequality, but equally, with an equality known to himself eternally; although, however, it may well seem that some could maintain that his being and procession is more properly from the Father, as from the first cause, than from the Son, of whom [the Father] is the cause. For when it is said that the Father is from no one, and the Son is from the Father, priority or posteriority is by no means to be understood thereby, or superiority in the one and inferiority in

approaches to theological thought are not mutually exclusive, but they can at certain points come into conflict, as they have tended to with regard to the procession of the Holy Spirit.

the other, but in each the equality of the same majesty. And although the Father is uncaused, and the Son has the Father as his cause, nevertheless there is the same power and glory, as I have said, of the one who is caused and the one who is uncaused. ... And so how could they, who are of the same eternity, majesty, power, virtue, will, and equality, send forth the Holy Spirit proceeding from themselves unequally rather than equally?

As in Nicetas's preceding statement, there is a slight bending expressed in this answer of Anselm—he grants that it can be maintained that the Spirit's derivation and procession is "more properly" (magis proprie) from the Father, meaning, of course, "in the strictest sense

---

Dialogue II, 1191D-1192C (italics mine). "Pater qui a nullo est, nec a Filio, nec a Spiritu sancto quidquum habet; sed nec Filius qui a Patre est, a Spiritu sancto quidquum habet. Habet autem omnia a Patre Filius, etiam ut sit Deus; est enim de Deo Deus, et habet ab illo, ut etiam de se ipso procedat Spiritus sanctus. Porro Spiritus sanctus habet ab ipso Patre, ut procedat etiam a Filio, sicut procedit a Patre; et ita quidquid est Filius, seu quidquid habet Filius, et quidquid est Spiritus sanctus, ab ipso Patre principaliter totum est. Qui Pater tanquam auctor et principium generationis et processionis a nullo est, et a nullo quidquum habet, et fortasse ob hoc putatur quod Spiritus sanctus nec amborum sit aequaliter, nec ab amboibus procedat aequaliter. Sed quid hoc? Nostra disputatio suscepit non qualifier ab utroque, sed utrum ab utroque Spiritus sanctus procedat. Quod ubi concessum fuerit, consequenter, si placet, de hoc etiam investigandum est. Attamen hoc velim, ut ad hoc ipsum breviter intendas, quia tibi placet. Dico autem quod nequaquam videtur auferre Spiritu sancto, quantum ad seipsum, aequalitatem existendi et procedendi ab utroque, quod alter a quo est, et a quo procedit, scilicet Pater a nullo est, alter vero a quo simileter est, et a quo similiter procedit, scilicet Filius a Patre est, quia nec prius, nec posterius, nec minus, vel plus propter hoc ab altero est, vel procedit; sed simul et semel ab utroque nullo inaequalitatis modo, sed aequaliter, id est cognita sibi aequalitate aeterniliter procedit: quamvis tamen a nonnullis videatur bene posse dici, quod magis proprie sit et procedat a Patre, tanquam a prima causa, quam a Filio, cujus ipse est causa. Cum enim dicitur, Pater a nullo est et Filius a Patre est, nequaquam intelligenda est ibi prioritas seu posterioritas, aut in hoc majoritas, aut in illo minoritas; sed in utroque ejusdem majestatis aequalitas. Et licet Pater nullam habeat sui causam, et Filius Patrem habet sui causam, tamen eadem potestas et gloria est, ut ita dixerim, causati et incausati ...; et ita qui ejusdem aeternitatis, majestatis, potestatis, virtutis, voluntatis, aequalitatis sunt, quomodo non aequaliter, sed inaequaliter Spiritum sanctum a se procedentem emittant?"
of the words." Although slight, the concession will prove significant. Nicetas's initial response is:

According to the things which you have covered with the help of reason, it neither appears unreasonable that the Holy Spirit should have the same being from the Father and the Son, nor proved as yet by this fact that he does proceed from both, whether equally or unequally. 

Anselm reiterates: "Since you grant that he has the same being from both, you must necessarily acknowledge that his being proceeds from both." But this Nicetas will not grant. To Anselm's continued argument Nicetas asks why the Gospel says nothing about it if it is true. Anselm replies (ch. xx) that Holy Scripture neither asserts that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, nor denies that he proceeds from the Son, and ends by accusing Nicetas of unwarrantedly adding the negative conclusion. But Nicetas states that the issue is the Latins' unwarranted addition, not a Greek denial, of an unscriptural assertion; which denial, however, he admits Greeks have sometimes fallen into in vehement reaction to arrogant Latin assertions.

In the following chapter (xxi) Anselm, after urging calmness on his opponent—in reading the debate Anselm himself seems to have gotten the more excited of the two—attempts a remarkable tour de force, maintaining that since the Greeks do not know whether the Holy

---

38 Dialogue II, 1193b. "Secundum ea quae suffragio rationis contexti, neque videtur absurdum, quod Spiritus sanctus idem esse habeat a Patre et a Filio, nec tamen videtur ob hoc adhuc probatum, quod ab utroque vel aequaliter, vel inaequaliter procedat."

39 Dialogue II, 1193b. "Quoniam concedis ei idem esse ab utroque, necesse quoque est te fateri idem ei esse procedere ab utroque."
Spirit proceeds from the Son or not, they should at least keep silent, and not oppose the Latins who know he does so proceed,

for what someone does not know, how is he to evaluate it rightly?

... And now you should not presume to deny any more this thing which is uncertain to you, which until now you were rashly accustomed to deny as ignorant. For it is unfitting that he who wanders from the safe road, and does not know he wanders, should strive to correct one who is walking rightly and knowledgeably in the way; and he who is not doubtful should carry the doubter along.

Nicetas understandably does not accept this line of reasoning at all, and takes the opportunity to contrast Greek humility before uncertain matters with the arrogant ignorance of some Latins. But he specifically excepts Anselm from that condemnation, praising his humility and gentleness, and stating that it is because of these qualities that he has been granted this public hearing, a privilege no Latin has hitherto been accorded. Considering some of the things which Anselm has said, this praise might well be a piece of irony, a private joke between Nicetas and the Greeks in the audience. But taken in the context of the whole dialogue it strikes me as genuine, though coming at this point also carrying a gentle rebuke.

Nicetas now turns the discussion to its third focus, by mentioning that the Council of Nicea said nothing about a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, and in fact anathematized anyone who would add or subtract from its creed. Anselm then (ch. xxii) reminds Nicetas in great detail of all the beliefs not stated clearly in Holy

---

40 Dialogue II, 1196C. "Quod enim quis ignorat, quomodo de hoc recte judicat? ... Et jam amplius hoc tibi incertum est, ne-gare non praesumas, quod hactenus tanquam nescius temere solebas nega-re. Quippe incongruum est, ut is qui secus viam errat, et errare se ignorat, ambulantem in via scinter et recte corrigere contendat; et is qui dubius non est, dubietatem inferat."
Scripture, but defined by the councils. In another digression (ch. xxiii), he expounds the doctrine held by both Greeks and Latins that the Holy Spirit presided at the general councils, and comes to the startling conclusion that since

the Holy Spirit has both composed the Gospel itself and the very councils celebrated by the orthodox fathers, and gradually teaching all truth, he has spoken nothing contrary to the truth; ... therefore, you can now safely say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, because what the same Holy Spirit appears to have expressed less clearly about himself in this regard in the Gospel, afterward he has supplemented plainly in various councils, as the master of both writings—

completely ignoring the fact that nothing of a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son was ordained at any of the said councils. Nicetas, however, ignores it also, and in a statement which sets the stage for the ultimate conclusion of the debate, he says:

You have treated very aptly the Gospel and the holy councils of the holy fathers, and you have credibly showed the same Holy Spirit to be the author of the Gospel and of the councils, which we also believe, and we venerate the same councils with an honor equal to the Gospel. Consequently, as I bear witness to you truly we and most of our philosophers do not disagree with you with regard to the meaning of this procession but, as I have now said often, with regard to the expression of the procession. Thus far it has been alien to us, not because we abhor the idea of a procession, which is right, but the expression of the procession, because it has not been used. Many doctors of the Greeks who have explained the divine Scriptures, although they suggest the same meaning of this procession to us very expressly by appropriate expressions, nevertheless have very clearly not employed this phrase of procession, nor have they allowed us this manner of speaking.

41. Dialogue II, 1201B. "Et ipsum Evangelium, et ipsa concilia ab orthodoxis Patribus celebrata idem Spiritus sanctus dictavit, et paulatim docens omnem veritatem, nihil veritati contrarium dixit; ... secure jam potes dicere, quod Spiritus sanctus procedat a Filio, quoniam quod idem Spiritus sanctus in hoc de seipso minus aperte in Evangelio videtur expressisse, hoc postea in diversis conciliis tanquam magister utriusque Scripturae manifeste supplevit."

42. Dialogue II, 1202B. "Satis convenienter contexuisti Evangelium et sancta sancorum Patrum concilia, et probabiliter ostendisti eundem
In chapter twenty-four, Anselm quotes Greek and Latin fathers in favor of the double procession, and in response to Nicetas's inquiry acknowledges the authority of the Greek as well as the Latin fathers. Nicetas praises Anselm's catholicity, and explains that when the Greek doctors speak of the Spirit's procession from the Father, they are using the word in its strict technical sense (proprie); but when they speak of his procession from the Son

this neither is nor is spoken in the strict sense, because what is from the Son, or proceeds or flows forth from the Son, neither is nor happens as from the first cause, because even the Son himself—that he is, and that he is the Son, and that he sends the Holy Spirit proceeding or flowing forth from himself—is not of himself but of the Father as of the first cause and first principle. . . . And so I concede that the Holy Spirit strictly proceeds from the Father, who is from no one; however, he proceeds from the Son not in this strict sense, because [the Son] himself is also from the Father; and this is what the wisest of the Greeks have delineated, as I have just said.43

Anselm now supports Nicetas's position regarding the somewhat equivocal

Spiritum sanctum esse auctorem Evangelii et eorumdem conciliorum, quod et nos credimus, et ideo par veneracione cum Evangelio ipsa concilia veneramur. Proinde ut tibi verum fatear, nos et plerique nostrorum sapientes a vobis non dissentimus in sensu hujus processionis; sed sic cut jam saepe dixi, verbum hujus processionis; hactenus apud nos fuit alienum, nec horremus processionis sensum, quia rectus est, sed processionis verbum quia insolitum est. Multi etiam Graecorum doctores qui divinas Scripturas exposuerunt, licet eumdem processionis hujus sensum convenientibus verbis satis expresse nobis insinuaverint, tamen hoc verbo processionis non adeo evidenter usi sunt, nec nobis in usu loquendi reliquerunt."

43Dialogue II, 1204D. "Non ita propria dicitur vel est, quia quod a Filio est, vel a Filio procedit vel profuit, hoc non est, vel hoc non facit tanquam a prima causa, quia ipse quoque Filius id quod est, et quod Filius est, et quod a se Spiritum sanctum procedentem seu profluentem mittit, hoc non a seipso, sed a Patre tanquam a prima causa Spiritus sanctus proprie procedere dicitur. . . . Et ita concedo Spiritum sanctum a Patre, qui a nullo est, proprie procedere; a Filio autem, quia et ipse a Patre est, non ita proprie procedere, et hoc est quod distinxerunt, sicut jam dixi, sapientissimi Graecorum."
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cal use of the term "procession" (ch. xxv), quoting Jerome and Augustine, and he summarizes thus:

From these words of the blessed doctors Jerome and Augustine, I think it is clearly to be granted that the Holy Spirit proceeds strictly and chiefly from the Father as from the first cause, because he proceeds from the Father in the first instance, while the Father possesses him from no other source but himself, for the Father is the first cause, and there is no cause of a first cause. But the Son, since he is derived not from himself but from the Father, has this procession of the Holy Spirit from himself not by his own ultimate right or power, but as a gift from the Father (from whom and by whom he himself has being by begetting). And so the Father is the chief author and causal first principle both of the begetting of the Son and of the procession of the Holy Spirit; and for this reason, although it may not be written that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son strictly and chiefly, nevertheless, as it is true that he proceeds from the Father, so also, once all ambiguity has been removed, it is true that he proceeds from the Son, and no inequality of his procession is allowed, since he is asserted to proceed from both equally, as has been said.44

In a further chapter (xxvi) Anselm and Nicetas briefly dispose of the idea of some Greek philosophers that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Son, a view which neither seems to entertain seriously. But the debate was already concluded on the grounds quoted above. Anselm gives thanks to the Holy Spirit for having brought about concord (ch. xxvii). Nicetas explains to Anselm

---

44 Dialogue II. 1206AB. "Ex his verbis beatorum doctorum Hieronymi et Augustini satis concedendum puto, Spiritum sanctum proprie et principaliter ex Patre tanquam a prima causa procedere, quia sic ex Patre procedit quasi primo loco, dum eum Pater ab alio non habeat, sed a seipso. Pater quippe prima causa est, et primae causae causa non est; Filius vero cum a seipso non sit, sed a Patre, hunc ipsum Spiritum sanctum a se quoque procedentem non a se, sed a Patre habeat, a quo et ipso per generationem esse habet. Est itaque Pater principalis auctor et causale principium tam generationis ad Filium, quam processionis ad Spiritum sanctum: ideoque temtseti non legatur adeo proprie et principaliter a Filio procedere; tamen sicut verum est eum a Patre procedere, ita quoque sublata omni ambiguitate verum est eum a Filio procedere, et nulla processionis ejus inaequalitas admittitur, cum ab utroque, sicut dictum est, aequaliter procedere affirmatur."
that the phrase expressing a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son cannot be used publicly until a general council has met and proclaimed it. (This is the only allusion to a central Greek contention against the Latins, namely that the Filioque clause is illegally added to the creed without the official sanction of a general council.)

All present praise God and go home.

Some general reflections regarding both dialogues with Nice- tas will be found following the analysis of Dialogue III. The conclusion which is reached in this dialogue, however, calls for particular comment. The conferees do appear to reach agreement of a sort regarding the Holy Spirit's procession from the Son; and although Nicetas may appear to make the greatest concession in acknowledging any legitimacy whatever to the idea, in actual fact the concessions are mutual. Nicetas asserts that if it is granted that the word "procession" has a somewhat different and uncertain meaning when used of the relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit than it has when used of the relationship between the Father and the Holy Spirit, he accepts the use of it in the former connection. Anselm asserts that as long as the reality of a procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son—a procession equal and simultaneous to that of the Holy Spirit from the Father—he accepts the idea of a real difference between the Father and the Son as regards their being sources of the Holy Spirit. Thus Nicetas accepts Anselm's basic contentions: the full equality of the Son with the Father, and the necessity of an ontological relationship between the Son and the Holy Spirit. And likewise, Anselm accepts Nicetas's basic contention: the utter uniqueness of the Father as
first principle, first cause, fount, and origin of the Godhead. And they claim, with justice as it appears to me, that in this conclusion they are in entire agreement with the fathers.

Yet the concessions by which they agree are extremely subtle points. It would not be difficult to parody the agreement as composed of distinctions without differences, or mere equivocations: "I will allow your phrase (equal procession) as long as you allow my denial of its signifance (strictly speaking, from the Father alone), and vice versa." I do not think such a judgment would be accurate or fair, but perhaps the basis of agreement was too subtle to be successful. In any case, there is no indication that this line of resolution of the Filioque controversy was ever pursued further. The idea of the Holy Spirit's procession from the Father through the Son, so briefly dismissed in this dialogue, was developed in later times as a possible basis for agreement; indeed, by the time of the Council of Florence (1439) it was regarded as the Eastern position, and the Greeks at that council accepted the orthodoxy of the Filioque doctrine on the ground that the Latins meant the same thing when they said from the Son that the Greek fathers had meant by through the Son. But the agreement purportedly reached in the discussion between Anselm and Nicetas seems to stand alone.

Was, then, the conclusion reported in Dialogue II actually the one reached by Anselm and Nicetas? Its very uniqueness may weigh against it. But there are also factors favoring the accuracy of the

---

written dialogue. First, the dialogue "reads real," except at a few points—it has the feel of a real debate rather than a monologue arbitrarily cast into dialogue form. Moreover, the basic positions and issues discussed are thoroughly consonant with those involved in such discussions between Greeks and Latins from the time of the patriarch Photius (ninth century) through the Council of Florence (fifteenth century) and beyond. It is very possible that the deepening hostility between East and West, especially after the mutual massacres which occurred in the 1180's and the conquest of Constantinople by Western crusaders in 1204, simply rendered so irenic and conciliatory a conclusion unacceptable to one or both sides.

One other question which suggests itself regarding the conclusion of this dialogue is whether agreement was reached—granted that it was reached—under the duress of a desperate Byzantine need for Latin material assistance against its enemies, as was true in the case of several union discussions of later times. At this particular period, although the Turkish power was steadily increasing, it was no immediate threat to Byzantium's existence. However, remembering that Anselm's very presence in Constantinople in 1136 was for the purpose of negotiating a common strategy for the two empires and the papacy against the aggressive expansionism of the Kingdom of Sicily under Roger II, the possibility cannot be simply dismissed. There were times during that decade and the next when an invasion of Constantinople by Roger was imminently expected and greatly dreaded. But as

\[46\] See Kelly, pp. 358-67; Dvornik, F., The Photian Schism (Cambridge: University Press, 1943); Gill, ch. 6; and Lossky, pp. 54ff.
have noted, the danger posed by Roger was equally felt by the papacy as well as both empires. Moreover, our dialogue ends on a note of mutual concession rather than one of Greek capitulation. Thus it might better be said that Roger's influence on this dialogue—if any—was to strengthen the desire of both sides to find a point of accommodation and harmony on which political and religious agreement alike could be built. If this external pressure was a real factor bearing on the dialogues—and the unusual dignity and publicity which Anselm indicates the Byzantine authorities gave them might be a sign of such a factor—this in itself could partly account for the subsequent failure of either side to pursue the line of resolution opened up here. For in such a case, a lessening of external pressure combined with the fore-mentioned growing hostility between Byzantium and the West might well result in the return of both sides to more partisan positions.

Dialogue III

The third book of the Dialogues covers the second discussion between Anselm and Nicetas of Nicomedia. The chief matters dealt with in this book are the primacy of the Roman see and the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the mass; but the mixture of wine and water in the mass is also treated briefly, and a misunderstanding of certain Greek anointings by the Latins is cleared up. This dialogue took place five days following the first one, on April 15, 1136. Apparently the first one had aroused considerable interest and discussion

\[47\] See above, p. 74.
among those who had attended it. In order to accommodate the great number of professors, scholars, and clergy who wished to attend the second dialogue, it was held in the apse of the great basilica of Hagia Sophia itself.

Following some introductory remarks and mutual compliments, Anselm begins the discussion (ch. ii) with the statement that all things in the Church can be traced to one of three sources: (1) the authority of Holy Scripture, (2) a universal tradition of the Church, or (3) local customs, constitutions, and ideas "whether because of the variety of places or because it has seemed best to each." Then he proceeds (ch. iii) to charge the Eastern Church with violation of the second principle and disobedience to the Roman Church by its use of leavened bread in the Eucharist. Nicetas defends the Eastern custom on the ground that its usage in this matter is of great antiquity and is among the things which are properly within each church's competence. To this Anselm retorts (ch. iv) that antiquity is no excuse for error and then asserts (ch. v) that the Eastern Church should obey the laws of the Roman Church because God has given to Rome the primacy.

This, of course, changes the subject from the eucharistic bread to the Roman primacy itself, for which Anselm now states his case. Citing the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul in Rome as consecrating the Roman Church to Christ in a pre-eminent way, he asserts for that Church both a divine protection from all error and

---

48 Dialogue III, 1211C. "... vel pro locorum varietate, vel prout unicuique benevisum est..."
heresy and a divine authority to rule the entire Church arising from that protection. To this Roman orthodoxy Anselm contrasts at length (ch. vi) the great number of heresies rampant in the East and especially in Constantinople.

Nicetas then states (ch. vii) the Byzantine position on the Roman primacy, namely (1) that the primacy—which he accepts—is built on the dignity of Rome as the seat of empire, (2) that the three ancient patriarchal sees of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch are essentially equal in status, like three sisters of whom Rome is the elder, (3) that the only actual authority of Rome with regard to the other patriarchates is its right to hear and judge appeals made to it from the decisions of the other patriarchal sees in certain cases, and (4) that because of the transfer of the seat of empire to Constantinople, that see as the new Rome has been given a primacy second only to old Rome, and has also been given jurisdiction over certain Eastern provinces.

Then (ch. viii), in the first passage of its kind in the Dialogues, Nicetas vigorously attacks the Roman Church, first because it divided the sovereignty—presumably by recognizing and crowning German emperors in the West—and secondly because it has tried to change a proper and traditional primacy of honor into a complete and absolute autocracy over the Church, one which, if accepted, would in Nicetas's view make the Eastern churches not sons but slaves of the Church. He concludes:

These things about the Roman Church, saving your peace, I will say, which Church I with you venerate, but I do not follow in all things with you, nor consider that it is necessarily to be followed in all things: whose so superior authority you have
set forth to us that, laying our rite aside, we should accept its form and example in the sacraments—although reason and the authority of the Scriptures be dashed to pieces—and that we, as blind men, should follow him who leads with closed eyes wherever he may command, led by his own spirit. But how safe or honest this would be for us, let Latin as well as Greek philosophers judge.49

Anselm interrupts Nicetas at this point (ch. ix), to commend the Roman Church for its prompt, fair, and thorough handling of ecclesiastical cases, and to remind Nicetas that the Constantinopolitan council which established Constantinople as the second see of Christendom was not ratified by a pope, and that the canon of the Chalcedonian council which confirmed that earlier council's action was in fact specifically voided by Pope Leo as contrary to the canons of Nicea. Nicetas asserts here that Peter's primacy over the other apostles did not involve an essential difference of rank between them since all received directly from Christ the power of binding and loosing—Peter did not alone receive this from Christ directly and the others from Peter. To this Anselm reiterates that Peter was chief of the apostles, with a real (though undefined) superiority of rank over them. He supports this contention with several passages of Scripture and concludes:

Therefore it is not fitting for the faithful to doubt or question in any way—rather they must hold most firmly—that Peter is constituted the chief [princps] of the apostles by the Lord. And

49 Dialogue III, 1220AB. "Haec de Romana Ecclesia, salva pace tua, dixerim, quam ego tecum veneror, sed non tecum per omnia sequor, nexo ex necessitate per omnia sequendam arbitror: cujus etiam auctoritate tuam excellenter ut pro nobis proposuisti, ut deposito ritu nostro ejus formam et imitationem in sacramentis indiscussa ratione et Scripturarum auctoritate susciperemus, et ut tanquam caeci clausis oculis ducentem sequeremur, quocunque illa proprio spiritu ducta praeret. Quod quam securum, seu honestum nobis fuerit, judicent tam Latini quam Graeci sapientes."
just as the Roman pontiff alone on account of Peter administers in the place of Christ, so doubtless the other bishops administer in the place of the apostles under Christ, and on account of Christ under Peter, and on account of Peter under the Roman pontiff his vicar: nor in this does it detract to any extent from any of the apostles if to each one humbly is assigned his own office.

Nicetas changes the subject and replies to Anselm's earlier accusation that the East is heresy-prone. He points out (ch. xi) both that heresy arises partly from intellectual activity gone astray—and thus may be as easily avoided in Rome by dulness of mind as by divine protection—and that the heresies which sprang up in the East were also put down through the general councils held in the East and composed mostly of Eastern bishops. Anselm continues his argument for a generic superiority of the Roman see over the entire Church:

The key word for the particular privilege and right of Peter and his successors in the Roman see, in Anselm's usage, is princeps, the meanings of which range from the simple right to speak first in an assembly of equals to the absolute right to rule. I have rendered the word as "chief." The context indicates that Anselm's understanding of the title is rather far along the spectrum toward "ruler," but not demonstrably there. The very question at issue in this dialogue is whether "primacy" necessarily involves "ruling authority": Nicetas, as we have seen, accepts a primacy which allows the Roman see the authority of a court of last resort, in addition to seniority of honor. There would be no issue if Anselm's view did not require significantly more than this.
ment as his successor in the vicariate; and so the Roman pontiffs, one after another in order, are the head of the Church on earth as Christ is the head of the same Church in heaven. 51

He continues (ch. xii) by citing the absurdity and confusion of a society with more than one head, the fallacy of determining primacy by secular sovereignty rather than the divine will, and the ridiculously large number of heads of churches which would result if each seat of secular government was ipso facto a head of churches. Returning then to Nicetas's statement, he asserts that it was not at all by the wisdom of Eastern bishops or councils that the heresies were put down, but by the authority and orthodoxy of the Roman pontiff, citing at length a number of examples.

At this point, Nicetas grants the accuracy of Anselm's citations, concedes his case ever so slightly, and turns the discussion back to the question of the form of eucharistic bread:

We have in the archives of this church of Holy Wisdom the deeds of old of the Roman pontiffs, and the acts of the councils, in which are found these same things which you have reviewed about the authority of the Roman Church: and thus it would be no small shame to us if we should deny the things which have been written among us by our fathers, and which we have before our eyes. Truly neither the Roman pontiff himself nor his emissaries would have held in condemnation anyone in the East, unless with the consent and vote and support of the established orthodox bishops throughout the East, who with the zeal of faith, sometimes with and also sometimes without the Roman Church, condemned heresies and confirmed the up-rightness of the catholic faith. But because you extend the authority of the oft-mentioned Roman Church so greatly, tell me, I beg, which of the Roman pontiffs has estab-

lished that unleavened bread is to be used in the sacrifice of the altar to such an extent that necessity should press us to ac­cept it, because if we did not accept it we would lie under just condemnation? . . . I confess that I have found this written no­where in the ecclesiastical books which are among us.52

Nicetas goes on to state (chh. xiii and xiv) that not only have no popes actually commanded the universal use of unleavened bread, but two of them, Melchiades and Siricius, specifically instituted the use of leavened bread. Careful to avoid saying that it is on this ground that he uses leavened bread, Nicetas argues that the positive institu­tion of two popes ought to carry more weight with Anselm than the mere habits of many. Nicetas then states and develops at length the idea that in the early Church leavened or unleavened bread was used indifferently, according to convenience. Gradually, he says, the Eastern and Western Churches respectively abandoned one form of the

52Dialogue III, 1228CD. "Nos in hoc archivio hagiae Sophiae anti­qua Romanorum pontificum gesta, et conciliorum habemus actiones, in quibus haec eadem quae dixisti de auctoritate Romanae Ecclesiae, re­periuntur: et ideo non parva verecundia nobis esset, si ea negaremus, quae apud nos a Patribus nostris scripta praecoculis habemus. Verum neque ipse Romanus pontifex, neque missi in damnatione alijus in Oriente habuisse nisi consensu et suffragio et adminiculor orthodoxor­um episcoporum per Orientem constituentor, qui zelo fidei aliquando cum Romana Ecclesia, aliquando etiam sine illa haereses damnaverunt, et rectitudinem catholicas fidei confirmaverunt. Quia vero tantopere auctoritatem saepe dictae Romanae Ecclesiae pretendis, dic mihi, quae­so, quis Romanorum pontificum statuerit, ut azymo pane in sacrificio altaris utendum sit, in tantum ut necessitas urgere nos debeat, quod illud suscipere cogamus; quod si non ceperimus, justae damnationi sub­jaceamus. . . . Fateor ego in ecclesiasticis libris qui apud nos sunt, musquam scriptum inveni."

The last-quoted sentence is attributed to Anselm by Migne rather than to Nicetas, to whom it was attributed in an earlier edition. In a foot-note Migne simply says he has transferred it to Anselm because no one will deny that it is his. In its brevity, however, and unqua­li­fied tone of concession, I find it unique and out of character for Anselm. Moreover, it suits the context of Nicetas's speech very well. So I have returned it to him.
bread, although still with no sense of right or wrong about the matter on either side. Finally, about 300 years ago, some Latins began to blaspheme the Greek custom according to the Greek chroniclers, thus provoking Greeks to respond, mistakenly though understandably, with a like accusation.

Anselm's response to Nicetas's case (chh. xv and xvi) is three-fold. First, neither citing a positive papal constitution nor regarding Nicetas's distinction between a positively-constituted law and a custom, Anselm maintains that the authority of the vast majority of the popes using unleavened bread should outweigh that of the two who used leavened bread, excellent as those two undoubtedly were. Secondly, he interprets the constitutions of the two popes as referring to blessed bread distributed by the bishop rather than eucharistic bread. Thirdly, while acknowledging himself impressed by the proposition that the form of eucharistic bread was not an issue in ancient times, he states that the existent authority of the papacy must be determinative. At this point Anselm responds at considerable length to an earlier assertion of Nicetas that the great number of ec-

---

53 This would be at the time of the East-West controversies connected with the "Photian Schism," which according to Dvornik "affected all religious and cultural contacts between East and West and raised problems that were to poison the relations between the two Churches and influence the whole course of Christian development for centuries" (The Photian Schism, p. 433).

This reference, incidentally, is the nearest allusion to Photius in the Dialogues. Dvornik notes the oddity that in these discussions Anselm "does not even mention Photius, though he argues about the procession of the Holy Ghost, the primacy and the Aymes, in fact about every problem that was once raised by Photius. Nor does his opponent father these differences on the unfortunate Patriarch, but rather presents them as topics of controversy that had always existed." (The Photian Schism, p. 345.)
clesiastical titles in the Roman Church which are Greek in origin, as well as the great number of Greeks who have been popes, indicates the great authority of Greeks among Romans, which should still obtain in Nicetas's opinion. Anselm's answer is that the Roman Church does not claim exclusive possession of wisdom, but only final authority, which the Greeks would find most gracious and generous, if they would only humble themselves to accept it as their ancestors surely did.

Nicetas then asserts that the Roman primacy has been discussed enough, and he asks Anselm to outline the reasons for which the Roman Church now considers unleavened bread so superior to leavened bread that the latter should be abolished. Anselm then maintains (ch. xvii) that unleavened bread was both (1) instituted by Christ at the Last Supper since that meal was a Passover Supper at which unleavened bread was required by Jewish law, and also (2) required in the sacrifices of the Old Testament law which Christ came not to abolish but fulfil.

Nicetas acknowledges the great weight of this argument, but opposes it with the facts that (1) in his institution of the Eucharist Christ used the word ἄρτος, which is universally used to indicate ordinary leavened bread, in contrast to the word ἄρτος, which specifically means unleavened bread, and (2) that there is one oblation in the Old Testament wherein leavened bread is required, namely the Pentecost oblation.

Anselm does not discuss Nicetas's first point, but asserts that Scripture must be interpreted harmoniously rather than divergently, and that the Pentecost oblation referred to by Nicetas is
not actually one of the priestly sacrifices of the law, but rather a lay offering. He makes the further points (ch. xviii) that in the Scripture leaven is consistently regarded symbolically as an image of evil, and that leavened bread is in practice much more difficult to use with the care and reverence which is essential in connection with the sacrament.

Nicetas now states (ch. xix) that although he holds to the Eastern tradition of leavened bread, he would not hesitate to use unleavened bread for the sacrament when leavened bread was not available. He feels that most of the learned among the Greeks would agree with him in this, but that the common people would be scandalized. And therefore he urges that a general council be held at which it can be decided, once and for all, whether only one form of eucharistic bread is to be used, or both forms accepted indifferently, throughout the Church.

This concludes the discussion of the form of the eucharistic bread, but Anselm has two other questions he wishes to discuss. The first has to do with the mixing of water with wine in the mass, which the Latins do before and the Greeks do after the consecration of the elements. The discussion (ch. xx) first centers around the Lord's institution of the sacrament, which is necessarily inconclusive, because there is no evidence on the point. Anselm then moves to a commendation of the Latin practice on the ground that the mass is a commemoration of Christ's passion, in which both blood and water flowed from his side as he hung on the cross; and from that point to the argument that as the wine represents Christ's blood, so the water repre-
sents the people of the Church, Christ's mystical body. To this Nice- 
tas replies that since the Church was not consecrated simultaneously 
with Christ himself, but subsequently and as a result of being united 
with Christ, the addition of the water (as representing the Church) 
after the consecration of the wine best portrays the theological 
truth of the matter. Anselm then argues at considerable length that 
not to consecrate the wine and water mixed separates Christ the head 
from the Church his body; to which Nicetas once again suggests a gen-
eral council as the only means of resolving the question.

Then Anselm raises his final question (ch. xxi), which is the 
Latin suspicion that certain anointings which are customarily admin-
istered to Latins who marry Greeks according to the Greek rite, con-
stitute a blasphemous repetition of baptism. Nicetas assures him 
that such is not the case, and that it is an unction which is not ad-
ministered universally in such circumstances, but only in the absence 
of evidence that the person has already received unction.

In the last chapter (xxii), Nicetas and Anselm both express 
their desire for a speedy end of all causes of disunity through a 
general council. And so the dialogue ends, with the audience prais-
ing God and the conferees.

This dialogue, like the previous one, gives the feel of reality— it sounds like a real discussion rather than a disguised mono-
logue. Nevertheless, in this dialogue there is much less interaction 
between the participants than in the other, less sense of a develop-
ment of views through discussion, and contrariwise, a strong sense of 
the exchange of fixed opinions with no expectation of any change or
development. This is not true of every part of the dialogue. The question about the anointings is dissolved by the simple denial of Nicetas that re-baptism is involved. With regard to the mixture of wine and water in the mass, Anselm does not concede the legitimacy of the Greek custom in so many words—indeed, Anselm never makes an out-and-out verbal concession in the Dialogues. But when both customs have been fully explained and compared, the difference appears so slight and the superiority of either so moot that Anselm's only response is the remark that some people can make anything look good, and he tacitly accepts Nicetas's peace-making referral of the question to a general council by changing the subject.

It is in the discussion of the two main topics of the dialogue that one senses great inflexibility. Indeed, it is wholly with regard to the Roman primacy that it appears—this fixedness of views appears in the discussion about the proper form of eucharistic bread only because Anselm insistently bases his argument about the subject on the authority of Rome. In relation to the primacy of the Roman see, one senses utter intransigence on both sides. There is little real discussion, no development of views, no new insights, no accommodation or compromise, but simply the explication of immutable opposition. It is in connection with this subject only that Nicetas

54 Note above, p. 82, that after stating the three sources of ecclesiastical practice, Anselm makes no attempt to establish that unleavened bread is required by Scripture or universal tradition rather than a matter of local custom, but simply asserts that the East is schismatic in differing from the Roman Church, which must always be followed. At several other points he adverts to Rome's authority—and even to the authority of Rome's mere custom—as the determinant of the matter.
displays anger. But that anger was brief, and the tone of the discussion is not so much hostility as unalterable opposition between views felt to be well-nigh irreconcilable. A remark of another Nicetas—the contemporary Byzantine historian surnamed Choniates—sums up the feeling one receives from this part of the debate very aptly:

Between us and them yawns a vast chasm of discord. We have no meeting of minds and stand diametrically opposed, even though we keep up our external contacts and often share the same habitations.\textsuperscript{55}

Why this chasm on this particular matter? In his important study \textit{Byzantium and the Roman Primacy}, Dvornik\textsuperscript{56} maintains that the eleventh century reform movement in the Western Church gave rise to a radically transformed concept of the nature of the Roman primacy which gradually spread throughout the West. He cites "the Gregorian idea of the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power"\textsuperscript{57} as one of the foundations of the new and very exalted view of the rights and privileges of the papacy. This new view naturally had profound effects on ecclesiastical relations between East and West, the first of which was perhaps the permanency of the schism of 1054.\textsuperscript{58} After reviewing a number of unsuccessful unity discussions and negotiations between Greeks and Latins in the twelfth century, Dvornik concludes that "all these projects met shipwreck on the rock of the new politico-

\textsuperscript{55}Quoted in Anastos, p. 135.


\textsuperscript{57}Dvornik, \textit{Byzantium}, p. 154.

\textsuperscript{58}There had been mutual condemnations and excommunications before this between East and West, which in due time had been rescinded or overlooked. The new view of the papacy made such accommodations much more difficult, indeed almost impossible.
religious conception of the papacy." Indeed, Schmemann goes so far as to say that after Gregory VII "for the West the whole problem of unity was reduced to a single point: submission to Rome and external recognition of its absolute primacy." 

With regard to Anselm's relation to the new view of the papacy we must note in general that, as Bihlmeyer states, the Praemonstratensians "placed themselves at the service of the papacy and rendered valuable assistance in achieving the religious, disciplinary, and political objectives of the pontiff." We have already noted, moreover, that Anselm himself was an adherent of the curial party at the time of his discussions with Nicetas. The dialogue itself shows, finally, that he had not changed his views at the time it was written: in a review of this portion of Dialogue III, Dvornik shows that Anselm's views accurately represent the new concept of the papacy. Thus, on this subject Anselm represented not simply "the Western view" but a partisan position to which he was committed by conviction and profession alike. He must have realized well that the position he was propounding was far from universal in the Latin Church itself—he may even have known that it was partly what he would call a novitas, although there is no evidence of such awareness on his part. It might be thought that the combination of a strongly-held conviction on a

---

59 Dvornik, Byzantium, p. 154.


61 Bihlmeyer-Tüchle, II, 214.


matter of importance with the awareness of the fact of its incomplete acceptance in one's own camp as it were, might naturally result in an excessively strong and inflexible presentation and defense of the view in the opposition camp. But be that as it may, Anselm's presentation and defense of a very high view of the Roman primacy in this debate is both very vigorous and quite inflexible.

Nicetas also could not help but be affected by the new view of the papacy as well as its forceful presentation by Anselm. Whether or not he had encountered the view previous to his discussion with Anselm—I suppose it extremely improbable that he was unfamiliar with it—he could not fail to recognize both its novelty and its threat to the dignity and independence not only of his Church but of the venerable tradition which it enshrined. Thus it is not surprising that Nicetas appears quite intransigeant on this question. On the contrary, as Dvornik comments at the conclusion of his survey of the Anselm-Nicetas debate,

it is quite surprising to observe that given these circumstances, during the first half of the twelfth century the Byzantines still recognized the principle of the Roman primacy in the Church in spite of all that had happened in 1054 and after.63

At one point, in one of several passages in which he urges the early convening of a general council, Nicetas actually expresses some hope for reconciliation:

Consequently, if there were a general council for the sharing of all counsel, with the most pious emperors exerting themselves, and it were to happen that a person of my insignificance was present, I would certainly say confidently these same things [the priority of charity over uniformity of sacramental rite] in the presence of

---

63Dvornik, Byzantium, p. 148.
all, I would fear neither Greek nor Latin in this judgment, and I would impress upon the gentleness of the Roman pontiff, with due humility and reverence, how with his help, when all occasion of quarrel and discord has been removed, we all, who were always one in the catholic faith, might bring about unity. . . . And I hope that he would patiently hear me humbly advising, as Peter, although he was chief of the apostles, humbly listened once to Paul firmly rebuking him, wherein both the firmness of Paul confidently and justly rebuking was commended, and the patience of Peter bearing much in quietness is praised, although I would be far inferior to Paul, and he should not be inferior to Peter. Thus it could happen that the Roman pontiff might be a Latin to the Latins and a Greek to the Greeks, and being all things to all men might win all, and by the humble authority of the apostolic see might be equal to everything on which we have disagreed.64

Yet even this has more of wish than of hope in it. Anselm has already made clear that in the Latin view the validity of the acts of even a general council depend on papal ratification; and I think it is significant that although Anselm agrees with Nicetas when he calls for such a council, it is never he who initiates the call.

"It was only after the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins that the Byzantines fully understood the development that had taken place in the idea of the Roman primacy," Dvornik says.65 While this


65 Dvornik, Byzantium, p. 155.
may be true with regard to the citizenry generally, one feels that no
one present at the discussion between Nicetas and Anselm should have
been unaware of the new concepts becoming standard in the West and the
tast gulf between them and anything the Byzantine Church would con­
ceivably accept. Indeed, as it turned out, nothing less than the im­
mence of the destruction of their entire civilization ever induced
the leaders of the Eastern Church to accept the Roman primacy as de­
ined in the West—300 years later at the Council of Florence—and
even then many Byzantines felt that the Turkish yoke would be prefer­
able to the Roman. When Constantinople fell, so did the submission by
which the Greeks had vainly hoped to secure their city with Western
arms.

The opinion has been expressed several times that these two
dialogues are substantially accurate records of the course of the ac­
tual debates between Anselm and Nicetas, and some reasons have been
given for so thinking. Additional factors which might be mentioned in
this connection are the digressions to irrelevant or undisputed sub­
jects which sometimes occur, intemperance of expression at times (only
once on Nicetas's part, and that at the most likely point), movement
back and forth between subjects, Anselm's reconsideration and revision
of an answer at at least one point, occasional failures—even by An­
selm—to develop a strong point or refute a weak one, subtle distinc­
tions between grudging or merely verbal concessions and real changes
or agreements, all of which are more likely to occur in actual dis­
cussion than in a treatise, in whatever form it may be cast. It is,
of course, conceivable that Anselm, like a dramatist, deliberately contrived all the many touches of reality which abound in these dialogues, but this actually seems most improbable. Anselm was a man with both an orderly, systematic mind and strong views. I find it difficult to believe that if he had been simply summarizing views in the form of a dialogue, he would have portrayed either the occasional disorder and inconsistency which appears, or the strengths of some of Nicetas's points and the weaknesses of some of his own. Lastly in this connection, the dialogues yield definite impressions of the personalities of the men involved—and Nicetas comes off the more admirable! He is pictured as wise, patient, reticent in condemnation, generous in admiration, confident without arrogance, almost courtly in demeanor. Anselm, on the other hand, appears brash, arrogant, sometimes foolishly clever, insensitive, vituperative at times (a characteristic we have noted in other connections), and rude. At the same time although Anselm cannot bring himself to concede any point in so many words, as we have noted, he does actually concede at times; whereas Nicetas, although he gives the verbal impression of concessions, actually yields no important point. A genuine love of the truth is apparent in Anselm here, which does redeem many of his less attractive qualities (many of which, after all, rise from his supreme confidence that he does indeed possess the truth).

Fina views the second and third books of the Dialogues as a summary, and an excellent one, of the Latin case against the Greeks—he calls it "practically a 'Summa contra Graecos.'" I believe this

---

Fina, XXXII (1956), 99.
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view must be received with qualification, first of all because of the strong indications that the books do set forth actual dialogues rather than general views. In the second place there is little indication that the dialogues were used as a manual of the Latin view. Although the views expressed by Anselm are quite representative of the Latin point of view in the twelfth century, the only point in which the West continued in those views was his exposition of the Roman primacy. His conclusions regarding the procession of the Holy Spirit were never developed further, and the other issues he discussed with Nicetas gradually faded from view.
IV
DIALOGUE I
THE UNITY AND MULTIFORMITY OF THE CHURCH

We turn now to the book which is the crown of Anselm's writings in my opinion, his work on the unity and diversity of the Church throughout history, "from Abel the Just to the last of the elect," as he puts it. This relatively short work is the first book of the Dialogues. It was written after all his other writings, and was included as a Preface to the Dialogues for the edification of the pope and Anselm's canonical brothers. In this book, Anselm steps back from the particular issues which occupied him in his previous writings to look at the whole vast sweep of what is today called "salvation-history," and to show both the diversity and the unity in that history from beginning to end.

Précis of Dialogue I

The title of this book is The Unity of Faith and the Variety of Manners of Life from Abel the Just to the Very Last of the Elect. Anselm thus announces that he means to include the entire sweep of human history, and to deal with this question of unity and diversity in the Church in the very broadest and most inclusive way. But the vital contemporary issue perturbing the Church, which had stimulated his mind to the whole question, was not forgotten for a moment. Anselm introduces his subject by referring to this very issue, which in

1Dialogue I, 11412. "De unitate fidei et multiformitate vivendi ab Abel justo usque ad novissimum electum."
fact he proposes to resolve. He poses first of all the questions being asked:

Why all these novelties in the Church of God? Why these new orders? Who can even count so many orders of clerics? Who is not amazed at so many types of monks? Who in short is not shocked that such different and even mutually conflicting forms of religious life are not done away with? Who would not despise a Christian religion subjected to so many variations, altered by so many innovations, agitated by so many new laws and usages, and tossed about by so many rules and customs being changed almost annually?  

Anselm does not pretend impartiality with regard to these questions. He calls those who urge them "slanderous inquisitors," and claims that they confuse the uneducated by asserting that any and all change in religion is inherently despicable. He acknowledges that there are some destructive movements abroad, but his ire is reserved for those who pretend shock at the fact that evil is mixed with good in the Church in this world. He bids them to absorb the lesson of the Gospel parables about the good and bad fish, and the wheat and tares, which are not sorted out and separated until the end. Actually, Anselm claims, these carping critics merely use the fact of abuses as an excuse for attacking those who are led by the fear of God and a true piety.

He then (ch. ii) proceeds to state his basic thesis, that the Church is one body, one society, from the time of its first member (Abel) right through time to its completion by the addition to it of

2 Dialogue I, 1141CD. "Quare tot novitates in Ecclesia Dei fiunt? Quare tot ordines in ea surgunt? Quis numerare queat tot ordines clericorum? Quis non admiretur tot genera monachorum? Quis denique non scandalizetur, et inter tot et tam diversas formas religionem invicem discrepantium taedioso non afficiatur scandalis? Quinimo quis non contentat Christianam religionem tot varietatibus subjectan, tot adinventionibus immutatam, tot novis legibus et consuetudinibus agitam, tot regulis et moribus fere annuatem innovatis fluctuas?"
whoever is the final person to be saved. This society is one by its faith in the one true God and one also by the bond of mutual love among its members and between them and God. It is ruled and guided by God the Holy Spirit, who is also the source and renewer of its life by maintaining and increasing among its members the bonds of faith and love. But this same Holy Spirit who is the source of its unity is also the cause of the multiformity of the Church; for it is he who continually gives a great variety of gifts to the individual members of the Church for the benefit of the whole body. Anselm here quotes the passage from St. Paul which might be called the text of his treatise:

Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit. To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good. To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another the ability to distinguish between spirits, to another various kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues. All these are inspired by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills. (I Cor. 12: 4, 7-11. RSV.)

In Anselm's view, the Church actually began with Abel at the dawn of history, and it embraces the righteous patriarchs, prophets, priests, kings, and people of Old Testament times. It is by their faith in the true God, he says, that these pre-Christian people are truly said to be of the Church of God. Anselm now reviews salient examples of what he means. It was by faith, he says (ch. iii), that Abel offered acceptable sacrifice to God. He received no direct divine command and had no written law to instruct him. He was taught only by the "law of nature" which inclines the creature to honor its
creator. It was not, moreover, the offered gifts that pleased God, but Abel's righteousness and faith in offering them.

It was by faith that Noah accepted the oracle he had been given and built an ark. When the flood had subsided and he had disembarked from the ark, it was by faith that he immediately built an altar to God and offered sacrifice to him; for he had received no directions concerning the offering of sacrifice. Likewise, it was by faith that Abraham offered sacrifice to God. Like his predecessors, he had no written law teaching him to offer sacrifice to God, although he did receive a special vision for his guidance. It was also an act of faith for Abraham to offer up Isaac when God commanded him to do so as a test of his faith. That proven faith was Abraham's righteousness, and in response to it God have him the first law as a seal of faith, the law of circumcision. Again, it was by faith that Jacob offered sacrifice after his vision of God at Bethel, though he was not commanded by any law to do so. And Joseph's blessing of his sons was an act of faith in God.

Anselm pauses here to summarize the development which has occurred through the believing response of these men to what they recognize (by faith) as God's initiative toward them. From Adam to Noah, he says, there were many true believers, who were guided only by the law of nature in their faithful response to God. From Noah to Abraham there were many more who followed where faith led them, even enduring persecution by their neighbors, although they were guided only by the law of nature. From Abraham until Moses the guidance of the natural law was supplemented by occasional divine commands and by the
rite of circumcision, and a great number in this period must be con­
sidered to be within the unity of the Church.

From Moses to David the Chosen People of God, as Anselm calls
them, were separated from among the heathen and gathered into one soci­
ety which Anselm does not hesitate to call the Church. To set this
community of believers off from all other peoples a law written by
God was instituted and a great variety of new rites and sacrifices
was established; indeed a whole new way of life was prescribed with
new commandments, precepts, and prohibitions. Yet it was at this
very time that Job, a Gentile with no certain knowledge of God, of­
fered acceptable sacrifice to God by faith, and he was thus of the
Church.

After mentioning a number of the developments between the
time of David and the coming of Christ, Anselm sums up thus:

And so the ancient fathers served the one God faithfully in many
ways by one faith. They all served through faith in what was to
come, and in that faith they were saved. And although most of
them did not have so great a knowledge of the faith that they
could know every article of faith, or become thoroughly acquaint­
ed with all the sacraments or Christ and the Church, or see the
mysteries of the incarnation, the nativity, the passion, the re­
surrection, and the ascension plainly revealed; nevertheless it
it is most firmly to be believed that, looking as if from afar,
greeting the Christ to come, and awaiting the grace of the pro­
mise so longed for, they are within the unity of the catholic
Church and belong to "the holy city, the new Jerusalem coming
down from heaven, prepared by God as a bride adorned for her
husband" (Rev. 21:2).
Anselm goes on to amplify what he has indicated in this passage, name-
that by faith he means faith in Christ, in the redeemer to come, how-
ever dimly or slightly these ancients conceptualized him or realized the full content of their faith. It should be noted here also that faith, as Anselm delineates it, is closely related to hope (looking as it does for a fulfilment in the future), to love (for he cites love of neighbor among the signs of faith in these pre-Christian peo-
ple), and to obedience (for he cites numerous acts of obedience or submission to God as acts of faith). Thus Anselm sees faith as the total response of men to God rather than as simply the mental accep-
tance of certain concepts, indeed as an act which entirely transforms their relationship to God, to the world, and to their fellow men.

Anselm now (ch. v) shows us the grand design of history as he sees it. Two great transformations have occurred thus far, each an-
nounced by a great earthquake. The first was the transition from idolatry to the law, accompanied by thunder, lightning, and an earth-
quake at Mount Sinai. The second was the transition from the law to the Gospel, accompanied by the terrible earthquake and the darkening of the sun on Good Friday. The third great change, which will also be heralded by an earthquake, is that from time to eternity at the end of the world "when all has been concluded and completed." However the transformations which have already occurred, involving manner of life

gratiam optatae repromissionis exspectantes, esse de unitate Ecclesiae catholicae, et pertinere ad 'civitatem sanctam novam Jerusalem descend-
entem de coelo, a Deo paratam tanquam sponsam ornatam viro suo' (Apoc. xxi, 2)."
As well as religion, have actually occurred very gradually:

So out of Gentiles he made Jews, and out of Jews Christians, and by removing and changing and re-arranging little by little, like a teacher or a physician, he led men almost imperceptibly away from the worship of idols to the regimen of the law, and then away from the law, which did not lead to perfection, to the perfection of the Gospel; when all the temporal dispensations had been removed, he instructed them in the entire perfection of the Christian law.\(^4\)

Turning next to the time of Christ (ch. vi), Anselm says that whereas the Old Testament proclaimed God the Father clearly, it revealed the Son only obscurely. Similarly, he says,

the New Testament revealed God the Son clearly, but did not show forth and acknowledge the Godhead of the Holy Spirit adequately. The Holy Spirit was proclaimed later, giving us a clearer manifestation of his Godhead.\(^5\)

In this very startling statement, Anselm carries the concept of a gradual and progressive revelation of God not only through pre-Christian times but beyond, to the period after the New Testament.\(^6\) This gradual self-manifestation of God to men was necessary, Anselm says, because the minds of men, depressed and dulled by sin and long-settled habits of idolatry, could only be enlightened and freed very gently and delicately;

\(^4\) Dialogue I, 1147CD. "Ita de gentibus Judaeos, de Judaeis autem Christianos fecit, et paulatim subtrahiendo, et transponendo, et dispensando, quasi furtim ab idolorum cultura ad legem, a lege autem, quae quidem ad perfectum non duxit, ad perfectionem Evangelii paedagogice et medicinaliter deducit, et tandem substracta omni dispensatione, omnem perfectionem Christianae legis edocuit."

\(^5\) Dialogue I, 1147D. "Novum Testamentum manifestavit Deum Filium, sed submonstravit et subimmit Deitatem Spiritus sancti. Praedicatur postea Spiritus sanctus, apertiorem nobis tribuens suae Deitatis manifestationem." (The key verbs, which I have italicized, appear to have been constructed by Anselm himself.)

\(^6\) See below, p. 124f, for further discussion of this point.
Nor was it easy to alter things which had come into veneration through long custom and over a great stretch of time; hence the life-giving remedies of the Gospel were received bit by bit, as if by sick men, and mixed as medicines by the divine art for men growing better. But finally faith in the Holy Trinity, growing little by little to its full integrity according to the strength of the believers, was perfected.

Having shown the unity and diversity of the Church up to the coming of Christ, Anselm now turns to the time between Christ and the end of the world. He discusses six ages within this period, "in each of which the Church with Christ fully present in it is renewed, not in one state or similar states, but in many and varied states of life." But even in the New Testament period itself the Church had a varied appearance. It had one form during the time of Christ's earthly life when he was choosing and enlightening with his divine teaching his apostles. It took a different form after his ascension and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, at which time it was made anew by the grace of the Holy Spirit and began gathering in both Jews and Gentiles, gently leading them from their former ways into the Christian life without rejecting harmless practices to which they were accustomed. It was at that time that the full doctrine of the Trinity be-

---

7 Dialogue I, 1148A. This translation follows that of J. Taylor and L. K. Little in Chenu. "Neque etiam facilis erat transpositio eorum, quae longe consuetudine, et prolixo tempore in venerationem devenerant; ideoque tanquam ab infirmis evangelica et salubris pharmaicia paulatin suspensa est, arte divina benignioribus medicinaliter commista."

8 Dialogue I, 1148C. "... in qua eademque Ecclesia, praesente jam Filio Dei, innovatur, nequaquam unus aut uniformis, sed multi et multiformes status inveniuntur."
gan to be proclaimed, new sacraments, rites, commandments, and customs were instituted, the canonical epistles were written, the Christian law was taught and recorded, and the catholic faith was proclaimed to the whole world.

And so the holy Church, moving through various states which gradually pass into each other even to the present day, is renewed and always will be renewed, like the youth of the eagle. Always safely grounded in faith in the Holy Trinity which can never be changed, but with a superstructure of a great many different forms of religion, it grows into a holy temple for the Lord.°

In the seven seals revealed to St. John in the sixth chapter of Revelation, Anselm sees signs of the seven states of the Church from the arrival of Christ to the final consummation of the Church in heaven (ch. vii). The white horse revealed at the breaking of the first seal stands for the first state of the Church, bright and beautiful with the whiteness of miracles, daily increasing in miracles and converts alike, and in its newness evoking amazement and praise.

The second state of the Church (ch. viii) is symbolized by the red horse revealed at the breaking of the second seal. It is the period of the martyrs, beginning with St. Stephen after whose death the apostles spread the Gospel throughout the world. Because of the violent hatred of the world stirred up by Satan, great numbers of Christians in every province were slain for a witness to Christ. But the Church actually flourished under persecution, and finally the

°Dialogue I, 1149A. "Et sancta Ecclesia pertransiens per diversos status sibi invicem paulatim succedentes, usque in hodiernum diem, sicut juventus aquilae renovatur et semper renovabitur, salvo semper, sanctae Trinitatis fidei fundamento, praeter quod nemo aliud deinceps ponere potest, quamvis in superaedificatione diversa plerumque diversarum religionum structura crescat in templum sanctum Domino."
devil abandoned this tactic and the world became Christian.

The black horse revealed after the third seal was broken (ch. ix) is the sign of the third state of the Church, or rather of the malicious teaching of the heretics by which Satan afflicted the Church in this period. By attacking the very heart of the Christian faith, the doctrine of the Trinity, the heretics sought the destruction of the Church. Anselm summarizes briefly but accurately the central error of each of the heresiarchs. Like the persecutors, the heretics did not succeed in ruining the Church, which rooted out their errors through the great general councils and other synods of the fathers. Thus at the conclusion of this state, as at the end of the previous one, the Church was actually stronger than it was before. On the firm dogmatic and canonical base laid down by the fathers and with their sanction, a variety of precepts, prohibitions and rules for Christian discipline were now developed, through which the Church increased in wisdom as it had grown in patience under the persecutions.

Satan, however, did not abandon his attempts to destroy the Church, Anselm cautions. In its fourth state (ch. x), symbolized by the pallid horse seen by St. John when the fourth seal was broken, he seeks its ruin by the rise of an innumerable multitude of false, hypocritical Christians who outwardly acknowledge Christ and mimic the works of a perfect Christian, but inwardly deny him and destroy souls by contact with them. They are the equivalent of the Scribes and Pharisees against whom Christ spoke so vehemently in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew.

To combat these insidious hypocrites, there have appeared in
this state of the Church by the grace of the Holy Spirit "religious men, lovers of the truth, renewers of religion,"\textsuperscript{10} such as Augustine of Hippo, who set forth a rule for living the apostolic life in common, Rufus of Burgundy, who during the reign of Pope Urban renewed that rule and founded a community of canons which gradually spread into many regions, and Norbert, who in the time of Pope Gelasius preached the Gospel in many countries, gathered a large number of religious, instituted many religious communities, and by word and example fashioned them into the perfection of the apostolic life. Anselm here goes into some detail about Norbert's life and the rapid spread of his order—the Praemonstratensian, of which we have noted Anselm himself was doubtless a member.

Next he cites Benedict of Nursia and the monastic rule of which he was the author, mentioning particularly the Camaldolese, the Vallambrosian, and the Cistercian orders, with a special mention of Bernard of Clairvaux. The Templars, a relatively new lay order, are mentioned, "who though they are neither monks nor regular canons are no less worthy than they."\textsuperscript{11} Finally Anselm cites the great variety of types of religious communities among the Greeks, Armenians, and Syrians, all of one mind in the catholic faith, but varying widely in customs, rules, habit, diet, and the use of the psalter. He mentions specifically certain monasteries he had visited on his Byzantine mis-

\textsuperscript{10}\textit{Dialogue I, 1154D.} "... viri religiosi, amatores, instauratores religionis." \textsuperscript{11}\textit{Dialogue I, 1156C.} "... eos non esse inferioris meriti, quam vel monachos, vel communis vitae canonicos."
sion; these houses, like others he saw at that time, follow rules written by St. Anthony, St. Pachomius, or St. Basil the Great.

Summing up his review, Anselm reminds his readers that "all of these, so divine, so holy, so good, in various times a variety of arrangements 'are the work of that one and the same Spirit who appor-
to each one individually as he wills' (I Cor. 12:12)." And then he explicitly answers the particular question he had originally posed: why such variety and multiplicity?

The Holy Spirit, who continually guides the great body of the Church since its beginning, and who will always guide it, knows how to renew the faithful when they are satiated and bored with long-familiar religious customs. He does this by the introduction of a new form of religious life, so that when they see others mount higher and higher toward the peak of religious perfection, they may be powerfully aroused by these fresh and different examples, and abandoning the slackness and love of the world by which they were being held back, they may eagerly and fearlessly lay hold of and imitate what is perfect. For everyone admires the unusual and unfamiliar more than the customary and familiar. Thus it is by the wonderful dispensation of God that ever new forms of religious life grow up from generation to generation, and the Church's youth, like the eagle's, is renewed so that it can soar higher in contemplation and gaze more directly with unblinded eyes upon the rays of the true sun.13

12 Dialogue I., 1157A. "Porro haec omnia tam divina, tam sancta, tam bona in diversis temporibus et in diversis ordinibus 'operatur unus at-
que idem Spiritus, dividens singulis prout vult' (I Cor. xii, 12)."

13 Dialogue I., 1157A. "Novit quippe Spiritus sanctus, qui tantum corpus Ecclesiae ab initio et nunc et semper regit, hominum animos 
tormentes, et diu usitata religione satiatos fideles aliquo novae re-
ligionis exordio renovare, ut cum viderint alios magis ac magis in al-
tiorem religionis arcem consendere, novis exemplis fortius excitentur, 
et relicta pigritia et amore saeculi, quo tenebantur, alacriter et sine 
formidine, quod perfectum est apprehendant et imitentur. Nam insolita 
et imusitata magis solent mirari omnes, quam solita et usitata. Et fit 
mira Dei dispensatione, quod a generatione in generationem succres-
te semper nova religione, renovatur ut aquilae juventus Ecclesiae, quo 
et sublimius in contemplatione volare queat, et subtilius quas, irre-
verberatis oculis radios veri solis contueri valent."
Returning to the consideration of the hypocrites with which the Church is afflicted in its fourth state, Anselm says that it should not be surprising that there are false brothers among such a multitude of good men. After all, even one of the apostles selected by the Lord himself was afterward called a devil by him; and these false brothers are simply members of that devil. We are to bear them charitably, praying that they may lay aside their hypocrisy and become true. Anselm here recalls the parables he had mentioned at the beginning of his treatise: we are all in the same net although we are not all destined for the vessels of the saints when the net is drawn ashore and emptied. We all grow in the same field although we will not all be gathered into the Lord’s barn at harvest time. This mixing of the good and the evil will only end at the conclusion of the fourth state of the Church, when the saints will follow the Lamb of God where he is going, and the hypocrites will be buried in hell.

The fifth state of the Church (ch. xi) is symbolized by the vision of the martyrs beneath the altar crying out for judgment and awaiting the completion of the number of the martyrs. The Church has increased mightily in patience, in wisdom, and in endurance through suffering the persecutions, the heretics, and the false brothers. Now the souls of the saints rest, and seeing the great miseries of the Church, cry out "How long, O Lord?" Anselm understandably offers no comment or interpretation of the specifics of this period. It is still in history before the return of Christ, and its particulars are not known.

The sixth state of the Church (ch. xii), marked by the ter-
rible earthquake which accompanied the opening of the sixth seal in St. John's vision, is the time of the Antichrist. The earthquake, which we have already noted as the sign of the third and final great transformation of life and religion, symbolizes the terrible persecution which will break out against Christians at this time. The special horror of this persecution will be that it will be undertaken in the very name of Christ. In his Name also, false teachings will be set forth, to the confusion of the faithful, who will not know what to believe or hold to. Christ himself and the very name of Christian will be utterly despised. The saints and teachers of the Church will be turned to worldly satisfactions and fall away from the faith. "Like unripe figs torn from the tree in a gale" (Rev. 6:13), all those who are not mature in good works will fall from the Church in this persecution. Further, the Church will abandon its public position and rites, and its sacraments will not be available to Christians. And in those days, "Who shall be able to stand?" (Rev. 6:17) "And when the seventh seal was opened, there was a stillness in heaven as if for half an hour." (Rev. 8:1) This stands for the seventh state of the Church (ch. xiii), which will follow the return of Christ in glory and the judgment.

All things now having been consummated, there will be a stillness of divine contemplation, the year of jubilee will be inaugurated, and the octave of infinite beatitude will be celebrated. The veil of the law will be removed, and Holies upon Holies will be revealed to the faithful; songs upon songs will be sung with boundless delight before the throne of God and of the Lamb; a solemn festal day "unto the very horn of the altar" (to the very summit of contemplation, that is, whether in intensity or frequency) will be established; the truth of all the figures and sacraments which have existed in various times since the beginning of the world will be revealed; and through him and with him all things...
will be fulfilled.\textsuperscript{14}

Even so, God will not, strictly speaking, be comprehended in the fullness of his divine substance. The union of creatures with the Creator does not, in Anselm’s view, annihilate their essential creatureliness. God remains incomprehensible and "inhabits light inaccessible to rational creatures, whether men or angels."\textsuperscript{15} It is this ineradicable boundary between God and the creature which Anselm sees symbolized in the silence of one-half rather than a whole hour.

Having now completed his survey of salvation-history, Anselm notes once again his answer to the problem with which he began.

No one then should be surprised nor deny that the Church of God is differentiated from the unchanging God himself by varieties of laws and observances both before the law, under the law, and under grace; or that the signs of spiritual grace which express the truth itself more and more should grow as time passed, so that the desire for salvation and the knowledge of the truth should increase from age to age. And thus at first good, then better, and finally the best things have been brought forth. But this variety is not because of God who is always the same "and whose years fail not," but because of mutability and historical change throughout time.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Dialogue I, 1159B.} "Omnibus jam consummatis, silentium divinae contemplationis erit, annus jubilaeus instaurabitur, octava infinitae beatitudinis celebrabitur; Sancta Sanctorum, sublato jam legis velo, fidelibus aperientur; Cantica canticorum ante thronum Dei et Agni infinita laetitia, cantabuntur; dies solennis usque ad cornu altaris, id est usque ad summam contemplationis arcem, in condensis seu in frequentationibus constitutur; omnium figurarum et sacramentorum quae ab initio saeculi in diversis temporibus fuerunt, veritas revelabitur, et universa per ipsum et cum ipso consummabuntur."

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Dialogue I, 1159C.} "Inhabitat lucem omni rationali creaturae, tam homini quam angelo, inaccessibilem."

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Dialogue I, 1160A.} "Itaque nemo miretur, neque causetur Ecclesiæ Dei ab invariabili Deo variis legibus et observationibus ante legem et sub legе, et sub gratia distinctam, quia oportebat ut secundum processum temporum crescerent signa spiritualium gratiarum, quae magis ac magis ipsam veritatem declararunt, ut sic cum affectu salutis in-
Nevertheless, through all time and change, Anselm reiterates, the Church is one: one by obedience to the one God, one by faith as she believes firmly those things which are to be believed, one by hope as she patiently looks forward to those things which are to be desired, and one by love as she loves God and in God the neighbor—and even, in the freedom of love, enemies for his sake. He concludes:

This then is the glory of the Church, the daughter of the King, the beauty of faith and the testimony of a pure conscience within, but "clothed about by varied garments fringed with gold" (Ps. 44:14), with a diversity, that is, of forms of religion and good works; and it is the chariot of God, multi-faceted with ten thousand thousands of delights. And so now let none of the faithful suspect any scandal in the fact that although the Church always holds the same faith, it does not always follow the same forms of living.17

Sources and Origin of the Work

With regard to the intellectual sources on which Anselm builds his understanding of salvation-history, Salet's recent work is most illuminating and convincing. He demonstrates Anselm's thorough grounding in the great fathers of the patristic age, and especially in the works of Gregory Nazianzus. Very few of Anselm's particular as-

crementum acciperet de tempore in tempus cognitio veritatis: et ita primo quidem bona, deinde meliora, et ultimum vero optima proposita sunt. Facta est autem haec varietas non propter invariabilis Dei, qui semper idem est, et cujus anni non deficient, mutabilitatem et temporalem mutationem de generatione in generationem."

17 Dialogue I, 1160 BC. "Est ergo gloria filiae Regis, quae est Ecclesia, ab intu fidei decore, et testimonio purae conscientiae, sed 'in fimbriis aureis circumamicta varietate' (Psal. xliiv, 14) diversarum religionum et actionum, et est currus Dei decem millibus multiplex millia laetantium. Ideoque jam deinceps nullus fidelis suspicatur in hoc esse aliquod scandalum, si Ecclesiae cujus semper est eadem fides credendi, non semper est eadem forma vivendi."
assertions are entirely new with him, as Salet shows. A great many are found, and some widely found, in the fathers, including his very positive treatment of the Gentile Job. The same is true of his overall scheme of the structure of history, all the elements of which are found in the fathers and even in the works of such contemporaries of his as Bernard of Clairvaux and Rupert of Deutz. Yet this does not mean, nor does Salet conclude from it, that Anselm was a mere compiler or adapter of patristic opinions. On the contrary, he was able to select and bring together all these individual elements and insights lying about as it were, uncoordinated, unrelated—unrealized actually—out of the dusty tomes of sermons, commentaries and so forth, and to make of them the basis of a magnificent vision of time and eternity which was actually his achievement and a significant addition to the Western Christian perception of God and man. Anselm brings into an ordered relationship all these scattered Biblical and patristic materials, moreover, without minimizing—rather, indeed, strongly emphasizing—the tremendous variety and change which has occurred. The bold picture of a community which is human and yet divinely created and sustained, moving through and engaging with all the changes and chances of time with ever-renewed vigor toward a completion and perfection of knowledge, love, and unity, and thence to a final transfiguration which is beyond imagining—this picture goes beyond anything the fathers conceptualized in significant respects; yet there is something classical about it, it expresses a view I feel that many of them

---

18 Salet, pp. 123-47.
would acknowledge as kindred to theirs. In any case I think we must recognize that it is above all the classical Church fathers' writings which are Anselm's sources.

The link between this work and Anselm's other writings has been mentioned, but it will bear more amplification here. All during his adult years the legitimacy, the very right to existence, of the order of Canons Regular to which he belonged was under severe and continual attack from conservative Benedictine monks, those of the Cluny reform as well as others. However reactionary, unjust, and futile such attacks may appear at this late date, they were deeply felt and really threatening at the time because of the powerful and entrenched position of monasticism in medieval society. Anselm's Defense is his first written response to these attacks, and in its counter-assertiveness and hostility it reflects both the power of the adversary and the heat of the conflict. In the present dialogue, however, which we may consider in the first instance as his more considered response, Anselm moves far beyond the narrowness, heat, and partisan pettiness of this contemporary controversy, setting the entire matter as he does within the context of the vast changes and developments which have existed within the Church from its very beginning, as he sees it, and will continue to exist until the end of time and after.

This in itself is a major accomplishment for one who was, as we have seen, no detached observer of universal history but a passionately involved participant in the events and struggles by which history was being made in his day. In such a position it is extremely
difficult to look beyond the particular items of controversy (often quite unimportant in themselves) in terms of which the essential issues of the time are usually decided, to those basic underlying issues themselves, and to the principles and criteria by which they must be evaluated. Yet on the whole, Anselm succeeds in doing this in Dialogue I. As Salet puts it, he

rises well above the quarrels of belfries and sacristies, above the problems raised by people changing from one order to the other, above the discussions about the greatest dignity of this or that form of religious life. Anselm shows to those who are scandalized by novelties of rule or psalmody or dress that these are details of minimal importance compared to the changes, considerable and yet legitimate, which have been produced in the course of the centuries in the one genuine religion, the unique religion of Christ.19

Irenic as it is, Anselm does not abandon his convictions in this work, however. In his review of the varied forms of religious life which God has brought forth in the Church to combat Satan's attempt to destroy it by the internal subversion of hypocritical false brothers, he lists St. Augustine and the clerical communities and orders which have followed his rule first, ahead of St. Benedict and the various forms of the monastic life. Moreover, he uses the phrase vita apostolica 20 only in connection with the former. Nevertheless, he is careful to emphasize that all these ways of religious life, including the lay order of Templars and the great variety of Eastern communities he has seen as well as those following the Augustinian and Benedictine traditions, have been raised up by God himself for the benefit of the Church in its struggle against false brothers within.

19 Salet, p. 16.  
20 See above, p. 12ff.
In this connection it is also noteworthy that with the exception of a brief passage at the beginning of the dialogue, in which Anselm characterizes those who question the novelties and changes in the Church as "slanderous inquisitors," his tendency toward a somewhat vindictive vituperation against opponents does not appear in this work. Anselm expresses his concern over hypocrisy strongly, to be sure, and he presents no criteria by which hypocrites might be distinguished from those who sincerely, however mistakenly, oppose what he favors. Moreover, there is a passage specifically titled "An Invective against the Hypocrite" (in chapter ten). However, in the context of instances of invective in his other writings, this passage has the character of a formal exercise in the art form, well and vigorously put, but generalized and not terribly impassioned. Further, Anselm expresses a possibility and hope for the repentance and transformation of the hypocrites, and whether or not they repent he sees in their very evil the stimulus by which God has raised up the varied forms of religious life which not only overcome the hypocrites, but add greatly to the Church's life and perfection. Most important of all, Anselm here is very careful not to state or imply that it is the conservative monks (or any other sub-group of the age) who are per se the hypocritical false Christians.

Two other points relative to Anselm's treatment of the hypocrites in Dialogue I, noted by Fina, should be mentioned. First, the hypocrites are condemned not only for opposition to the will of God, but also because they hinder the progress of the world toward the culmination of history. Secondly, the very inwardness and invisibility
of the evil of the hypocrites reveals Anselm's adoption of an ethic which is radically centered on inner intentions and motives rather than outward words and deeds. Anselm concludes his formal invective thus: "A good or bad intention imposes a name to the deed, and calls for either the merit or the punishment of a just retribution"; which is strong evidence for Fina's point. In his discussion Fina also notes that this view is very like, though not precisely identical to, the ethical theory developed and taught not long before by Abelard. Thus Anselm would appear to be in the forefront of the development of ethical as well as historical theory in his time.

If Anselm's starting-point for Dialogue 1 was the controversy over the legitimacy of the new religious communities in the West, his own in particular, certainly the theological conservatism of the Byzantine Church which he had encountered in his mission to Constantinople must also have stimulated and broadened his reflections. For at least as staunchly as the conservative monks of the West rejected the changes occurring in twelfth-century religious life, so also the Eastern Church rejected the changes which had taken place in the Western Church, and especially in the papacy, since the patristic period. It is puzzling that apart from his mention of the various religious houses he had visited while in the East, Anselm never refers to the

---

21 See Fina, XXXIV (1958), 30-33. 22 Dialogue I, 1154C.

23 This is not to assert that there had been no changes in the theology or practices of the Byzantine Church in the seven centuries since the Council of Chalcedon; but developments in Eastern theology and practice, occurring as they did in the context of a continuing classical tradition, always had to demonstrate their continuity with the fathers, and so were sometimes more patristic in appearance than in reality.
differences between the Greek and Latin Churches in this dialogue. A possible sign of influence on this work from his debates with Nicetas is Anselm's treatment of the destruction of the great heresies, which here he attributes to the councils of the fathers without mentioning the papacy, whose authority and orthodoxy he had credited wholly with the accomplishment in Dialogue III over against Nicetas's defense of the inherent authority of the councils themselves. Which brings us to an even more puzzling fact, namely that Anselm does not so much as mention the papacy or the Roman primacy in the body of this book, although the Dialogues as a whole is dedicated to Pope Eugene III, to whom, moreover, Anselm offers "absolute obedience in the Lord." Yet in Dialogue III, Anselm posits the papacy itself as the guarantor of both the unity and the orthodoxy of the Church, and both of these subjects are central to the theme of Dialogue I—but the pope is not brought into the picture in this regard at all. Whatever conclusions may be reached in respect to these questions—if, indeed, any conclusions are possible—I feel that it is beyond question that Anselm's encounter with Byzantine conservatism in religion contributed much to the breadth and depth of his view of the Church's course through history in Dialogue I.

Structure of Thought and Salient Features

The twin poles of Anselm's view of the Church in this work are the complementary elements of unity and diversity. His understanding of the necessity of the unity is derived integrally from the very unity of God himself. In regard to the divine unity and its
significance as the ground of all unity, it is possible that Nicetas's impassioned defense of the *monarchia* of the Father in their debate in Constantinople had stimulated Anselm's mind along this line, although certainly there was no lack of Western theological emphasis on the unity of the Godhead. In any case, simply because God is one, there is but one Savior who alone can reconcile the fallen and disunited race of mankind to the one Father. Christ exercises this function not only since the time of his incarnation, in Anselm's view, but from the very dawn of human history. Thus, too, the Christian Church as the community of those being restored by the Savior to fellowship with the Father must be one. And thus the Holy Spirit of the one God is the giver and replenisher of the one commonly shared life which the Church possesses in every age and place.

The unity of the Church, which the Holy Spirit continually maintains, is effected in two chief ways: by love and by faith. Anselm's view of love appears quite conventional, and he simply mentions it in passing at a few points. He uses the word *caritas*, of course, and thus has in mind the bond that comes from good will and concern for the person of the neighbor rather than that which arises from attraction or kinship. Anselm's view of faith, however, is far from merely conventional. Faith, to Anselm, is not simply or essentially the adherence of the mind to certain concepts or opinions. Rather he seems to hold a Biblical, even Hebrew, view of faith as a trust or confidence in, and a commitment to God himself as distinct from the acceptance of ideas about him. The great heroes of the Old Testament as he delineates them had various amounts of knowledge.
about God—all extremely inadequate and incomplete in comparison with what the Christian now has in the Church—but all, he says, exercised faith, acted in faith, and thus are within the one Church of God. Anselm's most extreme example of the distinction between faith and conceptual opinion is Job, a Gentile living during the time of Moses, who neither belonged to the chosen people nor had any certain knowledge of God at all as far as Anselm knows; yet by faith and love he was pleasing to God and within the Church. It would be patently ridiculous to suggest that Anselm was in any way unaware of or indifferent to the great importance of the knowledge of the truth or of theological accuracy. But nonetheless he defines the essence of faith as the response of the total man to the initiative of God, a response which is possible—and effective—even in the partial or complete absence of revealed information about God. 24

The other pole of Anselm's view is novitas, the newness, the diversity and change from time to time and place to place which exists or has occurred within the basic unity of the Church as he has defined it, and without destroying that unity. And the introduction of novitiae is also seen by Anselm as the work of the Holy Spirit in the Church.

He emphasizes that this diversity or "multiplexity" is in regard to forms, manners, and customs of religious life within the Church, but in fact as he traces it, there are also novitiae in the content of belief itself. God only very delicately and gradually—

24 See above, pp. 102-05.
"as if furtively," says Anselm—brings the pre-Christian Church from idolatry to the yoke of the law, and then similarly gradually from the law to the Gospel, and at last to the full law of Christ. He says that the Trinity was gradually revealed, and actually states that the Godhead of the Holy Spirit was not revealed fully or adequately in the New Testament but later.25 What he actually means by this is uncertain. A little further on in Dialogue I, Anselm says that the fulness of the catholic faith in the Trinity was attained in the apostolic period following Christ's ascension.26 On the other hand, in his debate with Nicetas about the procession of the Holy Spirit, he makes the point very strongly that the full Godhead of the Holy Spirit is not clearly taught in the Gospel—although he reiterates several times that it could be deduced from what is taught there—but rather in the general councils of the Church.27 One gets the impression here that Anselm was quite well aware of the significance and in fact novelty of what he was saying, and that he felt the need to be very cautious, whether through fear of heterodoxy or of the accusation of it.

In any case it is clear in the context of all of Anselm's writings that the general councils mark the end of any additions to the content of belief—the Filioque doctrine notwithstanding—in his view. He does not set forth a principle of the continual development of doctrine. But nevertheless the breach which Anselm here insinuates in the concept of a revelation utterly concluded and closed in the

---

25See p. 106 above.  
26Dialogue I, 1149A.  
27Dialogue II, 1199A-1202A.
New Testament or the apostolic generation should not be underestimated. It is a tiny opening in a doorway which the ancient fathers and most of the doctors for generations to come would regard as necessarily and permanently bolted and barred: the concept of genuinely new knowledge of God coming to light in the time after Christ, a knowledge which goes beyond the drawing out of necessary implications from the revelation in Christ or the insights which arise from seeing new significances in the relationship of the parts of that revelation.

In the first place, then, the gradual introduction of novitates in the knowledge of God was God's own method of gradually leading the dulled and depressed minds of fallen men to the fulness of truth. But concurrently with these developments, and extending beyond them all the way to the last state of the Church on earth, are the changes and variations which Anselm explicitly avows and wishes to justify. In pre-Christian times there was the gradual development of the sacrificial system and the ritual law, and in each stage of the Church since Christ, God has brought forth new manifestations of Christian life.

Anselm gives three reasons for the introduction of these innovations. In the first place they are the ways in which the Church meets and overcomes the new challenges of Satan in each age. However, Anselm does not view the innovations as mere temporary expedients which when used are cast aside with no permanent effect on the Church itself. Rather, through the attacks of the devil in each age of the Church and the innovations by which she combats and confounds him, the Church attains a perfection and completeness she did not previous-
ly have. Thus the changes are actually evolutionary developments preparing for and leading into one another in a pattern of growth toward perfection. Each stage builds on the last and leads to further development in the next until finally, when the Church has endured the terrible attacks and temptations of Antichrist, it will enter the endless perfection and glory of heaven itself. Fina notes Anselm's sense of a concurrent development of both the power and subtlety of evil and the capacity for goodness counter to it, which permeates the historic development and culminates in the final clash of the two and the eternal triumph of the good. We see here Anselm's tremendous though not blinkered optimism. And we must emphasize its essentially historical nature—it looks specifically forward through time to the fulfilment rather than upward away from time into a present eternity. The time between Christ's incarnation and the end of history is not a mere vale of tears for the testing of Christians before their deliverance (by death) from all sorrow, nor even a mere extension of time to enable the number of saints which God has decided on to be saved (as in Augustine), but a vital dynamic period in which the Church is working out and bringing into reality, by the creative power of the Holy Spirit, its own completeness and perfection in every way, including the numerical of course. Even the great falling-away foretold for the last days appears here as a temporary catastrophe, however dreadful, which in no way negates the sense of direction and progress through time which Anselm projects.

---

28 Fina, XXXIV (1958), 34.
Fina emphasizes Anselm's idea of progress by differentiating it explicitly from such concepts as reformatio, revolutio, evolutio, recreatio, regeneratio, reparatio, and restauratio, all of which were familiar in ancient and medieval thought, conveying the idea of a renovation of structure or life in which no genuinely novel element is present. But he also notes Anselm's conservatism in comparison with Joachim of Fiore: whereas Joachim posits a time within history in which the Church will be entirely beyond the power of evil (the age of the Holy Spirit), Anselm sees such complete triumph only occurring through the eschatological events.

A second function of the novitates, according to Anselm, is the renewal of the youth and vigor of the Church "like that of the eagle." In this image Anselm is adapting a psalm verse which may, in turn, refer to something similar to the legend of the phoenix, which plunges into fire periodically and emerges from it with new youth and life. This image is solemnly stated twice in the work, and in it Anselm seems to be balancing the genuine novelty of the novitates with the persisting identity of the Church which, though changed and changing through time by the addition of the novitates, receives fresh life and vigor rather than a different essence or identity through them. The image also emphasizes the contrast between the Church and all other earthly things, which do grow, mature, age, decay, and finally die.

29Fina, XXXIV (1958), 33-34.

30Ps. 103:5. "who satisfies you with good as long as you live, so that your youth is renewed like the eagle's." (RSV.)
The third reason which Anselm puts forward for the tremendous changes and varieties in religious custom and practice, before as well as since Christ's advent, is very different indeed. Human nature is such, he says, that the same old things, however fine or divine, become boring to men, and thus ineffective in their lives. For this reason God provides constant novelties and variations in his Church in order to turn men's attention to spiritual things, to arouse their devotion, and thus to further their salvation. A truly startling application of the traditional Christian idea of God's condescension to creaturely conditions and realities, and an even more startling example, perhaps, of psychological insight on Anselm's part.

We are not accustomed to this sort of answer to any question popping up in the twelfth century, a period not much given to psychological introspection or analysis. Nevertheless, it is obvious that Anselm has hit upon a genuine and significant aspect of human behavior and motivation here—one which, indeed, every successful teacher or religious institution has necessarily allowed for, whether consciously or not, yet one which has rarely, if ever, been straightforwardly recognized, evaluated, and taken up into the theory of the relationship between man and God. It is but another testimony to Anselm's perceptiveness and penetration that he so recognized this factor in human nature and pointed out its explicit relevance to the question of the legitimacy of novelty and variety in religion.

In this connection, it should be noted that this psychological insight does not stand alone, as if it were a chance discovery. Anselm's images of God's delicate nurturing of fallen man like a phy-
sician or a teacher, his very interiorized conception of faith, and his intention-centered ethic all point to an awareness of and emphasis on the inner spiritual and psychic realities of the individual. And his remarkable letter to his friend Wibald during the period of his disfavor at the imperial court reveals, as nothing else of his does, a most tender and sensitive psyche. Finally in this regard, Anselm's view of humility as the basic and key virtue must not be overlooked. (We might note in passing the appropriateness of such a view, for Anselm was nothing if not a proud man.) Humility, of course, is the first step on St. Benedict's ladder of perfection, and so it had been considered a sine qua non of growth in virtue for centuries. But Fina maintains that in both Anselm and Bernard we see a new and deeper concept of humility over against a rather formalized concept which prevailed at the time. In this very internalized concept, he says, humility is realized as "a power which transforms heart, spirit, and soul, and makes them really open to the word and works of God and one's neighbor." Indeed, in the receptivity and openness which humility engenders, it is to be seen as the foundation of knowledge as well as virtue, the very key to true perception and understanding.

To the question of how to distinguish good and legitimate novelties in ecclesiastical life from bad ones, Anselm's answer is, at best only hinted at. He acknowledges that not all new developments

---

31 See Pfändtner, VII (1931), 97-101, in which the letter is reprinted in full.

32 Fina, XXXIV (1958), 24-27. He cites a number of Anselm's references to humility and pride which are scattered throughout his works.
are good, but he is more concerned about those who take occasion from poor innovations to condemn all of them than he is to develop criteria for the discernment of the relative merits of the innovations themselves. He would certainly maintain, of course, that they must be marked by faith in God—and that in the Trinity as delineated by the general councils—for it is faith (along with love) which is the unitive element in and underlying all novitates. Beyond that, if his choice of scriptural passages in connection with his theme is indicative of the direction in which his mind would move on this subject, he would probably maintain that innovations must be tolerated without interference until they have had time to reveal their own inner and essential character in action if not until the end itself. At least such would seem to be the most obvious bearing of the parables he uses, namely those of the great catch of fish and of the wheat and tares.

Pursuing Anselm's view of novitas a step further, we might well argue that if the successive periods of time and the innovations which arise in them are indeed genuinely new, there can be no a priori criteria which can be applied to them in advance of their own revelation of their essence and value.

Brief as Anselm's treatise is, its depth and sweep invite comparison with the great Augustine's City of God. Fina points out a certain similarity in some aspects of the situations underlying each work. Both eras were periods of profound, even convulsive change, and as Christianity itself in Augustine's time was under severe attack as a destructive novitas, so in Anselm's time, the new manifestations of life in Europe were vigorously attacked by the upholders of the old
order which was then crumbling.\textsuperscript{33} Salet considers Anselm's vision of the history of the Church in some respects even broader and more grand than Augustine's, especially in regard to the time between Christ and the end, although developed in far less detail. In at least one respect, however, the opposite must be recognized. It is a strange fact that nowhere does Anselm so much as mention, let alone discuss or relate to his theme, profane history, whether of non-Hebrew peoples before Christ or of Christian or pagan peoples since. This is doubly strange when we recall that for most of the twenty years immediately preceding the writing of Dialogue I Anselm was deeply immersed in practical imperial and papal politics. This, of course, is in stark contrast with Augustine's emphatic and yet discerning contrast between the earthly city and the city of God. Why is this? Is it that in the twelfth-century milieu, Anselm simply assumed earthly politics to be the temporal domestic underside of a historical process which both included and transcended it? Is there an unrecognized belief here that this-worldly affairs are utterly irrelevant to the great picture of history's course as a whole? Was Anselm aware of his omission as such? Could he not have been? We cannot tell. Anselm certainly makes perfectly clear that the story he outlines so masterfully in Dialogue I is, for him, the significant story of mankind. For whatever reasons, recognized or not, he left it to others to explore the connection between this great overarching theme of all history and the mundane events of secular and ecclesiastical his-

\textsuperscript{33} Fina, XXXIV (1958), 18.
It is perhaps worth noting, however, the contrasting effort of Anselm's contemporary Otto, bishop of Freising, at this point. In his book *The Two Cities,* Otto, following Augustine's delineation of the cities of man and God and using the image of the *stages* of a man's life as his outline, paints a most pessimistic picture of the present and future as a period of continual decadence and decline. But somewhat later, when his cousin Frederick I had ascended the imperial throne, Otto wrote another book, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa,* in which the earthly city seems to be wholly taken up into unity with the heavenly, and to be passing with it from strength to strength, as if in the Christian empire "the kingdom of this world" had already "become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ." (Rev. 11:15) Such are the temptations of royal historians, as has often been seen. In this context, perhaps Anselm's omission was simple reticence, in a just recognition of the tremendous complexity and difficulty of the task involved. It is also possible that Anselm's own changing orientation with regard to papal-imperial politics inclined him to pass over the subject. And aside from all this, Anselm may well have felt that what he did write could not be lengthened without going beyond


36 See above, p. 35.
the allowable scope of what was after all an introduction to another work.

A final aspect of Dialogue I which calls for brief comment is Anselm's choice of eschatological events for mention and emphasis in his final chapter. In a word, he passes over the return of Christ in glory and the last judgment in a phrase and mentions the resurrection of the dead not at all. It would be improper to conclude from this either that Anselm rejected these elements of the Christian picture of the end, or that he thought they were unimportant. Yet I think the omissions do point up his central concerns. First, that his view is centered on the progressive development of the Church as a social organism rather than on the fate of individuals. Indeed, the central issue for individuals in Anselm's eyes was, after all, whether to be of the Church inwardly, and so to share in its glorious destiny, or to be of it only outwardly—hypocritically—and thus to lose all participation in its end. Secondly, the omission of any mention of the resurrection is most consonant with Anselm's essentially intellectual vision of fulfilment as contemplation of the divine mystery, purely and simply. It is a typically medieval vision, in which the chief use of a resurrected body would be for singing. Fina has called attention to—indeed lamented—what he considers Anselm's hyper-intellectualism, and while I disagree with this judgment, Anselm's view of heavenly fulfilment surely fits that description, albeit in common with most medieval theologians.

Conclusion

In view of the brevity of Anselm's essay, it would inevitably be true that little, if anything, could be dealt with exhaustively or conclusively. Nevertheless, in this little treatise we see a number of seminal ideas of great value—points of departure rather than conclusive views—which reveal an extra-ordinarily alert and creative mind. Some of the lines of thought and development which Anselm opened up were not much pursued for generations or centuries to come, and in the present state of knowledge it would be impossible to attribute surely to Anselm a direct or even indirect influence in such developments.

Beyond the beauty and elegance of the story of Church history itself as Anselm summarizes it, I would consider his chief contributions as four, of which the first is the introduction of subjective and psychological categories into serious thought. We should, of course, speak of re-introduction, for such categories had not been missing from Biblical or patristic thought—among the fathers Augustine in particular used them freely. Neither was Anselm the first medieval man to do this, but he was among the first. It was to be many centuries before this interest developed into a thorough-going science and art of psychology, but the very next century saw the institutionalization of one of the foundation-stones of a personalized, subjective piety, in the canonical requirement of annual auricular confession by all the faithful. The steady growth and development of personal introspective piety which occurred in the later middle ages,
and afterward in Protestantism and Catholicism alike, was the necessary pre-requisite of the modern science's development. Anselm may justly be considered one of the early initiators of this entire development.

Secondly, there is the impetus which Anselm gave to the pursuit of wisdom and understanding through the study of history. Here again, that impulse did not become the science of history for centuries, but from Anselm on the tradition of seeking the key to understanding in the study of events of human history, whether sacred or profane, rather than in the study of non-human physical nature or the logical analysis of existence and the construction of speculative intellectual systems of thought—this tradition grows in interest and strength in European civilization throughout the centuries. Its validity as such is still widely accepted in Western culture.

Thirdly, and closely connected with the above, is Anselm's belief in progress, which Chenu calls his "radical evolutionism." In Anselm and for centuries following him, the doctrine of progress remained subordinate and linked to doctrines of divine creation, redemption, sanctification, and providence, sober in the recognition of the tremendous opposing power of evil, and always tempered by the concept of the time of Antichrist, which continued to stand between all historical progress and the final eternal attainment. Thus, Fina states that the basis for Anselm's world- and history-spanning view, irradiated as it is with optimistic hope in spite of a vivid awareness of the

---

38 Chenu, p. 307.
power of darkness, is his conviction that a man prepared for cooperation with God can receive power to overcome evil and achieve genuinely new and better things.\textsuperscript{39}

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, however, the doctrine of progress was severed from its traditional context and, thus secularized, was gradually transformed into the first principle and law of all natural, human, and intellectual history—almost an article of faith of the Western liberal culture of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In this process, of course, the idea of an age of Antichrist standing athwart human progress was removed, and the sobering view of the opposition of a malevolent spiritual power was transformed into the hindering effect of lingering though clearly conquerable human ignorance. But at the present time, belief in progress is under a cloud. The cataclysmic political, social, and cultural events of the twentieth century, which have by no means certainly ceased as yet, have cast great doubt on the validity of a belief in progress, and in many quarters shattered it thoroughly. I mention all this only to note that it is not Anselm's concept of progress that has proved questionable or in any way unsound—indeed, it may very well be that it was the very isolating and absolutizing of the concept which, for many, have made it both unsound and highly misleading. In my opinion, the fruitfulness of Anselm's insight here is by no means exhausted.

Last and best of all, in my opinion, is Anselm's magnificent

\textsuperscript{39}Fina, XXIV (1958), 41.
contrast and juxtaposition of the permanent and the transient, the essential and the accidental, or rather, as he himself more accurately put it, the unity and the multiformity which may, indeed must, co-exist and co-inhere in history. Anselm firmly grasped the fact that unity through time—enduring identity—cannot simply be equated with changelessness in history. And at the same time he recognized clearly that things which are not permanently or abstractly necessary to the life of an institution or society may yet be, and often actually are, relatively necessary at one or another stage of its history. Indeed, it is precisely this fact which his concept of novitates interprets. Moreover, he saw the utter interdependence of both these factors in history.

Anselm conceived these inter-twined factors of unity and multiformity specifically in relation to the catholic Church, of course, but mutatis mutandis it is, I think, applicable and illuminating with regard to all societies, institutions, and communities. It is probably true of any social entity that in times of change its continued value or even existence depends on its internal capacity to distinguish accurately between the permanently necessary elements of its nature and the changing and legitimately changeable forms of expression of its life. For only so can it hold to the things which actually comprize its identity and yet be genuinely open to the novitates which inevitably arise within it if it is a living entity, and which cannot be judged, determined, or defined in advance in such a period. The deeper and more all-embracing the changes occurring in its milieu, of course, the more crucial is the quality of perception and the ac-
tion resulting from it—and the more difficult it is also. Many are the institutions and societies which have lacked such a vision at a critical point, and now are only names in history books, if that, or exist as fading relics of the past. As in Anselm's time, so always there is the powerful temptation of the powers that be, in sheer—faithless, Anselm might say—anxiety, to simply curse the new as unmitigated evil, and to harden once-meaningful traditions or patterns into a rigid shell which cannot but be shattered eventually. And of course there is also the opposite danger, possibly more real in twentieth-century societies than ever before in human history, to embrace all that is new uncritically simply because it is new, at whatever cost in the loss of the permanently valuable; for in spite of the contemporary loss of confidence in the doctrine of progress, we are biased toward the future today as no age has ever been before.

In the relatively slight work which we have been considering, Anselm of Havelberg gave to the Church of his century a vision of the nature of its identity and unity which could accept and incorporate the tremendous novitates which were arising within it, and he did this, moreover, with such clarity of structure that the basic elements to be discerned are identified once, as it were, and for all. Salet, writing recently enough so that the deepening crisis enveloping the religion and culture of the West was very apparent, writes, like Anselm himself to whom he refers, with special reference to the Church:

In our time, when the great movement of vast hopes is taking shape in the Church, and is awaking also some disquiet, there is for us light and comfort in seeing the serenity and confidence in
the Holy Spirit with which our author looks at the perpetual renewal in the Church.\textsuperscript{40}

Today, in a time of convulsive change perhaps even more profound and far-reaching than that which occurred in twelfth-century Europe, it seems to me that we need nothing more urgently than men with the depth and breadth of view to discern truly what is the permanently necessary, not only in religion but in society, culture, family structure, and civilization generally. For only in that discernment can we be genuinely open to those novitates by which we may be renewed without the loss of all the goodness and wisdom of which we are the heirs.

\textsuperscript{40}Salet, p. 22.
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Works of Anselm of Havelberg


Epistola apologetica pro ordine canonicorum regularium, in P.L. Vol. CLXXXVIII.

Liber de ordine canonicorum, in P.L. Vol. CLXXXVIII. (Anselm is no longer regarded as the author of this work.)


Vita Adelberti II, Magdeburgensis archiepiscopi, in Bibliotheca rerum germanicarum. Ed. by P. Jaffe. Vol. III. Berlin: Weidmannos, 1866. (Anselm is no longer regarded as the author of this work.)

Other Sources


Ehrenfeuchter, E. (Ed.), Chronicon montis sereni, in Monumenta Germaniae historica: Scriptores. Vol. XXIII. Hannover, 1874. (This series is henceforth cited as MGH. SS.)


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


Rupert of Deutz, De vita vere apostolica: Dialogorum libri V, in P.L. Vol. CLXX.


Literature

Anselm of Havelberg


Bayol, A., "Anselme." Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques. 1912-. Vol. III.


Spieker, C. W., "Der Bischof Anselm von Havelberg nebst einigen Be merkungen über die Kirchengeschichte von Brandenburg." Illgens Zeitschrift für das historische Theologie, X, No. 2 (1840), 3-94.


Praemonstratensian Order

Backmund, Norbert, Monasticon Praemonstratense. Straubing, 1949-.

Clapham, A. W., "The Architecture of the Praemonstratensians." Archeologia, 2d Series, LXXIII, No. 6 (1923).

Dereine C., "Chanoines." Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques. 1912-. Vol. III.
"Les Origines de Prémontré." Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, XLII, Nos. 3-4 (1947).

"Le premier ordo de Prémontré." Revue bénédictine, LX (1948), 85-88.


Grassl, B., "Der Prémonstratenserorden, seine Geschichte und seine Ausbreitung bis zur Gegenwart." Analecta Praemonstratensia, X (1934).


Le Fevre, F., "La liturgie de Prémontré." Ephemerides liturgicae, LXII, No. 3 (1948), 201-02.


Luyckx, B., "De la liturgie et du rit Prémontré." Pro nostris, XII, No. 3 (1947).


Smith, A., "Chanoines Regular." Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique. 1932- . Vol. II.


Waefelghen, R. van, "Les premiers statuts de Prémontré." Analectes de l'Ordre de Prémontré, IX (1913), 45ff.

Zak, A., *Der heilige Norbert.* Vienna, 1930.

**North-eastern Germany**


**Twelfth Century Europe**

Bernhardi, W., "Konrad III." *Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte.* 1883.


### Intellectual History


Other Literature


