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INTRODUCTION

Otto of Freising is best known as the philosopher of history who wrote The Two Cities and The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa. Unfortunately, the interest Otto evokes is often limited to his philosophy of history. Many never go beyond the German historian Wilman's view of Otto as "the first to have a conception of the world-sequence of history."¹

Otto of Freising's two historical works, The Two Cities and The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa, are important for more than his philosophy of history. The values and ideals Otto reflects in his writings are valuable in giving one insights into the ideals of the twelfth century, and this paper will concentrate on Otto's conception of the ideal historian, ruler, and philosopher. We will attempt to answer three questions about Otto's ideal historian, ideal ruler, and ideal philosopher. First, what did Otto conceive to be the purpose, the raison d'être, for each? Second, what

functions would Otto have his ideal figures perform to fulfill their purposes? Third, what virtues would each have to possess in order to function and fulfill his purpose? By answering these questions we hope to better understand Otto of Freising's Weltanschauung and the culture of the twelfth century.
CHAPTER I

OTTO OF FREISING: THE MAN

Historical commentators on the works of Otto of Freising do not fail to praise him. The German historians are indeed most vocal. Bernheim calls him "the greatest historian of the Middle Ages." Gundlach refers to Otto as "the peak of Medieval historians." But Germans are not the only historians to praise Otto. Charles Homer Haskins in his The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century, states that "in Otto of Freising the German historiography of the middle ages reached its highest point." The reason for such lavish praise is that Otto of Freising was able to capture in his writings the trends, ideals, and flavor of the twelfth century. As Adolph Hofmeister, the foremost German scholar on Otto, has said of him: "There is scarcely another individual in whom we see so clearly and so impressively revealed the riches and variety of the..."
movements that filled the twelfth century."4 Otto was able to capture the riches and variety of the twelfth century in his writings because of his leading role in twelfth century society and his sensitivity to the values of his culture. "The supreme expression of the Twelfth Century Renaissance in Germany is found in Otto of Freising . . . ."5

The chief source of information about the life of Otto is the work of his pupil and continuator, Rahewin, and a few incidental allusions in his own writings. Born between 1111 and 1115, he was the fifth surviving son of a family of eighteen born to Leopold III and his wife Agnes.6 His lineage is most impressive. "He was the grandson of Emperor Henry IV, brother-in-law of Henry V, half brother of King Conrad, and paternal

---


6A. W. A. Leeper, A History of Medieval Austria (London: Oxford University Press, 1941), pp. 8-9. It is interesting to note that Agnes had a total of twenty-five children from her two marriages.
uncle of . . . Emperor Frederick . . . "7 Being the fifth son destined Otto to a clerical career. The piety of Leopold, Otto's father, is well testified to; he was hailed as "the pious" and "father of the clergy and of the poor."8 Leopold's piety, which lead to his canonization by the Church, certainly made the youthful Otto aware of the Christian notion of the proper end of man. In 1117 Otto was made provost of Klosterneuburg, a monastery founded by his father.9 The income from this position no doubt was to help defray the expenses Otto would incur as a student at Paris. While provost of Klosterneuburg, Otto began to acquire the fundamentals of learning, not the least of these being the


acquisition of the use of Latin. Prepared with the international language of the intelligentsia of the middle ages, and his income as provost, Otto was ready to set forth for Paris.

In 1127 Otto ventured from Freising with some of his companions to Paris and the university springing up there. Of the five years Otto and his companions spent at Paris we know very little.\textsuperscript{10} We can well imagine how the disputations at Paris must have impressed these young Germans from the frontier. The atmosphere of Paris no doubt awakened in Otto and his companions a new appreciation of the world, its beauty and vastness.\textsuperscript{11} Otto became familiar with the writings of Aristotle while at Paris.\textsuperscript{12} Just with whom Otto studied at Paris is not known. However, we can deduce from Otto's own works that three men were very influential in his education. Otto as a student gave particular attention to the study of philosophy. We

\begin{footnotes}
know definitely that he had the greatest respect for and familiarity with the "Aristotelian books of the *Topics*, Analytics, and Elenchics." This interest in philosophy would have given Abelard, Gilbert de la Porée, and Hugo of St. Victor ample opportunity to influence Otto.

Upon completion of his education at Paris, Otto prepared to return home to take up an ecclesiastical career for which he had been trained.

Otto and his companions left Paris in 1133 for Freising. The monasteries of the middle ages, offering their hospitality to travelers, were no doubt frequented often by these young men journeying home. Otto, as provost of Klosterneuburg, knew well that the Rule of St. Benedict called upon the monks to receive guests "like Christ." The abbey of Morimond of the Cistercian Order had been, early in the twelfth century, active in establishing abbeys throughout Germany. Otto stopped at this abbey for the night and, attracted by the strict

---

13 ibid.
Cistercian life, declared his intention of joining the Order. One is led to ask why so young and educated a person, destined for a high clerical position, would join the Order of Cistercian monks noted as being "... a model for all monks, a mirror for the diligent, a spur to the indolent." Otto's decision to become a Cistercian points out the extraordinary power that the Order had in its calling forth for men to save their souls. Otto's sensitivity to life, aroused at Paris, found its fulfillment at Morimond. Having completed his education of the mind, he entered the monastery to acquire the art of love, eternal love. After completing the normal novitiate and living the life of monk for four years, Otto was elected Abbot of Morimond. Otto's election as abbot, in view of Chapter Two of St. Benedict's Rule entitled "What Kind of Man the Abbot Ought to Be," can well be taken as testimony of his

---

18 Bury, V, 676.
20 Otto, Gesta, p. 247. Book IV, Chap. XIV.
piety and virtue. Otto was not long to enjoy the life of a monk before being called back to the world.

Rahe win, speaking of Otto, says that at Morimond "he was found . . . good, and excellent that it was deservedly said to him: 'Friend, go up higher.'" His election as Bishop of Freising in 1137 was ideal for both the Church and the state, for here was a man of learning, high birth, and holding the Cistercian ideals; a man by birth tied in loyalty to the temporal lords of Germany and by vocation to the ideals of the reform movement. As Bishop of Freising he set out to restore the church of Freising which had suffered during the confusion of the reign of the Emperor Conrad, and during the period since the last bishop's death. "Otto found the church practically bereft of all goods, its resources dissipated, its buildings in ruins, its clergy in sad plight, with so little remembrance of its monastic tradition." Throughout his life, Otto endeavored to

---

21St. Benedict, pp. 7-12.

22Otto, Gesta, p. 247. Book IV, Chap. XIV.

23Ibid.

24Since wealth largely consisted of land at this time, secular princes were not above seizing Church lands while there was no bishop to defend them.

restore and reform the church of Freising to remembrance of its monastic tradition. Part of this restoration was the introduction of the study of Aristotelian philosophy at the cathedral school under his care at Freising. He brought to Freising "the subtlety of the philosophers." Otto's endeavors to restore the church of Freising were most successful.

When he was finally removed from life he had by divine aid, brought it back to such a condition that he had restored religion to the clergy, freedom to the community, abundance to the revenues, and beauty to the buildings. His care, his labor, his service to his see and his flock were so great that he became not so much its restorer as its founder.

Having restored the church of Freising, Otto's zeal for the Church found another outlet by answering St. Bernard's call to retake the Holy Land.

In 1147 at Regensburg Otto stepped forward after "a brief exhortation" by the abbot of Clairvaux and accepted the crusaders' cross. The capture of Edessa by the Turks in 1144 had aroused those present so that they "hurried forward of their own accord to receive

26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid., p. 76. Book I, Chap. XLIII.
29 Ibid., p. 75. Book I, Chap. XLII.
the cross."\(^{30}\) In May of 1147 when as Otto poetically puts it: "The flowers and plants come forth from the earth's bosom under the gracious shower of spring and green meadows smiled upon the world, making glad the face of the earth, King Conrad lead forth his troops, . . . .\(^{31}\) Of the slow and arduous pace of the crusading army, averaging from eleven to eighteen miles a day, Otto says little.\(^{32}\) We can well imagine the penance of suffering endured, for marching room was at a minimum, there was " . . . hardly sufficient room for the advance on foot."\(^{33}\) In October the crusaders reached Nicomedia and there Otto with 14,000 men under his command began the march along the coast into Syria. Otto's army was attacked by the Turks and was wholly destroyed. Otto escaped and eventually reached a port and set sail to join the remaining forces of Conrad.\(^{34}\)

Unfortunately Otto gives us little more

\(^{30}\)ibid.

\(^{31}\)ibid., p. 79. Book I, Chap. XLVI.


\(^{33}\)Otto, Gesta, p. 79. Book I, Chap. XLVI.

\(^{34}\)ibid., p. 95. Book I, Chap. LVII.
information on the Crusade. What is by far the most valuable of his statements on the Second Crusade concerns the purpose of the endeavor and the reason for its failure. He says of the Crusade: "Although it was not good for the enlargement of boundaries or for the advantage of men's bodies, yet it was good for the salvation of many souls ... ."\textsuperscript{35} For Otto the primary purpose of the Second Crusade was the salvation of souls. The reason for the failure of such a holy mission, in his eyes, was simply its lack of holiness. "The outcome of that expedition, because of our sins, is known to all . . . ."\textsuperscript{36}

After the Second Crusade, Otto returned to his see at Freising. During the remaining years of his life he acted as consiliator between Frederick I and the Church and continued his restoration of the church of Freising. Even as a bishop, Otto practiced the asceticism of the Cistercian Order.\textsuperscript{37} "He endeavored to please God to whom our consciences and hearts are known."\textsuperscript{38} His

\textsuperscript{35}ibid., pp. 105-6. Book I, Chap. LXII.
\textsuperscript{36}ibid., p. 79. Book I, Chap. XLVII.
\textsuperscript{38}Otto, \textit{Gesta}, p. 247. Book IV, Chap. XIV.
death was a final act of humility.

He had, while still alive, pointed out to the brethren with his finger a place for his tomb outside the church in a humble spot, where indeed he would have been trodden upon by all the brethren, it was thought best to ignore this last request of his, and he was interred with due honors inside the church near the high altar, and his tomb is held worthy of respect and veneration by all the brethren. 39

Rahewin's epitaph of Otto, written at the order of Emperor Frederick I, takes into account some of the many facets of Otto's life.

This man, if you ask his status, was in rank a bishop. His appearance? Comely, proper; a young man in years. His lineage? Distinguished by the lofty majesty of kings. His character? Worthy of praise for its marvelous integrity.

Religion? He was a monk. His viewpoint? He set forth ideas. May the Virgin, whose intercession he merited, commend him to Him whom she bore.

Often philosophy occupied his leisure. His training in theology was even greater. He was closely tied to literature. Now may the supreme vision serve as his mirror!

Let Germany lament him with general lamentation! But you more especially, Freising, bereft of such a man, you who were granted so much by him should mourn him with endless complaint.

Through his zeal, study flourished within you; pleasant disputations

39 Ibid., p. 214f. Book IV, Chap. XIV.
stimulated many. There was no one who did not perceive the distinction between custom and reason. Error and quibbling were laid bare.

This man exalted the holy service of the Church. He set the battle of wits in motion. All this is buried with his dust. No one can mourn sufficiently such a man. 40

Otto's piety gained recognition at his death and still does today. The Cistercian martyrrology places him among the Blessed of the Order. 41

Otto reconciled in himself the serving of Church and state, the study of philosophy and the Cistercian simplicity—the key to the reconciliation being the love and service of God. The ideals that Otto would require of the historian, ruler, and philosopher to fulfill, with which we will deal, all find their ultimate end in the service of God out of love of God.

40 ibid., p. 249. Book IV, Chap. XIV. This epitaph is in the form of a poem of twenty stanzas, the first eleven of which are composed in four thirteen syllable rhyme verse. The final stanza is a ten verse poem in a different meter. I have here quoted the second through sixth stanzas.

41 Fellner, p. 155.
CHAPTER II

THE IDEAL HISTORIAN

Why would Otto, a busy bishop and former monk, feel compelled to compose historical works at all? The *Consuetudines* of the Cistercian Order strictly forbade the writing of books without the consent of the general chapter.\(^4^2\) Even as a bishop Otto still owed obedience to his Order. During this period the Cistercian General Chapter still exercised its jurisdiction over prelates who hailed from its ranks, irrespective of dignity. "In all matters that pertained to religious discipline a Cistercian bishop or cardinal was subject to the rules of the Order . . . ."\(^4^3\) Dispensation from this regulation must have been fairly easy to obtain considering the literary output of the Cistercian Order. In the realm of historical writings alone the Cistercians, Helinandus


\(^{4^3}\)A Cistercian religious of Gethsemani, *Compendium of the History of the Cistercian Order* (Gethsemani, Kentucky: Abbey of Gethsemani, Kentucky, of the Order of Cistercians of the Strict Observance, 1944), p. 82. It was not until 1275 that the Cistercian General Chapter released prelates from some obligations of obedience to the Order.
of Froidmont, Gunther of Paris, Ralph of Cogeshall and Aubry of Toris-Fontaines followed Otto in producing books. This literary activity has lead some to state that " . . . Bernard and the other Cistercians of his time had renounced everything on entering the cloister except the realms of literature and this exception was perhaps to a greater extent than it seems."

Otto had certainly not learned his affection for history at Paris, for there was little concern in the schools for historical studies. The trivium and quadrivium were taught in the schools, and history was not one of the seven liberal arts. However, this does not mean that history had no place in the schools of the twelfth century. Grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmatic, music, geometry, and astronomy gave the instructor ample opportunity to provide historical examples. Texts of the twelfth century are filled with marginal information on history. "The extensive commentaries on ancient authors studied in the medieval schools, particularly Vergil and Lucian, include much historical detail beyond

---


46Leclercq, p. 160.
that given in the text . . . .n47 While the schools did not teach history as a subject, a historical approach was often taken in teaching the seven liberal arts.

It was from the monastery that Otto's affection for history probably sprang. As a monk he no doubt found examples in the classics of historical writings. The monastic predisposition toward the traditional encouraged him to become more acquainted with tradition and interested in acquainting others with it.48

The literary activities of Otto of Freising certainly found precedent in St. Bernard and others in the observance of St. Benedict's Rule. The motivation for this Cistercian literary output, and in particular Otto's motivation for writing his historical works, was charity. The monk was to give up the aid of the Rule and the joys which he sought in contemplation and give himself to the temporal world, if necessary, out of the love of others.49 Indeed, the Cistercian monk could not

48Leclercq, p. 156.
emancipate himself from charity and his duties toward the world.\textsuperscript{50} Motivated by charity towards his fellow man and a love of God, Otto wrote history to encourage the salvation of mankind. The history which Otto wrote is edifying in intention, the purpose to praise God by instructing the reader to do good and stimulating the reader to praise the Lord.\textsuperscript{51} The history that Otto wrote was monastic history, history that had for its purpose religious instruction.

By turning to \textit{The Two Cities} and \textit{The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa} we can see that Otto had one purpose in both works, to further his own salvation and the salvation of those who would read his works. For Otto, the raison d'\'\^etre of the historian was his personal salvation and the furtherance of the possibility of the salvation of mankind. In the prologue of the first book of \textit{The Two Cities} Otto relates that his history is to be "... a tale of human miseries."\textsuperscript{52} His purpose in \textit{The Two Cities} was "to record the conflicts of this world in order to demonstrate the wretchedness of changing

\textsuperscript{50}Ailbe J. Iuddy, \textit{The Cistercians} (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, ltd., 1952), p. 115.
\textsuperscript{51}Leclercq, p. 160.
events, that by pondering upon such events we may be lead by the eye of reason to the peace of Christ's Kingdom and the joy that abides without end." Otto's purpose was to lead men away from the transitory to the eternal. Why did he undertake this task of guiding men toward eternal happiness in union with God? Otto states "... it is not because of indiscretion or frivolity, but out of devotion, which always knows how to excuse ignorance, that I, though I am without proper training, have ventured to undertake so arduous a task." An arduous task indeed it must have been, for The Two Cities is composed of eight books. To laboriously write, under physical conditions unknown to modern day writers, such a lengthy history from the time of Adam to his own, certainly points up Otto's desire to please God and to further the salvation of human society. Otto's purpose was to compose in The Two Cities a Christian aid toward salvation; the chance of academic advancement or monetary reward did not motivate or await him.

In The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa Otto's

53 Ibid., p. 205. Book II, Chap. XLIII.
54 Ibid., p. 96. Book I, Prologue.
purpose remained the same as in *The Two Cities*. Otto's purpose here was "to extol the famous deeds of valiant men in order to incite the hearts of mankind to virtue, but to veil in silence the dark doings of the base, or, if they are drawn into the light by the telling to place them on the record to terrify the minds of these same mortals."\(^5\) For Otto the reason for writing history was to encourage the salvation of fellow Christians; this for Otto was the raison d'âtre of the historian.

In order to fulfill the raison d'âtre of the historian Otto felt two functions must be performed. First, and primarily, the historian must be capable of drawing from history God's lessons for man. "He sees God's guiding hand in all the ages. He conceives of history as an imparting to mankind a realization of the divine destiny shaping our ends."\(^6\) It is in the prologue to the seventh book of *The Two Cities* that Otto most clearly expressed his view of God's hand in history.

Therefore from the fact that every wise and good man loves and cherishes his own good works, we are privileged to understand clearly that God does not neglect His world,


as some claim, but rather that by His omnipotent majesty He created things that were not, by His all-wise providence guides His creatures and by His most kindly grace preserves what He guides and controls. But is man, though he is subject to mutability--wise only as he partakes in wisdom, good only as he partakes in goodness (nay, only as he is called good) --loves and cherishes his own good works, how much more must we believe that God, the only Being not subject to change, who alone is wise of His own wisdom, who alone is good of His own goodness, and therefore the only good Being, does this! Hence we have the well-known statement of Augustine: "There are two reasons why God loves His creation; that it may come into being and that it may continue in being. That there might be something which should endure, 'the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' Moreover, that this something might endure, 'God saw all that he had made and it was very good.'" If therefore God loves what He created, and none of the things that come to pass can come to pass without His will, if He regulates all powers, much more does He permit the kingdoms through which He governs other smaller matters, and the changes in them to come into being. That all this comes to pass without hatred or envy is made evident only by the fact that, to use Plato's phrase, "Envy is far removed from the best," but also by this fact, that the Author and Creator of all things can hate none of the things which He has made. This is why in the Book of Wisdom it is beautifully said of Him, "Thou hast compassion upon all, O Lord, and abhorrest none of the things which Thou didst make." And again, "But thou, O Lord, judgest all things in gentleness." Therefore that "the world passeth away," that it changes so pitifully, occurs--since, as I have said, nothing can come to pass without His nod--not from cruelty, for He "has compassion upon all," not from hatred, because "He hates none of the things which He made," "not from wrath because "He judges in gentleness," but by
His righteous judgment and for a reason which, although it be hidden from us, we yet believe to be most to our profit. For we must believe that the author of goodness and the fount of grace permits no evil save that which, however much it may in itself be hurtful, is yet of advantage to the whole. This truth may be seen in the downfall of the Jewish nation--because through the blinding of that people all nations received the light of truth. So let us leave it to God, under whose dispensation nothing can flow uselessly away, to see what advantage attends the changes in governments, and their final impairment.57

It was for the very reason that God shapes history that Otto saw value in it. The value of history is that of a teacher from which lessons can be drawn which will assist man in obtaining union with God. History for Otto is a teacher of men; one should be a "... student of history."58 The historian's primary function is to draw from history the wisdom God meant it to have for man. The lessons Otto drew out of history were primarily of a religious nature. He missed no opportunity of expressing his sense of pain at sin. The following are examples of Otto's disgust at sin:

In the third year from the incarnation of the Lord, Herod, the king of the Jews,

58 ibid., p. 270. Book III, Chap. XIV.
hearing from the Magi that the Christ had been born, committed a most monstrous crime. For fearing—since he was a foreigner—that a child had been born of the seed of David who would demand the throne of his father by right of inheritance, he had made careful inquiries concerning the place and time, and then ordered that male children of two years of age and under in the vicinity of Bethlehem should be put to death. But Christ's foster-father was warned beforehand by an angel, and the child was taken to Egypt. The Lord, in punishment for this crime, afflicted Herod severely with a most awful and loathsome visitation of disease. And so he ended his life in accursed fashion, both because of his very great bodily pains and because of his sinful deeds of murder. It is believed that this atonement was exacted of him beyond question on account of his sacrilege toward Christ and the deed committed upon the children of equal age with Christ. 59

and again:

At the time at which the people of God were in captivity in Babylonia, the kingdom of the Romans too was oppressed by the might of Tarquinius Superbus and his unrighteous tyranny. After he had committed other cruel acts the most vile deed against Lucretia, purest of women, a deed basely performed by Tarquinius' son and wickedly concealed by the father, was the wholly adequate cause for his overthrow. 60

59 ibid., pp. 231-32. Book III, Chap. VII.

60 ibid., pp. 163-64. Book II, Chap. IX.
and again:

During these days a certain villain, Mundus by name, very craftily deceived a certain pious matron, Paulina. For when he had often tempted her without avail to commit adultery, he induced the priests of a temple by a bribe to announce that one of the gods wished to have intercourse with her. The woman reported the matter to her husband; the husband approved. And so, coming by night to the temple, the woman awaited the god. Mundus accordingly came and gained his desire in the guise of a god. After this he taunted the woman with what he had done. She again informed her husband. When Caesar had learned of the crime from the husband he destroyed the temple as a due punishment; the priests he crucified but, moved by a foolish compassion, he spared the young man as one deluded by a great passion, and pursued him to leave the city. 61

The above are but a few of the many expressions of Otto against sin. It should be noted in all instances the sinner begins to suffer for his sins immediately after having committed them. To sin means to suffer, this was Otto's message to his readers. Otto's lessons from history were not confined to injunctions against sin alone. He also endeavored constantly to make apparent history's message that in God alone is eternal happiness. Speaking of the constant change of mundane

61 Ibid., p. 233. Book III, Chap. IX.
things, Otto saw a message to man:

We believe that this has come to pass by what is surely a wise and proper dispensation of the Creator, in order that, whereas men in their folly desire to cleave to earthly and transitory things, they may be frightened away from them by their own vicissitudes, if by nothing else, so as to be directed by the wretchedness of this fleeting life from the creature to a knowledge of the Creator.

Man should not cling to the worldly because it is transitory in nature.

It is not necessary at this point to enlarge upon the miseries of temporal affairs. For mark you, that mighty kingdom, although not yet utterly destroyed, still by its change gives to itself premonition in diverse ways of its own utter ruin! What then shall we say, who think to cleave to transitory things, when we see them change, then when they have changed begin to degenerate, and finally perish utterly?

Throughout The Two Cities Otto was constantly compelled "... to cry out against the wretchedness of life's vicissitudes."64 This constant reminding of the transitory nature of life had for its goal the reader's "... quest of the unchanging heavenly country."65

---

63ibid., p. 151. Book I, Chap. XXXII.
64ibid., p. 215. Book II, Chap. LI.
65ibid., p. 321. Book IV, Chap. XXXIII.
In the prologue to the sixth book of *The Two Cities*, Otto presented, perhaps clearer than anywhere else, one of the great messages of God in history.

Does it not seem to you that the world, after the manner of the sea, threatens with destruction by times of storm as the sea does by its waves those who entrust themselves to her? To what else am I to liken men who vie with one another for perishing honors than to creeping things of the sea? In the deep we see the lesser swallowed up by the greater, the weaker by the stronger, and at last the stronger—when they can find no other prey—tear themselves to pieces. Hence springs the saying: "The great fall upon themselves." All these things the prudent reader will be able to find in the course of this history. It is plain therefore that the citizens of Christ ought not, as do creeping things of the sea, to plunge into the salty sea or trust themselves rashly to treacherous gales; they ought rather to sail by faith in a ship—that is, the wood of the Cross—and in this present time to busy their hands with works of love, that they may be able by traversing the highways of this life to reach safely the harbor of their true country. 66

The turning away from the *civitas mundi* toward the *civitas Dei* and the pain of sin were the two main lessons, but not the only lessons Otto drew from history. Throughout both *The Two Cities* and *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* are scattered the lessons Otto

has drawn from the history he had been just describing. These historical lessons range from how to win war: "From all this it appears that in war wisdom is the dominant factor,"\textsuperscript{67} to when the commands of kings could justly go unheeded: "... if they order anything contrary to God and to our soul's salvation, we should learn to say with Peter 'We must obey God rather than men.'"\textsuperscript{68} In \textit{The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa} Otto drew from history its lessons for the ruler.

The purpose of \textit{The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa} was the same as \textit{The Two Cities}, to lead men to God, but the method was not the same. Otto did not dwell on the vicissitude of the earth, but rather dwelt on the harmony and peace that had come about. Otto's purpose was to write a guide for rulers. The ideals according to which Otto had Frederick behave are those he felt all rulers should observe. His object in writing \textit{The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa} was not to be strictly factual, but rather to paint the picture of the perfect ruler. Otto personified his concept of the ideal ruler in Frederick Barbarossa; he gave life to his concept of the ideal ruler by attributing to Frederick

\textsuperscript{67}ibid., p. 197. Book II, Chap. XXXVII.

\textsuperscript{68}ibid., p. 267. Book III, Chap. XLIII.
Barbarossa the virtues of the ideal ruler. All other rulers were thus presented with an image of the ideal ruler by which they could judge themselves. Failing to find in themselves the virtues that Frederick possessed, Otto hoped they would endeavor to gain them so that they could reach the eternal reward.

If Otto's reason for writing history was the encouragement of salvation, and if he considered it one of the historians functions to draw lessons from history to help one toward the goal of salvation, just what place did objectivity have in his histories? Did the fact that Otto saw history as the working of God in this world with the ultimate end being the millennium and union with God or damnation leave any room for objectivity? His history certainly was typical of medieval history which realized God's actions in history. Medieval historians are traditionally viewed as being far from objective. The tendency among some writers to designate as "medieval" anything which they do not understand or do not approve, regardless of the issue as to whether it existed in the middle ages or not, has reinforced the view that medieval historians were of little consequence. Because the word "medieval" has in some circles become synonymous with "antiquated," "superstitious," and "legendary," the works of medieval
historians have been branded likewise. The following are some random samplings of the views of twentieth century writers on the medieval historian. Albert Jordan has written: "History up to the eighteenth century had in great measure to be taken in trust; fiction had almost acquired the substance of reality." 69 M. V. Hay substantiates this view: "Broadly speaking it can be said that during the middle ages there were no historians, only hagiographers and chroniclers, both caterers for popular taste and prejudice, religious and national." 70 T. F. Tout further substantiates this view: "Like children, they did not see clearly the distinction between truth, sought by an intellectual process, and the romantic product of imagination." 71 How does Otto's work stand up to the charges that medieval historians lacked objectivity and a critical approach?

For Otto, objectivity, a critical approach

---


toward history, and indeed we might even say a scientific approach, was a necessity. The second function of the historian, in Otto's eyes, was to be objective, that is to attempt to represent the past correctly, to present a true historical picture to the reader. The interests of edification do not require that critical judgement be sacrificed, indeed the interests of edification demand that critical judgment be exercised. It is because history is God's work that it must be correctly portrayed. If one does not present a correct historical picture the lessons one draws from history could be false. To ensure that the correct lessons are drawn from history so that man can better reach salvation, history in Otto's eyes must be accurate, that is, the historian had to correctly portray history or risk losing its value. In a letter written in March of 1157 to Frederick I, dedicating a copy of The Two Cities to him, Otto brought out in a specific manner his view that the historian's function when writing history is to be truthful.

... The art of the historians has certain things to clear away and to avoid and others to select and arrange properly; for it avoids lies and selects the truth. Therefore let not your Discreet Highness be offended or interpret the matter in an unfavorable light in the hearing of the emperor, if it shall appear that in our history
certain matters have been spoken in criticism of his predecessors or ancestors, that the truth may be held in esteem, inasmuch as it is better to fall into the hands of men than to abandon the function of a historian covering up a loathsome sight by colors that conceal the truth.

A brief examination of The Two Cities and The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa illustrate Otto's critical approach to history, a critical approach made necessary out of the desire to present a true historical picture. The Two Cities, comprising a history of the world from Adam to Otto's time, is composed of eight books. Book I while shortest, deals with the largest period of history, from Creation to the downfall of the Assyrian Empire and the beginnings of Rome. Book II deals from the founding of Rome to the birth of Christ. Book III goes from the Nativity to the reign of Constantine and the Christian Roman Empire. Book IV goes to Odovacar and the end of the Roman Empire in the West. Book V ends with the Treaty of Verdun and the division of Charlemagne's empire. Book VI goes to the death of Pope Gregory VII in Salerno. Book VII ends with the year 1146. Book VIII deals with Otto's theological views on the ends of man. As is apparent, Otto was dependent on past historians in writing Books I through VI. Upon reaching

the year 1106 in his history Otto leaves his guides by stating: "What follows, since it is still fresh in men's memories, we shall record as it has been related to us by credible men or seen or heard by ourselves." What were the sources Otto used in composing the first six books of *The Two Cities*? In an endeavor to reach historical certainty on the past, Otto collected and used every past historical work within his grasp. The Cathedral library of Freising no doubt contained many of the works he used in composing his history. Hofmeister, in his translation into German of *The Two Cities*, gives an exhaustive list of the sources quoted by Otto. He subdivided the sources as follows:

A. Theologians: Among the most important being the Jerome version of the Bible and St. Augustine. A total of thirteen, with ten or more mentioned as possible.

B. Philosophers and grammarians: Aristotle and Cicero being the most important. Seven listed with one doubtful.

C. Poets: Nine in number with two as possibilities. Vergil, Horace and Ovid are the three most important.

73 *ibid.*, p. 407. Book VII, Chap. XI.

74 *ibid.*, p. 24. Intro. This library had been collected by his predecessors since the ninth century. According to Mierow, in 1926 there were over two hundred manuscripts from Freising covering the periods up to the twelfth century preserved at Munich. Unfortunately, I have not been able to determine if these were destroyed in World War II.
D. Historians: A list of over twenty-eight.75

A listing of these main chronicles and historians works alluded to by Otto gives one a picture of the research he undertook before writing *The Two Cities*. According to Charles Christopher Mierow, Otto quotes the following historians: Varro, Augustine, Pompeius Trogus, Justin, Suetoniuis, Tacitus, Orosius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Frutolf of Michelsberg, Rufinus of Aguleis, Cassiodorus, and Falvius Josephus.76 These authors are but a brief indication of the more important words Otto used in composing *The Two Cities*. Otto certainly did not neglect the sources. "In this vast composition Otto laid practically all the historical sources known to the Middle Ages under contribution."77

Granted Otto made the fullest use of source materials, the question still remains how critical was his approach to these sources? Sometimes he gives various views, leaving it up to the reader to decide upon the correct historical interpretation.78 Sometimes


77Thompson, I, 196.

he goes further and indicates the untrustworthiness of his account by adding the statement "so men say" or "it is said." Otto's presentation of Prester John is an example of this.

It is said that he is a lineal descendant of the Magi, of whom mention is made in the Gospel, and that, ruling over the same peoples which they governed, he enjoys such great glory and wealth that he uses no scepter save one of emeralds. Inflamed by the example of his fathers who came to adore Christ in his manger, he had planned to go to Jerusalem but by the reason aforesaid he was prevented--so men say.79

While he did not remove legends from his history he certainly lets the reader know that they are legends.80 Even when he included legends, he did not fail to point out the questionable foundation on which they rested. The following is the clearest example of this.

The venerable bishop Tiemo, having been captured with the rest, was ordered, as they say, to worship idols. Having asked for a respite (and secured it) he entered the shrine and, since he possessed most vigorous strength of mind and body, broke to pieces the idols which he was to have worshipped, showing thereby that they were not gods but the work of men's hands. For this he was led forth and, after suffering exquisite torments and

79ibid., p. 444. Book VII, Chap. XXXIII.
80ibid., p. 372. Book VI, Chap. XI.
all sorts of torture, was crowned with glorious martyrdom. That he suffered for his faith in Christ a most reliable tradition affirms, but that he demolished idols is difficult to believe because, as is well known, the Saracens universally are worshippers of one God.81

He completely rejected the improbabilities or impossibilities in legends.82 In regard to the Greek myths he gave each a natural explanation, as in the case of the Centaurs: "At that time the Lapithae, battling desperately with the Thessalians, and from a distance seeing them riding on horseback, thought they were part of their horses; hence arose the myth of the Centaurs."83 Sometimes Otto gave a historical explanation for myths, as in the case of Apis,84 Garynedi,85 Apollo and the nymph Carmentis.86 Otto's account of the founding of Rome is by far one of the best examples of the critical approach Otto took toward myths and legends.

81ibid., pp. 411-12. Book II, Chap. VII.
83ibid., pp. 141-43. Book I, Chap. XXI.
84ibid., p. 137. Book I, Chap. XV.
85ibid., p. 140. Book I, Chap. IXX.
86ibid., p. 143. Book I, Chap. XXIV.
Amulius succeeded Procas. Amulius's brother Numitor, when he learned that his daughter Rhea Silvia, whom he had made a vestal virgin, was guilty of unchastity from the fact that she bore children, ordered the twins whom she had brought forth to be exposed and cast into the water. These are the twin brothers Remus and Romulus, founders and builders of the city that was destined to be the capital of the world. The writers of Rome, assuming that Rome was destined to gain the rule of the whole world by martial prowess, claim that they were also the sons of Mars, and in proof of this assert that they were nursed and nurtured, contrary to nature, by a she-wolf—the beast, at any rate, of Mars. But whether they were really nourished by a wolf, as those writers say, or (as others have it) by some harlot or other called "Wolf" on account of her vile manner of living—as we call the houses of such women "lupanaria", after that same word, "lupa," "wolf"—is no concern of mine. I merely make this statement, that they were the sons not of Mars but of some man and, according to certain reliable authorities, a priestess. 87

Otto explained the origins of words to clarify historical meaning, 88 and often augmented historical sources with material gained from personal observation. 89

87 ibid., pp. 156-57. Book II, Chap. II.
88 ibid., p. 225. Book III, Chap. II.
89 ibid., p. 313. Book IV, Chap. XXVII.
Otto's critical judgement in regard to historical sources finds its clearest presentation in his approach to the conflicting historical reports over the elevation of Henry I of Germany to kingship. Otto says:

These conflicting accounts of historians resulted, I think, from the fact that since men's intellectual abilities had begun to grow and to keep pace with the glory of empire, as a result, when the imperial authority was transferred to the Franks and men's sympathies were divided upon the physical division of the kingdom, the writers extolled each his own state as much as he could with the aid of his transcendent abilities. But I myself, keeping a middle course in these matters, and, so far as I am able and can conjecture from what they have said, holding fast the thread of truth, will strive by God's grace to turn aside neither to the right hand nor to the left.

Otto can certainly not be criticized for being uncritical in the approach to his sources. In order to see God's plan in history Otto felt it necessary to be critical so that true historical sequence became apparent. From this one could draw the lessons which would help man move toward union with God.

In the attempt to gain historical exactness, Otto used the tool of archeology. Archeological

90Ibid., p. 378. Book VI, Chap. XVIII.
remains are used to verify historical events. In the eighth chapter of the first book of *The Two Cities* Otto refers twice to archeological remains. In the second paragraph of the same chapter we read:

The people of Treves say that after the death of Ninue Semiramis banished her stepson Trebeta from her kingdom. Trebeta built a fleet and made his way from Asia to Europe, that is, by sea to the Rhine and thence by the Moselle, and settled in a beautiful valley of Gaul. There he founded a prosperous city, abounding in resources and at that time the metropolis of all Gaul, which he called Treves after his own name. How large it was, and what sort of a town it was, may clearly be proven by its ruins.\(^{91}\)

In the last few paragraphs we have been dealing with Otto's approach to source material, but even history written from the best of sources is not ideal. In Otto's mind he would much rather have the historian write from first hand experience or conversations with contemporaries of the events under historical study. In the later part of the seventh and the entire eighth books of *The Two Cities*, and *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, Otto wrote history from first hand experiences. He wrote of the events others of a credible nature saw, and that he saw transpire.

\(^{91}\)ibid., p. 133. Book I, Chap. VIII.
This kind of history Otto liked to write, he liked it best because he felt the historian would be more accurate in writing of things that transpired during his own time.

It is said to have been a custom of the ancients that those who had perceived with their senses the actual events as they took place should be the ones to write about them. Whence also it is customarily called "history" from "hysteron," which in Greek signifies "to see." For everyone will be competent to speak more fully of the things which he has seen and heard. Being in need of no man's favor, he is not carried hither and thither in search of the truth, dubiously anxious and anxiously dubious. Truly, it is hard for a writer's mind to depend on another's judgment, as though incapable of making an investigation of its own.

In writing of the events that aroused the passion of his immediate ancestors and relatives Otto maintained the strictest objectivity. He related the circumstances that led to his half-brother, Conrad III, cheating Duke Henry out of the treasures of the realm, and narrated freely and openly the story of the defeat which his brother Leopold suffered at the hands of

\[92\text{Otto, } \text{Gesta, p. 159. Book I, Chap. XLII.}\]
\[93\text{Otto, } \text{Chronicle, pp. 431-32. Book VII, Chap. XXXIII.}\]
Duke Welf, as also his brother's plunder of churches. 94 Historical objectivity even demanded that he censor himself by noting that he was one of the bishops that Pope Eugenius III criticized for advising the emperor to the harm of the Church. 95

Otto's desire and attempts to portray history objectively and factually does not mean that he did not err now and again. The errors are, however, of a minor nature in view of the breadth of material covered. The fact remains that Otto, throughout his historical works, attempted to give a factual historical presentation of the past.

The functions that the historian had to fulfill in order to abide by his raison d'être were two according to Otto. First, the historian should draw out of history the lessons God intended it to have for man so that man could further his desire and capabilities of moving to union with God. Secondly, the historian should practice objectivity, with his goal the true representation of the past. Since the hand of God

---

94 ibid., pp. 431-34. Book VII, Chap. XXV.
95 Otto, Gesta, pp. 121-22. Book II, Chap. VIII.
was in history and lessons were to be drawn from history, objectivity was demanded so that the correct lessons could be drawn out of history, lessons that would lead men to God.

The question remains: What virtues did Otto describe as necessary to provide these functions? Unfortunately, nowhere in his histories does Otto provide a specific and clear answer to this question. From the goals Otto has ascribed to the ideal historian, it is possible to extract what seems like the logical virtues the ideal historian would have to have to fulfill these goals. First of these is learning. To read historical sources and exercise critical judgement as Otto demanded of the historian would require the virtue of learning. This learning would seem to include a knowledge of the language of the main sources of history. Those languages Otto deemed most important were: "Hebrew for the worship of God or because of its antiquity, the Greek, for its wisdom and the charm of its expression, the Latin, for power and also for wisdom."

Coupled with the ability to read the sources, Otto would, it seems, have demanded

---

96 Otto, Chronicle, p. 149. Book I, Chap. XXVII.
an ability to write in a fashion that would not hinder the transference of God's messages in history to mankind. But more important than learning would be the virtue of piety in Otto's eyes. A piety that would make the gaining of God's grace assured. What could be more logical than to call upon God to help explain His plan in history? This is the reason Otto called upon God for grace when attempting to ascertain historical truth. Indeed God's grace, according to Otto was needed to do so:

It is to be observed that all human power or learning had its origin in the East, but is coming to an end in the West, that thereby the transitoriness and decay of all things human may be displayed. This, by God's grace, we shall show more fully in what follows. 97

and again:

Since, then, the changeable nature of the world is proved by this and like evidence, I thought it necessary, my dear brother Isingsrim, in response to your request, to compose a history whereby through God's favor I might display the miseries of the citizens of Babylon and also the glory of the kingdom of Christ to which the citizens of Jerusalem are to look forward with hope, and of which they are 98 have a foretaste even in this life.

97ibid., p. 95. Book I, Prologue.

98ibid.
For Otto, God's grace helps the historian hold fast to truth when writing history. Thus, piety that evokes God's grace, and learning which assists in the search for historical truth would be virtues needed by the historian in order to fulfill the functions assigned him by Otto.

In conclusion, a summary of Otto's views of the ideal historian is as follows: The raison d'être of the ideal historian was his personal salvation and the furtherance of the possibility of the salvation of mankind. The functions the ideal historian was to perform were twofold: first, to be historically objective, that is to portray history truthfully so that the correct and true past emerged; and second, to draw from history the lessons God placed there for man to help him reach his salvation. The virtues required to provide these dual functions can best be described as piety and learning.

---

99ibid., p. 378. Book VI, Chap. XVIII.
Otto's conception of the ideal ruler is embodied in his portrayal of Frederick Barbarossa. He was able to bring forward this concept of the ideal ruler by having Frederick fulfill the functions he recognized the ideal ruler as having to fulfill, and secondly by making us aware of the virtues the ideal ruler would have to possess in order to carry out his functions. The raison d'être of Otto's ideal ruler emerges from the functions and virtues Otto attributed to Frederick I.

We should note that Otto praised Frederick Barbarossa, his embodiment of the ideal ruler, for fulfilling three functions. Maintenance of peace, providing justice, and fostering cooperation between Church and state are the three functions Otto attributed to the ideal ruler.

Otto deemed peace of great importance, since he felt man could best pursue God while peace reigned. Frederick represented to Otto one capable of ending war and bringing peace. Before the reign of Frederick
Germany was beset by war. Otto expressed his despair of life:

... Disturbance now seems so serious that not only do men throw everything into confusion by plundering and burning through all the rest of the year, but they do not shrink from committing violence contrary to divine and human law during the very season of Lent and the time for repentance.\textsuperscript{100}

Otto's bitterness over the turbulence of his time found its expression in \textit{The Two Cities}. In Otto's dedication of a copy of \textit{The Two Cities} to Frederick he hastened to inform him of this bitterness of spirit, \textit{"... led to by the turbulence of that unsettled time which preceded your reign..."}\textsuperscript{101} The warring in Germany was, in large measure, due to the conflict between the Welfs\textsuperscript{102} and the Waiblingen.\textsuperscript{103} The other ecclesiastical and temporal princes wished to end this warfare.

The princes, therefore, considering not merely the achievements and the valor of the youth already so frequently mentioned, but also this fact, that being a member

\textsuperscript{100}ibid., p. 445. Book VII, Chap. XXXIV.
\textsuperscript{101}ibid., p. 89. Dedication letter to Frederick I.
\textsuperscript{102}The ducal family of Bavaria, Italianized as "Guelf."
\textsuperscript{103}That is, the Hohenstaufen, so called from the village of Waiblingen in Swabia; the Italians turned Waiblingen into "Ghibelline."
of both families, he might--like a cornerstone--link these two separate walls, decided to select him as head of the realm. They fore­saw that it would greatly benefit the state if so grave and so long-continues a rivalry between the greatest men of the empire for their own private advantage might by this opportunity and with God's help be finally lulled rest. So it was not because of dislike for King Conrad, but (as has been said) in the interest of a universal advantage that they preferred to place this Frederick ahead of Conrad's son (likewise named Frederick), who was still a little child. By reason of such consider­ations and in this way the election of Frederick was celebrated.\footnote{104}

Frederick succeeded to the throne of a Germany in a state of disintegration; unrest and the famine and want that accompanied war prevailed. Frederick acted as a voice calling for harmony and an end to strife. Frederick's star shone brightly; in the early years of his reign he was able to bring some measure of peace. The promulgation of \textit{Landfrieden} was one of Frederick's first acts. His enforcement of this general land peace was effective. Feuds were healed and offenders dealt with; order at last seemed to be restored.\footnote{105} Otto noted that due to Frederick, "... so great a felicity of peace smiled upon the

\footnote{104} Otto, \textit{Gesta}, p. 116. Book II, Chap. II. The elective principle was, by this time, firmly established in Germany.

\footnote{105} Bury, V, 381.
entire transalpine empire that Frederick may rightfully be called not only Emperor and Augustus, but also Father of his Country.  

Frederick was successful in fulfilling his function as head of the state; he had brought peace. "An unprecedented brightness of peace dawned again . . . by reason of the virtues of our most victorious prince."

The maintenance of peace must also be accompanied by justice, the giving of each his due. Frederick, Otto's personification of the ideal ruler, was praised for fulfilling this function. Describing the coronation of Frederick, Otto felt compelled to tell of this ruler's regard for justice.

I think I ought not to omit the fact that while the diadem was being placed on Frederick's head, after the completion of the sacramental anointing, one of his retainers, from whom for certain grave offenses he had withdrawn his favor before he was king, cast himself at his feet in the center of the church, hoping to turn the latter's spirit from the rigor of justice on so happy an occasion.

But Frederick maintained his previous severity and remained unmoved and thus gave to all of us no small proof of his firmness, declaring that it was not from hatred but out of regard for justice that this man had been

---

excluded from his patronage. Nor
did this fail to win the admiration
of many that pride could not
dissuade the young man (already, as
it were, in possession of an old
man's judgment) from virtuous firm-
ness to the fault of laxity. What
more need be said? Neither the
intercession of the princes, nor
the favor of smiling fortune, nor
the present joy of so great a
festival could help that poor
wretch. He departed from the
inexorable prince unheard. 108

Otto further portrayed Frederick as stern,
but merciful. Returning through a pass from Italy
after his first expedition, Frederick was attacked
by brigands. After a tremendous and successful attack
upon the brigands' rock ledge position overlooking the
narrow passage, Frederick took over five hundred
prisoners. One of the brigands, a young knight,
approached the emperor and pleaded that he had been
"... misled by wicked men."

The glorious emperor decreed that of
them all only this man should be saved
from the sentence of death, imposing
upon him as penalty merely this, that
he should adjust the noose about the
neck of each man and inflict upon his
conrades the punishment of the
gallows. And so it was done. The
large sums of money that they promised

108 ibid., p. 117. Book II, Chap. III.
for redemption of their lives were of no avail to those poor wretches. They were hanged on the gallows by an unyielding judge. All the rest, who lay strewn along the slopes of the mountains, were piled in heaps on the very path to afford to all passers-by the warning example of their fate. 109

While this may appear a bit cruel, it was inexorable justice. The chronic insecurity of the time made the greatest possible severity on the part of the ruler desirable; crime being regarded as a menace to the order of society and an insult to the divine Majesty. Those who committed evil and caused war were reaping their reward: to each his due. Such action on the part of Frederick tended to instill in his subjects a fear of just sentence. A just sentence "... heaps misery on misery for those attempting to struggle against a prince who may be called not only a righteous judge but also a pious ruler." 110

As a righteous judge, Frederick did not restrict his enforcement of justice to peasants or brigands, even the highest of nobles learned to respect and fear his application of justice. Archbishop Arnold of Mainz and Count Palatine Herman incurred a taste of Frederick's

109ibid., p. 159. Book II, Chap. XL.

110ibid., pp. 134-35. Book II, Chap. XXI.
justice. Both had been guilty of pillaging and terrorizing the countryside by warring with each other when Frederick was out of Germany. The Archbishop, because of his age and episcopal station, was spared the emperors' penalty for breaking the peace.

The other was subjected to the due penalty. Now an old custom has gained the status of a law among the Franks and the Swabians, that whenever a noble, a ministerialis, or a peasant (colonus) has been found guilty by his judge of such offenses, before he is punished by sentence of death the noble is obliged to carry a dog, the ministerialis a saddle, the peasant (rusticus) the wheel of a plow, from one county into the next in token of his shame. The emperor, observing this custom, compelled that count palatine, a great prince of the realm, together with ten counts, his accomplices, to carry dogs the distance of a German mile. When this stern judgment was promulgated throughout the breadth of the transalpine empire, so great terror came upon all that everyone desired rather to keep the peace than to promote the confusion of warfare.\footnote{\textit{ibid.}, p. 163. Book II, Chap. XLVI.}

Justice prevailed and peace reigned, indeed the two could not exist independent of each other. But justice and peace could not exist, in Otto's way of thinking, unless a third function was also provided by the ruler, namely fostering cooperation between the
Church and the state. Peace, justice, and cooperation between Church and state were inseparable for Otto, all had to be in operation or none could operate.

Otto had to make Frederick Barbarossa a ruler who fostered a cordial relationship with the Church in order to have him fulfill his role as the embodiment of the ideal ruler. Otto did not write in The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa about the justification of the power of the Church or state. It is in the prologue to the fourth and seventh books of The Two Cities that Otto alluded to questions regarding the justification of kingship and priesthood. He set forth, in an objective manner, the claims of both, but he made no explicit mention of his own position. "To settle this point or even to discuss it is beyond our strength." While Otto did not settle the issue he did express an opinion. Speaking of himself, Otto wrote:

For, to speak as I think myself, I admit that I am absolutely ignorant whether the exaltation of His Church which is so clearly visible today pleases God more than its former humiliation pleased Him. Indeed, that former state seems to have been better, this present condition more

---

fortunate. However I agree with the holy Roman Church, which, I doubt not, was built upon a firm rock, and I believe that what she believes must be believed and that what she possesses can legitimately be possessed. For that she can be deceived by no error can be proved by this: "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Moreover, that her faith is to abide forever we may know from what was said to Peter: "I made supplication for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not." But that every least point of controversy may be solved by its own authority and example is again implicitly intimated by what is said to Peter: "Put out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught." Let what has been said concerning the righteousness of the priesthood and of the kingship suffice.113

We can not help being given the feeling that Otto had misgivings over the Church's rise in temporal power.

The reason for these misgivings was Otto's recognition that this rise in temporal power could harm the Church.

All can now see to what a mountainous height the Church, at one time small and lowly, has grown. What great calamities, how many wars and perils of wars followed in consequence of the weakness of the kingdom; how often unhappy Rome was besieged, captured, laid waste; and how pope was placed over pope even as king over king; it is a weariness to record.114

Otto does not deny the Church's right to rise

---

113ibid., p. 274. Book IV, Prologue.
114ibid., p. 401. Book VI, Chap. XXXVI.
in temporal power, but he does ask that it should be noted that this rise may well be harmful to the Church. Otto's position on this issue is similar to St. Bernard's, as expressed in his treatise, De Consideratione, written for Pope Eugenius III, his former pupil.\textsuperscript{115} The Cistercian ideals, common to both St. Bernard of Clairvaux and Otto, Bishop of Freising, were the basis for this protest against the immersion of the Church in purely secular affairs.\textsuperscript{116}

Otto tried to set aside the conflict between Church and state when he wrote The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa. He felt that conflict between the Church and the state was harmful to both. Otto often said that "... whenever the royal diadem had to be struck by the sacerdotal sword the kingdom was divided against itself."\textsuperscript{117} The kingdom was divided against itself when this conflict occurred, because both had authority over the same and identical body of Christians. A

\textsuperscript{115}St. Bernard of Clairvaux, De Consideratione, trans. by a priest of Mount Melleray (Dublin: Browne and Walon, Ltd., 1921), pp. 119-121. Book IV, Chap. III.

\textsuperscript{116}The key to conflict between the Church and state lies in determining what the secular and the spiritual affairs were. The two jurisdictions in fact overlapped and crossed each other so it was difficult to find satisfactory adjustment of claims that were reasonable.

\textsuperscript{117}Otto, Chronicle, pp. 389-99. Book VI, Chap. XXXIV.
conflict between the Church and the state does not provide for the common good. Otto had a deep understanding of how the conflict between the Church and the state could cause a man to be pulled one way and the other due to his loyalty to both. He also recognized that the Church and state had a common goal in their rule over the Christian people, the goal being promotion of the spiritual and temporal progress of humanity. If they did not cooperate, peace and justice could not prevail. The cooperation of empire and Church assured peace and justice. The moral duties of the state—providing justice and peace—are assured of realization when cooperation and harmony exist between the Church and state, for these have the same ultimate goal for their subjects, namely, the attainment of God and eternal happiness.

We must not, when looking upon Otto's presentation of Frederick as fostering cooperation between Church and state, view it in light of events after 1158. Otto died in 1158; the Frederick he knew is not the Frederick we know, because we can not help but recall the protracted conflict between Frederick

and the Church after 1158. This also means that we view Frederick's relationship with the Church before 1158 with a searching eye to the conflict which exploded after 1158. Otto was not looking for conflict, he was looking for examples of cooperation.

In his coronation oath, Frederick I, swore, "...to love and honor the pope, to defend the holy Roman Church and all ecclesiastical persons, to maintain peace and order, to protect the widows and the fatherless and all committed to our care." This is exactly what Otto would require of the ideal ruler. When Frederick announced his election to Pope Eugenius III, the pope responded by writing Frederick and heartily approving his election. However, the pope took the opportunity to remind Frederick of his oath:

We admonish you to bear in mind your oath to defend the Church and clergy of God, to keep peace and order, and to protect the widows and the fatherless, and all your people, that those who obey you and trust in you may rejoice and that you may win glory with men and eternal life with the King of Kings.  

---


120 Ibid., p. 178. A letter of Eugenius III of May 17, 1152, to Frederick I.
It is interesting to note that Frederick was warned in this admonishment that his personal salvation depended upon how well he performed his function as ruler. The empire is a burden; the ruler takes on added responsibility which he must fulfill and be judged by the King of Kings for his actions.

In *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, Otto points out Frederick's support of the Church and his defense of the papacy. He pictured Frederick making haste to Rome to save the pope from the enraged populace of Rome.\(^{121}\) The populace of Rome, under the instigation of Arnold of Brescia, sent emissaries to Frederick informing him of their love for him and their "... great and protracted expectant waiting in order to shake off the unseemly yoke of the clergy."\(^{122}\) Otto explicitly noted the Kings' "inflamed and righteous anger" toward the "insolent speech" of the Romans.\(^{123}\) Otto stressed again and again the support of the king for the Church.

It is important to note, in this instance, not only what Otto said, but also what he neglected to say

\(^{121}\) Otto, *Gesta*, p. 151. Book II, Chap. XXXIII.
\(^{122}\) ibid., p. 145. Book II, Chap. XXIX.
\(^{123}\) ibid., p. 146. Book II, Chap. XXX.
in The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa. Frederick had to foster cooperation between Church and state to act as the embodiment of Otto's ideal. When Frederick did not meet this ideal, Otto does not mention it or he gently slides over the event. There are two obvious examples of the selection or exclusion on the part of Otto. The first of these is the now famous stirrup incident between Hadrian and Frederick. The second incident is Frederick's appointment of Wichmann, Bishop of Zietz, as Archbishop of Magdeburg in the Saxon March.

The first incident occurred on Frederick's first trip to Italy to aid the Church and receive the crown of the Empire. Hadrian rode out to Frederick's encampment at Viterbo. Upon their first meeting Frederick refused to act as squire to the pope by holding the stirrup and bridle of his horse as he dismounted. Much confusion ensued with the pope finally descending from his horse without the customary duty being performed by Frederick. When Frederick then approached the pope for the customary kiss of peace he was refused. After a day of disputation, Frederick was convinced that acting as squire was customary and performed the duty, and then received the kiss of peace from Hadrian.¹²⁴ What does

Otto say of this apparent sign of future dissension between Church and state? He says nothing. Otto described the meeting of Hadrian IV and Frederick on June 1, 1155 in two sentences. "The king was encamped near Viterbo. Thither came the Roman Pope, Hadrian, with his cardinals, and was received with the honor due to his office." Not a hint of friction between the pope and the emperor did Otto allow to creep into his presentation. In the next few pages he goes on to deal with the cooperation of Hadrian and Frederick in ending the power of Arnold of Brescia over the people of Rome. However, this is not an indication of a major breach of objectivity by Otto, for the stirrup incident does not really take on great significance except in the light of the later conflict between the papacy and Frederick Barbarossa.

Otto was not ignorant of Frederick's claim to jurisdiction in some areas previously held to be ecclesiastical. Otto's treatment of Frederick's first real assertion of power in Church affairs points this out. In the Magdeburg incident, we can not help but note that Otto's presentation of this affair has

125 Otto, Gesta, p. 142. Book II, Chap. XXVIII.
126 Ibid., pp. 142-45. Book II, Chaps. XXVIII-XXIX.
Frederick performing justice in attempting to create harmony, not to cause conflict. The church of Magdeburg was without an archbishop and conflicting parties arose supporting two different claimants. The claimants approached the king to end the conflict. Otto wrote: "The prince endeavored in many ways to lead them back to unity and the bond of peace." He could not accomplish this, so he convinced one party to choose a compromise candidate in Wichmann, whom Frederick then invested with the regalia of office. Otto gave Frederick's justification for this action as follows:

The court holds and declares that when the controversy between the empire and the papacy concerning the investiture of bishops was settled, under Henry V, it was granted by the Church that when bishops died, if there happened to be a division in the choice of successor, it should be the prerogative of the prince to appoint as bishop whomsoever he might please, with the advice of his chief men; and that no bishop-elect should receive consecration before having obtained the regalia from the prince's hand through the scepter.

Otto next noted that Gerhard, one of the previous claimants to the archbishop's seat at Magdeburg, then hastened to Rome and charged Wichmann with

---

127 Ibid., p. 119. Book II, Chap. VI.
128 Ibid.
usurpation. Otto, without comment, then reproduced a letter Eugenius III sent to the bishops of Germany, including himself, condemning Frederick's actions and the bishops for supporting him in the appointment of Wichmann. The dispute is left by Otto until the death of Eugenius III. His successor, Pope Anastasius, who Otto felt had more experience in the customs of the Court, granted the pallium to Wichmann. Otto's entire presentation shows Frederick's attempts to bring harmony in the dispute over the See of Magdeburg. Although objectivity requires him to give Eugenius's letter condemning Frederick's action, Otto did not comment on the letter, and ends the entire affair on a harmonious note. Wichmann was given the pallium by Anastasius, one more experienced in the ways of the Court than Eugenius III.129

The ideal prince, then, cooperates with the Church, protecting it and ending disputes within it. This cooperation between Church and state was not an abstract ideal, for Otto endeavored in his dual role as bishop and as prince of the Empire, not only to assist in the maintenance of harmony between Church and state by his writings, but also by his actions.

129 Ibid., p. 123. Book II, Chap. X.
Rahewin, who continued *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* after Otto's death, gives us a good example of Otto as an arbitrator between the Church and state in the third book. In 1158 Otto was active in reconciling the Church and state after the Besançon affair. Pope Hadrian had sent Bernard, Cardinal Presbyter of St. Clement, and Rolando Bandinelli, Cardinal Presbyter of St. Mark's, to the Diet of Besançon to remonstrate Frederick for his failure to protect Eskill, the archbishop of Lund, who had been captured "by certain impious and godless men." The letter Hadrian sent reminded Frederick of the Church's past treatment toward him:

For you should recall, O most glorious son, before the eyes of your mind, how willingly and how gladly your mother, the Holy Roman Church, received you in another year, with what affection of heart she treated you, what great dignity and honor she bestowed upon you, and with how much pleasure she conferred the emblem of the imperial crown, zealous to cherish in her most kindly bosom the height of Your Sublimity, and doing nothing at all that she knew was in the least a variance with the royal will.

Nor do we regret that we fulfilled in all respects the ardent desires of your heart; but if Your Excellency had received still greater beneficia at our hand (had that been possible), in consideration of the great increase and advantage that might through you accrue to the Church of God and to us,
we would have rejoiced, not without reason.\textsuperscript{130}

The emperor and his attendants took "beneficia" in the technical feudal sense of benefice, thus concluding that the pope claimed overlordship of the empire. The misinterpretation may have been added to by the way in which the letter was translated to all by the chancellor, Rainald.\textsuperscript{131} The princes were in a turmoil over this letter, being brought to the verge of violence when the pope's legates did not disallow Rainald's interpretation:

\begin{quote}
A great tumult and uproar arose, from the princes of the realm at so insolent a message, it is said that one of the ambassadors, as though adding sword to flame, inquired: "From whom then does he have the empire, if not from our lord the pope?" Because of this remark, anger reached such a pitch that one of them, namely, Otto, Count Palatine of Bavaria (it was said), threatened the ambassador with his sword. But Frederick, using his authority to quell the tumult, commanded that the ambassadors, be granted safe-conduct . . . . \textsuperscript{132}
\end{quote}

The legates being sent on their way, Frederick sent a letter to the German bishops explaining the incident

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{130}ibid., p. 182. Book III, Chap. IX.
\item \textsuperscript{131}Rahewin claims the letter was "set forth in faithful interpretation:" the pope claimed that Rainald changed the interpretation when reading it to bring an end to the concord of Church and state.
\item \textsuperscript{132}Otto, \textit{Gesta}, p. 184. Book III, Chap. X.
\end{itemize}
to his benefit. The pope was next to send the German bishops a letter which still did not clarify the meaning of "beneficia," but called upon the bishops to "... bring back, as quickly as possible our aforesaid son [Frederick] to the right path."\(^{133}\) The German bishops, including Otto, addressed the pope with reverence, but called upon him to clarify the meaning of "beneficia:"

Indeed, by those words which were contained in the letter which you sent through your most prudent and honest envoys, master Bernard and master Roland the chancellor, venerable cardinal presbyters, the whole public of our empire has been set in commotion. The ears of the imperial power were not able to hear them patiently nor the ears of the princes to bear them. All present were so deaf to them, that we, saving thy grace, most holy father, on account of the sinister interpretation which their ambiguity permits, do neither dare, nor are we able to defend or to approve them by any form of consent--for the reason that they are unusual and have not been heard of us to the present time.\(^{134}\)

In February of 1158, Hadrian IV explained the meaning of "beneficia" to Frederick.

\(^{133}\)E. F. Henderson, (ed.), Selected Historical Documents of the Middle Ages (London: George Bell and Sons, 1903), p. 415. Letter from Hadrian IV to the German bishops.

\(^{134}\)ibid., p. 416. Letter of the German bishops to Pope Hadrian IV.
For your heart was stirred to anger, it is said, by the use of a certain word, namely "beneficium." Yet this should not have vexed the heart of even one in lowly station, to say nothing of so great a man. For although this word "beneficium" is by some interpreted in a different significance than it has by derivation, it should nevertheless have been understood in the meaning which we ourselves put upon it, and which it is known to have possessed from the beginning. For this word is formed of "bonus" [good] and "factum" [deed], and among us "beneficium" means not a fief but a good deed. In this sense it is found in the entire body of Holy Scripture, wherein we are said to be ruled and supported ex beneficio Dei, not as by a fief [seigniorum] but as by His benediction and His "good deed" [bono facto]. And indeed Your Highness clearly recognizes that we placed the emblem of imperial dignity upon your head in so good and honorable a fashion that it merits recognition by all as a good deed. Hence when certain people have tried to twist that word and the following formula, namely, "we have conferred upon you the imperial crown," from its own proper meaning to another, they have done this not on the merits of the case, but of their own desire, and at the instigation of those who by no means love the concord of Church and state. For by "we have conferred" [contulimus] we meant nothing else than when we said before "we have placed" [imposuimus].

This letter of explanation was given "..." to the venerable Bishop Otto of Freising to read and interpret

---

--a man who felt a peculiar grief at the controversy between the state and the Church."

Otto desired the ideal ruler to foster cooperation between Church and state, to maintain peace, and to promote justice. Frederick Barbarossa as the embodiment of the ideal ruler, is portrayed in The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa as having fulfilled the three functions which are the ruler's duty to provide. But Otto did not concern himself only with the functions to be provided by the ideal ruler. He also set forth the virtues that the ideal ruler would require in order to fulfill the functions demanded.

The over-riding feature that Otto brought out in dealing with Frederick was his vigor. When Frederick took the reins of rule in Germany he was in the prime of his life. A thirty year old man, above average in height, well proportioned with a genial expression and fiery red hair, his body gave the appearance of vigor. Otto portrayed the young Barbarossa as expressing this vigor by buckling on the

---

136 ibid., p. 199. Book III, Chap. XXII. We can not help but wonder how Otto would have handled the writing of this incident if he had lived to continue his history of The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa.

137 Bury, V, 382.
belt of military service. As a youth he had trained for his future role as warrior in the traditional Germanic way by participating in military sports, learning by apprenticeship the way of the warrior. Girding himself for a soldier's career, he showed aptness at the career, defeating, in his youth, Conrad of Dachau, later Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia. "These and other exploits as arduous he performed even in the years of youth, to the amazement of many, so that not inappropriately it might be said of him, in the words of the Gospel, 'What manner of child shall this be?" Frederick was a king who did not spare himself. In war, "... none fought more energetically than the prince, no one, not even a common knight, was quicker to take up arms, no professional soldier was more ready than he to undergo dangers." Frederick was a king who encouraged not only by threats, but also by example, a man who exerted himself in fulfilling his duties. It is because Frederick was vigorous that

138 Otto, Gesta, p. 59. Book I, Chap. XXVI.
139 ibid., p. 61. Book I, Chap. XXVII.
140 ibid., p. 154. Book II, Chap. XXXV.
141 ibid., p. 27. Book I, Prologue.
Otto felt that peace could again shine in Germany. "A lasting peace is anticipated under the most vigorous prince in the Roman world."\textsuperscript{142} The ideal ruler has vigor, which finds expression in vigorous actions leading to the fulfillment of the functions the ruler is to provide.

This vigor on the part of Frederick was not an unbridled vigor. Vigorous action for injustice would be no virtue at all. This vigorousness on the part of Frederick was represented by Otto to be prudent and based on good judgment. The purpose is to pursue, with vigor, the fulfillment of the correct answer to a problem. Before this vigorous action can begin the best solution to the problem must be found. We find that, in this period of a minimum of written record, the tradition of what was the correct response to a certain problem was often found in the memories of men. Invariably Frederick was given credit for seeking the advice and judgment of the bishops and princes.\textsuperscript{143} It was in these "chief men" that the tradition of what was just in a specific instance could be deduced.\textsuperscript{144} The

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{142}ibid., p. 25. Book I, Prologue. \\
\textsuperscript{143}ibid., p. 168. Book II, Chap. LIV. \\
\textsuperscript{144}ibid., p. 118. Book II, Chap. V.
\end{flushright}
ideal ruler is not only vigorous but looks for and accepts advice. Frederick as the ideal ruler was a man "... prudent in counsel and vigorous in war." 145

In writing The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa Otto expressed the ideals for a ruler, not only by praising Frederick's fulfillment of these ideals, but also in what he admonished Frederick to remember. At times he leaves his narrative to present advice to Frederick, the advice of a clergyman to a loved one encouraging the attainment of God. As Otto put it to Frederick, "these and other matters ... are written to you, Excellence, some to you as for you, others to you but not as for you ...." 146 What Otto wanted Frederick to realize was his dependence on God and the value of the "aid of divine Grace." 147 Otto felt that the characteristics Frederick possessed were "divinely inspired and granted to you [Frederick] by God for the general advantage of the whole world." 148

Frederick's realization of his dependence on God was sought so as to arouse within him a regard for

145 ibid., p. 41. Book I, Chap. VIII.
146 ibid., p. 111. Book I, Chap. LXX.
147 ibid., p. 50. Book I, Chap. XX.
148 ibid., p. 27. Book I, Prologue.
God and all pertaining to Him. This regard for God is piety and it is piety for which Otto gave Frederick praise. Frederick's army was forced by hunger to violate certain holy places while crossing through the Alps. Realizing this, after the crossing had been made, he ordered a collection to be taken up in his entire army, the money being sent back to pay the shrines that had suffered, as atonement. This was done to "... placate the Ruler and Creator of all; without whom nothing is well begun, nothing successfully completed." Frederick had, as Otto says, "provided nobly for the common good, fulfilling nobly a leader's task." The ideal ruler is to have piety; he must be pious because his success is so dependent on the grace of God, and failure to recognize God's grace could be disastrous to the common good. Piety is required of the ideal ruler so that he will be able to receive the assistance of God's grace in determining what is just and then in pursuing the just. He who has the burden of rule must realize that he will be judged by the King of Kings as to how well he provided in the temporal realm for the salvation of his subjects.

Self-discipline and the discipline of one's

---

149_1bid., p. 125. Book II, Chap. XI.
subjects are also required of the ideal ruler. Frederick exercised a firm discipline over his comrades at arms. This discipline was required so that justice could be pursued. Frederick realized that undisciplined soldiers could cause much injustice in the pursuit of justice. When dissensions broke out in his army after the sacking and burning of Chieri, he reacted with stern disciplinary measures.

He issued an order, not merely by public announcement but also through the administering of an oath to everyone of high and low degree, that none should venture to carry a sword within the confines of the camp to the possible hurt of a fellow soldier. He added as a penalty that whosoever wounded any of his fellows in violation of this peace regulation should lose a hand or even have his head cut off. After this order—as wise as it was necessary—had been laid down, the thoughtless violence of youthful spirits was calmed.¹⁵⁰

Only if peace was maintained among those who enforce peace could the land expect the blessing of peace. The ideal ruler must also show self-discipline. Otto gives us a good example of Frederick's use of self-discipline when the clergy and monks of Toranta, a city under the siege of Frederick's army, approached him asking to be let free to leave the city. Otto

¹⁵⁰Ibid., p. 132. Book II, Chap. XIX.
pictures Frederick "... with a heart inclined toward mercy, but to avoid all suspicion of weakness he maintained the outward demeanor of perseverance in his previous severity, ordering the priests to return to the citadel." 151 Self-discipline is required of the ideal ruler so that personal desire does not overcome the obligation to provide for the common good.

The reader of *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* cannot help being left with an impression of the personal magnetism of Frederick. The spirit of Otto's presentation builds up this impression. One way in which Otto heightens this impression is by attributing to Frederick a great faculty for rhetoric. Frederick's unprepared response to the ambassadors of the city of Rome, contained in chapter thirty of book two of *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, is a classic extemporaneus speech. 152 Frederick's magnetic nature is also brought out by his awareness of those individuals attracted to his leadership. He rewards instances of individual valor so as to encourage valor. A certain sergeant had stormed the walls of a besieged town, scaling them and bringing down a fully

151*ibid.*, p. 141. *Book II, Chap. XXVI.*  
152*ibid.*, p. 146. *Book II, Chap. XXX.*
armed soldier, and then returned to camp unharmed.

The King called the sergeant into his presence and decreed that for so notable a deed he should be honored by the belt of knighthood. But as he declared that he was a man of lowly station and wished to continue therein, his condition being satisfactory to him, the king permitted him to return to his own quarters, richly rewarded. 153

Frederick's respect for individual valor is a trait which Otto attributed to Frederick in his youth. When Duke Conrad was captured by the young Frederick he released the Duke without extracting the usual ransom. Frederick felt the Duke had fought valorously and so in a chivalrous act released him. 154 A personal magnetism that engenders respect and faithfulness for the sovereign is needed to fulfill the functions of the ideal ruler.

In Otto of Freising's The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa, Frederick is portrayed as the ideal ruler. Frederick is the "... paragon of emperors and kings." 155 Otto's presentation of Frederick Barbarossa is not necessarily a complete historical picture. Otto's purpose was not to present a perfect historical

153 ibid., p. 137. Book II, Chap. XXIII.
154 ibid., p. 60. Book I, Chap. XXVI.
picture, but to present his conception of the ideal ruler. Frederick Barbarossa is the embodiment of Otto's conception of the ideal ruler. The functions Frederick fulfills are those Otto would require of the ideal ruler. The virtues of Frederick are those that the ideal ruler must possess in order to fulfill the functions he is obligated to fulfill.

The virtues Otto felt were needed and attributed to Frederick, as the embodiment of the ideal ruler, were six. These six are all interwoven, if any one of the six is weak or missing, the embroidery will lose its form. All of the six virtues must make up the character of the ideal ruler, according to examples given by Otto in *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*. The first virtue is valor, the courage to take action. The second is the desire for the counsel of the wise, so that what action is just and correct can correctly be decided. The third virtue is vigor, once one knows what is correct and has the courage, one must act. The fourth virtue is self-discipline, one's vigor must be channelled for the common good at the expense of one's personal desires. The fifth virtue is a dynamic personal magnetism, a magnetism that encourages faithfulness to the sovereign and a desire among the subjects to obey the ruler's laws. The sixth virtue
is piety, a respect for and a fear of God that encourages the ruler to be thankful for God's grace and to fear His judgment. A ruler with these six virtues will be capable of maintaining peace, providing justice, and fostering cooperation between the state and the Church.

The virtues and functions Otto attributed to Frederick are those of the ideal ruler, but the fulfillment of these functions and possession of these virtues do not in themselves insure the emergence of an ideal ruler. An individual could possess all of the before mentioned virtues and perform all the before mentioned functions and still not be the ideal ruler. To be the ideal ruler, the virtues must be attained and the functions provided out of the desire for salvation. To Otto, Frederick may be the most august of rulers, but he is a vassal of the King of Kings. The raison d'être of the ideal ruler is his personal salvation, but for the ruler personal salvation is immediately linked with his performance in furthering the possibility of the salvation of his subjects. Otto minces no words when he informed Frederick that his salvation, the justification of his existence, would be determined by how well he performed the role of ruler assigned to him by God.
It is seemly therefore that a king, who has not only been ennobled by the loftiness of his spirit but has also been illumined by divine grace that he might know his Creator should hold before his mind God, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and that he should take all possible precautions not to fall into His hands. For inasmuch as it is, according to the apostle, "a fearful thing" for any man, "to fall into the hands of the living God," yet for kings, who have over them none save Him whom they need fear, it will be by so much the more fearful to fall into His hands as they can sin with greater freedom than all others, according to that word of the wise man wherein he says: "Hear, ye kings, and understand, learn, ye judges of the ends of the earth: give ear, ye that have dominion over many peoples, and make your boast over multitudes of nations, because your power was given you by the Lord, and your strength by the Most High, who shall search out your works, and shall make inquisition of your counsels. Because, though ye were officers of his kingdom, ye did not judge aright, neither kept ye the law of justice nor walked after the will of God, awfully and swiftly shall he come upon you; because a stern judgment shall befall them that be in high places."\[156

Otto's representation of Frederick in The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa is of a ruler who, with God's grace is treading the path to salvation. In the search to describe his virtues Otto refers to Socrates,

calling up his famous four virtues to describe his beloved Frederick. He is "temperate in prosperity, brave in adversity, just in judgment and shrewd in courts of law."\textsuperscript{157} Otto's prayers beseech God that Frederick who has had such a good beginning may be granted an even better ending.\textsuperscript{158} One must wonder how Frederick Barbarossa would have appeared in The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa if Otto had lived beyond 1158. Otto, who felt his writing unequal to the task of describing the magnificent exploits of Frederick, died with a bare two books of The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa finished.\textsuperscript{159} With Otto's death, Frederick Barbarossa as the ideal ruler seems to glimmer faintly and at times ceases to shine at all.

\textsuperscript{157} Otto, Gesta, p. 27. Book I, Prologue.
\textsuperscript{158} ibid.
\textsuperscript{159} ibid., p. 115. Book II, Prologue.
CHAPTER IV

THE IDEAL PHILOSOPHER

We are indeed fortunate that Otto of Freising had an interest in philosophical matters. His historical works contain a wealth of information on twelfth century philosophy. Otto felt that philosophy should be interspersed with history to make history more interesting. He states in the Prologue of Chapter One in The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa:

Nor will it be regarded as inconsistent with a work of this sort if the style is exalted, as the opportunity for a digression presents itself, from the simple diction of history to loftier—that is, to philosophic—heights. For this very practice is not at variance with the prerogative of the Roman empire: to intersperse the simpler with the loftier affairs. For Lucan and Vergil and all the other writers of the City frequently elevated their style of expression so as to touch certain intimate secrets of philosophy, in recording not only historical events but even fables, whether modestly in the manner of shepherds or peasants or in the more exalted style of princes and lords of the earth. For thus not only those whose pleasure consists in hearing the record of achievements, but also those to whom the refinement of subtle reasoning affords greater delight, are
attracted to read and to study such a work.\textsuperscript{159}

While Otto does not rank as one of the great philosophers of the twelfth century, he certainly qualifies as a knowledgeable observer and commentator on the philosophical disputes and personalities that filled the early twelfth century. The controversy over Universals was an important problem of this period. Abelard, Gilbert de la Porree, Hugo of St. Victor, and St. Bernard of Clairvaux all had their followers. Otto's background allowed him to be objective when dealing with conflicting schools of thought. In Otto of Freising the two major philosophic traditions of the twelfth century found reconciliation. The scholastic tradition of the emerging town schools and the monastic tradition of the monasteries combined in Otto of Freising, who had been exposed to both.

Otto's interest in philosophy no doubt went back to his student days at the emerging university at Paris. While at Paris Otto came under the influence of Abelard, the master dialectician. The school of Chartres, represented by Hugo of St. Victor and Gilbert de la Porree, also influenced Otto as a young scholar at Paris. After

\textsuperscript{159} Otto, \textit{Gesta}, p. 28. Book I, Prologue.
his student days at Paris, Otto joined the Cistercian Order at Morimond. He was then influenced by what has been termed the "Cistercian Mysticism," which found its embodiment in St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Thus we have in Otto of Freising, a man with sympathy toward the seemingly conflicting intellectual currents of the twelfth century. Because he had been a student of all the above he was able to combine those doctrines of each which he favored. He was also able to describe each with great insight. By noting Otto's own viewpoints on the role of philosophy in human life and the way he treats the philosophical controversies of the twelfth century in his histories, his conception of an ideal philosopher becomes apparent.

Before we can determine Otto's conception of the ideal philosopher it is necessary to determine if he felt there was any place for the practice of philosophy by Christians. We must ask Otto: What is the relationship between reason and revelation? Or to put it perhaps more clearly, what is the relationship between Christianity and philosophy?

The very name philosophy means the love of

wisdom. A philosopher is then one who pursues wisdom. "But what is wisdom? According to the classical definition it is the knowledge of the first principles and first causes."\textsuperscript{161} Otto would certainly agree with this definition of philosophy as the love of wisdom. He stated: "After the theological poets whom I have called sages, there arose the philosophers, men who preferred to be called by the modest name 'philosophers,' that is 'lovers of wisdom,' rather than by the name 'wisemen.'"\textsuperscript{162} He would also agree with Abelard that Christianity, logic, and philosophy are basically identical in their final purpose--logic being the study of \textit{Logos}, [Word, Reason], philosophy being the love of wisdom, and Christianity the religion of Christ. Since Christ is the true Wisdom and \textit{Logos}, philosophy and Christianity have the same ultimate end, true knowledge of the Word, Wisdom.\textsuperscript{163} Quoting John 14:6 and Proverbs 14:12, Otto presented this idea to his readers:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{161}Etienne Gilson, \textit{History of Philosophy and Philosophical Education} (Milwaukee: Marquette Univ. Press, 1948), p. 2.
\item \textsuperscript{162}Otto, \textit{Chronicle}, p. 161. Book II, Chap. VIII.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
By taking upon himself the form of a man He [Jesus] proferred mortal men a highway; to recall those who were utterly astray from the error of falsehood to the light of reason, He revealed Himself as the truth; to make over anew the perishing He showed Himself as the true life, saying, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." as though He were saying, "You are wandering astray; come therefore to me who am the way. That you may tread this way undismayed, learn that I am the truth. And if you have no provision for the journey, realize that I am the life." For many seek the way but, not finding the true way, wander about instead of walking in the right path. Again many tread a way which seems the true way, but do not thereby attain life. Of these methinks it was said: "There are ways which seem right unto men, but their ends lead to destruction." But the Saviour, coming into the world, says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," that is, "Through me alone one walks safely, with me alone one reaches truth, in me alone one continues in true life."164

For Otto the very purpose of man's having reason is so that he can acknowledge God.

Every man is capable of reason, to the end that he may acknowledge God as his creator, and not overlook his own deeds because his heart is blind or fail to hear because his ears are deaf. In brief, the very form of man's body, not inclined towards the ground as the bodies of the other animals are, but upright that he may give heed to the heavens, proves that man was created for this end. Besides, the inner man,

made after the likeness of his Creator, receives the means of investigating the truth not only in relation to other beautiful and great creatures outside himself but also in relation to himself, because he has "the light of the Lord's countenance set upon him as a seal."  

While it was true that for Otto philosophy and Christianity had the same ultimate end, the attainment of Truth, this does not mean that they were equal methods. For Otto, reason was essentially distinct from faith, and philosophy from religion. Reason was a useful tool and could discover Christian truths unaided by revelation.

Otto presented a number of examples of philosophers reaching Christian truths unaided by revelation. Writing to Frederick I, Otto took note of the king of the Persians, Artaxerxes II Mnemon (405-362) as an example of a pagan philosopher reaching a knowledge of Christian truths. Again in writing of Augustus he noted that this pagan emperor had be natural reason seen the value of humility. Otto stated:

And so when all the world had been made subject to the Romans and had been divided into provinces, the Gates of Janus were closed by

---


166 ibid., p. 87. Letter of Dedication.
Augustus for the third time and they remained closed for twelve years. But Augustus himself, although now master of all the world, yet never permitted himself to be called master either in earnest or in jest. In this he really avoids our arrogance: for we, though Christians and priests, greatly seek after the very thing which the heathen with natural insight refused.

It was because philosophy could reach truths unaided by revelation that Otto saw value in it. In a letter to Frederick Barbarossa's chancellor Rainald, he stated: "I believe, as Boethius says, 'That the greatest solace in life is to be found in handling and thoroughly learning all the teachings of philosophy.'" Otto found solace in philosophy because it gives man the capacity to comprehend the higher precepts of life. This is why pagan philosophy was of such interest to Otto. The Two Cities and The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa contain many citations of pagan philosophic works. Chief among these are Cicero, Seneca, Julian,

167 Ibid., p. 228. Book III, Chap. IV.
169 E. g. Otto, Chronicle, p. 131. Book I, Chap. VI.
170 E. g. ibid., pp. 200-201. Book IV, Chap. XL.
171 E. g. ibid., p. 288. Book IV, Chap. K.
Mercury, Epaminondas, Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato. His high regard and great interest in pagan philosophy is further substantiated by the fact that he alluded to the tradition that Plato was a pupil of Jeremiah. He also believed that Seneca had corresponded with St. Paul.

Seneca was famed for his life and for his learning; he cultivated the pursuit of philosophy, and showed that he would be friendly to the Christian religion by sending many letters to St. Paul the Apostle and receiving replies from him.

Otto felt that the pagan philosophers, unaided by revelation, reached almost the entire Christian truth save the Incarnation. Otto says of Plato:

He and the other philosophers by natural keenness comprehended the invisible as it were by means of

---

172 E. g. ibid., p. 138. Book I, Chap. XVI. By an error apparently general for the twelfth century, Otto regarded Mercury as a philosopher.

173 E. g. ibid., p. 179. Book II, Chap. XXIV.

174 E. g. ibid., p. 161. Book II, Chap. VIII.

175 E. g. ibid.

176 E. g. ibid., p. 94. Book I, Prologue.

177 ibid., p. 162. Book II, Chap. VIII.

178 ibid., p. 241. Book III, Chap. XV. Otto may have read letters falsely attributed to Seneca.
the visible. For all things that could be discovered by human wisdom regarding the nature of God they found out, all except those matters on which ultimate salvation depends. These things are learned through the grace of Jesus Christ by the gentle of heart. Hence Augustine says\textsuperscript{179} that he found this in Plato: "In the beginning was the word," and all that the evangelist sets forth in that most profound discourse, up to the point where he begins to speak of the mystery of the incarnation.\textsuperscript{180}

In another place Otto reaffirms that Plato had reached certain Christian truths:

Socrates trained Plato and Aristotle,\textsuperscript{181} the most renowned of all the philosophers, and with a keenness proportioned to their youth, since they surpassed their very teachers in understanding. The one of these discusses the power, wisdom and goodness of the Creator, and the creation of the world and of man, with as much clearness as wisdom, and so near is he to the truth that on this account he is believed by some of our people to have heard Jeremiah in Egypt and to have been instructed by him in our faith.\textsuperscript{182}


\textsuperscript{180} Otto, Chronicle, p. 163. Book II, Chap. VII.

\textsuperscript{181} Though we know that Aristotle was born some fifteen years after the death of Socrates and therefore could not be his pupil, it seemed popular during this period to assign Aristotle as a direct pupil of Socrates.

\textsuperscript{182} Otto, Chronicle, pp. 161-62. Book II, Chap. VIII.
Otto's belief that non-Christian philosophers, those not aided by revelation, could reach Christian truth by the use of reason is further demonstrated by the fact that he did not hesitate to avail himself of their testimony to uphold his eschatological views. Writing of the last judgment as the destruction of the world, Otto cited Plato, Sibyl, and Josephus to augment his argument:

"When"--according to the Apostle--"they shall be saying 'Peace and safety,' then sudden destruction shall come upon them."183 and all things shall be consumed by the terrible power of fire. Not only have our own people [Christians] with prophetic inspiration rightly foretold this destruction of the world by fire, but even certain of the heathen also, relying upon merely human reasoning powers, have had a vision through the aid of physical speculations. Plato, chief of philosophers, asserts in his Timaeus that in accordance with the secret plans of nature the world must be purified first by water, afterwards by fire.184 A certain one of the poets speaks as follows on the same theme:

..........remembers a time that is coming, Wherein the sea and the land and the boundless expanse of the

183 I Thess. 5:3.

184 Mierow points out that this passage has not been found in any remaining editions of the Timaeus. Otto, Chronicle, p. 463. Note 58. Book VII, Chap. VIII.
heavens, Even the boundless mass of the world shall in fire be ended.\textsuperscript{185}

The Sibyl too, in the prophecy she uttered concerning Christ,\textsuperscript{186} makes a clear reference to this final conflagration and the last judgment. Josephus states that the first man, who could more subtly trace the causes of things in that he saw at a closer range their primordial creation, predicted that there would be one destruction of all things by the power of fire, another by a multitude of waters.\textsuperscript{187} One of our own writers, Peter, agreeing with him said, "There were heavens from of old and an earth compacted out of water and through water, by the word of God, by whom the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: but the heavens that now are, and the earth, by the same word have been stored up for fire, being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men."\textsuperscript{188}

Otto felt that this use of ancient philosophers to uphold his eschatological theories was not out of place because God was responsible for the ancient philosophers having the ability to reason to Christian truths. He made note that the great ancient philosophers, Plato,

\textsuperscript{185}Otto is quoting Ovid, \textit{Metamorphoses} 1.256.

\textsuperscript{186}Otto must have obtained the information from Augustine, \textit{City of God}, 18.23, and 2.4.

\textsuperscript{187}Otto is quoting Josephus, \textit{Antiquities}, 1.2.

\textsuperscript{188}The last quotation is from II Pet. 3.5-7. Otto, \textit{Chronicle}, p. 463. Book VIII, Chap. VIII.
Socrates and Aristotle, were preparing the way for the acceptance of Christ.

He also created that first man on the sixth day. Nor ought He to have been made flesh in an early age of men. For the men that were descended from these sinful parents, men whose nature, marred by disobedience, made them more inclined and prone to evil, who as yet were making no use of their reasoning powers, and were roaming about rather in the manner of wild, brute beasts—the natural goodness within them being obscured,—these men, I say, had not learned to live companionably with one another, to be moulded by laws, to be adorned with virtues, and to be lighted by the power of reason to the knowledge of the truth. Hence we have most shameful stories and even more shameful deeds, most monstrous recitals and still more monstrous acts, regarding all of which I think I have said enough in what has preceded. Since men were thus devoid of reason, incapable of receiving the truth, unacquainted with justice and with laws, how could they receive, how understand, how comprehend the laws and the most lofty precepts about life that were to be given by Christ? And so the Law was given first that it might be suited to their feeble intellects and might support the infancy of the world not with solid food but with milk. Then as this age gradually grew and made progress—partly through the association of men dwelling together, partly through the putting together of their wisdom for the purpose of establishing laws, and partly through the agency of the wisdom and of the teachings of the philosophers—it was fitting that the Saviour of all should appear in the flesh and establish new laws for the
world at the time when, as I have said, the whole world had now bowed before the power of the Romans, and had been moulded by the wisdom of the philosophers, and the minds of men were suited to grasp more lofty precepts about right living.\(^9\)

It should be apparent that according to Otto of Freising, reason could reach Christian truths. For a Christian, reason was an accepted epistemological tool. For Otto it was possible for an individual to be a good Christian and a philosopher at the same time. Philosophy based on human reason, owing all its truths to the self-evidence of its principles and the accuracy of its deductions could reach some (many) Christian truths without having to depend in any way on revelation.\(^{190}\)

The recognition that reason could be a means to gain knowledge of God must have had considerable support in the twelfth century for we even find it expressed in the architecture of the period.

The recognition of the liberal arts as a means to the knowledge of God finds visible expression in the Cathedral of Chartes. Here, on the Western or Royal portal of the Cathedral the representations of the seven liberal arts were for the first time fashioned in sculpture.

\(^{189}\text{Ibid.}, p. 220. Book III, Prologue.}\n
\(^{190}\text{Gilson, The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy, p. 6.}\)
Here for the first time the principle teachers of pagan science—Donatus, Cicero, Aristotle, . . ., Euclid, Pythagorus, and Ptolemy—became part of the Church's architectural imagery. In this significant innovation . . . we recognize the symbol of the endeavor to give the masters of ancient learning their place as necessary members in the structure of the Christian faith. 191

Otto often wrote of the interest in philosophy shown by the saints and teachers of the Church. Otto wrote of Moses and Abraham as examples of those blessed by revelation by God but yet not foresaking philosophy.

Moses also, the giver of the law, "with whom Jehovah spake as a man speaketh unto his friend," and whom He filled with wisdom divine, was not ashamed to be instructed in all the wisdom of Egypt. Did not that great patriarch, appointed by God the father of nations, Abraham, a man trained in the learning of the Chaldeans and endowed with wisdom did he not, when called by God, desert his former manner of life, i.e., go to Egypt and yet not lay aside his wisdom? 192

For Otto there is no reason why a Christian could not legitimately practice philosophy. That he held such an opinion does not conflict with either the philosophical


tradition Otto learned at Paris or the mystical theology he embraced at Morimond. Abelard and St. Bernard both agreed that understanding based on reason had a place in the knowledge of the truths of God. Both the monks and scholastics agreed that knowledge was better than ignorance. St. Bernard was certainly clear in stating that the spouse of the Lord should not be a simpleton. The monks of the twelfth century did not show any reluctance to using the liberal arts as the examples of William of Auberive, Geoffrey of Auxerre, and Odo of Morimond will confirm.

That Otto had a high regard for reason can not be denied. But Otto also felt, and would require the ideal philosopher to realize, that reason had limitations. As an epistemological tool in understanding Christian truths it could fall short of its goal of understanding. Certain Christian truths made knowable if not understandable by revelation are beyond the scope of reason.

194 Leclercq, p. 205.
Otto felt that revelation certainly was not opposed to reason, but that human reason was not able to arrive at an understanding of some revealed Christian truths. Reason and revelation do not conflict; but reason due to human weakness is unable to reach an understanding of some revealed Christian truths. According to Otto, "Mortal wisdom is prone to slip."¹⁹⁷ Men's minds are hindered by concupiscence. This led Otto to cry out: "How pitiful the lot of mortals: How blind, how wretched their minds."¹⁹⁸ Man may attempt to understand what Otto calls the "secret counsels of God," but he is hindered by his mortality; man lacks the terminology to understand God's "secret counsels."

Accordingly we cannot comprehend the secret counsels of God and yet we are frequently obliged to attempt an explanation of them. What? Are we to attempt an explanation of things which we are unable to understand? We can render explanations, human explanations to be sure, though we may still be unable to comprehend God's own explanations. And so it comes to pass that while we speak of theological matters, since we lack the language appropriate to these matters, we who are but men use our own terms and in speaking of the great God employ

¹⁹⁸ibid., p. 183. Book II, Chap. XXV.
mortal expressions with the more assurance because we have no doubt that He understands the formulas we devise. For who understands better than He who created? Hence it follows that, although God is called ineffable, He yet desires us to say much in His praise. Therefore, since He is called ineffable, after a certain fashion He is seen to be effable. As Augustine says, this contradiction in terms can better be resolved by silent faith than by wordy disputation. And another has said: "Let what is beyond words be revered through the agency of silence."\textsuperscript{199}

Otto felt as Bernard of Clairvaux, that understanding based on reason has a place in the knowledge of truth of God. But reason also has certain boundaries as an epistemological method.\textsuperscript{200} Otto was not specific on just what is beyond the boundaries of reason. He did however mention one thing as definitely beyond reason, that being the true nature of God. Otto wrote that "it is to no purpose that certain people strive in this life to comprehend the divine nature . . . ."\textsuperscript{201}

If revelation is sometimes beyond the scope of human reason what place should it have with the philosopher? What is the philosopher to do who is a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{199} Ibid., pp. 218-19. Book III, Prologue.
  \item \textsuperscript{200} Sommerfeldt, "Abelard and Bernard of Clairvaux," p. 495.
  \item \textsuperscript{201} Otto, Chronicle, p. 509. Book VIII, Chap. XXXIII.
\end{itemize}
Christian? Is he to mingle his religion with his philosophy, or is he to keep them in water-tight compartments, or can he reach a more desirable solution by keeping them separated but still within communication with each other?\textsuperscript{202} Otto's answer to a question of this nature does much to clarify his conception of the ideal philosopher. We have already noted that for Otto a philosopher was by definition one seeking Truth, God, and that reason was a limited but an acceptable epistemological method to reach Truth. What then was the place of faith based on revelation? By definition revelation is knowledge given by God. Since the source of revelation is Truth, revelation is true and rational even if sometimes beyond the grasp of human reason. For Otto reason led up to revelation, the Greek philosophers being precursers of Christ.\textsuperscript{203} He does not deny that reason can reach Christian truths, but he also noted an historical event which could be of aid to reason for a Christian, namely the Christian revelation.

Otto would be inclined to ask: Once one is in possession of revelation how can one possibly philo-


phize as though one never heard of it?\textsuperscript{204} This does not mean that Otto would have the philosopher appeal to faith to prove rational arguments,\textsuperscript{205} rather that revelation could be used as a guide to determine if reason is reaching the truth. Since two truths can not conflict, if reason led to a conclusion opposed to the truth set down by revelation, then obviously reason was used incorrectly. If reason was capable of understanding a Christian truth, but failed to reach understanding of that truth, reason had not been used correctly, but if used correctly it would reach the truth as revealed. Reason well used can lead to the truth, only a misuse of reason can lead to conclusions opposed to revelation. Thus for Otto reason keeps its integrity as an epistemological tool while yet being aided by revelation.

The raison d'\'etre of the philosopher is to reach a knowledge of Truth, Wisdom, God, by the use of reason aided, but not losing its integrity to, revelation.

There are two basic functions that Otto attributed to the philosopher. Both of these functions have

\textsuperscript{204}Gilson, \textit{Spirit of Medieval Philosophy}, p. 5.

for their purpose, the helping of man to reach his ultimate goal, union with God. The first function Otto attributed to the philosopher is the defense of the faith by the use of reason. It was the philosopher who could reply to those who attacked the faith on rational grounds. By the use of reason unaided, by not begging the question on faith, the defamer of Christianity should be silenced. It is the philosopher who has the function to "... reply to the defamers, [and] stay the assailants and above all confute those who seek by argument and by force of words to destroy the faith that is in us." 206 Otto felt that the Church was blessed because it did not "... lack famous men, endowed with the greatest wisdom to defend it not only by their words, but by their writings as well from the attacks of the wicked." 207 Hilarius of Poitiers is an example that Otto gives of a Christian philosopher who defended the faith and instructed it. 208

The second function of the philosopher is to instruct the Church of God. By the use of reason the philosopher was to increase the ardor of faith by dis-

206 ibid.
207 ibid., p. 251. Book III, Chap. XXII.
208 ibid., p. 287. Book IV, Chap. VIII.
pelling disbelief with logical arguments. This is what Otto praised Hilarius of Poitiers for doing. "... Hilarius not only instructed the Church of God by word and example, but also left as memorials many writings that are redolent of Gallic subtlety and eloquence." Basil of Caesarea\textsuperscript{210} and Gregory of Nazianzus\textsuperscript{211} were also praised for leading the lives of philosophers who resisted the "... tyrant and heretic Valens\textsuperscript{212}... and left for the Church of God very useful and profound writings as memorials."\textsuperscript{213} Thus, the dual functions of the philosopher were, in Otto's eyes, defense of the faith by reason, and the instruction of Christians to increase their faith and love of God.

Otto's attitude toward his contemporary philosophers is the best indication of the virtues he deemed essential to a philosopher. Otto was not divorced from the philosophical controversies of the early twelfth century. Three of the major participants of the philosophical controversies of the twelfth century, St. Ber-

\textsuperscript{209}ibid.
\textsuperscript{210}St. Basil, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadonia.
\textsuperscript{211}Bishop of Constantinople in 381.
\textsuperscript{212}The Emperor Valens (364-378) was an Arian.
\textsuperscript{213}Otto, Chronicle, p. 289. Book IV, Chap. X.
nard of Clairvaux, Abelard, and Gilbert de la Porree, received considerable attention in Otto's historical works. His comments upon these individuals were not limited to philosophical questions alone, he also dealt with their personalities and the possession or lack of certain virtues by each. By noting Otto's comments on these major personalities of the twelfth century, the virtues he held of value for the philosopher become readily apparent, for they were his standards of judgment for contemporaries.

The majority of Otto's comments on Abelard center around his philosophical controversy with Bernard of Clairvaux. Otto had the greatest respect for Abelard's learning and readily admits that he was a "keen thinker." While Otto respected Abelard's learning, he commented negatively upon his rashness:

This Peter was a native of that province of France which is now called by its inhabitants Brittany. This region is productive of clerics endowed with keen intellects, well adapted to the arts but almost witless for other matters . . . . This Peter, I say, had from an early age been devoted to literary studies and other trifles, but was so conceited and had such confidence in his own intellectual power that he would scarcely so demean himself as to

214 Otto, Gesta, p. 83. Book I, Chap. XLIX.
It is quite evident that Otto did not approve of the contempt shown by Abelard for his instructors, based on over-confidence in his own intellect. Otto would require the philosopher to have a humble attitude toward his own grasp of philosophical truths. A humble attitude that could readily admit error and moves toward correction. The reason that Otto would require the philosopher to be willing to admit error is that he felt demons could take possession of the mind and lead it from the truth. The Antichrist could use philosophy to lead the philosopher to deny his faith.

For those who, employing human reasoning, philosophize regarding the causes of things, are more readily led by reasoning and by argument to the point of denying their faith than frightened into doing to by threats or enticed by the delights of the world. Let these words suffice concerning the life and the doctrine of Antichrist.

Abelard with his violent temper and conceit, represented to Otto the type of philosopher that Antichrist could easily lead astray. To guard against being led astray

---

215 ibid.
216 Otto, Chronicle, p. 147. Book I, Chap. XXVI.
217 ibid., pp. 460-61. Book VIII, Chap. IV.
by the Antichrist, Otto would demand the virtue of humility of the philosopher, a humility that would allow correction of one's philosophical doctrines, if they conflicted with faith and were thus in error.

Otto continued his narrative on Abelard as follows:

However, he first had a teacher named Roscellinus who was the first in our times to teach in logic the nominalistic doctrine. Afterward he betook himself to those very distinguished men, Anselm of Laon and William of Champeaux, bishop of Chalons-sur-Marne, but did not long endure the weight of their words, judging them to be devoid of cleverness and subtlety. Then he became a teacher and went to Paris, showing great capacity by his originality in discovering matters not only of importance for philosophy but also conducive to social amusements and pastimes. On a certain sufficiently well-known occasion he was very roughly dealt with, and became a monk in the monastery of St. Denis.

Otto's representation of Abelard as one "... showing great capacity ... in discovering matters ... con-

---

218 Roscellinus of Compiegne, who was compelled in 1092 to retract his more extreme propositions, died as a canon of Tours in 1121. Basically his nominalist teaching denied the reality of universals.

219 The reference is to his mutilation by canon Fulbert, the uncle of Heloise in 1119.

220 Otto, Gesta, p. 83. Book I, Chap. XLIX.
ducive to social amusements and pastimes" must have aroused some chuckles from his contemporary readers. Abelard's activity in the realm of social entertainment were the talk of Paris. Otto actually had little use for immoral behavior on the part of a philosopher. To be a philosopher entails certain ethical requirements. "No man can at one and the same time philosophize and indulge in such ways of life as are incompatible with philosophical thinking." Otto would require the philosopher to lead an exemplary life. The philosopher should possess the virtues of restraint in social amusements and pastimes. Moderation is the key in the social life of the philosopher.

Otto's opinion of Abelard become more positive after Abelard's stay at St. Denis.

There devoting himself day and night to reading and meditation, from being a keen thinker he became keener, from being a learned man he became more learned, to such a degree that after some time he was released from obedience to his abbot, came forth in public, and again assumed the office of teacher. Accordingly, holding to the doctrine of nominalism in natural philosophy, he rashly carried it over into theology. Therefore, in teaching

---

221 Ibid.

and in writing of the Holy Trinity he minimized too much the three persons which Holy Church has up to the present time piously believed and faithfully taught to be not merely empty names but distinct entities and differentiated by their properties. The analogies he used were not good, for he said among other things: "Just as the same utterance is the major premise, the minor premise, and the conclusion, so the same being is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." On this account a provincial synod was assembled against him at Soissons in the presence of a legate of the Roman see [112]. He was adjudged a Sabellian heretic by those excellent men and acknowledged masters, Alberic of Rheims and Letald of Novara, and was forced by the bishops to cast into the fire with his own hand the books that he had published. No opportunity of making a reply was granted him because his skill in disputation was mistrusted by all.224

After making these observations Otto went on to present the full text of St. Bernard's letter to Pope Eugenius III on Abelard, and Eugenius' reply.

Otto closed his comments on Abelard by noting that Abelard "... ended his day in a monastery ..."

---

223 Sabellius was a third century African priest whose teachings were held to over-emphasize the unity of the three persons of the Trinity.

224 Otto, Gesta, pp. 83-84. Book I, Chap. XLIX.
humbly setting forth his faith before his brethren."^{225}

While Abelard may well have said: "I do not wish to be a philosopher to the point of resisting Paul, I will not be an Aristotelian to the point of rejecting Christ,"^{226} in asserting his orthodoxy, Otto recognized the important necessity of good judgment was lacking. Otto criticized Abelard for being rash, for being conceited, and for being promiscuous.

Otto felt much more at ease with Gilbert de la Porrée. Gilbert, to a large degree, fulfilled Otto's concept of the ideal philosopher. Otto's representation of Gilbert centered around his controversy with Bernard of Clairvaux at the Council of Reims in 1148. There are three records of this trial, Otto's, John of Salisbury's, and Geoffrey of Auxerre's. Geoffrey of Auxerre presents the case against Gilbert while Otto of Freising and John of Salisbury are more in Gilbert's favor.^{227} Otto's account is not first hand as he was on the Cru-

^{225}ibid., p. 88. Book I, Chap. LI.


sade at the time, and John of Salisbury did not write his account until years after the trial. All three accounts agree for the most part, but each interprets Gilbert's ideas according to his own understanding of Gilbert's thought.

Otto made it very obvious to the reader when dealing with Gilbert that he had been in no way guilty of the vices practiced by Abelard. Otto specifically stated that Abelard and Gilbert were not of "like material." In fact, Gilbert represented to Otto a philosopher who was successfully fulfilling his raison d'etre. Note how Otto's representation of Gilbert diametrically opposes that he presented of Abelard.

Gilbert from his youth subjected himself to the instruction of great men and put more confidence in the weight of their authority than in his own intellect: such men as, first, Hilary of Poitiers; next, Bernard of Chartres; finally, the brothers Anselm and Ralph of Laon. From them he had secured not a superficial, but a solid education, not snatching his hand quickly from under the ferule. His moral sense and the seriousness of his intellectual attainments; he had applied his mind not to jesting and jokes but to serious matters.

---

229 Otto, Gesta, p. 88. Book I, Chap. LII.
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It is evident that Gilbert had the virtues Otto required of the ideal philosopher: respect for authority based on a humble attitude toward his own philosophical ability, and a fine moral sense which met the ethical requirements of the philosopher.

After making his readers well aware that Gilbert was an exemplary philosopher, Otto went on to relate how he came to be on trial and thus associated, in a sense, with Abelard.

While this man on a certain occasion was conducting a great gathering of the clergy of his diocese, he included in the address that he happened to be delivering for the purpose of exhortation certain remarks on faith in the Holy Trinity. Two of his archdeacons, namely, Arnold and Kalo, protested, summoning him to an examination before the supreme pontiff and the see of Rome as teaching a doctrine contrary to the accepted belief of the Catholic Church.\footnote{Otto, \textit{Gesta}, p. 82. Book I, Chap. XLVIII.}

The accusations by Arnold and Kalo were given more prominence when they approached St. Bernard of Clairvaux and induced him to favor their cause against Gilbert.\footnote{ibid.}

Otto is acknowledge by modern scholars as having had the best understanding of Gilbert's teachings in comparison to his contemporaries. Otto felt that
Gilbert was misunderstood.\textsuperscript{233}

Both in fact and in name he had performed the function of a teacher, and shortly before these days had been elevated to the dignity of bishop in the aforesaid city. He was accustomed by virtue of his exceedingly subtle intellect and acute powers of reason to say many things beyond the common custom of men.\textsuperscript{234}

Gilbert's teachings had been misunderstood not only to common men, but also those of subtle intellect. Otto went on to say of Gilbert that "... he was dignified in bearing and utterance, as he showed himself to be serious in behavior so was his speech difficult, and what he means was never clear to childlike minds, scarcely even to men of education and learning."\textsuperscript{235} Otto's contention that Gilbert was misunderstood by those making charges against him has been upheld by the most recent scholars into the matter. Nicholas M. Höring points out that Gilbert's word usage was at variance with that commonly used in the twelfth century. Gilbert's grammatical construction and word order in sen-

\textsuperscript{233}Williams, p. 124.
\textsuperscript{234}Otto, Gesta, p. 82. Book I, Chap. XLVIII.
\textsuperscript{235}ibid., p. 88. Book I, Chap. LII.
tences were uncommon for the period. This uncommon usage of words coupled with the complicated philosophic propositions that Gilbert held were responsible for much of the misunderstanding of his doctrines.

After presenting Gilbert to his readers as an exemplary person, Otto went on to deal with St. Bernard of Clairvaux's opposition to Gilbert. Otto had direct personal contact with Bernard; he knew this man well.

The relations of our bishop-historian to St. Bernard of Clairvaux should have been the closest, but they must seem very strange. The two churchmen were members of the same Order, they corresponded with a third illustrious Cistercian of that day, Pope Eugene III, and they met repeatedly at the General Chapters, for Otto continued even as bishop to follow monastic observances.

Otto says of Bernard:

Now the aforesaid abbot [Bernard] was both zealous in his devotion to the Christian religion and somewhat credulous in consequence of a habitual muddiness, so that he had an abhorrence of teachers who put their trust in worldly wisdom and clung too much to human argument. If anything at variance with the Christian faith were told him concerning anybody, he would readily


\[237\] Fellner, p. 166.
give ear. Thus it happened that not long before this, silence had been imposed upon Peter Abelard, first by the bishops of France, afterward by the Roman pontiff.  

Gilbert's trial readily points out his humility and willingness to accept authority. Gilbert expressed his willingness to conform to the doctrines of the Church. Gilbert had been charged with four heretical doctrines. According to Otto these were:

... concerning the divine majesty, to wit: that he asserted that the divine essence is not God; that the properties of persons are not the persons themselves; that persons in a theological sense are not predicated in any proposition; that the divine nature did not become flesh.

After reporting at length the council proceedings Otto concluded by noting how Gilbert fared on the charges against him.

No definite conclusions could be reached about the first three articles. And no wonder. For in the fourth article Bishop Gilbert did not differ much from the others, since they acknowledged that the nature became flesh, but in the Son, whereas he said that the person of the Son became flesh, but not without his nature. What defini-

---

238 Otto, Gesta, p. 88. Book I, Chap. XLIX.
239 Ibid., p. 82. Book I, Chap. LII.
tion could they reach concerning the predication of the persons, when they did not consider his usage—what he termed "using the word, of course, in its proper sense"—at variance with other teachers, even in natural matters? Concerning properties, whether they are part of the person, both for the aforesaid cause and for theological theories which are held here and there, a decision was withheld. Only concerning the first point did the Roman pontiff determine that in theology no interpretation should make a distinction between nature and person, and that God should be referred to as divine essence not only in the relationship expressed by the ablative case but also in that of the nominative. Whence up to the present time the more reliable disciples of that bishop maintain that reason may there make not a logical distinction but only a verbal one.

But the bishop, accepting with due reverence the aforesaid utterance of the supreme pontiff, having become reconciled with his archdeacons, returned to his own diocese with his episcopal status unimpaired and in the fulness of honor.

After concluding with his presentation of the trial Otto reiterated his unwillingness to judge the matter.

Whether the aforesaid abbot of Clairvaux in consequence of the frailty of

---

240 John of Salisbury reports that none of Gilbert's four propositions were condemned. See John of Salisbury, Memories of the Papal Court, p. 25.

241 That is, both are true, God is by divine essence and God is divine essence.

242 Otto, Gesta, p. 100-02. Book I, Chap. LXI.
human weakness, being a mere man, was deceived in this matter, or the bishop, being a very learned gentleman, escaped the condemnation of the Church by shrewdly concealing his view, it is not our task to discuss or to decide. For that holy and wise men, hampered by corruptible flesh, are frequently deceived in such matters is proved by both modern and ancient examples. For, not to mention the instance (which the blessed Gregory cites) of holy David, on whom the Spirit of the Lord is said to have come—as he was returning to his native land, from which he had been expelled by his son, he was taken unawares by the servant of Mephibosheth, who came to meet him with gifts. In Christian times the blessed Epiphanius, bishop of Salimis in Cyprus, a man of such notable sanctity that he even restored a dead person to life, could yet be so violently incited by his foes against John Chrysostom, whose memory flourishes in the Church today, that beyond avoiding him in his own city and being unwilling to communicate with him, he even aroused against him, to the best of his ability, the very people who had been entrusted to him. This incident, taken from the Tripartite History, has been more fully related in our earlier account. So much for that. 

It can not help but be noted that the example he gave us of one being deceived seems to conform more to the person of Bernard of Clairvaux than that of Gilbert de la Porée.

Otto's support of Gilbert must have caused him some doubts. On his deathbed Otto made note that his

\[243\text{ibid., p. 101.}\]
support of Gilbert was not meant to contradict the Church and that he accepted the faith taught by the Catholic Church. Rahewin depicted Otto's deathbed scene as follows:

When Otto learned from the reports and warnings of certain clerics that his death had been revealed to them, in visions or in dreams, he saluted his brethren with sincere brotherly love and bade them farewell. Then he set forth to attend the Cistercian chapter general, and being long since exhausted by his weakness and his bodily ailment, though as yet his friends who were with him had no anxiety about him, after a wearisome journey he arrived at the aforesaid monastery of Morimond. There he lay in bed for several days, and having now no doubt that he was at the point of death, when he had been anointed with the consecrated oil, as is the custom, and had disposed of his estate in a proper will, he gave instructions, among other dispositions wherein he anxiously made provision for his soul's salvation, that this present book should be placed in his hands. He then entrusted it to learned and pious men, that if he seemed to have said anything in favor of the views of Master Gilbert (as expressed in the preceding books) which might offend anyone, it might be corrected in accordance with their decision, and he declared himself to be an adherent of the Catholic faith in accordance with the rule of the Holy Roman—and truly the universal—Church. Then, after first acknowledging his sins with great contrition of heart and humble confession, he received the very holy sacrament and, in the midst of a great company of holy men, both bishops
and abbots, he gave back his spirit to the Lord.\textsuperscript{244}

Thus, the raison d’être of the ideal philosopher was to reach Truth, Wisdom, God, by the use of reason which did not lose its integrity to revelation. Otto himself met the demands he made of the ideal philosopher. Otto performed the functions of the philosopher as did Gilbert de la Porrée whom he admired. According to Otto the functions of the ideal philosopher were twofold: defense of the faith by the use of reason; and the instruction of the faithful by making apparent the reasonableness of faith. Both these functions, Otto thought, are means to lead men to God and salvation. Both Gilbert and Otto himself possessed the virtues Otto felt were required by the philosopher: a respect for authority based on humility, and an ability to admit error, and moderation in social entertainment so that one’s philosophical accomplishments are not belittled by one’s actions.

\textsuperscript{244}Ibid., pp. 247-48. Book IV, Chap. XIV.
From Otto of Freising's concept of the ideal historian, ruler, and philosopher there emerges his doctrine of man. In all the above, Otto considered as of prime importance the relationship of the individual to God. For Otto, man is understood in relation to God because God is his ultimate cause and his final end. Thus, Otto would evaluate not only men with the vocations with which we have dealt, but all men, no matter what vocation, in terms of their relation to the principal being, God. He would have all men realize that their essential nature is to be an image of God; . . . . the more man's intellectual and vocational activities allow that highest object of knowledge and love which is God, the more man has fulfilled his essential humanity.

In all instances Otto viewed society as corporate. Otto's prerequisite to man's happiness consists in active participation in the enjoyment of the benefits of peace, order, and justice as maintained by the community and the state. Maintaining this state is based on the recognition that the hope of man's finding happiness and salvation depends upon God. Only
in and through a relation of charity toward God and the community can the individual hope to realize his nature and live according to God's precepts.

What Otto required of his ideal historian, philosopher, and ruler is that they serve and love God, and serve and love man out of the love of God. The ultimate purpose being to further one's own salvation and the salvation of others.

No doubt Otto's fondness for St. Augustine led him to read these words from the *City of God*, which aptly sum up his desire for man.

The peace of body and soul is the well ordered and harmonious life and health of the living creature. Peace between man and God is the well ordered obedience of faith to eternal law. Peace between man and man is well ordered concord . . . . The peace of the celestial city is the perfectly ordered and harmonious enjoyment of God and of one another in God. The peace of all things is the tranquility of order.245

Otto's ideal historian, philosopher, and ruler all had their individual functions and virtues, but their raison d'être were all the same: the service of God and the service of man out of the

love of God so that in the end, salvation would be, with the help of grace, within reach.
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